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Abstract
This study is a thorough philological investigation of the ancient Egyptian word $\overline{\text{c3w}}$ (usually transliterated $\overline{c}$ in Old and Middle Egyptian texts and $\overline{3c}$ in Late Egyptian). The approach is diachronic, with consideration of the various manifestations of the word over more than three thousand years; all known occurrences are examined. The etymology is determined, its meaning is discussed, and its semantic development traced. Historical linguistic technique is employed to reconstruct the vocalization of the word and demonstrate its phonetic development. Evidence for differential development in the pre-Coptic dialectal forms is adduced. Phonetically similar words are introduced for comparative purposes, and much use is made of the vocabulary of Coptic. Lexicographical research is carried out on many ancient Egyptian terms. The methodology also requires the pursuit of questions of Egyptian phonology, orthography, and paleography. All the contexts of the word are presented, in order to ascertain the full range of its application and associations. Relevant non-linguistic factors—the associated artistic representations, and the distribution of the references—are introduced in conjunction with the textual material. In its literal meaning the word $\overline{\text{c3w}}$ means “babbler” in reference to humans and “brayer” in reference to donkeys (the word normally transliterated $\overline{c3}$). In its extended meaning, the word means “interpreter” when applied to Egyptians and “Egyptianized Nubian” (Nubian in Egyptian service) when applied to foreigners. In the conclusions, the historical and social implications of the usage of the term are reevaluated in the light of this new understanding of it.
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GENERAL INDEX

Abu Rawash, 57, 67; nn. 9, 980
Abusir, 58
Abydos, 2, 55, 67, 68; nn. 832, 1037
Afroasiatic, 13
Alliteration, 22, 49; nn. 182, 253, 262
Amarna, 20
"Amduat," 2, 10, 88
Armant, 89, 92
Asiatics, 58, 59, 67, 68, 70, 74, 85, 86, 92; nn. 828, 860, 862, 869, 877, 878, 955, 991, 1015, 1158, 1159
Aswan, 67, 68, 81, 91; nn. 896, 961
Asyut, 81
Aton, n. 1201
Bir Menih, 56
"Book of Caverns," 35
"Book of the Divine Cow," n. 262
"Book of Gates," n. 1202
Buhen, 85, 89
Byblos, 58, 68, 91, 92; n. 968
boat, 68
C-Group, 72; n. 1004
Consonants, doubled
single writing of, 13, 14, 21, 23
Contraction, 47, 48
Dahshur, 55, 57, 61, 67, 69, 71, 72, 91; nn. 829, 850
Dendera, 67, 77, 82, 83, 91; n. 1004

Determinatives
  importance of, 18, 21, 31, 32, (34), 35, 36, 38, 39; nn. 215, 1185

Dialects, 28, 42; nn. 106, 140, 142, 258

Dissimilation, 17; n. 194

"Donkey Curse," 34, 48-49

Elephantine, 67, 68, 81, 91

"Execheon Texts," nn. 1014, 1015, 1016

Eye of Horus, 65

Gebelein, 67, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 89, 91, 92; nn. 1012, 1031, 1070, 1071, 1076, 1078

Gebel el-Hammam, 54

Gebel el-Mueilha, 54

Giza, 57, 64, 67, 70, 71; nn. 832, 980, 1014

Hatnub, 68, 81

Hefau, 89

Helwan, n. 982

Hermonthis, 89

Hindallab, 54

Ibhat, 68

Illahun, 70

Israel
  stele of, 87; n. 24

Iumiteru, 89

Kush, 89

Late Egyptian
  definition of, 14, 36-37

Lebanon, n. 1174
Libyans, 62, 74

"Litany of the Sun," 21, 28, 30; n. 340

Magharah, 55, 57, 85

Medik, 85; n. 1143

Medinet Habu, 5, 32, 34

Memphis, 67, 70, 72; n. 832

Metathesis, 7, 46-47; nn. 331, 376, 614, 618, 619, 624, 632, 636, 656, 662
  graphic, 4, 7, 31, 39; nn. 65, 88, 172, 291, 354, 401

Middle Egyptian
  definition of, 10

Mo'alla, 32, 34, 77, 81, 91; n. 1072

Month, Lord of Hermouthis, 89

Naqada, 2, 55, 67

Naga el-Mashayikh, 86; n. 24

Nebwenenef, 2

Nubia(n), 62, 67, 68, 69-70, 71, 72-73, 74, 75, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82
  83, 85, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92; nn. 850, 857, 892, 896, 948, 949, 952,
  968, 977, 982, 998, 1002, 1004, 1007, 1008, 1012, 1014, 1048, 1049,
  1052, 1071, 1076, 1078, 1092, 1099, 1127, 1172, 1205
  artifacts, 72; nn. 1004, 1012
  language, 74; n. 896

Onomatopoeia, 74, 75; n. 262

"Opening of the Mouth," 65

Panehesy, Viceroy of Kush, 89, 92

Pathyris, 89

Punt/Puntite, 68, 91; n. 982

Qubbet el-Hawa, 51, 58, 72, 85; nn. 1090. 1092

Rizaqat, n. 1070

Rod el-Air, 85
Sahure, 58-61, 75-76, 90, 92; n. 955
Saqqara, 2, 55-56, 57, 64, 67, 77; n. 832
Sarenput I, n. 1145
Sarenput II, n. 961
Semna, 80, 89
Sennefer, 86; n. 53
Serabit el-Khadim, 85
Sinai, 55, 57, 67, 68, 85, 86, 91, 92; nn. 53, 860, 1015, 1174
Sneferu, 71, 91; nn. 968, 1012, 1016
Sobek of Sunenu, 89
Southern Upper Egypt, 67, 77, 81, 91; nn. 833, 834
Spelling
   historical and phonetic, 9, 15, 19, 29, 30, 31, 40; nn. 268, 340
Sumenu, 89
Syria/Syrian, 58, 61; nn. 860, 862, 864, 867, 880
Thebes, 2, 3, 77, 79, 81, 86, 87, 91, 92
Thinis
   nome of, 83; n. 949
Thoth, 88
Tjanefer, 3
Tomas, 52, 57, 68; nn. 882, 1143
Tonqala, 53
Wadi Atilla, 55
Wadi Beiza, 86
Wadi el-Allaqi, 53, 68
Wadi el-Arab 53
Wadi el-Hudi, 85; n. 1143
Wadi Hamama, 55, 68

Wadi Hammamat, 2, 54, 86; nn. 882, 961
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RANKS AND TITLES

\( \text{išk histributed, n. 1014} \)

\( \text{ncw}, 57, 64; \text{nn. 855, 1030} \)

\( \text{imi-r nncw}, 51-56, 61-62, 75-78, 82-83, 85; \text{nn. 53, 55, 798, 831, 882, 1033} \)

\( \text{imi-r3 wpwnt}, 57; \text{nn. 847, 976, 980} \)

\( \text{imi-r3 phww}, 57 \)

\( \text{3mi-r3 mšc}, 51, 53, 77, 78, 82; \text{nn. 717, 726, 1032} \)

\( \text{imi-r3 h₃swt}, 52-53, 77; \text{nn. 1035, 1145} \)

\( \text{imi-r3 h₃swt nḥwnt}, 51; \text{n. 1145} \)

\( \text{3mi-r5 h₃swt nḥwnt niwt Tp-rši}, 51 \)

\( \text{imi-r3 šnwt}, \text{n. 1014} \)

\( \text{imi-h₃t}, 56; \text{n. 839} \)

\( \text{imi-h₃t nncw}, 56, 57; \text{nn. 855, 1029} \)

\( \text{šr nḥ-šwt}, \text{n. 976} \)

\( \text{ḥr νn-šwt}, \text{n. 976} \)

\( \text{ḥr npt}, \text{n. 1208} \)

\( \text{ḥr}, \text{56} \)

\( \text{ḥr nncw}, 56-57, 61; \text{nn. 840, 980, 1020, 1029} \)

\( \text{ḥr nṣnt}, \text{n. 56} \)

\( \text{ḥr ntc}, \text{n. 56} \)

\( \text{ḥr ntc nncw}, 52, 56, 57; \text{n. 1029} \)

\( \text{ḥr ntc}, \text{86} \)

\( \text{āmr}, \text{n. 850} \)
\[
\text{\textbf{PERSONAL NAMES}}
\]

\(^{13}\text{d-w}^{13}\text{-y}, 52, 54; \text{nn. 753, 776}
\]

\(^{11}\text{lw-r$\#$-f} (?), 52, 57
\]

\(^{*}\text{lw-hn$^c$-f}, n. 155
\]

\(^{13}\text{cw}, 38, 86
\]

\(^{11}\text{t}\text{iti-f: M}$\text{hw-}$\text{t}, 51, 53
\]

\text{c3$\text{yr}$, n. 87
\]

\text{cnh-t$\text{f}$, 52, 55, 68; n. 819
\]

\text{cnhty-fy}, 32, 34, 77, 81; n. 952, 1033
\]

\text{Mr}$\text{n}$, 53, 62, 68, 69, 73; n. 10, 786, 828, 832, 850, 888, 892, 948
\]

\text{Pipi-nhtw: I}$\text{3k-ib}, 52, 53, 68; n. 728, 1002, 1014
\]

\text{Mrri = M}$\text{rrri-ikr}, 77, 82, 83; n. 10, 1042, 1119
\]

\text{N}$\text{ht-}$\text{I}$\text{3k}, n. 726
\]

\text{Rnpt-nfrt}, n. 55
\]

\text{Hrw-hw$\text{i}$-f}, 51; nn. 10, 850, 892, 949
\]

\text{H}$\text{k}$\text{3-ib, n. 726
\]

\text{Hwi-N}$\text{hu}$\text{šiw}, 71
\]

\text{Hwi-n$^e$, n. 751
\]

\text{Ś}$\text{b}$\text{.n}$\text{i} (the son of M}$\text{hw-}$\text{t}, 51, 62, 73; n. 724, 857
§3b·n-š (the son of Pipi-nhti), 52; nn. 858, 894, 916, 961, 1026
Sty-kš-š, 81
Kš-š-m-šn-š:šn, 52, 54
Titš, n. 759, 762
Dmš, 77, 78, 79, 80

GEOGRAPHIC AND ETHNIC TERMS
Bbw, n. 1100
'Imš, 91; nn. 773, 850
'Imtš, 77, 83
'lmš, 55, 57, 61; n. 773
'lmšn, 53, 55, 61, 62; nn. 773, 892, 949
'Iršt, 53, 55, 57, 61, 62; n. 850
'Itnw, n. 263
'Itnw, n. 263, 1158
Cšm/Cšmt, 85; nn. 960, 966, 1007, 1015, 1158
Wšššt, 53, 58, 62, 68, 78, 79, 81, 82; nn. 858, 916, 1026, 1048, 1052, 1069
Wššštšw, 78, 79; nn. 949, 1071
Wššt, nn. 949, 1069
Mšš, 55, 57, 61, 62, 87; n. 850
Mšššw, 80, 87; nn. 287, 949, 1067, 1127
Nššš, 58, 62, 69, 70-71, 72, 73, 80, 83, 87; nn. 892, 982, 1008, 1012, 1014, 1047, 1080, 1127, 1205
Nššš-brpw, 61-2, 69, 70-71, 72, 73; n. 1127
Rššw, 85, 86, nn. 263, 494, 1158, 1174
Hšššš, n. 1158
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\( \text{i} \text{cn}^{1} \), "baboon," 8, 9, 14; nn. 172, 262, 530

\( \text{i} \text{cn}^{2} \), "baboon" (fem.), n. 262

\( \text{i} \text{cn}^{3} \), n. 262

\( \text{i} \text{cn}^{4} \), "baboon," 8, 14; nn. 95, 172, 211

\( \text{(i)} \text{cn}^{5} \) = \( \text{i} \text{cn}^{3} \wedge \), n. 262

\( \text{i} \text{cn}^{6} \), "baboon," 18; n. 262

\( \text{(i)} \text{cn}^{7} \) = \( \text{i} \text{cn}^{5} \), n. 262

\( \text{i} \text{cn}^{8} \), "baboon," 18; n. 172

\( \text{i} \text{cn}^{9} \), "baboon," 18; n. 172

\( \text{i} \text{cn}^{10} \), "baboon," 18

\( \text{i} \text{cn}^{11} \), "baboon," 8, 9, 14; nn. 172, 262

\( \text{i} \text{cr} \), 21-25, 28, 36; nn. 251, 253, 258-60, 268, 287, 297, 331, 340

\( \text{i} \text{cr} \), "tomb," 21, 23, 37; nn. 280, 281, 285, 343, 369

\( \text{i} \text{cr} \), "stairs," nn. 279, 343

\( \text{i} \text{cr} \), "ladder," nn. 279, 343

\( \text{i} \text{cr}^{1} \), n. 251

\( \text{i} \text{cr}^{2} \), 23, 28, nn. 270, 339

\( \text{iw}^{\text{cyt}} \), 31; n. 386

\( \text{iw}^{\text{pyt}} \), n. 263

\( \text{in}^{1} \text{/in}^{2} \text{c} \), n. 262

\( \text{inh} \), 15; n. 169

\( \text{irt}^{\text{w}r} \), 64

\( \text{ib}^{1} \), 46-47; n. 613

\( \text{ibr} \), n. 263

\( \ast \text{c} = \text{i} \text{c}^{3} \wedge \), 1, 8, 75-76; nn. 1, 39, 55, 857

\( \ast \text{c}^{2} = \text{i} \text{c}^{3} \wedge \), 4, 8; n. 55
c3c, 31, 36-37; nn. 376, 530

c3c, 5, 32-39, 49

c3c[v], 32; nn. 386, 401, 530

c3w, "linen," 46-47; n. 621

c1, "cup," 29-30, 36

c1, "arm," n. 362

cy, nn. 362, 386

cc = c3c, n. 419

cc3w, 8, 10-14, 30, 36, 40, 88; n. 118

cc1/ccw, 36, 38; n. 480

ccw, 11, 13-14, 17, 30, 35-36, 40, 88

ccwy, 19, 36; n. 386

ccny, "baboon," 18

ccn, "baboon," 8, 14, 15, 17; n. 172

ccn(c), "baboon," n. 211

*cw = lc3w, 8; n. 53

ccn, n. 262

ccn = ccnl, n. 262

ccn/cnct = inc/inct, n. 262

ccn, n. 262

ccn, 15; n. 169

*c = lc, n. 251

*cet = lc, 22, 24-25

wpl, 88; n. 1201

whe, 87 (twice); n. 1185

wsh, n. 262
b3š-mcfi, 6; n. 74
b3k, 78, 80; nn. 1047, 1069
b3, 65; n. 924
bd, n. 358
p5, n. 172
pwy, n. 162
fcwt, "hair," 46, n. 634
m3št, 6
miwt, 47-48
m3nh, 17
minht/minhty, 16; nn. 174, 189
mcfwct, 15, 47-48
mçnn, n. 262
mçnht, "a staff," 16, n. 182
mçnht, "pendant," 16, n. 175
mçbçw, 15, 47
mšhm, 64; n. 928
mšhtiw, 65; n. 924
mtwt, 34; n. 441
nbwi/y, nn. 55, 798
ntnt, n. 930
ntnt, n. 930
nttît, 64; n. 928
ntri, 65; n. 923
rcw, 22; n. 253
rpyt, n. 263
rtb, n. 263

bf3w/bf3wt, 46; nn. 540, 591, 612

hmwr, 77, 83-84; n. 1131

bn, 18

śc, 22-24, 86; nn. 249, 259, 279, 1177

śr, n. 262

śi, n. 262

śwśt, n. 262

śwśt, n. 262

śmr/śmi, n. 262

śi, n. 262

śimi, n. 262

ś3śtyw, 83; n. 1122

śmr, n. 262

śi, n. 262

śc, 350

ścwt, n. 350

śśśw, nn. 540, 594

kni, n. 262

kris, 23; nn. 287, 594, 619

ti, n. 762

tf3/tf3, n. 65

tzi, n. 387

tsw, 83; n. 1120

dmr/dm3, 24; n. 262
INDEX OF SELECTED HIEROGLYPHIC SIGNS

A  2: 38; mn. 40, 908
D  6: nn. 215, 389
F 18: nn. 22, 908
G 14 = mwt/miwt: n. 654
M 24/25/26: n. 961
O 29: 4, 39
S 12: n. 55
S 24: 83; n. 1119
S 25: 4, 5, 6, 7; mn. 8, 10, 16, 20, 40, 55, 827
S 34: nn. 182, 861
S 38: n. 726
S 40: n. 182
T  3: n. 850
T 14: nn. 22, 755, 908, 1048
U 23: n. 850
V 23/22: n. 961
W 24 = nw/nîw: n. 262
X  2: n. 762
Y  5 = mn/min: n. 16
Aa 2: 84

xviii
INDEX OF EGYPTIAN ORTHOGRAPHY

\[ \text{\textcircled{1}} = \text{\textcircled{3}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{1}}, \ 15 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{2}} = \text{\textcircled{3}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{2}}, \ 15, \ 33; \ 	ext{n.} \ 412 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{3}} = \text{\textcircled{4}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{3}}, \ 14-15, \ 36-37; \ 	ext{nn.} \ 172, \ 189, \ 299 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{4}} = (\text{\textcircled{5}}) \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{4}}, \ 15; \ 	ext{n.} \ 419 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{5}} = \text{\textcircled{3}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{5}}, \ 15 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{6}} = \text{\textcircled{1}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{6}} \ (\text{before \textcircled{1}}), \ 15; \ 	ext{nn.} \ 172, \ 273 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{7}} = \text{\textcircled{1}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{7}} \ (\text{before \textcircled{1}}), \ 15-16 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{8}} = \text{\textcircled{1}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{8}} \ (\text{before \textcircled{1}}), \ 15 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{9}} = \text{\textcircled{1}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{9}}, \ 15 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{10}} = \text{\textcircled{3}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{10}}, \ 15; \ 	ext{n.} \ 160 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{11}} = \text{\textcircled{1}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{11}}, \ 15; \ 	ext{n.} \ 361 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{12}} = \text{\textcircled{3}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{12}}, \ 15; \ 	ext{nn.} \ 172, \ 361 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{13}} = \text{\textcircled{3}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{13}}, \ 15 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{14}} = \text{\textcircled{3}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{14}}, \ 15 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{15}} = \text{\textcircled{3}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{15}}, \ 15; \ 	ext{n.} \ 350 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{16}} = \text{\textcircled{3}} \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{16}}, \ 15 \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{17}} = (\text{\textcircled{5}}) \rightarrow \text{\textcircled{17}}, \ 15 \]
INDEX OF EGYPTIAN PHONOLOGY

/ʔ/, assimilation of, nn. 212, 337, 376, 619

\(\mathbb{A} > /ʔ/\), 20, 33, 36-37, 42; nn. 140, 235, 318, 413, 552, 619, 654, 705

\(\mathbb{A} \equiv \text{Semitic } /ʔ/\), n. 140

\(\mathbb{A} (= /ʔ/) > \_\), 14, 36; nn. 140, 172, 413

\(\mathbb{A} \equiv \_\), 14, 17-18, 21; nn. 65, 140

\(\mathbb{A} > Υ, 33, 42; \) nn. 140, 172, 376, 412, 619, 623

\(\mathbb{A} > \mathbb{E}/l/\), 14

\(\mathbb{A} (= /ʔ/) > \_\), 33, 42-43; nn. 140, 376, 386

\(\mathbb{A} (= /ʔ/) \equiv /r/\_l/, 13, 20; \) nn. 140, 235, 419, 705

\(\mathbb{A} \equiv \text{Semitic } /r/\_l/, 13; \) n. 753

\(\_\) = /ʔ/, 20, 37; nn. 140, 318, 331, 552, 615, 619, 654, 661

\(\_\) = /ʔ/, n. 140

\(\_\) (= /ʔ/) > \_ (before h), 8-10, 14-15, 17, 20-21, 23, 36; nn. 118, 140, 172, 225, 246, 268, 273, 376

\(\_\) (= /ʔ/) > \_ (before h), 15-16, n. 107

\(\_\) \equiv Υ, 29, 42; nn. 140, 331, 661

\(\_\) \equiv \text{Semitic } /y/\), n. 140

\(\_\) > \mathbb{E}/l/, 14

\(\_\) = /r/-, nn. 253, 263

\(\_\) \equiv \text{Semitic } /l/, n. 261

\(\_\) \equiv \text{Semitic } /y/, n. 140

\(\_\) > /ʔ/, 37, 42-43, 45; nn. 318, 552, 619

\(\_\) > \(\mathbb{A} (= /ʔ/)\), 14, 15, 17, 36, 37; n. 172

xx
c > i ( = /p/), 37, 172, 194

c > i ( = /p/)(before h), 10, 15, 17-18; nn. 169, 331, 332, 660

c ( = /p/) > n (after n), 18

c = voiced counterpart of h, 17

c = cuneiform h ( = /w/), n. 196

w, expressed by plural strokes, 21, 36, 49; nn. 53, 248, 469, 691

w > /p/, nn. 635, 638

w ≡ - i, nn. 253, 471

w ≡ - y, nn. 127, 172

r > i, 8, 13-15, 22-24; nn. 251, 259, 260

r > y, n. 259

n, double writing of, n. 262

/1/ ≡ r, 22; nn. 258, 260

/1/ = ʃ r, n. 419

/1/ > i, nn. 260, 261

/1/ = θ, n. 419
COPTIC INDEX

Delta, n. 376
DAE, 22, 24-28; nn. 251, 254, 306, 307, 331
DARK, n. 362
LAE, 28; n. 331
LAM, n. 552
BW, n. 552
BUTE, n. 362
EBIW, n. 552
EOOY, 46; n. 615
EPE, 45-46
EXW, n. 552
HI, n. 362
*ELA, n. 540
ELW, 46
ELW, 40-45, 47
*ELW, 43
EIDDY, 46
KU, 552
KC, nn. 594, 619
KOEP, n. 331
MAEIN, 25
MICE, n. 632
MAJ, 48; n. 655

xxii
xxiii

mday, 47
mooy, 46
mrday, 47
maaxe, 619
nay, 47
nay, 47; n. 572
naxpe, n. 619
oep, n. 331
cw, n. 552
cbpe, n. 632
cnay, 47
cwmt, 25
coop, n. 332
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PREFACE

The relationship which existed between Ancient Egypt and Nubia (the area of southernmost modern Egypt and the northern Sudan) was especially close. The inhospitable deserts flanking the Nile Valley provided a natural barrier isolating Egypt from most of her neighbors, but the river served as a direct link between Egypt and Nubia. The Old Kingdom Egyptians adopted an aggressive policy toward the South, seeking to dominate it for the security of their own frontier; they were also eager to exploit its natural resources and to acquire the other valuable raw materials which could be obtained there. Expeditions were regularly sent out to pursue these aims; their armed escorts dealt with any local opposition. At the same time Nubians are also known to have come to Egypt, either as prisoners of war or voluntarily. At least some of them were settled in Egypt; they served the Egyptians, and even accompanied expeditions to their former homeland.

The present dissertation is an attempt to elucidate some of the details of this relationship for the Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period (down to the end of the third millennium B.C.). The genesis of this study is to be found in a term paper prepared for Ahmed Fakhry when he was Visiting Professor of Egyptology in the Oriental Studies Department of the University of Pennsylvania. Inasmuch as the history of Egypt and Nubia is also of special interest to Professor David O'Connor, he encouraged me to pursue this topic.
All valid historical research must be grounded in sound philology, and the need for this particular study became clear when it emerged that the meaning of an especially important word for the history of Egypt and Nubia was not yet known. The word, traditionally transliterated $\text{C}$ in Old Egyptian and $\text{CC}$ in Late Egyptian, occurs in rock inscriptions found in Nubia; and it is elsewhere found in connection with Nubians. The recent controversy over the term has concentrated on two proposed translations: 1) "foreign mercenary troops" and 2) "interpreters." Certainly this is not one of the common Egyptian designations for foreigners in general: e.g., $\text{hjstiw}$, "desert dwellers," and $\text{pdt}$, "bowmen"; while other special words are used to describe the Nubians ($\text{Nhsw}$) and other mercenary troops (e.g., $\text{SrDn}$, the "Sherden"). Another verb is also used in connection with translation: $\text{wbC}$, "to loosen, unravel, explain, or interpret." What then is the real meaning of $\text{C/CC}$, and what distinguishes its sense from the other words mentioned here? The historical implications of the possible existence of "foreign mercenary troops" serving the Egyptians in Nubia are quite significant. Who were these foreigners? Where did they come from? How were they recruited? To what extent did they become "Egyptianized"—i.e., indistinguishable from Egyptians? Or are we rather dealing here with a large corps of Egyptian (or other) "interpreters"?

The methodology applied to this problem requires that all the related material from all periods be considered so that the full range of associations and usages of this term can be determined. Indeed, we must be sure that we are dealing with a single term, and exactly what
that term is. In this we encounter several difficulties. The Egyptian
script is not purely phonetic: individual words, rather than sounds,
are written schematically; vowels are not indicated. The relationship
between phonetically written words and their traditionally written
equivalents is not always readily apparent. Important phonetic
changes in the spoken language are not generally reflected in the
written language. In addition, the consonants Є, Ѕ, Ы, Є, and w
are to a certain extent mutable and interchangeable, further compli-
cating recognition of relationships. In this case, the parallel
developments observable in the word ЄЄЄн>ЄЄЄнa, "baboon"—containing
as it does one immutable and three mutable consonants—are extremely
informative.

The full reading of this word—actually ЄЄЄw—may be ascertained by
a comparison of all the variant spellings. For this the traditional
Egyptological transliteration system has been employed. However,
some of these symbols are ambiguous in regard to the phonetic value
which they represent, as the following developments and equivalences
show:

>/?/  /?/  /?/  Є

Є, Ѕ, Ы, Є, /?/ > Є, Є > /?/, -w ≡ -y. The phonetic
values of these symbols have been determined by comparative linguistics
applied to the Afroasiatic language family of which ancient Egyptian
is a part. The particular value intended in each case must be
decided on an individual basis until some general principles may be
laid down. As an aid in visualizing the phonetic processes at work,
recourse is had to linguistic reconstruction to deduce the theoretical pronunciation of ancient Egyptian words. Thus, the phonetic developments which they underwent, and which are only imperfectly recorded in their written forms, may be more readily understood. The principles of this procedure are well established, though the details may yet be further refined.

In this way all the forms of $\mathcal{C}_3$ may be identified, and the etymologically unrelated words may be excluded from consideration of its meaning and semantic developments. For this it is necessary to investigate the origins of all the phonetically similar words which may be written $\mathcal{C}_3$ in Late Egyptian. In certain cases, only the generic determinative of the word permits the identification of its root with any degree of probability. However, these determinatives are also subject to a certain amount of confusion. The orthographic similarities of these and certain other words (e.g., those written $\mathcal{C}_3(w)$ and $\mathcal{C}_3(=)$ must be taken into account and considered carefully.

In the course of this study, the etymology of the related word "donkey" (also to be read $\mathcal{C}_3$) becomes important for determining the meaning of the root $\mathcal{C}_3$. Once the spelling variants, phonetic developments, and root meaning of the word $\mathcal{C}_3$ have been determined, it is necessary to discover how the word is used and what it really means each time it is used. For this the contexts of the word $\mathcal{C}_3$ must be examined, with careful attention paid to any depictions accompanying the texts in which it appears, as well as their distribution pattern.
The results obtained from the Old Kingdom are confirmed by those of the First Intermediate Period, as well as the later occurrences. The word originally meaning "babbler" when applied to humans and "brayer" when used of donkeys, comes to mean "interpreter" in reference to Egyptians and "Egyptianized Nubians" (i.e., Nubians in Egyptian service, not necessarily totally acculturated) in reference to Nubians. Now we are able to recognize in the ḫṣw-foreigners the Nubians so well known to us from the many contemporary references to them, so that we may finally be able to put them into their proper historical framework.
INTRODUCTION: The *c-.w.-people

§ 1. The purpose of this study is to investigate one aspect of the written evidence pertaining to the history of the contacts between the ancient Egyptians and Nubians during the Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period (ca. 2613-2040 B.C.). The approach is philological, consisting of a reexamination of the contexts of the word *c., a term crucial to our understanding of the relevant documents.

Gardiner's study of 1915-17 included all the occurrences of this word known or recognized at that time. Not since then, however, has the word been reconsidered in its entirety. Recent philological investigations by Goedicke and Fischer have reopened the question of the meaning of the word, but have failed to resolve the matter satisfactorily. By restricting themselves to data from the Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period alone, they have unnecessarily prejudiced their conclusions; a complete understanding of this word cannot be had without including the material from the Middle and New Kingdoms as well. With this in mind, we shall undertake to restudy all the evidence here.

SECTION A: The writings (arranged chronologically)

§ 2.

1. : By far the commonest writing in the Old Kingdom, found in nearly every occurrence, and first attested early in
2

Dynasty V.9

2.Cb : Twice on the Dynasty VI stele of ḫw-t(I) from Naqada.10

3. ∪ : Once in a Dynasty VI graffito in the Wadi Hammamat.11

4. ∪ : Once in an inscription from the mastaba of nbi:nt-y at Saqqara (temp. late Dynasty VI).12 The correct reading of the relevant passage, not indicated in the published copy,13 should be ∪.14

5. ∪ : In Spell 64 of the Coffin Texts, on coffin Sq3C (temp. Dynasty X?).16

6. ∪ : On stele CCG 20026 from Abydos (dating to year 10 of Sesostris I).17

7. ∪ : In Pap. Boulaq 18 (dating to a King Sebekhotep of Dynasty XIII).18

8. ∪ : In the Amduat, Concluding Text of the Third Hour; spelling preserved from as early as the time of Thutmose III.19

9. ∪ : In an inscription from the tomb of the High Priest Nebwenenef at Thebes (No. 157),20 temp. early Ramesses II. Also found in the nearby
tomb of the Third Prophet Tjanefer (No. 158)\textsuperscript{21}:

10. $\text{\textit{\textcopyright}}$ (with numerous variants)\textsuperscript{22}: Attested frequently in the New Kingdom.\textsuperscript{23} The earliest such writing of this word is found during the reign of Merneptah.\textsuperscript{24}

11. $\text{\textcopyright}$ \textsuperscript{25}: In the Turin "Taxation Papyrus" (\textit{= Pap. Turin 1896 + 2006}),\textsuperscript{26} ro. 2.13, and vs. 2.2-9, 3.2-5, 3.8-15, dated to years 12 (recto) and 14 (verso) of Ramesses XI.\textsuperscript{27} Cf. also $\text{\textcopyright}$, ro. 3.3, 3.8, 5.1, 5.2, 5.7;\textsuperscript{28} and Pap. BM 10326, ro., line 9,\textsuperscript{29} dated no earlier than year 28 of Ramesses XI.\textsuperscript{30}

12. $\text{\textcopyright}$ \textsuperscript{31}: In Pap. BM 10052, 6.2, 7.13, 10.18, 11.4, dated to year 1 of the "Renaissance"\textsuperscript{32} (\textit{= year 19 of Ramesses XI}); Pap. Mayer A, 1.12, 9.3, dated to years 1 (1.12) and 2 (9.3) of the "Renaissance";\textsuperscript{33} and Pap. BM 10403, 1.27, dated to year 2 of the "Renaissance."\textsuperscript{34} Cf. also $\text{\textcopyright}$ of Pap. Bournemouth, line 12,\textsuperscript{35} dated no earlier than year 24 of Ramesses XI (\textit{= year 6 of the "Renaissance"}).\textsuperscript{36}

§ 3. Already in 1915 Gardiner suggested that $\text{\textcopyright}$ is the Late Egyptian equivalent of Old Egyptian $\text{\textcopyright}$.\textsuperscript{37} If by analyzing these and the intermediate forms we can elucidate the phonetic developments responsible for the observable differences between the earliest and latest spellings of this word, then we can be more confident of the conclusions to be drawn subsequently from our semantic considerations. If we can securely establish the basic etymology and the relationships between the various usages of the word,
we can better understand and refine its meaning. And if we can show that all the above cited writings do, in fact, represent spellings of the same word, then we can eliminate from further consideration certain alleged occurrences which may be shown to be inconsistent and irreconcilable with the discernible pattern for its development. The problem, as is the case with most ancient Egyptian writings, is to get behind the generally incomplete and sometimes misleading spellings\textsuperscript{38} to the underlying phonetic structure in the spoken language which they reflect. To accomplish these ends we must establish the correct and full reading of each individual writing, and reconstruct its vocalization.

SECTION B: Phonetic reconstruction

\S 4. No. 1: Temporarily disregarding the significance of the sign $\Box$ (S 25) here and in No. 2, we may conclude from this spelling that the word contains the consonant $\underline{\text{c}}$\textsuperscript{39}

No. 3: Betrays the presence of $\underline{\text{b}}$.\textsuperscript{40} The word is read $\underline{\text{c}} \underline{\text{b}}$ by Goyon,\textsuperscript{41} followed by Goedicke,\textsuperscript{42} Leclant,\textsuperscript{43} Edel,\textsuperscript{44} and Hornung.\textsuperscript{45} Fischer,\textsuperscript{46} however, argues in favor of reading $\underline{\text{c}}$, comparing this with the Late Egyptian $\underline{\text{b}} \underline{\text{c}} \underline{\text{w}}$\textsuperscript{47} and the Old Kingdom $\underline{\text{b}} \underline{\text{w}} \underline{\text{c}}$, "kilt."\textsuperscript{48} He considers the sequence $\underline{\text{c}} \underline{\text{b}}$ improbable because the sign $\underline{\text{b}}$ (O 29) is not used to write this word.\textsuperscript{49} He cites, instead, the phenomenon of graphic inversion of signs\textsuperscript{50} to explain the writing. That the absence of the sign $\underline{\text{c}}$, however, does not rule out the reading $\underline{\text{c}} \underline{\text{b}}$ is well illustrated by Gardiner's commentary on the use of the
monogram $\text{蜴}$ in a word from the inscriptions of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu. $^{51}$ In the main body of his article (on p. 16), Gardiner says "...the initial monogram...must read $\text{�藏}$ rather than $\text{ころ}$, since in the latter case $\text{脣}$ would surely have been written..." However, in the postscript $^{52}$ (on pp. 17-18), he admits that "...Vandier was...able to show me that in my remarks...I had been on the wrong tack....[T]here seems but little doubt that $\text{ลงไป}$ is the word I had attempted to explain. It begins with $\text{라[tempo]}$, not $\text{라[alif]}$...."

No. 4: Indicates the presence of $\text{라}$. $^{53}$

Leaving writing No. 5 aside for the moment, let us proceed to No. 6. This establishes the sequence $\text{𨺙}$ for the Middle Egyptian form, $^{54}$ and induces us to read, consistent with it, $\times^{55}$ and $\times^{56}$, respectively, for the Old Egyptian writings Nos. 3-4.

§ 5. It is now convenient for us to consider the significance of the sign $\text{ Gibraltar} (§ 25)$, common to the writings Nos. 1-6. This sign seems to represent a number of different garments, $^{57}$ described variously as "apron," "kilt," "skirt," "loin-cloth," "mantle," or "cloak." The form of the garment--whether depicted as an object presented in an offering scene or used as a hieroglyphic sign in the writing of the name of an object--is subject to considerable variation. $^{58}$ Some of the examples are painted yellow $^{59}$ or show spots like those of a leopard. $^{60}$

Besides its use as a determinative in the names of several distinct garments, the sign possesses its own phonetic value, which is of interest to us. For this, $\text{Wd I 40.4}$ cites a word $\text{腭}$ which occurs in the mastabas of Khabausokar, $^{61}$ Khufukhaf, $^{62}$ and Nesutnefer. $^{63}$ In addition to these certain occurrences, Kaplony has adduced two more.
The first, 64 consists of the garment-sign (§ 25) preceded by a phonetic complement---the writing characteristic of the root ḫām, "to wash"---giving the reading ḫām(ī) [≡ ḫām(ī)]. 65 The second example, 66 accompanies the depiction of a servant carrying two long strips of cloth, perhaps folded ḫām-garments, as in the mastaba of Metjen. 67 The reading is either simply ḫām, 68 referring to the garments, or ḫām(ī), as the title of the servant thereby identified as a "garment-handler." Edel 69 has also demonstrated that the abbreviated writing  cannot itself represent the word ḫām.

In the mastaba of Khabauskar 70 the word ḫām is used to head a list of three (pl. 1) or four (pl. 2) different garments, including the bášm(ī)-garment---which might be expected to show the yellow color or the spots associated with the panther or leopard skin from which its name was derived 71---and the míst-garment. 72 Similarly, in the mastaba of Khufukhaf, 73 besides the simple ḫām, two other garments are named: the ḫām:bášm(ī) and the ḫām:míst. The name ḫām thus appears to be a generic designation for several specific garments. 74

§ 6. The question remaining is how to interpret the writing  in the mastaba of Metjen. 75 On the basis of this writing, Gardiner 76 says of the word ḫām: "...O.K.... ḫām, var.... ḫām...." Jéquier 77 reads ḫām, followed by Fischer, 78 who refers to Wb I 27.15.

In addition to recognizing the word ḫām, 79 Wb lists, under a separate entry, the variant *ỳìm. 80 For the form *ỳìm, Belegstellen
cites "Berl 1105" (= the mastaba of Metjen) and "Mar Mast A2" (= Mariette, Mastabas, p. 79), with further reference to Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pl. 2. In Murray (= the mastaba of Khabausokar) the reading is unquestionably ḫn.\textsuperscript{81} The Mariette citation points again to Khabausokar,\textsuperscript{82} where, as seen above, the reading is consistently ḫn.\textsuperscript{83} This reference is mistakenly given here: it clearly belongs, not with Wb I 27.15, but with Wb I 40.4, for which Belegstellen cites only "Murray Saqqara Mast I\textsuperscript{2}" and "Ann serv 16 (1916), 262."\textsuperscript{84} Now the writing in Metjen may be seen as quite unparalleled, and the likelihood that it represents a genuine phonetic variant is minimized. In examining the facsimile reproduced in LD II 4a, it becomes clear that the peculiar writing of this example has been encouraged by the limited space available for the word there. The best balance--short of employing the monogram --is achieved by setting the bird over the arm, allowing the right angle of the elbow to frame the group naturally at the lower left hand corner. We have here to do simply with graphic inversion of a known type,\textsuperscript{86} with no phonetic consequences.\textsuperscript{87} We may therefore eliminate the form *\textit{ḥn*}--along with the metathesis which it seemed to imply--and read ḫn even in Metjen.\textsuperscript{88}

§ 7. Returning to our examination of the writings Nos. 1-6, the fact that they all contain the sign S 25, having the phonetic value ḫn, indicates that they, too, must represent a word beginning with ḫ. The importance of writing No. 5 now becomes apparent: it is here that the ḫ is made explicit by its use as a phonetic complement to the sign S 25.\textsuperscript{89}

In summary, the writings Nos. 1-6 taken together indicate a full
reading $i^C_3w^{90}$ for the word normally transliterated $^c$, $^c^w$, $^c_2$, or $^c_3$. Such a variety of spellings for a single word is, of course, hardly surprising: in general, the writing system of the ancient Egyptians was not purely phonetic,\textsuperscript{91} nor did they adhere strictly to a standard orthography. Thus the same word is also found in the abbreviated spelling of writing No. 7.\textsuperscript{92}

§ 8. Immediate confirmation of our rendering with initial $i$ is provided by writing No. 8. The writing $^c^C_3w$, which does not itself contain $i$, assures us, by its initial $c$, that $i$ was present in the earlier forms. The writing with two $c$ayins becomes completely understandable if we assume that it developed from $i^C_3w$. The development $i^C_3w > ^c^C_3w$ is explainable as the result of a simple phonetic phenomenon, amply attested: the "ayinization" of $i$ in words also containing $c$. As an especially instructive example, let us examine this principle at work in the word $i^Cnr$, "baboon."\textsuperscript{93} Already in Old Egyptian the final $r$ had become $i$, giving rise to the form $i^Cni$.\textsuperscript{94} By the period of Dynasties IX-X, the final $i < r$ was assimilated to the second radical of the word--the $c$--giving the form $i^Cn^c$.\textsuperscript{95} During late Dynasty XII or Dynasty XIII, the initial $i$ had also assimilated to $c$, giving $^C^c_n^c$.\textsuperscript{96} Thus, before the end of the Middle Kingdom, the series $i^Cnr > i^Cni > i^Cn^c > ^C^c_n^c$ had reduced the number of distinctive consonants in the word "baboon" from four to two.

That assimilation is attested earlier for the final $i$ than for the initial $i$ may simply be accidental, and does not necessarily imply that this was the actual order of the sound change. Both changes may
have occurred simultaneously, the operative principle perhaps being $i^c_>$ in words containing $^c$, regardless of the position of $i$ in the word.\footnote{97}

\section{Incomplete writings of this word abound, as is to be expected, prompting both Gardiner\footnote{98} and Faulkner\footnote{99} to regard $^c_{f_n}$ as the basic Middle Egyptian form—although each cites variants which are comprehensible only if they can be derived from $i^c_{n_l} (< i^c_{n_r})$. The tendency not to write initial $i$ in words where, by exceptional writings, its presence can be deduced, has led to misunderstanding about the processes at work in such words which originally contained both initial $i$ and an $^c$. Thus Vergote\footnote{100} regards $^c_{f_b}$—for example—as the basic form of the word "cup" or "bowl," which also appears as $i^c_{f_b}$ and $cc_{f_b}$. The initial $i$ in $i^c_{f_b}$ is explained as an augment, while the initial $^c$ in $cc_{f_b}$ is seen as a phonetic variant of this. Sethe\footnote{101} on the other hand, sees $^c_{f_b}$ as a noun derived from the root $i^c_{f_b}$. The basic form is, in fact, $i^c_{f_b}$; $^c_{f_b}$ represents $(i)^c_{f_b}$,\footnote{103} and $cc_{f_b}$ indicates the assimilation of initial $i$ to the medial $^c$.

The whole matter is further complicated by the conservative nature of the ancient Egyptians, who tended to preserve traditional spellings, only occasionally employing forms in which the results of even major phonetic events are visible—though these developments may have occurred much earlier than the time of the writings in which they are first attested. More often than not, new phonetic features are exhibited in mixed writings, partly historical and partly phonetic; purely phonetic spellings are rare. Not until all unusual spellings are collected and sifted with this in mind can the details of ancient
Egyptian sound change be known.

Nevertheless, it is safe to conclude that the assimilation of $\hat{1}$ to $c$ is one of the characteristics of Middle Egyptian,\textsuperscript{104} that form of the language first regularly written under Dynasty IX.\textsuperscript{105} The precedent for the exchange of $\hat{1}$ and $c$ is found already in the Old Kingdom,\textsuperscript{106} where original $c$ may be written $\hat{1}$ before $b$,\textsuperscript{107} as is commonly the case in Middle Egyptian.

§ 10. Returning now to writing No. 8, $cc\hat{3}w$ is found in all known copies of the Concluding Text of the Third Hour of the Amduat,\textsuperscript{108} indicating that this form was present in the manuscript from which the extant versions were derived. The form $cc\hat{3}w$ itself poses no problem for us if it developed from older $ic\hat{3}w$. Nevertheless, Hornung's observation\textsuperscript{109} that the word is not otherwise attested in this form could give rise to the suspicion that an uncorrected spelling error had somehow crept into the original manuscript of the text. That this is, in fact, not so, is confirmed by a previously disputed writing of $\hat{1}$ in a label accompanying the depiction of a garment which resembles the $\text{ mâdyt}$-kilt, as preserved on the Middle Kingdom coffin of Mentuhotep in Berlin.\textsuperscript{110} In the facsimile drawing published by Lepsius in 1867,\textsuperscript{111} the reading $cc\hat{3}$ is quite clear. In Steindorff's republication of 1896,\textsuperscript{112} the colored facsimile tints the garment yellowish (on p. 27 [15] the color is explicitly said to be yellow), which accords well with earlier depictions of the $ic\hat{3}$-garment.\textsuperscript{113} In Steindorff's time, however, only traces of the inscription containing the word in question remained; and he remarks\textsuperscript{114} that the name could not then be read with certainty. Jéquier\textsuperscript{115} regards the
reading \( cc_3 \) as doubtful, and seems to suggest that perhaps the word was actually \( ic_3 \). The traces indicated by Steindorff, however, fit \( cc_3 \) and not \( ic_3 \); and in view of the development \( ic_3 w > cc_3 w \), the parallel \( ic_3 > cc_3 \) is perfectly expectable. Even Jéquier himself had earlier accepted \( cc_3 \) "as a simple variant phonetic"\(^{116} \) of \( ic_3 \).

In view of the attested variability in the shape of the \( ic_3 \)-garment,\(^{117} \) we can confidently indentify this \( cc_3 \) as a kind of \( ic_3 \)-garment; \( cc_3 \) is, in fact, the latest known occurrence of any form of the noun \( ic_3 \). Before the discovery of the form \( cc_3 w \), the otherwise unparalled \( cc_3 \) might have seemed incredible; but now the two spellings complement one another and reinforce our interpretation of each of them.\(^{118} \) The writing \( cc_3 \), moreover, assures a Middle Kingdom date for the form \( cc_3 w \): its occurrence in a Dynasty XVIII inscription is but a survival from a period at least as early as Dynasty XII.

§ 11. Before attempting to explain the rare writing No. 9, let us next deal with the much more common No. 10, and its variants, the abbreviated Nos. 11-12. The difficulty of writing No. 10, involving as it does the apparent migration of \( \dot{\imath} \), now confronts us head on. How can we explain the transition from \( cc_3 w \) to \( \dddot{cc}_w \)? As long ago as 1915, Gardiner presented the formulation which would prepare the way for acceptance of the equivalence: \( ic_3 w = cc_3 w = \dddot{cc}_w \). With reference to an article by Erman,\(^{119} \) Gardiner affirmed that "...[\( cc \)] is a common equivalent from the time of the Middle Kingdom onwards both for old \( ic \) and for later \( \dddot{cc} \) ...\(^{120} \) Before the discovery of writings Nos. 8-9 (\( cc_3 w \) and \( cc w \)), however, and the present
reconstruction of the form $\text{I}_3$, the implications of this important statement could not be fully appreciated. Erman, in the above cited article, gives numerous examples of initial $\text{C}_1$ written $\text{C}_2$, but says (p. 99) that this remains unexplained. Later he simply states that $\text{C}_3$ at the beginning of a word may be written $\text{C}_4$ in the late New Kingdom. Gardiner summarizes the situation as follows: "The phonetic facts underlying these permutations are full of complexity, and may be even more complex than has been hitherto supposed."

§ 12. To visualize the processes involved we must resort to linguistic reconstruction and the vocalization of ancient Egyptian words. At the outset it is advisable to define the significance which should be attached to any such reconstructed forms. They may properly serve only as convenient models or schema by which we attempt to relate phenomena observable in the written language to the underlying phonetic phenomena of the spoken language. We proceed from known details to try to find a general pattern or principle which will account for them. Our reconstructions, however, must necessarily remain hypothetical, the degree of their precision subject to constant refinement; as our knowledge progresses, the constructions we make, like all theories, become obsolete, and need to be revised.

§ 13. For the vocalization of the word $\text{I}_3$, the pattern $\ast \text{V}_3 \text{W}_3 \ast$ suggests itself as the simplest possibility. The result coincides with Edel's "nomen agentis," vocalized by him $\ast \text{V}_3 \text{W}_3$. Leaving aside for a moment the question of the apparently wandering $\text{Z}_3$, the vocalization of $\text{Z}_3$, by analogy with that of $\text{C}_3$, should be $\ast \text{V}_3 \text{W}_3$. This reconstruction, however, is subject to
immediate criticism: doubled consonants—in this case two identical consonants which have chanced to fall together without a vowel between them (i.e., —cc—) are normally written only once. Thus the writing expected for *\text{\textit{vccy}}w would be *\text{\textit{cc}}\textit{y}, or the like. One might propose that the spelling \textit{ccw} was simply taken over—without reference to the pronunciation of this particular word—from a related form in which the two \textit{cayins} were separated by a vowel, as, for instance, the infinitive, vocalized *\text{\textit{scyc}}. This explanation, however, is most unsatisfactory, inasmuch as the noun \textit{ccw} is by far the commonest form of the word, the other forms, on the contrary, being so rare that their writings would, if anything, have been made to conform to it.

§ 14. \textit{ccw} must therefore be vocalized in such a way as to separate the two \textit{cayins} by a vowel. However, to suggest a reconstruction involving any pattern not immediately deducible from the antecedent *\text{\textit{vccy}}w > *\text{\textit{ccycy}}w, seems unnecessarily complicated. The answer lies in the seemingly erratic behavior of \textit{z}: the third consonant of \textit{ccw}, after two \textit{cayins}, it disappears entirely in \textit{ccw} (writing No. 9), only to reemerge at the beginning of \textit{zccw}, before the two \textit{cayins}.

§ 15. In order to solve this problem, it is necessary to determine what sound the symbol \textit{z} actually represents. Originally it must have been an \textit{r/l}-sound, corresponding at times to Semitic or Afroasiatic \textit{r/l}, and occasionally exchanging with other \textit{r/l}-symbols in Egyptian writing, already at the time of the Old Kingdom. Moreover, just as \textit{r} at the end of a word or syllable regularly
becomes i, so under certain circumstances also exchanges with i, even in Old Egyptian. In addition, Coptic consonantal ει = i (i.e.,/v/) may be derived from both original ι and i.

§ 16. Given the above cited phonetic similarities between ι and i, we are now prepared to explain the disappearance of ι from writing No. 9, ccw. Just as in Middle Egyptian i assimilated to c in words containing an original c, so by the time of Ramesses II ι also apparently suffered the same fate. This phenomenon was, in fact, characteristic of that form of the language which may be designated early Late Egyptian, as found written already in Dynasty XVII. On the other hand, the operative principle underlying the assimilation of ι to c had ceased to function by at least the time of Merneptah, the son and successor of Ramesses II. Further research is required to better fix the chronology of this change. In any case, iccw > ccw consequently became *ccw, vocalized *cccw and written simply ccw. But if ι is thus eliminated in writing No. 9, how can we account for its sudden reappearance as the first letter in writing No. 10, 3ccw?

§ 17. Since 3ccw cannot represent *3vcccw, but at the same time is unlikely to represent any more complex pattern, the best solution seems to be to regard 3ccw as representing *3vcccw, with the first consonant of the word rendered by the group 3c and the doubled medial cayin (-cc-) therefore written but once. Thus in the word 3ccw, the group 3cc represents two consonants only: initial i>c>3, plus c (i.e., ιc + c). Unexpected as this conclusion might be, we can enhance its credibility by reference once more to our paradigmatic ιcnr > ιcnl > 3cn > ccn. In this connection we may cite the Late Egyptian forms in which
the initial \( c \) of \( c_{cn} \) is replaced on the one hand by \( \overline{c} \), and on the other by simple \( \overline{c} \). The latter spelling, \( \overline{c}_{n}(c) \), recalls the hypothetical writing \( *\overline{c}_{n} \) aduced above\(^{147} \) for \( *\overline{v} \). Hence the existence of this writing may be postulated as a theoretical successor to our writing No. 10. The fact that such a writing is not now known does not detract from our present construction, but its future discovery or identification would further serve to strengthen our argument.\(^{148} \)

\[ \text{§ 18.} \] Already in 1910, Littmann,\(^{149} \) responding to Erman,\(^{150} \) suggested that the writing \( \overline{c} \) for initial original \( \overline{i} \) secondary \( c \) represents a mixed historical and phonetic spelling. The same orthographic device is illustrated by the well-known use of \( ri \) or \( \overline{ir} \) to stand for \( r > \overline{i} \),\(^{151} \) the less familiar combinations \( 3r = r > \overline{3} \); \(^{152} \) \( k\overline{r} = k > \overline{k} \); \(^{153} \) \( pf = f > p \); \(^{154} \) \( d\overline{t} = (d >) d > t \); \(^{155} \) \( sh \) or \( h\overline{h} = \overline{h} > h \); \(^{156} \) \( bp = p > b \); \(^{157} \) \( 3y \); \(^{158} \) \( 3l \); \(^{159} \) \( v\overline{e} \); \(^{160} \) or \( \overline{3} \);\(^{161} \) --each equivalent to \( \overline{z} > \overline{3} / z \); \( \overline{v} \); \(^{162} \) \( w \); \(^{163} \) \( w \); \(^{164} \) \( \overline{w} \); \(^{165} \) \( < > \) \( ( \text{before } h) \) and \( \overline{c} \) \( \text{before } c \) or \( h \).\(^{165} \) An example of \( \overline{c} = \overline{c} > \overline{c} \) before \( h \) is found in CT IV 298b/299b. Eight versions of this text write \( \overline{inh} \),\(^{166} \) the form usually quoted in the dictionaries.\(^{167} \) One version, however, clearly writes \( \overline{c}_{nh} \),\(^{168} \) showing initial \( c \) instead of \( \overline{i} \).\(^{169} \) The intermediate spelling, \( \overline{c}_{nh} \), preserved in B9C\( b \), represents \( \overline{c}_{nh} > \overline{inh} \). See also the writings of \( m_{c} {c}(w)t > m_{nh} {c}(w)t \).\(^{170} \) "tomb,"\(^{171} \) which show a shift in the value of \( \overline{b} \) (P 6) from \( c_{h} \) to \( ih \): e.g.,

\[ \text{(P 6)} \] from \( c_{h} \) to \( ih \): e.g.,

For \( \overline{c} = \overline{i} > c \) before \( c \), see \( \overline{c}_{w} \), representing \( \overline{i} {c} > c_{w} \).\(^{172} \)

For a certain example of \( \overline{i} {c} = \overline{i} > c \) before \( h \), see the word spelled
variously minht$^{173}$/m$^{c}$nht$^{174}$/mcnht$^{175}$. This word is found in the dictionaries under the entry mcnht$^{176}$ and it is interpreted as an m-formation from the root cnh$^{177}$. Beginning with the fact that there is an Old Egyptian word mcnht$^{178}$ it has been argued that the phonetic development of this word was mcnht (OE) > minht (ME)$^{179}$ with Grapow$^{180}$ explaining this as due to the influence of h. Exactly the opposite is to be expected, however: i.e., h > c before h$^{181}$. The mcnht of PT 815a$^{182}$ is, in fact, a designation for a kind of staff, and should be disassociated from the mcnht meaning "counterpoise (of a necklace)," "pendant," or "tassel," with which it has no etymological relationship. For this latter we should understand the normal sequence minht > mi$^{c}$nht > mcnht. There is yet another revealing series of writings for this word: Jéquier$^{187}$ cites only the latter form, which he dismisses as a scribal error. However, these writings are completely intelligible if the c they exhibit is understood to have been pronounced before the n of the group ---i.e., if we transliterate mcnht, rather than *mnht or *mn$^{c}$nht. The arrangement of signs here is justifiable insofar as one would hardly expect either or to intrude between and its phonetic complement , but the question still remains why the mn-sign (Y 5) should have been used in the first place. The answer lies in the fact that this sign, besides its reading mn, also possessed the value min$^{188}$; hence these writings represent mi$^{c}$nht, evidencing once more the shift of minht to mcnht$^{189}$. This leads us to speculate that the original spelling of this word may have been * , a writing actually reflected in two words certainly derived from the same root: .
"to string (beads) or fasten (an amulet on the neck),"\textsuperscript{190} and \textsuperscript{191} "the string or cord (?) (of an amulet)"--both of which should therefore also be transliterated \textit{mnh}.

\textit{§ 19.} Now is the time to consider the significance of the loss of initial \textit{c} as exhibited in such series as our archetypal \textsuperscript{c}c\textsuperscript{c}n\textit{c} > \textsuperscript{c}c\textsuperscript{c}n\textit{c} \equiv \textsuperscript{c}c\textsuperscript{c}n\textit{c}.\textsuperscript{192} Littman, in an article already mentioned,\textsuperscript{193} describes this feature in terms of dissimilation;\textsuperscript{194} and it is useful in this connection to compare the typologically similar change of \textit{c} to \textit{i} before \textit{h}.\textsuperscript{195} Phonetically, \textit{c} was the voiced counterpart of \textit{h},\textsuperscript{196} and, as has been seen,\textsuperscript{197} \textit{i} is sometimes found as the equivalent of \textit{i}; so the two conditions--\textit{c} > \textit{i} before another \textit{c}, and \textit{c} > \textit{i} before \textit{h}--are roughly parallel. Czermak,\textsuperscript{198} in fact, describes the change of \textit{c} to \textit{i} before \textit{h} as due to dissimilation. Dévaud,\textsuperscript{199} on the other hand, simply links this shift with a weakening of \textit{c}. Except in the specific context before \textit{h}, however, \textit{c} in Middle Egyptian seems to have remained strong enough to continue to effect the assimilation of \textit{i} to \textit{c}.\textsuperscript{200} Be that as it may, the change of \textit{c} to \textit{i} before \textit{h} surely foreshadowed certain developments later abundantly attested for \textit{c}; and when the initial \textit{c} of \textsuperscript{c}c\textsuperscript{w},\textsuperscript{201} \textsuperscript{c}c\textsuperscript{c}n\textit{c},\textsuperscript{202} or \textsuperscript{c}c\textit{b}\textsuperscript{203} was weakened, it may well have been by dissimilation from the following \textit{c}. But there is no evidence of this prior to the time of Late Egyptian.

In Late Egyptian the situation was completely different. The very fact that \textit{i} appears at all in \textsuperscript{c}c\textsuperscript{w} and \textsuperscript{c}c\textsuperscript{c}n\textit{c}, and is not immediately reabsorbed, indicates that at least by the time of Merneptah,\textsuperscript{204} Cayin had lost its old assimilatory powers. These and many other spellings betray the contemporary weakness of Cayin which
resulted in its disappearance from certain phonetic environments. Not only initial 𓏠 was lost; for we have seen the loss of final 𓏠 in 𓏠cswick/𓏠cswik/𓏠cswik/𓏠cswi. From the New Kingdom onwards, final 𓏠 was also written 𓊚, 𓊛, 𓊜, 𓊖, 𓊗, or 𓊘, apparently indiscriminately, showing that 𓏠 had lost its distinctive character here. Already under Thutmose III the preposition 𓊚𓊕 could be written *𓊚𓊕. Now we can understand two additional spellings of "baboon": 𓊚𓊚𓊕 and 𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊕, both represent *𓊚𓊚𓊕, with final weakened 𓏠 assimilated to the preceding 𓊚; so we should transliterate 𓊚𓊚𓊕 and 𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊕 (note initial 𓊚 equivalent to the 𓊚 of 𓊚𓊚𓊕). 𓊚𓊚𓊕 𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊕

Though we may thus observe the weakness of 𓏠 both initially and finally in these words, there is no evidence for a corresponding modification of medial 𓏠 in their forms. Since the original 𓏠 of 𓊚𓊚 and 𓊚𓊚𓊕 apparently remained unaltered throughout the New Kingdom, the stability of 𓏠 in Late Egyptian—apart from the earlier change of 𓏠 to 𓊚 before 𓊚—seems to have depended entirely on its position within the word.

SECTION C: The Late Egyptian writing 𓊚𓊚

§ 20. If we next examine the various words which are written 𓊚𓊚 in Late Egyptian, we shall observe the striking fact that so many words, with such different meanings, are spelled so alike as to be distinguishable only by their determinatives. Since there is no root *𓊚𓊚 in Old or Middle Egyptian, the proliferation of 𓊚𓊚-words in Late Egyptian is remarkable. Now it seems probable that they are not new creations, but
old friends in unfamiliar guises. The problem was recognized long ago by Gardiner.216

Until a few years ago it seemed the obvious and the right course to take Late-Egyptian writings at their face-value, and to argue from them both as to their Middle-Egyptian origins and as to their Coptic derivatives.... [Recent]discoveries... go far to undermine [this] over-simple assumption.... And yet that assumption lingers on, fostered and encouraged by the fact that Late-Egyptian writing is indeed most deplorably misleading.... The fact of the matter... is that Late Egyptian was habitually and perhaps even wilfully perverse in its methods of spelling. Possibly the primary intention of the scribes was to substitute phonetic writings for the old historic ones. Unfortunately the nature of the Egyptian script was such that phonetic orthography could often not be adopted without the suggestion of a false etymology.

In clarifying the origins of the Late Egyptian $\hat{\text{c}}\text{c}$-words, we shall discover that the configuration $\hat{\text{c}}\text{c}$ has no specific semantic significance; this writing, in fact, conceals the separate roots of the several words so written, by representing only the phonetic similarities which chanced to develop between them. We shall also have the opportunity here to substantiate our derivation of the word $\hat{\text{c}}\text{c}_w$, and further demonstrate the validity and general applicability of the underlying phonetic principles. By determining what phonetic characteristics these words have in common, we shall be able to improve our understanding of their meanings and better distinguish between them when they occur in ambiguous or difficult contexts.

21. $\hat{\text{c}}\text{c}$ (1-3). To begin with the root $\hat{\text{i}}\text{c}_3 > \hat{\text{c}}\text{c}$, from which the noun $\hat{\text{c}}\text{c}_w$ and the related forms217 are derived, the references to it are contained in Wb I 2.15, 3.1-2; next the verb and noun $\text{c}_w > \hat{\text{c}}\text{c}_w$ (sometimes written defectively as though $\hat{\text{c}}\text{c}$), "sleep," which is found in Wb I 169.8.218 The verb $\hat{\text{c}}\text{c}_{c}/\hat{\text{c}}\text{c}_w$ of Wb I 2.13 surely is identical with the $\hat{\text{c}}\text{c}_w$ of Wb I 40.6.219 The latter is attested only once during
the Amarna period, but the former is known several times from various New Kingdom documents. With reference to the specific context of 220, this word has been translated "to smear over," "coat," or "cover up (with plaster)"; elsewhere it is also translated "to patch up" 222 or "to smooth, plane, or true." 223 Although we would be inclined initially to postulate 220 > 224 before the Amarna period, already in the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, 224 gives us reason to hesitate. Because these earliest examples of 224 are found in non-literary ostraca, it might be argued that they reflect the contemporary pronunciation of the word, while the monumental boundary stelae at Amarna preserve a spelling appropriate to the Old Kingdom. 225 However, the likely predecessor of 220/224 in Old and Middle Egyptian displays initial 2 rather than i. Both 226 (verbal noun) occur in a context of ship building (temp. Sesostris I). 226 Simpson translates "to plane or shape." 227 Moreover, Hayes 228 cites Old Egyptian 229 part of a temple, 230 as a possible derivative from the same root: the determinative 231 is perhaps equivalent to 232 in the form 233 Simpson treats the root of the Middle Kingdom forms as a 3rd-wk. 234 If this is so, we may envision the following development: 235 > 235 > 235 > 235. (Note that some of the Middle Egyptian and Late Egyptian forms could have been written alike.) Treating all of these occurrences
together in order to find out what meaning they have in common--i.e.,
the basic meaning of the root they share--we might translate the verbal
forms as "to make smooth," and the verbal noun as "smoothing" or "a
smooth(ed) area." The verbal noun of 3c would be 3c(i)w: 236 hence
[(?)] and , and certainly also

(i.e., 3c(iw) or 3c(cw)). 237 The infinitive of 3c would be
*3yciwt 238 (OE) > *3ycycyt (LE), which would be written 239
and transliterated 3ycct; 240 and the Old Perfective (third person
masculine singular) would be *3yciyw 241 (OE) > *3ycycyw (LE), written
242 and transliterated 3ycyw. The one difficulty
remaining is to understand the nature of the relationship between these
forms and 3ccw. The equivalence of i and 3 poses no problem; 243 but
the presence of -w in a sdm-f-form 244 must be dealt with: 245 most likely
it is simply intrusive, calling for the transliteration 3ccyw. 246

§ 22. 3cc (4). According to Belegstellen, the form 3ccw of Wb I
3.4 occurs but once, in the Litany of the Sun, in the 17th invocation of
the "Great Litany." 247 The word, written with both -w and plural
strokes, should be a noun--either the plural of a noun *3cc, or the
singular or plural of a nominal formation in -w; 248 the determinative is

(D 54). Since this same determinative is found with the root
3cr, 249 it seems legitimate to inquire whether the two might not be
related--whether, in fact, the word 3ccw might be derived from the
root 3cr. At the same time it will prove convenient to consider the
word "tomb" of Wb I 40.3, which also may be written as though 3cc.
§ 23. The root \( \text{i} \) itself confronts us with several anomalies, which are summarized by Edel: 250 1) it is often written as though simply \( \text{i} \) 2) its causative infinitive shows the feminine ending \( -\text{i} \), 252 and 3) it alliterates with \( \text{C} \). 253 Of the objections to considering \( \text{i} \) as the original form of the root, the most difficult to deal with is the feminine causative infinitive. Edel is also troubled by the Coptic \( \text{C} \), which looks as though it could have been derived from \( \text{C} \). 254 As a solution to these problems, Edel proposes the sequence \( \text{C} \). 255 We shall here offer an alternative explanation for these phenomena, which seems to be less complex.

To begin with, though Semitic \( \text{i} \) certainly corresponds to Egyptian \( \text{i} \) ( 256 the order of the corresponding consonants in Semitic and Egyptian is not--and does not need to be--identical. A similar metathesis is found in the case of Semitic \( \text{i} \) and Egyptian \( \text{i} \), "donkey." Hence Semitic \( \text{i} \) has no more special relationship to \( \text{i} \) than to \( \text{i} \). Thus, for the development of \( \text{i} \) we may propose the following scheme:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{i})\text{C} & \\
(\text{i})\text{C} \text{C} & \text{C} \\
(\text{i})\text{C} \text{C} \text{C} & \text{C} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The configuration \( \text{C} \) implies that the separate existence of \( \text{C} \) ( 263 As an example of such a form, we may cite the writing --appropriate to the 3rd-wk. verb \( \text{C} \), "to wash"--used extraordinarily
of $\text{i}_\text{C}(\text{i}) < (\text{i})_\text{C}$.\textsuperscript{264} This $\text{i}_\text{C}(\text{i})$ appears in the phrase $\text{i}_\text{C}(\text{i}) \ r \ k(\text{r})s$,\textsuperscript{265} paralleled elsewhere by $(\text{i})_\text{C} \ r \ k(\text{r})s$ or $(\text{i})_\text{C} \ n \ k(\text{r})s$\textsuperscript{266} in which $\star(\text{i})_\text{C}k$ represents the Old Perfective $(\text{i})_\text{C}(\text{w})$.\textsuperscript{267} Hence $\star(\text{i})_\text{C}(\text{i})$ is actually to be transliterated $\text{i}_\text{C}(\text{w})$.\textsuperscript{268}

§ 24. Given the assimilation of $\text{i}$ to $\text{c}$ in Middle Egyptian, and the principle of the single writing of doubled consonants, we may confidently postulate $(\text{i})_\text{C}(\text{w}) > \text{i}_\text{C}(\text{w}) > (\star \text{cc_}\text{c}(\text{w}) =) \star \text{cc_}\text{w} > \star \text{cc_}\text{w}$\textsuperscript{269} as the normal development for the Old Perfective (3ms) of $\text{i}_\text{C}(\text{i}) < (\text{i})_\text{C}$. Likewise, our form $\text{sc_}\text{w}$ could represent $(\text{i})_\text{Cw}$\textsuperscript{270} > $\star \text{sc_}\text{w} > (\star \text{cc_}\text{c}(\text{w}) =) \star \text{cc_}\text{w}$: compare $\text{i}_\text{C} \ i$ (B1C, B1L) > $\star \text{i}_\text{C} \ i$ > $(\star \text{i}_\text{C} \ i =) \text{sc_}\text{w} = (\text{B1Bo});\textsuperscript{271}$ $\text{i}_\text{C} \ - \ (\text{participle}) > \star \text{i}_\text{C} \ - > (\star \text{i}_\text{C} \ - =)$ $\text{i}_\text{C} \ -$ (B3C, B4C) > $\star \text{cc_}\text{273}$ (B9C) > $\text{cc_} \ - \ (\text{B1L}, \text{B2P}; \text{B3L});\textsuperscript{274}$ $\text{s}(\text{i})_\text{C} \ - \ (\text{B2L}) \ (\text{participle}) > \star \text{s}(\text{i})_\text{C} \ - > (\star \text{s}(\text{i})_\text{C} \ - =) \text{s}(\text{i}) \ - \ (\text{B1L};\textsuperscript{275}$ $\text{s}_\text{C}_\text{r} \ \text{w} \ \text{(T1L)} > (\star \text{cc_}\text{c}(\text{w}) =) \text{sc_}\text{w} \textsuperscript{276} \equiv \star \text{s}_\text{C}_\text{r} \ \text{w} > (\star \text{s}(\text{cc}_\text{w}) =) \text{sc_}\text{w}$ (B6C);\textsuperscript{277} $\text{s}(\text{i})_\text{C} \ - \ \text{sn} > \star \text{s}(\text{i})_\text{C} \ - \ \text{sn} > (\star \text{s}(\text{cc}_\text{w}) =) \text{sc_}\text{w}$.\textsuperscript{278} For the word $\text{ic}_\text{C}(\text{i})$, "tomb,"\textsuperscript{279} the writing $\text{sc_}\text{w}$ well represents $\star \text{cc_}\text{w} > \star \text{ic}_\text{C}(\text{i}) > \star \text{cccc} > \text{cc_}\text{w}$. The writing $\text{cc_}$ seems to represent the form $\star \text{cccc} \ ( = \star \text{cc_}\text{c}_\text{c})$ as it would normally be written before a suffix pronoun: thus $\text{cc}_\text{f} \textsuperscript{280} = \star \text{cc_}\text{c}_\text{f}$.\textsuperscript{281} The spelling $\text{ic}_\text{C}(\text{i})$\textsuperscript{282} is probably only a scribal abbreviation for $\text{sc_}\text{w}$ and\textsuperscript{283} probably represents $(\text{sc}_\text{c}) \textsuperscript{285} < \text{sc_}\text{w}$, with $\text{sc}$ written for weakened final $\text{c}$.\textsuperscript{286}

§ 25. With this evidence for the consonantal identity of $\text{ic}_\text{C}(\text{i}) < (\text{i})_\text{c}$ and $\text{ic}_\text{C}$, "to wash,"\textsuperscript{287} we are better prepared to accept the possibility that the 3-lit. $\text{ic}_\text{C}(\text{i}) < (\text{i})_\text{c}$ could in certain other of its
forms also behave to some extent like a 3rd-wk. verb. This might be the explanation for the Old Egyptian feminine causative infinitive attested as $\text{si}^c_t$ or $\text{si}^c_t$. However, $\text{si}^c(i)t$—as a formation patterned after the causative infinitive of a 3rd-wk. verb—could have been written the same way. On the other hand, if the written $i$ is understood to represent not the initial $i$ of $(i)^c_r > i^c(i)$, but rather the final $i < r$, then the proper transliteration would be $\text{si}(i)^c_{fr}$. Possible support for this latter interpretation may be found in $\text{dmut}$, an otherwise isolated early Middle Kingdom writing of the infinitive of $\text{dm}<\text{dmr}$.

§ 26. Turning now to the Coptic evidence, Edel, who on the one hand sees a 2-lit. root as the basis for the feminine causative infinitive of this word, nevertheless sees a 3rd-wk. root behind the Coptic $\text{alx}$. For him $\star^c_{frt} > \text{alx}$, in exactly the same way as $\text{hd}(i)t > \text{qate}$. However, if the occurrence of a feminine causative infinitive associated with this word is a phenomenon restricted to Old Egyptian (as Edel himself seems to indicate by his formulation $i^c_r > i^c_r$), and if the root $(i)^c_r$ is preserved as $\star^c_{fr1} > \star^c_{fr1} > \star^c_{fr1}$ ($\equiv \star^c_{fr1}$) down to the Coptic period (as is maintained here), how can we explain the form $\text{alx}$? Curiously, it is from the same $\star^c_{fr1}$ to which he traces $\text{alx}$, that Edel elsewhere derives the form $\text{om}$. A similar ambiguity exists concerning the origin of the causative $\text{Talx}$, which Till assigns to $\text{alx}$, whereas Crum, Westendorf, Spiegelberg, and Sethe describe it as the causative of $\text{om}$. On the other hand, Kasser takes the form $\text{to1lx}$ as the causative of his $\text{om}$. The
The clarification of this situation depends on a reevaluation of the Coptic evidence.

§ 27. If we begin with the infinitive of ird, and attempt to relate it to ωλ, we can visualize the following developmental sequence:

\[
\ast 3a\text{ψ}\text{ψ}1 > \ast 3a\text{ψ}\text{ψ}2 > \ast 3a\text{ψ}\text{ψ}1 > \ast 3a\text{ψ}\text{ψ}1 > \omega\lambda. \]

But the forms ωλ and ωλε are also attested as variants of ωλ;\(^{311}\) and it is precisely their final -ε/-l which has been interpreted as indicating a derivation from a 3rd-wk. ird.\(^{312}\) However, the alternation of ωλ with ωλl and ωλε need not have any such implication, as may be seen by an examination of the dialectal forms of cwtm,\(^{313}\) oyoein,\(^{314}\) and maiein.\(^{315}\) Thus cwtm (SAA2FMfP) ≡ cwtm (SBFMf) ≡ cwtme (AA2)\(^{316}\) cwtm (S) ≡ cwtm (S) ≡ cwtm (F); oyoein (SOP) = oyoein (SAA2) = oyoein (S) = oyoein (SAA2) = oyoein (B)\(^{317}\) = oyoein (B); and maiein (SA2) = moein (S) = meiein (FMfP) = meiein (AA2) = mei (AA2) = MHN1 (B). Hence it is not surprising that ωλ, which represents *ω̅λ /*3όρι/,\(^{318}\) should also have had the graphic and phonetic variants ωλε/ωλl; and the equivalence of ωλ and ωλε/1 does not, therefore, require the assumption of an underlying form *ird.

Immediate verification of this conclusion is provided by Coptic wy,\(^{319}\) which comes from the root ird: *3aψψ > 3aψψ > 3aψψ > wy (i.e., *wy /*όρι/) = wyε/1.\(^{320}\)

§ 28. Turning next to the causative τάλο, there is no reason to doubt that this was derived from ωλ ≡ ωλε/1, in the same way as τάνγο is related to ωνε, and τάπο to ωγε.\(^{321}\) What, then, is the relationship of the formally intermediate δλε to ωλ on
the one hand and Τάλο on the other? To attempt to provide an answer to this question, the forms of ωλ, 322 Τάλο, 323 and Αλε 324—along with those of Τοιλε, 325 to be considered next—have been tabulated in the attached fig. 1. The table is complete for all forms of Τάλο, Αλε, and Τοιλε, and includes all forms of the status absolutus of the infinitive of ωλ. By way of explanation of the table itself: the letters across the top of the columns, and the numbers down the left side of the page, are for reference only. Column A indicates whether the form is infinitive (-) or qualitative (+): ± means that it may be either; 326 column B indicates whether or not the form is causative; 327 column C indicates the first vowel of the form; column D indicates whether or not a consonant precedes the λ (or ρ) 328 of column E; column E is central to the horizontal organization of the table, inasmuch as the position of this λ (or ρ) within a form greatly facilitates recognition of the other correspondences which exist between the forms; column F indicates the vowel following the λ (or ρ) of column E; and column G indicates whether or not a consonant follows the second vowel of the form (within the word itself): {ο}γ and {ε'ℓ} indicate that the consonants w and υ in these forms may be written oγ or γ and ε' or ℓ respectively. 329 Column H indicates whether or not the form is bound to a following letter (i.e., -τ within the word, in the case of the qualitative) or another word or a suffix, in the status nominalis (-) or status pronominalis (=): infinitive forms accompanied by no symbol in this column are status absolutus, and those accompanied by no symbol other than { - } or { = } also occur in the status absolutus; { - } indicates the form also occurs in the status nominalis, and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>SAA^2_{BF}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>A^2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>A^2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>\gamma</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>SAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>\gamma</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>FM \textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>BA^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A^2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>A^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>SS_{AA^2P}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>SAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\omega</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>S \textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>A^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>\pm</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>\alpha</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>\pm</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>\lambda</td>
<td>{\equiv}</td>
<td>SA^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Coptic Dialectal Forms of the Word ωλ/αλε
\{ = \} indicates that it also occurs in the status pronominalis. Column I indicates the dialects\textsuperscript{330} in which the form is found: in the case of an infinitive form which can be used in more than one state, the references are given to whichever state is not indicated in braces\{ \}. 

The particular vertical arrangement here adopted is intended to illustrate the close relationship of the various forms of \(\lambda \lambda e\) to the corresponding forms of \(\tau \lambda \lambda o\)--10:11, 12:13, 22:23, and 28:29; 15 seems to represent a form intermediate between 14 and 16/17--suggesting that \(\lambda \lambda e\) was, in fact, derived secondarily from \(\tau \lambda \lambda o\), perhaps by analogy with \(\tau \lambda \rho o / \omega \varepsilon / \lambda \varepsilon\).\textsuperscript{331} Likewise, \(\tau \omega \lambda e\)\textsuperscript{332} seems to be a secondary formation for the \(\tau\)-causative, derived directly from \(\omega \lambda / \omega \lambda e\). Finally, though the word \(\tau \omega \lambda e\)\textsuperscript{333} is quite unparalleled as a causative formation, \(\dagger\) does occasionally show the pattern /\(\text{t\v}{\text{y}}\)-/ in the status nominalis;\textsuperscript{334} so the alternation of \(*\text{t\v}{\text{y}}l\zeta\)-\textsuperscript{335} and \(*\text{t\v}{\text{p}}l\zeta\)-\textsuperscript{336} in the causative forms of \(\omega \lambda / \omega \lambda e\) is not entirely unexpected.\textsuperscript{337}

Now the derivation of \(\text{ccw}\)\textsuperscript{338} from an antecedent (i)\textsuperscript{crw}\textsuperscript{339} is not as improbable as might have appeared at first.\textsuperscript{340} The root \(\text{ccr}\) has two meanings: 1) "to ascend or mount up,"\textsuperscript{341} and 2) "to approach";\textsuperscript{342} of these the basic or primary sense seems to be the former,\textsuperscript{343} the latter being a developed or specialized usage. Therefore, in the Litany of the Sun,\textsuperscript{344} when the sun god Re is described as \(\text{nb}(\omega)\textsuperscript{345} \text{ccw}\ldots\), the meaning is probably "lord of ascent (or ascending)\ldots," with reference to the rising of the sun.

§ 29. \(\text{cc}\) (5). Next to be considered in the series of Late Egyptian \(\text{cc}\)-words is the \(\text{ccr}\) (also written \(\text{cc}\)), "vessel or container,"
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of *wb I 3.6. In searching for the origins of 3cc/3CC, one cannot fail to be drawn to the old word 3,346 "bowl," "cup," or "vessel." If these two words are, in fact, identical347--i.e., if they represent two spellings of but a single word--two observations about them may be made immediately: 1) the masculine form 3CC is to be preferred to the feminine 3CCt; and 2) the transliteration 3C must be incomplete, and needs to be emended. For the alternation 3cc/3CCt, we may cite 3CCt as the infinitive of 3CC < tCC,348 in which the -t is clearly intrusive, as well as 3CCt 349 found once as a writing for the plural of the word 3C itself.

The usual spellings of 3C-- 350 for the Archaic Period, and 351 or 352 for the Old Kingdom--do not indicate that 3C is other than the full reading of this word. However, a single writing from early in Dynasty V, 353 shows that c(i)354 is actually to be understood in all these cases. Now between the Old Egyptian c(i) and the Late Egyptian 3CC, we should expect to encounter the form CC. The illusion of such a form is presented by the writing 355 in the offering lists; but this spelling represents the dual--c(i)wy, "two vessels"356--as the variants357 clearly show.358 A somewhat different interpretation is required to explain the isolated New Kingdom 359 written as though a dual, but generally agreed to represent the singular 3C.360 Here the historical spelling of the dual ending ( 361 ) may have been used phonetically,362 to render the final -v (<-i) of this word thus confirming our reading c(i) for the Old Kingdom 363 or the ending -wy may have been added mechanically to the singular writing 364 by a scribe who simply
mistook it for the dual: 364 in this case we should transliterate \( \text{cc}<\text{wy}> \). Whichever interpretation is correct, however, they both imply the sequential development \( \text{c} \rightarrow \text{cc} \).

One final possible objection to the equation of \( \text{cc}/\text{cc}<t> \) with \( \text{c} \) is the fact that both occur together in a single manuscript. 365 In the document in question, Pap. Harris I, 366 the relevant spellings are found as follows: 367 \( \text{£} \text{ι} \text{θ} = 18a.8; 38a.13-14; 38b.1-6, 9, 11; 39.2-4, 12-13; 40a.1,10; 54a.9; 54b.9-11; 55a.4-5; 55b.7, 9-10; \) 368 \( \text{£} \text{ί} \text{θ} = 54b.14; 55a.2, 6; 55b.6, 8; \) 369 \( \text{£} \text{ι} \text{θ} = 12a.15; 32b.3-4; 33a.2; 33b.8-9; 52a.5; 52b.15-16; 53a.1; 64a.2; 69.2; \) 368 \( \text{£} \text{ί} \text{θ} = 12b.1; 13a.2; 15a.10; 64a.7-8; 69.3; 70a.4; 70b.10. \) An examination of the distribution of these different spellings confirms that, rather than contrasting with each other, they are complementary: the historical spelling \( \text{c} \) occurs as an abbreviated writing of the account-style lists, where it is the equivalent of 369 the full writing \( \text{cc}/\text{cc}<t> \) -- the contemporary spelling of the word--which occurs only in summaries or totals. 370 Thus this text presents no obstacle to acceptance of the identification of \( \text{c} \) and \( \text{cc}/\text{cc}<t> \).

30. 3\( \text{cc} \) (6). The 3\( \text{cc} \) of Wb I 3.3--for which Belegstehen cites the Litany of the Sun, the 26th invocation of the "Great Litany"--poses yet another kind of problem. From an examination of page 31 of Professor Hornung's new edition of this text, 371 it appears that this spelling is confined to the tomb of Ramesses IV; all the earlier versions, beginning from the time of Thutmose III, write \( \text{cc} \). Thus we might infer that 3\( \text{cc} \) is the Late Egyptian form of a word \( \text{cc} \), understanding \( \text{cc} > \text{c} < \text{cc} > \text{cc} \), just as \( \text{cc}<\text{w}>\text{c} < \text{cc}<\text{w}> \). 372 But the word \( \text{cc} \) eludes us:
not in Wörterbuch, and of no clear etymology, it would have to be considered a hapax of unknown meaning. The determinative \( Y \) (Y 1), however, suggests a possible relationship\(^{373}\) to the common word \( c^3l \), whose meaning would be appropriate to this context, and for which we may postulate the following development: \( c^3l \rightarrow c^3c \rightarrow *c^3c \rightarrow c^3c \).\(^{376}\) In this case the transliteration \( *c^3c \) must be abandoned\(^{377}\) in favor of reading \( c^3c \), with transposition of signs\(^{378}\) for purely esthetic reasons.

Precisely this kind of graphic metathesis is attested for the group \( iw^c > c_w^c \).\(^{379}\) The writings \( \text{\textit{\( i \)}} \text{\textit{\( w \)}} \text{\textit{\( c \)}} \) and \( \text{\textit{\( c \)}} \text{\textit{\( w \)}} \text{\textit{\( i \)}} \)---hardly to be read \( *c_iw^c \) or \( *i_w^c c \)--preserve at once the historical spelling of this group, alongside the elements of its new, phonetically spelled equivalent\(^{382}\)--a phenomenon likewise observable in the writings \( \text{\textit{\( c \)}} \text{\textit{\( c \)}} \text{\textit{\( y \)}} \text{\textit{\( r \)}} \) and \( \text{\textit{\( c \)}} \text{\textit{\( c \)}} \text{\textit{\( y \)}} \text{\textit{\( r \)}} \), showing simple rearrangement of the same signs. Erman comments on the writing \( iw^c c_y r \) for "garrison-troops," that it must be a mixed spelling, half phonetic and half historical:\(^{385}\) \( iw^c c_y r \), in fact, does represent \( i_w^c c_y r > c_w^c c_y r \).\(^{386}\)

Finally, to translate the present passage: the sun god Re is here described as a ram (\( \text{\textit{\( s \)}} \text{\textit{\( r \)}} \)), "raised\(^{387}\) (i.e., lofty) of head, and great\(^{388}\) of horns (or brow)."

31. \( c^3c \) (7). For the \( c^3c \) of \( \text{\textit{\( Wb \)}} \) I 2,14, Gardiner lists its
occurrences—the first of these dating from the reign of Horemhab; and he translates variously "put into confusion (?)","to harm," or the like," and "to injure";\textsuperscript{392} Pflüger\textsuperscript{393} translates "to importune," and Helck,\textsuperscript{394} "to oppress (?)." These translations point in a general way to the notion of afflicting or injuring, a sense appropriate to the use of the strong-arm determinative (D 40). But in order to refine our understanding of the nuances of this word, it is necessary once again to attempt to ascertain its origins and etymology. The primary candidate for the predecessor of this \textsuperscript{3}c\textsuperscript{c} is the word \textsuperscript{2}c\textsuperscript{c}, sometimes also determined with \textsuperscript{1}c\textsuperscript{c} \textsuperscript{395}

§ 32. Gardiner\textsuperscript{396} lists several derivatives from the root \textsuperscript{2}c\textsuperscript{c}, including: 1) \textsuperscript{2}c\textsuperscript{c}\textsuperscript{397} in the tomb of Ankhtify at Mo'alla, whose meaning he gives as "'valour,' 'spirit,' 'virility';"\textsuperscript{398} 2) \textsuperscript{2}c\textsuperscript{c}, "semen, (male) seed";\textsuperscript{399} 3) \textsuperscript{2}c\textsuperscript{c}, "'to beget or engender' (lit. 'to ejaculate')";\textsuperscript{400} 4) \textsuperscript{2}c\textsuperscript{c}\textsuperscript{401} "ithyphallic"\textsuperscript{402} or "ejaculating";\textsuperscript{403} 5) the word "strength"\textsuperscript{404} of \textsuperscript{Wb} I 2.12.

§ 33. This latter, restricted to inscriptions in the funerary temple of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu, is found as follows:

\textsuperscript{405} \textsuperscript{406} \textsuperscript{407} \textsuperscript{408} It occurs in contexts

contexts describing either 1) the king's strength,\textsuperscript{409} or 2) depriving enemies of their strength.\textsuperscript{410} \textsuperscript{Wb} transliterates "\textsuperscript{2}c\textsuperscript{c}\textsuperscript{j} (?)"; Gardiner\textsuperscript{411} recognizing in these writings a form of the word \textsuperscript{2}c\textsuperscript{c}, rejects the transliteration \textsuperscript{*}\textsuperscript{2}c\textsuperscript{y}, but does not attempt to explain the certain \textsuperscript{y}.
Most likely all of these spellings represent ꜱꜰ y, with the group ꜱꜰ in place of original ꜱ; the writing ꜱꜰ y, attested only once, is surely an error or incomplete writing for ꜱꜰ y. Projecting the usual development ꜱꜰ c > ꜱꜰ c > ꜱꜰ c, we can see ꜱꜰ y c as equivalent to ꜱꜰ c, but without the assimilation of ꜱ ( = y) to c. Here we have further evidence of differentiation in the development of ꜱ > ꜱ and ꜱ > ꜱ:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ꜱꜰ c} \\
\text{ꜱꜰ y c} ( = * y c) > ^* y c ( = * y c)
\end{array}
\]

The pronunciation reflected in the spelling ꜱꜰ y c must have originated at a time prior to the reign of Horemhab, and probably comes from as far back as the Second Intermediate Period.

§ 34. Other words from the same root are: 6) ꜱꜰ c, "waterhole," pool"; *(well)spring or fountainhead"; 7) ꜱꜰ c, "to spit (out);" 8) ꜱꜰ c (as a condition of the hair), "an (oily) secretion, discharge, or oozing (of the scalp), seborrhea"; 9) ꜱꜰ c, "poison or venom" (as a cause of disease); 10) ꜱꜰ c, "sapling, (young) shoot, or sprout." For the latter, see: ꜱꜰ c n(y) N pn (var.: ḡsūr N pn) m ꜱꜰ c w sḥt (var.: sḥwt), "The vigor of N is (that of) the saplings of the marshland"; ꜱꜰ c w pw n(yw) sḥt-ntr, "They are the saplings of the god's marsh," as the "name of the punt-poles" in the catalogue of ship parts; ḡnk (var.: ḡnt) ꜱꜰ c n(y) sḥt, "I am a sapling of the marshland"; ꜱꜰ c w sḥwt, "the saplings of the marshlands."
C3C as follows:

vb.: flow—ejaculate, beget/engender
  be potent/virile, be valorous
  be forceful, injure/harm

n.: fluid—semen—potency—(manly) strength—poison

To fill in the details of this general picture, several observations need to be made. The determinative 𓄖𓄶 434 found in the tomb of Ankhtify 435 and at Medinet Habu 436 seems to be the equivalent of 𓊝 (or 𓊞) 437 in PT 1200b, 1628c, 1788a, 438 and the Ramesseum "Dramatic Papyrus," line 33. 434 The C3C meaning "to beget or engender"—normally used of the father—also occurs of the mother 440 as the following citation 441 attests: ḫlk mmtw ihtw 441 tp(w)t n(yw)t rC(w)
  wtt*n.f wlm hnt n(y)t mltwt.1442 3st...ink pw C3C 443 C3C...C3C.n w1
  mltwt.1 3st. "I am this first seed of Re; he begot me in the belly of my mother Isis....I am the one whom the procreator (fem.) (or progenitress) bred 444...; my mother Isis bred 445 me." Both C3C-saplings and C3C-springs were to be found in marshy areas; 446 perhaps the saplings required abundant water to thrive. 447 For the development of the meaning "poison," a comparison with the word mttw—"discharge or secretion" 448 > "semen or seed" 449 "poison" 450—is most instructive; the words C3C and mttw also occur together in parallelism. 451 For the association between sexuality and injury, compare the "donkey curse," which portrays the sex act as a hostile gesture. 452

§ 36. C3C (8-9). Two more C3C-words must be introduced here,
though the etymology of each is still questionable. The translation of the \( \text{CBC} \) of Wb I 3.5—as found in the Berlin medical papyrus \( (= \text{Pap. Berlin 3038}) \), line 126—is uncertain: both "an unknown (fluid) drug"\(^{453} \) and "\( \text{CBC} \)-vessel"\(^{454} \) have been proposed for it. If the latter is correct, we have simply another occurrence of the word \( \text{CBC} \), "vessel";\(^ {455} \) but if the former is to be understood, two other words present themselves as possible equivalents of \( \text{CBC} \): 1) \( \text{ICBC} \), "barley,"\(^ {456} \) and 2) \( \text{ICBC} \),\(^ {457} \) an unidentified drug. Until the meaning of this \( \text{CBC} \) can be defined more exactly—and that of \( \text{ICBC} \) as well—further speculation is futile.\(^ {458} \) Similarly, the meaning of \( \text{CBC} \), attested in the second division of the Book of Caverns,\(^ {459} \) cannot yet be ascertained; not does the variant \( \text{CBC} \)\(^ {460} \) elucidate the matter. The problem in this case is that the determinative is too vague to permit positive identification with one or another of the various \( \text{CBC} \)-words:\(^ {461} \) solely on the basis of context (the word occurs merely as a label accompanying the depiction of a ram-headed god),\(^ {462} \) both "interpreter"\(^ {463} \) and "ejaculated one"\(^ {464} \) have been suggested as possible translations. To be sure, the alternation \( \text{CBC} \rightarrow \text{CBC} \) is known for the former;\(^ {465} \) but the perfective passive participle \( \text{CBC} \rightarrow \text{CBC} \) is also derivable from the root \( \text{CBC} \), given the hypothetical intermediary \( \text{CBC} \). However, because of the imprecision of the text, quite different translations might be equally valid: once again the evidence is inconclusive.

\( \S\) 37. \( \text{CBC} \) (10). Finally, we come to the \( \text{CBC} \)\(^ {467} \)
which is equivalent to $\text{cc}_1$.\textsuperscript{468} The writing with plural strokes indicates
a transliteration $\text{cc}_w$,\textsuperscript{469} which seems to verify the suggestion
previously made\textsuperscript{470} that $\text{cc}_1$ is, in fact, identical with $\text{cc}_w$.\textsuperscript{471} This
$\text{cc}_w$ is used of the heart,\textsuperscript{472} with the meaning "to become agitated or
anxious."\textsuperscript{473} Now Sethe has already pointed out\textsuperscript{474} that the $\text{cc}_2$ of
Sinuhe also involves the heart, as is evident from the context:

\begin{quote}
$\text{h3ty nb m3h(w) n.1 bmwt t3w br cc}_2 \text{ ib nb mr(w) n.1,}$\textsuperscript{475} which may be
translated "Every heart was afraid\textsuperscript{476} for me; women and men (alike)
became anxious:\textsuperscript{477} every heart was concerned about\textsuperscript{478} me."
\end{quote}

§ 38. To conclude this section, we may summarize our findings as
follows: for the several different Late Egyptian $\text{cc}$-words whose origins
we have attempted to trace, we have found of each of them--insofar as it
has been possible to determine--that their earliest forms shared in
common an original $\text{c}$ plus either $\text{i}$ or $\text{h}$ (or both) which were susceptible
to assimilation to $\text{c}$ in Middle Egyptian or early Late Egyptian,
respectively; thus $\text{c}_3$, $\text{c}_1$, $\text{cc}_1$, $\text{cc}/\text{i}$/$\text{cc}$ $\text{w}$ (?), $\text{c}_2$, $\text{c}_3$, $\text{c}_1$, and $\text{c}_3$
all appear as $\text{h3}$ $\text{c}$ (with various determinatives) in Late Egyptian--
to which may be added also $\text{cc}_w$, $\text{cc}$ $\text{w}$, written defectively as $\text{h3}$ $\text{c}$ $\text{w}$.
Chronologically, this shift is attested for $\text{c}_1$ and $\text{c}_1$ already in the
reign of Thutmos III, $\text{c}_2$ temp. Horemhab, $\text{c}_3$ temp. Merneptah, $\text{c}_1$ and
and $\text{c}_3$ temp. Ramesses IV.\textsuperscript{480}

Starting from the developmental sequence established for $\text{c}_3$ $\text{w}$--i.e.,
$\text{c}_3$ $\text{w}$ $\text{c}_w$ $\text{c}$ $\text{c}_w$ $\text{c}_w$--we have already postulated that the assimilation
of $\text{c}_2$ ($> /\text{c}_2/)$ to $\text{c}_2$ occurred in early Late Egyptian, possibly during
Dynasty XVII.\textsuperscript{481} On the other hand, the first appearance of $\text{c}_2$ or $\text{c}_2$
in place of initial $\text{c}$ (in forms derived from the words $\text{c}_2$ and $\text{c}_2$)
is dated to the reign of Thutmose III; and it is at precisely this time, as we have seen, 482 that the weakening of $c$--which underlies this substitution--is also found. Hence it seems not unreasonable to suppose that the change of initial $c$ to $\partial$ actually took place at about the same time, perhaps during the joint reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. 483 The picture changes again under Akhenaten with the emergence of standard Late Egyptian, 484 and with its official recognition of that orthography 485 in which the use of $\hat{c}c$ or $\tilde{c}$ to represent weakened initial $c$ became a regular feature--appearing with increasing frequency from the time of Horemhab onwards. It is also in the Amarna period, as evidence for a new attitude toward the script, that $\hat{c}$ /?/ occurs alongside $\tilde{c}$ /?/ for old initial $c$. 486 Before leaving this subject altogether, it should be noted that the use of $\tilde{c}$ alone to represent the initial weakened $c$ > /?/ of the words studied here is restricted to writings of those in which the use of $\hat{c}c$ would have resulted in the ungainly combination $\hat{c}cc$: i.e., $c\hat{c}i$, $\hat{c}tt$, 487 $c\hat{c}c$, $\hat{c}cc$ (?), 485 and the infinitive of $\hat{c}c$. 489

SECTION D: Words erroneously associated with the root $\hat{c}c$

§ 39. The foregoing discussion of the phonetic development of the word $\hat{c}cw$ now enables us to dissociate from it certain other forms whose relationship to it has been assumed previously. First, as has already been mentioned, 490 the $\hat{c}c$-garment is incorrectly identified by du Mesnil du Buisson as "the loin-cloth of foreigners"; similarly, Petrie 491 associates the $\hat{c}cc$-vessel with the root $\hat{c}c$ (> $\hat{c}cc$), which he
translates "foreign."\textsuperscript{492}

Then comes the word $\frac{\text{cc}_I}{\text{cc}_W} > \frac{\text{cc}_W}{\text{cc}_I}$\textsuperscript{493} The identity of $\text{cc}_I$ and $\text{cc}_W$ was postulated by Gardiner in 1915\textsuperscript{494}—and explicitly rejected by Sethe in 1923.\textsuperscript{495} Various attempts to interpret the relevant passage in Sinuhe\textsuperscript{496} have led to the translations "to shriek,"\textsuperscript{496} "to yell,"\textsuperscript{498} "to sigh or groan,"\textsuperscript{499} and "to murmur"\textsuperscript{500}—all of which could be regarded as modifications of the basic idea "to jabber or babble."\textsuperscript{501}

The identification is undeniably attractive, given the fact that the determinative $\text{f}_{\text{I}}$ (A 2) is used in both words, and the writing $\text{f}_{\text{II}}$\textsuperscript{502} has now given us a form of $\frac{\text{cc}_W}{\text{cc}_W}$ practically identical with $\text{f}_{\text{II}}$\textsuperscript{503} However, the formation $\frac{\text{cc}_W}{\text{cc}_W}$ represents a nomen agentis,\textsuperscript{504} whereas $\frac{\text{cc}_I}{\text{cc}_W}$ is infinitival,\textsuperscript{505} and $\text{cc}_W$ appears in a $\text{sdm-f}$ construction.\textsuperscript{506} Since it is impossible to assign $\frac{\text{cc}_I}{\text{cc}_W} / \frac{\text{cc}_W}{\text{cc}_I}$ to either the infinitive or $\text{sdm-f}$ or $\text{cc}_W$—which would be $\text{cc}_I > \text{cc}_W > \text{cc}_W / \text{cc}_I$—\textsuperscript{507} $\text{cc}_W / \text{cc}_I$\textsuperscript{508} $\text{cc}_I / \text{cc}_W$ must represent a separate 3-lit. root with final $-\text{I} \equiv -\text{m}$.\textsuperscript{510}

Next is the feminine proper name $\text{f}_{\text{I}}$,\textsuperscript{511} attested on a Middle Kingdom stele.\textsuperscript{512} Frankfort\textsuperscript{513} "...wonders whether [this] name means she who speaks foreign languages..."\textsuperscript{514} The masculine name $\text{f}_{\text{II}}$ does occur during Dynasty XII\textsuperscript{515}—the feminine counterpart of which would be $\text{f}_{\text{II}}$ $\text{cc}_W / \text{cc}_W$;\textsuperscript{516} but a Middle Kingdom form $\frac{\text{cc}_I}{\text{cc}_I}$ is inconsistent with our evidence regarding the chronology of the change of $\frac{\text{cc}_I}{\text{cc}_I}$ to $\frac{\text{cc}_W}{\text{cc}_W}$: this happened only in Late Egyptian.\textsuperscript{517}

Once more, however, the lack of a determinative\textsuperscript{518} prevents our discovery of this word's real meaning.
Finally, in Pt 455c (W) we find 3\, 519 again without a determinative, and in a context without parallel in the other versions of the Pyramid Texts. Read 3\,\textsuperscript{3}Cc\,\textsuperscript{w} by Sethe\,\textsuperscript{520} and Faulkner,\,\textsuperscript{521} this form has been connected with the word 3\,\textsuperscript{3}Cc\,\textsuperscript{w}, being translated\,\textsuperscript{522} both "talkers\,\textsuperscript{523}" and "foreigners."\,\textsuperscript{524} But the phonetic development implied by such an equation could not possibly have occurred early enough to be reflected in the Pyramid Texts.\,\textsuperscript{525} Sethe has already suggested a relationship with c\textsuperscript{3}c,\,\textsuperscript{526} "(well)spring or fountainhead, waterhole or pool,"\,\textsuperscript{527} a word which does occur elsewhere in the Pyramid Texts,\,\textsuperscript{528} and is sometimes found written without the 0-sign (0\,29).\,\textsuperscript{529} If this spelling does represent the plural of c\textsuperscript{3}c, we have here another example of graphic metathesis to achieve symmetry in the writing of a word containing more than one c\textsuperscript{ayin.}\,\textsuperscript{530} The reading c\textsuperscript{3}Cc\,\textsuperscript{w} does, in fact, give very good sense: c\textsuperscript{3}Cc\,\textsuperscript{w} wrw c\textsuperscript{3}(I)w hntiw Thnw, "the great and large watery places\,\textsuperscript{531} which are (at the) south of\,\textsuperscript{532} Thnw-Libya"--perhaps as a description for the great oases of the Libyan desert.\,\textsuperscript{533}

SECTION E: The ancient Egyptian word for "donkey"

\S\, 40. Edel\,\textsuperscript{534} was the first to draw attention to an unusual spelling of the word "donkey," from which he has successfully demonstrated that the usual transliteration c\textsuperscript{3}\,\textsuperscript{535} is incomplete; he argues, instead, for a full reading 3\textsuperscript{3}\,\textsuperscript{536} This form is of special
interest to us because of its possible connection with the root חָּיָּה. The writing in question, חָּיָּה, occurs in the phrase הָּדִּיקָּה לֵבָּה, "Removing (it) on donkey(-back)," as the caption accompanying a depiction of three donkeys laden with grain sacks. 537

Although admitting that חָּיָּה could itself be a singular (perhaps even a defective writing for a plural חָּיָּהוֹ), 538 Edel 539 favors understanding חָּיָּה as the plural of חָּיָּה, concluding that Coptic חָּיָּה cannot possibly be derived from חָּיָּה: one should expect the -ו to be preserved. 540 But although Edel discusses most of the Coptic plural forms of this word 541 --in which a ו could be attributed to the plural ending--he does not attempt the derivation of any of the singular forms other than חָּיָּה.

Quite apart from the Coptic evidence, חָּיָּה as the word for "donkey" would fit a pattern well attested for some other common animal names. 542 Its vocalization could have been *חָּיָּה, which would make it nearly identical with the word *חָּיָּה. 543 This also means that the consonants of both words must have undergone the same phonetic transformations-- חָּיָּה > חָּיָּה > חָּיָּה > חָּיָּה--though these developments are not observable in the word "donkey," due to its standardized, non-phonetic orthography. 544

If we begin with this חָּיָּה, 545 rather than *חָּיָּה, we may better understand the various Coptic forms which were descended from it.

§ 41. The following are the singular forms of "donkey": 546

1) חָּיָּה (S), 2) חָּיָּה (S), 3) חָּיָּה (S), 4) חָּיָּה (S), 5) חָּיָּה (S), 6) חָּיָּה (S). Two of these (Nos. 1 and 5) end in -ו, the remainder in -ו; and it is on the significance of this -ו that our reconstruction depends. For Till, 547 חָּיָּה must represent either ח or חו; י alone can represent ח only after ח, או, or ח: חי cannot
represent /ɔw/. So Till would understand ɛoy and ʃɛ1oy as /eʉ/ and /yû/, respectively. However, except in two specific instances --*a after m/a> oy, and *a before ñ > oy (A always; A² sometimes) --Till confesses that the origins of vocalic oy are still unknown. Some progress may be made if we deny that the -oy in ɛoy and ʃɛ1oy was necessarily strictly vocalic in origin: by reading -oy as /-ɔw/ we may confirm that ḳc3w was indeed the ancestor of the Coptic word "donkey," and elucidate the alternation of -oy and -w seen in its singular forms.

§ 42. Already at this point, before proceeding any further, a simple comparison between ɛoy and ʃɛ1oy--whether they are read as /eʉ/ and /yû/ or /ɛɔw/ and /yɔw/--shows immediately that the vocalization *tʃcɔ3aw cannot be correct. The accent of the monosyllabic yu/yɔw proves beyond doubt that the accent of the disyllabic eʉ/εɔw was on the second syllable, therefore that the accent of the antecedent ḳc3w was also on the second syllable: thus *tʃcɔ3aw. This hypothetical difference between *tʃcɔ3aw and *tʃcɔ3av (for which no Coptic equivalent is known) must have had a dramatic effect on pronunciation, so that even if both the vowels of *tʃcɔ3av were also originally *a, no confusion between the two words should have been possible in the spoken language.

§ 43. Now the singular forms of "donkey" may be presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST SYLLABLE</th>
<th>SECOND SYLLABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ɛoy</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ɛw</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ɛɛw</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ɛɛɛw</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ʃɛ1oy</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ʃɛ1w</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several details of this tabulation require clarification. To begin with, it must be kept in mind that the immediate predecessor of these forms was not \( \text{�c₃w} \); in accordance with the phonetic principles laid down so far, this should have been \( \text{ appName} \)—i.e., \( \text{appName} \). In the unaccented first syllable, neither \( \text{ appName} \) nor \( \text{ appName} \)—both of which had acquired the value /\text{appName}/\text{appName} \) was given any expression in the Coptic script.\text{appName} this syllable is represented only by the colorless vowel /\text{appName}/ (reduced from \( \text{appName} \)),\text{appName} or not at all.\text{appName} Although the initial /\text{appName}/ (<\text{appName}> of the second syllable is not written\text{appName} in Nos. 1-2, its presence is assured by the group \( \text{appName} \text{appName} \) in No. 3. On the other hand, the /\text{appName}/ in Nos. 4-6 cannot be attributed to earlier \( \text{ appName} \). Edel, throughout his study,\text{appName} assumes that /\text{appName}/ developed out of \( \text{ appName} \),\text{appName} an explanation excluded by the present reconstruction. But there is another possible source for /\text{appName}/ in Coptic, namely \( \text{ appName} \);\text{appName} and if we look back to the form \( \text{ appName} \) (\( = \text{ appName} \)), we find \( \text{ appName} \) there in exactly the position of later /\text{appName}/—i.e., as the first consonant of the second syllable. From this we must conclude again that in some dialectal forms \( \text{ appName} \) did not assimilate to \( \text{ appName} \).\text{appName} For /\text{appName}/\text{appName} \equiv /\text{appName}/ at the end of the word, the change of \( \text{ appName} \) to /\text{appName}/ is the normal development;\text{appName} but /\text{appName}/ must also have descended from \( \text{ appName} \), probably through an intermediate \( \text{ appName} \): i.e., \( \text{ appName} \) \( \text{ appName} \) \( \text{ appName} \) /\text{appName}/. The shift \( \text{ appName} \) is attested in Bohairic:\text{appName} \( \text{ appName} \) \( \text{ appName} \) but \( \text{ appName} \).\text{appName} and the loss of final \( \text{ appName} \) \( \text{ appName} \) \( \text{ appName} \) \( \text{ appName} \) \( \text{ appName} \) is paralleled in Akhmimic: \( \text{ appName} \) \( \text{ appName} \),\text{appName} but \( \text{ appName} \).\text{appName} (with the disappearance of \( \text{ appName} \) after it has colored the preceding vowel; the former presence of \( \text{ appName} \) in such words is indicated by the quality of this vowel, by a comparison of the various dialectal forms, or by knowledge of the
Pharaonic equivalents).

§ 44. Pursuant to the implications of this discussion, it should be observed that the form $\text{[i]l\omega}$ cited by Crum is highly improbable: we should expect to find either $\text{[\lambda]l\omega}$ ($= /\lambda\phi\tilde{\alpha}/$) or simply $\lambda\omega$ ($= /\acute{s}(\tau)\phi\tilde{\alpha}/$), consistent with our Nos. 3 and 2, respectively. With $\text{[* l\omega}$ eliminated from consideration, the development of the Coptic singular forms of the word "donkey" may be summarized as follows:

This schematic arrangement clearly illustrates why Edel was disinclined to reconstruct $\text{Ic\omega}$ as the forerunner of $\text{[e]l\omega}$: the two are so remote from one another that the relationship which exists between them is by no means obvious.

§ 45. Next we shall test this derivation—as well as the still unproven contention that -\text{\textgamma} in $\text{eo\gamma}$ and $\text{[e]l\omega}$ represents /-\textgamma/—by comparing the plural forms of this word. The plural of the masculine singular (Ic\omega>) $\text{*ycc\omega}$ would be (Ic3\omega>) $\text{*ycc\omega}$; and the
feminine singular (*c3wτ*) \(\text{580} \times \text{3aa} \text{cawv} \text{581}\) would have the plural (*c3wτ* \(\text{582} \times \text{3aa} \text{cawv} \)). Upon examination, all \(\text{583}\) the known Coptic plural forms \(\text{584}\) seem to fall into two separate groups: \(\text{585} 1)*\text{ā}(\text{p}) \text{aw} [= \text{eoo} \text{γ} (\text{S}), \text{ay} (\text{F}), \text{ey} (\text{B}), \text{ewo} \text{γ} (\text{S})] ; \text{586} 2)*\text{ā}(\text{p}) \text{av} [= \text{eoo} \text{ye} (\text{S}), \text{eoy} (\text{A})] \text{587} \) and *\text{aw} [= \text{ewo} \text{ye} (\text{S})] . \text{588}

Now it is evident that *\text{ā}(\text{p}) \text{av} and *\text{aw} fit the pattern of the feminine \(\text{589}\) plural *\text{3aa} \text{cawv} \text{t} \equiv *\text{3aa} \text{caw} \text{w} \text{v} \text{t} \text{590}\) while *\text{ā}(\text{p}) \text{aw}

conforms to the masculine singular *\text{3aa} \text{caw} \text{w} \text{t} \text{591} \) (as well as the truncated feminine plural *\text{3aa} \text{caw} \text{t}\).

An alternative interpretation would take the /\text{ā}/ of ewoy and \(\text{592}\) \text{ewoy} back to *\text{a} . According to this hypothesis, ewoy < *\text{3aa} \text{caw} \text{w} \text{t} \text{593}\) (the masculine plural), and \(\text{594}\) \text{ewoy} < *\text{3aa} \text{caw} \text{w} \text{t}\) (the feminine singular). However, such an explanation is superfluous, unnecessarily complicating the history of the Coptic forms: for the three feminine plural forms in Coptic can be derived from the old feminine plural, and all the Coptic masculine forms could well have been descendants of the old masculine singular. After all, the number of a Coptic noun (singular or plural) is not determined so much by its etymology as by syntactical usage: "singular" forms are frequently used in plural constructions \(\text{595}\)--all the more so, one might imagine, in the case of a word whose singular already ends in -w. Thus the singular forms "ew", ςω, and ew can be considered in every way the formal equivalents \(\text{595}\) of the plural forms eoγ, ay, ey, and ewoy. Two significant results are obtained: 1) the form τρω postulated above \(\text{596}\) for the singular is realized in ewoy, further enhancing our derivation of ew and ew from τρω, \text{597} \) and 2) the
equivalence of έγ and ένγ, as well as ἀνγ/ενγ, strengthens our position that -ογ represents /-ογ/ in έγ and ένγ. Finally, it should be pointed out that Edel⁵⁹⁸ himself derives ἀνγ = ενγ from *ίνγογ, which is nothing other than our own reconstruction of the masculine singular.

§ 46. The most striking of the Coptic plural forms of "donkey" are ενγ (B)⁵⁹⁹ and ελγογ (B),⁶⁰⁰ each displaying an apparently intrusive γ. Properly plurals of "ox, cow,"⁶⁰¹ these forms are also used for the plural of "donkey." The reverse is true of ένγ (S): appropriate to the word "donkey,"⁶⁰² it is also used as a plural of "ox, cow"---with the apparent loss of γ. Inasmuch as confusion between the names of such common animals seems unlikely, we must ask what phonetic phenomenon underlies the mysterious appearance and disappearance of γ in these forms. If we remove the γ from ενγ and ελγογ, we are left with *εγγ and *ελγογ; and if we insert an γ into ένγ in the same place it occupies in ενγ and ελγογ, i.e., after the initial ε, we get *ενγογ. But these forms are all known: εγγ (B) and ελγογ (S) as plurals of "donkey,"⁶⁰⁴ and ένγ (S)⁶⁰⁵ as a plural of "ox, cow." As we have already seen, εγγ, ελγογ, and ένγ stem from *ίνγογ⁶⁰⁶ < *ίνγογ; and ενγογ/ελγογ/ἐνογ share the configuration *ίνγογ.⁶⁰⁷ Now the pattern becomes clear: εγγ = ενγ, ελγογ = ελγογ, and ένγ = ένγ, with γ < β.⁶⁰⁸ Corresponding to /?-γ/ (γ<ε).⁶⁰⁹ Incidentally, this exchange of γ and ε also provides additional support for the readings χ(γ)ε.⁶¹⁰ which we have adopted for the εε of εεγ.

§ 47. Corroboration for the interpretation of -ογ as /-ογ/ in
these forms is to be found in the examination of other Coptic words likewise descended from predecessors containing *-ṃw: e.g., the feminine plural *ḥāfisaw(w)vt > ḥyw(SB) = ḥyw(SA₂F) = ḥyw(A) = ḥyw(SB)S, 611 "serpents"; 612 the masculine plural *iḥiyāw > *iḥiyāw 614 > ḫoy(S) = ẖafisig(SF) = ḫay(A²) = ḫay(F) = ḫay(SAB) = ḫawoy(B) = ḫay(S) = Hqawoy(F) = ḫooy(S), 615 "oxen, cows"; 616 *iḥiyāw 617 > *iḥiyāw 618 > ḫoy(SOP) = ḫoy(AA²F) = ḫoy(S) = ḫoy(FMN) = ḫoy(SbBO) = ḫoy(S) = ḫooy(S) = ḫooy(S) = ḫooy(S) = ḫaw(S) = ḫaw(B), 619 "honor, glory"; 620 ḫaw 621 > *ccwt > *ɔɔw ( = *ɔɔcw ) 622 = *ɔɔwvt ( = ẖiay(S) / ḫaw(B) ) 623 > *ɔɔcwvt 624 ( = ḫaw(S) / ḫaw(A) ), 625 "linen"; 626 ḫaw 627 > *ccwt 628 > *ɔɔw ( = *ɔɔcw ) 629 = *ɔɔwvt 630 ( = ẖiay(S) ) 631 > *ɔɔwvt 632 ( = ḫawvt(SA²) / ḫawvt(A) ) / īw (F) = ḫoy(S) / ḫaw(SAA²B), "to wash"; 633 *ɔɔwvt 634 ( = ẖo(S) / ẖo(M) 635 > *ɔɔwvt 636 ( = ḫo(SA²) / ḫaw(SA²BF) / ḫaw(A²) / ḫaw(SF) / ḫaw(F) / ḫaw(SFO) / ḫaw(S) / ḫaw(S), "hair"; 637 *mā w > ḫoy(SOP) = ḫoy(SA²F) = ḫooy(B) = ḫooy(S) = ḫooy(S), 638 "water"; 639 *d(ʾt)-iḥis(m)aw 640 > ḫooy(SP) = ḫay(SB) = ḫay(SA²), 641 "to send". 642

The significance of the foregoing lists may be summarized as follows: 1) the development *-ṃw > - ḫoy(S) = ḫoy(AA²F) = ḫooy (B) 643 is found in the case of *iḥiyāw ("oxen"), *iḥiyāw ("honor"), *māw ("water"), and *d(ʾt)-iḥis(m)aw ("to send"); 2) the development *-ṃw > - ʾ is found in the case of *ḥāfisaw(w)vt ("serpents"), *iḥiyāw ("honor"), *ɔɔwvt ("linen"), *ɔɔwvt ("to wash"), and *ɔɔwvt ("hair"); 3) the near phonetic identity of *sawcaw ("donkey[s]"),
*ễn > ṣaw ("honor"), *mát(haw) ("oxen"), *สู(cṿt) ("to wash"), and *瞀(cṿt) ("linen") is indicated by the existence of the following homonyms ending in -ṿọy : ẹọọy ("donkey [s]"644 or "honor") = ẹọọy ("oxen"), ẹọọy ("oxen" or "honor"), ẹọọy ("donkey")645 = ẹọọ ("to wash") = ẹọọy ("honor"), ẹọọy ("donkey"646 or "to wash" or "linen"), and ẹọọ - ("donkey"647 or "to wash"648). The important considerations for the interpretation of Coptic forms and the study of their etymology are: 1) because *-ṣaw > -ọ (≡ -ọọy)649 = -ọọy, it is for this very reason that -ọ may be called a phonetic variant of -ọy in these words: the equivalence should not be described in such terms as -ọọ = -ọọy;650 2) because *-ṣaw -ọọy, even if -ọy is to be interpreted as /-ų/,651 there can be no doubt that it originated in -ọọy = /-ṣaw/:652 the change of /ṣaw/ to /-ų/ is a secondary development, the result of contraction.653

§ 48. A similar course may be seen in the development of *-ṣaw: e.g.,

*ünüwyt654 (≡ mₚọọy(sp)/mmọy (s)/mẹẹy (ṣa²f)/mḥoy (f))655 > *nüwyt656 (≡ ṣọọy (sbop)/mẹẹy (ṣa²tom)/mọy (sₚ)/mọ (sₚₚ), 657 "mother",658 *mvḥicvwyt659 > *mvḥicwyt660 (≡ mọọẹy (s)/ẹęmọọay (s)/ẹępọay (s)661/mẹẹy (a²)) > *mvḥicwyt662 (≡ mọọẹy (s₀)/ẹęmọọay (sbo)/ẹęmọọay (fₚ)/ẹęẹẹy (f)/mŋẹey (f)/mŋẹey (f)/mŋey (a)/mŋẹy (f)/mŋẹ (a), 663 "tomb, cavern";664 *ṣimvi > *įvišt(y)665 > ṣnaọy (sabo) = cnaay (s)666 = cna (b)667 = cneọy (sₚₚ) = cneọy (sₚₚ), cno (a²) = cnoy (sₚ) = cno (sₚ) "two",668 *ḥw > naọy (sbo) = nnaay (s) = nnaay (s)669 = nẹọy (sₚₚf) = no (a²) = nọ (sₚₚ) = nọ (sₚ) "to look, behold";670 *ḥw > nay (sbo) = nẹy (ṣa²f) = nẹ
(AP) 671 = NO (AA²O) = NOY (S) = NW (SS²F), "hour, time"; 672
*imawi² 673 > 674 - MAJ NY (SA²BOP) = - MAJ N (S) 675 = - MA (SB) 676 =
- MEJNY (SA²FOM²) = - ME (M) 677 = - MO (SA²²) = - MOY (S) = - MW
(SS²A), "(the place) there." 678 To summarize our evidence for the
phonetic correspondences just demonstrated: 679 in each of these six words
we may observe the development *-iw > -w (A); in *imawi², "(the place)
there," *-iw > -oy; and *-iw > -oy (S) in *miwyt ("mother"),
imhi²yt ("tomb, cavern"), *isni² ("two"), and *ni² ("hour,
time"). Once again, the equivalence of -w and -oy in these words
should be described as *-iw > -w (A) = -oy (S), not -w# = -oy #; 680
and even if -oy has the value /-i/ rather than /-w/, its origins are
most certainly to be found in -oy = /-w/. 681

§ 49. Since the Coptic forms of "donkey" are consistent with our
derivation from original i²w, the Pharaonic writings should be
reexamined for evidence of final -w. 682 Thus, for example, in BD 15 as
preserved in the papyrus of Ani, 683 the word "donkey" is spelled i²w:

684

and in a version of BD 125 as recorded by Naville, 685 we

find . A similar writing evidently was also intended in one

version of BD 40: 686

687 Furthermore, in the parallel versions
of the "donkey-curse" the singular of this word is found as representing representing\(^\text{691}\) \((i)cō\,\overline{w}(t)\), \((i)cō\,\overline{w}\), and \((i)c(\overline{3})\overline{w}\), respectively. An alternative proposal, to regard the plural strokes as otiose,\(^\text{692}\) is less satisfactory: whenever possible, ancient writings should be allowed to speak for themselves, and not simply adjusted out of hand to suit our preconceived notions; the study of anomalous spellings may yet yield important data on the structure of many other words.

\[\text{§ 50.} \text{ A very unusual plural is found in Pap. Harris I 77.12 and 78.3:}\] Written as though a dual,\(^\text{694}\) this form is possibly to be transliterated \((i)cō\,\overline{w}(t)\)\(^\text{695}\) or, less likely, \((i)cō\,\overline{w}(t)\);\(^\text{696}\) however, it probably represents simply a conflation\(^\text{697}\) of \((i)cō\,(w)\overline{w}\,\overline{w}\)\(^{\overline{w}_w}\) "male and female donkeys." In addition, Sethe has suggested that word-play between \(cō\,\overline{w}(w)\) and \((i)cō\,\overline{w}\)\(^{\overline{w}_w}\) was intended in the sentence \(\text{i}m\,\overline{(i)}\,cō\,\overline{w}(w)\,\overline{w}\,r\,k\ldots\) \((i)cō\,\overline{w}(w)\). The mechanics of the proposed alliteration could be worked out as follows: if the vocalization of the negatival complement \(cō\,\overline{w}(w)\)\(^{\text{699}}\) were \(\overline{i\,cō\,\overline{w}}\), and the plural \(\overline{i\,cō\,\overline{w}}\) is vocalized \(\overline{i\,cō\,\overline{w}}\overline{(w)}\),\(^\text{700}\) then, when both \(cō\,\overline{w}\) and \(\overline{i\,cō\,\overline{w}}\) had become \(\overline{i\,cō\,\overline{w}}\) \(\overline{i\,cō\,\overline{w}}\), the correspondence between the two would have been reasonably close. For the moment, however, the relevance of these and other forms to the question at hand is a matter best left for future study.

\[\text{§ 51.} \text{ To summarize, there is no reason to doubt that the words "donkey"--here vocalized \(\overline{\overline{i\,cō\,\overline{w}}}\)--and \(\overline{\overline{i\,cō\,\overline{w}}}\) are parallel derivatives} \]
from the root \( ^{1}C_{3} \). We may conclude our whole discussion of the vocalization and phonetic development of \( ^{1}C_{3}w \) with an observation on methodology. In our reconstructions, we have tried to utilize all available hieroglyphic data before turning to Coptic and the external evidence for Egyptian vocalization. By collecting as many diverse writings as possible, and establishing the sequence or relative chronology of their appearance, we have been able to identify the different spellings of a single word, deduce its full reading, and follow the transformations which it underwent. We have observed that the analysis of a single Coptic word cannot be considered complete until every one of its forms has been taken into account. We have also seen that whereas all the Coptic forms of the word "donkey" may be elucidated by reference to the form \( (^{1}C_{3}w \rangle \star^{3}C_{3}w \), historical reconstruction applied independently to the Coptic forms could never yield \( ^{3}C_{3}w \). It seems better procedure to introduce Coptic, and the cognate words in related languages, only when investigations in the Pharaonic Egyptian lexicon have first revealed the earliest full form of a word and traced its development as completely as possible. Finally, just as Semitic \( ^{*}C_{y}r \) and the fictitious Egyptian forms \( ^{*}C_{3} \) and \( ^{*}C_{3} \) are not comparable, so Late Egyptian \( ^{3}C_{C} \) and Arabic \( l_{g} \) should not be compared—as has been done by Vergote. 705 When comparing cognates, it is essential that actual roots be used, rather than phonetic derivatives; it is incorrect to posit \( ^{3}C_{C} \) as the phonetic equivalent of \( l_{g} \). Likewise, in any philological study, precise root meanings must be determined, and the lines of semantic development distinguished; and it is to this end that we now begin an examination of the contexts of the root \( ^{1}C_{3} \).
SECTION F: The occurrences of the root $\text{iC}_3$ in the Old Kingdom

\S 52. During the Old Kingdom the root $\text{iC}_3$ occurs most commonly—excluding the word $\text{iC}_3\text{w}$, "donkey"—in the title $(\text{i})m(\text{i})-r(\text{S})$ $\text{iC}_3(\text{ww})$, known chiefly from inscriptions found in the tombs of Qubbet el-Hawa, and from rock-inscriptions left by the members of various expeditions passing through the desert regions surrounding the Nile Valley. Typically, these inscriptions usually contain little more specific information than names and titles; it is the exceptions—which are few—which provide the key to understanding the significance of the great bulk of these occurrences.

\S 53. Following is a list of the holders of the titles $(\text{i})m(\text{i})-r(\text{S})$ $\text{iC}_3(\text{ww})$ \text{706} (= $\text{M}_C$) \text{707} and $\text{sps}(\text{i})(\text{ni}-)\text{swt}$ \text{708} $(\text{i})m(\text{i})-r(\text{S})$ $\text{iC}_3(\text{ww})$ (= $\text{SN.M}_C$), based largely on the published evidence (arranged geographically): the symbol + is added before those references not included in Goedicke's list \text{709} of the occurrences of this title.

A. Qubbet el-Hawa

1. $\text{Hr}(\text{w})\text{-hw}(\text{i})\cdot f$ \text{710} = $\text{M}_C$ (also $(\text{i})m(\text{i})-r(\text{S})$ $\text{h3swt nb(wt)}$ $n(\text{iw})t$ $Tp\text{-râ(i)}$) \text{711} + 2. $\text{Dm}i\text{-Mâ(\text{i})\cdot n-}\text{i}$ \text{712} (eldest son of A.1) = $\text{M}_C$

3. $\text{s3b\cdot n(-i)}$ \text{713} : $\text{N(i)}\cdot \text{-cnh-Pipî}$ \text{714} (possibly son or brother of A.1) \text{715} = $\text{M}_C$ (also $(\text{i})m(\text{i})-r(\text{S})$ $\text{h3swt nb(wt)}$ $n(\text{iw})t$ $Tp\text{-râ(i)}$)

4. $\text{In(i)\text{-(-i)}\cdot t(i)\cdot f: Mjw(-i)}$ \text{716} = $\text{M}_C$ (also $(\text{i})m(\text{i})-r(\text{S})$ $\text{mâc}$ \text{717} and $(\text{i})m(\text{i})-r(\text{S})$ $\text{h3swt nb(wt)}t$) \text{718}

5. $\text{s3b\cdot n-}\text{i}$ \text{719} (eldest son, $\text{z3\cdot f sms(w)}$, of A.4) \text{720} =
Mc (also (1)m(i)-r(3) hššwt nb(w) f721 and (1)m(i)-r(3) hššwt nb n(i) (ni-)ššt m Tp-rš(i)722)

+ 6. Mbw-i(-wr) (eldest son of A.5)723 = Mc724

7. Hw(i)-ti725 (son of A.5) = Mc

8. Pipl-nqtw : 'Išk-lb726 = šN.Mc727 Mc728 (also (1)m(i)-r(3) f34(ww) nb(w)729 and (1)m(i)-r(3) hššwt 730)

+ 9. Ššb-n-i731 (son of A.8) = Mc (also (1)m(i)-r(3) hššwt 732

10. Cnbd-ti733 = Mc

+ 11. K(3·i)-m-šnw(-i)734 ( : šnw)735 = Mc

+ 12. Šbb-t736 = Mc

+ 13. Htw737 = šN.Mc

+ 14. Htp(i)738 (brother of A. 13) = šN.Mc

+ 15. Šbk-htab(w) = šN.Mc, 739 Mc740

+ 16. Šbk-htab(w)-nhn741 [ = (?A.15]742 = šN.Mc

+ 17. Dš-ty743 = Mc

+ 18. Šwnw744 = Mc

+ 19. ḫkr745 = Mc

+ 20. Mtr746 = Mc

+ 21. Hnw-z(3)w747 = šN.Mc

+ 22. ḫšl-n-hnt-š748 = Mc

23. Wār749 = šN. ḫMc

24. Tšw750 (son of A.23) = šN.Mc

B. Tomas

1. Hw(iz)-nš751 = Mc752

2. ṭ(3)š-d-v753 = Mc754

3. ḫšl-w-rš-f755 = Mc756 (also hr(i)-c 1c3(ww))757
4. ṣ3b-1 758 = ʂN.MC 759 (also (i)m(i)-r(3) lće3(ww) nb(w) n(iw) ẖ36t nb(t)) 760

5. ṣib[--l] 761 = MC

6. Titi-c nb(w) 762 = MC

7. c3w 763 = MC

8. 'Trî 764 = ʂN.MC

9. Ḥpi 765 = ʂN.MC

10. Ḥnn-t(1) 766 = ʂN.MC

+11. Bbw 767 = ʂN.MC

+12. Ḥw(l)-n-. Ḥr(w) 768 [ = J.1 or J.6 ] 769 = ʂN.MC ṣspâ(1)

(ni-)śwt (i)m(i)-r(3) lće3(ww) (niw) Z3tw ] 770

+13. Ḽbl 771 (son of B.12) = ʂN.MC

+14. ³ln(l)-(i)t(1).f : Mhw-1 772 [ = A.4 ] = MC (also

(i)m(i)-r(3) ẖ36t nb(w).f m'lmn 773 lrtt Wawt and

(i)m(i)-r(3) māc hr Z3tw)

15. (Pipi-nht(w) :) Ḥ(3)k-ib 774 [ = A.8 ] = MC (also (i)m(i)-

r(3) māc)

C. Tonqala (opposite Tomas) 775

+ 1. Ḥc3-w 776 = ʂN.MC

+ 2. c3w 777 [ = B.7 ] = ʂN.MC

D. Wadi el-Allaqi

+ 1. Wnf 778 = ʂN.MC

+ 2. Ḥw(l).n.-6 779 [ = B.1 ] = MC

E. Wadi el-Arab (Qara) 780

+ 1. ³ln(l)-(i)t(1).f 771 = ʂN.MC

+ 2. Nfr-sfḥ 782 = ʂN.MC
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F. Gebel el-Hammam

+ 1. $\text{Cnhb} \cdot \text{f}^{786} = \text{SN}.M^{C}$

G. Hagar el-Gharb (south of el-Kubaniya)

+ 1. $K(i) \cdot m \cdot \text{snw} \cdot i$ (snw) $^{788} [= A.11] = \text{SN}.M^{C}$
+ 2. $l(i) \cdot d \cdot v^{789}$ (son of G.1) = $M^{C}$
+ 3. $K(i) \cdot m \cdot \text{snw} \cdot i$ $^{790} [= (?) G.1] = \text{SN}(?) .M^{C}$
+ 4. $l(i) \cdot d \cdot (w)^{791}$ (eldest son 792 of G.3) [= (?) G.2] = $\text{SN}.M^{C}$

H. Hindallab (about a mile north of Hagar el-Gharb)

+ 1. $\ldots^{794}$ (son of $\text{Hnb} \cdot b \cdot b \cdot i$) = $\text{SN}.M^{C}$

I. Gebel el-Mueilha (on the Edfu-Berenice road)

+ 1. $K(i) \cdot m \cdot \text{snw} \cdot i$ snw $^{796} [= A.11/G.1] = \text{SN}.M^{C}$
+ 2. $l(i) \cdot d \cdot v^{797} = \text{SN}.M^{C}$

J. Wadi Hammamat

1. $Hw(i) \cdot n \cdot Hr(w)^{799} = \text{SN}.M^{C}$
2. $\text{Ndm} \cdot l \cdot b^{800} = \text{SN}.M^{C}$
3. $T\text{sw} = \text{SN}.M^{C}, M^{C} 801$
4. $l \text{by}^{803} = \text{SN}.M^{C}$
5. $\text{Sndm} \cdot l \cdot b^{804} = \text{SN}.M^{C}$
+ 6. $Hw(i) \cdot n \cdot Hr(w)^{805}$ (son of J.5) = $\text{SN}.M^{C}$
+ 7. $l(i) \cdot d \cdot v^{806} [= B.2] = \text{SN}.M^{C}$
+ 8. $D\text{i} \cdot n \cdot (i)^{807} = \text{SN}.M^{C}$
+ 9. $Hpv^{808} [= B.9] = \text{SN}.M^{C}$
10. $\text{Mr}(i) \cdot M\text{nw} \cdot C\text{nh} \cdot Mr\text{i} \cdot Rc(w)^{809} = M^{C}$
11. \( {\tt Rw}(i) \cdot {\tt w}(i) \) 810 = \( \text{SN.} {\tt M} \)

12. \( {\tt Rdil-n}(i) \) 811 = \( \text{SN.} {\tt M} \)

13. \( \text{3\&fw} \) 812 = \( {\tt M} \)

K. Wadi Atolla 813

+ 1. ... 814 = \[ M \] 815

L. Wadi Hanama 816

+ 1. \( N(i) \cdot k(i) \cdot c_{nh} \) 817 \([= \text{M.2 or M.3}] = {\tt M} \) 818

+ 2. \( c_{nh} \cdot t_i \) 819 \([= \text{A.10}] = {\tt M} \)

+ 3. ... 820 = \( {\tt M} \)

M. Magharah (Sinai)

1. ... 821 = \( {\tt M} \)

+ 2. \( N(i) \cdot k(i) \cdot c_{nh} \) 822 = \( {\tt M} \)

3. \( N(i) \cdot k(i) \cdot c_{nh} \) 823 = \( {\tt M} \)

4. \( \text{Sn} \) 824 = \( {\tt M} \)

5. \( c_{nh} \cdot Mrf \cdot Rc(w) \) 825 = \( {\tt M} \)

6. \( N(i) \cdot k(i) \cdot c_{nh} \) 826 \([= \text{M.2 or M.3}] = {\tt M} \)

N. Naqada

+ 1. \( \text{Tw-t}(i) \) 827 = \( \text{SN.} {\tt M} \), \( {\tt M} \) \[= (i)m(i) \cdot r(i) \cdot c_3(w) \cdot (nIw) \]

O. Abydos

1. \( (i)m(i)w \cdot r(\text{I}) \cdot d_3(\text{ww}) \) 828

P. Dahshur

1. \( (i)m(iw) \cdot r(\text{I}) \cdot d_3(\text{ww}) \) 829 \([= (i)m(iw) \cdot r(\text{I}) \cdot d_3(\text{ww}) \cdot nIw \]

\( Mdw^3 \cdot Im^3 \ [\text{I} \cdot \text{rtt}] \)

2. \( \text{wd} \) 830 = \( \text{SN.} {\tt M} \)

Q. Saqqara 831
1. $\text{hrw}(i)-\text{w}(i)^{832} [= J.11] = \text{MC}$

R. Provenance unknown

1. $\text{bb}-i^{833} [= (?) A.12] = \text{MC}$ (also $\text{hr}(i)-ς\text{t}3\text{ n}(i)$

$\text{Tp-r6}(i)$

2. $\text{nh}-i^{834} = \text{SN MC}$

§ 54. Further titles attested for officials associated with the $\text{iC3}(\text{ww})$ are: $\text{hrp}\; \text{iC3}(\text{ww})$, $\text{shd}\; \text{iC3}(\text{ww})$, $(i)m(i)-\text{ht}\; \text{iC3}(\text{ww})$, and $\text{hr}(i)-c\; \text{iC3}(\text{ww})$. For the various administrative grades in this hierarchy we may translate as follows: $\text{hrp} = "\text{director or controller}"$; $\text{shd} = "\text{supervisor, superintendent, or inspector}"$; $(i)m(i)-\text{ht} = "\text{deputy-}

or \text{vice-director}"$; $\text{hr}(i)-c = "\text{assistant- or under-director}"$.

Goedicke\textsuperscript{835} comments that the occurrences of the title $\text{hrp}\; \text{iC3}(\text{ww})$ seem to antedate the reign of $\text{Dd-k3-Rc}(\text{w})\; : \text{'Izz\dagger}$, so that there is no overlap between officials designated $\text{hrp}\; \text{iC3}(\text{ww})$ and $(i)m(i)-r(i)\; \text{iC3}(\text{ww})$. Hence it is not necessary in this connection to attempt to ascertain the relative ranking of the individuals who bore these titles: they may simply be acknowledged as the highest officers of the corps or organization over which they exercised authority.\textsuperscript{836} El-Dissouky\textsuperscript{837} associates the change-over from $\text{hrp}\; \text{iC3}(\text{ww})$ to $(i)m(i)-r(i)\; \text{iC3}(\text{ww})$ with the bureaucratic reforms instituted by $\text{Dd-k3-Rc}(\text{w})\; : \text{'Izz\dagger}$.\textsuperscript{838} As for the interrelationships of the remaining personnel, the $(i)m(i)-\text{ht}$ is inferior to the $\text{shd}$, who, in turn, is subordinate to the $(i)m(i)-r(i)$; the $\text{hr}(i)-c$ occupies the most junior position in the administrative structure.

§ 55. Following is a list of the occurrences of these titles:

i. $\text{hrp}\; \text{iC3}(\text{ww})^{840}$
Q. Saqqara

2. \( ^{11}\text{dfr}^{841} = \text{hrp} \, ^{1c}3(ww) \, \text{ nb(w) n(lw) } \, \text{ h3st} \, \text{ nb}t^{842} \) (also \( \text{ hrp tm3tw}^{843} \))

S. Giza

1. \( ^{13}(i)\text{-nfr(w)}^{844} \) (also \( \text{ hrp tm3tw} \), \( \text{ (i)m(i)-r(z) wpt(w)w}^{845} \), \( \text{ hr(i)-sšt3 n(i) h3st nb(t),} \)

\( \text{ and (i)m(i)-r(z) ph(w)w}^{846} \)

2. \( ^{13}(i)-\text{d3(w)}^{847} \) (also \( \text{ (i)m(i)-r(z) wpt(w)w} \))

T. Abu Rawash

1. \( ^{13}(i)-\text{h(f)i}^{848} \) (also \( \text{ (i)m(i)-r(i) wpt(w)w} \))

ii. \( \text{ šhd } ^{1c}3(ww) \)

M. Magharah (Sinaï)

7. \( \text{ Hámm [ (w)-... ]}^{849} \)

P. Dahshur

+ 3. \( \text{ šhd(w) } ^{1c}3(ww) ^{850} \) = \( \text{ šhd(w) } ^{1c}3(ww) \, \text{ niw } \text{ Md3 'Im3} \)

[ ] rtt ]

iii. \( \text{ (i)m(i)-h4 } ^{1c}3(ww)^{851} \)

M. Magharah (Sinaï)

8. \( \text{ N(i)-k(z-i)-cnh}^{852} \)

9. \( \text{ Thw(i)-f}^{853} \)

iv. \( \text{ hr(i)- } ^{1c}3(ww) \)

B. Tomas

+16. \( \text{ t1(w)-r6 -f}^{854} \) = B.3

§ 56. Strictly speaking, \( ^{1c}3(w) \) is not attested as a title in the Old Kingdom, since no individual bearing this title is known to us by name from this period. \( ^{855} \) However, the term \( ^{1c}3(w) \) is used alone as a
designation for certain unnamed persons or groups, as is indicated by the following occurrences:

v. יכ3(ו)

A. Qubbet el-Hawa

25. יכ3(ו)ןב(ו): in the phrase רמת unaffected by the following occurrences: יכ3(ו)ןב(ו)

26. יכ3(ו): in the sentence יכ3(ו)sgiving of KgORT ל וסינ(ו)ןב(ו)ש(י)ה

U. Abusir

1. יכ3(ו): as a legend accompanying the figures of certain individuals aboard the sea-going ships represented in the funerary temple of king Sahure.

§ 57. If we now examine the usage of the word יכ3(ו) in the last-cited reference (Uv.1)--in which it appears as a hieroglyphic label complementing the depiction to which it is appended--we may finally begin to unravel the complex set of circumstances which have so long served to obscure the true meaning of this term.

The Sahure reliefs portray the return of an Egyptian fleet from a voyage to the Syrian coast (probably Byblos). Asians are included among the passengers, in addition to the Egyptian crew, some of whom are labeled יכ3(ו). The foreigners are not captives, but willingly join with the Egyptians in praising Sahure. The occasion is apparently a visit to the court by a number of Syrian dignitaries and their families, eager to demonstrate their respect for the reigning Egyptian monarch. Originally at least ten ships
were depicted, five in each of two registers; the inscriptions associated with three of these ships are now completely destroyed, while some text survives over each of the remaining seven.

§ 58. Goedicke's interpretation of this representation rests on what he describes as a "careful examination of the scenes"; his argument may be summarized as follows: 1) the persons labeled \( \text{iC}_3(w) \) are non-Asiatic in appearance: "The group \([\text{iC}_3(w)]\) is placed above persons who differ in their appearance from the rest of the crew which is clearly depicted as Asiatic"; 2) the \( \text{iC}_3(ww) \) perform a characteristic and distinctive gesture, different from that of the Asians: "They have one arm lifted up in adoration while the other is placed on the head of an Asiatic standing in front of them"; 3) not everyone who performs this gesture is labeled \( \text{iC}_3(w) \): "The number of persons represented thus performing this particular kind of gesture exceeds many times the number of cases where \([\text{iC}_3(w)]\) is written"; 4) all persons who perform this gesture are \( \text{iC}_3(ww) \): "In one ship, for instance, there are no less than six persons of this kind; in others, less well preserved, even more." As a result of this analysis, Goedicke concludes that the appearance of these people "in such great numbers makes it difficult to consider them as 'interpreters.'"

§ 59. These points may now be handled individually. The physical description of the shipboard personnel has already been dealt with: we seem to have a clear and consistent distinction made between the Egyptians and foreigners depicted intermingled on each ship; and the persons labeled \( \text{iC}_3(w) \) are, in fact, identical in appearance with the other Egyptian crew members not so labeled. Of the single gesture
isolated and abstracted by Goedicke, the following actual occurrences may be tabulated:874 one \( \text{Ic}_3(w) \) rests his left hand atop the head of the child standing in front of him; two Egyptians--neither labeled \( \text{Ic}_3(w) \)--place their right hands against the back of the head of the foreigner in front of each of them; one \( \text{Ic}_3(w) \) rests his right hand on the shoulder of the foreigner in front of him; two Egyptians--neither labeled \( \text{Ic}_3(w) \)--place their right hands against the back of the head of the foreigner in front of each of them; one Egyptian--not labeled \( \text{Ic}_3(w) \)--places his left hand against the back of the head of the foreigner in front of him; a single Egyptian--not labeled \( \text{Ic}_3(w) \)--places his right hand on the back of the head of the foreigner in front of him, while his left hand is pressed against the foreigner's back; another Egyptian--not labeled \( \text{Ic}_3(w) \)--has his hands positioned almost identically on the head and back of an Egyptian (!) shown standing in front of him. Most of the individuals explicitly designated \( \text{Ic}_3(w) \) do not perform the gesture imputed to the \( \text{Ic}_2(ww) \) by Goedicke. As for the \( \text{Ic}_3(ww) \) themselves, their number is actually very small, being limited to one or two per ship: one ship has only one \( \text{Ic}_3(w) \) on board, five carry at least one \( \text{Ic}_3(w) \), and one shows at least two men who are so designated.

§ 60. Contrary to Goedicke's reasoning, it does not seem to be the case875 "that \( \text{Ic}_3(w) \) was used here in an attempt to specify certain persons as 'foreigners' where it was not obvious from their appearance"; rather, it functions to set apart the few Egyptians who are identified by it from the much larger number who are not, but who are otherwise indistinguishable from them. The personnel aboard the best
preserved ship consist of: 876 seven Egyptians, only one of whom is labeled $^{iC}_3(w)$. 877 seven adult Syrians, including two women (best differentiated by the absence of facial hair; the curvature of the breasts is less reliably indicated), and seven children or youths (likewise presumably all Syrians, despite their short haircuts). 878 Under these conditions the presence of Egyptian interpreters—one or two in each ship—able to translate conversations between the Egyptians and their Syrian shipmates, would be highly desirable, if not absolutely essential. 880

§ 61. Nevertheless, the translation "interpreter" is ill-suited to the other occurrences of the word $^{iC}_3(w)$ which we have enumerated so far. To translate "Overseer of Interpreters" 881 for the title $(i)m(i)-r(3) ^{iC}_3(ww)$, for instance, necessarily presupposes—as Goedicke 882 has already pointed out—the existence of a very large number of "Interpreters" who are not otherwise attested in our evidence from this period. On the other hand, the foreign affiliations of the $^{iC}_3(w)$-people are clearly specified in several contexts. Thus we find 883 $^{spd}(i) (ni-)w$ $^{iC}_3(ww) (niw) Z3tw [ = B.12 ] , (i)m(i)-r(3) ^{iC}_3(ww) (niw) M3im [ = N.1 ] , and $(i)m(iw)-r(3) shd(w) 2^{iC}_3(ww) niw Md3 7m3 [ yr ] rtt [ = P.1 = Pi.3 ] ; or, more generally, $(i)m(i)-r(3) ^{iC}_3(ww) nb(w) n(iw) h3st nb(t) [ = B.4 ] , and hpr 2^{iC}_3(ww) [ nb(w) n(iw) ] h3st nb [ = Q.1.2 ] .

The connection between the $(i)m(iw)-r(3) shd(w) 2^{iC}_3(ww) niw Md3 7m3 [ yr ] rtt [ = P.1 + Pi.3 ] and the $^{Nps}(i)w-beta$ 884—both mentioned in the Dahshur decree of Pepi I—has long been recognized. 885 The officials whose responsibilities included regulating the activities of the
The (i)m(i)-r(3) iC3(ww) [ = 0.1] are also found as commanders888 of Nhs(i)w and people from T5-Tmb(w) in the autobiographical inscription of Wnī, where we read889 ir(i)n bm-f māc n(i) dbcw cS3w...m Nhs(i)w(niw)890 'iritt (m) Nhs(i)w(niw) Md3(m) Nhs(i)w(niw)im3m m Nhs(i)w(niw) W3w3t m Nhs(i)w(niw)K33w m T5-Tmb(w)h3b w(i)bm-f hr-h3t māc pn (i).startTime891...smrww (i)m(i)w-r(3) iC3(ww)...hr-h3t t3zt n(i)t...

Nhs(i)w n(i)w h3swt (i)ptn: "(When) his majesty put together [lit. made] an army of many tens of thousands..., including [lit.: consisting of] Nubians from [lit.: of] (the countries of) Irtjet, Medja, Iam, Wawat, and Ksaw, (as well as) people from the land of the Tjemeh-Libyans, (then) his majesty sent me at the head [lit.: under the front] of this (whole) army, while...Companions and Overseers of the iC3(ww)-people...were in charge of the contingent of...the Nubians892 from these countries."893

Likewise, that the iC3(ww) [ = Av.25] in the tomb of Mhw-i's son S3b.n-i [ = A.5] are mentioned between rmtw, "Egyptians," and [N]hās(i)w, "Nubians," indicates--as Goedicke894 has already remarked--that these iC3(ww)-people "occupied a position which set them in some relation both to the Egyptians and to the Nubians." Fischer895 comments that the iC3(ww) seem to be "intermediaries" between the Egyptians and Nubians.

§ 62. With these circumstances in mind, Goedicke introduces896 for the title (i)m(i)-r(3) iC3(ww) the translation "overseer of foreigners,"897 with the variants898 "overseer of Egyptianized foreigners,"899 "overseer of foreign (mercenary) troops,"900 "overseer
of mercenaries,"\textsuperscript{901} or "overseer of auxiliary troops"

\textit{Hilfstruppen}. \textsuperscript{902} Edel also translates "overseer of foreign-speaking (mercenaries)"\textsuperscript{903} or simply "overseer of speakers of a foreign language" \textit{Fremdsprachigen}. \textsuperscript{904}

\S 63. The basis for all these translations--ranging from "interpreter" through "speaker of a foreign language" to 
"(Egyptianized) foreigner" and "(foreign) mercenary"--and the solution to our confusion over the real significance of the term \textit{iC\text{\textsuperscript{3}}(w)}, is to be found in Gardiner's\textsuperscript{905} original work on this word. There he established that the meaning of the root \textit{iC\text{\textsuperscript{3}}} was "to babble"\textsuperscript{906} (i.e., \textit{b\text{\textsuperscript{\textalpha}r\textsuperscript{\textalpha}p\textsuperscript{\textalpha}}})\textsuperscript{907} from which the noun "speaker of a foreign language"\textsuperscript{908} was derived. As Gardiner himself pointed out more than sixty years ago, this literal rendering generates two possible translations: (Egyptian) "interpreter"\textsuperscript{909} and (actual) "foreigner"\textsuperscript{910} (i.e., \textit{b\text{\textalpha}p\textsuperscript{\textalpha}p\textsuperscript{\textalpha}pos}, \textsuperscript{911} "barbarian")\textsuperscript{912}.

\S 64. The meaning of a word is, of course, determined not so much by its etymology as by its actual usage; and \textit{iC\text{\textsuperscript{3}}(w)} has a dual meaning. It is neither exclusively "interpreter" nor "foreigner"; and any analysis which attempts to disregard one or another of these co-equal meanings must necessarily either distort the evidence or construct an improbable cultural or historical setting for some of its occurrences. The problem remains, however, to discover the principle which will permit us to determine its exact meaning in each of its particular usages. Gardiner\textsuperscript{913} seems to suggest that the translation "interpreter" is appropriate in titles, and "foreigners" in descriptive epithets. Goedicke\textsuperscript{914} rightly objects to this formulation, though he
is unable to propose a more satisfactory alternative. But, if we
return to Gardiner's own description of the $^{\text{c}}3\text{(w)}$ as "...'speakers
of a foreign language,' whether as actual foreigners or whether as
Egyptians, who could thus serve as dragomans or interpreters," we can perceive at once the single feature in the non-linguist context
of the word which served to distinguish "interpreters" from "foreigners":
simply whether it was applied to an Egyptian or foreigner.

§ 65. In every case so far discussed, the meaning of $^{\text{c}}3\text{(w)}$
is "foreigner," except for Uv. 1, where the meaning is "(Egyptian)
interpreter." However, it must be kept in mind that, insofar as
our present evidence goes, all the ranking officials associated with
the $^{\text{c}}3\text{(w)}$-foreigners were Egyptians. It must also be noted here
that the meaning "interpreter" is not as rare or restricted as may
seem to be suggested by the evidence. In fact, two "literary"
ocurrences of $^{\text{c}}3\text{(w)}$ from the time of the Old Kingdom--displaying
its extended or figurative sense--confirm the correctness of the
translation "interpreter" when this word was used in reference to
Egyptians.

v(x). $^{\text{c}}3\text{(w)}$: literary occurrences

Q. Saqqara

3. $^{\text{c}}3\text{w n(i) itt hrt(w)}$: among the titles of $^\text{cnh}^3$. $^\text{nt-y}$
found in his mastaba

S. Giza

3. $^{\text{c}}3\text{(w) mw nhw ntnt(t)}$: among the titles of

$^\text{tr(t)}$-t = $^\text{tr(t)}$. $^\text{n-3ht(t)}$. $^\text{N(i)}$. $^\text{cnh}$. $^\text{Pipl}$ found
on his false-door stele
§ 66. At first sight, the translation "interpreter of the eye of Horus" for Qv(x).3 seems to make little sense. The "eye of Horus" is of central importance, of course, in the "Opening of the Mouth" ceremony, where it represents the sacrifice which Horus made on behalf of the resurrection of his father Osiris, and symbolizes the various materials and implements actually presented during the enactment of the ritual. 920 So one might understand this epithet in reference to some supposed function of a funerary priest.

However, Cnh[i] was a metal-worker, and this phrase occurs in a context involving metal-working. 921 Now we have a link between Cnh[i]'s profession and the "eye of Horus": in the Opening of the Mouth, the greatest magic is associated with the substance b13, which here means "meteoritic iron". 922 Both the ntr(i)-instrument 923 and the related mēhtw-adze 924 are said to be made of b13; and model implements of meteoritic iron 925 have been found. Thus it is possible that Cnh[i]'s skill was so great that he was entrusted with fashioning the implements 926 so vital to the performance of the funerary rites of the dead king.

§ 67. The second of these two examples—Sv(x).3—has already been discussed several times. Here the word k3(w) appears in a medical context: ltr(i)-i was the "Eldest Physician [lit.: Eldest of the Physicians] of the Great House, Dispenser [lit.: Controller > Provider] 927 of (Prescription) Powder(s) [or: Powdered Drugs], 928 (and) Interpreter of the Fluids 929 [lit.: Waters] inside the Abdomen." 930 Asserting that "a rendering '*'interpreter of water inside the abdominal cavity, 931 gives no sense," Goedicke 932 once
more rejects the meaning "interpreter" for \( ^\text{C}_3(\text{w}) \). He argues instead for the translation "oldest physician of the Great House who administers foreign drugs and water inside the abdominal cavity," seeing here "a reference to embalming..., the emptying and cleansing of the abdomen [being] a step in the preparation of the mummy." But Goedicke fails to justify his translation "foreign." Moreover, the alleged connection with mummification is spurious, being based on his misunderstanding of a related text. \( ^\text{r}(\text{i})-\text{w} \) seems, in fact, to have been an expert or specialist in the diseases of the abdominal area, perhaps an early gastroenterologist.

§ 68. Junker defines the literary or figurative meaning of the root \( ^\text{C}_3 \) as "to understand or know something unknown, secret, or obscure." Goedicke insists that "an ambiguity arises from the English usage of the word 'interpreter'.... While a connexion between the speaker of a foreign language and a translator might...be plausible, to go further and play on the wider connotation of the English word 'interpreter' as one who elucidates or explains, would not only be stretching the interpretation of the term beyond its limits, but would introduce quite unwarrantable implications." Despite these objections, however, the range of the word \( ^\text{C}_3(\text{w}) \), in its extended usage, does seem to be nearly as broad as that of the English "interpreter."

§ 69. Having thus examined all known occurrences of \( ^\text{C}_3(\text{w}) \) datable to the Old Kingdom, we should now consider whether the translation "(Egyptianized) foreigner" is exact, or whether we may further refine or elaborate upon this aspect of the meaning of this word. A study of the geographic distribution of references to the
foreigners will prove useful in this regard. As we have already seen, these are found as follows: 1) in inscriptions in the tombs of the Elephantine princes—41—and in their papyri—at the southern frontier of Egypt, and on two funerary monuments from Abydos [ = 0.1] and Naqada [ = N.1] in Southern Upper Egypt; 2) in the graffiti left by Egyptian expeditions in Lower Nubia, the deserts of Southern Upper Egypt, and the Sinai; and 3) in inscriptions from tombs located in the Memphite necropolis.

§ 70. The concentration of references to the foreigners in Aswan, Lower Nubia, and Southern Upper Egypt suggests that these "foreigners" were actually none other than the Nubians so well known in the service of the Egyptians at this time. This conclusion seems to be corroborated by the several texts which mention the together with various groups of Nubians. To find Egyptianized Nubians on the southern frontier is, of course, hardly unexpected. Their presence elsewhere in Southern Upper Egypt is likewise understandable if one but recalls that some of the desert roads which led directly to Nubia terminated in this stretch of the Nile Valley; and references to both foreigners and Nubians also occur at Gebelein and Dendera in the First Intermediate Period.

§ 71. The court officials affiliated with the—are those buried at Giza, Saqqara, Dahshur, and Abu Rawash—were probably put in charge of the Nubian settlement at Dahshur; and since there is no evidence for the employment of Asians at Sinai during the Old Kingdom, the foreigners mentioned there must have been Nubians as well. It was not at all uncommon for expedition leaders
to move their forces between quite far-flung places in the conduct of the foreign affairs of the king. Thus Wnˁ of Abydos (temp. Teti-Merenre) is known from a graffito in the Wadi el-Allaqi [= D.1]; and his autobiographical inscription relates that he was dispatched to Hatnub, Elephantine, Iḥat, and Wawat (where he recruited more Nubians for his work force), and that he led the mixed Egyptian and Nubian army which was sent against the (semi-)nomadic Asiatics by Pepi I. 

Hum(w)-ḥtp(w) of Aswan accompanied expeditions to both Byblos and Punt; cnh-ḥt, who was presumably based at Aswan [= A.10], is known from a graffito in the Wadi Hamama [= L.2], and was killed by Asiatic nomads while he was building a "Byblos-boat" (i.e., a sea-going ship) for a voyage to Punt; and Ppḫ-nḥt(w): Ṣḥk-ḥb of Aswan [= A.8], who is also known from a graffito at Tomos [= B.15], conducted expeditions both to Nubia and the "country of the Asiatics," where he went to retrieve the body of his slain colleague and punish those responsible for his death.

§ 72. The aims of ancient Egyptian foreign policy were essentially the same in the North as in the South: domination over the surrounding territories, for the security of the frontiers, and protection of the land-routes vital to exploitation of the mineral wealth of the deserts and control of trade with the inhabitants of neighboring and distant lands. With the notable exception of the extensive sea-trade carried on with Byblos, however, Egyptian contacts with Asiatics during the Old Kingdom were practically limited to hostile encounters with the nomads along the eastern frontier of the Delta, the Red Sea coast, and Sinai. On the other hand, one of the outstanding features of Egyptian
activity beyond the southern frontier was the large-scale
conscription of Nubian warriors, who served as troops in the
Egyptian army and accompanied expeditions abroad. In this way the
Egyptians came into close and prolonged contact with large numbers of
native Nubians.

§ 73. One group of such Nubians—probably the most important
group known from the Old Kingdom—was referred to by the designation
Nhś(i)w-ḥtpw. These "peaceable Nubians" are generally described as a
military/police force, and they certainly were among the Nubians
drawn upon by the Egyptians when staffing their foreign expeditions. The actual mechanism of the Egyptianization of these Nubians is of
considerable importance. It has been suggested that they came
voluntarily to Egypt where they were permitted to settle as
"colonists," an idea unsupported—as Goedicke has already
remarked—by any substantial evidence.

§ 74. Although Goedicke stresses the fact that the Nhś(i)w-ḥtpw
are mentioned only in the Dahshur decree of Pepi I and that this
document is, therefore, our only source of direct information about
this particular group of Nubians, he also compares them to the
Nhś(i)w found in Wnī's army. And since these Nhś(i)w are also
referred to by the term ḫ3(ww), it appears that we may actually have
at our disposal a vast array of information pertaining to the Nhś(i)w-
ḥtpw: this designation was not applied to some otherwise unattested
group of Nubians, but seems to be instead a unique description of a
rather well known group of Nubians, the ḫ3(ww). The phrase
Nhś(i)w-ḥtpw apparently represents the legal terminology by which their
official status was expressed: we can only regret the lack of further reference to Nubians in any other royal decree.

The equation \( N\text{bs}(i)w-htpw = N\text{bs}(i)w = i^{c}_{3}(ww) \) is reinforced by the occurrence of the title \( \text{hbd Nbs}(i)(w)(niw)\text{pr-}^{c}_{3}(i) \), "Supervisor of the Nubians of the Great House," found in the Giza mastaba of \( N(i)-c\text{nh-Hmm}(w) \) of Dynasty VI. This title must be a variant of the rare \( \text{hbd }^{c}_{3}(ww) \) encountered in the early part of Dynasty VI. Three Nubian servants are also depicted at Giza in two mastabas of Dynasty V date: \( N\text{bs}(i) \text{Hrs}(i) \), "the Nubian Retainer" and \( N\text{bs}(i) \text{Mrt}(w) \text{Mr}(i) \) and \( N\text{bs}(i) \text{sd}3(\text{wtf}) \text{Snb} \), "the Nubian Retainer Mr(i)" and "the Nubian Treasurer Snb."

§ 75. Edel concludes that \( ^{c}_{3}(ww) \)-foreigners--i.e., Egyptianized Nubians--were settled in Egyptian territory, and that they probably were accompanied there by their familias; and Fischer specifies of the \( N\text{bs}(i)w-htpw \) that they "were presumably quartered in the neighbourhood of Memphis." A comparable settlement of Egyptianized Asiatics may have existed near Illahun during the Middle Kingdom, perhaps in the region of the royal Residence of that time.

Komorzinski has suggested that it may have been as prisoners of war that the \( N\text{bs}(i)w-htpw \) originally came to Egypt. Hayes summarizes the implications of this assumption as follows: "Prisoners taken in such raids would...become automatically the property of the crown, with only a few individuals being parceled out to private owners." This is, in fact, the pattern which emerges from the available data concerning the situation of the Old Kingdom Nubians in Egypt: in contrast to the many occasions when Nubians are mentioned in contexts appropriate to
fighting men—thus directly or indirectly under the king's control—only rarely are they attested as domestic servants in private hands. The dates and places of the earliest appearances of the $\text{Nhš(i)w/ǐC₃(iiw)}$ are of great interest in this regard.

Thus whereas the $\text{Nhš(i)w-htpw}$ are mentioned only under Pepi I, in conjunction with certain provisions made for the benefit of the funerary establishment of King Sneferu at Dahshur, the $\text{ǐC₃(iiw)}$-Nubians are referred to much earlier, at the beginning of Dynasty V, when Nubians are also found as servants at Giza. And the fact that Nubian detachments were accepted into the Egyptian army, that Nubians were taken into private households, and that some of them bore purely Egyptian names, strongly suggests that these Nubians were not then recent arrivals in Egypt but were already at least partially Egyptianized.

§ 76. Now it may not be merely by chance that the $\text{Nhš(i)w-htpw}$ are found settled in the vicinity of the funerary foundation of Sneferu at Dahshur. For in a single year's campaigning in Nubia ($\text{ǐ3-Nhš(iw)}$) this king is said to have captured 7000 Nubians and brought them back to Egypt. This is undoubtedly the campaign celebrated in the name $\text{ǚ(wi)-Nhš(iw), (Sneferu-is-)}$ "The-Smiter-of-the-Nubians," borne by an individual known from Giza sometime after the middle of Dynasty IV. Even allowing for a measure of exaggeration in this figure, and the possibility that some of these prisoners of war may have been executed after their arrival in Egypt, it is still not difficult to imagine that a certain number of them should have survived in captivity. Of these perhaps the majority were originally dedicated to the enrichment of Sneferu's own funerary endowment, along with at
least some of the 200,000 large and small cattle taken in Nubia at the same time.

The Egyptianized Nubians of Dynasty V and the Nhś(i)w-htpw of the time of Pepi I could well represent their descendants living in the same area, though now diverted for other purposes as well. They would have been conveniently located to join the foreign expeditionary forces organized from the royal Residence; and their ranks were probably reinforced as a result of the Nubian campaigns of Dynasty VI, when new recruits regularly joined expeditions returning from the South. In this regard it should be kept in mind that the Old Kingdom expedition leaders buried at Qubbet el-Hawa constantly emphasize their ties with the court at Memphis. Archaeological evidence for the presence of Nubians in Egypt during the Old Kingdom is almost non-existent; however, a single pottery vessel of early C-group type was found in the fill of a shaft of a plundered mastaba at Dahshur. A Nubian settlement may have continued in existence at Dahshur down to the Middle Kingdom, as evidenced by the funerary stele of a Nubian woman (Nhśyt) found there.

§ 77. A final objection which might be raised against the identification of the ḫ3w-foreigners as Nubians is the fact that both ḫ3w and Nhś(i)w are mentioned together in a single inscription [= Av.25] where the two terms are not coextensive in their application, but refer to two different groups of people. The distinction was apparently troublesome for Goedicke, who proposes "that the ḫ3w were the settled population of the Nubian Nile valley, as contrasted with the Nhś(i)w in the mountain country."
However, such speculation is entirely unnecessary, inasmuch as the
difference between them is conveniently expressed by the translation
"any Egyptians, any Egyptianized Nubians, or any (other) Nubians."
The common term Nhš(ī) possesses an ethnic denotation, merely
indicating that one who bore it was of Nubian extraction;¹⁰⁰⁷ it
does not specify whether he was Egyptianized or not. Here it is
obvious from the context that the [N]hs(ī)w were not Egyptianized,
but rather the Nubians dwelling in Nubia, with whom Ṣib·n-ī was
trading. On the other hand, when the Nubians in Wnī's army are
called Nhš(ī)w, it is clear that these are not foreign enemies, but
the allies of the Egyptians; and references to Nubian servants and
the Nubians under Ṣ(ī)-Cnb·Hm(w)'s control are likewise
unambiguous.¹⁰⁰⁸ Nevertheless, the technical term Nhš(ī)w-htpw could
be employed if a greater degree of precision were required.

It is not at all unusual to find two words with intersecting and
partially overlapping applications of this kind. The fields to which
each of these terms—[^C]3(w) and Nhš(ī)—are appropriate may be
visualized as follows:
SECTION G: Summary

§ 78. Before proceeding to an examination of the word $\text{C}_3^2$ in the First Intermediate Period, we shall pause to summarize what has been said so far. The root $\text{C}_3^3$ seems to be onomatopoetic in origin, perhaps reproducing in some fashion the ancient Egyptians' impression of the unintelligible grunts and other strange noises uttered by the "barbarians" around them. From this root was derived the nominal formation $\text{C}_3^5$, which meant—when applied to someone who spoke a foreign language—"one who speaks gibberish or babbles." At this point, it must be stressed that no word can be studied satisfactorily in isolation, but must be considered as part of a semantic complex. For at just this moment the word $\text{C}_3^5$ developed two distinct meanings: applied to an Egyptian it means "interpreter," but when applied to a foreigner it means "Egyptianized Nubian." The reason for its specialization in reference to Nubians alone is purely historic. As we have seen, the Old Kingdom Egyptians were well acquainted with Nubians, and they must have been familiar with the Nubian language--at least the sound of it. But the detailed information which they possessed of the Nubians during the Old Kingdom is not paralleled by their knowledge of either the Asiatics or the Libyans.

§ 79. It is appropriate to observe here that there is yet a third ramification of the word $\text{C}_3^2$: for this is the complete transliteration of the word "donkey." This animal, therefore, must have been described by the ancient Egyptians as a "brayer." The
characteristic sound of the donkey apparently also underlies the Semitic *ṣyr.\textsuperscript{1018} The appellation ʾeqw was probably originally derogatory in intent, deriding the strange speech or outlandish manner of speaking of the only foreigners with whom the Egyptians maintained any close contact in the Old Kingdom, the Nubians. But this slang designation became accepted into the literary language, which gave it a certain respectability, especially as applied to Egyptians in the sense of "interpreter." In its transferred or metaphorlic usage,\textsuperscript{1019} in fact, the term acquired quite a complimentary or flattering connotation: "one able to understand or interpret (a difficult or esoteric art requiring great skill to perform)." This development may be presented as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{EGYPTIAN} \\
\text{"interpreter"}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{HUMAN} \\
\text{"babbler"
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FOREIGNER} \\
\text{"Egyptianized Nubian"
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ANIMAL} \\
\text{("brayer" \textgreater)}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{"donkey"}
\end{array}
\]

§ 80. We may conclude this portion of our presentation with a review of the other attempts which have been made to translate the word ʾeqw. The translation "Caravan Leader"\textsuperscript{1020} for (i)m(i)-r(3) ṣeqw rests on a suggestion made by Erman\textsuperscript{1021} in 1904 that *ṣ might mean "caravan"; in 1913 Sethe\textsuperscript{1022} also proposed
"(ship's)mate" or "petty officer" ("Maat") for $^\text{3}_r$, based on his study of the Sahure reliefs (Uv.1). But neither of these translations has any basis in etymology, as is clear from Gardiner's careful study of 1915-17. Nevertheless, the former has enjoyed a certain popularity; and it does fairly well describe one of the functions attested for so many of the Old Kingdom officials who bore this title. The latter never gained acceptance, being too obviously limited in its application. From the Sahure text again, Boreux later derived the fanciful "signal" or "one who gives the signal" for $^\text{3}_r\text{w}$ and "chief of signals" or "chief signalman" for $(\text{3})\text{m}(\text{3})-\text{r}(\text{3})\text{w}$. Meanwhile, working once more from only a small portion of the evidence, Read declared that the root meaning of $^\text{3}_r\text{w}$ must be "scholar." More recent descriptive translations—likewise without etymological justification—are "scout," offered by Fischer, Faulkner's "guide," and Allen's "stranger." Although each of these may seem to fit one or more of the contexts of $^\text{3}_r\text{w}$, it is impossible to proceed from any of them to demonstrate a line of semantic development consistent with the rest. All these translations should be abandoned completely, since their continued use can only impede our full understanding of this term and obscure the real meaning of the texts in which it occurs.

Next we shall see to what extent the material available from the later periods of Egyptian history complements and reinforces our interpretation of the Old Kingdom evidence.

SECTION H: The occurrences of the root $^\text{3}_r$ in the First Intermediate
§ 81. Although ḫ3ww is used only a few times in the First Intermediate Period, its range closely parallels that already observed for the Old Kingdom. The title (ẖ)m(y)-r(ꜣ) ḫ3(ww) continues in Southern Upper Egypt; in addition, ḫ3(w) is found alone twice, once in a descriptive text and once in a literary context. Following is a list of the holders of the title (ẖ)m(y)-r(ꜣ) ḫ3(ww):

Va. Gebelein
1. Dmt1031 (also (ẖ)m(y)-r(ꜣ) mzC)1032

Wa. Moalla
1. ēnht(y)-f(y)1033 (also (ẖ)m(y)-r(ꜣ) mzC1034 and (ẖ)m(y)-r(ꜣ) ḫ3swt1035)

Xa. Thebes
1. In(ẖ)-(ẖ)t(ẖ)-f1036 (also (ẖ)m(y)-r(ꜣ) mzC)
2. D3r11037

The exceptional usages of ḫ3(w) occur in the following constructions:

Yva. Dendera
1. in the sentence ṣ ...1038 ḫ3(w)w n(y)w ḫwnt ḫw hpr ṣ(ꜣ)mw1039 ḫmꜣs,1040 among the epithets of Mrri = Mrri(ẖ)-krę1041 found on the fragments1042 of a funerary inscription from his mastaba1043

Qva(x). Saqqara
4. in the phrase ḫ3(w) hmwṭ1044 ḫt3t, among the titles of ḫwi-ꜣ found on his false-door stele1045
§ 82. By understanding the title (i)m(y)-r(3) ıc3(ww) as "Overseer of Egyptianized Nubians," we are now in a position to explain a much quoted passage in Dm3's autobiographical inscription: ıw b3k-n.(i) W3w3t(y)w n hr(y)-tp nb hpr(w) m sp3t (t)n, if "I made people from (the land of) Wawat work for (or: serve) every overlord who arose in this nome." Dm3's claim to the title (i)m(y)-r(3) ıc3(ww) of itself implies that Nubians were numbered among the troops which he commanded as (i)m(y)-r(3) m3c, "General of an Army"; the reference to W3w3t(y)w in his autobiographical narrative confirms this fact, and specifies Wawat as the country of their origin. But it does not follow that Egypt was able to exercise any measure of control over Lower Nubia at this time. The distinction between W3w3t and W3w3t(y)w is crucial here, since the W3w3t(y)w of this inscription were not resident in Nubia, but settled in Egypt—more precisely, at Gebelein itself.

§ 83. That the spelling ıw represents W3w3t(y)w rather than W3w3t is generally acknowledged; but the implications of this distinction have not been recognized. Goedicke observes that the "object of b3k...is not a country but the population thereof..."; he transliterates W3w3t(y)w and translates "I taxed the people of W3w3t for any chief who happened to be in this area." He assumes that "b3k-n.(i) W3w3t(y)w indicates the southern limit of the administrative
activities of Dmi..."; and he is forced to conclude that

Spkt in this context has possibly not the basic meaning 'nome,' but seems to signify a larger area, namely the extent of jurisdiction to which Dmi belonged, i.e., the realm of the Theban rulers. Only by taking it in such a way can we understand why Dmi speaks about the taxation of Lower Nubia, which in all likelihood would otherwise be of no direct concern to the area where he dwelt.

Allen translates "I taxed the people of Wawat for any overlord who arose in 'this' nome," and comments that "it is rather surprising to find Wawat, south of the First Cataract, administered by lords of Thebes or vicinity in so unsettled a period...." Fischer transliterates Wsw3.t, but he comments that "Dmi...'enslaved Wsw3.t for every overlord who arose in this nome'," and "the general Dmi of Gebelein...boasts of having 'enslaved Wawat for every overlord in this nome'." He further refers to "expeditions to Nubia...undertaken by Gebelein" and "the overlords whom Dmi served in subjugating Wawat."

Sjve-Söderbergh translates "I made Wsw3t tributary to every nomarch who arose in this nome," but he denies that this necessarily implies military occupation of Lower Nubia. Others have simply translated without qualification: "[Dmi]...'made Nubia (Wsw3.t) tributary for every brj-tp who was in this (?) nome'", "Djemi... claims...that he 'made Lower Nubia (Wawat) tributary to every chief who arose in this (?) nome'", "I made Wsw3t tributary to every overlord who was in this nome'", "I taxed Wsw3t for every overlord who happened to be in this nome'."

§ 84. Dmi's "Nubian campaign" is a fiction; and the theory of Egyptian domination over Lower Nubia in the First Intermediate Period
lacks substantiation. The $\text{I}^{\text{c}}\text{3}(\text{w})$ who served Gebelein may have been descendants of the Egyptianized Nubians settled in Egypt from the time of the Old Kingdom, but it seems more likely that they were recently arrived there, having come expressly to seek employment in the army of one of the factions struggling for supremacy in the civil wars which followed the collapse of Dynasty VIII. We can imagine a situation similar to that described in the Semma dispatches when it is reported that a group of Medjay-Nubians $^{1067}$ attempted to enlist in Pharaoh's service: $\text{I}^{\text{I}}\cdot\text{n} \cdot \text{n} \cdot \text{r} \cdot \text{b3k} \cdot \text{n} \cdot \text{pr-c3}(\text{i})$, $^{1068}$ "We have come to serve" $^{1069}$ the Great House."

§ 85. A settlement of Nubian mercenaries at Gebelein $^{1070}$ during the First Intermediate Period is independently attested, consistent with our interpretation of Dmi's inscription. $^{1071}$ A stele $^{1072}$ from the region of Gebelein $^{1073}$ refers to $\text{niwt} \cdot \text{tn}$… $\text{Nhs}(\text{w}) \cdot \text{s} \cdot \text{sm-cv}(\text{w}) \cdot \text{s}$, $^{1074}$ "this town... (both) its Nubians and its Upper Egyptians." $^{1075}$ These Nubians are also represented by the stelae from their own tombs in this area. $^{1076}$ The Nubians are distinguished from Egyptians by their darker skin, short kinky hair, and special costume; in addition, they may be designated $\text{Nhs}(\text{y})$/$\text{Nhs}(\text{y})\text{t}$ $^{1077}$ The men are depicted as archers, each holding a bow and arrows; and they are usually accompanied by one or two hunting dogs. $^{1078}$ The stelae in question are those of: 1) the $\text{Nhs}(\text{y})$ $\text{Nnw}(\text{?})$; $^{1079}$ 2) the $\text{Nhs}(\text{y})$ $\text{Tnw}$; $^{1080}$ 3) the $\text{Nhs}(\text{y})$ $\text{In}(\text{i})-\text{i}(\text{i}) \cdot \text{f}$; $^{1081}$ 4) $\text{In}(\text{i})-\text{i} \cdot \text{kr}$; $^{1082}$ 5) $\text{Wth}(\text{?})-\text{kr}$ $^{1083}$ Fischer, commenting on the fact that the Gebelein Nubians "were buried in the Egyptian manner,"

$^{1084}$ remarks "that these mercenaries became Egyptianized to the extent that
they equipped themselves with funerary stelae made by the local craftsmen, and that they frequently adopted Egyptian names.\textsuperscript{1085}

§ 86. Just across the river from Gebelein,\textsuperscript{1086} in the tomb of C\textit{nht}(\textit{y})\textcdot f(\textit{y}) at Mo'alla, are preserved other depictions of Nubian archers in Egyptian service,\textsuperscript{1087} as also in the contemporary\textsuperscript{1088} tomb of St(\textit{y})-k\textparrow{\textit{i}}\textsuperscript{1089} at Aswan.\textsuperscript{1090} The Nubians are shown as "warriors...herdsmen and hunters"\textsuperscript{1091} at Aswan,\textsuperscript{1092} and as herdsmen at Mo'alla.\textsuperscript{1093} In addition, a Nubian is depicted among C\textit{nht}(\textit{y})\textcdot f(\textit{y})'s defeated enemies in a battle scene from his tomb.\textsuperscript{1094} This Nubian is surely a mercenary in the army of one of C\textit{nht}(\textit{y})\textcdot f(\textit{y})'s political rivals in Southern Upper Egypt. Fischer\textsuperscript{1095} points out "that Nubians were employed as mercenaries by virtually every group that took part in the struggle preceding Egypt's reunification...," citing\textsuperscript{1096} the wooden model of Nubian archers found in the tomb of M\textit{nh}-t(\textit{i})\textsuperscript{1097} at Asyut and the Nubians mentioned in a graffito at Hatnub.\textsuperscript{1098} The inscriptions of T\textit{n}(\textit{i})-(\textit{i})t(\textit{i})\textcdot f (= Xa.1) and D\textit{iri} (= Xa.2) confirm their presence at Thebes as well during the early\textsuperscript{1099} part of Dynasty XI.

When C\textit{nht}(\textit{y})\textcdot f(\textit{y}) boasts that he nourished the neighboring nomes of Upper Egypt as far south as Elephantine,\textsuperscript{1100} we appreciate the concern he evinces for his fellow Egyptians in their time of difficulty; now we can also understand his reference to grain of his which "reached Wawat" (\textit{pb}·\textit{n}·\textit{f} W\textit{3wtn}·\textit{wt}; \textsuperscript{1101} Once again, this fact must not be construed as arguing for any form of Egyptian control over Lower Nubia at this time. Nevertheless, C\textit{nht}(\textit{y})\textcdot f(\textit{y})'s
claim may not be an exaggeration: for as (1)m(y)-r(3) mëc and (1)m(y)-r(3) 2c3 (ww), he had to feed and otherwise care for the Nubian troops in his charge; and it is not impossible to imagine that his grain could actually have reached Lower Nubia among the foodstuffs and other goods which these mercenaries may have sent back out of their own salaries or living allowances to members of their families then still dwelling in Wawat itself.

§ 87. For 1c3(w)w1102 of Dendera (Yva.1), Fischer translates1103 "interpreters," while remarking1104 that "this is the only case...in which 'dragomans' are mentioned as being 'of' (mw) an Egyptian city."1105 On the basis of the Old Kingdom inscriptions which specify the origins of the 1c3(ww),1106 Fischer1107 is inclined to regard these 1c3(w)w as foreigners, which "would not contradict the evidence, since Nubian mercenaries are known to have belonged to the city of Gebelein and were probably also in Dendera's employ...." The determinative 2c (A 1) does not exclude this possibility, since the same sign is used in the word 8(5)mw.1109 For this latter1110 Fischer considers1111 whether it might not be a writing of 5m3w, "roving foreigners,"1112 for which the spelling 5m3w1113 implies the development 5m3w > 5saw1114 ( = 8(5)mw).

Fischer's1115 restoration of the beginning of Mrri's inscription rests on his assumption that 1c3(w)w means "interpreters" here, which Goedicke1116 rightly questions. The rendering "[I am one who makes] the interpreters of Dendera speak when nomadic foreigners accumulate in it"1117 does not provide satisfactory sense. But if 1c3(w)w here means "Egyptianized Nubians," then we could reasonably
expect some statement concerning the directing of mercenary troops in repulsing intruders or preventing foreign incursions into the nome. Fischer\textsuperscript{1118} himself cites an inscription of the "Thinite nomarch Tyrus, [who] ... describes himself as... 'overseer of the army... in repelling foreigners [pdt] who come down from the southern mountainlands,' concluding that the "Denderite Nome would have been almost equally exposed to incursions from this quarter." The word immediately before \(\textit{iC}z(w)w\) ends in \(-w\), and the traces above that also fit the sign (S 24);\textsuperscript{1119} and by reconstructing \(\textit{mrt}\), we may understand \(\textit{ink ir(f)}\) (or: \(\textit{ir(f)}\).\(\textit{n}(-i)\)) \(\textit{ts}w\ \textit{iC}z(w)n(y)w \textit{lwnt} \textit{lw bpr}\ \textit{s(3)mw lms}, "I served (lit.: acted) as commander of the Egyptianized Nubians of Dendera when(ever) nomadic foreigners appeared in it." The epithet \(\textit{ts}w\ \textit{iC}z(w)w\) seems to describe one of the duties of an \(\textit{(3)m(y)-r(z)}\) \(\textit{iC}z(w)w\).

\(\textit{Mrri}'s\) autobiographical inscription continues\textsuperscript{1121}... \(\textit{ink mrr\textsuperscript{3} n lwnt m\textsuperscript{1}-kd-s hsl\textsuperscript{3} n n\textsuperscript{3}lw f mrr\textsuperscript{3} n swz(iw)tw}w\textsuperscript{1122} Nhs(y)w\textsuperscript{1123} n(y)w bist.\textsuperscript{1124} "I am one beloved of (the nome of) Dendera in its entirety, favored by his city, and loved by outsiders (lit.: passers-by)\textsuperscript{1125} and the Nubians of the desert (as well)." Once more\textsuperscript{1125} \(\textit{iC}z(w)w\) is contrasted with \(\textit{Nhs(y)w}\),\textsuperscript{1127} in this formula the \(\textit{iC}z(w)w n(y)w lwnt\) are presumably intended to be included in the phrase \(\textit{mrr\textsuperscript{3} n lwnt m\textsuperscript{1}-kd-s}\), whereas \(\textit{Nhs(y)w n(y)w bist}\) is paralleled by \(\textit{swz(iw)tw}w\).

\(\S\) 88. The phrase \(\textit{iC}z(w) lwnt bist\) in the inscription of \(\textit{Iw1-3}\) (Qva(x).4) provides a close parallel for the usage of the word \(\textit{iC}z(w)\) in one of its Old Kingdom literary contexts (Sv(x).3: the "Eldest Physician of the Great House" \(\textit{br(1)-3}\).\textsuperscript{1128} Here the "Physician of the Great House\)\textsuperscript{1129} \(\textit{Iw1-3}\) is described as the "interpreter of a
difficult art"\textsuperscript{1130} (i.e., medicine).\textsuperscript{1131} The writing of \textit{bpmwt} has occasioned considerable confusion. Grapow\textsuperscript{1132} comments on the unusual determinative, which he describes as "a piece of flesh" (\textasciitilde F 51).\textsuperscript{1133} The sign in question, however, is actually the \textit{wt}-sign (Aa 2); and Goedicke, protesting "that \textit{bpmwt} is not attested with a determinative \textit{O}; nor would such a determinative seem to make sense,"\textsuperscript{1134} prefers to read \textit{hpmwt-wt} \textsuperscript{[= \textit{hpmwt-wt(y)}]}, "craft of the embalmer," at the same time confessing that "The sign \textit{O} is well attested in the Old Kingdom as determinative for \textit{wt} 'embalmer,' but I am unable to quote any other example of its use ideographically, as apparently here."\textsuperscript{1135} This analysis forces Goedicke to translate "foreign physician of the secret craft of the embalmer of the Great House,"\textsuperscript{1136} recalling his attempt to translate $Sv(x).3$ similarly.\textsuperscript{1137} El-Dissouky,\textsuperscript{1138} modifying this translation, understands "physician of the Great House, interpreter of the secret craft of embalming," further citing the construction \textit{k\textit{et} wt}, "work of embalming,"\textsuperscript{1139} in support of this view. The whole problem is illusory, however, since Aa 2 is appropriate to this writing of \textit{bpmwt}. As Gardiner\textsuperscript{1140} has pointed out, this sign is found several times as a phonetic determinative of the word \textit{mrwt}, "love"; and it must be simply in this way that it is also used here.

\begin{section}{The later occurrences of the root \textit{fC\textsuperscript{3}}}

\textsection 89. Next we shall see to what extent the root \textit{fC\textsuperscript{3}} continued in use down through the end of the New Kingdom, so we can once more test
our theory of the development of its meanings. Gardiner observed that the title \( (1)m(y)-r(z) \text{inc}(ww) \) becomes rare after Dynasty VI; nevertheless, it still occurs in the Middle Kingdom at Buhen, Medik, Wadi el-Hudi, Qubbet el-Hawa, and Sinai (Rod el-Air). In all these cases except at Sinai, the title is to be translated "Overseer of Egyptianized Nubians." At Sinai (Rod el-Air), the \( (1)m(y)-r(z) \text{inc}(ww) \text{chnw} \) is depicted accompanied by his four sons, Mrrw, Shtp-ib-Rc(w), \( \text{int(y)-hty-btp(w)} \), and \( S(l)-n(y)-\text{Wrt} \), each one with the title \( \text{inc}(w) \). Neither their names nor the representations of them suggest that these individuals are other than Egyptian. Consequently, "the title of the father is unlikely to mean 'overseer of the foreigners' but is rather 'overseer of interpreters' who are, in this case, his sons who accompanied him on this expedition."

§ 90. The title \( \text{inc}(w) \) is held by at least fifteen other Egyptians at Sinai (Magharah and Serabit el-Khadim) during the Middle Kingdom, when the introduction of Asians into the work gangs necessitated the presence of Egyptian "interpreters" there as well. These Asiatic workers are abundantly attested at Sinai: 1) by the name \( \text{c}_2\text{m} \), 2) by the epithet \( \text{c}_2\text{m/c}_3\text{m} \), 3) by references to groups of unnamed Asiatic workmen, 4) by the mention or depiction of the brother of the prince of Rtnw. Although the name \( \text{c}_2\text{m} \) and the epithet \( \text{c}_2\text{m/c}_3\text{m} \) do not in themselves necessarily constitute proof that their bearers were actual Asians, the other evidence for Asians in Egyptian employ at Sinai at this time strongly suggests that this was so, at least in the majority of cases. The appearance
here of a high official from ṭmnw is a matter of some significance. He is depicted respectfully, either in the Egyptian fashion,\textsuperscript{1161} or riding a donkey and accompanied by two retainers; and he is always associated with interpreters\textsuperscript{1162} in the lists of the personnel who made up these expeditions. Hayes\textsuperscript{1163} concludes that "...a brisk [Middle Kingdom] trade in Asiatic slaves [was] carried on by the Asiatics themselves, with Egypt...the principal market for this class of merchandise"; and one can only wonder whether the presence of the brother of the prince of ṭmnw is connected with his possible role as supplier of Asiatic laborers for the use of the Egyptians at Sinai.

§ 91. Middle Kingdom graffiti of Egyptian officials with the title ḥṣw are also found in the Wadi Beiza,\textsuperscript{1164} Wadi Hammamat,\textsuperscript{1165} and at Bir Menāh.\textsuperscript{1166} In addition, a stele in the Cairo Museum\textsuperscript{1167} belonging to ḫw-f-t-šnb\textsuperscript{1168} gives his title as ḥmsw ḥṣw or simply ḥṣw. On the other hand, the name ḥṣw\textsuperscript{1169} borne by a hr(y)-c, "Assistant," probably does not mean "Interpreter,"\textsuperscript{1170} but something like "Babbler,"\textsuperscript{1171} being a nickname referring to his manner of speaking instead of to his occupation.\textsuperscript{1172}

§ 92. Two New Kingdom tomb inscriptions refer to their owners as "interpreters." In Tomb No. 99 at Thebes,\textsuperscript{1173} Sennefer is described as ḥṣw [n(y) ḫṣw nb(w)t]\textsuperscript{1174} š(l)cry mdw(w)w·šn\textsuperscript{1175} [n n(y)-swt],\textsuperscript{1176} "interpreter of all foreign lands, who forwards\textsuperscript{1177} their pleas\textsuperscript{1178} (lit.: words) to the king." Anhermose of Naga el-Mashayikh, relating his career as a military scribe,\textsuperscript{1179} speaks of himself as ḫṣw n(y) ḫṣt nb(t) m-bšb nb(w).\textsuperscript{11} "interpreter of every foreign land in the presence of my lord." With this should be compared the semantically
equivalent mdw(w) r nfr m-bab nb(w) f whc mdw(ww) bs\=wt nb(w)t.  

"one who speaks well in the presence of his lord and interprets the 
words of all foreign lands."

§ 93. Now the occurrence of 1C\=sw in Pap. Boulaq 18 becomes 
crucial to our argument. Among the small group of Mdsyw, "Medjay 
Nubians," whose arrival at Thebes is reported near the end of the 
Middle Kingdom, is listed a Mdsyw 1C\=sw. One is tempted to translate 
"Medjay interpreter," a meaning which certainly fits the circumstances. 
But 1C\=sw in the sense of "interpreter" is used only of Egyptians. The 
syntax of this construction is also of interest, since it seems to 
represent two nouns in apposition rather than a noun and an 
adjective:  a Medjay Nubian, (namely) an Egyptianized one = "an 
Egyptianized Medjay Nubian" = *1C\=sw (ny) Md\=s.  

Here an Egyptianized 
Nubian, in the service of the Egyptian king, is apparently escorting a 
Medjay chieftain during an official visit to the Egyptian court.

§ 94. Turning next to the literary evidence from the New 
Kingdom which has already been discussed by Gardiner, we find 
in Pap. Anastasi I 28.6, "words confusing to hear" bn 1C\=sw 1C\=sw f 
se,  "(so that) not even an interpreter could understand them"; and 
in the Israel stele, "dwelling pleasantly" lw tw m 1C\=sw f,  "while 
they are (lit.: one is) babbling (away)"; and in Pap. Sallier I, ro. 
7.11-8.1: "I shall give you a hundred blows, but you will (only) shrug 
them off: you are with me as a beaten donkey who is (completely) 
recovered in (just) a day; you are with me m Nhsy\=w 1C\=sw tw \=ti  
ln(lw) f m ps lw,  "as a gibbering Nubian who is brought with the 
tribute."
§ 95. The meaning "interpreter" is appropriate to the contexts of ǐɛw when it refers to a god. In the Coffin Texts we find ẖwst-k ỉş trbwy ʊ(y) wnn t lmn n-k m ǐɛw-k. 1190 Whatever you may tread beneath your sandals (i.e., wherever you may roam), rest assured that I shall be your interpreter 1191 for you." In "BD" 97 we find Ỉn ḫw n(y) r(3)-f, 1192 "I am the interpreter of his speech (lit.: mouth)"; 1193 and in "BD" 125c Thoth is described as ǐɛw tswy, 1194 "the Interpreter of the Two Lands." 1195 Schenkel 1196 describes Thoth as "skilled in foreign languages." Černý cites "Thoth as Creator of Languages": 1197 [(There was ... probably...some lost myth or legend according to which Thoth differentiated the languages of the various countries.... [I]t is...Thoth who according to the New Kingdom beliefs created foreign languages." Thoth is called 1198 wḥ n(y) ḫṣt r k(l)t(l) (var.: r ḫṣt), "the one who distinguished the tongue of one country from another (country)" and sṭnw n(y) ḫṣwt nb(w)t, "the one who distinguished the tongue of every foreign language." The use of this terminology surely explains the substitution which occurred in the Saite recension of "BD" 125c when sṭnw came to replace ǐɛw. 1199 In addition, Thoth is called ǔɛw n(y) lb nb, "the interpreter of every heart," in a reconstructed New Kingdom hymn; 1200 and the sun god Res 1201 is called ǔɛw ḫṣt, "the Interpreter of the Afterworld," 1202 in the text of the Amduat. 1203

§ 96. We may conclude our presentation of the New Kingdom evidence for the word ǐɛw/ǔɛw with a discussion of the ǔɛw-foreigners so well known from the papyri of Dynasty XX. Our previous
work would lead us to expect that these 3\(\text{\text{\text{\text{c(w)}}}}\) also represent "Egyptianised Nubians";\(^{1205}\) and, in fact, they do seem to be none other than the Nubian troops of the Viceroy of Kush, Panehesy.\(^{1206}\)

Now, for the first time, individual "Egyptianized Nubians" (3\(\text{\text{\text{\text{c(w)}}}}\)) are known to us by name. They are associated with the "garrison of Kush,"\(^{1207}\) and organized under "troop commanders."\(^{1208}\) In addition, they are attested with a special attachment to the area of Gebelein.

Fischer\(^{1209}\) states that "There is some indication that the tradition of particularly close contact with the southern lands... may have persisted at Gebelein for many generations" after the establishment of the Nubian colony there, referring\(^{1210}\) to the practice of the cult of Sobek of Sumenu at Buhen and Semna during the late Middle Kingdom. Now in late Dynasty XX we find: "...the tombs of Iumiteru, they are the tombs in which I was.... I was in the West of Iumiteru.... I was in the West of Hefau with the [3\(\text{\text{\text{\text{c(w)}}}}\)] of Hefau, all of them";\(^{1211}\) "the [3\(\text{\text{\text{\text{c(w)}}}}\)] Peiser of Iumiteru";\(^{1212}\) and at nearby Armant: "The [3\(\text{\text{\text{\text{c(w)}}}}\)] Peikamen, who dwells in the town of Hermonthis";\(^{1213}\) and "the [3\(\text{\text{\text{\text{c(w)}}}}\)] Nesmonth of the temple of Month, Lord of Hermonthis."\(^{1214}\) In the Turin "Taxation Papyrus,"\(^{1215}\) these 3\(\text{\text{\text{\text{c(w)}}}}\)-foreigners are associated with Iumiteru, Pathyris, and Sumenu, confirming the presence of "Egyptianized Nubians" at Gebelein over almost a thousand years. That nothing more is heard of the 3\(\text{\text{\text{\text{c(w)}}}}\) after the end of Dynasty XX may reflect the historical reality of Panehesy's withdrawal to Nubia during the reign of Ramesses XI, and the subsequent separation which existed between Egypt and Nubia.\(^{1216}\)
§ 97. In the preceding pages we have attempted to demonstrate the need for precise philological methodology in researching a historical problem. In the history of Egypt and Nubia the meaning of the word $\text{Ic3w}$ has proven to be so crucial that this entire work has been devoted to it. In order to understand all of its ramifications, it has been necessary to examine its occurrences from all periods. The word $\text{Ic3w}$ is documented from the reign of Sahure (ca. 2487-2473 B.C.) in the Fifth Dynasty to that of Ramesses XI (1113-1085 B.C.) in the Twentieth, and through the related "donkey" down into the Coptic period. The problem has been to isolate the word itself—to ascertain what it is and what it is not—in order to find out what its true associations are. The variant spellings have been gathered, so that it might be determined what they represent and how this changed through time; in this way certain unrelated words which happen to be graphically or phonetically similar could be eliminated from consideration. Having excluded these, a second derivative from the same root was studied to see what common meaning they share. Having fixed the etymology, the semantic developments were traced. In the process of examining the contexts of $\text{Ic3w}$, an important discovery was made: the meaning of this word is decided in every case by its application either to Egyptians or to foreigners; and this usage is remarkably consistent for more than a thousand years. As Gardiner concluded in his review entitled "The First Two Pages of the Wörterbuch": 1217 "[W]e stand not at the end, but very near the
§ 98. The success of the historian lies in his ability to associate related phenomena which have not been considered together before. In our attempt to elucidate certain aspects of the history of Egypt and Nubia, we have found a considerable amount of new evidence for the forceful and highly successful Egyptian foreign policy exercised in Nubia during the Old Kingdom, involving the extensive employment of Nubian mercenary troops. The ancestors of these "Egyptianized Nubians," called ɪc3w3, "babblers," first came to Egypt as prisoners of war captured during Sneferu's campaign in Nubia at the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty (ca. 2613-2589 B.C.). They were settled in Egypt at Dahshur, and their descendants were organized into units of the Egyptian army, where they served under the command of Egyptian officers. They accompanied expeditions to areas at least as remote as Sinai and Iam, and presumably also to Byblos and Punt. They had a special relationship to the princes of Elephantine at the very southern frontier of Egypt; but they are also found at various other places in Southern Upper Egypt, which by its proximity was always accessible to Nubia along the overland desert routes. During the First Intermediate Period (ca. 2160-2060 B.C.) they are found settled in the Gebel-en-Mo'alla region and at Dendera, and apparently also at Aswan and Thebes. These are the Nubians mentioned under Egyptian control during the First Intermediate Period, dispelling the myth of Egyptian domination over Lower Nubia at this time. These Nubians continued in Egyptian service down to the end of the New Kingdom, when some of them are known to us by name among the
troops of the Viceroy of Kush Panehesy; and their settlements survived in the area of Gebelein and at Armant, near Thebes. For the distribution of references to the ḫ3w-Nubians, see the accompanying map (Figure 2, p. 93).

Our texts thus reflect the close ties known between the Egyptians and Nubians from the time of the Old Kingdom onwards. By contrast, the meagre evidence suggesting a comparable Egyptian familiarity with Asiatics before the Middle Kingdom is practically limited to references to the peaceful expeditions so often sent to Byblos during the Old Kingdom. Unnamed Egyptian "interpreters," also called ḫ3w, are found associated with the Asiatics depicted accompanying the return of such a mission in the reign of Sahure. Only beginning in the Twelfth Dynasty, when the introduction of Asiatics into the Egyptian work force at Sinai made the need for them more acute, are these interpreters known to us by name, then apparently organized into their own bureaucratic hierarchy.
Figure 2. Distribution Map of References to 1034-Nubians
NOTES

1. The traditional transliteration $\text{c}$ will be used here for the sake of convenience, until the full transliteration of this word can be determined.


5. The promised new study by Edel (cf. ZAS 97 [1971], p. 63, n. 25) has not yet appeared.

6. That these various forms are actually all writings of one and the same word will be demonstrated below when they are studied individually in their own contexts.

7. Written 𓊟 in Urk I 132.5.9, and 𓊳 in Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 58.9 (= pl. 57.4); so apparently also intended in Green, PSBA 31 (1909), pl. 54 (foll. p. 322), No. 37 (= 𓊱𓊬 𓊷): for the form of the determinative, published as though 𓊬, cf. CT I 190g (B12C), n. 1 *( 𓊱𓊬 ). The plural 𓊳 is implied in the writing of Urk I 137.4 (for the arrangement of the text, see below, n. 857).

8. With this compare the spelling 𓊱𓊬: Goyon, Hammamat, No. 87 (temp. Middle Kingdom); for this form 𓊱 of the sign S25, see below, n. 55.

9. Reisner, A History of the Giza Necropolis I, figs. 257, 258, 263 (pp. 438 and foll.): G 2150 (= the mastaba of K3(i)-nfr(w)). For the date, see Junker, Giza 7, p. 162; FM III, pt. 1, p. 77; cf. Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 61. Goedicke, ibid., p. 61 and n. 6, would date the earliest occurrence of this word to the end of Dynasty IV; according to FM III, pt. 1, p. 5, however, the mastaba involved (= F. 21 at Abu Rawash: see below, n. 848) is actually dated to the end of Dynasty V, or Dynasty VI.

10. Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 8 (7) and p. 10, lines 2, 5: = CGC 1638; for the transliteration of this name, cf. Edel, QH II 1, pp. 56-8 (3). The same spelling is found in Borchardt, Denkmäler, No. 1435 (= Urk I 102.5: Wnî [temp. Teti-Merenre]): in the construction 𓊬 in
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which the plural determinative $\text{ḏa}$ is to be associated with the rank $\text{ḏa}$.

(1)m(t)w-r(3), "Overseers," rather than the element $\text{ḏa}$ (for this use of the determinative $\text{ḏa}$, cf. Urk I 102.3-6; cf. also the corresponding singular form written $\text{ḏa}$ in Urk I 125.10, 127.11
[Br(w)-hw(ḏa)-f)]; similarly Petrie, Dendereh, pl. 8c, rt 4 (the inscription of Mrtrf; Fischer, Dendera, pp. 128-31: = temp. Dynasty IX): in the plural $\text{ḏa}$. For other writings of this word without preceding $\text{ḏa}$

(S 25), see below, n. 53: in addition to these references, add (Černý, JPA 33 [1947], p. 56 and fig. 4 [No. 43]: probably temp. Middle Kingdom; for this form of the sign S 25, see below, n. 55); $\text{ḏa}$ $\text{ḏa}$ $\text{ḏa}$ (Green, FSBA 31 [1909], pls. 35, 34 [foll. p. 252], Nos. 21, 14; probably temp. Middle Kingdom); and $\text{ḏa}$ = Naville, Todtenbuch II, pl. 330 [Ab; Allen, BD (1960), p. xix: = temp. Dynasty XVIII]; for $\text{ḏa}$ equivalent to $\text{ḏa}$, see below, n. 20).

11. Goyon, Hammamat, pp. 55-6 (No. 21); associated with an inscription dated to the first jubilee of Pepi I (= year 37: Edel, ZAS 97 [1971], p. 61).

12. For the transliteration of this name, cf. Edel, OI II 1, pp. 53-6 (2).


15. This example very kindly called to my attention by Mr. Edward Brovarski, who showed me a hand-copy of the inscription made by Prof. Charles F. Nisim while he was working in the nearby mastaba of Mereruka with the Oriental Institute's Saqara Expedition.

16. CT I, 276a (for the form of the sign S 25, cf. de Buck's n. 3*); for the date of Sq3c, see Allen, Occurrences, p. 35.

17. Lange and Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine; cf. PN I 58.22.

18. Scharff, ZAS 57 (1922), pl. 13** (foll. p. 152), 44.8, 45.17: = Mariette, Les papyrus égyptiens du Musée de Boulaq II, p. XXIX, 1.8.17. For the date, cf. Scharff, ZAS 57 (1922), p. 51; Hayes, CAH II.1, p. 48 and n. 10: probably temp. Sebekhotep III. This example was very kindly pointed out to me by Prof. Georges Posener; Scharff trans-
literates "hw(?)," which he does not attempt to translate.

   ; cf. Bucher, Les textes des tombes de Thoutmosis III et
d'Amenophis II, pl. 3. This example was drawn to my attention by Prof.
   Hornung. For the determinative 𓊒𓊒, see further below, n. 908; for the
date, see Hornung, Amduat II, p. 62; I, p. xiii(2-3).

20. Unpublished preliminary hand-copy made by Miss Cathleen Keller
in 1970 for the Dira Abu el-Naga Project of the Egyptian Section of the
University Museum, Philadelphia. Also recorded on p. 67 of the copies
which Sæthe made in Tomb 157 in 1905 for the Wh files; photostats of
these copies kindly made available by Dr. W. F. Reineke, through the off-
ices of Dr. Steffen Wenig. For 𓊒 as a form of the sign S 25, see
Gardiner, PSBA 37 (1915), pp. 117-20; for the determinative 𓊒, see be-
low, n. 908.


22. 𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒: Pap. BM 10053, vs. 2.16 (= Peet, Tomb-
Robberies, pl. XX); 𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒: Pap. BM 10053, vs. 3.4 (= Peet,
Tomb-Robberies, pl. XX), and Pap. Mayer B, lines 3 (three times), 4
(twice), 6, and 7 (twice) (= Peet, Mayer Papyri); 𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒: Pap.
BM 10052, 8.15 (= Peet, Tomb-Robberies, pl. XXX), and Pap. Mayer A, 6.4
(= Peet, Mayer Papyri); 𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒: Pap. BM 10052, 1.11, 2.9,
8.25 (= Peet, Tomb-Robberies, pls. XXV, XXX), and Pap. Mayer A,
1.8.12.21, 2.1.4.9.20, 4.9, 6.5.20.21, 9.2.15.20, 12.24 (= Peet, Mayer
Papyri); 𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒: Pap. BM 10403, 1.28.29.30, 3.17 (= Peet,
199, 2, line 4 (= Černý, LRL, p. 53.11 No. 35); 𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒: the
Abbott Dockets (= vs. of Pap. Abbott: Pap. BM 10221), A. 6.16.17.25,
B.6.7.8.9.10.16 (= Peet, Tomb-Robberies, pls. XXXIII-XXIV), and Pap.
Ambras, 2.12 (= Peet, Tomb-Robberies, pl. XXXVIII); 𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒: the
Turin "Taxation Papyrus," ro. 2.15, and line 3 of vs. opposite ro. 2
(= Gardiner, RAD, pp. 38, 44); 𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒: the Turin "Taxation
Papyrus," ro. 4.11 (twice) (= Gardiner, RAD, p. 41); 𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒: Pap.
BM 10052, 3.2, 9.1, 15.21 (= Peet, Tomb-Robberies, pls. XXVI, XXXI,
XXXV); 𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒𓊒: Pap. BM 10068, ro. 6.16 (= Peet, Tomb-Robberies,
pl. 12). See also below, n. 19. For the use of the signs \( \sqrt{\text{T14}} \) and \( \sqrt{\text{F18}} \), and the determinative \( \sqrt{\text{Q2}} \), see below, n. 908; for the determinative \( \sqrt{\text{B2}} \), see below, n. 215.

23. With the exception of the occurrences in Pap. BM 10068 (ro. = year 17 of Ramesses IX: Peet, Tomb-Robberies, p. 2 [III.4]; Pap. Mayer B (= Liverpool M. 11186; undated: Peet, Mayer Papyri, pp. 19-20; cf. Peet, Tomb-Robberies, p. 3 [VI]), Pap. Bibliothèque Nationale 199,2 (dated no earlier than year 6 of the "Renaissance" (= year 24 of Ramesses XI—see below, n. 30): Wente, LRL, p. 15 and n. 45), and those of n. 24 below, all of these examples are found in documents dated to the reign of Ramesses XI, years 9-24 (see Peet, Tomb-Robberies, pp. 2-3, and Mayer Papyri, pp. 10 [1.1], 14 [8.1]; Gardiner, RAD, p. xiii): Pap. BM 10053, vs. = year 9 (of Ramesses XI): the Turin "Taxation Papyrus" (= Pap. Turin 1896 + 2006: see below, n. 26), ro. (and vs. opposite ro. 2) = year 12 of Ramesses XI; the Abbott Dockets (= vs. of Pap. Abbott: Pap. BM 10221) = year 1 of the "Renaissance," corresponding to year 19 of Ramesses XI; Pap. BM 10052 = year 1 of the "Renaissance"; Pap. Mayer A (= Liverpool M. 11162) = years 1-2 of the "Renaissance"; Pap. BM 10403 = year 2 of the "Renaissance"; Pap. Ambras (= Pap. Vienna No. 30) = year 6 of the "Renaissance" (= year 24 of Ramesses XI).

24. Autobiographical inscription of Anhermose, High Priest of Onuris, from his tomb at Naga el-Mashayikh, line 19 (Kees, ZAS 73 [1937], p. 80): \( \sqrt{\text{G4}} \). For the determinative \( \sqrt{\text{B2}} \), see above, n. 20. So also the nearly contemporary Pap. Anastasi I, 28.6 (EHT, p. 80 [= pl. 40]), dated on palaeographical grounds to approximately the time of Seti II (ibid., p. 1*): \( \sqrt{\text{G4}} \) (for the determinative \( \sqrt{\text{B2}} \), see below, n. 215). For contemporary writings of other forms from the same root (temp. Merneptah), cf. the "Israel stele," line 22 (KR1 IV 18.5; Lacau, Stèles du Nouvel Empire, pl. 19 [photo]): \( \sqrt{\text{G4}} \) (infinitive); Pap. Sallier I, ro. 8.1 (Gardiner, LEM 85.11; for the date cf. ibid., p. xvii, and Caminos, LEM, p. 303): \( \sqrt{\text{G4}} \) (adjective).

25. For the use of the sign \( \sqrt{\text{F18}} \) and the determinative \( \sqrt{\text{Q2}} \), see below, n. 908.


27. Gardiner, RAD, pp. 37, 43-4: for the dates, see ibid., pp. xiii-xiv.
28. Ibid., pp. 38, 41, 42.

29. Černý, LRL, p. 17.15 (No. 9).


31. For the use of the signs and , and the determinative , see below, n. 908.

32. Peet, Tomb-Robberies, pls. XXIX, XXX, XXXI; for the date, see ibid., p. 3(V2).

33. Peet, Mayer Papyri, pls. 1, 9; for the dates, see ibid., pp. 10 (1.1), 14(8.1); cf. Peet, Tomb-Robberies, p. 3(V3).

34. Peet, Tomb-Robberies, pl. XXXVI; for the date, see ibid., p. 3 (V4).

35. Černý, LRL, p. 65.11 (No. 44).

36. Wente, LRL, p. 16.


38. Cf. below, § 20.

39. WB I 159.8-11 transliterates simply .

40. This also shows in CT I 276a (TLC: temp. Dynasty XI [Allen, Occurrences, p. 37]): . This writing shows two peculiarities:

1) the suffix 'k (not indicated here) precedes the determinative (A 2), an obvious error; and 2) appears to have been attracted by the sign S 25, before which it is normally written (cf. the writings Nos. 1, 4, and 5). So closely was associated with this sign that the two formed a hieratic ligature: see Edel, OH, II 2.1, pls. 28, 30-3, 77-8, and Bd. 1, pl. 106 (288); cf. de Buck's facsimile of the writing in T2C; cf. Polotsky, II. Dynastie, § 20; Kayser, Altertümer in Hildesheim, No. 4590 (fig. 33); Vandier, Mo'a'illa, pls. 15 (left = p. 162: I1), 15 (rt. = p. 185: II1), 20 (= p. 232: V1), 22 and 6 (= p. 256: VII 1); and Budge, BD (1899), pl. 41 (= Pap. BM 10477; probably temp. Amenhutep III: cf. Allen, BD [1960], p. xxv [Es]):
Budge, *BD* [1898: Text], p. 202, as $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}}$. In the fuller writing of TLG, the scribe seems not to have analyzed the group $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}}$ into its component parts; he failed to separate $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}}$ from the $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}}$-sign, and has written once more $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}}$ where $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}}$ alone should have been. (For the $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}}$ in this form, see below, n. 89.) The $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}}$ also appears in the forms found in "BD" 125c, as cited by Naville, *Louifya*, pl. 28 (= Ca), and *Todtenbuch I* pl. 138(43), II pl. 330: $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}}$ (Fb); $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}} \ (\text{Pa})$; $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}} \ (\text{Ab})$; $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}} \ (\text{Aa})$; $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}} \ (\text{Ab})$. (For the $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}}$ in these forms, see below, n. 53; for the determinative $\underline{\text{ Huff \text{h}}}$, see below, n. 908).

41. *Hammamat*, p. 56.


44. *OIB* II 1, p. 90(3); *ZAS* 97 (1971), p. 55 and n. 1, and p. 63, n. 25.

45. *Amduat* II, p. 75(5).

46. *Coptite Texte*, p. 141. Dr. Fischer has communicated to me privately that he has since abandoned this reading.

47. Cf. below, § 11.

48. See further below, § 6.

49. Fischer does not mention the writing No. 6 which, in any case, falls outside the period of his study.

50. *EAG*, § 97.
51. JEA 34 (1948), pp. 16, 17-8 (ref. Wb I 2.12). On this word see further below, § 33.

52. Written after Vandier had called Gardiner's attention to an occurrence of this word in the then still unpublished tomb of Ankhtify at Mo'alla; cf. Vandier, Mo'alla, p. 256(p). See also below, § 32.

53. The w also occurs in CT I 276a (T2c and T9C, dated by Allen, Occurrences, p. 37, to late Dynasty XI and Dynasty XI respectively): 𓊳𓊫𓊫 (For these writings, cf. de Buck's nn. 2*-3* and n. 40, above; for the i in T9C, see below, n. 89). The w also appears in our writing No. 7, as well as in writings on the Middle Kingdom stele CGC 20035: 𓊫𓊫𓊫 (Lange and Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine; Gardiner, PSBA 37 1915, p. 123); in seventeen Middle Kingdom inscriptions at Sinai (Cerný, Sinai) [Nine of these are dated explicitly to the reign of Amenemhat III: 83b; 85N 10, 11; 88; 92W 5; 94(b) 6, 7; 100W 5, 6; 105N 2, 3; 112W 9, Sb 1; 143W 2. Seven others, in which the name of the king either was not mentioned or has not survived, may also belong to this reign: 133A 10, 11; 136Wb' (in 136Nb the w is not written); 141Wb (also written once without w); 153, 412N 1, 2 (the writing in 412N 1 is damaged, but w is undoubtedly to be restored); 510, 5; 511, 2, 3 (abbreviated writing, without w, in 511, 4, 5, 6, 7). The w is also written in 121, 7, the only occurrence in an inscription certainly dated to Amenemhat IV. (This writing shows the determinative 𓊫, on which see further below, n. 908.) In two additional Middle Kingdom Sinai inscriptions--32 (temp. Amenemhat III) and 71r (the only occurrence in an inscription securely dated to the reign of Amenemhat II)--the w is not written out.]; in Theban Tomb 99 (Sennefer: temp. Thutmose III): (Urk IV 540. 4-5; Gardiner, PSBA 39 [1917], pp. 133-4); and in "Bd" 125c and 97, as cited in Budge, BD (1899), pls. 41 and 51 (= Ea); Guillement, Ramses IX, pl. 47.14 (= Tf); Naville, Iouiya, pl. 28 (= Ce), and Todtenbuch I pl. 138(43), II pl. 330: 𓊫𓊫𓊫 (Ae); 𓊫𓊫𓊫𓊫 (Ea = "BD" 97; incorrectly published in Budge, BD (1898: Text), p. 202, as
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50.7; cf. Gardiner, *PSBA* 37 [1915], p. 124), (Pakhry, *Wadi el Hudi*, pl. 17A, and p. 44 [No. 26]; cf. Weigall, *Antiquities of Lower Nubia*, pl. 50.6; (Clère and Vandier, *TPPI*, § 18, lines 1-2; § 19, line 2); (Edel, *Beiträge*, fig. 8 [reversed]; cf. Gardiner, *ZAS* 45 [1908-09], pl. 7B [foll. p. 124]; Müller, *Felsengräber*, pl. 5b [photo]; de Morgan, *Cat. mon.* I, p. 183. Gardiner, *PSBA* 37 [1915], p. 124, misquotes this example as , and (Edel, *Beiträge*, fig. 11 [reversed]; cf. Müller, *Felsengräber*, fig. 4; de Morgan, *Cat. mon.* I, p. 184), the plural strokes do seem to represent the plural ending. Nevertheless, the plural strokes are ambiguous in the writing (Weigall, *Antiquities of Lower Nubia*, pl. 50.8): perhaps the two sets of plural strokes were used here to represent -w (i.e., the w of the stem of this word plus the -w of the plural); or the second set may simply have been added mechanically to the group , if this formed a hieratic ligature which the scribe failed to analyze correctly (cf. above, n. 40). For the use of the plural strokes to represent w other than in the plural ending, cf. below, §§ 22, 37, 49.

54. As already pointed out by el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 135 and n. 3. The same reading is indicated by the forms , of "BD" 125c (see above, n. 53); and the sequence is confirmed by the form of CT I 276a (Tlc: see above, n. 40).

Modern confusion has been occasioned by the extremely abbreviated writings of the words *c and nbw/y in which the signs S 25
(= ( ) / ( ) / ( ) ) and S 12 (= ( ) / ( ) / ( ) ) are not accom-
panied by any distinctive phonetic complements. For these spellings of *c, see n. 10; for nbw/y, "gold-worker"—an adjectival formation in
-wy derived from the noun nbw, "gold"—see Vercouetter, Kush 7 (1959),
pp. 144-6; Wb II 241.1-7; Cime, p. 129. This confusion is due to some
extent to failure to observe the precise form of the sign used in each
case. Thus in Goyon, Hammamat, No. 21 (temp. the first jubilee of Pepi
I), we find a $p$6(i-)(n-) swt (i)m(f)-r(3) nbw(yw) [ ( )]
Rnp(t)-nfrt: Goyon, p. 176 (index), transliterates imy-r nbw(?)
el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 123(9) and n. 7, translates "overseer
of gold"; Vercouetter, p. 146 and n. 132, also seems to understand "Over-
Nfrmnpt) and Edel, ZAS 97 (1971), p. 62, n. 21, understand
(i)m(f)-r(3) *c(w). Again, in Goyon, Hammamat, No. 64 (= Couyat and
Montet, Hammamat, No. 123; temp. year 16 of Sesostris I), we find

nbw(yw) [ ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )] enumerated among the 4000 members of an expedi-
tionary force—Goyon, p. 88, reads nbw, clearly identifying this
sign as S 12; on pp. 176 (index) and 182 (sign-list), however, he reads
*sw and identifies the sign as S 25; Vercouetter, p. 146 and n. 132,
seems to understand nbw(yw). Once more, in Goyon, Hammamat, No. 60
(temp. Nebtowere-Mentuhotep), we read (i)m(y)-r(3) nbw(yw) Bbi: Goyon,
pp. 81 and 176 (index), vacillates between the readings nb(? ) and *c;
el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 123(9) and n. 7, translates "overseer of
gold"; however, he also reads as though (i)m(y)-r(3) *c(w) (pp. 133-4
and n. 1 on p. 134).

Other abbreviated writings of nbw/y in the title "Overseer of
Gold-workers" are the following: (Weigall, Antiquities of Lower
Nubia, pl. 58.4; cf. Vercouetter, Kush 7 [1959], p. 146 and n. 130);
(Couyat and Montet, Hammamat, No. 35; for this writing, cf.
Newberry, JEA 24 [1938], p. 183 and n. 4: Newberry translates "Overseer of
gold"; so also Vercouetter, Kush 7 [1959], p. 146 and n. 131, and
e1-Dissouky, "Elephantine," pp. 111, 123[9] and n. 7); (Fischer,
JNES 18 [1959], p. 269 and fig. 25, and Dendera, p. 194 8 and fig. 37
on p. 193; Fischer translates "Overseer of Gold"; so also el-Dissouky,
"Elephantine," p. 117 and n. 2; p. 123[9] and n. 8); (CGC 20704);
(CGC 20594); (CGC 20594); (CGC 20515); and
(CGC 20751). Similarly abbreviated writings of the title nbw/y also
occur: (Green, *PSBA* 31 [1909], pl. 34 [foll. p. 252], No. 10);
(Steindorff, *Aniba* II, p. 249 [55]; cf. Vercoutter, *Kush* 7 [1959], p. 146 and n. 139); (CGG 20285); (CGG 20536); and (Urn IV 1149.17: plural).

56. Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Vases*, pp. 101-2, n. 6, failing to distinguish the different levels on which this sign may be employed in the Egyptian writing system, confuses the logographic or ideographic usages of the sign (in the names of various garments) with its purely phonetic usage in the spelling of a semantically unrelated word; hence he describes this garment as "the loin-cloth of foreigners." For this translation of the name of the *fc*-garment, see below, §§ 63, 39.


59. Read, *BIFAO* 13 (1917), p. 142 and n. 3; Junker, *Giza* 3, p. 184 and fig. 28 (foll. p. 166); Staehein, *Tracht*, pp. 61-2, n. 7 (on p. 61) and fig. 12 (on pl. 7); cf. also Klebs, *Reliefs*, fig. 9 (p. 20) = fig. 76 (p. 96).


63. The form cited by Read, *BIFAO* 13 (1917), p. 142 and n. 3, as a spelling for the word *fc* seems to be fictitious, probably deduced incorrectly from the writings of "BD" 125c (see above, n. 40).

21. (Saad, p. 37, renders \( \frac{\text{\textcircled{}}}{} \) and reads \( \frac{\text{\$\text{\textcircled{}}}}{} \). Not cited by Edel, ZAS 102 (1975), p. 17.

65. For the alternation of final \( \text{\textcircled{}} \) and \( \text{\textcircled{}} \), see below, § 15. With this compare the word \( \text{\textcircled{}} / \text{\textcircled{}} \), "saw" (= Wb V 298.13-14, I 144.3):

(Junker, Giza 4, p. 72 and pl. 9 \( = \text{Giza 7, p. 58} \): mastaba of \( K\text{\textcircled{}}^\text{\textcircled{}} \)-m-nh [temp. Dyn VI]; for the determinative, see PT 627a [M])

(Smith, JEA 19 [1933], p. 153 and pl. 24: sarcophagus of Mn\text{\textcircled{}} \text{\textcircled{}} .

\[ \text{Glyptothek AEIN 896c ["Izi: temp. Dynasties III-IV"]} \]

\[ \text{(PT 627a [N: written in P]; for this graphic metathesis, cf. FAG, § 96; cf. also below, n. 320) = } \]

\[ \text{(CT I 211c, n. 1* [B17C]) = } \]

\[ \text{(Gardiner, JEA 41 [1955], p. 15} \]

and pl. 5 [foll. p. 10], col. 100: Pap. Ramesseum [E]; cf. Faulkner, CDWE, p. 298; = \( \text{\textcircled{}} \) (Seele, The Tomb of Tjanefer at Thebes, pl. 10, line 6; = \( \text{\textcircled{}} \); cf. below, § 18).

66. IAF, pp. 1026-7, n. 1678 = Abu Bakr, Giza, fig. 38 on p. 52.


69. Ibid., p. 30.

70. For the references, see n. 60 above.


72. Ibid., p. 29.
73. For the references, see n. 61 above.

74. So Jéquier: PSBA 37 (1915), pp. 249-50; RT 37 (1915), p. 114 and n. 4; and Frises, p. 25 and n. 8; Smith, JEA 19 (1933), p. 154; Staehelin, Tracht, p. 35 and n. 7, and p. 61, n. 8. Edel, PAS 102 (1975), p. 30, has shown that 째�Middle, keypressly (i), etc., are to be understood as 째�Middle, keypressly (i), etc.; cf. EAG, §§ 310, 312, 327.

75. Berlin 1105 = LD II 4a; Gardiner, PSBA 37 (1915), p. 119 and pl. 11 (8) (foll. p. 118); Jéquier, Frises, p. 26 (fig. 68); Smith, JEA 19 (1933), p. 157 (fig. 4); cf. also Jéquier, PSBA 37 (1915), p. 248, n. 13; Schäfer, Aeg. Insch. I, p. 86.

76. Gramm, p. 506 (S 25); cf. p. 551.

77. Frises, p. 25.

78. Coptite Nome, p. 141.

79. Wb I 40.4.

80. Wb I 27.15.

81. Belegstollen correctly includes this reference under Wb I 40.4 (see immediately below).

82. = Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pl. 1.

83. See above, § 5.

84. Cf. above, nn. 60-1.

85. Cf. § 4 above.

86. EAG, §§ 92-3, 97.

87. Cf. the spellings of the name of princess 𒈹𒉡 (temp. Nebhepetre-Mentuhotep). The name, usually written 𒈹𒉡 (see Clère and Vandier, TTPP, § 27A, for variants of both forms), is found in the large hieroglyphic inscriptions on her wooden coffin in Cairo Museum (JdE 47355: = PM II, pp. 387-8) written exceptionally once each (see Winlock, BMMA, Nov. 1921, pt. ii, fig. 21 on p. 46; = Excavations at Deir el Bahri 1911-1931, pl. 9) and (my own copy). Yet in spite of these last two writings, because of the well established variants with and
none would be tempted to read the name *\textsuperscript{C}\textsuperscript{\$}\textsuperscript{yt}. For this name, see PN I 59.5, II 346 (59.5); note that Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), p. 76 and n. 77, reads \textsuperscript{C}\textsuperscript{\$}\textsuperscript{yt}.

88. Edel, ZAS 102 (1975), p. 17, regards this writing as a possible example of graphic metathesis. Both Smith, JEA 19 (1933), p. 156, and Kaplony, IAF, p. 1026, n. 1678, do transliterate \textsuperscript{I}\textsuperscript{C}\textsuperscript{3} when discussing this example; but neither comments on the writing nor the reasons for reading it as they do.

89. This \textsuperscript{I} also appears in CT I 276a (T1C and T9C: see above, nn. 40, 53); and in "RD" 97 (Aa bis = Pap. EM 9900: Naville, Todtenbuch II, pl. 214; = temp. Dynasty XVIII: Allen, BD [1960], p. xix): . Note that Gardiner, PSBA 37 (1915), p. 120, reconstructed the root of this word as \textsuperscript{I}\textsuperscript{C}\textsuperscript{w}(?)

90. So transliterated by Schenkel, without comment, in Helck, Lexikon I, col. 1116, and II, col. 315; cf. Bell, NARCE 87 (October 1973), p. 33, where the verbal root is transliterated \textsuperscript{I}\textsuperscript{C}\textsuperscript{3}.


92. For the \textsuperscript{w} of this form, see above, n. 53; for the use of the sign \textsuperscript{C}, and the determinative \textsuperscript{C}, see below, n. 908.

93. Wb I 41.5-8; Spiegelberg, RT 28 (1906), pp. 162-3 (LXXXI); Erman, ZAS 46 (1909), pp. 96-104; cf. Vandier d'Abbadie, Ed'E 16 (1964), pp. 151, 154, and Ed'E 17 (1965), pp. 178, 187; Hornung, Amduat II, p. 47 (139) [ref. ibid., I, p. 28 (139) and n. m].

94. FAG, § 128.

95. CT III 331b (Spell 243); for the date of the earliest versions, see Allen, Occurrences, p. 33 (S1C, S2P). For \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{I}\textsuperscript{C}\textsuperscript{n}}(S1C) as a writing of \textsuperscript{I}\textsuperscript{C}\textsuperscript{y}, see below, n. 530. The writing \textsuperscript{I}\textsuperscript{C}\textsuperscript{C}\textsuperscript{w} for the plural of "baboon" in Pap. EM 9900 (Nebesny) (= "BD" 5: cf. Naville, Todtenbuch I, pl. 7 [Aa], and II, pl. 18 [Aa]; Budge, BD [1898: Text], p. 28) is merely a defective writing, representing \textsuperscript{I}\textsuperscript{C}(n)\textsuperscript{C}\textsuperscript{w}.
96. *CDME*, p. 11; *Wb. med.*, p. 136: = Pap. Ram. III, A 33; for the date, see Gardiner, *Ramesseum Papyri*, p. 2. (Erman's observation of *ZAS* 46 (1909), p. 101, n. 3, was written before the discovery of this form.)

97. Additional research is needed to resolve the question.

98. *Gramm*, pp. 461 (E 2 and n. 2), 551.

99. *CDME*, p. 11.

100. *Phonétique*, p. 97.


104. Cf. below, § 11.


106. The occurrence of occasional Middle Egyptian elements in texts of the Old Kingdom may be regarded as intrusions from the dialect later to become the basis for the standard orthography of Middle Egyptian; see also below, n. 142.


109. Ibid.

110. *PM* I.2, pp. 622-3: temp. "early Dyn XII."

111. *Aelteste Texte*, pl. 28.

112. *Grabfunde* I, pl. 5.

113. See above, § 5.

114. *Grabfunde* I, p. 27(15).


117. See above, § 5.
118. We must now consider the possibility that writing No. 6 is also to be interpreted as $\text{C}_{2} \text{C}_{3} \text{w}$ rather than $(1) \text{C}_{3} \text{w}$. The sequence $\text{C}_{3}$ is normally written $\text{C}_{3}$ (Gardiner, Gramm, § 32), rather than $\text{C}_{3}$ (cf. Dendera, p. 344). However, since writings Nos. 1, 3-4, and 8-9 all begin with $\text{C}_{3}$, the habit of writing $\text{C}_{3}$ at the beginning of this word may have been so strong as to influence the spelling of No. 6. In any case, it seems more likely that the group $\text{C}_{3}$ here is to be understood as $\text{C}$ (= phonetic complement) + the bilateral $\text{C}_{3}$, rather than $\text{C}_{1}$ (1) (the first radical) + $\text{C}_{3}$ (= the second and third radicals). For sure examples of $\text{C}_{3} = \text{C}_{3} \text{w}$, see Edel, ZAS 102 (1975), p. 15, Nos. 14, 19-20, 21 (see p. 14 [c]), 22; Urk I 39.16 (cf. FAG, § 777 = § 500bb), 67.15 (cf. Fischer, Dendera, p. 144), 174.6 (cf. FAG, § 229, Amm.), 263.8.9 (cf. FAG, § 33 = § 145); PT 405a (W); Clère and Vandier, TPPI, § 19 (lines 3, 4); Fischer, WZKM 57 (1961), p. 70; PN II 346 (59.2); Junker, Giza 3, p. 182 (A4) and fig. 27 (foll. p. 166); Abu Bakr and Osing, MDAIK 29 (1973), p. 111 (170); Wb I 166.5, 167.13.

119. ZAS 46 (1909), pp. 96-104.


121. See above, n. 119.

122. AG, § 93c, Amm.; cf. NAG, § 46. Cf. also SV I, § 148.2; Gramm. med., §§ 25.2, 57; Czermak, Laute, §§ 97 (p. 135 and n. 1), 133; Maspero, RT 38 (1916-17), pp. 140-1(3).

123. PSBA 37 (1915), pp. 119-20.

124. I have been encouraged by Dr. Virginia Davis to attempt this in the first place, and greatly assisted subsequently by her suggestions.

125. The symbol $V$ is used to represent any vowel in a word.

126. As first pointed out to me by Virginia Davis.

127. FAG, § 227. In § 225 he likens the ending $-w$ to the $-y$ of the impf. act. ppl. (§ 630 ee), and in §§ 142, 142N, 146, 146N, 234N, he gives other examples of final $-w = y$. (Cf. Gramm. med., § 34.2; cf. also below, nn. 162, 695.) With this should also be compared the animal names ending in $-w$, vocalized by Edel *šadmāw (ZAS 81 [1956], pp. 9-10, and FAG, § 244).


129. On this hypothetical writing, see further below, § 17.
130. Cf. EAG, § 685c; Gardiner, Gramm, p. 431; Till, KG, § 267, and DG, § 196.

131. But cf. below, §§ 51, 79.

132. See above, n. 24.


134. Cf. below, § 23.

135. EAG, §§ 131, 133-4, 137, 141; Gramm. med., § 22.1; Vergote, Phonétique, pp. 76, 77 (n. 1), 96; SV I, §§ 83, 85; Korostevtsev, Néo-égyptien, n. 21. See also Gardiner, Gramm, §§ 18 (table on p. 27) and 20, § 202 (awty > 1(w)ty = 3(w)ty [cf. Erman, NAG, § 799]), and 13 with n. 7 (3t > 3t: cf. Urk IV 972.5 (temp. Hatshepsut/Thutmos III) = (?), 12/c); CDME, p. 13 (iv-mw > 1(w)ms = 3(w)ms); Wb I 124 (frt = 3frt). See also below, n. 140.

136. SV I, § 80; Vergote, Phonétique, pp. 80, 95; EAG, §§ 132-4, 753.1; FWS, p. xv; cf. Gardiner, Gramm, p. 430; Till, KG § 270, and AKG § 27b (p. 38); Steindorff, Lehrbuch, § 25.2.2 and Anhang II 1.2 (= p. 20). Cf. (hk3·k·k) hky·k·: Pap. Millingen 1.2 (for the parallels, see Helck, Amenemhet, p. 10) and Urk IV 573.1 (temp. Thutmos III); cf. also (hk3·k·k) hky·k· (infinite): Urk IV 82.13 (temp. Thutmos I). See also below, n. 140.

137. SV I, §§ 100, 130; Vergote, Phonétique, p. 63; cf. Gardiner, Gramm, § 20 and p. 430; Edel, ZAS 81 (1956), pp. 9-10; Till, AKG, § 28 (p. 39); Steindorff, Lehrbuch, § 25.2.1 and Anhang II 2.1 (= p. 20); Maspero, RT 38 (1916-17), p. 140(2). See also below, n. 140.

138. See above, § 8.

139. See above, § 2.9.

140. Cf. FWS, § 186. But note that 3 did not always assimilate to 3. Original 3 generated two separate sounds in Coptic—probably distinguished along dialectal lines (see below), §§ 33, 44, and n. 376—hence:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{3} & \rightarrow /2/ \\
& \rightarrow /x/
\end{align*}
\]
(cf. Czermak, Laute, § 95. For $\mathcal{Z} > /\mathfrak{z}/$, see below, n. 318. SV I, § 81, posits $\mathcal{Z} > \text{Coptic } /\mathfrak{z}/$ in an unaccented syllable, and $\mathcal{Z} > \text{Coptic } /\mathfrak{r}/$ in an accented syllable. For $\mathcal{Z} = \text{Semitic } /\mathfrak{z}/$, see Vergote, Phonétique, p. 128 [1.a]; cf. Gardiner, Gramm, § 18 [table on p. 27].), just as

\[ \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow /\mathfrak{z}/ \]

(see FAG, § 137; SV I, §§ 109, 89; Gardiner, Gramm, §§ 18 [table on p. 27], 20; cf. FWS, pp. xiii-xv; Czermak, Laute, § 100. For $\mathfrak{i} > /\mathfrak{r}/$, see below, n. 318. SV I, §§ 108.1-2 [cf. §§ 100-1, 103.1-2, 129-30], posits $\mathfrak{i} > \text{Coptic } /\mathfrak{r}/$ in an unaccented syllable, and $\mathfrak{i} > \text{Coptic } /\mathfrak{r}/$ in an accented syllable. For $\mathfrak{i} = \text{Semitic } /\mathfrak{r}/$, see SV I, § 88.2; Vergote, Phonétique, pp. 131 [2.a], 76; FWS, pp. xiii-xiv; Gardiner, Gramm, §§ 18 [table on p. 27], 20. For $\mathfrak{y} = \text{Semitic } /\mathfrak{y}/$, see FAG, § 137; SV I, § 88.2; FWS, pp. xiii-xiv. For $\mathfrak{i} = \text{Semitic } /\mathfrak{r}/$, see FAG, § 137; SV I, § 88.1; Vergote, Phonétique, pp. 131-2 [2.b], 76; FWS, pp. xiii-xiv; Gardiner, Gramm, § 20.). The relationships which exist between $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathfrak{i}$ and $/\mathfrak{y}/$ and $/\mathfrak{r}/$ may be represented as follows:

\[ \text{OE} \quad \text{ME} \quad \text{LE} \quad \text{DEMITIC} \quad \text{COPTIC} \]

\[ /\mathfrak{y}/ \quad /\mathfrak{z}/ \quad /\mathfrak{r}/ \quad /\mathfrak{r}/ \]

For $\mathcal{Z} > \mathfrak{i} = /\mathfrak{y}/$ in Old Egyptian, cf. $\mathcal{Z} > /\mathfrak{z}/$ and $\mathcal{Z} > \mathfrak{y}$, and $\mathfrak{i} (\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{y} (\mathfrak{q})$ (so already in Old Egyptian: see FAG, §§ 139-40; Gramm. med., § 24.1; SV I, §§ 88.2, 102, 121bis, 124, 130, 132; Gardiner, Gramm, §§ 18 (table on p. 27), 201).) Thus $\mathcal{Z} = /\mathfrak{r}/$ in Old and Middle Egyptian, but $\mathfrak{i} = /\mathfrak{i}/$ in Late Egyptian. Since $/\mathfrak{y}/$ did not assimilate to $\mathfrak{c}$ (see below, n. 386), and $/\mathfrak{r}/ > \mathfrak{c}$ before Middle Egyptian or after early Late Egyptian (see below, §§ 19, 38), the assimilation of $\mathcal{Z} /\mathfrak{i}/$ to $\mathfrak{c}$ was restricted to $\mathcal{Z} /\mathfrak{i}/ = /\mathfrak{r}/$ in Middle and early Late Egyptian.

141. Erman, NAG, §§ 1-2; Davis, Syntax, p. 3 and n. 4 (on p. 337); Korostovtsev, Néo-égyptien, p. 4; cf. Gardiner, Gramm, p. 5; Behnke, Amarna, § 1; see also H. S. Smith and A. Smith, ZAS 103 (1976), pp. 53, 75-6.

142. The Late Egyptian elements found already in Middle Egyptian texts may be regarded as reflections of the spoken Middle Ki gdom dia-
lect which came to be written as standard Late Egyptian: see Davis, Syntax, pp. 151-2, 185-6, 188-90, 202.

143. For this date, see above, § 2.10.

144. See further below, §§ 19, 38.

145. Note especially the form \( \text{cc}_n \) of Lange, Papyrus Harris, p. 80, line 15 (= IX.10).

146. Ibid., p. 62, line 10 (= VII.11) and p. 68, line 2 (= VIII.4).

147. See above, § 13.

148. Parker, JEA 26 (1940), pp. 86, 93 (A, 17), suggests that a late demotic spelling \( \text{cc}_3 \text{nt} \) may represent a form of \( \text{nt} \): i.e., \( \text{cc}_3 \text{nt} = \text{nt} \times \text{nt} \).


151. Gardiner, Gramm. §§ 279; EAG, §§ 762, 128, 30, 134, 573aa; Gramm. med., §§ 1.1, 47.4, 49.2bb, cc; SV I, § 241a; SDT, p. 53(e); Korostovtsev, Néo-égyptien, p. 34.

152. Erman, NAG, § 50; Korostovtsev, Néo-égyptien, p. 33 (§ 23b) and nn. 75-6; Peterson, JEA 52 (1966), pl. 31 (foll. p. 128) II.3, and pp. 125, 121.

153. EAG, § 111; SDT, p. 53(e).

154. SV I, §§ 216.2; Vergote, Phonétique, pp. 18-20; Czermak, Laute, §§ 3-4; Gramm. med., §§ 1.1aa, 38; SDT, p. 53(e); cf. EAG, § 114.

155. Gramm. med., §§ 1.1bb, 78.3, 80.4; Erman, NAG, §§ 54, 257; SV II, § 667; Behnk, Amarna, § 11; Korostovtsev, Néo-égyptien, p. 34.

156. EAG, §§ 120, 111; SV I, § 261; Czermak, Laute, §§ 53, 102; Vergote, Phonétique, pp. 65-6; Kaplony, IAF, p. 394 (§ 58).


158. Attested already in Old and Middle Egyptian: EAG, §§ 134, 753.1; Gardiner, Gramm. p. 276 (commentary to n. 12); SV I, §§ 75, 84, 133; FWS, § 158, n. 265 (= p. 87); Behnk, Amarna, § 5a. See also below, § 33.

159. Gramm. med., §§ 1.1bb, 22.1bb; see also below, n. 624.

160. SV I, § 75; \( dd = dd_{12} = dd_{12} [ y_{12} = z_{1} (= l) > y ] \); \( dd = dd_{12} = dd_{12} [ y_{12} = \)}
\(d > t > j > \gamma\).

161. Gramm. med., §§ 1.1aa, 22.1aa.

162. Gramm. med., §§ 1.1bb, 94 (p. 58, n. 2), 114 (but cf. §§ 34.2 and n. 4): the Middle Egyptian demonstrative adjective \(pwy = pw > py\) (cf. FAG, §§ 142N, 146, 182, 193). CT VII 385d (B3C), I 386b (B3C): \(\text{šnwt} = \text{šnwt} > \text{šnyt}\). Cf. Schenkel, Studien, § 16d (pp. 52-3).

163. CT VII 461e (B1Bo): \(\text{šnwt} = \text{šnwt} > \text{šnit}\).

164. FAG, §§ 572, 573aa, 574aa, Anm.: \(\text{škw} = \text{škw} > \text{škw}\).

165. See above, n. 107.

166. Two other versions substitute entirely different words: B9C gives \(\text{dnh}\), and B3C has \(\text{mmn}\).


168. TLCB. Another version (SsqSsq) probably intends the same thing, though its spelling is defective: \(\text{h}\) is not written; and for \(c\), instead of simple \(\text{heh}\) (D 36), \(\text{hr}\) (D 40) is found.

169. For the word \(\text{inh}\), Wb does not cite an occurrence earlier than those of CT IV 298b/299b. The spellings with \(c\) are quite exceptional, but their relatively early dates (Dynasties IX-X for SsqSsq, and Dynasty XI for TLCB: Allen, Occurrences, pp. 35, 37) suggests that a certain priority ought to be assigned to them. (Note, however, that Lacau, Corps, § 105, does not seem to share this view.) In fact, \(\text{cnh}\) must be the original or etymological spelling of the word commonly written \(\text{inh}\) — the form \(\text{inh}\) reflecting the change of \(c\) to \(i\) before \(h\): see Dévau, Sphinx 12 (1909), p. 110; cf. FNS, § 364. For \(\text{cnh}\) in PT 2243a, see now Faulkner, Supplement, p. 71.

170. For the \(w\) in this word, see below, n. 659.

171. Dévau, Sphinx 13 (1910), pp. 157-8; Grapow, Präfix m-, p. 7, and p. 14, n. 1; Wb II 49.7-14; CDME, p. 105; Gardiner, Gramm., p. 190, n. 1, and p. 568.

172. E.g., CT VII 306g (B2L: temp. Dynasties XI-XII [Allen, Occurrences, p. 17]): \(\frac{\text{heh}}{}\); see also below, § 30. For \(\text{cc} = \text{c} > \text{cc}\), see below, § 24. Other possible examples of \(\text{c} = \text{c} < \text{i}\) make us refer once more to our paradigm \(\text{cnr} > \text{cin} > \text{cn} > \text{ccn} > \text{ccn}\). Erman, Glossar, p. 6, mentions a spelling \(\text{ccn}\); and this form (= Naville, Todtenbuch II, pls. 158 [Pb], 18 [A1: properly a plural]; Piankoff, Litany, pl. 2) might be thought to provide an instance of \(\text{c} = \text{c} < \text{i}\): i.e., \(\text{ccn}\). However, this writing surely represents \(\text{ccn}\).
with graphic transposition, the two ayins being written together to achieve a more balanced or symmetrical arrangement of signs in this word: see below, n. 530. However, in NAG, § 46, Erman cites a form ḫccnv; cf. Lange, Amenemope, 17.9.22. Grumach, Amenope, pp. 109, 116-7, reads ḫnj, without comment; but clearly we should read (with the demonstrative adjective or definite article p3) p3 ḫccnv (or ḫccnv[hw]). Here ḫ- represents the secondary weakening of ḫ--(掴) ḫ--> ḫ-—equivalent to ḫ- = (��_dx) ḫ>��; see below, § 38. For roughly contemporary writings (for the date of Pap. BM 10474, see Williams, JEA 47 [1961], p. 106 and n. 1) in which this initial ḫ is simplified to��, see Edwards, Amuletic Decrees (for the date of these examples—no earlier than Dynasty XXI—see pp. xiii-xv): p3 ḫccnv (L6, ro. 58 [= pl. 13]; T1, ro. 102 [= pl. 19]; T2, ro. 41 [= pl. 22]; T3, ro. 55-6 [= pl. 28]; P3, ro. 30 [= pl. 32]; C1, 37 [= pl. 37]; Ch 82 [= pl. 43]/p3 ḫccnv (L1, ro. 2 [= pl. 1]); T1, ro. 54 [= pl. 19]; P3, ro. 90-1 [= pl. 34]/p3 ḫccnv (L6, ro. 63 [= pl. 13]) = p3 ḫccnv (T2, vs. 87 [= pl. 26]; cf. also PN I 100.6). For the final -w = -syscall or these forms, see below, § 19; for p3syscall, see FAC, § 134 (ref. Urk IV 654.16, temp. Thutmose III).

173. Lacau, Sarcophages: (Jordan) (28091: 35, 38, 40), (28083: 25, 27, 29, 31; 28091: 42). For the sign D 36 used instead of D 38, see Gardiner, Gramm., D 36. Both of these texts date to Dynasty XII: Allen, Occurrences, p. 15 (28083 = B1C; 28091 = B9C). See also Dévaud, Sphinx 13 (1910), p. 160; i; Grapow, Prüf- m., p. 8, and Wb II 47.10-12:

174. Lacau, Sarcophages: (28089: 8; 3 = (��_gy), (28090:11); cf. also i (28090:9). Both of these texts date to Dynasty XII: Allen, Occurrences, p. 15 (28089 = B12C; 28090 = B13C). See also Hornung, Amduat I, p. 71 and nn. i-j (ref. No. 304): m 않 =.

175. Lacau, Sarcophages: (28091: 33, 44), (28092: 31, 33, 35). Both of these texts date to Dynasty XII: Allen, Occurrences, p. 15 (28091 = B9C; 28092 = B10C). See also Hornung,

Amduat I, p. 71 (No. 304): m 않 = ; cf. also n. j on p. 71.

176. Wb II 47.10-13; CME, p. 105. See also Mace and Winlock, Senkhitisi, pp. 66, 46 (n. 5), 123; Hornung, Amduat II, p. 87 (304).

177. Grapow, Prüf- m., p. 16; Jéquier, RT 39 (1921), pp. 145-6, and Frises, p. 66 and n. 7.

178. PT 815a.

180. Präfix m-, pp. 14 (n. 1), 5.

181. See above, n. 107.

182. See also CT III 371b and 377d/378a. This word is found written ⲟ ⲟ in PT 49+3, where it alliterates with 竞争对手; see Faulkner, Supplement, p. 6. Faulkner, Pyramid Texts, p. 16, translates "a pendant." However, all the offerings of PT 43a-49+3 are clearly scepters, wands, or staffs: the only exception being the 𓖓𓖓 of PT 48b, which seems to be intrusive, having been attracted secondarily to the 𓖓-scepter immediately following it in PT 49. For the determinative Ⲝ (S 34), cf. PT 49+1, where the determinative of the 𓖓-scepter, Ⲝ (S 40), has been corrected out of original Ⲝ as noted by Faulkner, Supplement, p. 6, n. a: see Jequier, Neit et Apouit, p. 26 (line 319; cf. pl. 12). This latter error is possibly the result of confusion due to similarity in the shapes of the signs S 34 and S 40 in contemporary hieratic: cf. Posener-Krieger and de Genival, Abu Sir, palaeography pl. 11. The choice of Ⲝ as determinative of 𓖓𓖓 was perhaps influenced by the proximity of the other Ⲝ -signs in the inscription in which this word occurs. Cf. Hassan, Giza 6.2, p. 230(65).

183. Faulkner, Pyramid Texts, p. 147, n. 2; Sethe, Komm. IV, p. 56 (PT 815a); = Mb II 47.14.

184. For the references, see above, n. 176.

185. Lacau, Sarcophages: 28089.19.21; 28090.7; 28087.23.25. All three of these texts date to Dynasty XII: Allen, Occurrences, pp. 15, 17 (28087 = B17C; 28089 = B12C; 28090 = B13C).

186. For the sign D 38 used instead of D 36, see Gardiner, Gramm, D 36.


188. EAG, § 31, 31N, 34, 34N, 50; SV I, §§ 111, 410; GNS, p. 41, n. 1; Gardiner, Gramm, § 285.

189. Grapow, Präfix m-, p. 8, cites a form 𓖓𓖓, 𓖓𓖓, dated to Dynasty XIX—unfortunately, without giving its source. In this spelling, 𓖓 could represent a weakening of medial 𓖓—i.e., 𓖓→𓖓—after the preformative m-. 
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190. Wb II 87.8-11; CDME, p. 109; Gardiner, Gramm, p. 569.

191. Wb II 87.12.

192. See above, n. 172.


194. For the equivalent change of initial ġ to ī also described as dissimilation, see Czermak, Laute, § 97: ḫ<cc.

195. Dévaud, Sphinx 12 (1909), pp. 107-10, and Sphinx 13 (1910), pp. 153-9; FAG, § 122; Gramm. med., § 31.2; SV I, § 148.3; Sethe, ZÄS 64 (1929), p. 66 (§17e); Czermak, Laute, §§ 133, 97; Steindorff, Lehrbuch, § 51 and Anhang II 3.3 (p. 20).

196. FAG, § 122; Gramm. med., § 54; Czermak, Laute, § 69; Vergote, Phonétique, pp. 95, 73; FWS, § 198; Korostovtsev, Néo-égyptien, pp. 11, 19, 22; Till, WZKM 36 (1929), p. 187. Note also that both ṣ and ū may affect the quality of the preceding vowel in the same way: Till, DC, §§ 24-5; 44, 46-7; thatū (< hū) may be used to represent āyin in Coptic transcriptions of Arabic: Crum, CD, p. 632a; and that hū (≡/hū/) may be used for ṣ in cuneiform transcriptions of ancient Egyptian: Vergote, Phonétique, pp. 97-8. See also below, § 46.

197. See above, § 15 and n. 140.


201. See above, § 2.9.

202. See above, § 8.

203. See above, § 9.

204. See above, § 16.

205. For these spellings of the word "baboon," see above, n. 172.

206. See above, n. 162.

207. This symbol may be used in a transliteration to represent the complete absence of any written expression for a consonant whose existence is known by etymology; thus the form transliterated ẓn(C) could also be rendered ẓn>f.

209. Cf. Gardiner, *Gramm.*, § 171 and n. 4 (on p. 130). It is of interest to note that this apparent loss of final ś occurs in a word containing ḫ.

210. Maystre, *BIFAO* 40 (1941), p. 97; Naville, *Tottembuch II*, pl. 158 (Pf); *KRI* IV 29.4; *Wb* I 191.10. Found as early as the reign of Seti I.

211. Lange, *Papyrus Harris*, p. 39, line 22 (= V.5); cf. Erman, *ZAS* 46 (1909), p. 99, n. 2. Spiegelberg, *RT* 28 (1906), p. 163 and n. 1, quotes two more such writings, Cnn and ḫCnn, with the reference to Erman, *Glossar*. The spellings found in Erman, however, (ibid., p. 6) are Ccn and ḫCcn (for this latter, see above, n. 172); so Spiegelberg’s forms may be fictitious.

212. See further below, n. 262. For examples of /p/ assimilated to the following consonant in Coptic, see below, nn. 337, 376, 619.


214. See above, § 9.

215. Through confusion of determinatives, however, even this criterion may fail. So the determinative sh (D 6), properly belonging to ḥéwy, "sleep" (see below, § 21), is found incorrectly with ḫCcw, the word here under discussion (cf. Peet, *Tomb-Robberies*, pp. 92 and 101, n. 27: ref. Pap. EM 10068, ro. 6.16 [see above, n. 22]; cf. Gardiner, *JEA* 34 [1948], p. 17, n. 2), and the ḫCC of *Wb* I 2.14 (cf. Gardiner, *Mes.*, p. 21 [59], and *JEA* 34 [1948], p. 17 and n. 1), to be discussed below (§§ 31-5: ḫCC [7]). Cf. also the use of ḫ (A 24)—properly belonging to ḫCC(3) (see below, § 21)—as determinative of the ḫCC here under discussion (see above, n. 24); and ḫ (Y 1)—properly belonging to ḫCC(6) (see below, § 30)—as determinative of ḫCC(3) (see below, § 21) and ḫCC(7) (see below, §§ 31-5).


217. See above, n. 24.


220. Hayes, *Ostraka*, pls. 13-14, nos. 63 ro. 5, '66.6', '65.2', [64 ro. 5]; Spiegelberg, *Ostraka*, pl. 17, no. 133.2.4; Erichsen, *Papyrus Harris I*, 59.9; 60.2; Gardiner, *JEA* 34 (1948), p. 18.


224. Hayes, *Ostraka*, pls. 13-14; for the date, see ibid., pp. 6-7.

225. Before the assimilation of ₃ to ₅.

226. Simpson, *Papyrus Reisner II*, pls. 5 (B13), 20 (Fr. 1 vs. ₃ ₃): Simpson transcribes tr. a. b. c. d. e. f. g. h. i. j. k. l. m. n. o. p. q. r. s. t. u. v. w. x. y. z. For z. c. c. associated with carpenters at work on "planking" (ph3), see Spiegelberg, *Ostraka*, pl. 17, no. 133.


228. *Ostraka*, p. 31; see also *Wb* I 3.9.

229. Quibell, *Saqqara* (1907-1908), pl. 61.3 (photo); = *Urk* I 181.9. 10; *Wb* I 3.9. The fragment is dated to the end of Dynasty V or beginning of Dynasty VI: see *Urk* I, p. 180 (§ 25 = 116).

230. Associated with "floor(ing) or ground" (z3tw).


232. Ibid., O 36, n. 1.

233. Hayes, *Ostraka*, pl. 14: 69.3; for the date, see ibid., pp. 6-7; temp. Hatshepsut and Thutmose III.

234. *Papyrus Reisner II*, pp. 28, 34: 3c(i); p. 57: 3c(w).

235. For ₃ = /₃/ (OE/ME) and ₃ = /₃/ (LE), see above, n. 140.

236. *EAG*, § 239.
237. Hayes, Ostraka, pp. 21-2, translates this form exactly as he does the 𓊝� cited above in n. 220.

238. Cf. EAG, § 688; Till, KG, §§ 272-3.

239. See above, n. 220 (Gardiner): the spellings found in Hayes and Spiegelberg are therefore defective or non-etymological.

240. See above, § 17.

241. EAG, § 579; Till, KG, § 272.

242. See above, n. 220 (Erichsen): the spelling 𓊨 is therefore abbreviated.

243. See below, § 38.

244. See Davies, Amarna V, pls. 25-6, 28: Sandman, Akhenaten, p. 129.13-14: N 23 = bn 𓊤-w-f, S 24 = bn 𓊤-w-f, U 22 = bn 𓊤-w (sic: cited incorrectly as 𓊤-w-f in Davies, Syntax, pp. 20, 73, and n. 154 on p. 356).

245. The šdmw·f-form (EAG, §§ 511, 513, 516.1, 521) is surely not in question here.

246. It is less likely that we should transliterate 𓊤-w, with the group ḫw representing the weakening of final -w (akin to -w).

247. Piankoff, Litany, p. 23(17) and n. 23, simply translates "manifestations" (?). A new edition of this text by Prof. Erik Hornung is forthcoming. Prof. Hornung has very kindly made available to me an advance copy of his page 22, on which this word and its context appear.

248. For abstract nouns in -w, sometimes written as though plurals, cf. Gardiner, Gramm, § 77.1 and Z 2 (p. 536), nn. 17-18; EAG, § 234; Edel, ZÁS 79(1954), p. 87; Faulkner, Plural, § 36. For other uses of the plural strokes to represent -w, see Gramm. med., §§ 2.4, and von Deines, Ergänzungen, p. 135 (VIII § 2.4 and Amm. 2).

249. Not necessarily accompanied by ḫw (N 31): Wb I 41 and IV 32 [𓊤][s-i-r]; GNS, pp. 12-13; CEMP, pp. 45, 214 [s(i)r]; Gardiner, Gramm, p. 551 [s(i)r]; Erman, ZÁS 46 (1909), p. 98, n. 2; EAG, §§ 428bb, 669bb.

250. EAG, § 428bb.

251. But Edel also cites (ibid., § 428bb) an instance (Mar., Mast. p. 368 = Borchardt, Denkmäler 1453; cf. Erman, ZÁS 46 [1909], p. 98, n. 2) in which it is written as though *cr, and he remarks elsewhere (ibid., § 128) that final -w need not have been written; cf. Gramm. med., §§ 49.2, 47.4. (For *cr taken as the basic form of the root ḫr,
cf. Faulkner, *CDME*, pp. 11, 45; Westendorf, *KH*, p. 229 [TAW], and ZAS 90 [1963], p. 129 and n. 4; Spiegelberg, *KH*, pp. 3 [ALE], 144 [TAW], 179 [AU]; Till, *AKS*, p. 45 [S 35a]; Vergote, *Phonétique*, p. 81 [B.1.1]; cf. also Otto, ZAS 79 [1954], pp. 43, 51. Edel also mentions (ibid., § 428bb; cf. § 283) the Old Egyptian occurrences of c(r)(t). "cobra, uraeus," a derivative from the root c(r). (For the form t(r)(t), cf. SV II, § 863; cf. also Erman, ZAS 46 [1909], p. 102, n. 3.)

252. See below, § 25.

253. Edel correctly points out (ibid., § 428bb and n. 2) that a proposed alliteration between c(r) and c(w) would not be complete, nor especially convincing. (For the w of c(w), cf. ibid., §§ 106, 243.) However, between c(w) and c(w) the match is almost perfect: for -i = -w, see EAG, §§ 142, 142N, 146, 146N; for i- = r- see below, n. 263.


256. Cf. EAG, §§ 428bb, 130.2; *Gramma med.*, § 51.2.

257. Cf. Edel, ZAS 81 (1956), p. 11, and p. 9 and n. 4. For the w of this word, see below, §§ 40, 49.

258. = *iC1*. The /r/1/ variation found in the forms of this word is probably dialectally determined; some dialects seem not to have had the sound /1/ at all. For examples of this r (= /1/) written p, see below, § 27 (fig. 1.24): TAPo; and Erman, ZAS 46 (1909), p. 102 and n. 3: o(p)arkes.

259. = *iC1C*. The symbol C is used to represent any consonant in a word. The writings sCr and sCry (see Erman, ZAS 46 [1909], p. 98, n. 3; ZBT IV 32; *CDME*, p. 214) must represent (s)Cry and (s)Cry, in which the final -y could represent an inflectional ending; otherwise \( \text{v} \) could be merely a space-filler (see Erman, NAG, § 28; Korostovtsev, *Néégyptien*, p. 32; Behnk, *Amarna*, § 2.10); or -ry could represent r>y (\( = i \)). An examination of the examples on an individual basis would be required to determine which is the explanation appropriate to each.

260. = *iC1#. The symbol \# may be used in a transliteration to indicate either that a consonant is in the word-final position—i.e., that no other consonant follows it in the word—or in the word-initial position—i.e., that no other consonant precedes it in the word. The preservation of /r/1/ in word-final position was probably a matter of dialect: i.e., the general rule /r/1/> i# may not have been valid for all dialects.
261. For ₁<\kä/>₁, cf. Gramm. med., § 51.8 and 47.3, n. 1; Vergote, Phonétique, p. 132 (2e); FWS, p. xiv and § 392, n. 527; Blackman and Fairman in Miscellanea Gregoriana, p. 420(95): Egyptian ₁ = Semitic ₁/₁.

262. For parallels for the failure of ṛ (as normally preserved when not in the word-final or syllable-final position: see Till, KG, § 39) to appear in the writing of this word, cf. EAG, § 128, end: examples include ṛn:nil = ₁n(i)₂(₃), the Old Egyptian plural of ₁n:nil, "baboon"; cf. also the feminine ṛn(₁)ₗt (Griffith and Newberry, Bersheh II, pl. 11.5: = Wb I 41.9, and CDME, p. 11) = ṛn:nil (CT III 331b: TII, B4C, B4C, LII). For further examples, see the forms of (dmr: see PT 2073b >) dm₁ (and (smr: cf. EAG, § 689 >) sm₁ (for both, cf. Gardiner, Gramm, § 270, Obs.) quotable from Middle Egyptian: e.g., dm₁:f (= sm₁:f) (dm₁:w) (= Old Perfective) [for both, see Grapow, Umschreibung, pp. 105, 331: = E6 766f (91.14) and Sm 31A (10.19)]; and sm₁ (infinitive: see EAG, § 689; Gardiner, Gramm, § 299 [p. 224, n. 9a]). Cf. also Černý, ASAE 44 (1944), pp. 295-8: síst > stt = (?) st(₁)t.

In this same connection should perhaps also be cited the word customarily transliterated ṛnw. Many examples of the contexts in which it occurs have been gathered together by Baer, JAOS 83 (1963), pp. 2-3, n. 5. Most significant for our understanding of its meaning are Baer's entries (i) and (k), which put this word into parallelism with ṛnw, "moaning or groaning (as expressions of grief)"—Wb I 77.12.14, and CDME, pp. 17-18—and (d), in which ṛnw is found paralleled by ṛ(t)w, "mournings"—Wb I 116.14, and CDME, p. 28. The best understanding of most of these passages can be achieved by translating ṛnw as "shriek(ing), wailing), (cry of) woe, (sound of) mourning, lament(ation)," or the like: cf. Gardiner and Sethe, L. to D., p. 20 (IV.2); GAS, p. 103; Gardiner, Gramm, p. 551; Wb I 41.10-11; Blackman and Fairman, JEA 29 (1943), p. 10(e); Simpson, JEA 52 (1966), p. 50. The only exception is Baer's (j), ṛnw n, "hail to..." (cf. ṛnw, "hail," used alone—without n—in CT I 1741 and "NB" 12 [Naville, Todtenbuch I, pl. 11.11 (Pa)]), used as a greeting or salutation, or to attract attention, in which the call or shout involved has become worshipful in intent: cf. CDME, p. 11; cf. also Gunn, JEA 16 (1930), p. 151; Baer, JAOS 83 (1963), p. 2 (n. 5); Simpson, JEA 52 (1966), pp. 42-4. This shift probably occurred in the context of Baer's (h)—to which must be added Simpson, JEA 52 (1966), p. 9, line 2 (foli. p. 48)—in which ṛnw is described as "useful or beneficial" (3b). It can only be wondered whether in "baboon" and "(cry of) woe" we may have two related developments of a common root ṛn(₃) (which was perhaps onomatopoetic in origin). If so, the word "baboon" (a 4-lit. noun: EAG, § 219) should be understood literally as "shrieker or wailer"—with reference to the noise this animal makes; and the word *ṭnw should be transliterated ṛnw, and regarded as a "nomen actionis" (cf. EAG, § 234). In fact, the ṛn-pot ₃ (W 24), with which this word is normally written, is known to have had the phonetic value ṛn in certain other words (cf. EAG, § 31; SV I, § 111). As corroborative evidence for this latter view, the forms Cₘₚ and ṛₙₚ should be compared. Translated "complain or complaint" (CDME, p. 43; Wb I 191.9.12; cf. Erichsen, Glossar, p. 63: ṛₙₚ = "to cry out or shriek"), these words, when nouns, may actually represent (i)ₙₚ and (i)ₘₚ, re-
spectively. For \((\text{i})C^\alpha C_n\) as a writing of "baboon," see above, § 19; cf. also \(\text{i}n^C/\text{i}n^C_t > C_n^C/C_n^C_t > \text{chin}\) (WB I 94.12-13, 191.13; CIME, pp. 23, 43; Lefebvre, *Parties du corps*, p. 16 (§ 16) and nn. 2-3; Lacau, *Corps*, § 160).

For alliteration between \((\text{i})C^C_n\), "baboon," and \(C_n^C\), "to go around," in the Book of the Divine Cow (temp. Seti I), see Maystre, BIFAO 40 (1941), p. 97, line 73; for the recognition of this word-play, see Bleeker, *Hatvar and Thoth*, p. 111 and n. 2; Piankoff, *The shrines of Tur-Ankh-Amon*, p. 32, n. 98; Wilson in ANET, p. 9, n. 10; Roeder, *Urkunden*, p. 148. For the correspondence to be complete, \(C_n^C\) (WB I 191.11) must also be interpreted as \(C_n^C\); so the origins of this word \(C_n^C\) must now be investigated. Edgerton and Wilson, *Historical Records of Ramses III*, p. 91, n. 19b (ref. MH II 96.19) understand \(*C_n^C\) as "...the reduplicated form of \(C_n\), 'turn about'..." However, the simplex \(*C_n\) does not seem to exist: the root meaning "to return, come back, turn back, turn around, go around" (v.i.-v.t.) is generally taken to be \(C_n^C\) (2nd-gem.: WB I 188.13-189.7; CIME, p. 43; Gardiner, *Grmm.*, p. 557; Vycichl, *MDATK* 16 [1958], p. 381 [6]). But the derivation of \(C_n^C\) from \(C_n^C\) does not fit our pattern, which would require an original \(*C_n^C\) *\(>*\) \(C_n^C\). That the root in question was actually 3rd-wk. has already been suggested: SV I, § 396; Erman and Grapow, *Handwörterbuch*, p. 25; Kees and Badawi, *Handwörterbuch*, p. 38. Most occurrences of this word in Middle Egyptian texts are ambiguous in this regard; but one seems to be clear and unequivocal: the negatival complement \(\text{i}n^C_{(j)w}\) (see Gardiner, *Grmm.*, § 346.3, n. 9 = Urk IV 519.2 [temp. Hatshpsut]: cf. VM V 67; written with \(\sigma = \text{mw/nw};\) for the formation, see EAG, § 742) is appropriate only to a 3rd-wk. verb (see Gardiner, *Grmm.*, § 341, and EAG, § 742: the 2nd-gem. form would be \(C_n^C\)). Moreover, the verbal noun \(\text{i}n^C_{(j)w}\) (also written with \(\sigma = \text{nw/nw}--\) not cited in WB--occurs in GAS, pl. 14.14 (for the usage, cf. Gardiner, *Grmm.*, § 485.2, n. 12); MH I 46.28 and II 85.5 The evidence which may be adduced in favor of regarding this root as 2nd-gem. is limited to the occurrence of \(\text{i}n^C_{(j)w}\) in "Peas.": B2, 116. Gardiner (JEA 9 [1923], p. 21 and n. 6; cf. Sethe, *Lesestücke*, p. 24, n. e), treating this form as infinitival, transliterates \(\text{i}n^C_{(j)w}\) and translates "...[in order] to...bring him back." Nevertheless, the writing remains troublesome; and an alternative interpretation is not excluded.

In fact, the redundant writing of the consonant \(n\) in certain environments is mentioned by Gardiner in *Grmm.*, § 62, end: see also § 186.3, n. 8; cf. Caminos, *JEA* 38 (1952), pp. 51-2(5), 53-4(34); 54(36); Korostovtsev, *Néo-égyptien*, p. 33 (22); *Grmm. med.*, §§ 45.1, 43.6cc. And the application of this principle to certain other passages in Middle Egyptian literature may provide a key to the correct understanding of this crux. Thus, in "Sh.S." 144-5 we find \(\overset{\text{wtn}}{\text{h}}\) (= sdm.f: see Blackman, *Stories*, p. 46.3, n. b) paralleled by \(\text{sfr}^C_{-}\); in "Sh.S." 132 \(\overset{\text{kht}}{\overset{\text{h}}{\text{h}}}^C\) the perfective sdm.f form of
the adjective-verb knf: cf. Gardiner, Gramm, §§ 150 [p. 117, n. 2], 454.5) is employed after ir; in Peas. B2, 75 sin n-tw replaces


= Caminos, Hieratic, pl. 24.11) sin n-f is used after the negation n sp (cf. Gardiner’s comment in Gramm, § 456, n. 13). Against this background we may be justified in transliterating "Sin(i)f and translating "...so that he should come back."

A separate root Cnn, "to twist, wind around, or bind up," is known (see Wb I 192.9-11, and Fag. §§ 488b-b, 724.2, 738, 639.3), with a nominal derivative in m- (see Wb II 47.7-9, 81.25, and Hornung, Amdutat I p. 169 and nn. e, x, and II p. 164 (696): m Cnn > mi nn/ m(i)nn = m Sn < mny). For a suggestion of possible word-play between the word "baboon" and this root, see Moussa and Altemüller, Nefer: ref. Fischer, Bi Or 31 (1974), pp. 67-8 and nn. 6-7. Despite Fischer's rejection of the meaning "twist" for Cnn, and his incomplete rendering of "baboon" as Cnr, his objection is valid: the phonetic basis for the supposed alliteration of Cnn and l Cnr (> l ni) is lacking in Old Egyptian.

263. For f = at the beginning of a word, see Fag. §§ 127, 428bb and n. 2; Fgs. §§ 392, n. 527. Cf. CT I 45c: l th = r th (B480); CT I 63c: r p (v) t = r p (v) t (BHC3) = i p (v) t (79C). See also Rtm = *l rm (Cerny, Sinai, No. 115w ) = ( i rm =) ( l ) tmw: cf. Cerny, Sinai II, p. 19; Posener, CAH I, 2, p. 557, n. 2, and Princes et pays, pp. 66-7.

264. Breasted, Smith Surgical Papyrus, pl. XIII.13.15 and pp. 87, 88 (cf. pp. 370, 512, 520); see also Gramm., §§ 23.1, 49.2ee; Wb. med., p. 25. This manuscript is dated to late Dynasty XVII or early Dynasty XVIII: cf. Grapow, Von den medizinischen Texten, pp. 88-9.

265. For this transliteration of the word "bone," see below, n. 619.

266. Breasted, Smith Surgical Papyrus, p. 88 and n. 1, p. 521.

267. Cf. Gramm., § 166.6 and n. 5; Gardiner, Gramm., §§ 314, 317.

268. Cf. Gardiner, Gramm., 310 (3rd-wk.); Fag. § 579. In both (i) cr(w) and l cr(w), i had already assimilated to cr; so the spelling
\( i^c(iw) \) must be regarded as historical, and \((i)c_(r)(w)\) might better be transliterated \((c)c_(r)(w)\). For an example of the infinitive of \( i^c \), "to wash," written \( cc(i)t \) or \( cc(c)c_e = cc_c \), cf. Erman, \( NAG \), § 46: = Davies, Amarna II, pl. 7; cf. p. 14, n. 1. (Erman’s observation of \( ZAS \) 46 [1909], p. 96 and p. 99, n. 1, was written before the discovery of this form.)

269. \( NAG \), § 579; \( Till \), \( KG \), § 272.

270. For the form \((i)c_rw\), see below, § 28.

271. \( CT \) VII 443c.

272. For this form, cf. \( CT \) VII 443c (B2Bo).

273. For \( f^c = i>^c \) before \( c \), cf. above, § 18.

274. \( CT \) VII 439b.

275. \( CT \) VII 332g. For the suppression of \( i^c \) after the causative preformative \( s^- \), see below, § 25.

276. This writing may also represent \( s(i)c_rw\).

277. \( CT \) I 72c. The form \( scc(w) \) may also be read as \( s(i)c_cw\).

278. \( CT \) VII 275c (B4Bo). The form \( scc.sn \) may also be understood as \( s(i)c_c.sn\).

279. \( Wb \) I 40.3; Erman, \( ZAS \) 46 (1909), p. 99. To these references add Gardiner, \( JPA \) 41 (1955), pp. 10, 17, and pls. 4.74, 3.27, 2.14a (retrograde): \( \frac{a}{d} \), \( \frac{a}{d} \). With this should be compared \( \frac{a}{d} \), "stairs or staircase" (\( Wb \) I 208.3; Erman, \( ZAS \) 46 [1909], p. 99), and \( f^c(i) < *icr \), "ladder." The existence of this word--not in \( Wb \)--may be deduced from \( PT \) 291c (W). The writing here has long been considered corrupt (see Faulkner, \Pyramid Texts\, p. 65, n. 30: Faulkner transliterates as \( s^h=j^c \)), since the parallels agree in giving \( i^c(i) < i^c r = i^c r / s(i)^c r \). \( PT \) 291c (T), \( CT \) I 158d. However, an examination of the palaeography of \( PT \) 291c (W: see Piankoff, \( Unas \), pl. 16 reveals at once that the sign used to write \( i^c(i) \) is not the same as that used to write \( i^c c \) in \( PT \) 300a (W). For the latter, the ship's mast (P 6) is employed; for the former, a kind of ladder (not in Gardiner's sign-list; compare the difference in the forms of the two signs used in the writings of \( CT \) I 25a/14b \( = c^t c \) and 58e \( = m^h k t \), "ladder") in B38o: note that the signs seem to have coalesced in the other versions). From this we may conclude that there was an old word \( *icr > i^c(i) \), "ladder," from which the phonetic value of this sign--as attested here--was derived.
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280. Wb I 40.3 (Belegstellen): (from the Theban tomb No. 23 [T34]; PM I.1, p. 38: = temp. Merneptah); Spiegelberg, ZAS 64 (1929), pp. 82 (10), 80 (1 and n. 6), and 79: ](temp. Ptolemy V Epiphanes) and (= *c<w>f; temp. Nectanebo II).

281. Cf. also Berguet, La stèle de la famine, col. 12 = pls. 1, 4, and pp. 11, 21-2: --there taken as plural, i.e., cc(w) (= *c<cc>v)."

282. Spiegelberg, ZAS 64 (1929), pp. 82(10), 80(1) and n. 7 on pp. 80-1: = temp. Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (for the date, see Mariette, Mastabas, p. 15).

283. See below, § 29 (**cc{s}). Spiegelberg, ZAS 64 (1929), pp. 80-1, n. 7, understands this as a writing of *c{s}.

284. Ibid., pp. 82(10), 79, and n. 7 on pp. 80-1: = temp. Nectanebo II.

285. Ibid., p. 82(10) and n. 7 on pp. 80-1, transliterates *c{s}, with reference to Wb I 40.3, where the transliteration *c [= *c(r)] is given.

286. Cf. above, § 19.

287. *c(iw)-r k(r)s is hardly likely to represent an elaborate example of haplography, for which the less involved *(i)c(r(w) (r) k(r)s would be expected: cf. Gardiner, Gramm, § 62; Gramm. med., § 7; EAG, § 102; cf. also Gardiner, LEM, p. 45.12 (= Pap. Anastasi IV 10.5): n3 (ny) M<gh>-iw pr( iw) (r) [Gardiner, p. 45a, reads (w), followed by Caminos, LEM, p. 171; the idiom, however, calls for pri r (~h3 i m) p3 w n3 (ny) g<gh>b(ly) hr mrw, "the Medjay-people who have gone out into the (outlying) district [cf. Wb I 243.2], the gazelles upon the desert."

288. EAG, § 689. For the position of the feminine ending -t, written either before or after the determinative, cf. EAG, § 690.

289. Ibid., § 428bb, 689.

290. Ibid., § 692; Gardiner, Gramm, § 299 (caus. 3rd-wk.).

291. For the transposition of signs necessarily assumed for such a reading, cf. EAG, § 92. For the graphic suppression of i after the causative preformative s-, cf. EAG, § 443.

292. Cf. Gardiner, Gramm, §§ 270, Obs.; 279, n. 2; 299, n. 0 (on p. 224); and Peet, ZAS 52 (1914), pp. 110-11: ref. "Sh.S.", line 79. For a 3rd-wk. infinitive written this same way, see EAG, § 688 (3bb).
293. \textit{FAG}, §§ 428bb, 689.
296. See above, § 23.
297. For the form \( *\lambda \lambda \epsilon \), see above, n. 258.
298. For this assimilation, cf. the forms cited in § 24 and n. 268.
299. For \( \lambda \lambda \epsilon \equiv \lambda \lambda \), see above, § 17.
304. \textit{KH}, p. 144.
305. \textit{SV II}, § 211.
306. Steindorff, \textit{Lehrbuch}, § 277, states that \( \tau\alpha\lambda\omega<\omega\lambda\lambda\epsilon \).
307. \textit{Compléments}, p. 64 (410a). Westendorf, \textit{KH}, p. 225 and nn. 5, 7, describes \( \tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon \) as a secondary causative formation of either \( \omega\lambda\lambda \) or \( \lambda\epsilon \).
308. \textit{Compléments}, p. 80 (522a).
309. For this vocalization, see the references of n. 130 above.
310. For the failure of \( \lambda \) and \( \lambda \lambda \epsilon \) to appear in the Coptic script, see Till, \textit{KG}, §§ 31-2; § 33 and n. 4. For \( *\alpha \lambda \lambda \epsilon >\omega \), see ibid., § 54, and Till, \textit{DG}, § 29.
311. Crum, \textit{CD}, p. 520a, and Kasser, \textit{Compléments}, p. 80 (520a, 522a): \( \omega\lambda \) (\textit{SAA}²\textit{BF}), \( \omega\lambda\lambda (B) \), \( \omega\lambda\epsilon (S) \). The form \( \omega\lambda\epsilon \) is cited by Kasser as \( \omega\lambda\lambda (\epsilon ?) \); he also makes a special entry for it, apart from \( \omega\lambda \equiv \omega\lambda\lambda \); cf. Westendorf, \textit{KH}, p. 291, n. 5. For the equivalence of \( \omega\lambda\lambda (B) \) and \( \omega\lambda\epsilon (S) \), cf. Till, \textit{DG}, § 54.
312. See above, n. 300, for the references.


318. For  as a symbol representing the glottal stop in Coptic (<), cf. Till, KG, § 31 and n. 2, and §§ 32-3; cf. also Steindorff, Lehrbuch, Anhang II 1.1, 2.2 (= p. 20). See also above n. 140.

319. Crum, CD, p. 535b, and Kasser, Compléments, p. 82: ωυ (SA), ωυέ (SA²), ωυώ (B). For the ability of υ to behave in this respect like the λ of ωλεί, as well as Β, Μ, Ν, and Π in similar circumstances (Till, DG, § 51) — cf. Till, KG § 12, and DG § 22: υ = the voiceless counterpart of Б.

320. Edel (NAWG 1963, pp. 178-9, and EAG, § 426N) quotes a writing [ ], which he transliterates Çfi, postulating metathesis: Çfi > Çfi. Most probably, however, this is to be taken simply as a writing of Çfi, with graphic inversion of signs (cf. EAG, § 96; Gramm. med., § 83). Strangely, Edel sees in this Çfi alone the origin of both ωυ and ωυέ/ι: ωυέ < Çafvi (masculine infinitive of Çfi treated as a 3-lit. verb), and ωυέ/ι < Çafvi (feminine infinitive of Çfi treated as a 3rd-wk. verb). (cf. Edel, OH II.1, p. 124; Kaplony, Beiträge, p. 113 “[n. 44].) Note that Lacau, BTAO 52 (1953), pp. 14, derives ωυέ/ι from Çfi = Çafvi.

321. Till, KG, § 276.

322. See above, n. 311.

323. Crum, CD, p. 408a; Kasser, Compléments, p. 64.


325. Crum, CD, p. 410a; Kasser, Compléments, p. 64.


327. For the various standard forms of the causatives in *t¹ (< *t¹), see Till, KG §§ 276 and Bemerkung 2, and DG §§ 218: infinitive < *t¹↔(t¹↔→(Z)¹↔); qualitative < *t¹↔ (for the development of *t¹ in the qualitative, cf. till, DG, §§ 34, 39, 43; cf. EAG, §§ 490, 480.

328. See above, n. 258.

330. For the significance of these abbreviations, see Crum, CD, pp. xi-xiii, and Kasser, Compléments, pp. x-xi, 117-28.

331. For $\omega$, cf. Till, KG, § 257, Bemerkung 2: $\omega$, properly a qualitative ($\approx \star t' a h \nu w < * t'a h\nu h w$), also used as an infinitive, in place of $\omega$ ($\approx \star t'a h \nu < * t'a h\nu c$). Hence, perhaps $\lambda \varepsilon$ was also originally simply a qualitative form ($\approx t' a h \nu w$) of $\omega \lambda / \omega \lambda \varepsilon$. It should be noted, however, that the alternation $\omega / \lambda \varepsilon$ in the infinitive of $\omega$ may also have been conditioned by the equivalence $\omega (\approx \star \tilde{a}) \equiv \lambda$ before $\varrho (\approx \beta)$ in the same word. The forms of the infinitive and qualitative of $\omega$ are $\omega \varepsilon / (S^2AA^2F)/\omega \varrho (S)/\omega \varepsilon / (S^2BF)/\omega \varrho (M)/\lambda \varepsilon / (SAA^2F)/\lambda \varepsilon (S)/\lambda \varepsilon (F)$: see Crum, CD, p. 536b; Kasser, Compléments, p. 82; Westendorf, KH, p. 297. The correspondence $\omega (\approx \star \tilde{a}) \equiv \sigma (BF)$ before $\varrho (\approx \beta)$ is a well-known phonetic phenomenon: see Till, DG, § 33; Steindorff, Lehrbuch, § 52. For $\star \tilde{a} > \varrho \approx \sigma \lambda$ before $\varrho (\approx \beta)$, see $t'a h\nu h w$ (the usual reconstruction, $t'a h\nu h w$--see Till, AKG, p. 28 [§ 17a], and KG, § 53; Sethe, ZA 64 [1926], p. 66 [§ 17b]; FAG, §§ 242, 144; Westendorf, KH, p. 142--is problematical for two reasons [cf. also $t'a h\nu h w$, immediately following]: 1) the assumed final -w is never written in the earlier stages of the Egyptian language, nor is its presence reflected in the Coptic evidence; 2) the reconstruction with original $\lambda$ [cf. also Steindorff, Lehrbuch, § 51: $t'a h\nu h w$] fails to account for the $\omega$ which is found in several forms of this word) $> * \lambda \varepsilon$ (O)/$\omega \: \nu (S)/\omega \nu (O)/\log \nu (B)/\nu (SAA^2F)/\lambda \varepsilon (FM)$ (for $\lambda > \nu / \varrho$, see above, n. 140; for $\sigma (SAA^2F) \equiv \lambda$ (F) before $\varrho$, see Till, DG, §§ 246, 248) $> * \lambda \varepsilon$ (for this metathesis, cf. below, n. 614) $\approx \lambda \varepsilon$ (F), "moon"; $t'a h\nu h w$ $> * \lambda \varepsilon$ $\equiv t'a h\nu h w (S)/\rho (SAA^2F)/\lambda \varepsilon (S^2F)$, "angle, corner." For these Coptic forms, see Crum, CD, pp. 257b, 132a; Kasser, Compléments, pp. 42, 22; Westendorf, KH, pp. 142, 73.

332. No. 4 in the accompanying table. For this analogical formation, cf. CW $\omega (\nu)$ (SA), "to set up, to upright; to reprove, correct," as a form of the $\varepsilon$-causative of $\omega$. The usual forms of this word, $\omega (SAA^2F) = \omega (B) = \omega (SAA^2F)/\lambda \varepsilon (SAA^2F)$, are derived from $\star s a t h \varepsilon$ (cf. FAG, § 685f; CW $\omega (\nu)$), however, seems to be based directly on $\omega * t'a h\nu c$ ($\approx * t'a h\nu w$). The forms $\omega (SAA^2F)$ were derived secondarily from the status nominalis $\omega$. Following the pattern of the $\varepsilon$-causative $\lambda \varepsilon (SAA^2F)$, $\lambda \varepsilon (SAA^2F) = \lambda \varepsilon (SAA^2F) = \lambda \varepsilon (SAA^2F)$ (for $\lambda$ (SBF) = $\varepsilon$ (AA)), see Till, DG, § 52), "to make to stand, set up"; see Till, AKG, §§ 106c, 108a (pp. 121, 123-4); Westendorf, KH, p. 210, n. 4; cf. SV II, § 220. For these Coptic forms, see Crum, CD, pp. 380b, 455a; Kasser, Compléments, pp. 60, 70; Westendorf, KH, pp. 210, 257.

333. And the related forms: nos. 5-8 in the accompanying table.

334. Crum, CD, p. 392a, and Kasser, Compléments, p. 62: $T \varepsilon (S)$; $T \varepsilon - (A)$; $T \varepsilon - (A)$ (SAF: = conjunctive participle). For the status nominalis $T$ in the $\varepsilon$-causatives, cf. Till, KG, § 276, Bemerkung 1.
335. \(< *\tilde{v}_y^\prime (\tilde{v}_r^\prime)\tilde{\lambda}^\prime\). For \(*\tilde{v}_\lambda^\prime >/\tilde{v}_\lambda^-/-\), see above, n. 140; for \(\ominus (S) = \Delta (A^2)\), cf. Till, DG, § 24, and KG, § 51.

336. For the usual forms of \(\dagger\) in the status nominalis, cf. Crum, CD, p. 392a, and Kasser, Compléments, p. 62: \(\dagger^- (SAA^2BF), \tilde{\tau}e^- (AF), \tilde{\tau}a^- (F)\). For \(*\tilde{v}_\lambda^\prime >/\tilde{v}_\lambda^-/-\), see above, n. 140.

337. In the form \(\tilde{\tau}\lambda\lambda\tilde{o}\), \(\tilde{\lambda}/\tilde{\lambda}\) seems to have assimilated to the following \(1/\); cf. \(\tilde{\tau}e \tilde{\rho}e^- (P) = \tilde{\tau}e \tilde{\rho}e^- (SAA^2BP) = \tilde{\tau}a \tilde{\rho}e^- (SAA^2BFP)\), forms of the status nominalis of \(\tilde{\tau}\lambda\lambda\tilde{o}\) (the \(\tilde{\tau}\)-causative of \(\omega\tilde{\rho}\tilde{e}\)). Crum, CD, p. 455a; Kasser, Compléments, p. 70; Westendorf, KH, p. 257. In the form \(\tilde{\tau}H\lambda\lambda\tilde{o}\), the \(\tilde{\lambda}/\tilde{\lambda}\) seems to have affected the color of the preceding vowel: cf. below, n. 615.

338. See above, § 24.

339. For the word \((i)^c\tau w\), cf. GNS, pp. 12-13; Erman, ZAS 46 (1909), p. 99.

340. Prof. Hornung has pointed out to me (in a letter of March 18, 1975) that the root \(\text{\(\tilde{\lambda}c\)}\) appears elsewhere in the Litany of the Sun "in the normal writing, without any variant," which would seem to argue against its identification with \(\text{\(3\cc\)}\). However, Gardiner, JEA 14 (1928), p. 93, has already addressed himself to this question in another context: "Those who are familiar with the vagaries of Egyptian scribes will not be perturbed.... It is no unusual thing for the same text to spell a phrase in one place in its old historical form, and in another place in the phonetic Late Egyptian fashion." Cf. Korostovtsev, Néo-égyptien, p. 29. Hence we may see in this spelling evidence for the partial "modernization" of a Middle Egyptian text during Dynasty XVIII.

341. Wb I 41.15-18; Gardiner, Gramm, p. 551; FAG, § 428bb; CIDME, pp. 11, 45.

342. Wb I 41.19-22; Gardiner, Gramm, p. 551; FAG, § 428bb.

343. For the words \(\text{\(1\cc\)}(i) (< \text{\(1\cc\)}\text{\(c\)}\text{\(c\)}), "(built) tomb," \(\text{\(1\cc\)}(i) (< \text{\(1\cc\)}\text{\(c\)}\text{\(c\)}), "ladder," and \((i)^c\tau\text{\(c\)}\text{\(c\)}, "stairs or staircase," all having in common the idea of "going up," see above, § 24 and n. 279.

344. See above, § 22.

345. For the \(-w\) in this word, cf. FAG, § 106, 214, 243aa.

346. Wb I 158.13-18; CIDME, p. 36; Gardiner, Gramm, W 10 (p. 528, n. 7).

347. Westendorf, Gramm. med., § 57, suggests the derivation of both this word and the drug \((?)^3\cc\) to be considered below, § 36 \((3\cc[8])\) from \(\text{\(h\cc\)}\): for the drug \(\text{\(h\cc\)}\text{\(w\)},\) see Wb. Drog., pp. 410-11.
348. See above, n. 24.

349. Wb I 158.13 = Erichsen, Papyrus Harris I, 28.12.

350. Kaplony, IAF, pp. 280; 283 (Sp 8); 979, n. 1548. The determinatives (an alabaster vessel: Gardiner, Gramm, W 3 and n. 1; BIFAO 30 [1931], p. 168) and (a block or slab of stone: Gardiner, Gramm, O 39 and N 37, n. 6; BIFAO 30 [1931], p. 169) may sometimes represent these vessels, respectively, as made specifically of alabaster, or of stone in general; otherwise may also represent the shape of the vessel. Kaplony understands both and to depict the shapes of the vessels: thus he translates (Sp 8) as "alabaster: (namely) vessel(s) of the form , and vessel(s) of the form ."

An alternative rendering would be "-vessel(s) of alabaster, and -vessel(s) of (other) stone(s)"; similarly, (Sp 28) could represent "-vessel(s) (of alabaster), and (other) alabaster (vessels)."

[For as "(vessels of) alabaster," see Gardiner, BIFAO 30 (1931), pp. 167-9, and Gramm, p. 172; Wb IV 541.4; CUME, p. 270.] Contemporary -vessels are recorded in various stones: cf. Kaplony, IAF, pp. 281-3, and Saad, Ceiling Stela, p. 48 and pl. 27, where we find (ni/m) [see FAG, §§ 310, 312, 327] m G ("granite"), G ("alabaster"), G [see Harris, Lexicographical Studies, pp. 91, 133-4], and n(m)t(i)t ("white quartzite") [see ibid., pp. 88-9, 91; see also Balz, MDAIK 3 (1932), pp. 66-7; Kaplony, IAF, pp. 281-2]--Kaplony reads G, G, G, and ntt, respectively. The other two vessels represented in Saad and discussed by Kaplony are probably to be read G probably to be translated "that which is under the arm," perhaps describing the way in which this container might have been carried and G (cf. Wb IV 418.6, 421.9; Balz, MDAIK 3 (1932), p. 95 and n. 3; Junker, Giza 4, p. 72, and Giza 1, p. 187; Jequier, Frises, p. 118--but G may be a dual, "the two wash vessels" > "(the double) wash-set"; and G (w)tiw is the plural of this latter formation]--Kaplony reads G and G [which Saad reads as G].

351. E.g., LD II 28, where this word occurs 29 times in these two spellings. For the determinative , see Gardiner, Gramm, W 10.

352. E.g., Borchardt, Denkmäler, No. 1418 (temp. Dynasty VI), where this word occurs 30 times in these two spellings. Wb I 158 (see after entry 7) points out that it is not always possible to determine whether "bowl, cupful" or "portion, serving" is to be understood in each such occurrence; nor is it normally crucial that such a distinction necessarily be made.

353. LD II 28; FM III.1, p. 142 = the tomb of Sn-m-nfr at Giza (G4940). See Balz, MDAIK 3 (1932), pp. 68, 111; Hassan, Giza 6.2, p. 29(8).

354. Inasmuch as this spelling is unique, it might be questioned.
whether the word involved is actually to be understood as *\textsuperscript{\textcircled{c}}\textsuperscript{\textcircled{i}} rather than \textsuperscript{c}\textsuperscript{i}; for the graphic metathesis which it would be necessary to postulate in this case, see EAG, § 96.

355. E.g., Lacau, Sarcophages: 28006 (= p. 19, list: 43a, 44a; pl. 2); 28009 (= p. 25, list: 18a [misnumbered as 16 in the publication], 19a); 28007 (= p. 21, list: 28a, 29a);

; 28008 (= pl. 3, list: 29, 30):

356. I.e., \(\text{c}(i)\text{wy n(y) mw} \text{c}(i)\text{wy n(y) bd}\), "two vessels (full) of water, and two vessels (full) of natron."

357. E.g., Lacau, Sarcophages: 28005 (= pl. 15, list: 19a, 20a; pl. 2); 28001 (= p. 2, list: 22; pl. 1); ; 28004 (= p. 12, list: 21a, 22a; pl. 1); 28027 (= p. 72, list: 29a, 30a):

. (For the date of these early Middle Egyptian writings, cf.


358. There is a word \textsuperscript{2c}\textsuperscript{i}, "(double) wash-set" [Wb I 39.20-1; Kaplony, IAE, pp. 279-80 and p. 978, n. 1543; Hassan, Giza 6.2, p. 461 (123); cf. Jéquier, Frises, p. 117: = "washing-utensils" (collectively) or "water-pot or ewer" or "(wash) basin" (separately)], which is, however, clearly distinguishable from \textsuperscript{c}(i) in the Old Kingdom offering lists—for "(cool) water and a (double) wash-set" and "two cups of (cool) water," cf. Hassan, Giza 6.2, pp. 55(25), 87-8, 311-13(120);
Smith, JEA 19 (1933), pl. 22 and p. 151:

---and in the New Kingdom papyri---

cf. Peet, Tomb-Robberies, pls. 17-18 [= Pap. BM 10053, ro. 1.9, 10, 15; 5.14], and Mayer Papyri, Pap. Mayer B, line 11: \(\frac{\text{\char118}}{\text{\char119}}\) or \(\frac{\text{\char119}}{\text{\char118}}\), as against \(\frac{\text{\char119}}{\text{\char118}}\) or \(\frac{\text{\char118}}{\text{\char119}}\). In early Middle Egyptian we have forms attested showing \(\frac{\text{\char119}}{\text{\char118}}\) \(\frac{\text{\char118}}{\text{\char119}}\); see Jéquier, Frises, p. 118 and n. 4 = Lacau, Sarcophages 28001 (p. 2, Nos. 1-2; pl. 1):

"a (double) wash-set (with) water, and a (double) wash-set (with) natron"; so also 28004 (p. 11, No. 1; pl. 1): \(\frac{\text{\char118}}{\text{\char119}}\). (For the date of these examples, cf. Lacau, Sarcophages II, p. 150; for the use of the depictions accompanying these hieroglyphic labels as determinatives, see EAG, § 57. For the use of bd, "natron" in cleansing or purification, see Harris, Lexicographical Studies, pp. 191-3; cf. Hassan, Giza 6.2, p. 311 [120]).

359. Pap. Lansing 15.4: = Gardiner, LEM, p. 115.5; dated to "the latter part" of Dynasty XX: Gardiner, LEM, p. xviii.

360. Ibid., p. 115a.5c; Caminos, LEM, pp. 426, 421; Erman, and Lange, Papyrus Lansing, p. 130.

361. For \(\frac{\text{\char118}}{\text{\char119}}\) = \(\text{\char118}\) and \(\frac{\text{\char119}}{\text{\char118}}\) = \(\text{\char118}\), see § 18.

362. For the dual ending written without \(\text{\char118}\) already in the Old Kingdom, see EAG §§ 287, 149. Several such spellings for the dual of \(\text{\char118}\) \(\text{\char119}\) [see FWS § 184, n. 302; cf. Erichsen, Glossar, p. 52: \(\frac{\text{\char119}}{\text{\char118}}\)], "arm or hand," may be quoted (see EAG, §§ 287N, 289, 348; Faulkner, Plural, § 27; CDME, p. 297):

\[
\frac{\text{\char118}}{\text{\char119}}, \frac{\text{\char119}}{\text{\char118}}, \frac{\text{\char118}}{\text{\char119}}, \frac{\text{\char119}}{\text{\char118}}, \frac{\text{\char118}}{\text{\char119}}, \frac{\text{\char119}}{\text{\char118}};
\]

these writings perhaps indicate the assimilation of \(\text{\char118}\) to \(\frac{\text{\char118}}{\text{\char119}}\) in the dual of this word: \(\text{\char118}\) \(\text{\char119}\) \(\text{\char118}\) \(\text{\char119}\) \(\text{\char118}\) \(\text{\char119}\). Examples of "false duals" may be cited for some other biliteral nouns whose first consonant is \(\text{\char118}\):

1) \(\text{\char118}\), "room or chamber" [Wb I 160.1-2; CDME, p. 37] Late Egyptian \(\frac{\text{\char118}}{\text{\char119}}\); "house" (masc.) [cf. Gardiner, AEO II, pp. 206*-207* (422); FWS, §§ 182; 184 and nn. 302-3; cf. also Wb I 159.15. Fecht (FWS, § 182, n. 295) regards \(\frac{\text{\char118}}{\text{\char119}}\) as a masculine word for "house" in Old and Middle
Egyptian also; more likely, however, the word in question is either $c(i)$, "arm or hand," or $c(y)$, "portion or piece," specialized in the sense of "region or place." (cf. Fws. §181; Wb I 157.14-20; Cdme, p. 36 [2]). Note that Spiegelberg, ZAS 51 [1913], p. 125, reconstructs this form as $\ast c^{\ell}i = \ast c^{\ell}l_y$ (cf. Fws. §§182, 184); and Fecht (Fws. §184, n. 303) reconstructs $\ast c(y) = \ast c^{\ell}l_y$ (cf. Westendorf, KH, p. 46: $\ast c(y)$)--thus allowing for the development of $\mathbb{H}$ from original $\ast l$ in the first syllable of this word: Till, DG, §44, and KG, §61. Nevertheless, a phonetic situation seems to have prevailed here in which $\ast l$ before $l(=y)$ sometimes became $\mathbb{H}$: cf. Crum, CD, pp. 547b, 22b, and Kasser, Complements, pp. 83, 5: $\mathbb{H} e\ell(\ell)$ (SAA §47 BF) $= \mathbb{H} \ell(\ell)$ (S) $= \mathbb{H} y\ell(\ell)$ (F); $\ast l_{\ell\ell}$, and $\mathbb{H} e\ell(\ell)$ (O) (SB) $= \mathbb{H} y\ell(\ell)$ (SAA §47 F) (SAA §47 F) (S). (For $\ast l_{\ell\ell}$, see EAG, §65; GNS, p. 23, n. 2; Fws. §§182, 184 and n. 302; Westendorf, KH, p. 306; Spiegelberg, KH, p. 188 and n. 6; Ericson, Glossar, pp. 484-5; Wb IV 397. For $\ast l_{\ell\ell}$, see Till, KG, §270, and DG, §198. For $\ast l_{\ell\ell}$, see Edel, ZAS 81 (1915), pp. 9-10; cf. Till, KG, §69, DG, §52. For $\ast l_{\ell\ell}$, see Till, KG, §34, and KG, §57; and for $\ast l_{\ell\ell}$, cf. Till, KG, §§39-40.) For the change of gender, cf. the commonly accepted sequence $b\ell y > b\ell y > b\ell y$ (masc.): Erman, NAG, §131; Sethe, ZAS 47 (1910), p. 11 and n. 1; Gardiner, Gramm, W 34, n. 1 (p. 483] > $\mathbb{H}$ [Crum, CD, pp. 66a], found as $\mathbb{H} y$ in demotic (Erichsen, Glossar, pp. 52-3; Westendorf, KH, p. 46; Spiegelberg, KH, p. 33; Fws. §184; cf. Gardiner, AEO II, pp. 206*-207* (422), where the demotic form is cited as $\mathbb{H} y$).

2) $c(t)$, "limb or member (of the body)"

[Wb I 160.14-23; Cdme, p. 36] >

$\text{demotic } c(t) = c(y) = c(y) = c(y) = c(y)$

[Erichsen, Glossar, pp. 51, 56; Erichsen transliterates $c(y)$ as $c(t)$].

3) $c(i)$ or $c(y)$, "portion, piece, or pair"

[WB I 158.5-12; Cdme, p. 36 (4); cf. Fws. §§181-2] > $\mathbb{H}$, "pair or couple" [Crum, CD, p. 66b], found as $\mathbb{H} y$ in demotic (Erichsen, Glossar, p. 52; Westendorf, KH, p. 46; Fws. §184; Spiegelberg, KH, p. 34. Note that, as with $c(t)$, $c(y)$ > $\mathbb{H}$, "house," Spiegelberg, ZAS 51 (1913), p. 125, reconstructs this form as $\ast c(i)$, whereas Fecht (Fws. §184, n. 303) reconstructs $\ast c(y)$.

4) $c(y)$, "condition or state"

[Wb I 158.1-4; Cdme, p. 36 (3)],

found in Late Egyptian as $\mathbb{H}$, $\mathbb{H}$

62.12, 68.1: Pap. Anastasi IV 5.1; V 12.7, 21.4], $\mathbb{H}$, $\mathbb{H}$

[Kerny, LRT, p. 3.8; Pap. Turin 1973, line 8—with determinative D 54 from the word $\mathbb{H}$, "track": Cdme, p. 36; Wb I 159.4], and

$\mathbb{H}$, $\mathbb{H}$


We should also mention in this connection the word $\mathbb{H} y$, or

$\mathbb{H} y$, "document, warrant, deed, or title" [Urk I 278.4, 300.5, 301.6, 302.1, 306.5.6.7; Vandier, ASAE 36 (1936), p. 36; Hassan, Giza
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2, fig. 219 (fol. p. 190)], which represents the full writing of the word normally transliterated simply $C$ [\textit{Wb I} 158.19-20, 159.1; \textit{CDME}, p. 36. Edel (\textit{EAG}, §1099b; cf. §§1074-6 and 1076N, 1092 and 1092N) has determined that both $C^y$ and $C^x$ are nominal; \textit{Wb I} 159.2 does not divide between nominal and verbal; Goedicke, \textit{Dokumente}, pp. 28-9, describes $C^x$ as nominal and $C^y$ as verbal; Gunn, \textit{JEA} 19 (1933), p. 106 (§57), and \textit{JEA} 34 (1948), p. 28(3), understands both $C^x$ and $C^y$ as verbal.

Gunn himself, however, considers the equivalent of $C^y$ (\textit{JEA} 19 [1933], p. 106 [§57]), and also admits a predicative usage of this latter before a noun (\textit{JEA} 34 [1948], pp. 28-9 [D = 12]), clearing the way for unconditional acceptance of Edel's interpretation of the construction involving this word.

The structural identity of five of these words--$C^x$ (\textit{f}), "arm or hand"; $C^x$ (\textit{i}), "bowl, cup, or vessel"; $C^y$ (\textit{x}), "portion, piece, or pair"; $C^y$ (\textit{y}), "condition or state"; and $C^y$, "document, warrant, deed, or title"--leads us to inquire whether there might not be an underlying etymological relationship between them: see \textit{PWS}, §181. If we posit their meanings as developments of the basic "arm or hand," the sense common to all of them is "handful" or "something (able to be) held in the hand." Then each can be explained as follows: both $C^x$ (\textit{i}), "vessel," and $C^x$ (\textit{f}), "portion," refer to quantities roughly equivalent to a "handful"; $C^y$ (\textit{y}), "condition or state" derives from "portion" (\textit{r\textsuperscript{2}} "share" > "position or situation"); and $C^y$ in legal usage represents the certificate or credentials which could be "held" and produced as necessary for inspection, if the bearer's right to behave in the way authorized therein were challenged.

363. For $C^y$ used to represent weakened final $C$ (\	extit{CC} > $C^y$), see above, §19.

364. See above, nn. 355-7.


366. Erichsen, \textit{Papyrus Harris I}. Belegstellen includes under \textit{Wb I} 158.5-7, "portion or serving," several of the writings here taken as "vessel or jar": 40a.10, 54a.9, 54b.9.14, 55a.4-5, 55b.8.

367. In addition to the spelling $C_1$ $C_2$ $C_3$ of 28.12: see above, n. 352.

368. The determinative \textit{W} l perhaps indicates that an ointment jar--or a jar of that type or shape--is here intended; but this spelling probably represents only a variant of the more common writing of this word. For such a writing in Old Egyptian, see \textit{EAG}, §312 (ref. \textit{Urk I} 43.3).

369. See above, §24: $D_4$ $D_1$ $D_5$ = $D_3$.

370. Nearly always before $D_3bn(w)$, "various (kinds)," or after $D_3md$, "total"--except in 13a.2, 33a.2, 52a.5, 69.2, 70a.4.
371. See above, n. 247.

372. See above, §§16-17.

373. Cf. above, § 20 and n. 205.

374. This word is spelled normally later in the same invocation, p. 31 of Hornung's edition.

375. Wb I 161 makes this a 2-lit. root, *šš; it is, however, certainly a 3rd-wk.: see CDME, p. 37; Gardiner, Gramm., p. 557; EAG, §§89 (= 501), 337; SPIEGELBERG, KH, p. 1; Westendorf, KH, p. 2; SV I, § 396. Wb., med., p. 121, transliterates *šš/*šš.

376. The Coptic evidence for this word--see CRUM, CD, p. 1b, and KASSE, Compléments, p. 1; TILL, KG, § 270--indicates that the assimilation of medial š did not always occur:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{cšš} & \rightarrow \text{cšš} \\
\text{*šš} & \rightarrow \text{šš}
\end{align*}
\]

The metathesis involved in the shift *šš > šš, see below, n. 614. For the assimilation of š to the following š (̣ṣ̌š), see below, n. 619: -šš -šš; cf. also VERGOTE, Phonétique, pp. 95-6; Vergote (see also Westendorf, KH, p. 2, VYCHI, WZKM 40 [1933], pp. 175-6; SV I, §§ 396, 392, 77, 79; SPIEGELBERG, KH, p. 1) reconstructs *šš as the immediate predecessor of šš, but he explains this *šš as the direct descendant of cšš, without the intermediate steps postulated here. The assumption (see TILL, KG, § 270; VYCHI, WZKM 40 [1933], pp. 175-6, and MNAK 16 [1958], p. 380 [21]; LACAU, Corps, p. 41, n. 3) that šš could have developed only from *šš--a fictitious form metathesized from the consonants of the word cšš--is clearly erroneous. For *šš-, see TILL, DG, § 52, and KG, § 69; for šš > šš (SA) and šš (F), see TILL, DG, §§34, 43, and KG, § 57. is here treated as šš rather than šš (cf. TILL, KG, § 33, and DG, § 48) to conform to the evidence provided by the parallel branch of this reconstruction.

377. The possibility that *šš (̣ṣ̌š) actually represents a metathesized form of *šš seems less likely.


379. See above, § 18.

380. E.g., CT III 322g (S1C); see also ERMAN, ZKS 46 (1909), pp. 100-1.

381. E.g., CT I 214h and 194b (B10Ch), IV 9f (Sg6C: with [---]) restored in the lacuna; FAULKNER, Coffin Texts I, p. 206, n. 1, reads
A purely phonetic spelling of \( \text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc} \) is found, e.g., in CT IV 9a (TIL, B2L): \( \frac{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}}{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}} \); see also Erman, \( \text{ZAS} \ 46 \ (1909), \ p. \ 100 \).

E.g., Lange, \( \text{Papyrus Harris} \), pp. 13.1, 14.15 (= I.2.5); Peet, \( \text{Tomb-Robberies} \), pl. 30 (= Pap. BM 10052, 8.25); see also Erman, \( \text{ZAS} \ 46 \ (1909), \ pp. \ 101-2; \ Wb \ I \ 50-1. \) Erman reads \( \frac{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}}{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}} \).

E.g., Gardiner, \( \text{Hieratische Papyrus Berlin} \), pl. 6 (= "Sin." B 47): cited in \( \text{CDIE} \), p. 13. Erman, \( \text{ZAS} \ 46 \ (1909), \ p. \ 101, \) transliterates \( \frac{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}}{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}} \).

Erman understands the development of this word as \( \frac{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}}{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}} \). His \( \frac{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}}{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}} \), however, actually represents \( \text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc} \). Middle Egyptian \( \text{\textsc{y}} \) does not assimilate to \( \text{\textsc{c}} \): see above, \( \S \ 21 \ (C\text{\textit{cy}}) \) and n. 362 \( \text{\textit{C\textsc{y}}} \), and below, \( \S \ 22 \ (C\text{\textit{cy}}) \).

Written \( \frac{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}}{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}} \). For \( \text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc} \), "to raise or lift up," used of the head, see \( \text{Wb} \ V \ 405.7 \) (to the references of \( \text{Belegstellen} \), add \( \text{PT} \ 1347a \) and \( \text{CT} \ I \ 292c) \).\( \frac{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}}{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}} \) (= Urk I 282.13) occurs as a writing for \( \text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc} \) already in the reign of Pepi II: see \( \text{EAG} \), \( \S \ 29 \).

Piankoff, \( \text{Litany} \), p. 24 (26), translates "high(?)." Professor Hornung, in a letter of March 18, 1975, suggests translating "broadly spreading" ("breit ausgeladend").

JEA 34 (1948), pp. 16-17: \( \frac{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}}{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}} \) (the decree of Horemhab: see Helck, \( \text{ZAS} \ 80 \ [1955], \ pl. \ 10 \ [fol. \ p. \ 114], \ line \ 28 \).

Mes, pp. 49-50 N 24, N 27), and \( \frac{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}}{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}} \) (the decree for Quenn Isiemkheb: See Gardiner, \( \text{Mes} \), p. 21 (twice)--for the determinative \( \text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc} \) (D 6), see above, n. 215). To these must now be added \( \frac{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}}{\text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc}} \): Černý and Gardiner, \( \text{Hieratic Ostraca} \), pl. 47.1, vs. 8; p. 14: = Ostracon Nash 2 (for the determinative \( \text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc} \) [\( \text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc} \)], see above, n. 215). This example was kindly pointed out to me by Virginia Davis, who translates "to evict(?)" in her \( \text{Syntax} \), p. 35 (cf. p. 41). Here \( \text{\textit{C\textsc{w}}cc} \) is used at the
end of an oath in the construction (lines 8-9) ...şw · ṭać<š> - kâ m  
py · 1 pr di · t(w) (<di · ti: for the writing of this word, see Erman, NAG  
§§ 332, 336: the Old Perfective third person masculine singular written  
\[ \text{pseudo-semantic] } \]
; cf. Gardiner, Gramm, § 310; Wb II 464.  
For the feminine form of the Old Perfective accompanying a masculine noun, cf. Till, KC § 257, Bemerkung 5) r Pr-ţać(š)..., which we may  
translate "...then may I be punished in my (own) house, it (also)  
having been ceded (or delivered over: cf. Wb II 465,7) to Pharaoh."  
For the probable import of this statement, compare the apodosis of yet  
another oath found in Mes, p. 10 (N 35) and n. 67 (on p. 22): ...şw · ṭać  
r phwy pr... "...then may I be (sent) to the rear of the house,"  
which Gardiner explains to mean "may I (come to) occupy the lowest position among  
the staff of the house (hold)."

391. Ibid., p. 21 (59).
393. JNES 5 (1946), p. 263 (29) and n. 59.
394. ZÄS 80 (1955), p. 120: ref. pl. 10 (foll. p. 114), line 28  
(= Urk IV 2150,2).
395. Cf. below, § 33.
397. Not in Wb. Vandier, Mo'alla, seems to read alternately ṭać  
(p. 256[5]) and ṭać (p. 293).
398. Vandier, Mo'alla, pp. 252, 256 (p), 293, translates "force"  
(="force, vigor, strength, might, or power"); Faulkner, CDME, p. 38,  
translates "valour(?)"
399. Wb I 166,18; Faulkner, Coffin Texts I, p. 259, p. 15; Wb. med.,  
pp. 129, 132 (§§ 7-8), and 412, n. 1; Dawson, JEA 21 (1935), p. 40; Kees,  
ZÄS 57 (1922), p. 114.
400. Wb I 166,17.
401. For the various spellings of this word, see Piankoff, Litany,  
pl. 5 (34): [Here represents ṭ + ṭać + ṭ, with the usual
transposition of and . For similar writings of $C_3^C$, see CT IV 4e (TII): (twice); CT V 189e: ; Wb. med., p. 129: , . Piankoff, p. 179 (13), seems to read $C_3^C$. Piankoff, p. 179 (13), (see also Hornung, NAWG 1961, pl. IV(a) [foll. p. 110]: ) [Here represents $C_3 + \underline{3} + \underline{3},

with transposition of $C_3$ and $\underline{3}$, and $\underline{3}$ the only phonetic complement accompanying the biliteral $C_3$. Piankoff, p. 179 (13), seems to read $C_3^C$. For similar writings of $C_3^C$, see CT IV 4e (Sq6C): ; Wb. med., p. 129 (ref. Bln 189): $C_3^C(y)$. Here represents $C + \underline{3} + \underline{3}$, again with transposition of $\underline{3}$ and $\underline{3}$, this time $C$ being the only phonetic complement accompanying the biliteral $C_3$. For the use of the group $\underline{3}$ as a writing of $C_3^C$—with no phonetic complement accompanying the biliteral $C_3$—see CT IV 181e, j; 3b; see also PT 1628c (M): .

402. Wb I 167.1.

403. Piankoff, Litany, pp. 13 (17), 25 (34), translates "Ejector."

404. Edgerton and Wilson, Historical Records of Ramses III, translate both "strength" (pp. 16, 29, 48, 59, 80, 95) and "potency" (p. 37).

405. MH I, pl. 23 (line 54); II, pls. 82 (line 27), 88 (lines 2-3).
406. Ibid., p. 55 (line 45), p. 51 (line 6).
407. Ibid., p. 62 (line 16).
408. Ibid., p. 24 (line 16).
409. Ibid., p. 31, 44, 62, 82, 88; in the context of p. 44, 62, 82, the king is likened to a bull.
410. Ibid., p. 23, 28; in the scene of p. 23, a pile of severed phalli is depicted.
411. JEA 34 (1948), pp. 16, 7-18.
412. For $\ddot{\mathfrak{y}} = \ddot{x} > \gamma$, see above, § 18 and n. 140.
413. For $\ddot{x} (= ?) > \gamma$ in a word containing original $\ddot{\mathfrak{y}}$, see above, n. 140.
414. See above, n. 140.
415. See above, § 1.
416. See above, § 16.
417. Wb I 166.15; Wb. med., p. 133.
418. Faulkner, Pyramid Texts, p. 191 (PT 1200b), and Coffin Texts I, p. 150 and n. 3 (CT III 61).

419. Kees, ZAS 57 (1922), p. 114; Sethe, Komm. II, p. 247 (Sethe misspells $\mathfrak{v}$ here), and p. 138 (33a); Sethe, Urgöttner, § 140 (p. 71 and n. 2). Drioton, AsAE 41 (1942), p. 28-9, and AsAE 44 (1944), p. 114 ($\ddot{\mathfrak{v}}$), translates "overflow." These translations agree well with Faulkner's observation, Pyramid Texts, p. 262 and n. 1, that $\mathfrak{c}^\circ$ in PT 1788a "appears here to be something which flows..." (Faulkner translates "a current(?).") Both Sethe, Urgöttner, and Drioton identify this word with $\mathfrak{c}^\circ$ (= Wb I 169.1-2: "sweat; spit(tle) or saliva"). Kees, ZAS 57 (1922), pp. 113-4, identifies the word $\mathfrak{v}$ (Gautier and

\[ \mathfrak{v} \]

Jäquier, Licht, p. 23), which he translated "outflow, secretion, discharge," as a writing of the word $\mathfrak{c}^\circ$. However, the variants $\mathfrak{c}^\circ$, $\mathfrak{c}^\circ$, $\mathfrak{c}^\circ$—showing the alternation $\mathfrak{v} \equiv \dddot{x} \equiv \dddot{\mathfrak{v}}$—indicate that $\mathfrak{c}^\circ$ (1) is an incomplete writing of a 4-lit. word whose final consonant was $\dddot{x}$. Hence $\mathfrak{v}$ should be transliterated $\mathfrak{c}^\circ(1)$, rather than $\mathfrak{c}^\circ$; and

$\mathfrak{c}^\circ(1)$ must be regarded as a word of unknown etymology and meaning. For $\dddot{x} = \dddot{\mathfrak{v}}$, see Gramm. med., §§ 51.5-6, 48; Harris, Lexicographical
Studies, p. 190; for $\xi = 1^1$, see Gramm. med., § 51.5; for $\phi = 1^1$, see Gramm. med., § 51.7.

420. Wb I 166.16; Drioton, ASAE 41 (1942), pp. 28-9. Kees, ZÄS 57 (1922), p. 114, translates "to spurt or squirt out"; Sethe translates "to bubble up, gush (out), or spout": Komm. V, p. 92 (PT 1200b), and SDT, pp. 134(33), 138(33a-b); Simpson, Papyrus Reisner II, p. 21(1), translates "to gush, overflow, shoot." Faulkner, Pyramid Texts, p. 244 and n. 2 (PT 1628c), translates this $\theta^2\sigma^\gamma$ as a noun, and the accompanying $\theta^2\sigma$ (= "spit(tle)""): Wb I 134.7; SDT, pp. 134[33], 138[33a-b]) as a verbal form: "...they have warded off his evil influence which he spat out against you." But cf. CDME, p. 186: $\xi\omega\varepsilon + \delta\sigma\mu\varepsilon\varepsilon = "to\ prevent\ (that)""); on this construction, see EAG, § 483, 523.


422. Wb. med., pp. 129-33, and 412, n. 1. Here belong the references of Wb I 167.2-4 ($\theta^2\sigma^\gamma$ treated as an illness); see also Dawson, JEA 21 (1935), pp. 39-40: "[an] evil secretion injected into the body of the patient by a god or demon"> "[an evil] influence"; cf. CDME, p. 38: "evil influence (causing disease)."

423. Not in Wb.

424. CT IV 4e.

425. Faulkner, Coffin Texts I, p. 204, translates "N is...dangerous in the reeds of the fens," apparently understanding $\theta^2\sigma^\gamma\ n...$. For a similar sentiment from the Pyramid Texts, cf. PT 567c = 568c: $\varphi^3\delta\tau\ \varphi^3\delta\ n\ \varphi^3\delta\ \varphi^3\mu\varphi\ \varphi^3\mu\varphi$. "As you are flourishing (lit.: green), so shall N flourish, even as a living rush flourishes"; and PT 569c-d: $\cdots\varphi^3\delta\tau\ \varphi^3\delta\ (\varphi^3\delta\text{w}^3\varphi\ (\varphi^3\delta\text{w}^3\varphi\ \varphi^3\delta\text{w}^3\varphi...", "Even as your papyrus plant is flourishing, so shall N (be) [cf. Gardiner, Gramm, § 62A (p. 422)]; as the living rush flourishes, so shall N flourish..." These passages were called to my attention by Virginia Davis.

426. CT V 189e.


428. CT V 189d. Cf. Jéquier, BIFAO 9 (1911), pp. 46-7(5).

429. CT IV 35b.

430. Faulkner, Coffin Texts I, p. 213 and n. 2 on p. 214, translates "I am the throwstick of the fen."

431. CT IV 3b.

432. Faulkner, Coffin Texts I, p. 204, translates "the reeds of the
fens."

433. N(35).


435. See above, § 33.

436. N 41 (?).

437. Wb I 166.15-16.


439. Cf. Wb I 381.16, 382.2: wtt, "to beget," used of females.

440. CT IV 179c-d; 181e, j.

441. For mtwt treated as a plural, see FAG, §§ 286N, 28N: ref. Sethe, Kommentar V, p. 337 (PT 1416c); Faulkner, Coffin Texts I, p. 259, n. 1. For the plural demonstratives in Middle Egyptian, cf. Gramm. med., § 94 (p. 58); §§ 102.7, 110bb (‘pu); cf. also Gardiner, Gramm., § 110.

442. For this transliteration of the word "mother," see below, n. 654.

443. For the relative form c³c after ḫnk ḫw, cf. Gardiner, Gramm., § 385, n. 2. Note that the group ḫnk in this text is used in place of simple ḫnk: cf. FAG, §§ 173a, 573aa; Schenkel, Studien, pp. 42-6 (§13).

444. Faulkner, Coffin Texts I, p. 258, translates "I am indeed the Great Seed"; Zande, ZAS 100 (1974), p. 142(19c-e), translates "I am the one who has discharged semen"—both disregarding the feminine ḫt of c³c.


446. See PT 1200b-c and CT III 61m: c³c ḫw, "pools or springs," in the Sḥt-ḥtpw.

447. For another possible connection between a tree and the idea of potency, cf. the "willow" (ḥr)—always found near water (see Keimer, BIFAO 31 [1931], pp. 189-90)—taken by Daumas (Dendra, p. 33; Le temple de Dendra, caption accompanying the thirteenth page of photographs [un-numbered]) as a symbol of fertility.

449. Wb II 169.1-2; Wb. med., pp. 132(§7), 412; Wb. Drog., p. 292; CDME, p. 121; Gardiner, Gramm., p. 571.

450. Wb II 169.6-8; Wb. med., pp. 132(§7), 412; Dawson, JPA 21 (1935), p. 40; CDME, p. 121: Faulkner also translates "ill-will (?)"; Gardiner, Gramm., p. 571.


452. Gardiner, JPA 26 (1940), p. 24 and pl. 7 (foll. p. 28), line 6: nk sw (l)c3w(t) nk (i)c3(w)(t) hmt.f; Spiegelberg, BT 25 (1903), pp. 192-8: nk sw (l)c3(w) nk (i)c3(w)(t) hmt.f, nk sw (l)c3 (w)(t)...nk (i)c3(w)(t) hbs(yt)(t)f, nk (sw) (i) c3 [(w)...], nk sw (p5 (f)c3(sw) (nk) p3 (l)c3(sw)(t) hmt.f hrdw.f, nk sw (i)c3(sw) nk (i)c3(sw) hmt.f nk hmt.f hrdw.f, nk (i)c3(sw)(t) hbs(yt)(t)f nk hbs(yt)(t)f hrd.f; Marciniak, Dir el-Bahari I, p. 11 (No. 11, line 11): nk sw (f)c3(sw)(t) nk (l)c3(sw)(t) hmtc(w)(t)(f). Cf. Müller, Sitz. Berl. Ak., Jahrg. 1910, p. 945 and n. 2. For the transliterations of "donkey" used here, see below, § 49.


455. See above, § 29.

456. Edel, OR II.1, p. 21(2); not in Wb.


458. Westendorf, Gramm. med., 57, suggests the derivation of both this 3cc and 3cc, "vessel," from the form hcc: see above, n. 347.

459. Piankoff, BIFAO 42 (1944), p. 12 and n. 2; pl. 23 (foll. p. 62), line 6: versions 0, P; see Piankoff, BIFAO 41 (1942), pp. 1-2: 0 = the Osireion at Abydos, temp. Merneptah; P = the tomb of Pedamenopet (No. 33 at Thebes), temp. Saite Period. Not in Wb.

460. From the tomb of Ramesses VI: see Piankoff, BIFAO 42 (1944), p. 12, n. 2; BIFAO 41 (1942), pp. 1-2.

461. See above, § 20.

462. See Hornung, Amduat II, p. 75(5).

463. Ibid.; Unterweltbücher, p. 336. For this translation, see below, § 63.

464. Cf. Piankoff, BIFAO 42 (1944), p. 12: Piankoff translates "ejected one" or "one who has been ejected."
465. See above, § 2.9-10.

466. Cf. EAG, § 638: = \( \pi \alpha \zeta \gamma \varepsilon \zeta \mu \wedge \).

467. Barnes, Ashm., ro. 51; not in Wb.

468. "Sin." B 132 = R 158; = Wb I 169.5.

469. For the use of plural strokes to represent -w, see above, n. 248.

470. \( \text{SV I} \, \text{§} \, 417, \text{and} \, \text{II} \, \text{§} \, 697; \text{ZAS} \, 58 \) (1923), p. 15, n. 1. Cf. also Gardiner, who admits (PSRA 37 [1915], p. 123, n. 13) that the identification is possible; he had previously denied that this was plausible (GNS, p. 50).

471. Wb I 169.12. For final -i = final -w, see EAG, §§142, 142N, 146, 146N.

472. In the construction \( \text{i} \, \text{w} \, \text{ib.} \, \text{f} \, \text{ccw.} \, \text{f} \); see Wb. med., p. 135; Grapow, Umschreibung, pp. 163 (Eb 206: 41.21), 164 (Eb 207: 42.9).

473. See Wb. med., p. 135; von Deines, Übersetzung, p. 94 (Eb 206a, 207a); Faulkner, CDME, p. 38, translates "flutter." Gardiner, PSRA 37 (1915), p. 123, n. 13, translates "to beat"; cf. GNS, p. 50. Sethe, SV I, § 417, translates "to shriek"; on this, however, see below, § 39.


476. So Wb II 31.9; cf. GNS, p. 50. Literally, "burned."

477. So Sethe, Erläuterung, p. 10: "to be anxious or afraid" ("bängen").

478. Literally, "was sick for"; cf. Wb II 95.13, and CDME, p. 110: "to have compassion or feel sorry for."

479. The earlier translations of \( \text{ccw} \) include "to faint" (Sethe, ZAS 58 [1923], p. 15, n. 1) and "to shudder" (Gardiner, Gramm 1, 322 [= p. 246, n. 4]), both apparently later abandoned by their respective proponents, and certainly to be rejected as indefensible: Blackman, JPA 22 (1936), p. 37, n. 2, says "I do not know what reason Gardiner has for translating...'shudder'..., a translation which, as Gunn also feels, ill suits the determinative." For other spurious translations of \( \text{ccw} \), see below, § 39.

480. No such precise date is possible for \( \text{ccw} \); see above, § 37 (= Ramesside).
481. See above, §16.

482. See above, §19.


486. See above, §21; cf. also above, n. 140.

487. = "tomb": see above, §24.

488. See above, §36.

489. See above, n. 24.

490. See above, n. 56.

491. *Vases*, pl. 45.1; cf. p. 31(48).

492. For this translation, see below, §63.

493. See above, §37.

494. *PSBA* 37 (1915), pp. 122–3: Gardiner speaks of "the eager way in which the Retenu-people discussed...Sinuhe's fight with the mighty man of Retenu...—naturally in their own language; by the half-contemptuous word Sinuhe indicates the babble of strange sounds that arose on that memorable occasion." See also *GNS*, pp. 171, 177, 184, where *š* is translated "to jabber or babble (in a foreign tongue)." Faulkner, *CDWE*, p. 38, following Gardiner, translates "jabber"; Barnes, *Ashm.*, p. 13 translates "chattering." For these translations, see below, §§63, 78–9.


496. See above, §37.


501. See above, n. 494.
502. See above, § 2.9.
503. See above, § 37.
504. See above, § 13, and below, § 63.
505. See above, § 37.
506. See above, n. 471.
507. In the perfective sdm.f (*c̄ycc₂̣₂̣_): see FAG, § 490.
508. For the infinitive 3c̄ct, see above, n. 24 and § 29.
509. In the perfective sdm.f (*c̄ycc₂̣₂̣_).
511. PN II 259.2: read 3c̄ç by Ranke.
513. Ibid., p. 242(24).
514. For this translation, see below, § 63; the name is not translated in PN II 259.2.
515. See below, § 91.
516. See FAG, §§ 226-7.
517. See above, § 38.
518. Cf. above, § 36.
519. See Piankoff, Unas, pl. 36.
522. For these translations, see below, § 63.
524. Speleers, Les Textes des Pyramides Egyptiennes (1923-4) I p. 34 and n. 4, and II pl. 1(6) = Textes des Pyramides Egyptiennes (1934), p. 65 and n. 2, and p. 268; Moret, Le Nil et la civilization égyptienne, p. 89, n. 1 = The Nile and Egyptian Civilization, p. 77 and n. 3.
525. See above, § 38.


527. For these translations, see above, § 34.6. Piankoff, Unas, p. 54, following Sethe, also translates "fountainheads."

528. 1200b, 1788a.

529. PT 1788a:  
CT III 61m:  
(strokes, see Faulkner, Plural, § 18a and n. 1; cf. FAG, § 278. Cf. c³c, "to spit (out)" (see above, § 34.7), PT 1628c (N):  . For a similar writing of c³c, "sapling or (young) shoot" (see above, § 34.10), see CT IV 35b (B2L):  

530. See above, § 30 and nn. 95, 172, 401:  ,  , and  

531. Literally, "springs or waterholes."

532. So Sethe, Komm. II, pp. 247, 234; Piankoff, Unas, p. 54. Faulkner, Pyramid Texts, p. 91, n. 13, arguing specifically against Sethe's interpretation of this passage, and believing that a "description of persons rather than places is required" here, translates (ibid., p. 90) "who preside over." For hntř as "south of", see ODMP, p. 194.


534. ZAS 81 (1956), pp. 9-11.
535. Wb I 165; CDME, p. 38; Gardiner, Gramm., pp. 557, 459 (E 7), 456 (D 52).

536. See also Edel, ZAS 102 (1975), p. 16; Kaplony, Beiträge, p. 77 and n. 317 on p. 198; Vycichl, MDATK 16 (1958), p. 380(2).

537. Hayes, Scepter I, fig. 57 (on pp. 100-1). This relief comes from the Saqqara mastaba of R\(\text{w}^{(w)}\)-m-k\(\text{h}_{(w)}\), the eldest son of king Izozi, dated to the end of Dynasty V: see Hayes, p. 94; Edel, ZAS 81 (1956), p. 10; PM III, p. 154.

538. For an undoubted plural form, see CT VII 52h (Sq6C; Allen, Occurrences, p. 35: = temp. Dynasty X \([?]\)): \(\text{w}_{(w)}\) --as cited by Kaplony, Beiträge, p. 198, n. 317, and Edel, ZAS 102 (1975), p. 16. The \(\text{w}\) is ambiguous (cf. above, n. 53), representing either the \(\text{w}\) of the singular \(\text{w}_{(w)}\) (cf. EAG, § 277) or the \(\text{w}\) of the plural (cf. EAG, §§ 278, 272).


540. That this is not necessarily always the case is indicated in Edel's own reconstructions (ibid., pp. 10, 11): \(\text{w}^{(w)}\text{h}_{(w)}\text{w}_{(w)}\text{y}_{(w)}\), \(\text{w}^{(w)}\text{h}_{(w)}\text{w}_{(w)}\text{y}_{(w)}\text{w}_{(w)}\text{y}_{(w)}\text{y}_{(w)}\). Edel, ZAS 81 (1956), p. 11: he mentions \(\text{y}_{(w)}\) and \(\text{y}_{(w)}\text{y}_{(w)}\) only in passing.

541. ZAS 81 (1956), p. 11.

542. Ibid., pp. 9-10, and EAG, § 244.

543. See above, § 13.


545. Note that one of the reconstructions of this word which Edel rightly rejects does end in final -\(\text{w}\): see ZAS 81 (1956), p. 9 and n. 3.

546. Crum, CD, p. 75b, and Kasser, Compléments, p. 13. See also below, § 44.

547. KG §§ 18-19, and DG § 5.

548. But cf. KG § 15, and DG § 5: \(\text{y}_{(w)}\) = /\(\text{y}\)/ or /\(\text{r}\)/ or /\(\text{y}\)/.
550. Till, DC, § 32, and ARG, pp. 22-3 (§11b), 36 (§25), also states that *-šh→ tɔγ (AA²); on this see further below, §§ 47-8.

551. Till, DC, § 29, and KG, § 55.

552. Cf. Till, DC, §§32-1, 48; e.g.: 1) *bəsəicity > kwe (SA²) = kwe (SA² FM² OP) = xw (BC) = δw (S) = ko (S) = xo (B) = ko (S) = kəγ (SAA² F), "to place, set down"; 2) *bəsəicity > Bw (SA² BFM) = Bw (A), "tree"; 3) *səcəicity > yw (S) = ywate (S) = ywate (S) = ywate (B) = ywate (SAA² FP) = ywate (SA² BM) = ywate (A) = ywate (A), "to cut"; 4) *səcəicity yw (SAA² BFM) = yw (SA² BM) = yw (A) = yw (AA²), "sand"; 5) *saicw > *saicw (cf. Till, KG, § 267; Steindorff, Lehrbuch, § 247) > Cw (SAA² BFM² OP) = Cw (SAA²) = Cw (SAA² BM² OP) = Cw (SAA²) = Cw (SAA²), "to drink"; 6) *sə tecw > *sə tecw (cf. Till, KG, §§ 268 and n. 5; Steindorff, Lehrbuch, § 247) > Cw (S) = Cw (SAA² FM) = Cw (SAA²) = kəγ (SAA²), "to conceive"; 7) *vəzəicity > xw (SA²) = xw (SAA²), "to conceive"; 8) *vəzəicity > ekw (S) = ekw (S) = ekw (S) = ekw (B) = ekw (B) = ekw (F), "tongs, pincers"; 9) *bəvəcircity > Bw (AF²) = Bw (BBF) = Bw (SAA²) = Bw (SAA²) = Bw (SAA²) = Bw (SAA²), "honey"; 10) *vəzəicity > *vəzəicity (for this form without -w-, see FEG, §§ 36, 442, and Gardiner, AEO II, pp. 192*-193*; for the formation itself, cf. FEG, §§ 336, 630ee; cf. §§ 339) > ekw (B) = ekw (BF) = ekw (B) = ekw (B) = ekw (F), "viper." For these Coptic forms, see Crum, CD, pp. 94b(1), 28a(2), 590b(3), 549b(4), 318a(5), 518a(6), 759b(7), 65a(8), 52b(9), 25b(10); Kasser, Compléments, pp. 17(1), 7(2), 89(3), 84(4), 52(5), 80(6), 12(8), 10(9), 6(10); Westendorf, KH, pp. 55-6(1), 2(2), 330(3), 302(4), 175(5), 289(6), 45(8), 32(9), 18(10). In all these words the original <, or 3 after *h has become /w/ in Coptic. For *-aw→ -aw in our Nos. 1, 5, and 10, cf. Till, KG, §§ 33, and Steindorff, Lehrbuch, § 52: *-aw-> aw (BF); for /w/ = 3, see below, § 46.

553. KG, § 62, Bemerkung.

554. As first pointed out to me by Virginia Davis. For the position of this accent, cf. FEG, § 157.

555. See above, § 13.

556. See above, n. 318.

557. See above, n. 310.


559. Represented by 3 in the chart. See Till, KG, § 64.

560. See above, n. 557.
561. See Till, KG, §33, and DG, §48; but cf. above, n. 376, and below, n. 586.

562. Cf. above, §15 and n. 140.


564. Cf. above, n. 137.


566. See above, n. 140.

567. For *ā > o (SB), see Till, DG, §24, and KG, §51.

568. Though not for the word "donkey" itself: the only singular forms of this word in Bohairic are εώ and ὦ.


571. Till, DG, §34.

572. Till, DG, §42, and AKG, p. 25 (§14): for the forms of NAY (<*naw) in which the -w is not preserved, see also Crum, CD, p. 234b, and Kasser, Compléments, p. 38: ΝΟ (ΑΑ"Ο), ΝΩ (ΣΣ"Γ), ΝΕ (ΑΠ); cf. below, n. 667.

573. CD, p. 75b.

574. As first pointed out to me by Virginia Davis.

575. See Till, DG, §52, and KG, §69.

576. For the plural εώγ, see below, §45.

577. For the plural εἱώγε, see below, §45.

578. See above, §40.

579. Cf. EAG, §§269, 272.

580. Edel, in ZAS 81 (1956), pp. 10-11, understands this form as Ἡ3t.

581. Cf. EAG, §§244, 227.

582. Ibid., §§244, 269. Edel, ZAS 81 (1956), p. 11, takes this form as Ἡ3wt.
583. See also below, § 46.


585. For the diversity of plural forms belonging to a single word, see Till, KG, § 83.

586. For the alternation between initial ē- and ā-, see Till, Di, § 32, and KG, §§ 67, 69; for ā- and ē- read as /āː-/ and /ēː-/ instead of /āʔ-/ and /ēʔ-/ respectively, see above, n. 376; for *ē > o (S) and ā (AA²P), see Till, DG, § 24, and KG, § 51; for *-ēw > -ōw, see above, § 43. For *ē > ē (B), cf. Edel, ZAS 81 (1956), p. 11; cf. also FWS, § 68.

587. For *-ũ > -ē, see Till, DG, § 54, and KG, § 67.

588. For *-y > *āʔ-, see above, § 43.

589. For the plural forms in final -ē as feminines, see Crum, CD, p. 75b; Westendorf, KH, p. 48; Edel, ZAS 81 (1956), p. 11.

590. For the loss of the feminine -ē, see Till, KG, §§ 75, 39, and DG, §§ 55, 8; Gardiner, Gramm, § 26, n. 1a; cf. FAG, §§ 211, 113. For the single writing of -ww- in Coptic, see Steindorff, Lehrbuch, §§ 28, 57.2; SV I, §§ 57-60; Setha, ZAS 64 (1929), p. 67 (§ 34a); cf. FAG, §§ 156, 251. Edel, ZAS 81 (1956), p. 11, reconstructs ēwōy/ēwēy as *ēwāwāwēwē.

591. As pointed out to me by Virginia Davis. For the loss of final unaccented *-wē in Coptic, cf. below, § 47: ṣwōw/ṇwōw/ẓōy < *d aftāw(wē).


593. For the disappearance of final unaccented *-w, see FAG, § 244; see also above, n. 540.

594. Till, KG, § 82, and DG, § 58. And vice versa: e.g., ḳālC/ḳ[le]C/KH[el]C (< the old plural *kāsēw; cf. Till, AKG, p. 28 and n. 4 [§ 17a]; see further below, n. 619), and ṣwōC (< the old plural *šēsēw [FAG, § 227, regards this form as a singular]) = ṣwōwC (< the old singular *šēsēw), are used as both the singular and plural of the words "bone" and "shepherd," respectively; see Crum, CD, pp. 119b, 589b; Kasser, Compléments, pp. 21, 89; Westendorf, KH, pp. 69, 327.

595. And potentially also the functional equivalents.

596. See above, § 43.

597. Likewise, Ewōy provides the feminine counterpart of the masculine *wōy postulated as the intermediate form between *wēw and ēwēw.

599. Crum, CD, p. 75b.

600. Westendorf, KH, p. 48 and n. 7.

601. Crum, CD, p. 64a.

602. See above, §45.

603. Kasser, Compléments, p. 12(64a).

604. See above, §45.

605. Crum, CD, p. 64a.

606. See above, §45.


608. See Till, KG, §40, and DG, §10.

609. See Till, AKG, p. 39 (§27eα): Sethe, Z̄S 64 (1929), p. 66 (§27eα), is surely wrong in disputing this; see Vergote, Phonétique, p. 95; Steindorff, Lehrbuch, §26a.4,b,c. See also above, n. 196, and below, n. 619.

610. See above, n. 586.

611. For ʿ = ḃ, see Till, KG, §12, and DG, §22: cf. also above, n. 319; for *-āw > -ω, see below, §47 (conclusions).

612. Crum, CD, p. 740b, and Kasser, Compléments, p. 104. The other forms of this word are derived from *ḥāšāw > ʾōḥ (SBO) = ᵃʾōḥ (S) = ᵃʾōḥ (AA²-P); and *ḥāšěf > ʾāwymb (SA) = ᵃʾōḥ (S). Note that the form *ḥāšěf was created by analogy, through confusion with *ḥāšěb, "thing, matter, event," with which it shares in common not only the forms ᵃʾōḥ and ᵃʾōḥ (borrowed unetymologically from *ḥāšěb), but also ᵃʾōḥ, ᵃʾōḥ, ᵃʾōḥ, and even ᵃʾōḥ (all of which were borrowed by *ḥāšěb from *ḥāšāw and *ḥāšēw): cf. Crum, CD, p. 653a; Kasser, Compléments, p. 95; Westendorf, KG, p. 354.

613. For the singular ḫ(ḥ), see FWS, §68.

614. For metathesis of this type, cf. Till, KG, §§30, 33, and DG, §48; Steindorff, Lehrbuch, §33; Vergote, Phonétique, pp. 88 (D.3.a-b), 94, 92. See also below, nn. 618, 619, 624, 632, 636, 656, 662 and above, n. 331.
615. For *r̥̂- (> r̥̂̆-) > Δ - /ê/, see Till, DG, § 52; for *r̥̂- > H, cf. below, HOQ, "honor, glory" and above, n. 337 (TALO); for *r̥̂ > - ê̌ (OY), see Till, DG, § 27: cf. also below, XEY, "to send"; the development *r̥̂ > - H is unexplained; for EYQ, see above, § 46.

616. Crum, CD, p. 64a; Kasser, Compléments, p. 12; Westendorf, KH, p. 44.

617. For the form *r̥̂̆w̥̆, see Edel, ZÄS 79 (1954), pp. 87-8(2); cf. FAG, § 239.

618. For the metathesis involved, see above, n. 614.

619. For 3̌ > /r̥̂/<, see above, n. 140; /r̥̂w̥̆/> - /w̥̆w̥̆/ is to be explained as assimilation of /r̥̂/ to the following /w/ (EOYQ = EYQO); /w̥̆w̥̆/> /w̥̆w̥̆/; 00 Y = 0w̥̆; /w̥̆w̥̆/> *w̥̆w̥̆ = /w̥̆w̥̆/; cf. above, n. 376; *r̥̂ > r̥̂ (EOYQ = EYQO); see above, § 46; cf. also *k̄̂̄w̥̆ = MAWX (S)/MAWX (S)/NAWX (A)/NAWX (ESAM)/NEECE (F) > *k̄̄̄w̥̆ (cf. Gramm. med., § 80.3; FAG, § 256a(N); CDMD, p. 137; Vergote, Phonétique, p. 95; Wb II 304, 384; Gardiner, Gramm. pp. 575, 577; Blackman and Fairman in Miscellanea Gregoriana, p. 420(96); see also above, n. 614) = MAWX (S)/MAWX (B), "tooth": the spelling MAWX (S) is etymological, representing either 1) a mixture of MAWX and MAWX (S) or 2) a form of MAWX with secondary doubling of the Δ (cf. below, n. 641; *k̄̄̄w̥̆ > *k̄̄̄w̥̆ (see Lacau, Corps, §§ 378-82, 386-7; cf. Till, KG, § 39, and AKG, § 17e [= p. 28 and n. 4]; cf. Gramm. med., § 49; SI, §§ 72, 240; note that Ward, Bior 29 [1972], p. 23 [§ 373-86] still prefers to read "bone" as *k̄̄̄, rather than k̄̄̄ (r̥̂) > KAC (S) = KAC (SBF) = KEC (SAA²) = KEC (SF²M) = KHNC (SF²) = KHC (SF²) = KIC (SF²) = KAC (S) = KAECE (S) = KEC (SF²) = KEC (S) = KEC (P) = ZEEC = KEC/ZECEC [= keq]/ (P) (cf. Kasser, Compléments, p. x, n. 3; pp. 23, 41), "bone's" (see above, n. 594); *MUDI > *MUDI = [med̄ = ] /med̄ /: for med̄ = [med̄ = temp. Dynasties XXI-XXII and demotic; see Černý in Crum Stud., p. 39(5)], see Westendorf, KH, p. 113; for [med̄ = actually

as a writing for /r̥̂/, cf. FWS, § 367, n. 492: 3̌ > /r̥̂/ after d; for the effect of /r̥̂/ on the preceding vowel in an unaccented syllable, cf. Till, DG, § 52, and KG, § 69; *MUDI (for 3̌ > k̄̄̄ before d, see Till, DG, § 16; cf. Steindorff, Lehrbuch, § 34) = MEUXE (A²)/MAWX (B)/MACZT (C) > *MUDI (for d > k̄̄̄, see Crum, CD, pp. 390, 745; Till, KG, § 47) = MEUXE (A²)/MAWX (B)/MEUT (S) > *MUDI (for this metathesis, see above, n. 614) = *MUDI (for 3̌ > k̄̄̄, especially after T, see Crum, CD, pp. 745, 541) = *MUDI (for 3̌ > /r̥̂/, see Till, KG, § 39) = MAWX (S)/MAWX (S)/MAWX (S)/MEUXE (SAA²)/MEUXE (A²)/MEUXE (A)/MEUXE (F)/MEUXE (F)/MEUXE (S), "ear." For these Coptic forms, see Crum, CD, pp. 249b, 119b, 212b; Kasser, Compléments, pp. 40, 21, 34; Westendorf, KH, pp. 137, 69, 113.

621. For c₃w(t), "linen," in Old Egyptian, see Edel, ZAS 102 (1975), p. 15. Edel's No. 8 = Petrie, Denderah, pl. 3 (the sarcophagus of Mn3; Fischer, Dendera, pp. 91, 170-1: = temp. Dynasty VIII or IX): (as a designation for two types of cloth). Wb I 166.6 reads

\[c₃w(t)\]

for this example, but there does not seem to be space for a in the facsimile of this inscription; see now also Edel, ZAS 102 (1975), pp. 13-14. For the usual Middle Egyptian spelling c₃(w)t, see Wb I 166.6; CDME, p. 38; cf. Spiegelberg, KI, p. 31. For c₃(w)t > 31YY, see Westendorf, KI, p. 53. Edel, ZAS 102 (1975), pp. 13-17, proposes that the Coptic 31YY / 31YY / 31w(w) is to be derived from \(*(i)c₃(w)t = *(i)c₃(w)t > *(i)c₃(w)t = *(i)c₃(w)t > *(i)c₃(w)t\), and that the explicitly feminine \(*(i)c₃(w)t\), which first makes its appearance in Middle Egyptian, is carefully to be distinguished from the masculine \(*(i)c₃w\) of Old Egyptian. Against these reconstructions might be argued that the initial \(i\)- which they postulate is nowhere found written; nor is its presence required to explain the Coptic forms, as our own derivation demonstrates. And although Edel completely dismisses the possibility (ibid., pp. 14, 16) that \(*c₃w\) may be a defective writing for c₃w(t), nevertheless he is forced by the Coptic evidence to admit (ibid., p. 16) that the Middle Egyptian \(*c₃t---\) which never betrays the presence of \(w-w\) must represent \(c₃(w)t\). In the end, a simpler picture is obtained if we understand in both \(c₃w(t)\) and \(c₃(w)t\) two spellings of the same word, each exhibiting a different orthographic idiosyncrasy. For the graphic suppression of the feminine -t in Old Egyptian, cf. FAG, §§ 210, 113, 65; this phenomenon may be more characteristic of Old Egyptian than has been admitted previously.

622. Cf. above, § 17.

623. For \(3 > /γ/\), see above, n. 140; for \(*\frac{\gamma}{c} - \frac{\Delta}{c} (S) = -\frac{\Delta}{c} (B)\), see Till, DG, §§ 25, 48.

624. For evidence of this metathesis in demotic, see Erichsen, Glossar, pp. 52, 55: \(c₃w = (c₃w(t)>) *₃c₃w(t)\), and \(c₃w = *₃c₃w(t)\): the word is feminine in demotic; cf. Westendorf, KI, p. 53. See also above, n. 614.

625. \(*\frac{\gamma}{c} > - ω\ ; *\frac{\gamma}{c} > /\frac{\Delta}{c}γ/ = ω\\{w\}\).

626. Crum, CD, pp. 88a, xvii; Westendorf, KI, p. 53.

627. For the form of \(₃c₃t\), see FAG, §§ 724.4b, 725: \(₃c₃t = *₃c₃w₃t\) as a nomen actionis; but cf. § 240: \(₃c₃t\) (nomen actionis) vocalized \(₃c₃w₃t\). Cf. Gardiner, Gramm, §§ 208 (p. 223 and Obs.), 299 (3rd-wk.).
For a writing of ḫw, see CT IV 95a: p. For the position of the determinative 𓊁𓊁𓊁 (N (35)), cf. FAG, § 724.4b: ḫw (with the ending - ḫw written after the determinative); for the position of the feminine -t, cf. FAG, § 94. Faulkner, Coffin Texts I, p. 237, n. 6, reads ḫw (= ḫw; cf. FAG, § 239), discounting the ḫ as a scribal error.

628. For the infinitive ḫw, see above, n. 268.

629. Cf. above, § 17.

630. For this vocalization, cf. above, n. 627.

631. For ḫw, cf. o ḫw (S), the qualitative (< ḫw) of O ḫw (W), "to be well off, flourish": Crum, CD, p. 477a; Westendorf, KH, p. 269; cf. Till, AKG, p. 27 (§ 17b). See also ḫw, "hair."

632. For this metathesis, cf. above, n. 614. Edel, NAWG 1963, p. 178, unable to explain the Coptic forms of this word as derivatives from either of the two usual patterns for the infinitives of 3rd-wk. verbs (i.e., *māv > *māv, *sūv > *sūv; see FAG, §§ 687-8; Till, KG, §§ 272-3), reconstructs the infinitive of ḫw as * ḫw = * ḫw. Note that Lacau, BITFAO 52 (1953), p. 14 and n. 2, reconstructs this infinitive as * ḫw = * ḫw; so also Steindorff, Lehrbuch, § 247; FNS, § 185, n. 304. Cf. above, n. 320.


634. The oldest attested writing of this word, ḫw, dates from no earlier than Dynasty XXI (see Edwards, Amulectic Decrees II, pl. 20 [line 47], and I, pp. xiii-xv, 59 [n. 42], 122; Černý, BITFAO 57 [1958], pp. 210-11), and is not necessarily complete nor strictly etymological (Edwards transliterates ḫw; Černý transliterates ḫw, but reconstructs * ḫw).

635. For ḫw, see above, n. 631; in ḫw, /- w/- seems to have become /- y/-: cf. below, n. 638.

636. For this metathesis, see above, n. 614.


638. The form ḫmwy seems to have been borrowed from ḫmwy, "from (among)/(out of) them" > ḫmwy (see Edel, 2H 84 [1959], pp. 25-6, and
EAG, §§ 751b (Edel's reference to ZAS 84 is incorrect: read p. 26, instead of p. 52), 758; Till, DG, §§ 156, 117, 50, and KG, §§ 237, 185, 65; in MOO, /-w/ seems to have become /-ω/: cf. above, n. 635.


640. For this reconstruction, see EAG, §§ 453, 490; Till, KG, § 277 and n. 26, and AKG, p. 41 (§ 33c); Spiegelberg, KH, p. 280 and n. 3; see also above, n. 327.

641. For $X = T (< d) + \iota (< \pi)$, see Till, KG, § 23; for $\ast -\dot{\alpha}\nu -\dot{\varepsilon}y$, see above, n. 615; $-\dot{\alpha}\nu -\Delta\varepsilon\gamma$ represents secondary (unmetrical) doubling of the vowel; see Till, KG, §§ 34, 33 (n. 4); DG, § 48; and AKG, p. 29 (§ 17f); see also above, n. 619, and below, nn. 666, 669, 675.


644. See above, § 45.

645. See above, § 41.

646. See above, § 41.

647. Crum, CD, p. 75b: = SABF.

648. Ibid., p. 75a, and Kasser, Compléments, p. 13: = SAA ² BM Φ.

649. For the loss of $-\sigma\gamma$, see above, § 43.

650. Cf. below, § 48.

651. See above, § 41.


654. Edel, EAG, 107, transliterates "mother" as mīwt (see also ibid., §§ 28, 31, 205), having deduced $i (< \pi$ or $\dot{i}$) from the Coptic. For the certain presence of $i$ in this word, cf. EAG, §§ 28, 31 (ref. PT 550a) and §§ 28, 28N, 286N (ref. PT 1416c), for the use of the mūt-bird (G 14) as mīwt in the writing of kəmīwt--in PT 1416c written unequivocally $\ddot{i}$ + $\dddot{i}m$ + mīwt + $\dddot{e}$; cf. § 34 (ref. PT 1462a; so also PT 1462b) for this sign used as mīwt in the writing of kəmīwt (P) = *kəmīwt (M) = *kəmīwt (with assimilation of n to the following m; cf. EAG, § 251: bəm(w)m = *bəmwmən (w)m = *bəmwmən (w)m = bəmwmən (w)m; Blackman and Fairman in Miscellanea Gregoriana, pp. 419-20 (92); Fairman, ASA 43 (1943), pp. 268-9 (40), 225 (175b); FWS, § 367; cf.
Wb III 376.14-16, 377.1: *hymtuentuy > hmunuy; cf. also Till, KG, §35, and DG, §14; in PT 1462a (M) written unequivocally as k + km + t + mvt + t (Edel transliterates kmnt and kmnt(?), respectively).

655. For (*-iy > -iy (-iy) ≡ -εε (A²) ≡ -H (F), see Till, DG §§37, 41; KG, §60; and AKG, pp. 24-5 (§12d), 36 (§25); see also above, n. 619. The M of AMAY seems to have been borrowed from MMMAY/AMMAAY, "there": cf. below nn. 674-5; cf. also above, n. 638.

656. For this metathesis, see above, n. 614.

657. For *-iw > -iyy (SB) ≡ -εεy (A²) ≡ -O (A), see Till, DG, §§42, 34, and AKG, p. 25 (§14 and n. 1); for *-iy > -iy (S²) ≡ -O (A), cf. above, §47.

658. Crum, CD, p. 197a; Kasser, Compléments, p. 31; Westendorf, KH, p. 106.

659. For the w in this word, see FWS, §373 and n. 504. Cf. Peet, Tomb-Robberies II, pl. 2 (Pap. Abbott [= Pap. BM 10221] 3:17):

\[ \frac{\text{\textbf{r}}}{\text{\textbf{u}}} \frac{\text{\textbf{w}}}{\text{\textbf{y}}} \text{ is mnh\textbf{wy}t, "tombs"; for y as the ending of the plural, see below, n. 695.} \]

660. For -ch > -ch-, see above, §18.

661. For ερανγύ < cm(w)c < cm(w)c < cm(w)t < cm(c)(w)t < cm(c)(w)t, cf. Grapow, Prefix -c, pp. 7, 11, 12-13; for c > cy, see above, n. 140.

662. For this metathesis, see above, n. 614.

663. For the form MOA(A), see Till, AKG, §14 (p. 26, n. 1).

664. Crum, CD, p. 212b; Kasser, Compléments, p. 34; Westendorf, KH, p. 112.

665. For this reconstruction, cf. FAG, §390; Gardiner, Gramm, §260.

666. The doubling of the vowel of this form is secondary (i.e., unetymological); cf. above, n. 641.

667. For *-iy > -A, see below, n. 676. Cf. also above, n. 657: *-iy > -O (A); and below, nn. 671, 677: *-iy > -E.

668. Crum, CD, p. 346b; Westendorf, KH, p. 190.

669. For the unetymological doubling of the vowel of this word, cf. above, n. 641.

670. Crum, CD, p. 233b; Kasser, Compléments, p. 38; Westendorf, KH,
pp. 129-30.

671. For *

672. Crum, CD, p. 2346; Kasser, Compléments, p. 38; Westendorf, KH, p. 130.

673. For this reconstruction, see Edel, ZAS 84 (1959), pp. 25-6; for \( \text{im(w)} \), cf. Gardiner, Gramm, § 205.1.

674. The Coptic forms quoted here are incomplete in themselves, since they do not occur alone, but are always preceded by another word or letter (as indicated by -): for the \( M \) commonly found in the place of this -, cf. Till, DG, § 50, and KG, § 65.

675. For the secondary doubling of this vowel, cf. above, n. 641.

676. For *

677. For *

678. Crum, CD, p. 196b; Kasser, Compléments, p. 31; Westendorf, KH, p. 106.

679. Cf. above, n. 657.

680. Cf. above, § 47.


682. Just as Edel, ZAS 81 (1956), pp. 10-11, quotes a writing of 

683. = Pap. BM 10470; temp. late Dynasty XVIII to early Dynasty XIX: Allen, BD (1960), p. xxv.

684. Facsimile of the Papyrus of Ani in the British Museum, pl. 1: = sheet 1, line 14.


687. Naville's copy actually gives \( \frac{\sqrt{}^2}{\sqrt{}} \). For the reading \( (3)^{C3w} \),

however, cf. Budge, BD (1898: Text), p. 108.10; WB I 165.11
(Belegstellen) also includes this example among the occurrences of the word "donkey."

688. Cf. above, n. 452.


690. Spiegelberg, RT 25 (1903), p. 195(15); pp. 194-5: = temp. Dynasty XXII(?).

691. For the plural strokes used for ḫ, see above, n. 248.

692. Whether as "fill-strokes" or simply a scribal error.

693. Erichsen, Papyrus Harris I, p. 95.1.8; cf. Erman, NAG, § 21.

694. For apparent duals as plurals (accompanied by plural strokes), see Erman, NAG, §§ 143 Anm., 156; for duals accompanied by plural strokes, cf. Gramm. med., §§ 125gg, hh, ii.

695. For -.WriteHeader as the ending of the plural, see Gramm. med., § 127cc (2); FAG, § 146N; Faulkner, Plural, § 25; Erman, NAG, §§ 150-1; Korostovtsev, Néo-égyptien, pp. 56-7.

696. For ḫ = ḫ, see above, n. 127.

697. Cf. the use of the split-column in Old Egyptian: FAG, § 89.

698. SDT, p. 138(33b): ref. p. 134(33); cf. above, n. 420. Sethe transliterates both ḫw and ḫw simply as ḫw.

699. For the -w of this form, see Gardiner, Gramm, §§ 341, 343; FAG, §§ 741, 1110. For the reading Im(1), see Gardiner, Gramm, § 342, and FAG, § 1103.

700. Cf. above, § 45.

701. See further below, § 79.

702. Cf. above, § 23.

703. See above, § 40.


323, n. 8: "Semitic $\sqrt[3]{\text{cc}}$, 'be evil', = Egyptian $\text{cc}$, 'do harm, evil'" (= Emmer, *Egypto-Semitic Studies*, p. 11); but this $\text{cc}$ (= $\sqrt[3]{\text{cc}}$) is merely the Late Egyptian spelling of the root $\text{cc}$ (= $\sqrt{\text{cc}}$).


710. Urk I 120.14, 121.10, 123.9.13.16, 124.5, 128.4 (temp. Merenre-Pepi II).

711. Urk I 124.2.

712. De Morgan, *Cat. mon.* I, pp. 171 (lower r.t.: twice), 172 (pillar 2); cf. el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 129 and n. 6. For the reading of the name Māʾ(ʾ)·n·ʾ, see Edel, QH II 1, p. 49(46e); for the transliteration, see pp. 56-8(3).

713. For the formation of this name, see Edel, QH II 1, pp. 49(46), 50(48).

714. De Morgan, *Cat. mon.* I, p. 173 (pillar 3a); cf. el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 130 and n. 3. For the reading of the name N(ʾ)·Cnh·Pīp̣, see Edel, QH II 1, p. 68; on p. 115, n. 98, however, Edel transliterates as though Cnh·n·(ʾ)·Pīp̣; cf. *PN* II 271.6 and n. 1.


717. Once called (ʾ)m(ʾ)-r(3) $\text{mc}$ hr $\text{znw}$, "Overseer of the army in Zatjew"; see Edel, *ZAS* 97 (1971), p. 55, fig. 3. For the interpretation of hr as "in" (rather than "from": so Edel, *ZAS* 97 [1971], pp. 55, 57), see Edel, *ZAS* 100 (1974), p. 76; cf. *ZAS* 97 (1971), p. 57.


719. De Morgan, *Cat. mon.* I, p. 144, lower (b); cf. von Bissing, *ASAE* 15 (1915), p. 4; Edel, *ZAS* 97 (1971), p. 56. Edel, QH II 1, pp. 52-3(70) and n. 44, regards the final -3 found here in the writing of this name as the ending attested in certain nicknames.


723. Edel, QH II 1, pp. 77, 35(25), 38(46b).

724. It is apparently Mhw-i(-wr) who is depicted (unnamed) as sib n-i's eldest son (s3 f sm(sw)) in de Morgan, Cat. mon. I, p. 148, middle; there he bears the title (i)m(i)-r(z) fci(z)(ww) = (personal hand-copy; de Morgan represents the whole group only by the sign i); cf. von Bissing, ASAE 15 [1915], p. 12.

725. Von Bissing, ASAE 15 (1915), p. 8 and n. 1 (read Ω 43: 3); see Edel, QH II 1, pp. 77-8, 49(43), 37(43), 56(3), 63(22). For this transliteration of the name, see ibid., pp. 56-8(3). Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 62, reads \( \text{Hw} \), while citing ASAE 15 (1915), p. 7.

726. For the transliteration of this name—usually rendered \( \text{Hk}s-fb \)—cf. FAG, §§428cc, 91; Sethe, Komm. I, p. 127 (PT 202b); WB III 170.1 and I 33.14; Osing, NAHK 30 (1974), p. 112 and nn. 154-8; Gardiner, Gramm. S 38 and nn. 6-8; JEA 31 (1945), p. 116; Rees, ZÄS 77 (1941), pp. 24-6. Møller, Hieratische Papyrus Berlin, pl. 6 (Str Cb ro., line 3), once transcribes \( \text{f} \) in a damaged context; however, the traces there actually suit \( \text{f} \) (S 38): cf. Møller, Paläographie I 453. This interpretation of the name seems to be confirmed by the spellings \( \text{fr} \) and \( \text{fr} \) (= (i)m(i)-r(z) fci(z)(ww) (i)m(i)-r(z) mzc, certainly the same individual) and \( \text{fr} \) (= smw\( ^c \)r(i) hr(i)-h(3)b(t) of Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 58 (Nos. 10, 16). Cf. also the name \( \text{mzc} \) found in Lange and Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine, No. 20091(n). Ranke, FN I 212.6, reads as Nht\( i \)-bk\( k \), "Nht\( i \) is ruler"; however, this name is surely better understood as (N)ht-\( i\)k, "The-Ruler-is-Mighty (or: Victorious)."

727. De Morgan, Cat. mon. I, p. 201(4) = Bourniat, RT 10 (1888), p. 187(1): rock-inscription at the foot of the hill of Qubbet el-Hawa. In this inscription Pipl-nht(w): \( \text{fik-fb} \) is mentioned only as \( \text{fik-fb} \): see
also below, B.15; cf. below, n. 796.

728. Urk I 131.16.17, 135.5.

729. Urk I 132.5.9.

730. Urk I 132.12.


732. Based on my own hand-copy of the inscriptions contained in tomb 35d, used here with the kind permission of Dr. Labib Habachi; cf. el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 162.

733. Urk I 134.14. For the reading of this name, see Edel, QH II 1, pp. 47(17), 56-9(3), 61(10); see also below, n. 762. Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 62, transliterates "cnht (?) .


735. For Šnw as the "good name" of this K(3.1)-m-Šnw(3.2), see below, n. 796.

736. Edel, QH II 1, p. 98.

737. Ibid., pp. 37(38), 88(13a), 95, 103(3), and pl. 17(34 h/2 [49]).

738. Ibid., p. 103(3).

739. Ibid., pp. 40(53), 67, 88(13a), 97, and pls. 103-6(102/181 [286]).

740. Ibid., II 2.1, pls. 28, 33-4.

741. Ibid., II 1, pp. 40(54), 67, 88(13a), 97, and pl. 106 (102/182 [287], 102/177 [288]).

742. Edel (ibid., p. 67) gives good grounds for this proposed identification.


745. Ibid.
746. Ibid.

747. Edel, QH II 2.1, pls. 76-87.

748. Ibid., pls. 29-32.


751. For the formation of this name, see Edel, QH II 1, pp. 50-1 (48); Fischer, Kush 10 (1962), p. 333; cf. Junker, Giza 12, pp. 109-14. For the reading Hw(t) - n-s, see PN II, pp. 26, 29; PN I 268.12 renders Hw(t) - n-s(?): cf. Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 62; Piotrovsky, Fouilles en Nubie (1961-1963), pp. 134, 135; PN VII, p. 75; Černý, Sinai II, p. 61, n. 1; Kadish, JEA 52 (1966), p. 25, reads Hw - n-s. [PN I, p. xxviii (268.12) and II 381 (268.12), renders N(i) - s(w) - hw(i), with the feminine counterpart (I 423.2) N(i) - s(i) - hw(i) = Hw(i) - n-s: so PN II, p. 29); cf. el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 172.


753. For ı(3)d as the transliteration of the word "boy" (= Semitic *yld/ylḏ), see CDME, p. 34; Hodge, Anthropological Linguistics 17 (1975), p. 241; Folia Orientalia 17 (1976), pp. 16-17(9). For Egyptian 𓊨 = Semitic /l/, see above, § 15. Edel, MDAIK 13 (1944), p. 51 (§47c), transliterates "boy" as Ỉ(w). For the nickname ỉ(3)-d, cf. Junker, ZAS 63 (1928), p. 62; see also below, n. 776.

754. Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 58.28 = Urk I 209.4 (temp. Nfr - z3 - Hr(w) = Pepi I). For ỉ(3)-d's title šbd pr- 3(ỉ) ( = šbd hnt(ỉw) - 3(ỉ) (nɪw) pr- 3(ỉ) ), cf. Junker, Giza 9, p. 130 and Abb. 59-60 (pp. 130, 132); cf. Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 28, n. 2.

755. The reading of this name is very uncertain: = (?). It is based on the photographs published by Leclant, Orientalia 31 (1962), pl. 38 (fig. 18), and Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 56.3, as compared also with those of a separate rock-inscription in which the same noun occurs a second time (= (?)): Leclant, Fouilles en Nubie (1961-1963), fig. 6 on pl. 3 (foll. p. 122); Orientalia 31 (1962), pl. 38 (fig. 19); Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 56.2. For ḫ, cf. Gardiner, Gramm. U 40, nn. 1, 3-4; T 13, n. 1; T 14 (3d); for the form of this sign, cf. Polotsky, 11.
Dynastie, § 23. Sethe, Urk I 209.2, renders it as though "Iw-hn[,] f", but comments (ibid., n. a) that this can hardly be a name; Piéronne, Institutions III, pp. 110, 113, 543 (58, 60), reads this name "Iou-hena-af" and "Ii-hena-af"; Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 62, reads only "Iy...". See further below, Biv.16.


757. Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 58.28 = Urk I 209.4.

758. For the formation of this name, see Edel, OH II 1, p. 50(48).

759. Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 58.9. Also described as "m3(w) hr Pipi hr Titf" (for the transliteration of this royal name, see below, n. 762.

760. Reading : cf. Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 57.4. Weigall, pl. 58.9, transcribes as though "(i)m(i)-r(i) 3(w) nb(w) T3-Sm(w)..."; cf. Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 63 and n. 1. See also below, Q1.2.

761. Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 58.14. Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 62, transliterates this name S3b...

762. Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 58.11. For the writing of the royal name as , cf. EAG, §§ 94-5; for Titf written , see Edel, OH II 1, p. xii(32). For spellings which show that the word "bread" should be read t', and consequently that the original phonetic value of the sign (X 2) was t--as witness the use of or in group-writing (cf. Gardiner, Gramm., § 60, X 2, XI and n. 5; Edel, OH II 1, p. 57--see CT I 204a: (B17C), the writings of the suffix (see above, n. 441) is proven by the use of alone to write this suffix in "my father" (= f in B13C) and "from my hand" (= m-c-f in B12C) in these same texts. Cf. also the various writings of the ending -t discussed by Edel, OH II 1, pp.
56-65: on pp. 57, 59(17D), 63(17, 11) Edel cites the writings which also reveal the full phonetic structure of the word "bread,"

763. Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 58.15.
764. Ibid., pl. 58.12.
765. Ibid., pl. 58.13.
766. Ibid., pl. 58.17. For the reading of this name, cf. PN I 245.5-6, 244.25; Edel, QH II 1, pp. 64-5(34). Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 62, reads ḫn...nt.
768. Edel, ḫnš 97 (1971), p. 61: = (?) (mr[t]-rc(w)-) ḫn(3).n-hr(w).
769. Ibid., pp. 59-61.
770. Ibid., p. 59 and figs. 4-6 (p. 60).
771. Ibid.
772. Ibid., p. 55 and figs. 1-3 (pp. 54-5).
773. For 'ṭm+m = 'ṭm3, see FAG, § 136.
774. Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 58.10. For this transliteration of the name, see above, n. 726; Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 62, transliterates 'ṭkib.
775. PN VII, p. 90 (regarded as temp. Middle Kingdom).
776. Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 64 (No. 3). For the formation of this name, cf. ʾṭ(m)3-d-ḥ (3.2 above) and ʾṭ(m)3-d-ḥ (3.2 below); read ḫnš in PN II 304.23 (regarded as temp. Middle Kingdom), and PN VII, p. 90.
779. Ibid., p. 134 and n. 3 on p. 133.
780. Van de Walle, Cdʾ 22 (1947), pp. 290-1: described as temp. early Middle Kingdom (Dynasties X-XI); PN VII, p. 320.
781. Van de Walle, Cdʾ 22 (1947), fig. 12 (opp. p. 290).
782. Ibid.

783. Ibid.


785. See PM V, p. 221.

786. De Morgan, Cat. mon. I, p. 207(30) = Petrie, A Season in Egypt, pl. 12(326). The name seems to be written as though K(3)-nb(w).f, with V 31b instead of V (V 30); cf. Urk I 106.15 (Wnī): V 31 for V 30. For the name Cnh-nb(w).f at Qubbet el-Hawa, see Edel, QH II 1, pp. 34(18), 45(18).

787. PM V, p. 219.


789. Ibid.

790. De Morgan, Cat. mon. I, p. 204(5); the reading of the name is far from certain: = (?)\(\frac{\text{?}}{\text{?}}\).

791. De Morgan, Cat. mon. I, p. 204(5); the reading of the name is far from certain: = (?)\(\frac{\text{?}}{\text{?}}\).

792. Understanding z3.f snw(w) mrlī.f.


795. Unpublished photograph taken at the site in 1954 by M. F. el-Ramly of the Geological Museum, Cairo; sent to Professor James Muhly in 1975 by Darwish el-Far, then Director of the Geological Museum. Called to my attention by Professor Muhly, and used here with his permission.

796. Named in two separate graffiti as K(3·f)-m-snw(.f)

\[
[\text{?}\text{?}\text{?}\text{?}\text{?}\text{?}, \text{rn·f nfr šnw} [\text{?}\text{?}\text{?}\text{?}\text{?}\text{?}\text{?}] \text{and simply šnw:} \text{?}\text{?}\text{?}]
\]

once associated with a cartouche. Apparently that of Nfr-kū-RC(w) = Pepi II (the photograph is blurred). For individuals referred to solely by
their "good names," cf. Edel, OH II 1, p. 69(9); Fischer, Dendera, p. 76 and n. 320.

797. Written ḫṣ.[m] p.

798. The Nefermpt which Goedicke includes among the holders of the title (i)m(ī)-r(3) ḫw(w) (see JEA 46 [1960], p. 62) is actually (i)m(ī)-r(3) nbw(īw): see above, n. 55.


800. Goyon, Hammamat, No. 21.

801. Ibid.


803. Ibid., No. 21.

804. Ibid.

805. Ibid. Not to be identified with J.1, but possibly identical with B.12; cf. above, n. 799.

806. Ibid.

807. Ibid. For the formation of this name, see below, n. 811.

808. Ibid.


814. Green's copy of this inscription indicates that the name has not survived.

815. The reconstruction of the title as \[(\text{i}m\text{i})r(\text{3})\] is not certain.


818. For the writing of this title, see above, n. 7.

819. Green, PSBA 31 (1909), No. 39; understanding \(\frac{\text{a}}{\text{b}}\).

820. Ibid.; the name is not represented in Green's copy of this inscription.

821. Černý, Sinai, No. 13 = Urk I 56 (temp. Dd-kr\text{c}(w)) = \(\text{Izzi}\), the year after the 3rd census). A trace of one sign of the writing of the name is preserved.

822. Ibid., No. 16 = Urk I 92.5 (temp. Mr\text{r}-kr\text{c}(w) = Pepi I, the year after the 18th census). Not to be identified with M.3. Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 62, lists only one Nyk\text{r}\text{nkh} here, citing Urk I 92.6. Pirenne, Institutions III, pp. 110, 112, 565 (157, 157bis), distinguishes "Nekankh the elder" and "Nekankh."

823. Černý, Sinai, No. 16 = Urk I 92.6; not to be identified with M.2.

824. Černý, Sinai, No. 16 = Urk I 92.7.

825. Černý, Sinai, No. 17 = Urk I 113.9 (temp. Nfr-kr\text{c}(w) = Pepi II, the year of the 2nd census). For the reading of this name, cf. J.10 above. Černý, Sinai II, pp. 224, 64, transliterates Myr-kr\text{c,nnkh} and renders "Meryre onkh"; Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 62, transliterates Myr\text{r}\text{c,nnkh}.

826. Černý, Sinai, No. 17 = Urk I 113.10 (temp. Nfr-kr\text{c}(w) = Pepi II, the year of the 2nd census).

827. Fischer, Coptic Nome, pl. 10, lines 2, 5: = CGC 1638. For the provenance and date, see Fischer, Coptic Nome, p. 8(7); a date in the reign of Pepi II seems to be indicated: see Fischer, Dendera, p. 76 and n. 320 (on p. 138 Fischer describes this piece as "a late Old Kingdom stela"). For the writing of the title \[(\text{i}m\text{i})r(\text{3})\] is not certain.
above, n. 10; for the form of the sign (S 25: reproduced as in Bornhardt, Denkmäler II, p. 103), see Fischer, Coptic Nome, p. 28 and n. 1.

828. Bornhardt, Denkmäler, No. 1435 = Urk I 102.5 (Wn1); for the writing see above, n. 10. Included among the unnamed officials who accompanied the "army of many tens of thousands" (Urk I 101.10) which Wn1 led against the Asiatic nomads during the reign of Pepi I.

829. Bornhardt, PAS 42 (1905), pl. 2 (foll. p. 8) = Goedicke, Dokumente, fig. 5 (foll. p. 56); cf. Urk I 29.16, n. f. Included among the unnamed addresses of the Dahshur decree of Pepi I (temp. the year of the 21st census). For the plural (1)m(1w)-r(3), see Fischer, Coptic Nome, p. 28 and n. 2. Cf. also below, n. 850.


831. Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 62, erroneously includes Gg1 (ref. GCC 71, 72, 1455) in his list of holders of the title (1)m(1w)-r(3) in3(Gw).

832. James, BM Hieroglyphic Texts I, p. 25 and pl. 25.1 (No. 199). James reads Hww/Hw-wi; Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 62, transliterates Hww1. The provenance is uncertain: both "Giza" and "the necropolis of Memphis" have been suggested. James dates this inscription to Dynasty IV or V; Goedicke includes it in his group designated "Pepi II and later." The closest parallel for this piece seems to be the nearly identical obelisk of Wn1 = Bornhardt, Denkmäler, No. 1310 (pl. 2): the provenance is said to be Abydos; for a similar object, however, No. 1309 (also Wn1), the provenance is given as Abydos (?), because the Jd'E clearly lists Saqqara. Cf. also Nos. 1308 and 1312 (both temp. Dynasty V) and 1313 (temp. Old Kingdom: the inscription is erased) -- all from Saqqara -- and Nos. 1311, 1314 (both temp. Dynasty VI, provenance unknown). These data suggest assuming for BM 199 the provenance of Saqqara and a date early in Dynasty VI, making the identification with J.11 above (temp. Pepi I (?)) seem probable.

833. Bornhardt, Denkmäler, No. 1406 (temp. Dynasty VI). Bornhardt suggests Saqqara (?) as the provenance of this piece. The title br(3) 3st3 n(1) Tp-rá(1) assures his connections with Southern Upper Egypt.

834. James, BM Hieroglyphic Texts I, p. 36 and pl. 34.3 (No. 1480): temp. Dynasty VI. Provenance unknown; = (?) Southern Upper Egypt: James notes that the style of this piece is "more characteristic of provincial than Memphite work; likewise, 'Iny's principal title suggests that his base of operations was in Upper Egypt."

835. JEA 46 (1960), pp. 62, 64.

836. Fischer, JNES 18 (1959), p. 267(21), in commenting on the
title hrpr pr-hd, "Director of the Treasury," attested in inscriptions from the mastaba of K3(\(\tilde{\iota}\))m(\(\tilde{\iota}\))-pr(w) (p. 233: = temp. the first half of Dynasty V) at Saqqara, says: "The title seems...to be unparalleled in precisely this form, supervisors of the pr-hd generally having the rank of Imy-\(\tilde{\iota}\), šmd, or Imy-h-\(\tilde{\iota}\)...". In the case of an overlap between bearers of the titles Imyr(\(\tilde{\iota}\))m(\(\tilde{\iota}\))-r(\(\tilde{\iota}\)) Ch, "Overseer of the Palace," and hrpr Ch, "Director of the Palace"--Junker, Giza 3, pp. 178, 175 (\(\beta\).2), 176, 177 (\(\beta\).1): mastaba of N(\(\tilde{\iota}\))-\(\ddot{s}\)-fr-nfr(w) (G 4970); p. 168: decorated around the middle of Dynasty V--it is the father who is called Imy-r(\(\tilde{\iota}\))m(\(\tilde{\iota}\))-r(\(\tilde{\iota}\)) Ch, while his eldest son K3(\(\tilde{\iota}\))-m-fr(\(\tilde{\iota}\)) occupies the position of hrpr Ch.


838. Baer, Rank and Title, p. 297.

839. Helck, Beamtentitel, p. 107 and n. 6; Junker, Giza 6, pp. 18-19 (see Giza 6, pp. 209, 215 fig. 83; 7, pp. 138; 135 fig. 50; 8, pp. 51-2 and fig. 18, pp. 64-5 and fig. 28); Yoyotte, RdE 9 (1952), pp. 145-6. Inexplicably, Černý, Sinai II, p. 14 and p. 61, n. s, states that "...Iemy-\(\tilde{\iota}\)...

840. Wb I 159.10 (Belegstellen) erroneously includes the of stele Bologna Wb No. 2 (\(\tilde{\iota}\))l (temp. MK) among the occurrences of hrpr \(\ddot{\iota}\)3(\(\tilde{\iota}\)w). Here we should understand šhm c = Wb IV 246.20; for this writing, cf. Moret, BIFAO 30 (1931), pls. 1, 3 (foll. p. 913), line 9 [= Rb 111.3]: ....

841. LD II 101a; cf. Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 61 and n. 9 (temp. Dynasty V: Goedicke suggests that źl-df\(\tilde{\iota}\) may be "related to the family of K3nfr" [= Sl.1 below]).


845. = "Overseer of Expeditions": see Junker, Giza 7, p. 161; Fischer, Dendera, pp. 221-3.

847. G 5340 (temp. mid-Dynasty V): Junker, Giza 7, pp. 158, 161-3, 167 (fig. 70); ID II 85a; Goedicke, JFA 46 (1960), p. 61 and n. 8. Goedicke describes K3(ā)-š(w)dš(w) as the son of K3(ā)-nfr(w) [ = Sî.1]. Sî.1 did have a son named K3(ā)-š(w)dš(w) for whom the title (ī)m(ī)-r(3) wp(w)wt is attested: see Junker, Giza 7, pp. 161-3; Junker, however, concludes that Sî.2 is probably the grandson of Sî.1.

848. Bisson de la Roque, Fouilles d'Abou-Rosach (1924), p. 58; Goedicke, JFA 46 (1960), p. 61 and n. 6; PM III.1, p. 5 (F.21: = temp. late Dynasty V, or Dynasty VI; Goedicke says "probably at the end of the Fourth Dynasty"); cf. above, n. 9). For the reading of this name, cf. Junker, Giza 6, pp. 95-6; PN I 340.15, and II 392 (340.15); EAG §473cc; Goedicke transliterates K3hýf. The transliteration WR3.f (so PN I 256.26; cf. PM III.1, p. 5) is surely incorrect.

849. Černý, Sinai, No. 18; cf. Goedicke, JFA 46 '960), p. 64 and n. 1. Černý, Sinai II, p. 64: = temp. Dynasty V or VI.

850. Borchardt, ZAS 42 (1905), pl. 2 (foll. p. 8) = Goedicke, Dokumente, fig. 5 (foll. p. 56); cf. Urk I 209.16, n. f. Included among the unnamed addressees of the Dahshur decree of Pepi I. The split-column arrangement of the text compels us to read "...the Supervisors and Overseers of..." at this point; cf. Borchardt, ZAS 42 (1905), pp. 304. In the photographs published by Borchardt (ZAS 42 [1905], pls. 1-2 [foll. pp. 4, 8]), the forms of the signs I (T 3) and II (U 23) used in writings of the words ēbd and ēmr (= Urk I 205,15, 210.16) are clearly differentiated. Goedicke, JFA 46 (1960), p. 61 and n. 4, and Dokumente, p. 55, admits that the text reads ēbd; but he assumes that this is an error for ēmr. Fischer, Coptite Nome, pp. 28-9, and Dendera, p. 138 (followed by Edel, ZAS 97 (1971), p. 63 [\$]), reads and translates ēmr(w) without commenting on the writing. The combination ēmr (ī)m(ī)-r(3) fš(w)j(ww) is attested in similar circumstances (Urk I 125.10, 127.11 [Hr(w)-hw(ī)-f: ēmr (ī)m(ī)-r(3) fš(w)j(ww) nb], 102.5 [whi: ēmrw (ī)m(ī)-w-r(3) fš(w)j(ww)]), but this is not in question here. Likewise, although difficulty in distinguishing between the signs T 3 and U 23 is encountered elsewhere (see Černý, Sinai II, p. 52, n. c), that also is not the case here. For another example of ēbd misread ēmr (so Goedicke, JFA 46 (1960), p. 61, n. 4; = Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 58.28 = Urk I 209.4), see Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 28, n. 1. For ēbd (ī)m(ī)-r(3) as 'Supervisor and Overseer of..." see Junker, Giza 8, p. 64 and fig. 28 (p. 65). Pirenne, (Institutions II, p. 254 and III, pp. 14, n. 5; 83; 110; 259; 527 17; 626) treats ēbd (ī)m(ī)-r(3) fš(w)j(ww) as a compound title, with ēbd qualifying (ī)m(ī)-r(3): he translates "chief or superior director," understanding ēbd (ī)m(ī)-r(3) as a rank above that of (ī)m(ī)-r(3). Sève-Sëderbergh, Egypten und Nubien, p. 27, translates 'Overseer of Interpreters and Supervisor (? of MdP, 'īm and 'īṛt." As Fischer points out (JNES 16 [1957], p. 227 and n. 22), this translation implies that these three Nubian countries were already subject to Egyptian control; such, however, was not the case.
851. Pirenne (Institutions III, pp. 113, 259, 543 [60]) erroneously attributes this title to Biv. 16 (below).


854. Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 58.28 = Urk I 209.4 (temp. Nfr-z3-Hr(w) = Pepi I). See above, n. 755. Pirenne (Institutions III, pp. 113, 259, 543 [60]) transliterates this title as though it were (i)m(f)-ht R3(ww).

855. See Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), pp. 61, 64; cf. Fischer, Coptic Nome, p. 29. For R3(w) nevertheless described as a title (ref. Uv.1 below), cf. Sethe in Borchart, Sa3bu-re(w) II, p. 87; Gardiner, PSBA 37 (1915), p. 118; Smith, JEA 19 (1933), p. 156; el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 139; Cf I 159 and Belegstellen I 159.8.


857. Urk I 137.4 (tomb of Shb-n w = A.5); the actual arrangement of the text (see de Morgan, Cat. mon. I, p. 147) is based on split-column writing: [see Goedicke, JEA 46 [1960], p. 60 and n. 7, and p. 61; Gunn, JEA 19 [1933], p. 106 [§ 56]; cf. FAG, § 89). For the translation of these elements as plurals, cf. el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 136 and n. 3; Goedicke, p. 60, erroneously translates in the singular: "...any Egyptian (lit. man), any 3, or any Nubian...."

For  as the plural determinative, see Faulkner, Plural, pp. 36-7 (Faulkner wrongly considers the of Urk I 150.9 as a singular: see FAG, § 982); FAG, § 274. For  as a writing of rmû, see FAG, § 53; cf. Faulkner, Plural, p. 35 and n. 2; for  as a writing for rmû, see Faulkner, Plural, p. 35 (= LD II 43c). For the singular  see above, n. 7; for examples of the plural R3(w) nb(w), see
858. Unpublished inscription from the tomb of S̄y-b-n-p (= A.9): based on my own hand-copy, used here with the kind permission of Dr. Labib Habachi. For the physical arrangement of this text, cf. el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 165; el-Dissouky's copy is inaccurate, however, in giving 𓊘𓊥𓊏: this phrase is actually written 𓊢𓊥𓊏, as correctly indicated by Fischer, Copptic Nome, p. 30 and n. 1. Neither el-Dissouky 𓊢𓊥𓊏 nor Fischer 𓊢𓊥𓊏 (cf. Goedicke, JEA 52 [1966], p. 173) precisely represent the writing of the group n(1)t md$\tilde{c}$:

= 𓊓𓊠. This sentence may be translated: "The $\text{fc}_3(\text{ww})$-people whom I had pacified (disposed) along lit.: upon (both) the west and east (sides) of Wawat so that my contingent of soldiers might return [lit.: be brought back] safely." With this translation, compare those of Fischer, Copptic Nome, p. 30 [where $\text{fc}_3(\text{ww})$ is rendered "scout(s)"] and el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 165 [with $\text{fc}_3(\text{ww})$ translated "interpreters"]; Goedicke, JEA 52 (1966), p. 174 [with "foreigner(s)" given for $\text{fc}_3(\text{ww})$]. Goedicke (ibid., pp. 173-4) would transliterate ẖpt(w) n(1), understanding in ẖpt(w) the Old Perfective; hence he translates "The foreigner(s) were peacefully disposed towards (me)...." For these translations of $\text{fc}_3(\text{ww})$, see below, §§ 63-80.

859. Borchardt, ʕâhhu-reć II, pls. 12-13 (pl. 13 is a detail from pl. 12, representing the best preserved ship drawn on a larger scale); cf. PM III.1, p. 328(12). This is perhaps the earliest occurrence of the word $\text{fc}_3(\text{w})$; see also S.1 above = temp. early Dynasty V.

860. Gardiner, PSBA 37 (1915), p. 118, speaks of "sailing in ships to Syria"; and on p. 124, he describes the $\text{fc}_3(\text{w})$-persons as standing "in the very midst of Syrians on their way either to Syria or to Sinai." For the departure of the fleet, however, see Borchardt, ʕâhhu-reć II, pl. 11; cf. PM III.1, p. 328(11). Note that here, insofar as these reliefs are preserved, Asiatics are not represented, and no persons are labeled $\text{fc}_3(\text{w})$.

861. Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 64, describes these vessels as "foreign." That the ships are, in fact, Egyptian is clearly indicated by the hieroglyphs--w$\tilde{t}$ (D 10: the sound uninjured eye of Horus) and Cnh (S 34: the sign of life)---which adorn their prows and sterns. In addition, the details of their construction are discussed by Assmann in Borchardt, ʕâhhu-reć II, pp. 132-61; Faulkner, JEA 26 (1940), pp. 4-7 and pls. 2-3 (foll. p. 6); Landström, Ships of the Pharaohs, pp. 63-9; cf. Boreux, Nautique, pp. 465-88.

862. For Syria as the destination of the fleet, see Gardiner, PSBA 37 (1915), pp. 118, 124. The foreigners in these ships are described as Syrians by Montet in Mélanges syriens I, pp. 194, 195, and the caption of fig. 1 on p. 192, and Smith, Interconnections, pp. 10, 151, and fig.
6 (caption). On p. 150, Smith simply calls them "Asiatics": cf. also Borchardt and Sothe in Šaḫu-reć II, pp. 27-8, 87; Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 64; Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 29; PM III 1, p. 328(12).

863. Montet in Mélanges syriens I, p. 194; Smith, CAH I.2, p. 183; Drower, CAH I.2, pp. 350, 358.

864. Men, women, and children or youths; see Borchardt, Šaḫu-reć II, p. 27; see also below, n. 878. The foreign men are distinguished from the Egyptians by their dress and facial characteristics: the Egyptians wear kilts or simple girdles, have short tight-fitting wigs, and lack facial hair; the Syrians wear skirts, have long flowing hair tied up with head bands, and have short pointed beards.

865. It seems hardly surprising to find Egyptian ships manned by Egyptian crews. That the non-Syrian personnel aboard these ships are, in fact, Egyptian has already been observed by Sethe in Borchardt, Šaḫu-reć II, p. 87; Gardiner, PSBA 37 (1915), p. 118; Smith, CAH I.2, p. 183; el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 139.

866. Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 64, concludes that the Egyptian-looking persons seen on the ships are really foreigners, and that the label š3(w) written above a few of them was intended to designate them all "as 'foreigners' where it was not obvious from their appearance." Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 29 (see also Dendera, p. 139), commenting on the appearance of the persons designated š3(w), says of them that "if they are foreigners, [they] are foreigners who have adopted Egyptian ways," adding that he "cannot prove that the designation š3(w) was ever applied to the Egyptians themselves...."

867. For the peaceful nature of the expedition represented here, see Montet in Mélanges syriens I, pp. 193-5; Smith, CAH I.2, p. 183; Interconnections, p. 150; Drower, CAH I.2, p. 358. For the Syrians regarded as captives, see Borchardt, Šaḫu-reć II, pp. 27-8; Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 29, and Dendera, p. 139 (followed practically word-for-word by el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 139).

868. The various gestures displayed by all the ships' personnel—Egyptians and foreigners alike—seem to represent diverse manifestations of "adoration," described as š3(šw) in the accompanying hieroglyphic legends: for this term, cf. above, n. 617. Note the near identity of the pose of the determinative (A 30) with the attitude adopted by most of the persons on these ships, as well as the large-scale Egyptian crewmen shown giving adoration (rdš š3(šw)) to Sahure in the upper registers at the right of pl. 12.

869. That we need not necessarily interpret this representation literally as the commemoration of an actual historical event, is demonstrated by the discovery of an apparent adaptation of this motif preserved on a single block from the causeway of the Unas pyramid at
Saqqara (unfortunately, no inscriptions connected with this scene have survived): see Hassan, ZÄS 80 (1955), p. 139 (fig. 2); cf. AAA I (1938), pl. 14b (foll. p. 182); Smith, Interconnections, pp. 8, 11, 150, and fig. 9b; Landström, Ships of the Pharaohs, p. 65 and fig. 192 on p. 64. Such a depiction of the arrival of Asians may simply have fulfilled symbolically the requirements of contemporary royal iconography; cf. Drower, CAH I.2, p. 358.

870. Smith, Interconnections, p. 151, mentions "at least eight vessels," without further elaborating on their number; Borchardt, Saâhu-re Sé II, pp. 27, 25, reconstructs the scene as involving twelve ships originally.

871. JEA 46 (1960), p. 64.

872. Ibid.

873. See above, nn. 864-5, 862.

874. In two instances the thumb of a foreigner's right or left hand is shown, apparently accidentally, as though resting against the head of a child standing in front of him.

875. As Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 29, has already pointed out.


877. It is perhaps such an individual who is intended by the lone Egyptian depicted in each of the two ships in the Unas parallel to this scene; it is, of course, possible that there were originally two more Egyptians represented, making one at each end of both ships. Otherwise, as preserved, there is a total of sixteen male Asians, one female, and one child or youth; all except the child—who seems to be holding onto the skirts of two of the adults—have their arms upraised in adoration.

878. Two children in another boat (the second boat in the second register of pl. 12, directly above the best preserved boat) are depicted as though holding onto the skirts of some of the adult Asians, with their left arms extended toward the waists of their parents (?); cf. Montet in Mélanges syriens I, p. 194.

879. Goedicke himself (JEA 46 [1960], p. 63), referring specifically to the circumstances of desert travel, asserts that the "particular services rendered by an interpreter make it improbable that more than one would be appointed for an expedition...." The logical extension of this statement easily accounts for the presence of one interpreter per ship on a sea voyage.

880. For the possible significance of the peculiar gesture described above, if it is not an act of coercion—which seems improbable, inasmuch as it is applied equally to an Egyptian—we may perhaps see in
it the efforts of the more knowledgeable Egyptian crewmen to adjust the
postures assumed by the apprentice or junior seamen and inexperienced
Syrian travelers standing among them.

881. With the variant "Overseer of Dragomans": Gardiner, _PSBA_ 37
(1915), pp. 124-5; _JEA_ 43 (1957), p. 7; _Egypt of the Pharaohs_, p. 96;
Faulkner, _JEA_ 39 (1953), p. 34; Sethe, _ZAS_ 61 (1926), p. 68, n. 1, and
pp. 72-3; Säve-Söderbergh, _Ägypten und Nubien_, pp. 10, 27, 45, 50, 67-8;
Černý, _Sinai_ II, p. 14; James in _FM Hieroglyphic Texts_ I, pp. 25, 36;
Fischer, _Coptite Name_, pp. 27-8, and _Dendera_, pp. 138-9; el-Dossouky,
"Elephantine," pp. 130, 133, 140, 155, 158, 152, 172; Allen, _AISL_ 38
(1921-2), pp. 55, 58; van de Walle, _Cdn_ 22 (1947), pp. 290-1; Vandier,
Mo'alla, pp. 19, 294; Kees, _Orientalia_ 21 (1952), pp. 89, 90, 92, 97;
61, 62(c), 63; Lopez, _Rd_ 19 (1967), pp. 57, 66; Kayser, _Alterthumer in
Hildesheim_, p. 53 (No. 4590); cf. Pirenne, _Institutions_ III, pp. 83,
159; see also below, n. 909.

882. _JEA_ 46 (1960), pp. 61, 63, 64. Citing the Tomas rock-
inscriptions in which "no fewer than eight [(i)m(3)w-r(3) fC3(ww): =
B.4-10, 15] are mentioned together...[in] the successive listing of a
number of contemporary title-holders" (_JEA_ 46 [1960], p. 63), Goedicke
reminds that to translate "Overseer of Interpreters" in such a case
"would require the assumption of a convention of 'interpreters'..., which
can hardly be considered seriously" (_JEA_ 52 [1966], p. 172).
Goedicke is in error, however, in referring here to the "inscription"
(_JEA_ 46) or "graffito" (_JEA_ 52). Weigall, _Antiquities of Lower Nubia_,
p. 108, does not claim that all the inscriptions in which these officials
are named should be regarded as contemporaneous. On the contrary,
the photographs of pl. 57 seem to indicate that they are not even necessarily
closely related physically; the inscriptions of pl. 58, therefore, seem to be arranged purely schematically, for reference purposes
only. Nevertheless, Goedicke's argument is valid; for nine men with the
title 8ps(1) (nf-)swt (i)m(3)-r(3) fC3(ww) [= J.1-9] did accompany a
single expedition to the Wadi Hammamat.


884. Urk I 211.3 [Nhš(i)w-hpt(w) nb] .10 [Nhš(i)w-hpt(w) nb(w)],
212.8 [Nhš(i)w-hptp nb(w)] .10 [Nhš(i)w-hptp (i)pa]. See Borchardt,
_ZAs_ 42 (1905), pls. 1-2 (foll. pp. 4, 8), and Goedicke, _Dokumente_, fig.
5 (foll. p. 56): [Urk I 211.10 gives Nhš as
the writing of the plural determinative here),


886. Urk I 212.10.

887. For this translation of ḫtp(w), cf. Borchardt, ZAS 42 (1905), pp. 7-8, 9, 10; Komorzynski, AAA 1 (1938), p. 46; Säve-Söderbergh, Ägypten und Nubien, p. 27; Goedicke, Dokumente, pp. 56, 63(25); Kees, Das alte Ägypten, pp. 35, 78—all translate "peaceful" or "peaceable [friedlich]. See also EAG, §§ 355N, 1138: "peaceable" [friedfertig]; Fischer (Dendera, p. 140, n. 614, and Kush 9 [1961], p. 76) and Kees (Ancient Egypt, p. 73): "peaceful"; Gunn, JEA 34 (1948), p. 28(3): "pacific"; Goedicke (JEA 46 [1960], p. 63) and Kees (Ancient Egypt, p. 142): "pacified."

888. See Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 63 and n. 5; Dokumente, p. 77; Faulkner, JEA 39 (1953), p. 34. Pirenne, Institutions III, p. 257 and n. 3, strangely regards the (i)m(i)w-r(z) gē-pr [Urk I 102.6] as the commanders of the foreign troops in Wnī's army; cf. also p. 258.


890. See EAG, § 314.

891. Cf. EAG, § 852.

892. The Ṭāji-Libyans are not said to be Nhs(i)w in Urk I 101.16; nevertheless, they inhabited a region somewhere to the southwest of Egypt at this time (see Edel in Äg. Stud., pp. 68-9[7], and fig. 2 on p. 59), and were accessible to the ancient Egyptians through rough the same territory as the Nubians of Iam (see Urk I 125.15-17, 126.1-10: Hr(w)-hw(i)-f; for the reconstruction of this text, see Edel in Äg. Stud., p. 54), so it is not unreasonable that they should have been included here somewhat loosely with the Nubians who certainly made up the bulk of Wnī's foreign troops.

893. For the structural analysis of this text, cf. EAG, §§ 1146, 670.

894. JEA 46 (1960), p. 61. In JEA 52 (1966), p. 174, however, in
considering the significance of the term $\text{fc}_3(w)$ [= Av. 26] as it is used in the tomb of $\text{Pipf-nht}(w)$'s son $\text{Sb-n-f}$ [= A.9], Goedicke asserts that "...there...the $\text{fc}_3(w)$ were not connected with the Egyptians in any way."

895. Coptite Nome, p. 29.

896. Nevertheless, el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 140, persists uncompromisingly in the translation " overseer of interpreters," arguing rather unconvincingly that "such an overseer of interpreters was responsible for one or another of these Nubian countries insofar as the differences in their languages or dialects were concerned." Goedicke, \textit{JEA} 46 (1960), p. 64, errs in the opposite direction in his insistence that $\text{fc}_3(w)$ never meant "interpreter" or "dragoman" in the Old Kingdom; cf. Fischer, \textit{Coptite Nome}, p. 29. Goedicke admits (\textit{JEA} 52 [1966], p. 172) that "a connexion between the speaker of a foreign language and a translator might...be plausible..."; however, he claims (\textit{JEA} 46 [1960], p. 61, n. 1) that at the time of the Old Kingdom the "problem of foreign languages, particularly in relation to the South, was hardly of any great importance. Thus today at Aswan, the majority of the population is bilingual, speaking Arabic and Nubian." Whereas Dr. Labib Habachi has confirmed to me in a personal communication of June 1973 that most Nubian men are bilingual in both Arabic and Nubian--many Nubian women do not speak Arabic--he has further informed me that by contrast, hardly any Arabic-speaking Egyptian either speaks or understands even a word of Nubian.


898. The identification of these "(Egyptianized) foreigners" as "mercenary troops" is clearly implied.


903. \textit{ZAS} 97 (1971), pp. 60, 63(β), and p. 61, n. 15; cf. p. 62, n. 25; cf. also \textit{QH} II 1, p. 90(3).


908. Gardiner, PSBA 37 (1915), pp. 125, 120, 112, 121; JEA 27 (1941), p. 25, n. 4; JEA 34 (1948), p. 17; Wilbour Papyrus II, p. 80; Egypt of the Pharaohs, p. 96, n. 1; Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), p. 61, and JEA 52 (1966), p. 172 and n. 7; Hornung, Amduat II, p. 75(5); Schenkel in Helck, Lexikon I, col. 1116, and II, col. 314; cf. Wb I 3.2; Junker, ZAS 63 (1928), p. 68(e); Caminos, LEM, p. 320, n. (8.1); Vergote, Phonétique, pp. 130, 133; Tresson, Oum, p. 13. This translation explains the use of the three signs ḫ (A 2), (F 18), and ḫ (T 14) so often encountered in writings of forms of the word ḫ-sw: see above, §2 and nn. 22, 24, 40, 53. The abbreviated writing ḫ (see above, §2.12) represents "foreign-speaker" ideographically; cf. ḫ, (see above, §2.7.11), ideographically, simply "speaker." For the combination ḫ, cf. Gardiner, Gramm, F 18; Erman, NAG, §26.

909. With the variant "dragoman": Gardiner, PSBA 37 (1915), pp. 125, 120; Egypt of the Pharaohs, p. 96 and n. 1; Gramm, pp. 556, 506 (S 25); Hornung, Amduat II, p. 75(5); el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," pp. 140, 139; Schenkel in Helck, Lexikon I, col. 1116; cf. Wb I 159.8, 3.1; CDME, p. 39; Jéquier, PSBA 37 (1915), p. 246; Jonckheere, CdE 26 (1951), p. 247 and n. 2, and p. 250 (ref. n. 4); Lefebvre, Grammaire, p. 413 (S 25); PM III.1, p. 328(12); Tresson, Oum, p. 13; Kees, ZAS 73 (1937), p. 82 (2.19); Frankfort, JEA 14 (1928), p. 242(24); du Mesnil du Buisson, Vases, pp. 101-2, n. 6. See also above, n. 881.


912. Gardiner, Wilbour Papyrus II, p. 80; cf. Goedicke, JEA 46

914. JEA 46 (1960), p. 60.
915. PSBA 37 (1915), p. 120.

916. El-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 166, concludes that the $\text{lC}_3$($\text{ww}$) mentioned in Av.26 "are in all probability the interpreters who accompanied [ $\text{s}_5\text{b-n-I}$ ]...or were sent before him to Wawat...": see above, n. 896; cf. Pirenne, Institutions III, p. 113. Fischer, Coptic Nome, p. 30, speaks of the $\text{lC}_3$($\text{ww}$) as "Egyptianized foreigners, who were used...as interpreters..."; and Edel, QH II 1, p. 90(3), describes them as "Egyptianized foreigners...whom the Egyptians were accustomed to take along on their foreign expeditions to serve as interpreters...." It was, however, the Egyptian commanders of the $\text{lC}_3$($\text{w}$)-foreigners who functioned as interpreters (i.e., "speakers of a foreign language") in regard to the orders which they issued to their troops.

917. Fischer, Coptic Nome, p. 30, speaks of the $\text{lC}_3$($\text{ww}$) as "Egyptianized foreigners, who were used...as...foremen of mercenaries ..."); but the $\text{lC}_3$($\text{ww}$) themselves were the "mercenaries," while their "foremen" were Egyptians.

918. See above, § 2.4.

919. Junker, $\text{zn}_3$ 63 (1928), pl. 2 (foli. p. 52):

\[ \text{zn}_3(w) \]


$\text{zn}_3$($w$) ($\text{ntw}$) [cf. PAC, §§ 101, 101N; Fischer, JARCE 3 (1964), pp. 123-4] $\text{pr-}\text{C}_3(t)[\text{for the word-order of the elements of this title, cf. PAC, §§ 100, 179; see also the variant writing cited in Junker, p. 65 (ref. n. 2: Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara (1905-1906), pl. 14)) hpr mnhm $\text{lC}_3(w) mw m-bpw ntn(t)f.t.}$. For the date of this inscription--temp. late Old Kingdom--see PM III.1, p. 137; cf. Junker, p. 59.

920. Cf. Wb I 107.14; PT 31a-117c (passim); OM Scenes 55 II a-m, 50d-1, 62c-k, and passim.

921. As pointed out to me by Edward Brovarski.


923. PT 30b, and OM Scene 26a; see Otto, OM II, pp. 5-6, 17-18, 80-1. Harris, Lexicographical Studies, p. 58, p. 166 and n. 6, and p. 167, describes the ntr(t)-instrument as a "block," and assumes that its material must have been other than iron.

924. PT 13c, 14a; OM Scenes 26f, i and 46d, g. Although Harris,
Lexicographical Studies, p. 58 and nn. 7 and 14, and p. 166 and n. 11, describes the material of the mšhtw as iron ("meteoric iron": ibid., pp. 59-60; cf. p. 53 and n. 9), he assumes that the equivalent biš pr(ī) m štš = (PT 14a, and OM Scence 261, 46g) was not iron.

925. Bjorkman, Meteoritics 8 (1973), pp. 124-5(2, 4); Wainwright, JEA 18 (1932), p. 7 and n. 5; Lucas, Materials, p. 239 and n. 3.

926. For the iron "amuletic eye set in a gold bracelet" recovered from the tomb of Tutankhamun, see Lucas, Materials, p. 239 and n. 2 ("Whether [this is also] of meteoric iron...is not known, since an analysis has not yet been made.") It is conceivable that "nhšš was engaged in the manufacture of such an amulet for the use of one of the rulers of Dynasty VI.

927. Cf. CDME, p. 196.

928. The noun mššm is an m-formation (Goedicke, JEA 52 [1966], p. 173; see also Junker, ZÁS 63 [1928], pp. 67-8[d]; cf. FAG, § 256) based on the root ššm, "to pound or crush" (Wb. med., p. 785; CDME, p. 238). El-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 139, translates "controller of the pharmacists," understanding hrp mššm(w).

929. Cf. Junker, ZÁS 63 (1928), p. 68(e): "the (hidden) fluids"; Jonckheere, CdvE 26 (1951), p. 247: "the (hidden) liquids (i.e., the humors)."

930. The form nntš(ī) is here taken as the feminine of the nominalized adjective in -ī derived from the noun nntš, later attested as nntš, (cerebral) "membrane" (Wb. med., p. 490; Lefebvre, Parties du corps, §§ 11, 29; = Wb. II 356.12) > "diaphragm" (Lefebvre, Parties du corps, § 29; Grapow, Anatomie, p. 67 n. 6; = Wb. II 356.11). Cf. Goedicke, JEA 52 (1966), p. 173: Goedicke translates "abdominal cavity"; followed by el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 139. This word is probably related to nntš (= Wb. II 357.11; cf. FAG, § 61), for which a meaning ("membrane;">skin or hide" would be most appropriate: cf. Sethe, Komm. V, p. 293 (ref. PT 1363b). For the sense of mw m-hnw nntš(ī), compare the paraiel expression mw n(y)w [see FAG, §§ 286, 286N, 286N] ãt, "the fluids of the belly": Wb. med., p. 359; cf. Junker, ZÁS 63 (1928), p. 68(e).

931. So translated by el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 139.


933. See above, n. 896.


935. Cf. el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 139: "...in [this] instance the term [nšš(w)]...is connected with a particular operation
probably made during the embalment."

936. Goedicke, JEA 52 (1966), p. 173, concludes that the use of $\mathfrak{f}_c^3(w)$ in this context serves to "strengthen the proposed rendering 'foreigner.'" However, "foreigner" is clearly inappropriate here; and $\mathfrak{f}_c^3(w)$ is not attested elsewhere as an adjective with the meaning "foreign."

937. See below, § 88.


940. See further below, § 88.

941. Goedicke, JEA 46 (1960), pp. 63, 64; Schenkel in Helck, Lexikon I, col. 1116.


948. For the association of the $\mathfrak{f}_c^3(w)$ with the Tubh-Nubians in the autobiographical inscription of Wnf, see above, § 61 and n. 892. The constructions $\mathfrak{f}_c^3(ww)\, nb(w)\, n(\bar{iw})\, \text{hést}\, nb(t)\, (= B.4)$ and $\mathfrak{f}_c^3(ww)\, [nb(w)\, n(\bar{iw})]\, \text{hést}\, nb\,(t)\, (= Q1.2)$ are to be understood as "all the Egyptianized Nubians of every (Nubian) country"; for hést nb(t) as "every (Nubian) country," see Abu Bakr and Oving, MDAIK 29 (1973), p. 127, n. 97.
949. Cf. Edel in *Ag. Stud.*, fig. 2 on p. 59, and p. 63. On his third journey to Mend, br(w)-tj(w) (-A.1) left the Nile in the Thinite nome (see Edel in *Ag. Stud.*, pp. 62-3, 73-4 and fig. 3; Fischer, *WZKM* 57 [1961], p. 75, n. 38; Dendera, p. 141 with n. 621, and p. 12, n. 56; *JNES* 16 [1957], p. 227 and n. 21; cf. *JAOS* 74 [1954], pp. 31, 34; Kees, *Orientalia* 21 [1952], p. 90, n. 3; see also Dixon, *JEA* 44 [1958], p. 44 and nn. 8-10) and then followed the "oasis road" (*Urk* I 125.14) to his destination. For Nubian encroachments into the Thinite area "though the oasis routes of the western desert...towards the end of the Eighth Dynasty," see Fischer, *Coptite Nome*, p. 71; see also Dendera, p. 141 and n. 620; *JNES* 16 (1957), p. 227. For W3w3t(y)w and M3(y)w referred to--probably as mercenaries--in a fragmentary inscription from Naqada, see Fischer, *Coptite Nome*, pp. 70-1 (22: temp. IIIP; ibid., pp. 50, 71: possibly to be dated as early as Dynasty VIII).

950. See below, §§ 82, 85.

951. See below, § 87.

952. In the tomb of cnh(y)-f(y) at Mo'allas the inscriptions mention 3(y)w, and Nubians are portrayed in the paintings; see below, § 86.

953. See below, §§ 75-6.

954. See below, § 90.

955. Note that when the word 3(y)w is used in association with the Asiatics represented in the reliefs of Sahure (= Ur.1), it is not the Asiatics themselves who are labeled 3(y)w, but the Egyptian interpreters who accompany them.


957. Ibid., 107.1, 10-11.


960. Ibid., 101.9: 3(y)w br(y)w S(y)w, "the Asiatics who dwell [lit.: are] upon the sand"; for S(y), "sand," see above, n. 552.

961. *Urk* I 140.17; see Sethen, *ZAS* 45 (1908), p. 10; cf. Newberry, *JEA* 24 (1938), pp. 182-3. One of Hm(w)-htp(w)'s superiors, Trf of Aswan, in his own inscriptions is also associated with expeditions to northern as well as southern countries. An inscription in his tomb at Qubbet el-Hawa names him as a 3(y)w-ntn fr (for the uncertainty of the reading of this title -- = either 3(y)w-ntn or htm-ntn -- see Fischer, *Coptite Nome*, pp. 126-9), based on my own hand-copy of
this inscription; cf. Urk I 141.10: \[\text{[text]}\] = \(\frac{\text{[text]}}{\text{[text]}}\), based on my own hand-copy of this inscription:

cf. Edel in \textit{Ag. Stud.}, p. 64, n. 2; cf. Urk I 141.11: \(\frac{\text{[text]}}{\text{[text]}}\); de Morgan, \textit{Cat. mon. I}, p. 199: \(\frac{\text{[text]}}{\text{[text]}}\), "Treasurer of the God [i.e., the king], who used to bring to him [lit.: the king] the products of the southern and northern countries." In an inscription in the Wadi Hammamat [= Couyat and Monnet, \textit{Hammamat}, No. 35 (pl. 10, and p. 46 with n. 1); Newberry, \textit{JEA} 24 (1938), fig. 2 on p. 183] one of his titles is \(\frac{\text{[text]}}{\text{[text]}}\), "Overseer of All the Southern and Northern Countries." For this form of the sign M 26, cf. Müller, \textit{Paläographie} I 291; see also Newberry, \textit{JEA} 24 (1938), p. 183, n. 5; el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 111, n. 1. For this form of V23/22, see James, \textit{Hekanakhte}, pal. pl. 10; Posener-Kriéger and de Cenival, \textit{Abu Sir Papyri}; pal. pl. 13; Müller, \textit{Paläographie} I 459; cf. el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 111, n. 2. For the use of M 26 in place of M 24, cf. the unpublished tomb of \(\frac{\text{[text]}}{\text{[text]}}\) (= A.9) at Qubbet el-Hawa [in the geographical expression \(\frac{\text{[text]}}{\text{[text]}}\) based on my own hand-copy of this inscription, used here with the kind permission of Dr. Labib Habachi; cf. el-Dissouky, "Elephantine," pp. 124, 162] and the nearby tomb of Sarenput II [in the construction \(\frac{\text{[text]}}{\text{[text]}}\); see Müller, \textit{Felsengräber}, pl. 34; de Morgan, \textit{Cat. mon. I}, p. 155; Kees, \textit{ZAS} 70 (1934), p. 86; Edel, \textit{ZAS} 87 (1962), p. 107; cf. Urk VII 8.16]. For other examples of M 26/25 used in place of M 24, see Gardiner, \textit{JEA} 43 (1957), p. 7 and n. 1, and \textit{Gramm}, M 25 and n. 2; Kees, \textit{ZAS} 70 (1934), pp. 84-6; Sethe, \textit{ZAS} 44 (1907), p. 22; cf. Müller, \textit{Paläographie} I 290 (Golen.).

962. Urk I 134.16: \(\frac{\text{[text]}}{\text{[text]}}\), "Asiatics who are among [lit.: belong to] those who dwell upon the sand."

963. See Sethe, \textit{ZAS} 45 (1908), pp. 7-11; \textit{WB} V 118.3-4; \textit{CDME}, p. 285.

964. Urk I 134.13-17.

965. Ibid., 133.10.

966. Ibid., 134.13: \(\frac{\text{[text]}}{\text{[text]}}\).

967. Ibid., 134.13-14, 135.3-4.

968. According to the Palermo Stone (= Urk I 236.12), Sneferu received 40 shiploads of "cedar" wood (\(\text{[text]}\); therefore from Byblos) in a single year of his reign--incidentally, the same year in which he undertook his highly successful Nubian campaign.


973. Ibid., pp. 62, 77.


975. See above, n. 919.

976. Hassan, *Giza* 6.3, pp. 133(2), 255, transliterates as though simply šbd Nbs(s)lw; cf. Fischer, *Kush* 9 (1961), pp. 76-7 and n. 82. However, N(i)-chn-Hmµ(w) also bore the titles Rh [or (i)r(i) (i)h(wt): for these alternative readings, cf. Goedicke, *MDAT* 21 (1966), pp. 61-2] (ni-)šwt (ni) pr-c3(i) (without honorific transposition in fig. 126 [p. 135], lintel: see p. 133[6]; also abbreviated as Rh (ni-)šwt in fig. 129 [p. 137], right and left jambs: see p. 133[9]), (i)m(i)-r(z) wp(w)tw (ni)šwt pr-c3(i) (fig. 129 [p. 137], right and left jambs: see p. 133[1]; also abbreviated as (i)m(i)-r(z) wp(w)tw in fig. 130 [p. 138], inner right jamb: Hassan does not recognize this variant), and (i)r(i) nbw (ni) hkr(t (ni-)šw(t) (see p. 133[4]; also written defec- tively (?) (i)r(i) nbw (ni) hkr: see p. 133[3]: accepted by Edel, *ZAS* 87 (1962), p. 103, n. 5, as a genuine variant, though reproduced by him erroneously in hieroglyphic type as). Hassan also imputes to N(i)-chn-Hmµ(w) the fictitious titles *(i)m(i)-r(z) wp(w)tw (ni-)šw(t) (ni) pr-c3(i) [= p. 133(13)] and *(i)r(i) nbw (ni) hkr(t (ni-)šw(t) (ni) pr-c3(i) [= p. 133 (5): with shading indicated in the space actually occupied by the which has here been misplaced: cf. fig. 126 [p. 135], lintel--where, however, the is not indicated at all]: accepted as genuine by Edel, *ZAS* 87 (1962), p. 103). The former represents a conflation of the titles (i)m(i)-r(z) wp(w)tw and Rh (ni-)šw(t) (ni) pr-c3(i) in fig. 130 (p. 138), right inner jamb and soffit (for the title Rh (ni-)šw(t) (ni) pr-c3(i), which here curiously runs across both the soffit and the right inner jamb, see immediately above on the lower lintel), while the latter represents a faulty resolution of the titles (i)r(i) nbw (ni) hkr(t (ni-)šw(t) and šbd Nbs(s)lw (ni) pr-c3(i) in fig. 126 (p. 135), lintel.

978. Hassan, Giza 6.3, figs. 126 (p. 135), 130 (p. 138); cf. Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), pp. 76-7 and n. 82.

979. For this date, see Fischer, Dendera, p. 140, n. 614; cf. PM III.1, p. 247.

980. Note that the title (ḏ)m(ḏ)-r(zi) wp(ww)t borne by Nḏ-Cnh-Hmm(w) is also associated with three holders of the title ḫrp ỉc3(ww) at Giza (= Si.1-2) and Abu Rawash (= Ti.1).

981. Cf. Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), pp. 75, 76, 62 and n. 43, and JARCE 2 (1963), p. 36, n. 4, and pp. 36-7 with n. 10; Goedicke, Dokumente, p. 63: Goedicke collapses the two Giza references (see below, nn. 983-4) into "Giza III, figs. 27-28."

982. Fischer, JARCE 2 (1963), pp. 34-9(5), also calls attention to a Southerner (Nubian or Puntite) represented as the owner of a late Archaic Period stele from Helwan.

983. Junker, Giza 2, p. 194 and fig. 28 on p. 182: the mastaba of Ṣšḥ-ḥtp(-tḥ) (for the reading of this name, see ibid., p. 188), temp. early Dynasty V (see ibid., pp. 172-4; cf. PM III.1, p. 149) = G 5150.

984. Junker, Giza 3, pp. 179-80, 170, and fig. 27 (foll. p. 166): the mastaba of Nḏ-ṣwt-nfr(w), temp. early to middle Dynasty V (see ibid., p. 168; see also PM III.1, p. 143) = G 4970.

985. QH II 1, p. 90(3).


989. AAA 1 (1938), p. 46.

990. PIMK, p. 99.

991. In reference to the possible origins of the Asiatics found in Egypt—though not before the Middle Kingdom: see Goedicke, Dokumente, p. 63—as servants of private persons.

992. This is the earliest known occurrence of the word Nh(i); Śwveisöderberg, Ägypten und Nubien, p. 9, erroneously cites this geographical designation as though it were Tš-Zt(i).

993. Urk I 236.10 = the Palermo Stone (ro., lowest register, right-hand year-frame, columns 2-3): for a photograph, see Schäfer,
Annalen, pl. 1; Gardiner, Egypt of the Pharaohs, pl. 3 (foll. p. 62).

994. Or series of campaigns.

995. For this writing of the perfective active participle, cf. EAG, § 628cc.

996. Junker, Giza 1, p. 254 and fig. 63 (p. 252); = FN I 234.21. For the date of this example, see PN III.1, p. 139; = G 4840; see also Junker, Giza 1, p. 251.

997. FN II 376 (234.21).

998. Junker, Giza 1, p. 254, suggests that this name may have been given to a child born at the time a campaign against the Nubians was in progress.

999. For a second example of the name, see Borchardt, Denkmüller, No. 1695 (temp. Dynasty VI).


1001. If not all.

1002. Prisoners also continued to be brought back from the rather rare battles fought with the Nubians during Dynasty VI: see Urk I 133.14-15 (pipe-nht(w): 'iik-ib); cf. Lopez, Rd'F 19 (1967), pp. 51-2 (figs. 1, 3), 61-2 = Inscripciones rupestres, pp. 25, 27-9 (Nos. 27-8).


1004. See O'Connor, "Nubian Archaeological Material," p. 210 and n. 100. This mastaba, belonging to a Nfr-šr(t) t-n-d, is to be dated to Dynasty VI: see Junker, Giza 3, pp. 12-13; the limestone false door from this tomb is now in the Cairo Museum (= Borchardt, Denkmüller, No. 1393), as Ranke, FN I 195.9, has pointed out. O'Connor, p. 211 and n. 102, also signals a Nubian bowl of early C-group type found at Dendera, where—as we have already had occasion to mention (see above, § 70)—Nubians are found in a First Intermediate Period context. See also Fischer, Dendera, p. 17, n. 71.

1005. = Borchardt, Denkmüller, No. 1481; see Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), p. 76 and n. 78. For the date, cf. PN III, p. 231. For the name, cf. PN II 300.16: Ranke reads nhșj'-tn-š-nn; Fischer transliterates šnt-nn. However, the second element of this compound, written 𓊢, is probably to be understood as 'Inni?: for in in Middle Egyptian, see EAG, §§ 1076, 1076N, 1092, 1092N; Davis, Syntax, p. 170; for the name 'Inni, see FN I 38.3-4 (205.9 and 204.17 are probably writings of this same name); cf. Abu Bakr and Osing, MDAIK 29
(1973), p. 112 (194 and J3). The double name is unusual, and may well represent "Cnh't ('s daughter) 'Innī'": see Edel, QH II 1, p. 72( ); cf. EAG, 307N; Gardiner, Gramm, § 85; James, Hekanakhte, p. 139(2).


1007. Or had some characteristic trait or quality which permitted him to be regarded as somehow Nubian: cf. Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), p. 75; cf. also Posenen, Syria 34 (1957), pp. 155-6, for the same consideration in regard to the term Cim, "Asiatic."

1008. In the Old Kingdom exorcism texts from Giza the designation Nhâ(ī)/Nhâ(ī)t is used to distinguish partially (?) Egyptianized Nubians (those bearing Egyptian names) from proper Egyptians: see Abu Bakr and Oising, MDAIK 29 (1973), pp. 115-6.

1009. No semantic connection has been demonstrated between this root and the ḫ̄-garment; see above, n. 56.


1011. In the literal meaning of βαρβάρος βαρβάρος iβέν.

1012. By this translation we intend to refer to the ḫ̄(w) only as Nubians in Egyptian employ, whether as mercenaries, servants, or in any other capacity. Nevertheless, the use of the term "Egyptianized" conveys certain other implications. The large group of Nubians captured by Sneferu must have been purely Nubian in culture when they first were transported to Egypt. Thus subdued and resettled, however, they rapidly lost their ties with their old Nubian homeland. Probably treated as slaves at first, as they and their descendants came to play a more important role in Egyptian society, and consequently became more familiar with the Egyptians, they seem to have adopted certain Egyptian ways. The extent of this acculturation is perhaps indicated by the fact that some of them bear Egyptian names; and they may have learned to speak the Egyptian language (though quite possibly with a recognizable accent). Far more significant, however, is the almost total lack of Nubian artifactual material which may be associated with the ḫ̄(w); see above, § 76 and n. 1004. The explanation for this phenomenon may lie in the fact that when evidence is found for "Nubian" (Nhâw) burials in the Gebelein region during the First Intermediate Period, they seem to have been buried there in the Egyptian fashion; see below, § 85; cf. also above, n. 982. These features would have distinguished the ḫ̄(w) from the Nubians still dwelling in Nubia at the time. Nevertheless, the ḫ̄(w) seem to have preserved their own Nubian style of dress (see below, § 85), and they never lost their reputation as skilled archers and desert warriors or hunters.

1013. Or languages. Cf. above, n. 916.
1014. Cf. the wealth of material contained in the Old Kingdom
ejection texts from Giza, dated to the year after the 5th census
(temp. Pepi II): Abu Bakr and Oising, **MDAIK** 29 (1973), pp. 131, 133 and
n. 129; cf. pp. 97, 99. The magical purpose of these texts was to ward
off the consequences of some actual or potential danger posed by a

group of associated (?) Egyptians and Nubians (ibid., pp. 128-30). In-
dividual Nubians (designated Nhē(f)/Nhē(f희 or bearing non-Egyptian
names: ibid., pp. 115-6) are mentioned by name, along with five Nubian
troop commanders (ibid., pp. 116, 101.17; = (i)m(f)-r(5) šmw(t): for
this title, cf. **Urk** I 133.13, 134.10 [see Gunn, **JEA** 19 (1933), p. 106
(f56) = Pīp²-nht(w): 'Išk-ḥb; for the final -t in šmw(t), cf. Fischer,
Kush 9 [1961], p. 77; **JAOS** 81 [1961], p. 423) and a Nubian chieftain
(= ḫšt ḫst: for this reading, see above, n. 726) and his wife (Abu
Bakr and Oising, pp. 116, 112).

1015. Egyptianized Asiatics (for this phraseology, cf. Hayes,
**PLMK**, pp. 93, 102) are not found in Egypt until the Middle Kingdom: see
above, n. 991; nor were Asiatics employed by the Egyptians at Sinai un-
til the Middle Kingdom: see below, § 90. Asiatics (Cšmw) are not
mentioned in the execution texts before the Middle Kingdom: see Abu

1016. The Tmh-Libyans are not mentioned in the execution texts
before the Middle Kingdom: see Abu Bakr and Oising, **MDAIK** 29 (1973), p.
127 and n. 99; for Egyptian relations with the Tmh-Libyans during
Dynasty VI, see above, § 61 and n. 892. Moreover, according to the
Palermo Stone (= **Urk** I 237.13), Sneferu did bring back 1100 Tmh-
Libyan prisoners from a campaign he waged in the west.

1017. It is probable that two different vocalization and accent
patterns were involved here: cf. above, § 51.

1018. Koehler and Baumgartner, **Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti
Libros**, p. 702. From English literature may also be cited Eeyore in
A. A. Milne's *Winnie the Pooh*.

1019. Used only of Egyptians and Egyptian gods; see below,
§ 95.

1020. With the variants "Caravan Conductor," "Caravan Leader,"
"Caravan Director," "Caravan Chief," and "Director of Expeditions":
Borchardt, **ZAS** 42 (1905), p. 4 ("Karawanken(?)-vorsteher"); Breasted, **ARE**
I, §§ 312, 332, 334, 336, 343, 351, 356, 360; Faulkner, **JEA** 39 (1953),
14 (cf. p. 100 and n. 67: ref. ḥr p(3)(ww), and **Verwaltung**, p. 200;
Pakhry, **Wadi el Hudi**, pp. 19, 44, 60, 93; Habachi, **Archaeology** 9
(1956), p. 13; Pirenne, **Institutions**, pp. 133, 219, 254; III, pp. 7,
14 (n. 5), 83 (n. 9), 107, 110, 113, 127-9, 197-8, 200-4, 207, 231,
39, 259 ("conduite de caravanes"); III, p. 110 ("chef de caravanes");
III, pp. 110, 257 ("directeur de expéditions"); de Wit, **Cd'E** 31 (1956),
p. 96(10); Piotrovsky in Fouilles en Nubie (1961-1963), p. 135. Firenne also occasionally renders "director of interpreters or of caravans" (III, pp. 14, 550, 626) or, more specifically, "director of interpreters (of a caravan)" (III, pp. 112-3, 483, 565), combining two separate translations. Helck,Beamtentitel, p. 115, translates "Overseer of Caravan Leaders," intertwining "Overseer of Caravans" with the equivalent "Caravan Leader."


1024. BNAutique, p. 473 and n. 5; p. 134 and n. 6. Boreux regarded the more usual translation, "interpreter," as a development somehow related ("une idée un peu analogue") to this suggestion concerning the word ERIC.

1025. BIFAO 13 (1917), pp. 143-4: "By accepting 'scholar' as the primary sense...we are enabled to get a much clearer view of the sense development. It is quite in accordance with the laws of language that a word meaning 'scholar' should come to be used in the specialised sense 'dragoman, interpreter,' from which could arise the meaning 'speaker of a foreign language' and hence 'foreigner.'"

1026. Copitice Nom, p. 30. Fischer concludes that the F3(ww)
"were used...as scouts, spies, agents, couriers...." El-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 166, struggling to reconcile this conception with a more familiar one, depicts the F3(ww) of Sib.n-I (Av.26), for instance, as "the interpreters who accompanied [S3b.n-I]...or were sent before him to Wawat to scout the roads and the deserts in order to safeguard his army against any sudden attack."

1027. Faulkner, Coffin Texts I, p. 60 (ref. CT I 276a): perhaps representing a blend of "scout" and "dragoman"; see further below, § 95.

1028. BD (1974), p. 286: certainly inspired by the translation "foreigner"; see further below, § 95, and nn. 1193, 1195.

1029. The other ranks attested for the officials associated with the F3(ww) in the Old Kingdom—hrp, šbd, (f)m(f)-ht, and hr(f)—find no counterpart in the First Intermediate Period, evidently indicating a simplification of administrative structure. The title šbd(f) (nl-)šwt (see above, § 53) does not survive the end of the Old Kingdom: see Fischer, JAOs 81 (1961), p. 423.

1030. As in the Old Kingdom, the title F3 does not yet occur in this period; cf. above, § 56.
1031. Two funerary inscriptions, presumably from his tomb (exact location unknown). For the more famous of the two, see Goedicke, *JNES* 19 (1960), fig. 1 on p. 288 (photo) = Allen, *AJSL* 38 (1921-2), p. 56 (reversed: photo of a squeeze); the present location of this piece is unknown. For Gebelein as the provenance of this piece, see Goedicke, *JNES* 19 (1960), p. 291; Fischer, *Kush* 9 (1961), p. 45, n. 3 (12). The second stele has recently been published in a photograph: see Keyser, *Altertümer in Hildesheim*, No. 4590 (fig. 33).

1032. In the case of the Hildesheim fragment (No. 4590), Keyser, *Altertümer in Hildesheim*, p. 53, inexplicably translates this title as "Overseer of the House" ("Heuervorsteher"). My own collation of this inscription shows the following: 

\[ \text{combination of the titles } (\overline{r})m(\overline{r})-r(\overline{z}) \text{ and } (\overline{r})m(\overline{r})-r(\overline{z}) \text{ in Old Kingdom, see above, A.4, B.15; cf. B.14. See also below, Wa.1 and } \text{Xa.1.} \]

1033. Vandier, *Mo'alla*, pp. 162 (I ω1), 185 (II ω1), 220 (IV 2), 232 (V ω1), 256 (VII 1). Goedicke, *JEA* 46 (1960), p. 62, includes ʿnḫtīff in his list of holders of the title (i)m(\overline{r})-r(\overline{z}) \text{ during the Old Kingdom.} \]

1034. Vandier, *Mo'alla*, pp. 162 (I ω1), 186 (II 3), 198 (II 54), 220 (IV 2; cf. IV 21), 242 (VII 2), 256 (VII 1), 257 (inscr. 16.3), 258 (inscr. 16.4: restored), 261 (inscr. 16.14).

1035. Ibid., pp. 162 (I ω1), 185 (II ω1), 220 (IV 2), 232 (V ω1), 256 (VII 1). For the combination of the titles (i)m(\overline{r})-r(\overline{z}) \text{ in Old Kingdom, see above, A.8, A.9; cf. also A.4, A.1, A.3, A.5, B.14.} \]

1036. Clere and Vandier, *TPPI*, §11; temp. the Theban nomarch \( γn(\overline{r})-(\overline{t}) \text{t(\overline{r})} \cdot \phi \) at the very beginning of Dynasty XI.

1037. Ibid., §18, lines 1-2, 7; §19, line 2; temp. Wšb-Cnh:

\( γn(\overline{r})-(\overline{t}) \text{t(\overline{r})} \cdot \phi \). Dšrt had a military career: in §18, line 3, he relates that he fought against the forces of the Heracleopolitans in the region of Abydos (Ch3·n(\overline{r}) hns pr H(t)y m tnt(\overline{r}) t n(y) t Tny). For this title written (i)m(y)-r(\overline{z}) \text{ in Old Kingdom, see above, A.8, A.9; cf. also A.4, A.1, A.3, A.5, B.14.} \]
lines 1-2; §19, line 2), see above, n. 53; the variant spelling without the plural strokes (§18, line 7), is probably due merely to lack of space: cf. Petrie, *Qurneh*, pls. 2-3 (lower).

1038. For the restoration of this word, see below, §87.

1039. For the reading of this word and its interpretation, see below, §87.


"The segments of Mrτri's frieze inscription...are obscured by numerous lacunae and by the uncertainty of the sequence.... The sequence follows Griffith's reconstruction of the text in [Petrie, *Denderah*], pl. 25B, 1t; which is a rearrangement of the order in which the stones were found (see [ibid.,] pp. 16, 48). Due allowance must be made for the possibility that sections are missing."


1044. For the reading of this word, see below, §88.


1047. For bꜰk as "to make serve," see Wb I 427.12: to the examples cited in Belegstellen, add Urk IV 282.12: bꜰk-t ḫswt; Fischer, *Coptite Nome*, p. 113, fig. 16(b), line x + 10 = Habachi, *MDATK* 19 (1963), p. 29, fig. 10: bꜰk-t(w) ḫḏf-tp ḫl(w)... Habachi, *MDATK* 19 (1963), p. 22, fig. 6 (cf. Sāve-Söderbergh, *Ägypten und Nubien*, p. 55 and n. 1): bꜰk Nhs(y)w... ḫn ḫr(w)... For the construction bꜰk n, cf. Urk IV 83.5-7.
1048. For a nearly contemporaneous writing of this word, see Anthes, Hattub, pl. 16 (No. 16, line 6): \[\text{\begin{figure}[h]
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=1in]{image1.png}
\end{center}
\end{figure}}\] (temp. Dynasty X: \[\text{\begin{figure}[h]
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=1in]{image2.png}
\end{center}
\end{figure}}\] Fischer, Coptic Nome, p. 71). Note that in this writing \(\text{(T 14)}\) is found in the place of the \(\text{(N 25)}\) of \(\text{\begin{figure}[h]
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=1in]{image3.png}
\end{center}
\end{figure}}\) of \(\text{\begin{figure}[h]
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=1in]{image4.png}
\end{center}
\end{figure}}\) text. See also Fischer, Coptic Nome, pl. 20 (No. 22): \[\text{\begin{figure}[h]
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=1in]{image5.png}
\end{center}
\end{figure}}\] (for the date of this piece, see above, n. 949). Both these inscriptions evidently refer to Nubians from Wawat serving as mercenary troops: see Fischer, Coptic Nome, p. 71.

1049. JNES 19 (1960), p. 290(m). He believes that this indicates "that the latter and not the district were subject to taxation"—by which he may be suggesting that a personal tax or a head tax might have been imposed by the Egyptians on the inhabitants of Lower Nubia individually; or perhaps he has in mind the imposition of a tax based on population rather than land holding (a property tax) or land use (e.g., agricultural production).

1050. Ibid., p. 291(n).

1051. Ibid., p. 289.

1052. Ibid., p. 291(n). Cf. also p. 290(m): "The taxation seems historically interesting since it possibly implies that \(\text{\begin{figure}[h]
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=1in]{image6.png}
\end{center}
\end{figure}}\) and presumably also other Nubian territories were at some time not paying taxes to Egypt"; and p. 291: "...it is interesting to note that the Thebans took up the old royal policy against Nubia of extending a kind of dominion, which appears to have been interrupted for a certain period."

1053. Ibid., p. 291(m).

1054. AJSL 38 (1921-2), pp. 55, 60.

1055. Ibid., p. 60.


1057. Ibid., p. 53.
1058. Ibid., p. 77.
1061. "Ägypten und Nubien, p. 45.
1062. Ibid., pp. 45, 55; cf. ibid., p. 61.
1063. Polotsky, II. Dynastie, § 85c.β.
1066. Schenkel, MHT, p. 116(83).
1067. Male and female: Mḏy(w), Mḏy(w)t.
1068. Smither, JFA 31 (1945), p. 9 and pl. 5.8-9.

1069. For the construction bšk n, "to serve," see Wb I 427.1-2 and CDEE, p. 78; cf. especially Urk III 87.15: bšk.n n.f, used of an army serving its lord. To these examples add Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 113, fig. 16(b), line x + 6 = Habachi, MDAIK 19 (1963), p. 29, fig. 10: bšk.sn n.f, used of foreign territories (wššt and whšt) serving the Egyptian king; Volten, Politische Schriften, p. 41 = "The Instructions for King Herikare," lines 82-3: šbtp n.f Imn (y)t ml-kd.s r-mn-m pdšwt n(yw)t 8(ī) bšk-sn n.s, "I pacified the whole west as far (north) as the coastal plain (lit.: the marshy flatlands), so that they (now) serve her [ref. niwt(ī), line 81]."

1070. See Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), p. 44, n. 2: "...the name Gebelein is used for the sake of convenience to refer to the region on the west bank between Gebelein itself and Rizaqat, about 10 km. downstream."

1071. Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), p. 77, consonant with his view of the forceful subjugation of Lower Nubia during the First Intermediate Period, comments that "the Nubians of Gebelein were probably themselves the means of this subjection of their former homeland." In fact, "the Nubians of Gebelein" were ḫm's Wššt(y)n.

1072. Berlin 24032. See Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), pp. 45-6: "The date is not much earlier than the Xth Dynasty, more or less contemporaneous with the Mo'allā inscriptions...."

1073. For this provenance, see ibid., p. 44 and n. 5 (p. 45).
1074. Ibid., p. 47, fig. 1, lines 5-6.
1075. For this interpretation of the word written 

, see ibid., pp. 48, 52-3(m). See also Fischer, Dendera, p. 139(c).

1076. Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), p. 44; Fischer (ibid., p. 52 [m]; pp. 76-94[7]) speaks of a Nubian colony at Gebelein. See also Fischer, Dendera, p. 140(h).


1078. See ibid., pls. 11-13 (foll. p. 64) and pp. 57 (fig. 3: = pl. 11), 60 (fig. 4: = pl. 13b); cf. ibid., p. 56. Fischer (ibid., p. 77) remarks that it "seems likely that the Nubians enjoyed considerable prestige among the Upper Egyptians at Gebelein on account of their prowess as hunters and warriors...."

1079. MFA 03.1848: ibid., pl. 11 (foll. p. 64) and fig. 3 (p. 57). For the uncertainty about the reading of this name, see ibid., p. 57, n. 20.

1080. Turin Suppl. 1270: ibid., pl. 13a (foll. p. 64). His wife is named Ngs(y)t.

1081. University of California, Cat. 6-19911: ibid., pl. 12b (foll. p. 64).

1082. Leiden F 1938/1.6: ibid., pl. 13b (foll. p. 64) and fig. 4 (p. 60). For the reading of this name, cf. Gardiner, Gramm, § 62; Gramm. med., § 7.

1083. Turin Suppl. 1273: Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), pl. 12a (foll. p. 64). For the uncertainty about the reading of this name, see ibid., p. 61, n. 34.

1084. Ibid., p. 44.

1085. Ibid., p. 77.


1087. Vandier, Mo'alla, pp. 53. 57-9, 96-8; fig. 8 on p. 56; pl. 26 (= Fischer, Kush 9 [1961], fig. 6 on p. 65; cf. p. 63).


1089. See ibid., p. 63 and fig. 5 on p. 64; p. 77.
1090. No. 110 at Qubbet el-Hawa (unpublished); excavated by Dr. Labib Habachi.


1092. See also Edel, *ZAS* 100 (1974), p. 6: a bowl found during Edel's excavations at Qubbet el-Hawa is decorated with a representation of a black-skinned Nubian hunter; the date and context are not specified.


1097. For this name, see *PN I* 164.17; for its formation, see above, n. 10.


1099. For the Nubian mercenary *Thm[H]w* in the service of Nebhepetre-Mentuhotep, see ibid., p. 78, n. 86.

1100. *iw grt s'nh.n(-ī) Pr n(y) 3bw* (Vandier, *Mo'alla*, p. 221: IV 22-3); *iw grt s'nh.n(-ī)...ibw...* (ibid., p. 239: V/31).

1101. Ibid., p. 220 (IV 14).

1102. For the writing of this word, see above, n. 10.

1103. Or "dragomans": *Dendera*, pp. 138-9; *Coptite Nome*, p. 29.


1105. But see below, § 96.

1106. See above, § 61.


1109. Fischer, *Dendera*, p. 139(c).

1110. Fischer, *Dendera*, p. 138, transliterates *Smw·w*.
1111. Ibid., p. 139(c).

1112. Caminos, Hieratic, pp. 69, 32; cf. Gardiner, Gramm, p. 594 and A 33, n. 5; CDME, p. 266; Wb IV 470.

1113. See Gardiner, Gramm, A 33, n. 5; CDME, p. 266; Wb IV 470.2-471.8.

1114. Cf. EAG, § 136.

1115. Dendera, pp. 138-9(a).


1117. Cf. Fischer, Dendera, p. 139(d); cf. p. 138. So also Schenkel, MMT, p. 130.

1118. Dendera, p. 141; temp. the end of Dynasty VIII.

1119. See ibid., p. 138(a); for this sign as used elsewhere in the inscriptions of Mrrt, see Petrie, Dendereh, pl. 8 (bottom mid.).

1120. For this use of tsyw, cf. tsnw n(y) nsw f, "commander of his army" (= "Sin" B100-1); tsnw n(y) hnw, "commander of sailors" (see Budge, Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae, &c., in the British Museum, III, pl. 8: No. 248).

1121. See above, n. 1040.

1122. Fischer, Dendera, p. 140(g), transliterates "swtsw--or &swtswy?" For this formation, see Gardiner, Gramm, § 364; EAG, §§ 234-6, 342; cf. §§ 681.3-5, 682. Compare kswty (see Gardiner, AEO I, pp. 59*-60*), Chswty, Chswty, hwnwt (see ibid., p. 44*), Cbwty (see Wb I 174.2-3), Bswty (see Cerny, Workmen, p. 241 and n. 1).

1123. For the details of the determinative of this word, see Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), pl. 15.b (preceding p. 65). This fragment is now in the Metropolitan Museum (= MMA 98.4.3c): see ibid., p. 63, r. 44.

1124. For the ordering of the elements in this formula, see Fischer, JARCE 10 (1973), pp. 5-9 (esp. p. 7: D.1-2).

1125. Fischer, Dendera, p. 140(g), observes that this word "more likely refers to traveling Egyptians than to nomads."

1126. See above, § 77.

1127. See Fischer, Dendera, p. 140(h): "The fact that the Nhswy-w in Mrrt's inscription are said to be nw b3st might distinguish them from [the] Nubians resident in Egypt...." For a similar statement con-
cerning the significance of the term $\text{Nhs} (\overline{\text{i}}) \text{w} \text{-htpw}$, see Borchardt, ZAS 42 (1905), p. 7: these Nubians were perhaps designated as "peaceable or peaceful" in order to distinguish them from hostile Nubians. Fischer, Kush 9 (1961), p. 63, n. 44, would like to see $\text{Nhs} (\overline{\text{y}}) \text{w} \text{n(y)} \text{w h3st}$ as a reference to "a specific group of Nubians," the $\text{Mdyw}$, though he admits that the evidence for such an identification is lacking.

1128. See above, § 67.

1129. $\text{zînw} (\overline{n}) \text{ pr-C3(i)}$.

1130. See Peet, PSBA 37 (1915), p. 224; Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 29. Read, BIFAO 13 (1917), p. 142, translates "scholar (or skilled practitioner) in a different art": cf. above, § 80; see also Grapow, Kranker, Krankheiten und Arzt, p. 90, and p. 88: "expert in (and practitioner of) the secret art."

1131. For the use of the word $\text{hmwt}$, "skilled craft" in reference to medicine, see Wb III 84.14. Grapow, Kranker, Krankheiten und Arzt, pp. 88, 96, cited further occurrences from the time of Darius.


1133. Cf. Wb I 159.11, III 84.15.


1135. Ibid. El-Dissouky, "Elephantine," p. 139, is more positive: "Notice the sign $\text{q}$ which is well attested in the O.K. as determinative for $\text{wt}$, 'embalmer' (Wb I 379), but here it seems that it is used ideographically with the meaning 'embalming'...."


1137. See above, § 67.


1139. Wb I 378.10.

1140. Gramm, p. xxxvi (p. 539); to these examples, add Clère and Vandier, TPPI, § 27A : $\text{22q}$.


1143. Weigall, Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pl. 50.6-8: cf. above,
n. 53; found "at the North Terminus of the Medīk-Tūmas Road": ibid., p. 96 and pl. 50 (caption); cf. PM VII, p. 52. In(ī) (No. 6) is probably the nickname of In(i)-īt(i)-f (No. 8); No. 7 is possibly of this same In(i)-īt(i)-f as well. If these graffiti belong to the like-named individuals whose inscriptions have been found at Wadi el-Hudi, then their date is temp. Nebtowere-Mentuhotep of Dynasty XI; see below, n. 1144.

1144. Fakhry, Wadi el-Hudi, Nos. 1, 3-4, 4a, 26, 53, 66(?) ; cf. above, n. 53. Nos. 1, 3, 4a belong to an In(i)-īt(i)-f, No. 4 to In(i), and No. 26 to In(i) ... : probably all represent the same individual; Nos. 1, 3, 4 are temp. Nebtowere-Mentuhotep, and No. 4a is associated with an inscription dated to this king.

1145. The tomb of Sarenput I (temp. Sesostris I). Edel, Beiträge, figs. 8, 11 (both reversed); = Urk VII 6.17, 7.2; cf. above, n. 53. Sarenput I was also Imy-r(f) hās(ut) nb(wt) (Urk VII 6.17, 6.5; Edel, Beiträge, fig. 8; Müller, Felsengräber, fig. 5), Imy-r(f) hās(ut) (Urk VII 7.2 = Edel, Beiträge, fig. 11), and hry-sūt n(y) n(y)-sūt m n cf (Urk VII 1.16).

1146. Černý, Sinai, No. 511.2-3; cf. above, n. 53.

1147. The Imw of No. 105N2 is perhaps the same individual at an earlier stage of his career.

1148. No. 511.3.4. As the eldest son—the first of the four sons depicted; also drawn on a slightly larger scale than the others—Mrwy seems to have been permitted to write his name twice: once associated with the name of his father Čnhw, and once with his brothers.

1149. No. 511.5. The ḫb-sign (F 34) seems to have been replaced by the ḫmm-sign (W 9) in the writing of this name.

1150. No. 511.6.

1151. No. 511.7. Probably the same individual in Nos. 510.5, 412N1 (S(i)-n(y)-Wrt), 94b6 ([S(i)]-n(y)-[Wsr]t). 


1153. See ibid.

1154. See above, n. 53, for the references.


1156. Černý, Sinai, Nos. 85N4 (temp. Amenemhat III); 414.4 (temp. Middle Kingdom).
1157. Ibid., Nos. 81.5 (temp. Sesostris III); 24A5 (AIII); 112 Sb14 (AIII); 93Wt (AIII) = 95P2 (AIII) = 981, r, b (AII); 123B2 (AIV).

1158. "Asiatics from (lit.: of) ...": see ibid., Nos. 110W22 (AIII): c3m(w) n(yw) H3m2; 120Nb (AIV): c3m(w) (nyw) Rtnw = \[ cf. ibid., II, p. 19: "20 men of Retjenu"; p. 123: "Retjenu 20" ]; 114Sb (AIII):

\[ c3m(w) n(yw) Rtnw = \] [ cf. ibid., II, p. 118: "from Retjenu, 10 Asiatics" (cf. p. 232 [index]: = c3m); p. 19: "of Retjenu, 10 foreigners (H3sytw: cf. Černý, Achiv Orientální 7 [1935], p. 384: reading \[ ] as a determinative [instead of \[ ] in the same inscription]: 115Wb (AIII?): c3m(w) n(yw) 'Rtnw = \[ cf. for this writing, see above, n. 263]; 85N30 (AIII): c3m(w) (nyw) ...].

1159. Černý, Sinai, Nos. 85N12-13 (AIII); 87Wb (AIII); 92S1-2 (AIII); 112Wb, Sb2 (AIII). Compare the depictions of Nos. 405SE (AIII); 103W (AIII); 115Wb (AIII?); and see further No. 163 (MK), containing three Asiatic names determined by figures of Asiatics (cf. ibid., II, p. 147).

1160. Cf. above, § 78 and n. 1007.

1161. Ibid., No. 87Wb.

1162. Ibid., Nos. 85 (N10-11); 112 (W9, Sb1); 92 (W52).


1165. Goyon, Hammamat, No. 87; cf. above, n. 8.

1166. Green, PSRA 31 (1909), pls. 35, 34 (fol. p. 252) and pp. 250, 253: Nos. 21, 14; cf. above, n. 10.
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