" Sinuhe: Linguistic dissonances "

Andréas Stauder

INTERPRETATIONS OF SINUHE

INSPIRED BY TWO PASSAGES
(PROCEEDINGS OF A WORKSHOP
HELD AT LEIDEN UNIVERSITY, 27-29 NOVEMBER 2009)

edited by

Harold M. Hays†, Frank Feder and Ludwig D. Morenz

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LINGUISTIC DISSONANCE IN *SINUHE* [*]

Andréas Stauder

Introduction

Middle Egyptian written narrative literature is strongly palimpsestic in its earliest phases, communicating with, and differentiating itself from, contemporary written genres.[1] The phenomenon extends to language itself, in *Sinuhe* more than in any other text. The latter composition abundantly draws from a variety of contemporary textual genres and associated higher written registers of language. This results in a heterogeneous performance of language, which, taken as a whole, does not correspond to any individual variety of its time, nor of any earlier period. I here present three simple case studies of such communication with contemporary higher written registers, considering the linguistic selections made by the composer of *Sinuhe* in relation to the intended stylistic and semantic effects.[2]

In approaching the language of *Sinuhe* in the perspective just outlined, the following, related and often combined, dimensions are of relevance: (a.) the salience of otherwise rare and/or unexpected expressions; (b.) the antiquated nature of expressions; (c.) the potential of certain expressions to index ("point to") dimensions of meaning that lie beyond the mere lexical or grammatical meaning of these expressions. Expressions that are salient and/or antiquated and/or indexically loaded are used in *Sinuhe* at structurally and semantically crucial articulations, which they contribute underscoring. Moreover, their (repeated) presence in certain parts of the poem–contrasting with their absence in other parts–contributes defining different spaces within the poem, which are thus made to resonate with each other, semantically and aesthetically.

1. The royal nose: B 237 *fnd=k pw*

A preliminary illustration of the combined dimensions just evoked is provided by the selection of the *pw* demonstrative in the following passage, at the end of Sinuhe's reply to the king: B 236-238 *ꜥnḫ.tw m ṯꜣw n dd=k, mr Rꜥ Ḥr Ḥwt-ḥr fnd=k **pw** špss mrrw mntw nb wꜣst ꜥnḫ=f n ḏt* "People live on the breath of your giving; May Ra, Horus, and Hathor love this Thy[3] noble nose which Montu lord of Waset desires to live for ever!"[4]

---

[1] For literature as a differentiated discourse, R. Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt: A Dark Side to Perfection* (London and New York 2002), 91-98.
[2] A fuller study of the language of *Sinuhe* is in preparation by the present author.
[3] Given the specific constraints of the here adopted translation language, the antiquated nature of the demonstrative is transferred onto the English possessive.
[4] Translation after R. Parkinson, *Reading Ancient Egyptian Poetry. Among Other Histories* (Chichester 2009), 291-292. Alternatively (following Fr. Feder, TLA): "Men live on the breath of your giving, beloved of Ra, Horus, and Hathor. This Thy noble nose which Montu lord of Waset loves, may it live for ever!"

The use of an antiquated *-w* demonstrative, rather than of an *-n* one, recurs occasionally in contemporary inscriptional registers, e.g. Khusobek 8 (*temp.* Senwasret III) *ir.n=i miḥ*ᶜ*t tw s3ḥ.ti smnḫ st=s* "I made this tomb glorified, its place perfected".[5] In *Sinuhe*, the *-w* demonstrative occurs only here and contrasts with *-n* demonstratives everywhere else in the poem,[6] thereby suggesting on internal grounds that the selection of *pw* relates to the high status of the royal "nose". In the preserved external record an almost exact parallel, both for the general phrasing and for the selection of the antiquated demonstrative, is given by e.g. Chapelle Blanche, #180[7] *ḏ.n=i n=k* ᶜ*nḫ-ḏd-w3s r šrt.k tw*[8] *nfrt mrrt.ti*[9] ᶜ*nḫ=s ḏt* "I give you life-stability-prosperity to this Thy beautiful nostril which I desire to be alive for ever".

Both the antiquated flavor and the indexation of the royal participant were immediately available to ancient audiences, as they are to modern ones. In addition, the more specific reference would have been available to at least some members of an elite audience with prior exposure to registers similar to the ones now preserved in Chapelle Blanche. In adapting to *pwy*– common notably in the Book of the Dead–the tradition represented by AOS retains the general antiquated flavor and derived indexical effect, while losing the specific textual communication with Middle Kingdom royal inscriptional registers.

2. Sinuhe's split identity at the apex of his journey: B 149f. *w*ᶜ*r w*ᶜ*r*

The following passage–at the very apex of the poem–features one highly remarkable expression, *w*ᶜ*r w*ᶜ*r* (...)*, s33 s33y* (...). This is discussed first in relation to the densely-woven texture of the surrounding cotext, then for the stylistic register that the expression itself evokes.

B 149-156

*w*ᶜ*r w*ᶜ*r n h3w=f*	*iw mtr=i m ẖnw*	(a)
s33 s33y n ḥḳr	*iw=i ḏ=i t3 n gsy=i*	(b)
rww s t3=f n h3yt	*ink ḥḏt p3ḳt*	(c)
bt3 s n-g3w h3b=f	*ink* ᶜ*š3 mrt*	(d)
nfr pr=i wsḫ st=i	*sẖ3wy=i m* ᶜ*ḥ*	(e)

"A fugitive flees because of his surroundings,[10] yet my reputation is in the Residence;
A creeper creeps for hunger, yet I give bread to my neighbor.
Someone leaves his country for nakedness, but mine are white clothes and fine linen;
Someone runs away because of lack of someone he may send, but I am rich of dependents.
My house is good, my place is large, memory of me[11] is in the palace."

---

[5] To be compared with the more common phrasing of the same formula as in e.g. CG 20538, 2 *ir.n=i grt m*ᶜ*ḥ*ᶜ*t tn s3ḥ.ti smnḫ st=s* (*temp.* Amenemhat III). For the *m*ᶜ*ḥ*ᶜ*t*-formula, W. Simpson, *The Terrace of the Great God at Abydos: The Offering Chapels of Dynasties 12 and 13* (PPYE 5; New Haven and Philadelphia 1974), 10-13.

[6] E.g. R 23 *mš*ᶜ *pn* "this expedition", B 6-7 *ḫnw pn* "this residence", etc.

[7] P. Lacau & H. Chevrier, *Une Chapelle de Sésostris Iᵉʳ à Karnak* (Cairo 1977), #180, 75-76, with note c where the parallel with *Sinuhe* is already noted; sim. Chapelle Blanche #82 (p. 49-50).

[8] Sic. Note the hypercorrect spelling, reinforcing further the effect induced by the selection of the *-w* demonstrative.

[9] *Mrrt.ti* as a spelling for *mrrt=i*.

[10] As argued by Fr. Feder, *h3w* may here have overtones not unlike those Latin *tempus* can have, and may therefore be rendered in translation by the like of "(bad) fortune" (Fr. Feder, 'Tempus und *h3.w* – Begriffe für Zeit und missliche Umstände in Latein und Ägyptisch', *ZÄS* 130 (2003), 213-214). The present translation takes the option of a more literal rendition, in keeping with the veiled, allusive character of the Egyptian text, and in order not to obscure the long-distance resonance with B 2 and B 55-56 (on which see below).

Halfway through the poem, the passage constitutes the dramatic turning point in the overall formal arc,[12] after Sinuhe's fight with the strongman of Retenu and just before his impassioned plea to the king for return (B 156f *nṯr nb š3 wˁrt tn ḥtp=k ḏ=k wi r ẖnw* (...) "Whatever god has fated this flight, may you be merciful! may you bring me home![13] (...)"). Sinuhe finds himself at a maximal distance from Egypt, not only in being geographically abroad, but also in having achieved full successes there, rather than in Egypt as the general framing of the poem as an autobiography should have implied. Yet, in articulating such achievements abroad, he finds no other voice[14] than expressing these achievements in *Egyptian* terms and categories, resulting in a series of strong antitheses. In the first verse, this is underscored linguistically by the here strongly assertive *iw*, pragmatically interpreted as contrastive. Compare (with two otherwise syntactically equivalent situational predicate constructions): (a.) (...) *iw mtr=i m ẖnw* "*yet* my reputation is in the Residence" (antithetic context, *iw*), but (e.) (...) *sẖ3wy=i m ˁẖ* "(and) memory of me is in the palace" (not antithetic).[15] In terms of the overall form, such antitheses are significantly articulated at two other places. In ironic impliciteness, they are foreshadowed in the very beginning of the poem, when Sinuhe begins speaking: R 2-3 *ink šmsw šms nb=f* "I was a follower who followed his master" – which an audience familiar with the poem would have known Sinuhe was precisely not to do.[16] They find an ultimate echo in the very last verses: B 308-310 *in ḥm=f rḏ irt=f, nn šw3{w} iry n=f mitt, iw=i ḥr nswt nt ẖr-nsw* "It is His Majesty who caused it to be done. There is no other vile man for whom the like has been done. I am in the favour of the king's giving."[17]

The passage under consideration is itself bound together by the framing expressions: (a.) (...) *iw mtr=i **m ẖnw*** – (e.) *sẖ3w=y **m ˁẖ***. It is internally articulated by the alternation in how Sinuhe refers to himself, first obliquely, then directly: (a.)-(b.) *wˁr **wˁr*** (...) *iw mtr=i* (...) – (c.)-(d.) *rww **s*** (...) *ink* (...) (see further below). The latter articulation is chiastically reinforced on the

---

[11] Reading as an objective genitive, parallel to B 150 *iw mtr=i m ẖnw*. A reading with a subjective genitive is possible as well: "my memories are in the palace". In either readings, Sinuhe underscores, from different perspectives, that, even as he achieves successes abroad, he has never ceased to have the king, and all values associated and epitomized by the latter, as his ultimate point of reference. I thank A. Gnirs for drawing my attention to that possibility. The ambiguity is possibly intended, and a double reading certainly legitimate.

[12] For the central status of the middle part of *Sinuhe*, also H. Hays, this volume. For the formal arc of *Sinuhe* more generally, e.g. J. Assmann, 'Die Rubren in der Überlieferung der Sinuhe-Erzählung', in M. Görg (ed.), *Fontes atque Pontes: Eine Festgabe für Helmut Brunner* (ÄAT 5; Wiesbaden 1983), 18-41; J.-R. Pérez-Accino, 'Text as Territory: Mapping Sinuhe's Shifting Loyalties', in Fr. Hagen et al. (eds), *Narratives of Egypt and the Ancient Near East. Literary and Linguistic Approaches* (OLA 189; Leuven 2011), 177-194.

[13] Alternative translation: "(...) to the Residence!" (compare *ẖnw* in B 150). Both dimensions are intended, and here identified with each other.

[14] In allusion to Sinuhe's "search for a voice", R. Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture*, 149-168.

[15] For other instances of strongly assertive *iw* introducing a subject-initial construction with full noun subject, and with an inferred contrastive interpretation, e.g. *Sinuhe* B 50 *ntf ḏr ẖ3swt, iw it=f m-ẖnw ˁẖ=f* "He (scil. Senwasret) subjugates the foreign countries, while his father is inside his palace" (the passage articulates one important aspect of *Sinuhe*, royal succession; note the cleft-sentence, which places "Senwasret" under narrow focus). In an inscriptional register, e.g. BM EA 1671 (Heqaib), 9-10 *ink ḥḳ3-ib n pryt, iw s nb ḥr ḥtm ˁ3=f* "I am a ruler of the heart/Heqaib in period of strife, when everybody else closes their doors."

[16] Compare R. Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture*, 150; H. Hays, this volume. For the autobiographical motif alluded to, and ironically subverted, e.g. *šms nsw r nmiwt=f* "who accompanies the king on his journeys" (R. Doxey, *Egyptian Non-Royal Epithets in the Middle Kingdom* (PdÄ 12; Leiden 1998), 114).

[17] As a token of how this final passage could metonymically evoke the whole poem, note the quotation of B 309 *nn šw3 iry n=f mitt* on a Karnak block-statue of Amenhotep son of Hapu, cf. R. Parkinson, *Reading*, 182 and fn. 18.

phonetic level (*ḥ-ḥ-ḥ-ḥ*): (a.) (...) *n ḥꜣw=f* (...) – (b.)-(c.)(...) *n ḥḳr*[18] (...), (...) *n ḥꜣyt* (...) – (d.) (...) *n-gꜣw ḥꜣb=f* (...). In achieving textual cohesion, such formal devices are also strongly meaningful. The framing articulation gives formal prominence to *ẖnw* "Residence" (a.) and *ꜥḥ* "palace" (e.), and thereby underscores one core semantic dimension of the poem, "centrality", right at the point when Sinuhe is farthest away from this. Both ends of Sinuhe's journey are locally evoked: his flight, with fourfold lexical variation (*wꜥr, sꜣꜣ, rwi, btꜣ*); and his ultimate reintroduction into elite (funerary) culture (e.g. (c.) *pꜣḳt* "fine linen"[19]). Among the phrases underscored by assonances, the chiastically central (b.) *n ḥḳr* "for hunger" and (c.) *n ḥꜣyt* "for nakedness" echo the quintessentially Egyptian idealbiographical topoi prominent in Sinuhe's stay abroad, and thus the associated tensions (below, [3.2.]). As to the external phrases, (a.) *n ḥꜣw=f* "because of his surroundings" echoes B 2 (...) *iw=i m ꜥr wꜣ* "(...) as I was in proximity, aside", the initial "misplacement" which sets Sinuhe in motion [App.], as well as (the in context deeply ironic [App.]) B 55-56 *n ꜥḥꜥ.n.tw m ḥꜣw=f* "One cannot keep standing in his presence". The phrase (d.) *n-gꜣw ḥꜣb=f* "because of *lack* of someone he may send" acquires strong resonances if the locations of *ḥꜣb* elsewhere in the poem are considered, always at structurally crucial junctions, and always as a "sending" from or to the king.[20]

Yet more remarkable is how the lyric is introduced, by a stylistic construction entirely unexpected in literary register: *wꜥr wꜥr* (...), *sꜣꜣ sꜣꜣy* (...). As instances of virtuosic word-play underscoring key semantic aspects, tropes that involve two words from the same root are not uncommon in Middle Egyptian literature,[21] including with subject and predicate form the same verbal lexeme.[22] In the present case however, the formulation, although superficially similar, is of a yet more specific different type, and reflects an additional expressive intent. (a.) and (b.) are the first two double verses in a sequence of four in which Sinuhe obliquely refers to himself before doing so directly. The very same patterning[23] is found in the Pyramid Texts,[24] also with verbs of motion. Compare:

---

[18] For the phoneme conventionally transcribed as *ꜣ* probably being an uvular trill (/ʀ/), i.e. a liquid, e.g. A. Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian. A Linguistic Introduction* (Cambridge 1995), 31, 33.

[19] Compare e.g. B 292-293 *sd.kw m pꜣḳt, gs.kw m tpt* "I was clad in fine linen; I was anointed in fine oil."

[20] R 17-18 *smrw nw stp-s(ꜣ) ḥꜣb=sn r gs imty r rdt rḫ sꜣ-nsw* (...) "The Companions of the Palace sent to the western side to have the royal son know (...)"; B 174-175 *wn.in ḥm=f ḥꜣb=f n=i ḥr ꜣwt-ꜥ nt ḥr-nsw* (...) "His Majesty sent to me with presents of royal giving (...)"; B 242-243 *tsw im nty m-sꜣ pḥrt ḥꜣb=f wpwt r ẖnw r rdt rḫ.tw* "The commander there who was in charge of the patrol sent a message to the Residence to let One know". (NB: R 13-14 *ti sw ḥꜣb* (...) is an an interpolation, cf. R. Parkinson, *Reading*, 164.)

[21] W. Guglielmi, 'Der Gebrauch rhetorischer Stilmittel', in A. Loprieno (ed.), *Literature*, 476-479.

[22] In *Sinuhe*, B 215-216 *nb siꜣ siꜣ rḫyt siꜣ=f* (...) "The Lord of perception, perceiver of the Rekhyt, perceives (...)"; in other Middle Egyptian literary compositions, e.g. *Khakheperreseneb* tBM EA 5645 ro. 5 *n dd dd dd dd.ti=f(i)* "No speaker has spoken, may the one who will speak speak." In a non-literary register, but with virtuosic word-play similarly bringing to the fore a key semantic aspect of what is being said, compare the locus classicus: *ḫpr.n(=i), ḫpr.n ḫprt – ḫpr.n ḫprt nbt m-ḫt ḫpr=i* "As soon as I came/When I had come into existence, Being came into existence; every being came into existence after I had come into existence" (pTurin 54065: cf. P. Vernus, 'Formes "emphatiques" en fonction non "emphatique" dans la protase d'un système corrélatif', *GM* 43 (1981), 73-74; Fr. Junge, *"Emphasis" and Sentential Meaning in Middle Egyptian* (GOF IV/20; Wiesbaden 1989), 17, 54; A. Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian*, 197).

[23] The verbal form belongs to a different morphological category in *Sinuhe* and in Pyramid Texts. The parallel is here about the patterning itself.

[24] O. Firchow, *Grundzüge der Stilistik in den altägyptischen Pyramidentexten* (VIO 21; Berlin 1953), 197-198; J. Allen, *The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts* (BAeg 2; Malibu 1984), §305. Also, occasionally, in later funerary compositions, A. Baumann, *The Suffix Conjugation of Early Egyptian as Evidenced in the Underworld Books* (UMI; PhD Chicago 1998), 130-132; D. Werning, 'Linguistic Dating of the Netherworld Books attested in the New Kingdom', in G. Moers et al. (eds), *Dating Middle Egyptian Literary Texts* (LingAeg SM; Hamburg, forthcoming), #30. The possible connection with the Pyramid Text

a) e.g. PT 25 (= Pyr. 17a-c[W,N])

   si si ḥnꜥ kꜣ=f,
   si Ḥr ḥnꜥ kꜣ=f, si Śtš ḥnꜥ kꜣ=f, (...),
   si.t(i) ḏd-k(w) ḥnꜥ kꜣ=k

   "Someone (lit. a goer) has gone with his ka!
   Horus has gone with his ka! Seth has gone with his ka! (...),
   you too be gone with your ka!"

b) B 149-156

   wꜥr wꜥr (...), *iw mtr=i* (...)   *sꜣꜣ sꜣꜣy* (...) *iw=i di=i* (...)   (a-b)
   rww s (...), *ink* (...)   *bhꜣ s* (...), *ink* (...)   (c-d; *variatio* [above])

   "A fugitive flees (...), yet my reputation (...); A creeper creeps (...), yet I give (...).
   Someone leaves (...), but mine are (...);   Someone runs away (...), but I am (...).

Against the poet's otherwise manifest broad recourse to, and magisterial command of, formulations associated with diverse written genres, it is therefore plausible that the formulation in *Sinuhe* may have been indirectly inspired by ritual registers similar to the ones now preserved in Pyramid Texts. In *Sinuhe*, such sequence of oblique, then direct, reference is further recast into the literary "Sonst-Jetzt" schema, and powerfully underscores the character's "Ich-Spaltung",[25] at the height of his journey.

      The poet selects the *wꜥr wꜥr* trope–only here in the poem, and in this form only here in the extant corpus of Middle Egyptian literature–for a lyric that is located at the very apex of the overall arc-form of the poem. Locally, the passage is set against, and contrasts with, the more straightforward narrative of Sinuhe's fight with the strongman of Retenu. In combination with the general elements of denser texturing discussed above, the use of *wꜥr wꜥr* is a deliberate device for intensification, which would have been lyrically reflected in performance.[26] For at least some members of an elite audience, the expression may have further resonated with whatever exposure to similar rhytmicized formulations in ritual registers they may have had.

3. Sinuhe in dialogue with the foreign ruler: B 45, B 114 *ḏd.k(i)*

In two places–B 45 and B 114, both *ḏd.k(i)* "I spoke"–*Sinuhe* has a pseudoparticiple used with an active-transitive event other than the lexical statives *rḫ* "to know" and *ḫm* "not to know" (for which the construction is regular). This construction is exceedingly rare in Middle Egyptian: only six other instances are known in the overall corpus. In standing out of the ordinary, the construction carries considerable salience [3.1.]. It also comes with strong indexical force, derived from its textual associations [3.2.]. The following discussion examines the ways in which the poet exploits such salience and indexical associations in a literary work, *Sinuhe*.

3.1

The active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple with events other than lexical statives is exceptional in Middle Egyptian, and therefore salient when used in *Sinuhe*. As a preliminary illustration, a comparison with the otherwise very similar dialogue situation in *Shipwrecked*

---

formulation is already alluded to in passing by H. Grapow, *Untersuchungen zur ägyptischen Stilistik I. Der stilistische Bau der Geschichte des Sinuhe* (VIO 10; Berlin 1952), 61, who however dissolves such comparison into the broader, and thereby diffuse and inconsequential, type of "Paronomasien".

[25] G. Moers, *Fingierte Welten in der ägyptischen Literatur des 2. Jahrtausends vor Christus: Grenz-überschreitung, Reisemotiv und Fiktionalität* (PdÄ 19; Leiden 2001), 256-257.

[26] For the realization of the passage in a modern performance, compare R. Parkinson, *Reading*, 268-269.

Sailor is instructive. In both cases, a higher-status participant–the Serpent, respectively the local ruler–questions an Egyptian *šmsw* about the reasons of his presence abroad.[27] In *Sinuhe* B 45, the use of *ḏd.k(i)*–rather than some other, more ordinary expression, such as ꜥḥꜥ.n wšb.n=i, ꜥḥꜥ.n ḏd.n=i, or the like–stands out.

a) *Shipwrecked Sailor*, dialogue with the Serpent:
  - 67-69 *iw wp.n=f rꜣ=f r=i,*[28] *iw=i ḥr ẖt=i m-bꜣḥ=f, ḏd=f n=i* ("Who brought you (...)?")
  - 73 [unintroduced] ("You speak to me, but I am not hearing it (...)")
  - 81-83 *iw wp.n=f rꜣ=f r=i, iw=i ḥr ẖt=i m-bꜣḥ=f, ꜥḥꜥ.n ḏd.n=f n=i* ("Who brought you (...)?")[29]
  - 86-88 *ꜥḥꜥ.n wšb.n=i n=f st, ꜥwy=i ẖꜣm m-bꜣḥ=f, ḏd=i n=f* (The sailor tells his story.)
  - 111 *ḏd.in=f n=i* (The Serpent tells his own story.)

b) *Sinuhe* B, dialogue with Amunenshi:
  - B 34-35[30] *ꜥḥꜥ.n ḏd.n=f n=i* ("Why did you come (...)?")
  - B 37 [unintroduced][31] (Sinuhe evokes Amenemhat's death and tells his own flight.)
  - B 43 [unintroduced][32] ("How will this country be without him (...)?")
  - **B 45-46[33] *ḏd.k(i)* r=i n=f wšb=i n=f:** (encomium to Senwasret)
  - **B 75[34] *ḏd.in=f ḫft=i*:** (Amunenshi's laconic response)

In appreciating this out of the ordinary construction of the pseudoparticiple in *Sinuhe*, a look on contemporary inscriptions is illuminating. In the latter, the salience derived from the rarity of the construction is exploited for underscoring major textual articulations. E.g.:

a) Berlin 1204 (Ikhernefret; *temp*. Senwasret III)[35]
  i. (ll.2-9: royal order of mission: *wḏ-nsw n rpꜥ ḥꜣti-ꜥ* (...))
     Among 1sg. past active-transitive events (the king speaking):
     l.3: *iw wḏ.n ḥm=i* (...) "My Majesty has ordered (...)"

  ii. (ll.10-24: Ikhernefert carrying out the royal mission)
     l.10 **ir.k(i)** *mi wḏt.n nbt ḥm=f m smnḫ wḏt.n nb=i* (...) "I have acted in conformity to everything His Majesty has ordered (...)"
       This sentence introduces the second part of the text, and encapsulates all actions of the official subsequently evoked. The latter are then phrased with the regular form: *iw ir.n=i* (...), *smnḫ.n=i* (...), *iw ḫrp.n=i* (...) *iw ms.n=i* (...) *iw sḫkr.n=i* (...) "I acted (...), I perfected (...), I directed (...), I fashioned (...), I adorned (...)". The use of the active-

---

[27] Formal similarities extend to details: in both cases, the Egyptian *šmsw*'s initial reply is unintroduced, while his second turn-taking involves *wšb*; in both cases, the high-status participant concludes with a *ḏd.in=f* form.

[28] For this formulation, compare e.g. *Debate of a Man and his Soul*, *passim*. Further, A. Gnirs, 'Die levantinische Herkunft des Schlangengottes', in H. Guksch & D. Polz (eds), *Stationen. Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Ägyptens Rainer Stadelmann gewidmet* (Mainz 1998), 204.

[29] Note the slight variation in the serpent's reiterated question: *ꜥḥꜥ.n ḏd.n=f n=i*, differing from *ḏd=f n=i* in his first question to the sailor.

[30] R 58 identical with B.

[31] R 59 *ꜥḥꜥ.n ḏd.n=i n=f*.

[32] R 67 *ꜥḥꜥ.n ḏd.n=f ḫft=i*.

[33] R lost.

[34] R lost.

[35] Text: H. Schäfer, *Aegyptische Inschriften aus den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*, vol. I (Leipzig 1913), 169-175. K. Sethe, *Ägyptische Lesestücke zum Gebrauch im akademischen Unterricht* (Leipzig 1928²), 71.

transitive participle–only in l.10–underscores the main articulation, both formal and semantic, of the text. This is also expressed on yet another level, namely layout, with *ir.k(i)* at the beginning of the line.[36]

b) BM EA 574 (Khentemsemti; *temp*. Amenemhat II)[37]
    i. (ll.2-10: general honours and praise by the king)
       Among 1sg. past active-transitive events:
       l.6: (...) *nḏ.n=i iȝt* (...) "(...) I held office (...)"

    ii. (ll.11-14: appointment to inspect temples, trip to Elephantine and back to Abydos)
       Among 1sg. past active-transitive events:
       l.12: (...) *wḏ.n=i nbt wḏḥw=sn* (...) "(...) I ordered the fashioning of their offering tables (...)"

    iii. (ll.14-22: funerary texts)
       l.14, **wḏ.k(i)** *rn=i r bw ḥr nṯr wsir ḫnti-imntiw* (...) "I have placed my name on the place where Osiris Khentamentiu (...) is."
          The active-transitive pseudoparticiple introduces the last section of the composition, thereby underscoring the transition to the more specifically funerary part. It further gives prominence to the dead's name, and to written death[38] "in the place where Osiris Khentamentiu is". Within the overall composition of BM EA 574, the passage further echoes a previous mention of the official's "name" (*rn*), in the first section which was devoted to the official's relation to the king, l.3 (...) *dm rn=i ḫnt mitw=i* "(...) and my name was pronounced before my equals".

In *Sinuhe*, the active-transitive pseudoparticiple with *ḏd* introduces two major pieces, the encomium to Senwasret (B 46-75), and Sinuhe's grand monologue after he is challenged by the strongman of Retenu (B 114-127). In either cases, the selection of a salient and unexpected expression highlights the pieces it introduces. This stylistically parallels the similar text-articulating exploitation of the construction in contemporary inscriptions.

       In addition, a dynamic effect is observed in *Sinuhe* B 45, whereby the literary text differs from inscriptional parallels. The encomium is introduced by a much-elaborated expression: *ḏd.k(i) r=i n=f wšb=i n=f*, contrasting with the previous, mostly unintroduced turn-takings (compare above). The encomium comes as the crowning piece of the first dialogue with Amunenshi, in rhythmical progression: A.'s first question (B 34-36; short); S.'s reply on Amenemhat's death and his own flight (B 36-43; longer); A's second question (B 43-45; short); S.'s reply in form of an encomium to Amenemhat's successor, Senwasret (B 45-76; much longer). The use of an unexpected and intrinsically salient expression in B 45 further reinforces the formal and semantic *Steigerung*. Amunenshi's reply (B 75-78), ironic and laconic, is all the more cutting.

3.2
In further appreciating *ḏd.k(i)* in *Sinuhe*, one additional dimension has to be taken into account, namely the textual associations of the expression.

---

[36] Layout plays a role in other contemporary stelae; e.g., also in reference to the speaker, the placement of *ink*'s in Louvre C1, cf. Cl. Obsomer, 'La date de Nésou-Montou (*Louvre C1*)', *RdÉ* 44 (1993), 103-140.
[37] Text: *HTBM* II, 8-9; K. Sethe, *Lesestücke*, 75.
[38] On "written death" as applied to Earlier Egyptian funerary texts, cf. J. Richards, 'Text and Context in late Old Kingdom Egypt: The Archaeology and Historiography of Weni the Elder', *JARCE* 39 (2002), 76, 85.

In the Middle Kingdom, the active-transitive pseudoparticiple with events other than lexical statives is confined to non-royal inscriptional registers:[39] funerary self-presentations[40] and the related genre of expedition inscriptions.[41] The use of the construction hearkens back to Old Kingdom usages in similar genres:

a) Wadi el-Hudi I, n°14, l.10 (*temp*. Senwasret I)
   in.k(i) im r-ꜤꜢt-wrt
   "I brought it (*scil*. the amethyst) back from there in very large quantities."

   Compare: Hatnub Graffito 4, 5 (*temp*. probably Pepi II)
   in.k(i) im mḫy m mw
   "I brought it (*scil*. a boat) back from there, floating on the water."

b) Djehutihotep, 2-3 (= *Urk*. VII 47, 14; *temp*. Amenemhat II-Senwasret III)
   rḏ.k(i) iwt ḏꜢmw n ḥwnw nfrw (...)
   "I had troops of vigorous young people come (...)"

   Compare: Sabni son of Mekhu (QH 26),[42] col. 4
   rḏ.k(i) f[Ꜣ].t(i)=f in ṯst nt pr-n-ḏt(=i)
   "I had him (*scil*. the body of my dead father) carried by the troops of my own estate."

c) Berlin 1204, 10 (Ikhernefret, *temp*. Senwasret III)
   ir.k(i) mi wḏt.n nbt ḥm=f (...)
   "I have acted in conformity to everything His Majesty has ordered (...)"

   Compare: Weni, col. 10-11 (= *Urk*. I 100, 11)
   ir.k(i) mr-ḳd r ḥst w(i) ḥm=f ḥr=s r ḫt nb
   "I have acted entirely so that His Majesty praised me about it more than anything."[43]

---

[39] Besides *Sinuhe* B 45 and 114, two other (possible) instances of the active-transitive pseudoparticiple are known in Middle Egyptian from outside inscriptional registers: *Amenemhat* §6f and *Mutter und Kind*, Spruch F, V.10-VI.1. In the case of *Amenemhat* §6f, active readings have been proposed, but the passage is passive on grammatical grounds, cf. A. Stauder, *Linguistic Dating of Middle Egyptian Literary Texts* (LingAeg SM 12; Hamburg, forthcoming), §6.1.2.2. Even if active, such usage would be consonant with the analysis made in the present paper: the form would be used at a highly significant juncture in the account of the assassination of the king (cf. above, [3.1.]), and it would contribute to indexing funerary self-presentations (cf. this sub-section), in line with multiple other elements of such inter-generic reference otherwise found in *Amenemhat*. The instance in *Mutter und Kind*, on the other hand, is securely active: Spruch F, V.10-VI.1 *ir.kw rf wḏ-nsw n gb* (...) "I have made a royal decree of Geb (...)" (= N. Yamazaki, *Zaubersprüche für Mutter und Kind. Papyrus Berlin 3027* (Berlin 2003), 24). The date of composition of the text, preserved only in an Eighteenth Dynasty copy, remains unclear, although some details are suggestive of a post Middle Kingdom composition (A. Stauder, *Linguistic Dating*, §5.3.4.2. (iii.)). The use of the active-transitive pseudoparticiple is probably best interpreted here as a frozen expression (with the high-frequency verb *iri*) used as a general token of elevated language in a formal register, and possibly additionally underscoring the status of the item that is thus introduced, a *wḏ-nsw n gb*.

[40] Berlin 1204, 10 (quoted above, [3.1.], (a)); BM EA 574, 14 (above, [3.1.], (b)); *Urk*. VII 47, 14 (quoted below, (b)).

[41] Wadi el-Hudi 14, 10 (quoted below, (a)).

[42] E. Edel, *Die Felsgräbernekropole der Qubbet el-Hawa bei Assuan. Aus dem Nachlass verfasst und herausgegeben von Karl-J. Seyfried et al.* (vol. 1; Paderborn etc. 2008), pl. 9; = *Urk*. I 136, 17.

[43] Sim. col. 9 (= *Urk*. I 100, 10); col. 37 (= *Urk*. I 106, 11) *ir.k(i) mr-ḳd r ḥst w(i) ḥm=f ḥr=s*. Compare also col. 29 (= *Urk*. I 106, 4) *ir.k(i) n=f imi-rꜢ šmꜤw* "I have acted for him (*scil*. His Majesty) as overseer of Upper Egypt."

As the above implies, the genealogy of the here discussed exceptional construction is a purely *textual* one: after a gap in the First Intermediate Period and early Middle Kingdom, the construction is *revived*, textually, in a few Middle Kingdom inscriptions belonging to the very same written genre in which the expression had previously been in use, in the Sixth Dynasty. Similar purely textual scenarios apply to a variety of other expressions used in the same Middle Kingdom written registers, such as the "Old Egyptian past tense *sḏm=f*".[44] With the active-transitive pseudoparticiple, additional confirmation of the scenario is found when the original locus of the expression in Old Kingdom autobiographies is considered. Contrary to the common opinion,[45] the construction does not belong to the regular paradigm of Old Egyptian grammar, and has its origin in the specific textual conditions of Sixth Dynasty "Ereignisbiographien".[46] As such, the construction is *intrinsically* associated to the genre of funerary autobiographies. Its revival in Middle Kingdom exponents of the genre could therefore only be textual itself.

Given the tight textual associations just evoked, the active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple with events other than lexical statives functions as a strong linguistic index of the autobiographic genre itself, in the Sixth and in the Twelfth Dynasties alike. While *Sinuhe*'s framing as a fictionalized autobiography is evoked throughout the poem, notably at its beginning and end, it is strongly textually emphasized during *Sinuhe*'s stay abroad, where it results in the deepest fault-lines (e.g. B 96-97 *iw=i ḏ=i mw n ib rḏ.n=i tnm ḥr wꜣt nḥm.n=i ꜥwꜣ* "I used to give water to the thirsty; I placed the wanderer back onto the road, I rescued the robbed"). This is also where the active-transitive pseudoparticiple is used twice, contrasting with the lack of the same construction in all other parts of the poem. This linguistic evocation of the autobiographic genre—precisely in the place where Sinuhe cannot fashion himself into a monumentalized written death—is strongly dissonant.

An additional dimension relevant for appreciating the selection of the construction under discussion in *Sinuhe* lies with the role of the king in the autobiographic genre. Such role – a major triggering factor in the development of early forms of the genre in the Fifth Dynasty[47] – remains central to Sixth Dynasty "Ereignisbiographien", and still lies at the core of the exposition in

[44] Cf. P. Vernus, *Les parties du discours. Autopsie d'une théorie* (CSÉG 5; Genève 1997), 70-77, and specifically 73-74, with a direct illustration of the workings of such textual genealogy in BM EA 828 (Samontu, *temp*. Amenemhat II). Contra M. el-Hamrawi, 'Alte-Reichs-Sprache und Mittlere-Reichs-Sprache in abydenischen Texten der 11.-12. Dynastie', *LingAeg* 12 (2004), 89-122, who proposes a mixed dialectal and socio-linguistic scenario for this and other expressions occuring in Middle Kingdom texts from Abydos.

[45] E.g. E. Doret, *The Narrative Verbal System of Old and Middle Egyptian* (COr 12; Genève 1986), 61-66; J. Osing, 'Zur Syntax der Biographie des *Wnj*', *Orientalia* 46 (1977), 165-182; and much subsequent literature based on these initial studies.

[46] Such extension of a resultative form to possessive meanings is semantically natural, *given the appropriate textual conditions*. In a nutshell, the active-transitive use of the pseudoparticiple in the Old Kingdom is an extended usage of a regular resultative form. In using the construction, the official – i.e. the tomb owner speaking within the specific textual space of his "Ereignisbiographie" – presents his accomplishments in response to the king's agency as having accrued to himself for his own written death. For the purpose of the present discussion, the textual association of the construction with the "Ereignbis-biographie" and related genres is therefore *intrinsic* from the very beginning, and the construction is specific to the repertoires of these. Detailed discussion in A. Stauder, *Voice and Perspective in Earlier Egyptian* (in prep.; provisionally, *La détransitivité, voix et aspect*, PhD University of Basel 2007); id., 'Composition et rhétorique: l'inscription funéraire d'Ouni à Abydos', in prep.

[47] J. Stauder-Porchet, 'Les actants des autobiographies événementielles de la Vème et de la VIème dynastie', in J. Winand et al. (eds), *Hommages à un collègue distingué* (OLA; forthcoming).

several major Middle Kingdom self-presentations.[48] The royal figure is thus central to the very written genre to which the active-transitive pseudoparticiple is generally associated. The association is a yet more direct one, with the construction under discussion being used specifically for actions of the official in response to the king's initiating agency: exclusively so in Sixth Dynasty "Ereignisbiographien"[49] that feature the construction in their repertoire and still occasionally so in the revived Middle Kingdom usages discussed above. Thus, respectively, e.g. Weni col. 42-44 *hꜣb wi ḥm=f r ḥwt-nbw* (...), **sḥꜣ.k(i)** *n=f ḥtp pn n hrw 17* (...) **šꜥ.k(i)** *n=f wsḫt* (...) *n hrw 17* "*His Majesty sent me* to Hatnub (...); I had this offering table descend *for him* (...) in only seventeen days; I cut this barge *for him* (...) in only seventeen days"; Ikhernefret, *wḏ-nsw n rpꜥ ḥꜣti-ꜥ* (...) *iw wḏ.n ḥm=i* (...) **ir.k(i)** *mi wḏt.n nbt ḥm=f* (...) "*Royal decree to* the patrician and count (...): '*My Majesty has ordered* (...)' I (*scil*. Ikhernefret) *have acted in conformity to everything His Majesty has ordered* (...)".

In *Sinuhe*, both uses of the active-transitive pseudoparticiple are in dialogues with Amunenshi. Although only a "ruler" (*ḥqꜣ*; B 99; B 114), the latter is otherwise stylized as a local quasi-pharao who "installs" Sinuhe in positions (*rdi wi m N*: B 86-87; B 99-101), for whom Sinuhe acts (*passim*) and "carries out missions" (B 117 (...) *wi ḥr irt wpwt=f* "(...) me doing his missions"), by whom Sinuhe is rewarded (B 78-81), and in whose heart he attains regard (B 106-109). Such stylization of Amunenshi as a quasi-Egyptian king is further underscored linguistically by the use of a synthetic -*in*- infixed form in B 75 (*ḏd.in=f ḫft=i*), generally reserved to high-status participants in literary Middle Egyptian, and exclusively to royals elsewhere in *Sinuhe* (e.g. B 243, B 256, etc.).[50]

In pronouncing the encomium to Senwasret, Sinuhe implicitly points to his own problematic situation as a fugitive from that very king.[51] In his later monologue, he is confronted with his own identity abroad, "like a bull of the roaming-cattle in the midst of another herd" (B 118-119 *mi kꜣ n ḥww m-ḥr-ib ky idr*). Yet in both cases Sinuhe introduces his speeches with a construction that is textually associated with a quintessentially Egyptian genre, that embodies core Egyptian values and in which the official's relation to the royal figure often occupies center-stage. Both speeches are addressed to Amunenshi, the *foreign* ruler. In the final section, by contrast, when the deep fault-lines running through the poem would be partially resolved by Sinuhe's reintegration into "centrality", he would address the real (i.e. Egyptian) king via a *sḏm.n=f*, compare: (to the *foreign* ruler) B 45-46 **ḏd.k(i)** *r=i n=f wšb=i n=f* "I on my part spoke to him to answer him"; (to Senwasret, ordinary Middle Egyptian) B 260-261 **wšb.n=i** *st m wšb snḏw* "I answered it with the answer of a frightened man".

Just as the whole encomium to Senwasret, and Amunenshi's laconic reponse to it, the twofold use of *ḏd.k(i)* in addressing the foreign ruler would have sounded contextually dissonant, and deeply ironic, to elite audiences familiar with usages of the construction in contemporary

---

[48] In various ways, compare e.g. Sarenput I, Khnumhotep II, and Khnumhotep III Cf., respectively, D. Franke, *Das Heiligtum des Heqaib auf Elephantine. Geschichte eines Provinzheiligtums im Mittleren Reich* (SAGA 9; Heidelberg 1994), 8-29; 192-215; A. Lloyd, 'The Great Inscription of Khunmhotpe II at Beni Hassan', in A. Lloyd (ed.), *Studies in Pharaonic Religion and Society in Honour of J. Gwyn Griffith* (EES OP 8; London 1992), 21-36; J. Allen, 'The Historical Inscription of Khnumhotep at Dahshur: Preliminary Report', *BASOR* 352 (2008), 29-39.

[49] A. Stauder, 'Ouni' (in prep.).

[50] In addition, the use of the -*in*- marked form may have some conclusive force within the structure of the dialogue, (compare with a similar use in *Shipwrecked Sailor* [3.1.]. The two dimensions need not be mutually exclusive.

[51] B 49-50 *prt ḥꜣt ḫft wḏ=f* "coming and going are by his (*scil*. Senwasret's) command" (while *pri-hꜣi* is a set collocation, this has here broader overtones, and ironically alludes to *Sinuhe*'s crossing the Egyptian border); B 56-57 *pḏ nmtwt pw sk=f bhꜣw nn pḥwy n ḏd n=f sꜣ* "he is far-striding when he destroys the fugitive; there is no end for the one who shows him the back."

funerary self-presentations.[52] The exploitation of the expression for highlighting a major textual articulation is common to *Sinuhe* and contemporary funerary self-presentations [3.1.]. The additional semantic tension derived from the deliberately misplaced indexical overtones of the expression, on the other hand, is found only in *Sinuhe* [this section]. Besides fictionality, such linguistic dissonances are another 'sign of literature', integral to written literature's proposal of a denser space of ambiguity for aesthetic experience.

Appendix: "Alpha" and "Omega"

1. Although less relevant than the above to a discussion of issues of style and repertoires, the "alpha" and "omega" proposed for common discussion are illustrative of broader compositional strategies in the poem: concentric structuring supporting the overall arc-form, and thematic threads dynamically spun throughout the poem.

The two encounters with the royal word echo each other:[53] the former prompts Sinuhe's centrifugal flight, the latter his centripetal reintegration. They constitute crucial stages in Sinuhe's overall progress which, among other things, is presented as a tale of the character's changing positions.

a) B 1-2

ist wi [ʿḥ]ʿ.kw sḏm.n=i ḫrw=f iw=f ḥr mdt iw=i m ʿr wꜣ

"I was standing there, and I heard his voice while he was speaking, just as I was in proximity, aside."

b) B 199-201 (for issues of grammar as reflected in the translation, below [App.2.])

spr.n wḏ pn r=i   ʿḥʿ.kw m-ḫr-ib wḥwt=i
šd.n.t(w)=f n=i   ḏ.n(=i) wi ḥr ẖt=i (...)

"When this decree reached me, I was standing in the midst of my tribe;
It was read out to me, and I put myself on my belly (...)."

In both cases, Sinuhe is standing (ʿḥʿ), yet, as he himself proclaims in his encomium to Senwasret, "one cannot keep standing in his (*scil.* the king's) presence" (B 55-56 *n ʿḥʿ.n.tw m hꜣw=f*).[54] In B 1-2, his very first textual appearance after his initial recitation of titles, Sinuhe

---

[52] While audiences of various backgrounds would have been sensible to aspects relating to the formal salience of the expression [3.1.], the denser indexical dimensions just discussed would have been available to a much more restricted elite audience only, familiar with funerary self-presentations similar to the ones cited in the main text. In Ramesside times, if not well before, both dimensions were lost, compare B 45, appearing in AOS and DM 4 as *sḏd.n=f n=i* (...) (B 113-114 is lost in AOS; no Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses are preserved for either passages). In Egyptological reception, the appreciation of the indexical connections of *ḏd.k(i)* has similarly been lost, as is manifest in the various attempts at defining intrinsic semantic features of the form that would account for its use in *Sinuhe* on a purely grammatical level. Thus (in terms of modality, aspect, and voice, respectively): H. Jenni, 'Diathese und Modus des ägyptischen Pseudopartizips', *ZÄS* 134 (2007), 128; R. Hannig, *Pseudopartizip und sḏm.n=f* (HÄB 32; Hildesheim 1991), 47-48; W. Schenkel, 'Das altägyptische Pseudopartizip und das indogermanische Medium/Perfekt', *Orientalia* 40 (1971), 302-303.

[53] Complementary perspectives in J. Jay, this volume.

[54] As a token of ancient Egyptian readings of *Sinuhe*, note that this passage was probably present to the mind of the redactor(s) responsible for the tradition documented in R, when he made the following insert at the beginning of Sinuhe's fight with the strongman of Retenu: R 156 *iwt pw ir.n=f n=i ʿḥʿ.kw, ḏ.n=i wi m hꜣw=f* "He came to me while I was standing, and I put myself in his presence." Although introduced in terms reminiscent of the encomium to Senwasret (compare B 110-111 *pry pw nn sn-nw=f* "he was a hero

"stands" in an unfitting position, stylistically emphasized by a powerful oxymoron (lit. "in proximity" (*m ʿr(w)*) "away, afar" (*wȝ(w)*).[55] This prompts Sinuhe's precipitated flight, his "placing himself between / crouching down into bushes" (twice, B 5 *rdt(=i) wi imit(w) bȝty*; B 17-18 *šsp.n=i ksw m bȝti*)[56], and mostly night-time journey. In B 199-201, Sinuhe again stands in a position that is unfitting, for him as an Egyptian: "in the midst of my *tribe*" (*m-ḥr-ib wḥwt=i*). Yet, the royal word, solicited by and personally addressed to Sinuhe, is now a proper *wḏ*.[57]

Sinuhe prostrates himself to the royal word, in a gesture he later repeats when facing the actual person of the king:

B 249-257

> *dḥ<n>.n=i tȝ* **imitw špsw** (...) *gm.n=i ḥm=f ḥr st wrt {m wmt}*[58] *nt dʿm*
> **wn.kw rf dwn.kw ḥr ẖt=i**, *ḥm.n=i wi m-bȝḥ=f, nṯr pn* **ḥr wšd=i ẖnmw**
> *iw=i mi s it m ʿẖẖw, bȝ=i sbw, ḥʿw=i ȝdw, ḥȝty=i n ntf m ẖt=i, <n> rẖ=i ʿnẖ r mwt*
> *ḏd.in ḥm=f n wʿ m nn n smrw:* **ts sw imi mdw=f n=i**
>
> "I touched ground between the sphinxes (...) I found His Majesty on the great seat of electrum. Being thus stretched out on my belly, I lost myself in his presence, although this god was addressing me in a friendly manner. I was like a man seized in the dust, my soul having perished, my limbs failed; my heart, it was not in my body, I did not know life from death. Then His Majesty said to one of these Companions: 'Raise him up, let him speak to me!' "

The passage recapitulates Sinuhe's bodily disintegration and near-death during his flight, yet the king himself disperses it all in addressing his word to Sinuhe directly (*ḥr wšd=i*), in a friendly

---

without second"; B 52 *pr-ʿ nn twt n=f* "he is a champion without compare"), the strongman of Retenu is no Senwasret, and one *can* stand (*ʿḥʿ*) in his vicinity (*m hȝw=f*).

[55] I follow P. Vernus's analysis (this volume, §1.0, and fn. 3; with references to the previous discussion of this much-disputed expression). For adverbial *wȝ* "far", compare further *Eloquent Peasant* B1 321-322 *iw ḥr.tw n ḥnt wȝ* "One falls far for greed". Further also in *Satirical Letter* 10.5-6, noted by R. Parkinson, *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant. A Reader's Commentary* (LingAeg SM 10; Hamburg 2012), 259. No emendation is therefore necessary, pace e.g. R. Koch, *Die Erzählung des Sinuhe* (BAe XVII; Bruxelles 1990), 11a. Incidentally, note that neither R, nor the New Kingdom versions G, C, and AOS seem to have felt the need for emending either, as can be judged from the retained road determinative (N 31).

[56] For the association of bushes with thieves, cf. *Ipuwer* 5.11-12 (lastly R. Enmarch, *A World Upturned. Commentary on and Analysis of The Dialogue of Ipuwer and the Lord of All* (Oxford 2008), 111). The motif of bushes recurs in Ramesside war reliefs, where it is specifically associated with enemy deserters, expressing their physical and moral weakness (I thank A. Gnirs for pointing this to my attention). Sinuhe, fleeing the Egyptian army, is himself a deserter and anti-hero. Cf. A. Gnirs, 'Ägyptische Militärgeschichte als Kultur- und Sozialgeschichte', in R. Gundlach & C. Vogel (eds), *Militärgeschichte des pharaonischen Ägypten, Altägypten und seine Nachbarkulturen im Spiegel der aktuellen Forschung* (Krieg in der Geschichte 34; Paderborn etc. 2009), 67-141, here 102f and fig. 6.

[57] The genre of the royal *wḏ* entertains deep relations with autobiographies. In the Middle Kingdom, compare e.g. Ikhernefret, discussed above [3.1.]. Some Old Kingdom "Ereignisbiographien" contain royal *wḏ*'s in central positions (e.g. Sabni son of Mekhu), or evoke such in their layout (e.g. Weni, Werra), cf. A. Stauder, 'Ouni' (in prep.). Fifth Dynasty (auto)biographies often reflexively refer to themselves as royal *wḏ*'s, cf. J. Stauder-Porchet, 'Les autobiographies événementielles de la Vᵉ dynastie: premier ensemble de textes continus en Égypte', in M. Barta et al. (eds), *Abusir and Saqqara in the Year 2010* (ArOr Supp 9; Prague 2011), 747-766. For royal letters as royal *wḏ*'s in Old Kingdom tomb biographies, also E. Eichler, 'Untersuchungen zu den Königsbriefen des Alten Reiches', *SAK* 18 (1991), 141-171. Generally on the *wḏ-nsw* as a genre, P. Vernus, 'Les "Décrets royaux" (*wḏ-nsw*): l'Énoncé d'auctoritas comme genre', *BSAK* 4 (1991), 239-246. For a possible additional level of meaning in *Sinuhe* B 200, in relation to the notion of "stela" (*wḏ*), J.-R. Pérez-Accino, 'Text as Territory', 183.

[58] For this emendation, A. Gardiner, *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe* (Paris 1916), 96.

tone (*ḥnmw*). In line with multiple figures of reversal in the final, re-integrative part of the poem, Sinuhe is no longer "between bushes" (*imit(w) b3ty*), but "between sphinxes" (*imitw šspw*). While he could not previously "keep standing" (cf. B 55-56 *n ῾ḥ῾.n.tw*), he is now made to stand up (*ts sw*) in presence of, and by, the king himself. The linguistic register (*wn.kw rf dwn.kw* (...)) is august.

From positions "in proximity, aside" (B 2 *m ῾r w3*), and "in the midst of my tribe" (B 199-200 *m-ḥr-ib wḥwt=i*),[59] Sinuhe is reintegrated into "the heart of" (*m-k3b*) the court and royal necropolis: B 280-281 *iw=f r smr m-m smrw, rd.tw=f m-k3b šnyt* "He is to be a Companion among Companions, he shall be placed in the very heart of the Court"[60]; B 300-301 *iw ḥws n=i mr m inr m-k3b mrw* "A stone pyramid was built for me in the middle of the pyramids." No longer standing (B 1, B 199 *῾ḥ῾*), Sinuhe is made to rest: B 293-294 *sḏr.kw ḥr ḥnkyt, ḏ.n=i š῾ n <n>miw=f*[61] (...) "Lying on a bed, I gave the sand back to the ones who fare on it (...).

2. *Sinuhe* B 199-201 has been translated in different ways,[62] reflecting two options in syntactic interpretation, as an "emphatic construction" or as a "setting construction":[63]

spr.n wḏ pn r=i ῾ḥ῾.kw m-ḥr-ib wḥwt=i (a)
šd.n.t(w)=f n=i ḏ.n(=i) wi ḥr ḫt=i (b)

a) *Emphatic construction*:[64]
"It was while I was in the midst of my tribe that this decree reached me;
It was after I had put myself on my belly (...) that it was read to me."

---

[59] Also B 118-119 *m-ḥr-ib ky idr* "in the midst of another herd".

[60] In actual autobiographies, compare e.g. *in grt nsw-bity ḥpr-k3-r῾ ḏi wi m-m smrw=f n mnḫ(=i) ḥr ib n ḥm=f* "Moreover, it is the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Kheperkara who placed me among his Companions, for my excellence upon the heart of His Majesty' (Wepwawetaa, Leiden V 4; = K. Sethe, *Lesestücke*, 72, 17-18); sim. Berlin 1204, 7; BM EA 562, 14-15; *Urk.* I 301, 3.

[61] B reads *n imiw=f* "to the ones who are in it". This reading, while coherent as it stands, most probably arose as an haplology for an original *n nmiw=f*, resonating with *nmiw-š῾* just above (B 292) (cf. Fr. Feder, TLA, commentary to B 294). In B this is fully reinterpreted, as demonstrated by the (regular) logographic spelling of *imiw*.

[62] For a survey of translations, W. Schenkel, this volume. The passage is also grammatically discussed in contributions by J. Jay and W. Schenkel in the present volume.

[63] For the initial identification of the setting construction as a construction related to, but distinct from, the emphatic construction, P. Vernus, *GM* 43 (1981), 73-88. Other labels for the setting construction include: (a.) "second schème" (P. Vernus, in contrast with the emphatic construction, i.e. the "scheme" that historically was identified "first" [by H.-J. Polotsky in 1944]); (b.) "Rang-V Erweiterung" (e.g. W. Schenkel, 'Standardtheorie und invertierte Standardtheorie', *ZÄS* 125 (1998), 140-160).

[64] E.g. H.-J. Polotsky, 'The "Emphatic" *sḏm.n=f* form', *RdÉ* 11 (1957), 114-115 [NB: before the discovery of the setting construction]; J. Winand, 'La progression au sein de la narration en égyptien. Éléments d'une grammaire du texte', *BIFAO* 100 (2000), 418, 430; *id.*, *Temps et aspect en égyptien. Une approche sémantique* (PdÄ 25; Leiden and Boston 2006), 433-434 [questioning]. The position expressed in L. Depuydt, *Conjunction, Contiguity, Contingency* (Oxford 1993), 129-139, is paradoxical. Semantically, the author understands the passage under consideration in a way that comes very close to a setting construction. He then attempts to derive such interpretation from an emphatic construction, because his broader theoretical framework excludes the existence of the setting construction.

b) *Setting construction*:[65]
"When this decree reached me, I was standing in the midst of my tribe.
It was read out to me, and I put myself on my belly (...)"
"Emphatic construction" and "setting construction" are closely related. Independently of which construction is recognized in B 199-201, the following common analysis applies: In the first clause of each double verse, a *sḏm.n=f* form is used ((a.) *spr.n wḏ*; (b.) *šd.n.t(w)=f*), rather than a pseudoparticiple (*wḏ spr*; *iw=f šd*). This signals that the clause, although syntactically complete, requires some further elaboration to be semantically complete. The required elaboration is provided by the following clause (*ꜥḥꜥ.kw* (...); *ḏ.n(=i) wi* (...)), which is thereby tightly bound to the preceding one. Functionally, both the setting and emphatic constructions grant prominence to the second clause, as an effect of having reduced such in the first clause. More generally, they function as devices for higher inter-clausal integration.

        Differences between the emphatic and setting constructions lie with the status of the second clause. With an emphatic construction, the second clause is syntactically subordinate to the first one. In a past narrative context, the second clause is therefore not part of the main chain of events. Temporally, the event it expresses is interpreted as anterior relative to the event in the first clause (schematically: 2 [*here*: prostration] < 1 [*here*: reading]). With a "setting construction", the second clause is the main clause, to which the first clause provides a setting. In a past narrative context, the second clause is therefore part of the main chain of events. Temporally, the event it expresses is interpreted as posterior, or simultaneous, relative to the setting expressed in the first clause (schematically: 1 [beginning of reading[66]] ≤ 2 [prostration]).

        In distinguishing between the two constructions in text, various dimensions can be helpful: (i.) elements of distinctive linguistic form, when such are given, (ii.) inferences on the relative sequence of events, and (iii.) inferences on textual coherence.[67] As to the first, linguistic form, morphology is distinctive only in some cases.[68] In *Sinuhe* B 199-201, it is not. In addition, the two constructions may have been formally distinct in their intonational contour. Such differences are not available to the present-day Egyptologist. Nor were they available to an ancient Egyptian reader of *Sinuhe*, confronted with the sole written text.

        In the absence of elements of distinctive form (i.), the relative sequence of events is considered (ii.).[69] In *Sinuhe* B 199-201 double-verse (a.) is indistinctive in this respect because the second clause involves a non-dynamic event (*ꜥḥꜥ*): the temporal extension of the latter includes the event in the first clause, whichever analysis is made. In double-verse (b.) both events are dynamic, yet no direct inference can be made either: either sequence of events (2 < 1; 1 ≤ 2) is

---

[65] A majority of translations (recently e.g. R. Parkinson, *Reading*, 289). In grammatical discussion, e.g. A. Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian*, 274-275; S. Uljas, *The Modal System of Earlier Egyptian* (PdÄ 26; Leiden 2007), 355; the present author (below, in the main text).

[66] The grammatical construction itself only expresses that the first clause is a setting to the second one. The temporal interpretation of such setting event as still ongoing, or not, at the time of the main event, is a matter of the hearer's/reader's inferences. In the present case, the relation would be one of simultaneity with respect to the whole event of reading (i.e. prostration *while* reading goes on), and one of posteriority with respect to its most salient moment, its inception (i.e. prostration *upon* inception of reading). Note that the very same effect is observed in the here selected translation language (compare above, main text).

[67] The first two dimensions (i.-ii.) are already discussed in P. Vernus, *GM* 43 (1981). The third dimension–which is made explicit here–is implicit in many translations. It can resolve instances where neither (i.) nor (ii.) is diagnostic; cf. the last paragraph of the present sub-section.

[68] An analysis as a setting construction is required when the second clause is formally marked as a main clause, e.g. with *iw sḏm.n=f* or *iw + sḏm(w)*-passive (P. Vernus, *GM* 43 (1981), 76 (ex. (5); fn. 13), 79-80). Similarly, when the second clause is headed by *ḥr*, this must be a main clause, and an analysis of the overall scheme as setting construction follows, e.g. Hymn to the *Nileflood* 3.5 *wbn=f, ḥr tꜣ m ḥꜥꜥwt* "Whenever he rises, the land is in joy" (sim. 12.1-2).

[69] P. Vernus, *GM* 43 (1981), 73-88, in particular 78-79, 84.

possible in the physical world, and neither conflicts with general patterns of human behavior.[70] Based on his knowledge of the protocol associated with the situation described, an Egyptian reader would have immediately identified the right temporal sequence.[71] For a present-day Egyptologist however, such cultural knowledge is not given (at least at present), and has to be reconstructed–precisely from texts such as *Sinuhe* B 199-201, here resulting in a hermeneutical circle. Note that this is the sole level at which an Egyptian reader has an advantage over a present-day Egyptologist in interpreting the passage. This does not lie with a better native knowledge of the language, let alone of its vocalized forms, but with the Egyptian reader's capability to draw upon cultural, i.e. extra-linguistic, knowledge not (yet) available to the Egyptologist.

At this point, with neither linguistic form (i.) nor temporality (ii.) being here helpful, a modern reader is still agnostic as to which analysis–emphatic or setting construction–applies to *Sinuhe* B 199-201. Yet, there remains another dimension to be considered, available to the Egyptian and Egyptological readers alike: textual coherence (iii.).[72] As evoked above (part 1 of the present Appendix), B 199-201 lies at a crucial juncture in the overall poem, as the second encounter with the royal word. In his progress, *Sinuhe* goes from problematic "standing" (B 1-2;

---

[70] Compare with the different situation in the following passage, where a direct inference *can* be made on the relative sequence of events, leaving no other possible analysis than as an emphatic construction: B 32-34 *ḏd.n=f nn − rḫ.n=f ḳd=i, sḏm.n=f šs3=i, mtr.n wi rmṯw kmt ntiw im ḥnꜥ=f* "He said this because he knew my character, he had heard of my understanding, and the Egyptians who were there with him had witnessed in my favor". In terms of human behavior, *rḫ.n=f* (...), *sḏm.n=f* (...), and *mtr.n wi rmṯw* (...) must be anterior to *ḏd.n=f* (2', 2'', 2''' < 1). Compare, with the opposite temporal sequence, the evidently absurd: "He said this, and (thereby/in saying so) learnt about my character, heard of my understanding, (...) ?!"

[71] P. Grandet, *Contes de l'Égypte ancienne* (Paris 1998), 28, who proposes a parallel with an Ottoman court ceremonial, implying a sequence of events 2 < 1 (and therefore an emphatic construction; further discussion by J. Jay; for the general principle, and importance, of such culturally-based inferences, J. Winand, *Temps et aspect*, 433-434; *id.*, *BIFAO* 100 (2000), 430). Nothing supports that such ceremonial would extend to Ancient Egypt. In effect, as the discussion below demonstrates (interpretation as a setting construction), it does not.

[72] *Sinuhe* B 199-201 is from a narrative context. Arguments on textual coherence are often just as decisive in non-narrative contexts. Consider for instance *Merikare* E 135 *rmm=sn, iw=f ḥr sḏm*. Tense is here present, and no argument can therefore be made on the relative sequence of events (ii.). As to form (i.), both interpretations as "they weep only when he listens" (emphatic construction) and as "whenever they weep, he is listening" (setting construction) are equally acceptable (as noted in P. Vernus, *GM* 43 (1981), 78). If, however, textual coherence (iii.) is taken into account, only the latter analysis is possible: *Merikare* E 135-137 (...) *irr=f šsp n ib=sn*; *ṯs.n=f r m33 st*; *ts.n=f k3ri ḥ3=sn*; *rmm=sn iw=f ḥr sḏm*; *ir.n=f n=sn ḥḳ3w m swḥt* (...)"(...) for their (*scil.* the people's) hearts, he (*scil.* the creator god) creates light; to see them he sails; behind them he has raised a chapel; *whenever they weep, he is listening*; for them he has made rules in the egg (...)". The reason is as follows. On the one hand, all sentences other than *rmm=sn iw=f ḥr sḏm* are emphatic constructions. On the other hand however, the overall textual segment gains its cohesion by topic continuity (i.e., roughly: continuity on what the passage is "about"): the passage is *about* the creator's action, while mankind is presented in its *relation to* the creator (*n ib=sn, r m33 st, ḥ3=sn, rmm=sn, n=sn*). If *rmm=sn iw=f ḥr sḏm* was interpreted as an emphatic construction, the clause that has the creator god as its subject, *iw=f ḥr sḏm*, would be syntactically subordinate. Simultaneously, the clause that relates such action to mankind, *rmm=sn*, would be a main clause, and mankind would be the main topic of the broader sentence. In the overall sequence of main clauses, topic continuity on the creator god would thereby be disrupted, oddly enough only in this sentence; compare: "(...) behind them *he* has raised a chapel; *they* weep only when he listens; for them *he* has made rules in the egg (...)." If, on the other hand, the sentence is interpreted as a setting construction, the clause that has the creator god as its subject, *iw=f ḥr sḏm*, remains the main clause of its sentence, and the clause *rmm=sn* is in a textually "peripheral" status similar to other phrases relating such action of the creator god to mankind (*ḥ3=sn, n=sn*, etc.). Compare: "(...) behind them *he* has raised a chapel; whenever they weep, *he* is listening; for them *he* has made rules in the egg (...)."

B 199-200) to prostration (B 200-201; B 249f). In this large-scale trajectory, B 199-201 expresses the crucial moment of transition. The events *ꜥḥꜥ.kw m-ẖr-ib wḥwt=i* and *ḏ.n(=i) wi ḥr ẖt=i* therefore belong to the main chain of events. This leaves the setting construction as the only possible analysis.