

Coping with Obscurity

The Brown Workshop on
Earlier Egyptian Grammar

edited by

James P. Allen
Mark A. Collier
Andréas Stauder

Wilbour Studies



Brown University

Department of Egyptology and Assyriology

‡ LOCKWOOD PRESS

COPING WITH OBSCURITY



Wilbour Studies in Egyptology and Assyriology
(formerly Wilbour Studies in Egypt and Ancient Western Asia)

Series Editors

James P. Allen

John M. Steele

NUMBER 3

COPING WITH OBSCURITY: THE BROWN WORKSHOP ON EARLIER EGYPTIAN GRAMMAR

COPING WITH OBSCURITY
THE BROWN WORKSHOP
ON EARLIER EGYPTIAN GRAMMAR

by

JAMES P. ALLEN
MARK A. COLLIER
ANDRÉAS STAUDER

 LOCKWOOD PRESS

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

Wilbour Studies in Egyptology and Assyriology is a series of the Department of Egyptology and Assyriology at Brown University, Box 1899, Wilbour Hall, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912.

PUBLISHED ON BEHALF OF BROWN UNIVERSITY BY
LOCKWOOD PRESS
PO Box 133289
Atlanta, GA 30333
www.lockwoodpress.com

© 2016 by Brown University. All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America

ISBN: 978-1-937040-42-0 (hardcover)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015959294

This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Workshop Participants	ix
WOLFGANG SCHENKEL	
Grenzen und Chancen bei der Erschliessung des älteren Ägyptisch	1
DANIEL A. WERNING	
Hypotheses on Glides and <i>Matres Lectionis</i> in Earlier Egyptian Orthographies	29
CHRIS A. REINTGES	
Marked and Unmarked Word Orders, Verbal Inflection, and the Cartography of Early Egyptian Sentence Structures	45
SAMI ULJAS	
To See an Invisible Form: Paradigms, Parallels, and Practices Once Again	97
JEAN WINAND	
The Syntax-Semantics Interface in Earlier Egyptian: A Case Study in Verbs of Cognition	109
JULIE STAUDER-PORCHET	
Earlier Egyptian Prepositions: Between Grammar and Lexicography	141
MARK A. COLLIER	
Alternatives and the Grammar of Earlier Egyptian: Negation with Low-End Indefinites and Negation with <i>n ... js</i>	151
ANDRÉAS STAUDER	
The Earlier Egyptian “Emphatic” Construction: An Alternative Analysis	169
PASCAL VERNUS	
Restricted Circulation in Old Egyptian as Mirrored in Later “ <i>Repristination von Tradition</i> ” and Revivals: The dependent pronoun <i>kw</i> ; the <i>nfr-n</i> negation; the <i>n wnt sdm=f</i> negative construction	201
Bibliography and Text Sources	225
Index of Texts Cited	257

PREFACE

JAMES P. ALLEN, MARK A. COLLIER, AND ANDRÉAS STAUDER

THE PAPERS IN THIS VOLUME were initially presented and discussed at the Brown Workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar, held at Brown University on March 27–29, 2013, under the auspices of the university’s Department of Egyptology and Assyriology. The impetus for the workshop came from the conference “New Directions in Egyptian Syntax,” held at the University of Liège in May, 2011 (now published as Grossman et al. 2014), at which the three of us were participants. In conversations, we identified a number of desiderata for future research, prompted in part by the presentations and discussions at the conference. First, we felt the need for an extended conversation among those of us struggling to find new models of Egyptian grammar. Second, we realized that the conversation had to be focused on Earlier Egyptian, which still has the greatest degree of opacity in its verbal system and therefore the greatest need for new approaches to grammatical analysis. And third, we determined that the participants in the conversation had to contribute not just whatever interesting subject they might happen to be working on but thoughts about the core problems of working with Old and Middle Egyptian texts—not just the interpretation of written forms but also consideration of the broader, extra-grammatical factors that can influence the production of a written form in a given text.

From the mid-1960s until recently, studies of Egyptian grammar were dominated by the “Standard Theory” model based on the work of H. J. Polotsky. The attractiveness of that approach for the Earlier Egyptian verbal system derived largely from what seemed to be the relative transparency of syntax as opposed to morphology. Earlier Egyptian relies largely on contrasts in synthetic morphology to produce different verb forms, but the nature of the writing system obscures many of these: for example, the difference between the active and passive *sḏm.f*, both of which appear on the surface to be morphologically identical in many cases. Faced with this obscurity, Egyptologists have come to rely on whatever meager clues the writing system might provide to identify distinct forms, such as the different *sḏm.f* forms generally supposed to underlie the distinction between pairs such as *mꜣ.f* ~ *mꜣꜣ.f* “he sees,” *mr.f* ~ *mrw.f* “he wants,” and *ḏj.f* ~ *rḏj.f* “he gives.” The “Standard Theory” afforded apparent confirmation of such distinctions by noting their affinity with certain syntactic environments. In addition, it offered a syntactic explanation for a number of visible but previously puzzling alternants such as non-“emphatic” *sḏm.n.f* versus *jw sḏm.n.f* (analyzed as dependent versus independent). By the late 1980s, however, some scholars had begun to doubt the validity of identifying verb forms as syntactically conditioned, and more recently, the value and genesis of certain written morphological indices have been called into question as well. At the same time, scholars increasingly began to draw attention to the influence of factors such as lexical semantics, pragmatics, and scribal practice on the textual production of verb forms and constructions, features neglected in the “Standard Theory” approach.

At the Liège conference it became evident that many, if not most, of the participants regarded the “Standard Theory” model as no longer productive, in part if not whole, for the analysis of Egyptian grammar, and in particular for its earlier stages, Old and Middle Egyptian. Having cut that anchor, however, we are now faced with the task of developing consensus on productive avenues of approach to Earlier Egyptian grammar, to guide our research in the twenty-first century.

The Brown workshop was intended to address that concern. The editors invited seven colleagues representing the current spectrum of thinking on Earlier Egyptian grammar, to engage in a three-day

discussion. We deliberately chose the term “workshop” rather than “conference” to emphasize the primacy of discussion over the presentation of research. Each participant contributed a preliminary draft of the paper in this volume beforehand and was allotted an hour and forty-five minutes at the workshop, with presentation slated to last no longer than thirty to forty-five minutes so as to allow ample time for discussion.

To focus the contributions and discussion, participants were asked to address three areas of fundamental concern. First is the role of the textual corpus itself, the dataset that forms the basis of all research into the grammar of Earlier Egyptian. The field still lacks good grammatical descriptions of all the genres within this corpus. Fundamental questions need to be addressed. What elements of linguistic form occur in actual texts? What kinds of functions do they perform, in what kinds of texts, in what frequency, and in alternation with what other elements of linguistic form? To what extent can formal features or constructions that are essentially limited to one genre be generalized to the language as a whole, and if they are not broadly applicable, what determines their appearance in the genre for which they are attested? How do scribal, cultural, and other extra-linguistic factors determine the phenomenology of the diverse types of Earlier Egyptian as they present themselves to the modern interpreter, and how can these factors be taken into account in linguistic analysis of an often highly formal written record? Or, as one of the organizers put it, “what is it, after all, that we call Earlier Egyptian?”

Second is the nature of the written evidence. If not all written criteria can be regarded as grammatically significant and if, as the past three decades of research have shown, syntactic criteria can themselves be illusory, what parameters can we establish to identify verb forms? For example, is the presence or absence of a distributionally limited and highly variable feature such as the ending *-w* formally significant or not in a given form or environment, and how can we tell? If nominal, adverbial, or attributive function is not primary to the existence and use of verb forms and constructions, what governs their use? More broadly, how do the domains of the lexicon, morphology, syntax, and semantics interact with one another in the production of particular forms or constructions?

Third is the role of pragmatics. To what extent are forms and constructions determined by extra-grammatical factors such as the speaker’s choice and style? To what degree is it possible to produce a pragmatic analysis of earlier Egyptian language data (and thus to engage ancient Egyptian language data with a more cognitive and indeed rationalist take on the human contribution to the production of meaning in language)? Do the surviving data, and the current understanding of the ancient cultural encyclopedia, provide a sufficient basis for such study or not?

In general, we intended the workshop as an opportunity to address the fundamental question of how we understand forms and constructions in terms of morphology, function, and (contextualized) meaning; to identify the successes and limitations of existing approaches; and to determine what productive new directions are open for future research. Each of the papers in this volume addresses these questions, some more directly than others. In their diversity, the papers demonstrate a common sense of the complexity of the empirical data, of the multiplicity and interrelatedness of relevant dimensions, and of the need for renewed and explicit interpretive strategies. They are illustrative not of a unified paradigm of ongoing research but of a multiplicity of approaches to Earlier Egyptian. To echo the title of the seminal 1986 Copenhagen conference (Englund and Frandsen 1986), the current situation may resemble “Chaos” after the (illusory) certainty of the “Standard Theory” but it is also clear that we stand on the threshold of, if not “A New Paradigm,” a new understanding of Earlier Egyptian.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

JAMES P. ALLEN, Brown University

MARK A. COLLIER, University of Liverpool

CHRIS H. REINTGES, Université Paris Diderot and Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique

WOLFGANG SCHENKEL, Universität Tübingen

ANDRÉAS STAUDER, École Pratique des Hautes Études

JULIE STAUDER-PORCHET, Universität Basel

SAMI ULJAS, Uppsala Universitet

PASCAL VERNUS, École Pratique des Hautes Études

DANIEL A. WERNING, Excellence Cluster “Topoi: The Formation and Transformation of Space and Knowledge in Ancient Civilizations,” Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

JEAN WINAND, Université de Liège

INDEX OF TEXTS CITED

Amenemhet		10735, 2A, 1.1	133
Ild	123	Boeser 1909	
Ve	121	pl. 33, a.9–11	198 n. 120
Assmann 2002		Brovarski 2001	
510	214	pls. 31–32,	
Badawy 1976		A2, 7–8	122
Fig. 19	144	pl. 30	134
Baer 1966		Cairo	
2, 8–9	76	CG 583	
Barns 1956		8	128
pl. 2	106	8–9	219
pl. 12, B9	155	CG 20003	213 n. 103
Bauer	<i>see</i> Peas.	2	213 n. 100
BD Nu		2–3	171 n. 15
18, 5–6	195 n. 112	CG 20007	
113, 4	128 n. 53	4	146 n. 16
Beni Hasan		CG 20538	
I, pl. 21	132	II c 11	126
Berkeley Hearst Museum of Anthropology		II c 12–13	21 n. 92
6-2024	213 n. 100	CG 20543	
Berlin		A 10–11	120 n. 32
10025, ro. 3	160 n. 40	A 15–16	121
10025, vo. 4–5	131	CG 20764	
22820, 4–5	126	x+3	118
Berlin 1911		JE 20764, x+4	126
pl. 1, 3	174 n. 24, 194 n. 108	JE 38001	212
pl. 1, 5	179 n. 57, 198 n. 120	JE 38998, 2	125
pl. 2, 3–4	157	JE 46200, 5–6	124
pl. 2, 4	58 n. 14	JE 69771	218
pl. 2, 5–6	58	Carnarvon and Carter 1912	
pl. 4, A 6	132 n. 61	pl. 76, 2	215 n. 114
pl. 4, Be–f 2–3	132	Chicago OIM	
Bible		16955	213 n. 100
Matt. 21:10	117 n. 18	Clère 1995 (Luxor statue of <i>Jmn-m-jn.t</i>)	
BM		90	214
498	210 n. 86	Collier and Quirke 2002 (pUC)	
562, x+6	128	32206, 1–3	102
581, B 2	123 n. 41	32213, 23–vo. 2	194 n. 108
581, B 11	120	CT	
828	146 n. 18	I, 49b	65
10103 ro. 5	222	I, 60b	25 n. 105
		I, 82a	14 n. 56
		I, 154d–f	85

(CT)		V, 254d	26 n. 111
I, 189b	25 nn. 105/108	V, 284b	129
I, 201a–c	14 n. 57	V, 325i	14 n. 60
I, 254f	69	V, 375e	171 n. 8
I, 397b–398b	62	VI, 22o	48
II, 102b	174 n. 24	VI, 53b–c	173 n. 22
II, 115c	83	VI, 56j	25 n. 103
III, 26c	186	VI, 73g	129
III, 48b	25 n. 108, 62 n. 20	VI, 86f–g	129
III, 76g	77 n. 45	VI, 102b	61–62
III, 88i	69	VI, 136o	81
III, 98h	94	VI, 155e–f	69–70
III, 148b	83	VI, 157g	25 n. 102
III, 156c	68	VI, 167a–d	186
III, 293a	25 n. 102	VI, 176g	121
III, 303h	174 n. 28	VI, 187c	126
III, 321b–c	98	VI, 246p	119
IV, 82d	25 n. 103	VI, 246s	210 n. 56
IV, 141j	40	VI, 264v	133
IV, 244a	88 and n. 61	VI, 267s	217
IV, 246s	206 n. 56	VI, 273g	25 n. 102
IV, 288–89a	14 n. 58	VI, 288n	25 n. 108
IV, 305b	25 nn. 105/108/109	VI, 315k	66–67
IV, 306c	25 n. 105	VI, 343e	25 n. 102
IV, 309a	206 n. 56	VI, 357i	83
IV 310b–311a	98	VI, 380h	129
IV, 323a	25 n. 105	VI, 399u	119
IV, 323c	25 n. 105	VI, 403k–l	218
IV, 323d	25 nn. 105/108	VII, 24a	216
IV, 324a	25 n. 105	VII, 35o	223 n. 167
IV, 338l	25 n. 102	VII, 44g	131
IV, 391a	206 nn. 48 and 51	VII, 45o	25 n. 104
IV, 412	206 n. 56	VII, 96m	79
V, 11c	194 n. 108	VII, 111i	80 n. 53
V, 11c–d	194	VII, 111j	80
V, 83a	68 n. 23	VII, 115h	49 n. 6
V, 92a–b	58	VII, 115i	49 n. 6
V, 94e	206 n. 52	VII, 115j	49, 92
V, 97f	60 n. 17	VII, 115k	67
V, 97g	60	VII, 220g	101 n. 23
V, 111d	74 and n. 38	VII, 221h	39
V, 167d	26 n. 111	VII, 259a	98
V, 176d	25 n. 105	VII, 262h	25 n. 102
V, 186f–g	103	VII, 282e	25 n. 102
V, 199c	25 n. 102	VII, 413d	25 n. 108
V, 199c–d	106	VII, 443b	216
V, 203l	26 n. 111	VII, 495g	101 n. 23
V, 207c	26 n. 111	VII, 508b	216
V, 242c	40	VIII, 213	202 n. 13

VIII, 261	75 n. 42	199, 16	126
VIII, 307	60 n. 16	Hassan 1936	
VIII, 327	210	109, Fig. 116	79 n. 52
VIII, 347	210 n. 86	Hassan 1975	
Drioton 1943		II, Fig. 5	213 n. 100
502–504	213 n. 100	III, Fig. 33, 6	120 n. 32
Drioton and Lauer 1955		III, Fig. 39, 6	120 n. 32
240	213 n. 99	Hatnub	
Duties of the Vizier (Davies 1943)		16, 9–10	174 n. 24
R 2–3	171 n. 15	<i>Hb.</i>	
DZA		10.15	42
28.584.200–240	42	22.25	39
30.157.810–30	42	39.17	42
30.246.960	125 n. 46	40.1–4	40
Edel 1984b		42	40
27 Fig. 5, 63–64	49 n. 7	59.20	40
Edel 1994		63.3	40
62	213 n. 99	67.10	39
el-Aguizy 2010		67.11	39
20, cols. 5/6	221 n. 151	75.2	39
el-Khouli and Kanawati 1988		76.18	39
pl. 6	213 n. 100	Helck 1975	
Erman 1919		22	101 n. 23
25	205	28	130
26	102	83	118
Fischer-Elfert and Grimm 2003		88	130
71–74, pl. 19	213 n. 102	90	130
Fowler		95	103, 132
38–39	123	Heqanakht	
Gardiner 1930		I, ro. 2	163 n. 56
OIM 13945, 1	120	I, ro. 5	160 n. 38
Gardiner and Sethe 1928		I, ro. 8–9	157
pl. 1, 10	120	I, ro. 10–11	155
Gemnikai		I, ro. 13–14	156
I, pl. 18	79	I, ro. 14	160 and n. 38, 161 n. 46, 162 n. 55
Griffith 1898		I, ro. 16	160 n. 38
pKahun 3, 2	118	I, ro. 17	160 n. 38
Gunn 1924		I, vo. 4–5	155
164 (5)	216 n. 121	I, vo. 9	160 n. 38, 162 n. 50, 165
Hammamat		I, vo. 10	157
114, 10–12	197 n. 199	I, vo. 17	160 n. 38
		II, ro. 5b	134
		II, ro. 14	160 n. 38
		II, ro. 28	158
		II, ro. 29–30	195, 197 n. 119
		II, ro. 31	162 n. 55, 163 n. 56

(Heqanakht)		<i>KRI</i>	
II, ro. 33	163 n. 56	I, 49, 12	220
II, ro. 39–40	160 n. 38	I, 50, 6–7	220
II, ro. 41–42	160 n. 38	I, 110, 15	220 n. 142
III, ro. 4–5	154	I, 111, 1	220
Herdsmen		I, 111, 15–112, 1	221
15–16	215	I, 113, 4–5	222 n. 159
Ipuwer		I, 113, 9	220
11, 12–13	126 n. 51	I, 113, 13–14	220
James 1962		I, 239, 5	222
pl. 24, 4	158	II, 120, 14	127
pl. 25. 1–2	158	III, 284, 1–2	126 n. 51
Jéquier 1933		IV, 8, 9/12	222 n. 161
Neith 28	49 n. 3	V, 265, 11–12	222–23
Neith 93	83	V, 267, 5–7	219
Neith 801	83	VII, 227, 2	219
Neith 831	78	Lacau und Chevrier 1956–69	
Jéquier 1935		pl. 19, scene 15	14 n. 59
Aba 594–95	66	Lapp 2004	
Jéquier 1936		pl. 39, 34–35	90 n. 61
N 1055+44	48 n. 4	LD	
N 1009	80 n. 47	II, 35	83
Junker 1940		Leb.	
39	206 n. 47	84	125 n. 47
Junker 1943		Leclant 1961	
231, Fig. 94	79	200	130 n. 57
Junker 1953		LES	
215 Fig. 83	146	23, 3–4	133 n. 62
Kanawati 2007		Louvre	
pl. 29, 54	122	406, 5–6	214
Kanawati and Abdel Razeq 1999		C 167, 1	128
pl. 59 (b), col. 5	216	C 286, 4	58 n. 13
Kanawati and Hassan 1996		Mehuakhti	
43–44	213 n. 101	B.3	145
Kanawati and Hassan 1997		Mereruka	
pl. 37	79	II, pl. 134	77
Khakheperreseneb		Merikare	
ro. 1	128	130	124
ro. 7	123	E 33–34	121
Kheti		E 55	187
V, 4–5	132	E 135	171 n. 10, 194
		Montet 1936	
		91	206
		97	207 n. 59

117	206	69, 2 and 3	212
MOR		152, 5	212
scene 27	210 n. 86	Petrie 1900	
Moussa and Altenmüller 1977		pl. 9	145
fig. 8, 1	133	pLeyden I 365	
fig. 11, 4, 2	133	vo. 1–2	222
Neferti		pNaga ed-Dêr 3500	
6	127	5	217
oDeM		Posener-Kriéger and de Cénival 1968	
1603, 4–5	134	pl. 71 B	202 n. 9
Osing et al. 1982		pSmith	
pl. 58	213 n. 100	2, 3	128
pl. 60, 8–9	179 n. 57	3, 10	21 n. 88
Pantalacci 1998		3, 20	21 n. 88
307	122	13, 20	21 n. 88
pBremner-Rhind		14, 12	21 n. 88
26, 13–14	218	19, 6	85 n. 58
pChester Beatty III		Ptahhotep	
9, 14b	133	11	20 n. 85
Peas.		52	121 n. 34
B1, 16	21 n. 93	122–23 L2	197 n. 119
B1, 25	163	178–79	121 n. 34
B1, 57	25 n. 106	287–88	123
B1, 157–58	148, 194 n. 108	463	127
B1, 298–99	169, 197 n. 119	489	123
B1, 327–29	198 n. 120	pWalters Art Museum 551	
B2, 47	123 n. 40	col. 6, 7	211
B2, 135	186	col. 7, 20	211
Bt 28–29	163	col. 7, 32–33	211
R 7, 4	163	pWestcar	
R 11, 3–4	186	4, 22	129
pEbers		7, 6–7	130
36, 6	20 n. 86	8, 17–18	186
37, 6	20 n. 86	9, 6	167
41, 1	134	9, 7–8	168
41, 14	20 n. 86	10, 5	102
42, 1	20 n. 86	11, 7	173 n. 22
63, 14	165 n. 61	11, 10–12	170 n. 6
102, 15–16	195 n. 112	11, 15–16	174 n. 24
106, 5–6	128	Pyr.	
Petosisiris		29b	81–82
47	212 n. 98	120b	66
49	212 n. 98	132a	198 n. 120
61, 16	212	133b	93 n. 67
		134a	47 n. 3, 166

(Pyr.)		1428d	121
153b	90	1540b	90
179a	189, 198	1626	210
204b	189	1632c	101 n. 25
235a–b	75	1646b	71 n. 33
242b	208 n. 66	1654c	92
243b	189 n. 87	1656d	92 n. 66
319a	59 n. 14	1689b	76
323b	83	1696a–b	90
335a–b	118	1699c	101 n. 25
344a–b	202	1713a	62 n. 19
353a–c	202	1742b–c	77
449a–b	86	1788b	101 n. 24
461a	93 and n. 67	1886c	80 n. 47
461b	93 n. 67	2041	208 n. 66
462c	93 n. 67	2083c–d	47 n. 3
483a	39	2110d	79
555b	69 n. 28	2250c	129
603d	83	Quibell et al. 1898	
604b	65	pl. 31	93
609b	215 n. 89	Rothe et al. 2008	
614a–c	60	ML 19	208 n. 30
617b	1989	Sandman 1938	
620b–c	210, 215 n. 90	16, 12	131
639a	210 n. 82	41, 10	131
693c–d	190	95, 16–17	124 n. 42
705c	61 n. 17	Sethe 1928b	
715a	68 n. 25	70, 24 – 71, 1	119
746a	61 n. 17	84, 6–7	194
771a	120, 122	84, 7–8	164
776b	210	84, 8–11	187
815b	48–49 n. 4	Sh.S.	
852e	62 n. 19	14	173 n. 22
877b	82	28–30	171 n. 15
910a–b	47	45–46	123
934b	179 n. 57	117–19	103
1027c	218	119–23	173 n. 22
1069b	78	139	173 n. 22
1090e–f	68–69	139–40	124
1141c	101 n. 24	Simpson 1966	
1198a	62 n. 20	pl. 9, 5	206 n. 49
1205b	83	Simpson 1980	
1206e–f	68	pl. 15	213 n. 100
1223b	74 n. 38, 83	Sin.	
1242b	129 n. 56	AOS vo. 54	3 n. 7
1267b	68		
1269b	86		
1373b	83		
1426a	77, 90 n. 63		

B 3–5	5 n. 16	Turin	
B 15–19	4–5 n. 14	1447, 12	213
B 32	122	Urk. I	
B 50–51	4 n. 10	13, 3–7	187
B 101–102	171 n. 11	38, 16	51 n. 10
B 107	122 n. 36	39, 1	51
B 114	3 n. 4	39, 10–16	198 n. 121
B 123	131 n. 59	42, 16	216
B 142–43	160 n. 38	61, 17 – 62, 12	136
B 149–55	5–6 n. 17	73, 2	202
B 188–89	173 n. 22	103, 7–8	73
B 197	219 n. 135	106, 4	79
B 199–201	172 n. 18	108, 1–2	86
B 214–15	119	122, 6–7	61
B 255–56	120	125, 15–16	85
B 263	174 n. 27	128, 5–8	118
B 267	3 n. 7	128, 7–8	76
R 22	123	129, 5	121 n. 33
Sinai		179, 12 – 180, 10	208 n. 33
63, 10	132	179, 17	121
90, 2–3	164	180, 1	120
Siut		180, 7	122
I, 243	125	185, 4	77 n. 44
I, 266	148	194, 13	83
IV, 65	127	213, 7	124
<i>Stundenwachen</i>		217, 4	101 n. 25
Day Hour 2	209	224, 4–6	187
Day Hour 4	209	226, 1	102
Day Hour 5	210	255, 5	81
Day Hour 11	211 n. 87	292, 7	79 n. 52
Night Hour 1	209	Urk. IV	
Night Hour 3	209, 211 n. 87	57, 8	130
Night Hour 4	210	58, 2–3	121
Tacke 2013		85, 9	131
I, 164	222	97, 6–7	125 n. 45
Tepemankh		119, 14–16	118
A.1	145	346, 3–7	119
<i>TPPI</i>		363, 12	219
§ 15	106	384, 12–14	128
§ 15, 11	174 n. 28	401, 7	133
§ 20, 6	122 n. 36	449, 16	124
§ 20, 6–7	121	861, 5–6	127
§ 31, 8	217	1239, 15	125
TT 353	210	1425, 14–15	127
		1804, 17–18	102
		1818, 6	219
		2028, 9–12	130

Urk. VII		206, III 7	49 n. 5, 67, 91
16, 9–10	187	220, IV 14–15	171 n. 14
		260, II 0.3	50 n. 7
Vandier 1950			
185, II.α.2	189	Wente 1975–76	
198, II.ε.2-3	190 n. 94	6, col. 6	132
202, II.η.2	189		
206, III 5–6	49, 59	Wild 1953	
		pl. 115	133