CHAPTER II. THE ACTIVE \textit{r sDm.t=f} CONSTRUCTION

The construction studied here, \textit{r sDm.t=f}, is the sister construction of \textit{Dr sDm.t=f}, which is analyzed in the first study on the \textit{sDm.t=f} verb form.\footnote{Studies \textit{sDm.t=f} I (\textit{Dr sDm.t=f}). Although the main results concerning the verb form in that construction are repeated here in brief, knowledge of the approach and the theoretical concepts involved, particularly with respect to relative tense, is a prerequisite for the present study.} There it is argued that the literal translation of \textit{Dr sDm.t=f} is "at a time point that he is to hear yet" and that the verb form is a relative future tense, the specific meaning of which is to locate its Event in a future relative to a Reference point/situation in the context. Whereas \textit{Dr sDm.t=f} is of rare occurrence, we are on much firmer ground with the \textit{r sDm.t=f} construction, which has a long history continuing into Coptic.\footnote{For diachronical remarks on this point see for Late Egyptian Frandsen, Outline Late Eg. Verbal System, 106 (§56); Korostovtsev, Grammaire néo-égyptien, 303 (§333); Cerný - Groll, Late Eg. Grammar, 415 (33.1); Winand, Études néo-égyptien, 292-293 (§464). Junge, Einführung Neuägyptisch, 243-244 (5.4.2.(2)): "Der Umstandssatz der Nachzeitigkeit: Terminativ". For Demotic see Johnson, Demotic Verbal System, 230. For Coptic see Vergote, Grammaire copte IIb, 234 (§167).}

Since I consider it most improbable that any scholar would disagree with the statement that both constructions contain the same verb form, I feel justified in proceeding in the present study from the results already obtained and from my definition of the \textit{sDm.t=f} as a relative future tense.

§ 1. The issues concerning \textit{r sDm.t=f} and its constituent parts.

First, with respect to active meaning, there is the problem of the identification of the -t-affixed verb forms following the preposition/conjunction, which involve the \textit{sDm.t=f}, the feminine infinitive, the feminine-neuter Perfective/Prospective Relative Form with implicit antecedent and, in principle, also verbal nouns with the ending -t or defectively written -(w/y)t.\footnote{See already my remarks in Studies \textit{sDm.t=f} I (\textit{Dr sDm.t=f}), §5, end [p. 10].}

In the study on \textit{Dr sDm.t=f} it is observed that, as far as the evidence for Old Egyptian and Middle Egyptian of the Middle Kingdom is concerned, \textit{Dr sDm.t=f} almost exclusively occurs in the absolute time field context of the immediate future of injunctions and self-exhortations.\footnote{See Studies \textit{sDm.t=f} I (\textit{Dr sDm.t=f}), §15 (4) [p. 19].} There is only one example where the absolute time field of the reference situation is the present, besides the unique example involving the past, which dates from a New Kingdom historical inscription and calls for attention. The question of whether \textit{r sDm.t=f} can freely operate in any absolute time field is of vital importance for the theory of the \textit{sDm.t=f} as a relative future tense, since relative tenses function quite independently of the absolute time of the reference point/situation. Consequently, the constructions in which they occur are also subjected to this rule.

Concerning the meaning of the construction \textit{r sDm.t=f}, there is general agreement that this is "until he hears/(has/had) heard", thus \textit{r} with the purely temporal meaning "until". This is in perfect agreement with the theory of the \textit{sDm.t=f} as a relative future tense, which entails that in the subordinate clause \textit{r sDm.t=f} the conjunction should essentially signify relative future distance in time with respect to a reference situation. Relative future time location in subordinate clauses is generally expressed with the translations "before" and "until".\footnote{It is amazing that Gardiner, \textit{EG}, 374 (§454,4), with regard to \textit{r} + (his) Perfective \textit{sDm.t=f} (now the Prospective \textit{sDm.t=f}; see Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 151, n.1), correctly states that "after \textit{r} 'until' ... relative future time is indicated", whereas on the preceding p. 373 (§454,4) he claims that "the \textit{sDm.t=f} form always has relative past meaning after prepositions": this includes the indubitable \textit{r sDm.t=f}, which is also consistently translated by him with "until".} Therefore, I postulate that the only correct translation of \textit{r sDm.t=f} is "until"--which is in accordance with the temporal conjunction "before" used to translate \textit{Dr sDm.t=f} and \textit{n sDm.t=f}.

Despite the general agreement about the meaning "until", the meaning of \textit{r sDm.t=f} must be put to the test, as some scholars hold the opinion that a modal translation with "so that/in order that" is...
also possible. The statement that in the case of a translation of the relative future with "so that/in order that he will/would hear (/have heard)" the construction has a relative future time reference is certainly correct, but such a time reference does not a priori entail that its verb form is a relative future tense, which is the central issue.

The following points of interest concerning genuine or purported constructions translated with "so that" are in need of closer observation. First, it must be investigated whether certain indubitable constructions translated with "so that" cannot be equally well or better translated with "until". Second, in the case of purported constructions with the obligatory meaning "so that", the possibility of one or more alternative identities of the verb form and alternative translations must be considered—of course, with more or less the same effect. Third, the question of other verb forms following the conjunction when having the temporal meaning "until" is also of importance for a clear picture.

Unlike the essential meaning of the preposition/conjunction Dr, direction is inherent in the basic meaning of the preposition/conjunction r. With respect to the temporal aspect of r as a conjunction used to express movement towards the future, Roeder has defined this as follows: "bis hin zu" einer Zeit: von einem Zeitpunkt bis zu einem anderen". This sense of "from a starting point in time up to a final point" is of importance for establishing the roles and the interaction of the preposition/conjunction and the verb form. Thus, in r sDm.t=f it is the case that both constituent parts involve the future, which may obscure their individual roles in this respect. This requires a final investigation of how the translation with "until" is realized, but, in accordance with the procedure followed for Dr sDm.t=f, I shall, provisionally, only proceed from the relative time reference of the construction.

§ 2. The identification strategy of the -t-affixed verb forms after r.

The most important rival of the sDm.t=f is the infinitive. Although it is a well-established fact that r + infinitive in the Pseudo-Verbal Sentence has temporal future meaning ("on the way to reaching a final point in time" = "shall/will"), r + infinitive as adverbial complement is generally regarded as expressing purpose, "in order to". Below I shall produce evidence that in this latter role r + infinitive can also express the notion of "on the way to finally arriving at a point in time" = "until". In itself this is quite logical and it is, of course, only the translation which brings about the shades of meaning. The temporal or 'final' colouring in the translations of the preposition r are just possibilities within the range of the semantic palette of the expression of finality inherent in its meaning. For example, the Dutch preposition/conjunction "teneinde" in "hij studeerde hard teneinde te slagen", in a literal English translation "he studied hard 'to the end of' succeeding", expresses at the same time being on the way to finally arriving at a result, as well as the aim of the student to achieve a goal.

Because the infinitive can be masculine, the Prospective sDm=t=f enters the arena too. Vennus has characterized the (Subjunctive) Prospective sDm=f as basically a 'modal form', but he notes that the situation is complicated by the merging into the (Subjunctive) Prospective sDm=f of another form, the (Emphatic) Prospective sDm.w=f. More recently, Jansen-Winkeln has produced compelling evidence that in this latter role sDm.t=f is the evidence produced by von Deines - Westendorf, Wb. med. T., 506 (sub c.3).
evidence corroborating this picture. Based on these opinions, it is reasonable to assume that these strong modal affinities of the (Subjunctive) Prospective sDm=f have exerted substantial influence on the meaning of the unitary Middle Egyptian Prospective sDm=f when used with (relative) future time reference. I postulate that the meaning of r + Prospective sDm=f is exclusively modal "so that/in order that", its use to express tense in "until he hears/(has/had) heard" is not a very obvious option, given that another construction with a specialized finite verb form is available for this.

It seems quite logical to assume that the shades of meaning of the preposition/conjunction r as they appear in translation are due to influences exerted by the meaning of the verb forms following it. The exclusivity of the sDm.t=f as establishing the relationship between two time situations, as is evident from Dr sDm.t=f and n sDm.t=f, entails its specialization for expressing such a relationship. In consequence, it is most probable that, among the suffix conjugation forms, the temporal clause with "until" is exclusively the domain of the r sDm.t=f construction.

From this standpoint the infinitive occupies the intermediate position between exclusively temporal "until" for the sDm.t=f and modal "so that/in order that" for the Prospective sDm=f.

It is my impression, that generally speaking, there exists a certain, and very understandable, preference in Egyptology to regard verb forms with expressed agent--and also with obligatory object in the case of the transitive verbs!--as finite suffix conjugation forms, rather than as the infinitive. The strategy of alternative identification as the infinitive can really be based on a significant semantic distinction, as I hope to have shown in the preceding study on Dr sDm.t=f.

There is, of course, the question of why Egyptian would generally prefer the expression of an agent with a principally infinite form as the infinitive, as if it were a finite verb form. The use of the infinitive in such a role in narrative texts seems to me eloquent evidence of the fact that the Egyptian infinitive is closer to operating as an optionally finite form than the infinitive in the modern languages familiar to us. Also, the possibility of construction of agent and semantic object according to the manner of the suffix conjugation points, in my opinion, in that direction.

A final problem is the possibility that a -t-affixed verb form after r can also be identified as the feminine-neuter Perfective/Prospective Relative Form with implicit antecedent, which is of frequent occurrence after this preposition with the meaning "in accordance with", like after mi. That this is

Prospective sDm.w=f see already Studies sDm.t=f l (Dr sDm.t=f), n.34.

Jansen-Winkeln, Finalatsz. GM 146 (1995), 37-61. His main objective was to establish the substantival character of the form; contra Depuydt, Prospective sDm.t, JARCE 30 (1993), 27 (C), who argued in favour of the Subjunctive Prospective sDm=t being an adverbial verb form. I note here that, fully comparable to the English usage, the form can be translated in its well-known adverbial use as a final subordinate clause with the implicitly adverbial "that he may ...", as an alternative to explicit "in order that". In "that he may ..." the modal meaning is expressed by "may" and the substantival character by the special use there of "that".

It seems that the editors of the medical texts follow the same policy, given the fact that all examples of r sDm=t/s referred to in von Deines - Westendorf, Wb. med. T., 761 (l.a.1-2) are rendered in the official translation (von Deines - Grapow - Westendorf, Übersetz. med. T., passim) with "so that". The choice in favour of the identification of the verb form as the Prospective sDm=t in Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 147 (§211,1) may well be based on the assumption that it concerns a finite verb form if the agent/subject is expressed.

A according to Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 151 (§214,4), and I fully agree with him, the Prospective sDm=t occurs after the preposition/conjunction r with both the meanings "so that" and "until". However, the two examples given as evidence for this may equally well contain the infinitive (see for the form iwt my note 17 below; see further in this section my remark on the infinitive + agent as alternative explanation). Of the example H 148, which can only have the meaning "until", it is noted by Westendorf on p. 151, n.2 that--significantly, in my opinion--the parallel Eb 463 has the sDm=t form xpr.t. The improbability of the Prospective sDm=t as expressing the 'until' notion after the preposition r is possibly implicitly confirmed by--though not explicitly stated in--Venus, Future at Issue, as may be inferred from the fact that Venus nowhere mentions the purely temporal future use in the subordinate temporal clause. Note that his example CT [830] VII 31 k of r + Prospective sDm.w=f given on p. 30, n.12 does not contain a construction with r and, actually, reads m-xt Xnm.w=f I4 pa n anx[w] Dt.

For example, justifiably with respect to the word "presumed", Gardiner, EG, 228 (§304,3-ObS.) observes under the heading of the infinitive that "when subject closely follows the verb-form, it is to be presumed that the verb-form is not the infinitive, but the sDm.t form, or alternatively, if there is an ending -t, the sDm.t form"; cf. also p. 227 (§304). Compare the approach to mi rDm=t, constructions of Venyn, Études VI. RdE 38 (1987), 168-174.

See Gardiner's remarks, EG, 222 (§298); Lefebvre, GEC, 201 (§397).

For the confusion between the relative form and the sDm.t=f after mi see, e.g., Erman, Ág. Grammatik, 209 (§418). Also, certain examples given in Sethe, Verbum II, 158 (§353,13a-b,f) as evidence for the sDm.t=f after the prepositions m and mi are in fact feminine-neuter relative forms with implicit antecedent.
a good alternative identification requiring a translation somewhat different from "so that" will be shown in the section on r Hst constructions.

To sum up, my strategy with respect to the identification of a -t-affixed active verb form--provided that it is not a relative form--and with respect to the meaning of the construction will be as follows:

1) When it concerns a certain sDm.t=t, the translation is exclusively "until".
2) When the form is either a sDm.t=t or a feminine infinitive, while the meaning is "until", I choose the sDm.t=t, because r + infinitive is semantically ambivalent.
3) When a translation with "so that" is required, it concerns the infinitive and the translation should rather be "to the purpose of".
4) The verb iw/iy. The construction written r iyt=f with the meaning "until" is considered to contain the sDm.t=t form (r iyt=f); with the meaning "to the purpose of", it contains the infinitive (r iyt=f). The construction written r iwt=f with the meaning "until" contains the infinitive (r iwt=f); when translated with "so that", it contains either the (Subjunctive) Prospective sDm=f or the infinitive (r iwt=f). In the latter case the construction is then more exactly translated with "to the purpose of" or something similar.

§ 3. The absolute time of the reference situation and of the context.

Before embarking on the examples, I would like to repeat that the absolute time of the reference situation may well differ from that of the general context. 18

In the following examples the time of the reference situation is the absolute past, and the general context is retrospective, and thus also of the general past.

Sinuhe B, 247. Sbb.(w) atx.(w) tp-mAa=f r pH.t=f dmi n ITw "mixing and straining were done in my presence, until I reached the town of Itju".

Statue Cairo CG 534, back, 3-5.19 ink qbb n niwt=t gw m pr=f di=i snDt nTr=f m ib=i nsw m HAty=f SstSn nb=t xt ay=f r pH.t=f lAwt nt did=sn "I was one tranquil in his town and one silent in his house, while I placed the fear of my god in my heart and of the king in my heart, and the awe for my lord through my limbs, until I reached the old age which they give".

Absolute present time reference of the reference situation occurs in the following examples from CT Spell 60, where in a speech situation the deceased is addressed and his present situation is described.20

CT [60] I 250 b/B10C c. iw=s m sA=k r HD.t tA r HAt.f=k r Xr.t-Tr "she [Bastet] is your protection, until the earth dawns, until you go down to the necropolis". It may be inferred from r HD.t tA that r

---

18 Some examples are: Urk. I 220.16 - 221.1: iw [S]Ad.n=i sw n mpt 3 r iw(t=?) r Xnw sk sw Xr mw "I dug it [the canal] for three years, until (my?) returning to the Residence, when it [the canal] contained water". Pap. (med.) Kahun, 2,4-5: wrs=s Hr.m tA r iw n=n sA iaw-r "she must spend the day being sober until the coming of the time of after breakfast". Sinuhe B, 309-310: iw=s Xr Hswt nt-nsw r iw hrw n mni "I was under the praise of the king until the coming of the day of death". CT [40] I 176 f-g: iisk wi aA m tA pn n anxw [m] mdw=ik imy DADA mt r iw=t= iH Tr=i r iyt=f "indeed, I am here in this land of the living [as] your intercessor who is in the Tribunal of Man until my coming to you". CT [98] II 94 a-c/B1C: Dd s r pn Hr knn nt tp=f di=f sy Hr mAst=f Hr pag r iw aff r xnp=s "a man recites this spell over a louse of his head, while he holds it on his knee whilst spitting, until the coming of a fly to snatch it". With regard to the last example, a translation expressing consequence (infinitive "to the purpose of") is not excluded; the verb form could then also be the Subjunctive Prospective sDm=f ("so that a fly comes"); the variants B2L and B2P have the form iw, i.e. the defective writing iw.(w) of the Emphatic Prospective sDm=f. This change may well point to a case of the shift from a temporal 'until' notion into a modal one of 'so that', a distinction often quite narrow; the shift is quite understandable when the Subjunctive Prospective iw=t=f and the infinitive iw are indistinguishable. See also my §8 below [pp. 38-39]. The parallel of CT [49] I 217 b/B12C with the 'until' notion shows the writing r iy=f iw, whereas the others have r iy; we may well be concerned here with the interchange of the infinitives iy=i and iy=, -- An obvious exception is stela Florence 2510, 6-7 (= Schiaparelli 1774; publ. Bosticco, Stele egiziane Firenze, no. 18, see also pp. 24-25): ink spd Hr xrp mvt=f r iw hrw nfr n imy=f "I was one keen on leading his subjects until the day on which it would be good for me came", but the fact that the next line contains a mistaken writing of the sDm.n=f in did=ni st n sA=i m imyt-pr does not make the orthography very reliable. The form nfr was identified by Gardiner, EG, 307 (§389,3) as a relative form.

19 See Studies sDm.t=f I (Dr sDm.t=t), §4, end [p. 9].

20 Publ. Borchardt, Statuen. II, 84-85. The statue dates from the Middle Kingdom.

For a partial translation see Kees, Totenglauben, 271; Münster, Unt. Göttin Isis, 25, n.328; 36, n.465 and 467; Willems, Chests of Life, 146.
The infinitive as heading is tense indifferent that you may be in it, until the earth dawns”. Embalming, (i.e.) your Place of Embalming in the temples as what Re made as your protection, wn=k im=s r HD.t 

The God’s Booth, is presenting the requirements of the lector priest, until the earth dawns”. “no sooner does day brighten than the god removes himself in the Place of Embalming, (i.e.) your Place of Embalming in the temples as what Re made as your protection, that you may be in it, until the earth dawns”. The infinitive as heading is tense indifferent and represents in the following example the general present.

Stela Metropolitan Museum of Art New York 17.190.1960, 1-2. dwA Ra xft wb<n>=f r xpr.t HIp=f m anx “worshipping Re when he rises until his setting in life takes place”. Absolute future time reference of the reference situation does occur in speech situations in particular. May be embedded in a narrative context, as in the next example.

Sh. Sailors, 118. mk Tw r it Aby Aby Abd km.t=k Aby 4 m-Xnw-n iw pn “see, you will pass month after month, until you have completed four months on this island”. CT [158] II 359 c - 360 a/S2P. iw=sn Hna=k Dr.kA=sn Hna=k k r xt.t 4I X wnt(=)sn Hna=k “they are with you”. The absolute time of the reference point (Dr.kA=sn) is the future. For its being embedded in the narrative context of a dialogue between Re and Horus CT II 357 c: aHa.n Dd.n 1r “then Horus said” and, farther back, CT II 356 b: aHa.n Dd.n Ra “then Ra said” are testimony.

In the following example the description of the situation of the deceased in the hereafter is in the absolute present context. Embedded in it is a request which has absolute future time reference.

CT Spell 691 contains the speech of a text. May be embedded in it a request which has absolute future time reference. CT [691] VI 324 d-e. Dr.kA=sn Hr grHw=sn nw anx r wDA.t=k wbn=i “may he cause to add a multitude of nights to my nights of life, until I proceed that I may shine”.

Examples occur also in the absolute future context of stipulations, instructions and injunctions. Tomb of Hapidjefa (Siut I), 278. Hna prt nsn m-sA Hm-kA=f Hr sAxt=f r PH.t=sn qaH mHty n Hwt-nTr “and they must make the procession behind his ka-priest whilst glorifying him, until they have reached the northern corner of the temple”.

Stela of king Neferhotep at Abydos, 13. m sDr(w) grH mi hw r spr.t=k r Ab Dw “do not sleep night nor day, until you have arrived at Abydos”. Ptahhotep, 86-87. HH n=k sp nb mnx r wnt sDr=r=k nn iw im=f “seek out for yourself every excellent deed, until your conduct is without wrongdoing (lit., while there is no wrongdoing in it)”. It is probable that wnt is the sDm=t verb form here, with sDr=r=k as subject. It is unlikely that we have here an occurrence of the nominalizing particle wnt, followed by a converted main clause of an A deverbal Sentence with sDr=r=k as subject and nn iw im=f as predicate.

21 Zande, Crossword Puzzle, 61: r hA.t=k “in order that thu mayest descend to the netherworld”. Seibert, Charakteristik, 121 offers two options: “für den (oder bis zum) Tagesanbruch”. Note that Kees, Totenglauben, 271 and M. Unt. Göttin Isis, 36, n. 465 translate the following Prospective sDm=t forms in final use in CT I 252 e with “until” too.

22 For the translation of the participle construction with r in CT I 252 e see Vernus, Études III, RdE 35 (1984), 186 (4).

23 For the translation of the participle construction with r in CT I 252 e see Vernus, Études III, RdE 35 (1984), 186 (4).

24 Gardiner, EG, 222 (§298); Edel, AÅG, 351 (§695).


26 Sethe, Sprüche für das Kinnen der Seelen 3, ZÄS 58 (1923), 58 (38): “so werden sollen” sie nunmehr von dir sein, damit Seth weiss dass sie mir sind*.

27 Grieshammer, Jenseitsgericht, 47-48 took wbn=i to be the syntactical equivalent of r wDA.t=k (“bis ich fortorge und wieder erscheine”). The spell is a precursor of BD ch. 71, recently treated by Aa, Niet ten dode opgeschreven (dissertation A msterdam); for r wDA.t see p. 62 (Aa, Chons, Ga).

28 Publ. Griffith, Inscriptions Siut, pl. 6; M ontet, Tombeaux de Siout, Kemi 3 (1930-1935), 56.

29 Translated in Théodoridès, Contrats d’Hapidjefa, Revue internationale des droits de l’antiquité. 3e série 18 (1971), 120.


31 Thus also Gardiner, to judge from his quotation in E, 163 (§215).

32 Thus also Zába, Maximes de Ptahhotep, 118 (86) and Loprieno, sDm=t, GM 37 (1980), 21. See further Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 150 (ex. 82).
I hope to have sufficiently demonstrated the flexibility of the \textit{r sDm.t=f} construction occurring in any absolute time field of the reference situation, and shall now pay attention to the other question, that of modal "so that" assumed to be a possible translation of \textit{r sDm.t=f}.

§ 4. The examples of \textit{r snb.t=f} suggested to mean "so that" as well.

The verb \textit{snb} "to be healthy" has a masculine infinitive, and no alternative identification of the verb form in the expression \textit{r snb.t=f} is possible. The theory of the \textit{sDm.t=f} as a relative future tense requires a translation with "until". Almost all constructions of the preposition/conjunction \textit{r} with a form of the verb \textit{snb} "to be(come) healthy" in the medical texts have \textit{r snb=f/s}, quite often with the addition \textit{Hr-a(wy)} "immediately, very soon", but rare instances with the \textit{sDm.t=f} do occur.\(^{33}\)

An example is Pap. (med.) Kahun, 1,29 \(^{34}\) \textit{wnm.(w) m[H]t [r] snb.t=s}. In his grammar of the medical texts Westendorf translates the passage with "the fat must be eaten, so that she becomes better", but the official translation of the corpus gives "until", as also in the only other instance of \textit{sDm.t=f} without the addition of a time adverb.\(^{35}\)

Although, generally speaking, the translations of the same passage with "so that" and "until" are not worth much argument, this point is essential for the present issue. In any case it makes clear that "until" is a most suitable translation. Indeed, because it is so self-evident that a medical prescription is meant to cure a patient, it could be argued that this needs no special mention through the expression "so that he becomes better". It is conceivable that it may be more important to indicate precisely until what time the medicine must be taken continuously, and that what is specified here is that this is not for a fixed period, i.e. a course of treatment, but all the time until the patient is better.\(^{36}\)

The above argument notwithstanding, Westendorf may have had good reason to translate the rare construction \textit{r snb.t=f} with both "so that" and "until". The main argument for "so that" may well come from the following example.

Pap. (med.) BM 10059, 15.13.\(^{37}\) a\textit{D}r.\(\textit{H}w\) \textit{Hr-s r snb.t(w)=f Hr-awy} "the white spot is kept under control owing to it, until(?) he is better, very soon".\(^{38}\) Only here, owing to the presence of the time adverb Hr-awy, does the translation of \textit{r snb.t=f} with "until" give an awkward effect, and "so that" fits undoubtedly better. A temporal adverb other than "finally"\(^{39}\) cannot, or not smoothly, be connected with the temporal conjunction "until". It is evident that "until" as meaning "all the time before a final point" and involving some length of time is incompatible with an extension with Hr-a(wy) "immediately, very soon".

I am inclined to consider the example under discussion as an incidental mistake for or corruption of the much more frequent examples of \textit{r + (purported) Prospective sDm=f + Hr-a(wy)} "so that he becomes better instantly", which in the medical text corpus seems to be nothing more than a variant with more or less the same meaning as simple \textit{r snb=f/s}.\(^{40}\) Less probably, Hr-awy might be conceived of as some afterthought "which, by the way, will be the case very soon".

Compare the following passages of \textit{r snb.t=f} outside the medical corpus, which are equally well translated with "until". There is no need for a translation with "so that".

Dramatische Ramesseumsnapyrus, 102-103 (scene 33.22). \textit{gn.n(=) i(=) tn nn r snb.t=f rf} "it was until he was better again that I have embraced this tired father of mine."\(^{41}\)

---

\(^{33}\) For the references see von Deines - Westendorf, \\(Wb.\) med. T., 761 (I.a.1-3), where both "so dass" and "bis dass" are given as possible translations of \textit{r snb=t=l}s and \textit{r snb=t=fs}. The official translation in von Deines - Grapow - Westendorf, Übersetz. med. T. of the instances referred to in the dictionary consistently gives the meaning "so dass" for both \textit{r snb=t=l}s and \textit{r snb=t=fs Hr-awy}, whereas for \textit{r snb=t=l}s this is "until", except for case L 58 with Hr-a(wy).\(^{34}\)

\(^{34}\) = Case Kah 9, publ. in Grapow, Med. T., 461.


\(^{36}\) Thus also for the example Pap. (med.) Kahun, 5-24-25 with the \textit{sDm.t=f} in Grandet - Mathieu, Cours d’égyptien II, 116: "jusqu’à ce que".

\(^{37}\) = Case L 58, publ. Grapow, Med. T., 380; note the spelling with tw for t, which is uncommon for the writing of the \textit{sDm.t=f} in the medical texts.

\(^{38}\) von Deines - Grapow - Westendorf, Übersetz. med. T., 219: "so dass er sofort gesund wird".

\(^{39}\) Cf. Satzinger, \textit{sDm.t=f}, JEA 57 (1971), 58-69: "schliesslich hörte er".

\(^{40}\) A more argument for some corruption may be the writing \textit{r snb.t(w)=f}; see my note 37 above.

\(^{41}\) Sethe, Dram. Ram. Pap., 211: "bis". Thus also Aßmann, Verborgenheit des Mythos, GM 25 (1977), 17.
What seems to me significant evidence is that in the medical texts, except for one example, the time adverb Hr-awy "immediately, very soon" is not collocated with r snb=t=f but, instead, with r snb=f. This agrees with my hypothesis that the meaning of r sDm.t=f is exclusively temporal "until". 42

This evidence is nicely supported by the following passage, which contains two constructions with the preposition/conjunction r, one with t and the other without but with Hr-awy.

Pap. Ebers, 50.16-21. 43 ir.t(w) m nhp r xpr.t nw n sTy=r Hna swr st r snb=f Hr-awy "It is made in the early morning, until the time of breakfast comes, and it is drunk, so that he becomes better immediately". 44 Where "until" is obligatory, the sDm.t=f is used, and where a final/consecutive translation is required, owing to Hr-awy, either the Prospective sDm=f or the infinitive is used. 45

It is worth noting that of all the instances in the medical texts of r snb=f (Hr-awy) none shows the optional -w/y-affix of the Prospective sDm=f, which might be taken as an indication that the construction does not contain that verb form. Whatever the value of my argument about the greater suitability of a translation of r snb=t=f with "until", the whole matter can be solved by identifying the form in r snb=f as the formally identical infinitive. 46 That is, irrespective of whether a temporal translation with "until" or a modal one with "in order to", "to the purpose/effect of", "with the consequence of" etc. is to be preferred. The latter translations are obligatory when Hr-awy is present. Occasionally, the notion "until" is also expressed with r snb=t=f.

Some medical parallels containing verbs other than snb, involving xpr, whn, swA (all with masculine infinitive), show the interchangeability of the sDm.t=f construction with a construction without a -t-affix in the verb form. 47 According to my hypothesis, it concerns in the latter case r + infinitive; indeed, "until" is most suitable.

§ 5. The expression r Hst=t=f "so that he praises/d" claimed to contain the sDm.t=f.

Before turning to expressions with r Hst, I would like to present an example which exposes the identification problem of constructions of r + -t-affixed verb forms rather clearly.

Urk. IV 345,10-11. TA=sn antyw r mrt=sn ATP=sn aHaw Htp.t ib=sn "they may take myrrh in accordance with what [as much/long as] they want, and they may load the ships, until their heart is satisfied". There can be little doubt that r mrt=sn contains a relative form. However, in his

42 Note that, for example, in the Myth of the Destruction of Mankind (ed. Hornung, Himmelskuh, p. 3 (lines 7-8/SI = verse 28) all parallels have mdw n=n r sDm(q)=n st: "speak, so that we may hear it", but this is due to a redundant t, of frequent occurrence in this text; e.g., also p. 11 (line 29/SI = verses 112-113) mdw n=n r phyl w ky (contra Vernus, Études III, RdE 35 (1984), 187, n.176, who identifies a sDm=t=f, "until" is unsuitable here). Note the genuine sDm.t=f in p. 4 (lines 9-10/SI = verse 34) in mdw n=n r swA.t(w)=D Od bi=bn (Hr-awy) T r=sn "I cannot kill them, until I have heard what you have to say about it", where the writing with tw indicates the pronounced t; see already Studies sDm.t=f I (Dr sDm.t=f), n.3.

43 = Case Eb 283, publ. Gropaw, Med. T., 246.

44 Von Deines - Gropow - Westendorf, Übersetz. med. T., 141.

45 I disagree with deines - Westendorf, Med. T., 141, 510-511 (§3): "Im Gebrauch von r sDm=f und r sDm.t=f ist kein Unterschied festzustellen (etwa: 'so dass' gegenüber 'bis dass')". Cf. also Westendorf's remarks, op.cit., 138, n.5.

46 Cf. the translation of Pap. Ram. III,B,8 in Grandet - Mathieu, Cours d'égyptien II, 116: rdi r=sDm.t=f "to apply to him until he is better". However, they identify the form as a Prospective sDm=f.

47 Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 195 (§ 269,1a). It concerns: 1) Pap. Ebers, 80,15-17 (= Eb 642) sDr m nhw maAw r xpr sminy "to remain overnight in a new pot until the forming of its cream"; par. Pap. Hearst, 8,12-13 (= H 111; r xpr t "until ... has formed"). 2) Pap. Berlin 3038, 5,1-4 (= Bln 52) tw.(w) Hr=s [r whnyt(w)]=t(f) "it is to be bandaged with it, until it shrinks"; par. Pap. Ebers, 74,2-3 (= Eb 569) rdi.(w) r n sn hit whnyt dD=t(f) "it is to be placed at the opening of the khesed-swelling until its shrinking of its own" (von Deines - Gropow - Westendorf, Übersetz. med. T., 236 "so that"). Pap. Edwin Smith, 7,14-22 (= Sm 19) wdxr=k swH mnw=t(f) swAw At ih=t(f) "next, you put him on his stretcher, until the time of his suffering has passed"; cf. Pap. Edwin Smith, 2,2-11 (= Sm 4) dl.(w) r tA Hr mnw=t(f) r swAw At ih=t(f) "(he) is to be placed on the ground on his stretcher until the passing of the moment of his suffering". For the incorrect use or corrupt writing in Pap. Berlin 3038, 13-3-8 (= Bln 154) iib(b)f wxA.(w) dp=t(f) HtAy=t(f) "his heart is 'nighted'; he tastes his hasty-heart" compare Pap. Ebers, 102,9-11 (= Eb 855w) lw ib=t(f) wxA=t(f) HtAy=t(f); note that in the Pap. Berlin parallel the very common word ib "heart" is corrupted into iib written as the verb "to be thirsty"! I am not convinced that Vernus, Études III, RdE 35 (1984), 186, n.165 is right when he postulates that r sDm.t=f expresses the "accompli" and the form without the "inaccompli", see already Studies sDm.t=f I (Dr sDm.t=f), n.4 and n.100.
grammars Erman mistakenly recognized the verb form written $\text{mr}=\text{sn}$ as an $\text{sDm}=\text{f}$. On the other hand, it is impossible to translate $r \text{Hst}=\text{f}$ as an active participial construction, which would require the verb $s\text{Hst}$, or as a relative form, which would require resumption with $\text{Hr}=\text{s}$. Most clearly, it is a $r \text{sDm}=\text{f}$ construction. Thus, despite their formal similarity, the two constructions with $r$ are quite different.

A number of scholars recognize the $\text{sDm}=\text{f}$ in the expression written $r \text{Hst}=\text{f}$, which shows a rich variety in construction. Because a translation with "until" is not suitable here, I choose an alternative identification of the verb form.

The most complex of these constructions is of the following type. For example, Urk. I 100.11.49 $\text{ir.k}(\text{wi}) \text{mi-qd} r \text{Hs.t/Hst} \text{w(i)} \text{Hm}=\text{f} \text{Hr}=\text{s} r \text{xt \ nb}$. Edel translates with "I acted ... so that His Majesty praised me on account of it exceedingly".\[50\]

He also notes another frequently occurring variant of the expression with -t-affixed verb form, now without expression of both the object $\text{w(i)}$ and the prepositional phrase $\text{Hr}=\text{s}$: $\text{ir.y(=i)} r \text{Hs.t}=\text{k/Hst}=\text{k}$. In Edel's translation: "I do that you may praise".\[51\]

There is also a narrative version of this construction: Urk. I 100.9 $\text{ir.k}(\text{wi}) r \text{Hs.t/Hst} \text{Hm}=\text{f}$. Another version is without object but with resumption: Urk. I 217.2 $\text{wn}(=i) \text{Hr} \text{wHm}=\text{f} m \text{mtd}=\text{f} \text{nb} im r \text{Hs.t}=\text{f/Hst}=\text{f} \text{Hr}=\text{s}$.\[52\] In the next example of the expression, the form $\text{Hst}=\text{k}$ is the object of the main clause verb and there is no preposition/conjunction $r$: Eloquent Peasant B1, 3 $\text{ir.y}=\text{i/Hst}=\text{k}$.\[53\]

Ambiguous though the identification of the verb form in most variants may be, the verb form in the latter case can only be a relative form: "I shall do what you like". Indeed, all variants contain the same verb form, if it is assumed that it concerns a relative form. In $\text{ir.y(=i)/ir.k}(\text{wi}) r \text{Hst}=\text{k}" I shall act/have acted with a view at what you will/would praise" the antecedent implicit in the relative form is its semantic object, and there is no need to emend the dependent pronoun $w$.\[54\]

When the relative form itself is provided with a grammatical object, the grammatically necessary resumptive pronoun in $\text{Hr}=\text{s}$ is present: "I acted ... with a view at that concerning which His Majesty would praise me".

In the example Urk. I 217.2 $\text{wn}(=i) \text{Hr} \text{wHm}=\text{f} m \text{mtd}=\text{f} \text{nb} im r \text{Hst}=\text{f} \text{Hr}=\text{s}": I used to replace him in every matter of his there, with a view at that concerning which he would praise" a dependent pronoun as object is absent, while a resumptive pronoun is present. This is somewhat unusual--though not impossible--with a relative form or passive participle construction of a transitive verb with resumption.\[55\] The word $\text{Hst}$ need not be regarded as a substantive $\text{Hs.t}(\text{wi})$ "with a view at his praise for it" or something of the kind.

This alternative identification of a relative form was made long ago by Gunn, who identified the form as the Prospective Relative Form.\[56\] He made the very perceptive remark that the preposition $r$ rather expresses the notion of intention on the part of the agent of the verb form in the main clause ("with a view at") than of compliance with the wish of the superior ("in accordance with"). I do not
doubt the correctness of this identification and his remark. In theory, the variant construction $r\ Hst\ wi\ Hm=f$ is also possible. That no occurrence is known to me seems to suit the identification of $Hst$ as a relative form. This may well be accidental, however, because this construction occurs with the preposition $mi$, which in such instances has practically the same meaning.

This construction $mi\ Hst=f\ wi$ can only contain the infinitive, with the literal meaning "just like his praising me", if it is taken for certain—as I do—that the $sDm.t=f$ does not occur after prepositions other than $r$ or $Dr$. The theoretically possible construction $r\ Hst=f\ wi$ would then also contain the infinitive, and not the $sDm.t=f$. It would then have the meaning "to the purpose of his praising me".

Edel also notes examples without $-t$-affix: first, $ir(=i)\ r\ Hs=k$ "I act so that you praise", which contains either the Subjunctive $sDm=f$ or the Prospective $sDm(.w)=f$ of Old Egyptian. Second, $ir.y(=i)\ Hs=k$ "I shall act in order that you praise" contains the Subjunctive $sDm=f$.

§ 6. The preposition $r$ "until" + the infinitive as adverbial adjunct.

In § 2 I argue that it is not the Prospective $sDm=f$ but the infinitive that covers the 'until' notion in addition to the $sDm.t=f$. I would now like to draw attention to a few indisputable examples in the medical texts of $r$ + infinitive as adverbial adjunct with a non-modal sense, albeit that "until" is here used rather in the spatial sense "as far as", "to the end".

In § 2 I argue that it is not the Prospective $sDm=f$ but the infinitive that covers the 'until' notion in addition to the $sDm.t=f$. I would now like to draw attention to a few indisputable examples in the medical texts of $r$ + infinitive as adverbial adjunct with a non-modal sense, albeit that "until" is here used rather in the spatial sense "as far as", "to the end".

Pap. Ebers, 100, 6-7. $iw\ mtwt\ 6\ sSm\ n\ rdwy\ 3\ n\ rd\ wnmky\ 3\ n\ rd\ iAby\ r\ pH\ Tbt$ "there are six vessels leading to the legs, three to the right leg, three to the left leg until reaching the sole of the foot".

Pap. Ebers, 101, 11-14. $wtn\ aDt=f\ pw\ m\ Swt=f\ iAbt\ r\ dmD\ m\ qaH=f$ "it means that his fatty mass in his left side is present until uniting with his shoulder".

The next example seems to contain an indubitable instance of $r$ + infinitive with the temporal meaning "until", also without the expression of the agent.

Stela of M entuhotep son of Hepy (Petrie M useum London UC 14333), 3-5. $xaw=i\ m\ aq\ Hr\ nb=f\ wwr\ Xr\ pHwy=f\ iryw-sbx\ xam.y\ r\ pH\ bw\ nty\ Hm\ im$ "my appearance was of one who had access to his lord, (with) the great ones behind him and the gate-keepers bowing until reaching the place where the Majesty was". Grammatically correctly, the speaker in the participial construction $aq\ Hr\ nb=f$ is referred to in the 3rd person in $Hr\ nb=f$ and, consequently, also in $Xr\ pHwy=f$. Therefore it is unlikely for a suffix pronoun $(=i)$ to be virtually present behind $pH$. In my opinion, it can only concern a masculine infinitive of a transitive verb followed by a substantive denoting the semantic object.

A further example may be the following.

Tomb Siut III, 5. $aHa\ Hr\ pgA\ n\ xArt\ r\ dr=f\ DArw=s$ "one who remained steadfast in the arena for the widow until his removing her needs". A translation with "so that" cannot be excluded, however.

At first sight, no problem of identification of the verb form seems to arise in the following example, where a seemingly clear instance of the feminine infinitive is present.

CT [99] II 95 g - 96 a/S1C. $in\ m<hy>\ xnty\ pr\ 9Hwty\ smh.y=f\ ib\ n\ s\ np\ r\ swA(t?)//swA.t=(i?)\ Hr=f$ "it
is Sem(hy), the foremost of the house of Thoth, who will make forgetful the heart of this man until the passing by him/I pass by him\(^\text{\textsuperscript{76}}\). The form written swA\(t\) appears to be the feminine infinitive of a IV\text{ae}\ text, but there is good evidence that the infinitive of this verb is masculine swA\(t\).\(^\text{\textsuperscript{77}}\) Unless it is assumed that this verb can have both a feminine and a masculine infinitive, as is occasionally the case with the verbs Sm\(t\) "to go away\(^\text{\textsuperscript{71}}\) and sDm\(t\) "to proceed\(^\text{\textsuperscript{72}}\), I propose to emend it here either into an infinitive swA\(t\) or to assume a sDm\(t\(<s>-i\) with the suffix pronoun \(-i\) not written out.

§ 7. The identification problems of \(r + -t\)-affixed verb form + agent.

The following examples are formally ambiguous since they are just as likely to contain the sDm\(t\(<t>-f\) as the feminine infinitive + agent expression according the suffix conjugation.\(^\text{\textsuperscript{73}}\) In the case of transitive verbs there must also be an object; if not, the suffix pronoun or substantive following denotes the semantic object.

The following example contains an intransitive verb of motion.

Inscr. Wadi Hammamat 110, 3-5.\(^\text{\textsuperscript{74}}\) iw in gHst bkAt Hr Smwt Hr=s r rmT xft-Hr=s iw inty=s Hr mAA Hr sAsA n n(<nt>)-s H A-s r spr=s r Dw pn Sps r inr pn "the coming of a pregnant gazelle in a walking, her face towards the people in front of her, while her eyes were looking straight ahead and without her turning back until her arriving at this noble mountain, at this stone".\(^\text{\textsuperscript{75}}\) Owing to the intransitive use of ann with the preposition HA, the only possibility seems to be to consider the form after nn to be the infinitive + suffix pronoun \(-s\) as agent/subject. However, Gardiner identifies a suffix conjugation form in \(r spr=s\). I argue that the presence of the same suffix pronoun as agent in the preceding \(nn + \) infinitive construction makes it rather probable that it also concerns an infinitive in \(r spr=s\).\(^\text{\textsuperscript{76}}\) I take iw in the circumstantial Pseudoverbal Sentence as marking a significant point here.

In the next example the choice between the two forms is made on the slenderest of morphological evidence, although it concerns the very frequent verb (\(r\)).

PT [570] §149a-c/M. ia<nt>-n n m\(m\)-k n Ra xsr=k HA At pt r dl sw Tm Axt sDm\(t\)-f bAw=f Hswwt=f m r n pDsT-nTw "be mounted up to N in your name of Re, that you may dispel the cloudiness of the sky until [to the purpose of] Horus of the Horizon's showing himself, that he may hear his [my] power and his [my] praise from the mouth of the Ennead of Gods".\(^\text{\textsuperscript{77}}\) There is evidence that the

---

\(\text{\textsuperscript{70}}\) See Studies sDm\(t\)-f (Dr sDm\(t\)-f), §8, ref. ex. CT [769] V 404 I-n [p. 12]. On the basis of my postulate that \(r +\) Prospective sDm\(t\)-f does not have the meaning "until", also case Pap. Edwin Smith 4 (2,7) di.(w) \(r\) IA Hr mnn-f \(r\) swA At ih-f "(he) is to be placed on the ground on his bed until the passing of the moment of his suffering; publ. Grapow, Med. T., 303. For further evidence see von Deines - Westendorf, Wb. med. T., 724 (1); note the parallel instance with sDm\(t\)-f (\(r\) swA\(t\))) in case Sm 19 (7,18); publ. Grapow, Med. T., 321-322.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{71}}\) Infinitive Smt: e.g., CT [502] V 86 i/B1Bo Sm\(t\) min iw bkA "going today, returning tomorrow". Infinitive Smt: CT [1004] V 220 I sm\(t\) l\(\text{\textsuperscript{\textit{m}}\,}\text{\textit{l}}\) sm\(t\) l\(\text{\textsuperscript{\textit{m}}\,}\text{\textit{l}}\). Among the few occurrences of the verb in the Coffin Texts the infinitive Smt\(t\) is more frequent than Sm\(t\): CT [250] III 345 a/SIC\(\text{\textsuperscript{\textit{t}}}\); CT [421] V 258 a/B1Y (cf. also Faulkner, Coffin Texts II, 68, n.1); CT [428] V 274 a; CT [574] VI 184 i; CT [674] VI 302 a-b. Interesting is also that, when a verbal abstract is present, the indirect genitive is used, according to treatment as a normal substantive: Roccati, Papiro ieratico, r., rubrum hor. above lines 13-18 r n Smt\(t\) n HAw "spell of the repelling of the snake"; the infinitive is Smt\(t\).

\(\text{\textsuperscript{72}}\) See §7, end below [p. 38].

\(\text{\textsuperscript{73}}\) See my remarks in §2 above [pp. 29-30].

\(\text{\textsuperscript{74}}\) Couyat - M ontet, Instz. Ouadi Hammamat, pl. 29; Readingbook, 76-77.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{75}}\) Schenkel, Memphis - Herakleopolis - Theben, 263 (441).

\(\text{\textsuperscript{76}}\) Other examples containing transitive verbs + expression of agent and semantic object may be the following. Admonitions, 13, 4: Sm\(t\)-f Hr mTw r mAA\(f\) wDnw "his going is on the roads until he sees the flood". With the meaning "until" it is unlikely that the form is a Substantival sDm\(t\)-f, or even an Emphatic Prospective sDm\(t\)-f, which latter form does, occur after \(r\) (see Vernus, Future at Issue, 30, n.12), but as far as the evidence in the medical texts goes (see Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 211,1) it has the meaning "so that". Pap. Ebers, 6,14-16 (= Case Eb 20, publ. Grapow, med. T., 192): swr in r s wSd\(f\) wrmyt nm t x\(t\)=f "to be drunk by a man until his urinating away the emptiness that are in his belly"; Lefebvre, GEC, 359 (1971) identified here \(r +\) Perfective sDm\(t\)-f and translated with "until"; von Deines - Grapow - Westendorf, Übersetzung med. T., 110 preferred "so that". Stela in private collection (publ. Steindorff, Bildnis und Biographie, in: Studi Rosellini II, 264): n sp dl=ia mAA=s n bt HAA r sma=s n A r imnt nfrt "I never caused them to see something shameful(?) until their being interred in the Beautiful West". Ptahhotep, 128: Hr=k m-Xrw r wSd\(f\) Tw "your face downward until his addressing you". However, a coalescence of the radical \(d\) and the \(-t\)-affix of sDm\(t\)-f cannot be excluded, this yielding r.wSd\(t\)-<f>-f.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{77}}\) I follow Faulkner, Pyramid Texts, 224 and 225, n.6.
sDm.t=f form has the stem rdi. 78 Under the assumption that the sDm.t=f of the verb (r)di has only this stem, the construction r dit sw 1nw must be identified as an infinitive with both semantic subject and object expressed according to the manner of the suffix conjugation.

Although, surprisingly, there is no certain evidence for r sDm.t=f in Old Egyptian, 79 the indubitable meaning "until" in the following two examples is enough reason to suspect the occurrence of this verb form there.

In the first time situations are complicated because they concern a speech situation in a past context.

PT [518] §1197d-1198aP: st.in=sn Tbw.t=sn ir A sA.in=sn mnwxw=sn n wDA ib=sn ir Hs.t=f ir=sn n "so they threw off their sandals onto the ground, they took off their clothes. 'Our heart was not happy, until you descended', they said." 80 The absolute past tense of the reference point is here set by n wDA is, hence considered to be the n sDm=f construction, and not the n + Prospective sDm=f of Old Egyptian. The speech situation in which the reference point is situated is embedded in an absolute past time context set by the citation verb with past tense and the sDm=in=f forms.

The point raised in § 6 concerning the masculine infinitive of the verb swA "to pass" brings me to the case of the verb sDA "to proceed".

This verb is used in the following example from the Old Kingdom, ranged by Edel under the sDm.t=f constructions. In Old Egyptian the verb is treated as a caus. 2-lit., the infinitive of which verb class is feminine. 81 Edel also considered the infinitive to be an alternative for identification of the verb form.

Urk. I 216.7. [n] rdi(=i) xsf=sn n=(i) xt s<D>A.t=sn (s<w>A.t=sn?) r is=sn n [Xrt-nTr] "I did not cause them to punish (me) for anything, until they proceeded to their tomb of the necropolis". 82

However, a Middle Kingdom example with the undubitable meaning "until" has r sDA=f.

Stela of Tjeti (British Museum 614), 12. 83 Spss.kwi aA.kwi apr.n=i wi m Iš=t[i Dš=i rdi=t m] Hm n nb=i n-aAt-nt mmr=t wi 1r WAH-anx nsww-bity sA-Ra Inf axn.(w) mi Ra Dt r sDA=f m Hpt r Axt=f "having become wealthy and great, it is from my own property that I have provided myself, which the Majesty of my lord had given me, as he loved me so much, the Horus Wahankh, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, the Son of Re, Intef--may he stay alive like Re forever--until his proceeding in peace to his horizon". Gardiner regarded sDA=f as a finite form, just as he did in the instance Inscr. Wadi Hammamat 110 discussed above. 84 However, it must then be a Prospective sDm=f, for which I reject a meaning "until" in the construction with r. 85 Although the infinitive in Old Egyptian is

78 "Early Middle Kingdom Account", 19: ky m-a 1wni n rdi=t sw "another with Huni, which he has not yet given" (publ. James, Early MK Account, J EA 45 (1968), 51-56: note that there is no reason to emend n into n=r, for which see p. 55 (r)). Gardner, EG, 318 (§404): passive n rdy. More uncertain is CT [70] I 297 b/27C: n wDA ib=r r rdi=t=n=k possibly "my heart is not weary until he [= the officiant] gives you", as translated by Faulkner, Coffin Texts I, 66, whereas Barguet, Textes des sarcophages, 116 ("mon coeur ne se lasse pas du don qu'il te fait") interprets the form as a relative form; also possible is an identification as the infinitive "my heart has not become weary of giving it [= bread] to you", although r is not the usual preposition with wD. Unfortunately, I have no further evidence on whether the active sDm.t=f of the verb (r)di shows the r in the stem. With reference to the present example, Allen, Inflection, 102-103 (§189) remarks that "the sDm=f is attested with the base stem D [thus, without r, LZ] if at all; the infinitive is also possible here ("in order for Horus to show himself"), but the infinitive after ir does not otherwise occur with expressed subject in the PT"; the passage is translated with "until Horus of the horizon has shown himself". Sethe, Übersetzung und Kommentar P. T. V, 377 translated with "dant/sodass" and on p. 389 draws a comparison with ir,y(=i) r Hs.t/Hst=k, treated by me in §5; cf. Faulkner’s commentary, Pyramid Texts, 225, n.6.

79 Already noted in Studies sDm.t=f I (Dr sDm=t=f), §18, end [p. 22].

80 Sethe, Übersetzung und Kommentar P T V, 86: "nicht ist unser Herz froh geworden, bis du herabsteigst". Faulkner, Pyramid Texts, 191: "we were not happy, until you came down". Allen, Inflection, 218 (§334): "n wDA ib=n could be pretende or future".

81 Edel, AäG, 195-196 (§442) and 348 (§689). Allen, Inflection, 592 (§750). See also Vernus, Études VI, Rde 38 (1987), 173, n.54. Meeks, Année Lexicographique I (1977), 358 (77.4033); 3 (1979), 280 (79.2885); NB in Simpson, Notes Giza Mastabas, in: Fs. Edel, 495 emend sDA in sDAf, as apparent from fig. 3.

82 NB Edel, AäG, 16 (§33); the writing sA stands for swAj ("to pass") and 369 (§734; the writing sA stands for sDA and is due to a confusion between the signs Aa17 and U29 in hieratic). Since I have shown in Studies sDm.t=f I (Dr sDm=t=f), §8, ref. CT [769] VI 404-1 n [p. 12] that the infinitive is swA, and not swAt, this instance would be certain evidence for sDm.t=f in Old Egyptian, under the proviso that the writing concerns the verb swA.

83 Publ. Blackman, Stele of Theothi, J EA 17 (1931), 55-61, pl. 8.

84 Gardner, EG, 126 (§163,11-b).

85 See §2 above [p. 29].
sDAt.\textsuperscript{86} I consider the present instance evidence that the verb in Middle Egyptian was not only treated as a caus. 2-lit., which verb class has a feminine infinitive, but also as a 3-lit. verb, just like the related wDA, which verb class has a masculine infinitive.\textsuperscript{87}

§ 8. A case of a shift of meaning in the Coffin Texts.

Quite often, there is only a narrow borderline between the expression of finality and of pure future, and translations do admit both "so that" and "until". This may find expression in the choice of the verb form, for which the parallels to the following passage from Coffin Texts Spell 75 are testimony.\textsuperscript{88}

CT [75] I 398 c - 399 b/S1C. swA bA=i m sgr Hr=sn r aq=f [r kAr]. With infinitive: "may my ba pass as a silent one by them until/to the purpose of its entering [into the shrine]". With Prospective sDm=f "...., so that it enters [into the shrine]".

Ibid./S2C. swA bA=i Hr=s m sgr r aq.t=f r kAr "may my ba pass by it as a silent one, until it enters into the shrine". The form is the sDm.t=f.

Ibid./T3C. swA bA=i m g<A>wt Hr=sn aq.t=f r kAr Hwt "may my ba pass in wondering at them, that it may enter into the temple shrine". The form is the (Subjunctive) Prospective sDm=f in final use.

§ 9. The roles of the preposition/conjunction and of the verb form.

Though there is no problem about connecting subordinate clauses translated with "until" with relative future time reference, the theory of the sDm.t=f being a relative future tense seems to run into problems here. As already explained, a relative future tense locates the time of its Event in a future relative to a Reference point in the context.\textsuperscript{89}

Drawing in the analysis of the time relations in the construction Dr sDm.t=f for comparison, it can be seen that Dr functions as a Reference point relative to which the Event of the sDm.t=f is located in the future: there is an interval between the two time points.\textsuperscript{90} Because in r sDm.t=f the time of the Event of the sDm.t=f itself is the final point of a process, a problem is now created because there seems to be no interval between the reference time and the Event. Furthermore, because a situation which is described as a process can as such hardly fulfil the role of Reference point, no specific Reference point relative to which the Event is located in the future seems to be present.

To solve this problem, I would like to return to Roeder's definition of the conjunction r in its temporal sense, i.e. "from one point proceeding up to another point".\textsuperscript{91} This starting point is represented by the verb form in the main clause, and it must be to this time situation that the sDm.t=f is related. This comes clearly to the fore if we take a look at examples with main clause verbs whose action is in general of short duration.

CT [157] I 342 a/S2P. dy r=Tn sw Hr Hnkwt=f r snb.t=f "put him in his bed (all the time) until he is better" receives the interpretation "keep him in bed".

Dramatische Ramesseumspapyrus, 102-103 (scene 33,22). qn.n(=i) it(=i) pn nn r snb.t=f "it was (all the time) until he was better that I have embraced this tired father of mine" becomes "I have kept

\textsuperscript{86} See my note 81 above.

\textsuperscript{87} From the remark in Gardiner, EG, 593 ("sDA probably caus.") I surmise that he did not have unequivocal evidence about the verb class, for which the gender of the infinitive may form an indication. Infinitive sDAt in CT [1084] VII 356 b-c/B2L : sDA m Htp r stp-sA n Wsir swA <Hr> arwt "proceeding in peace to the palace of Osiris, passing (by) the gates". Infinitive sDA: CT [901] VII 107 k: r n sDA Hr arwt.

\textsuperscript{88} For the archetypal text of the passage under discussion see Jürgens, Überlieferungsgeschichte, 180-181 (154-155). Note that he could not be decisive about the construction containing the verb aq in the archetype (indicated by † ... †); bare aq=f, usually considered to have final meaning, is translated with "bis er eingetr"itt", which, in my opinion, cannot be correct. A nearer example of a shift in grammatical construction and meaning is CT [98] II 94 a-c (see my note 17 above) with the writing r iwt, which might contain either the infinitive (both "until" and "to the purpose of" are possible) or the Subjunctive Prospective sDm=f (only "so that"), which would meaning also be present in B2L and B2P where the verb form is the Emphatic Prospective sDm=f form iw.(w?).

\textsuperscript{89} See Studies sDm.t=f I (Dr sDm.t=f), §4 [p. 8].

\textsuperscript{90} Op. cit., §17 [p. 20].

\textsuperscript{91} See above §1, end [p. 28].
embraced".  

Urk. IV 117, 3-4. stA.tw n=k tkA m grH r wbn.t Sw Hr Snbt=k "a torch will be lighted for you at night [and kept burning all the time] until the sunlight has arisen over your breast" becomes "a torch will be burning".

The interactions between the main clause and the subordinate clause construction r sDm.t=-f, and between the constituents of the latter construction can be formulated as follows. The relative future tense sDm.t=-f locates its Event in a future relative to a Reference point, which as such is devoid of absolute time reference but receives this through the main clause situation. As is evident from the above examples, it is the starting point of the process represented by r which functions as the Reference point. In this way the requirements for the interval necessary in relative time location are fulfilled. It is the meaning of the preposition/conjunction r which is responsible for lengthening the main clause situation from the initial point serving as Reference point into a process which proceeds until reaching its final point, represented by the Event of the sDm.t=-f: "all the time before" = "until". In other words, the meaning of r is responsible for 'filling' the 'empty' interval between Reference point and Event with a process.

My final conclusion is that under this reconstruction of the roles of the preposition/conjunction r and the verb form the theory of the sDm.t=-f as a relative future tense still holds.

Appendix A: the passage Eloquent Peasant B1, 81-82.

This passage reads mk iw wa m nA n sxty r Swt pr=f r IA.

A number of translators of this passage have rendered the preposition/conjunction r with "until" and "(just) before", which points to their interpretation of the form written Swt as a sDm.t=-f. The obvious problems most translators have here were recently noted by Vernus, who argued that it cannot concern a r sDm.t=-f construction and that the form written Swt must be an infinitive. I fully agree with his argument about the form not being a sDm.t=-f, but have strong doubts about the infinitive proposed. On account of the plural strokes in the word Swt, I would not see an infinitive here, but rather a substantive "emptiness". In my opinion, the simple translations of Faulkner with "about the poverty of his house" and Gardiner with "concerning the indigence of his house" hit the mark. Indeed, the use of the preposition r when expressing respect/relation is very suitable here: "see, such a peasant comes (to the Nile valley) (only) 'in connection with/in relation to/to the measure of' the emptiness of his house near the bottom".

---

93 So Wb. IV, 428, 3: "before".
95 Faulkner, Concise Dictionary, 263; Hannig, Grosses Handwörterbuch, 809; Gardiner, EG, 594 (under the verb Swt).
97 Gardiner, Eloquent Peasant, JEA 9 (1923), 10.
98 Gardiner, EG, 126 (§163, 6).