



Staats- und
Universitätsbibliothek
Bremen



Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Bremen

**DFG-Projekt "Digitalisierung und Erschließung des Nachlasses des
Ägyptologen Adolf Erman (1854-1937)"**

Brief von Alan Henderson Gardiner an Adolf Erman

Gardiner, Alan Henderson

14.04.1905

Nachweis dieses Dokuments im [Kalliope-Verbund](#)

[urn:nbn:de:gbv:46:1-80754](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:46:1-80754)

Leiden

14/4/05

Dear Professor Erman

Many thanks for your helpful notes, which solve some of my difficulties, although alas! not all. — I am ashamed to say that I had not recognized the "Wortspiel"-system, in which the papyrus is constructed. It solves several points very neatly. I had vaguely seen some connection between Chapter 300 and 400 and the opening words of these chapters III $\bar{\sigma}e$ and IIII $\bar{\sigma}e$, but had carried the idea no further. Goodwin was very acute! — On Monday I shall start on a very careful final collation.

The most interesting point is perhaps the play upon III - ~~see~~ $\bar{\sigma}e$ cf. $\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}$ - $\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}$.

The reading of $x\epsilon\epsilon^{\text{S}}$ was I believe unknown. -
Now it may, I presume, be read sww or
s(β)ww. x must be the old ~~Ⲫⲓ~~ in a
delapidated form, so or the like, just as it
occurs in ~~Ⲫⲓ~~, which in my "Mes," I have
identified with AA ~~Ⲫⲓ~~ = NÄ ~~Ⲫⲓ~~.
Now comes the question, what is the old
Egyptian form of $x\epsilon\epsilon^{\text{S}}$. Is there a
word ~~Ⲫⲓ~~, or the like? or a word ~~Ⲫⲓ~~?

Of course ~~Ⲫⲓ~~ as a play upon q is
interesting - but I suppose there was
hardly any longer a doubt as to the
reading psdt.

During the last days I have read two
extremely interesting letters, very badly
transcribed by Sp. in the Correspondances,
also some very interesting accounts,
equally badly published by the same scholar.

P.S. I reopen my letter to make a very wild suggestion: if it is wrong I am sure you will be kind enough to forget it! Leid 1350. 1, 17. it says "Am $\text{𐤀} \text{𐤁} \text{𐤂} \text{𐤃} \text{𐤄}$ "

$\text{𐤄} \text{𐤃} \text{𐤂} \text{𐤁} \text{𐤀}$

"Thebes bringeth captive the two ends; "belonging to $\text{𐤄} \text{𐤃}$ and belonging to $\text{𐤁} \text{𐤀}$ "; he (Amon?) says to her." If the parallelism is complete, the two ends must be $\text{𐤄} \text{𐤃}$ and $\text{𐤄} \text{𐤃}$ respectively. Are the two words not to be distinguished? $\text{𐤄} \text{𐤃}$

(one) will perhaps mean "eternity forwards" and $\text{𐤄} \text{𐤃}$ "eternity backwards". If this is so, $\text{𐤄} \text{𐤃} \text{𐤄} \text{𐤃}$ becomes an intelligible formula.

I cannot call to mind for the minute anything which speaks against this interpretation. And the associations of $\text{𐤄} \text{𐤃}$ are distinctly sepulchral, i. e. point to a time when a man is dead and gone - "die Vergangenheit"?