



Staats- und  
Universitätsbibliothek  
Bremen



## **Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Bremen**

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

**Brief von Battiscombe Gunn an Adolf Erman an British  
Museum / Department of Egyptian Antiquities (London)**

**Gunn, Battiscombe**

**Saqqara, El Badrashein, 01.05.1926**

---

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

[urn:nbn:de:gbv:46:1-82363](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:46:1-82363)

1. May, 1926.

Department of Antiquities,  
Saqqara, El Badrashein,  
Upper Egypt.

Dear Professor Erman,

Very many thanks for kindly sending me a copy of your review of my "Studies" in OLZ. I was delighted to receive it, and wish to tell you how much I appreciate such a long description of my book from the pen of the Altmeister of our science ! I am indeed pleased that there is so much in it that you approve; your very favourable review will do much to gain acceptance for my little discoveries.

I am sorry that my terminology, and perhaps over-logical attitude, have given you difficulties. I did my best to explain the new terms in the introduction (p. XIII). As to your objection (in your second paragraph) to my taking  $\text{ⲙⲟ}$  in its special context on p. 103 as "what ought to be done" and not merely as "what is done"; my standpoint is that "what is done" is meaningless in the context, which is "... a god who loves men in a far country which men know not". Such a god as this is surely almost unique ! therefore the customary meaning of  $\text{ⲙⲟ}$  will not be applicable here.

With regard to my description of nn on p. 140, I really cannot see any difficulty, except that instead of saying ~~"is a predicate..."~~ "predicates..." I should perhaps have done better to say "is a predicate expressing..." The translation "es ist nicht vorhanden" I hold to be wrong, for "es ist nicht vorhanden" is a proposition (Aussagesatz), while nn is nothing but a predicate,

i.e., half of a proposition.

What you say about the use of n sdm.f, namely that it has present meaning, but for some stylistic reason is used in narrative, is very interesting, but I find it difficult to accept. Why should we begin by assuming that n sdm.f means "er hört nicht" ? Only because we are accustomed to assume that sdm.f means "er hört". But in Old Egyptian (as I point out on p. 72) sdm.f is very much used in narrative, and we cannot assert that in its original use sdm.f is more present than past in meaning.

Again thanking you for the very great pleasure that you have given me by your long review (which I fear must have cost you a good deal of trouble) of my book, believe me, dear Dr Erman,

Yours most sincerely,

Battiscombe Gunn

PS. I send you under separate cover an offprint of an article of mine in the Annales which may interest you.