

224f. – ³⁰ Z. B. Cheti (pSallier II), 5, 6f. vom Töpfer: „Er gräbt sich mehr als ein Schwein in den Sumpfboden hinein (*šw r šj*)“; 8, 1f. vom Schuster: „Sein Vorratshaus ist vollgepfropft (*wdj.f wdjw*) mit Kadavern“; vgl. auch den ernsthaften Gebrauch im Amenemope 4, 1f.: „Du wirst meine Worte als ein Vorratshaus (*wdj*) des Lebens finden, und dein Leib wird heil sein (*wdj*) auf Erden!“, pAnast. I 4, 7f. (*tzw ... bn st tzw*); vgl. auch das bislang nicht befriedigend erklärte W. in *Wenamun 2, 44ff. – ³¹ Guglielmi, in: Fs Westendorf I, 502ff. – ³² Guglielmi, in: LÄ VI, 24. – ³³ Morenz, Wortspiele, (s. Anm. 1), 336; Schott, Mythe und Mythenbildung, 62; ders., Die Deutung der Geheimnisse des Rituals für die Abwehr des Bösen, in: AAWLM 1954. 5, 170. – ³⁴ Z. B. Pyr. 1256a–1258b; AHG, 386f., Nr. 186; Černý–Gardiner, Hier. Ostraca, 39, 1; W. zwischen *jmw*, *mnw* „beständig“, *mnt* „Lebensweise“ und *mnjt.j* „mein Landepflock“ s. Guglielmi, in: Fs Westendorf I, 494. – ³⁵ Dawson und Peet, in: JEA 19, 1933, 167ff.; Guglielmi, a.a.O., 495f. – ³⁶ pHarris 500; Guglielmi, a.a.O., 497f. – ³⁷ oCG 25220; oGardiner 314; oDeM 1408; „Tausendstrophienlied“; Zandee, De Hymnen aan Amon van Papyrus Leiden I 350, in: OMRO 28, 1947, 128f.; Vorläufer in Pyr. Spr. 736–740 (2266a–2270b); CT II, Spr. 120–128; 7 Liebeslieder des pChester Beatty I, Tf. 22–26; Guglielmi, a.a.O., 500ff.; Miriam Lichtheim, Ancient Egyptian Literature II, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1976, 182ff.

Lit.: Siegfried Morenz, Wortspiele in Ägypten, in: Fs Jahn zum 22. November 1957, Leipzig 1957, 23–32, wieder abgedruckt in: Elke Blumenthal und Siegfried Herrmann (Hg.), Siegfried Morenz, Religion und Geschichte des alten Ägypten, Köln–Wien 1975, 328–342; Schott, Mythe und Mythenbildung, 59ff.; Guglielmi, Zu einigen literarischen Funktionen des Wortspiels, in: Fs Westendorf I, 491–506; Jan Assmann, Ägypten, Theologie und Frömmigkeit einer frühen Hochkultur, Stuttgart–Berlin–Köln–Mainz 1984, 102–116. W. G.

Worttabu s. Sprachtabu

Würfel s. Brettspiel, Senetspiel

Würfelhocker (statue-bloc). La série statuaire qu'on désigne par le terme de statues-blocs (W.) est caractérisée par la masse géométrique que forme le corps du personnage représenté; celui-ci est assis par terre, les jambes relevées verticalement devant lui et les bras croisés sur les genoux. Ce type de statue a connu une faveur exceptionnelle à partir du ME jusqu'à l'époque gréco-romaine; seuls des personnages privés se sont fait représenter de cette manière¹.

Lorsqu'elles apparaissent pour la première fois, au début de la 12e dyn., les statues-blocs donnent l'impression d'une vigueur toute naturaliste. Les jambes et les bras, détaillés avec soin, se dégagent nettement du bloc de pierre dans lequel ils sont taillés; le corps est particulièrement ramassé². Ce

n'est que vers le milieu de la 12e dyn. que commence à se développer le type classique de la statue-bloc. Le sculpteur renonce de plus en plus à faire ressortir le modelé du corps, des bras et des jambes; même les pieds, encore découverts dans quelques cas, finissent par disparaître dans le vêtement qui les recouvre. Le personnage s'adosse rarement à un pilier dorsal (*Rückenpfeiler)³.

A la 18e dyn. les statues-blocs se multiplient rapidement. Si l'attitude de l'homme accroupi demeure grosso modo la même dans tous les cas, certaines différences se remarquent sur les surfaces. Le pilier dorsal se généralise progressivement, les mains adoptent des positions différentes et on voit apparaître, de temps à autre, entre les jambes du personnage, une statuette de divinité ou un symbole divin sculptés en haut relief et enfermés quelquefois dans un naos (*Naophor)⁴.

On peut considérer que le répertoire des formes est épuisé à la fin du Nouvel Empire. Les époques subséquentes ne font que remettre à la mode des types anciennement connus. C'est ainsi que la Troisième Période Intermédiaire; particulièrement attirée par la statue-bloc, imite de préférence les modèles du NE, en élargissant considérablement le pilier dorsal⁵. Sous les rois de la 26e et de la 30e dynasties, on assiste à une timide renaissance des conceptions artistiques du Moyen Empire⁶. La période gréco-romaine, qui a produit d'innombrables statues-blocs, mélange toutes les traditions⁷.

Fort heureusement, la plupart des statues-blocs sont pourvues d'inscriptions qui permettent souvent de les dater avec précision. Encore brèves au ME, celles-ci ne cessent de s'amplifier au cours des âges au point de recouvrir toutes les surfaces disponibles y compris le pilier dorsal et le socle.

¹ Bonne bibliographie chez Leclant, dans: OLP 6/7, 1975/1976, 355, n. 4. – ² Le Caire JE 48857. 48858: Vandier, Manuel III, 235–236; Temple haut de Pépi Ier P/T 232: Leclant, dans: OLP 6/7, 1975/76, 355–359; München Leihgabe: Wildung, dans: MDAIK 37, 1981, 503–507 (le fragment de statue-bloc Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum E. 16. 1969, inédit, appartient au même personnage). Cf. A. Eggebrecht, dans: Fs Will, 143–163. – ³ Bothmer, dans: The Brooklyn Museum Bulletin 20. 4, 1959, 11–26; id., dans: BMA 2–3, 1960–62, 19–35. – ⁴ Vandier, Manuel III, 450–462. – ⁵ Georges Legrain, Statues et statuettes de rois et de particuliers (CG 42001–42250) I–III, 1906–25, passim. – ⁶ Bothmer, Egyptian Sculpture, passim. – ⁷ Voir surtout les nombreuses statues-blocs, pour la plupart inédites, sorties de la cachette de Karnak: PM II², 154–161. H. de M.

Wüste. The desert had both symbolic and practical connotations for the Egyptians. The Nile Valley (*Nil) and *Delta represented a life line of

water, rich soil, and vegetative growth inhabited by a homogeneous people, sharply demarcated from the hostile and unproductive desert with its spirits and foreigners. Egypt was the fertile black land (*kmt*), juxtaposed on either side with the desert hills (*hst*). The north-south symmetry of the Two Lands, Upper and Lower Egypt, was opposed to the bilateral symmetry of the Eastern and Western deserts (*Ostwüste, *Westwüste). The eye of the sun, identified with the daughter of *Re (*Sonnenauge), rose in the Eastern and set in the Western Desert, the domain of *Seth and the entrance to the underworld, where the sun and the dead were reborn. Things of the desert were indicated by the determinative , representing three hills, sometimes shown in red color with yellow dots, suggesting sand; this was used to identify concepts such as horizon, cemetery, mine or quarry, as well as foreign countries, and implied potential peril in a hostile outside world. The desert was not as sterile and forbidding in Predynastic and OK times as it is today. The 5.Dyn. reliefs of *Niuserre show oryx, addax, ibex, *gazelle, a large feline, ostrich (*Strauß, *Wüstentiere), and cattle on a hummocky and sandy desert surface, mantled by grass, shrubs and trees.¹ Buried tree roots or trunks have indeed been found in former wadis at *Armant (between a Badarian level and 12.Dyn. graves) and under dune sand near *Merimde (dated 1150 B.C., calibrated),² indicating that minor watercourses of the low desert on both sides of the Nile floodplain were once lined by trees and desert shrubs, much like the wadis of southeastern Egypt are today. In part, this can be explained by a greater frequency of sporadic rains (*Regen) in the Egyptian deserts c. 4200–3800 B.C., c. 3500 B.C. and c. 1050 B.C. (calibrated radiocarbon dates).³ In part, it must be attributed to human “desertification,”⁴ specifically the progressive destruction of desert vegetation within walking or donkey-riding distance of the floodplain margins to obtain fuel and building materials.⁵ Both of these changes are consonant with the essential disappearance of elephant (*Elefant), *giraffe, Barbary sheep (*Mähnschaf), and lion (*Löwe) from the Nile floodplain and its margins not long after Dyn. 1, and in *Dachla after the aceramic Neolithic (*Wüstentiere, *Westwüste).⁶ The last reliefs to show vegetation on desert surfaces date to Dyn. 5–6 (*Jagddarstellungen, *Jagdmethode).⁷ MK representations of hunt enclosures are barren (*Landschaft).

Sedentary settlement in the Egyptian deserts was restricted to the *oases, where permanent water was available at springs and wells (*Brunnen). Nomadic settlement (*Nomaden, *Beduinen) did

of course persist on the coastal plain (west of the Delta), in the Eastern Desert, and *Sinai until modern times. Although the Egyptians perceived the desert as a frontier, peopled by dangerous and hostile outsiders (*Libyen, *Asiaten, *Bedja, *Blemmyer), the settled population of the Libyan oases during the late 19th century was only 30,000, with perhaps 30,000 nomads on the coastal plain and only a few thousand in the *Sinai and the southern half of the Eastern Desert.⁸ The combined desert populations in Pharaonic times were therefore considerably less than 75,000, and they can hardly have constituted a serious military threat. However, 3% of the Egyptian population in 1882 (some 200,000) comprised semi-sedentary “beduin” squatting along the floodplain margins.⁹ This confirms the impression that the power base for accession of the Libyan dynasties was within the alluvial lands of Egypt, among the descendants of coastal nomads who had settled in the western Delta a century or two earlier.¹⁰

The Egyptian deserts were subject to persistent royal exploitation, to mine building stone (*Steinbrüche), metals and precious stones (*Goldminen, *Kupfer, *Bergbau). Wells were dug and way stations erected (*Expeditionswesen), to allow sporadic expeditions or sustained mining activities (*Expeditionen) by conscripted peasant or nomad labor (*Fronddienst). Security was provided by a special corps of desert police (*nju*) (*Polizei). More persistent were commercial routes into or across the deserts (*Handel, *Karawanenwege). These included trails from *Hermopolis magna, *Seper-meru, Asyut (*Assiut), and *Abydos to the oases (at times administered politically); desert shortcuts such as Nag Hammadi to *Armant; alternative desert routes to Nubia from *Memphis, *Abydos or *Elephantine (*Herchuf); the Red Sea (*Rotes Meer) route to *Punt via the *Wadi Hammamat (*Felsinschriften) and, above all, the major trade arteries from *Heliopolis via the *Wadi Tumilat or directly from the eastern Delta to Sinai and Asia.

¹ Bissing, in: ASAE 53, 1956, XIa. XIb; Elmar Edel and Steffen Wénig, *Die Jahreszeitenreliefs aus dem Sonnenheiligtum des Königs Ne-user-Re*, Berlin 1974. — ² Hu-zayyin, in: Robert Mond and Oliver Myers, *The Cemeteries of Armant*, EES 42, 1937, 7f.; Hassan, *Nature*, London 1985 (in press). — ³ Karl W. Butzer, *Studien zum vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Landschaftswandel in der Sahara III*, AAWLM, Math.-Naturwiss. Kl. 1959. 2, 43–122; id., in: BSGE 32, 1959, 43–87; Karl W. Butzer and Carl L. Hansen, *Desert and River in Nubia*, Madison 1968; Butzer, in: Williams and Faure, *The Sahara and the Nile*, Rotterdam 1980, 253–280; Fred Wendorf and Romuald Schild, *Prehistory of the Eastern*

Desert, New York 1980; Hassan, op. cit. There now are 71 radiocarbon dates for geological and prehistoric materials indicative of greater moisture or better ecological conditions in the Egyptian deserts between 10,000 and 2000 years ago; most of these refer to moist intervals dating c. 7600, 7000–6700, and 5800–5000 B.C. (calibrated to calendar years). These moist spells are similar but not identical to (and generally briefer than) those experienced in the tropical rainfall belt of the southern Sahara, see Butzer, in: *Geo-Journal* 7, Helmstedt 1983, 369–374; Williams and Adamson, in: Williams and Faure, *The Sahara and the Nile*, Rotterdam 1980, 281–304. Even during the wettest of these moist phases, shallow aquifers such as those of Kurkur were not sufficiently recharged to yield spring flow (Butzer and Hansen, op. cit., 378 ff.). Rainfall within Egypt did not coincide with the Nile flood season (ibid., 288 ff., figs. 5–7 to 9), suggesting greater winter or spring rains. – ⁴ Gabriel, in: *Geomethodica* 5, Basel 1980, 81–108. – ⁵ Tree growth persists in those areas of the Eastern Desert (*Ostwüste) conservationally utilized by the Ma'aza and *Bedja. The barren desert stretch east of Middle Egypt today is regularly exploited for fuel by fellahin (J. Hobbs, personal communication). – ⁶ Butzer, *Landschaftswandel III* (v. n. 3); id., in: *BSGE* 32, 1959, 43–87; Churcher, in: *SSEAJ* 13, 1983, 178–187. – ⁷ *Ptahhotep I, *Niuserre, *Sahure, *Mereruka. – ⁸ Karl W. Butzer, *Early Hydraulic Civilization in Egypt*, Chicago 1976, 97. – ⁹ Gabriel Baer, *Studies in the Social History of Modern Egypt*, Chicago 1969, 3. – ¹⁰ Černý, in: *CAH II*, 1965, chapter XXXV; Kitchen, *Third Interm. Period*, 245. 345 ff.; see also T. L. Thompson, *The Settlement of the Sinai and the Negev in the Bronze Age*, Wiesbaden 1975. K. W. B.

Wüstenstraßen s. Karawanenwege

Wüstentiere. The desert *fauna of Egypt is of interest for both its ecological interferences and as a prehistoric to historical hunting resource (*Jagd). The key herbivorous animals are three large genera—wild donkey (*Esel), Barbary sheep (*Mähnschaf), ibex (*Steinbock); three medium-sized ones—addax, oryx, hartebeest (*Antilope), in addition to *gazelle and ostrich (*Strauß). Information is provided by the relatively sparse paleontological faunas, the parietal and mobile art of Egyptian civilization (*Jagddarstellungen), and the desert rock art.

The late Pleistocene Nile Valley faunas (*Qau el Kebir, *Kom Ombo, *Nubien)¹ have relatively few open-country forms, viz. wild donkey, Barbary sheep, bubal hartebeest, two gazelles (*Gazella dorcas*, *Gazella rufifrons* or *leptoceros*), and ostrich; it lacks rhinoceros (*Nashorn), elephant (*Elefant) and *giraffe, which presumably only migrated northwards after 9000 B.C. Faunas of the Neolithic Fayum² include elephant, hartebeest and dorcas gazelle, while Predynastic and later

faunas of southern Egypt and Nubia³ have little else than dorcas gazelle. Neolithic faunas of *Dachla⁴ include rhinoceros(?), elephant, the African buffalo (*Syncerus kaffer*), zebra, wild donkey, ibex, addax, oryx, hartebeest, two gazelle species, and ostrich. Fragmentary Neolithic faunas from *Charga, Nabta, and the Gifl Kebir⁵ are limited to gazelle. The rock art representations of the Eastern Desert (*Ostwüste),⁶ which lack paleontological corroboration, emphasize elephant, giraffe, ibex and ostrich, with some oryx and rhinoceros, those of the Gebel Uweinat (*Westwüste)⁷ giraffe, oryx and ostrich, with some addax. The Nile Valley art⁸ of all categories emphasizes elephant, giraffe, Barbary sheep, ibex, addax, oryx, bubal hartebeest, gazelle and ostrich. This suggests that the representations are qualitatively more or less reliable in their particular contexts, but are quantitatively biased in favor of large and medium-sized forms.

Ecologically this is an Ethiopian fauna characteristic of semidesert environments with localized sources of water and some tree growth, intelligible in the light of slightly more frequent rains and greater spring activity in prehistoric (early to mid-Holocene) times (*Wüste). The impression of stepwise decimation of this fauna (faunal breaks)⁹ remains. Elephant and giraffe are increasingly less common in late prehistoric rock art of the Eastern Desert and valley margins; together with Barbary sheep they become rare or absent, in or adjacent to the Nile Valley, after Dyn. 1; by NK times gazelle and hartebeest are the main desert animals.¹⁰ In Dachla, elephant, buffalo and zebra, present in early Neolithic contexts, are rare or absent in the later Neolithic.¹¹ Increasing climatic desiccation, hunting pressures on small populations, and progressive cultural devegetation explain these changes.

¹ Karl W. Butzer and Carl L. Hansen, *Desert and River in Nubia*, Madison 1968, 113 f. 148; C. S. Churcher, *Late Pleistocene Vertebrates from Archaeological Sites in the Plain of Kom Ombo, Upper Egypt*, *Life Scientific Contributions*, Royal Ontario Museum 82, Toronto 1972, 1–172; Gautier, in: Fred Wendorf and Romuald Schild, *Prehistory of the Nile Valley*, New York 1976, 349–367. – ² Gertrude Caton-Thompson and Elinor Gardner, *The Desert Fayum*, London 1934, 89; Gautier, op. cit.; Wenke, in: *ARCE Newsletter* 122, 1983, 25–40. – ³ For an overview of recent work, see Gautier, in: Lech Krzyżaniak and Michał Kobusiewicz, *Origin and Early Development of Food-Producing Cultures in North-Eastern Africa*, Poznań 1984, 44–56. Also, Behrens, in: *ZÄS* 88, 1963, 75–83; Claude Gaillard, *Contribution à l'étude de la faune préhistorique de l'Égypte*, *Archives du Muséum d'histoire naturelle du Lyon* 14, Lyon 1934, 1–125. – ⁴ Churcher, in: *SSEAJ* 11, 1981, 193–211; 13, 1983, 178–187. – ⁵ Gautier, in: Fred