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This book is neither a grammar of Ancient Egyptian for Egyptologists nor a handbook for the study of hieroglyphs. Rather, it has been written aiming at the needs of a multiplicity of audiences. To use a fashionable word, I wanted to address the interdisciplinary interests of linguists and Egyptologists. In order to achieve this result, I had to resort to sometimes quite diverse methodological frames and scholarly conventions, which have been and are at best indifferent to each other, and at times even in overt conflict. On the one hand, the main goal of the book is to provide the linguistic audience with an introduction to the historical grammar of Ancient Egyptian, one of the oldest and longest documented languages of mankind: from its oldest (Old Egyptian) to its most recent phase (Coptic), Ancient Egyptian remained in productive written use for more than four millennia – from about 3000 BCE to the Middle Ages. On the other hand, the book also tries to reach the numerically much smaller public of Egyptologists interested in linguistic issues, i.e. my own professional milieu, offering a global presentation of the language from a structural as well as historical point of view.

Traditionally, the study of Ancient Egyptian has been the monopoly of the latter group of scholars, who operate within the discipline called “Egyptology.” In this field of scholarship, the study of the language is necessarily rooted in philology and has been mainly pursued with the aim of editing or translating Egyptian and Coptic texts. The handbooks for the academic and individual study of Egyptian, first and foremost Alan H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* (Oxford University Press, third edn 1957), share the assumption that potential readers are Egyptologists interested primarily in acquiring the philological tools needed for their professional encounter with Ancient Egypt: Gardiner’s grammar bears the appropriate, although certainly modest subtitle *Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*. While much work has been done since then in Egyptian grammar and some of the theoretical foundations of Gardiner’s approach to Egyptian have been shaken if not damaged, a linguist interested in the strategies adopted by Egyptian as a language will experience some distress in finding the answers to his or her queries in modern secondary literature.
This distress is not due to a lack of linguistic sophistication among Egyptologists; on the contrary, the presence of Egyptological linguistics as one of the most vital components of the field of Egyptology is one of the reasons for my trying to make its discoveries available to other linguists. But I doubt that the work of the more linguistically inclined Egyptologists has been or is adequately noticed by professional linguists. For one, scholars of Egyptian linguistics tend to follow the conventions of the broader field of Egyptology in terms of attitudes to transliteration (just to quote an example: for a variety of reasons, there is no universally accepted system for the phonetic rendition of Egyptian) and translations (which address the semantic, rather than the grammatical sphere, interlinear translations being discouraged or unknown). Secondly, over the last decades we have preferred to engage in a dialog among ourselves rather than with the broader audience of comparative and general linguists, and we have developed conceptual and terminological conventions that often appear opaque, if not downright incomprehensible to the non-initiated. This is due in part to the specific methodological frame adopted by modern students of Egyptian, the so-called “Standard theory,” in part to the ignorance of Egyptian among linguists. Only recently, thanks to a new generation of Egyptologists also trained in linguistics, has there been a shift towards an increased interest in theoretical issues. The present work is a product of this change of perspectives within my own scholarly community: although I have tried to explain unusual terms when they appear for the first time, a certain familiarity with linguistic terminology is expected from the Egyptological readership of the book; as for general linguists, while no previous Egyptological knowledge is required, I expect them to devote particular attention to the introduction and to the chapter on graphemics, where basic preliminaries on chronology, typology, and notational conventions of Egyptian are discussed at some length.

The concept of “Ancient Egyptian” is taken throughout this book in its broader scope to comprise all the stages of the language from Old Egyptian to Coptic. While focusing on Old and Middle Egyptian, i.e. on the language of classical literature, the analysis proceeds diachronically to investigate the main features of Late Egyptian and Coptic, especially when this evolution displays changes which attract the linguist’s attention. In essence, I have tried to present synchronical sketches of the main properties of classical Egyptian, Late Egyptian, and Coptic and to consider the mechanisms of linguistic change inherent in the history of the Egyptian language.

Although philological and not interlinear, the translation of Egyptian and Coptic passages provides in parentheses enough information for the non-specialists to allow them to recognize all the elements of the morphosyntactic as well as lexical structure of the sentence. Most Egyptian texts are referred to according to the Egyptological conventions as established in the Lexikon der Ägyptologie (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975–1986), in short LA; only less commonly quoted texts are accompanied by a reference to their edition. Notes, bibliography and indices try to blend the expectations of the two potential readerships for which the book is intended. In the notes, whose number had to be limited to an acceptable minimum, books and articles are usually referred to in short title; the reference in full detail, however, is given both at first mention and in the bibliography at the end of the volume. While abbreviations are used in the notes, I have tried to avoid them in the final bibliography; for the most common ones, the reader is referred to the list provided in vols. I and IV of the LA. In the notes, I often mention only the more recent treatments of a particular topic, even if the interpretation offered by the authors differs from mine; this is the reason for the relative paucity of references to older secondary literature. Modern treatments, however, usually contain abundant references to previous studies as well. The index of Egyptian and Coptic passages and of Egyptian grammatical words is intended mainly for the Egyptological audience, whereas the register of topics is conceived with a linguistic public in mind.

I would like to mention and thank those friends and colleagues who in different ways have participated in the completion of this book: first and foremost Wolfgang Schenkel, who followed its development with particular attention and saved me from many inaccuracies; Bernard Comrie, who acted as a careful and inspiring linguistic reader, and Gerald Moers, who provided invaluable help in the preparation of the indices; further Heike Behler, Mark Collier, Andrea M. Gnirs, Orly Goldwasser, Sarah I. Groll, Friedrich Junge, Frank Kammerzell, Aldo Piccato, Dana M. Remeis, Deborah Sweeney, and Thomas Ritter for fruitful debates and assistance; and finally Judith Ayling, Hilary Gaskin, and Ann Rex of Cambridge University Press for guiding me in editorial matters. The book was written in part during a sabbatical year funded by a University of California President’s Fellowship in the Humanities (1993–94); I would like to acknowledge with sincere thanks the help and generosity of the Office of the President for providing me with ideal research conditions.

This book is dedicated to my wonderful daughter Victoria, who is more often than I can bear away from my eyes, but always closest to my heart.
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The language of Ancient Egypt

1.1 The genetic frame

Ancient Egyptian represents an autonomous branch of the language phylum called Afroasiatic in the USA and in modern linguistic terminology,¹ Hamito-Semitic in Western Europe and in comparative linguistics,² Semito-Hamitic mainly in Eastern Europe.³ Afroasiatic is one of the most widespread language families in the world, its geographic area comprising, from antiquity to the present time, the entire area of the eastern Mediterranean, northern Africa, and western Asia.

The most important languages of the ancient and modern Near East – with the notable exceptions of Sumerian and Hittite – belong to this family, which is characterized by the following general linguistic features: a preference for the fusional (or flectional) type; the presence of bi- and tri-consonantal lexical roots, capable of being variously inflected; a consonantal system displaying a series of pharyngealized or glottalized phonemes (called emphatics) alongside the voiced and the voiceless series; a vocalic system originally limited to the three vowels /a/ /i/ /u/; a nominal feminine suffix *-at; a rather rudimentary case system, consisting of no more than two or three cases; a nominal prefix m-; an adjectival suffix -i (called nisba, the Arabic word for "relation"); an opposition between prefix conjugation (dynamic) and suffix conjugation (stative) in the verbal system; a conjugation pattern singular first person *'a-, second person *ta-, third person masculine *ya-, feminine *ta-, plural first person *na-, with additional suffixes in the other persons.

The individual branches of the Afroasiatic family are:

(1) ANCIENT EGYPTIAN, to which this book is devoted.

(2) SEMITIC, the largest family of the Afroasiatic phylum.⁶ The term derives from the anthroponym "Sem," Noah’s first son (Gen 10,21–31; 11,10–26) and has been applied since A. L. Schlözer (1781) to the languages spoken in ancient times in most of western Asia (Mesopotamia, Palestine, Syria, Arabia), and in modern times, as a consequence of invasions from the Arabian peninsula in the first millennium B.C., in northern Africa and
Aramaic is divided into Western Aramaic (Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian), Akkadian in Amarna in central Arabia in an earlier form of the language (called "pre-classical North Arabic") are known from literary language of the second millennium BCE; (2) Canaanite in Palestine, divided into: (1) Northwest Semitic of the second millennium BCE, which includes inscriptions from Byblos in Phoenicia and from the Sinai peninsula, Amorite (inferred from northwest Semitic proper names and expressions in Old Akkadian and Old Babylonian), Early Canaanite (glosses and linguistic peculiarities in the Akkadian international correspondence from the Late Bronze archive of el-Amarna in Egypt), and especially Uguritic, the only northwest Semitic literary language of the second millennium BCE; (2) Canaanite in Palestine and Phoenicia during the first millennium BCE, including Hebrew (the most important language of the group, documented in a literature ranging from the Bible to modern times and resurrected as a spoken vehicle in modern Israel), Phoenician and Punic, and Moabite; (3) Aramaic in Syria and progressively in Mesopotamia as well: Old Aramaic (1000–700 BCE), Classical or Imperial — including Biblical — Aramaic (700–300 BCE); for the later phases (from the second century BCE to survivals in modern times), Aramaic is divided into Western Aramaic (Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Nabatean, Palmyrene, and modern Western Aramaic in a few present-day Syrian villages) and Eastern Aramaic (Syriac, Babylonian Aramaic, Mandaic, and contemporary remnants in eastern Turkey, northern Iraq, and the Caucasus).

Southwest Semitic in the Arabian peninsula, including: (1) Arabic, often grouped with Northwest Semitic into a "Central Semitic," the most widespread Semitic language, spoken at present by 150 million people from Morocco to Iraq: contemporary written Arabic (which overifies a variety of diversified spoken dialects) represents a direct continuation of the language of the Qur'ān and of classical literature; inscriptions from northern and central Arabia in an earlier form of the language (called "pre-classical North Arabic") are known from the fourth century BCE to the fourth century CE; (2) Epigraphic South Arabian, contemporary with pre-classical North Arabic, followed by modern South Arabian dialects; (3) Ethiopic, the result of the emigration to eastern Africa of South Arabian populations, subdivided into classical Ethiopic ("Ga'az") from the fourth century CE, the liturgical language of the Ethiopian church, and the modern Semitic languages of Ethiopia (Tigre, Tigrinya in Eritrea; Amharic, Harari, Gurage in central Ethiopia).

Some of the most important characteristics of the Semitic languages are: in phonology, the articulation of "emphatic" phonemes as ejectives in Ethiopia and as pharyngealized stops in the Arabic world; in morphology, a tendency to the paradigmatization of the triradical root, which is inflectionally or derivationally combined with a series of consonantal and vocalic phonemes to produce regular, i.e. predictable morphological forms; a preference for the Verb-Subject-Object syntactic order in the older forms of the languages, usually replaced by a SVO (in Arabic and Hebrew) or SOV order (in the modern Semitic languages of Ethiopia, probably under the influence of the Cushitic abstratum) in the later phases.

Berber, a group of related languages and dialects currently spoken (mostly in competition with Arabic) by at least five million speakers in northern Africa from the Atlantic coast to the oasis of Siwa and from the Mediterranean Sea to Mali and Niger. Although written records exist only since the nineteenth century, some scholars take Berber to represent the historical outcome of the ancient language of the more than 1000 "Libyan" inscriptions, written in autochthonous or in Latin alphabet and documented from the second century BCE onward. The linguistic territory of Berber can be divided into seven major areas: the Moroccan Atlas (Tachelhit, Tamasghit), central Algeria (Zenati), the Algerian coast (Kabylin), the Gebel Nefusa in Tripolitania (Nefusi), the oasis of Siwa in western Egypt (Siwi), the Atlantic coast of Mauritania (Zenaga), and the central Sahara in Algeria and Niger (Tuareg). Isolated communities are also found in Mali, Tunisia, and Libya. The Tuareg have preserved an old autochthonous writing system (tifinjart), ultimately related to the alphabet of the old Libyan inscriptions.

Characteristic for Berber phonology is the presence of two allophonic varieties of certain stops: a "tense" articulation, connected with consonantal length, as opposed to a "lax" one, often accompanied by spirantization. E.g., the two variants of /k/ are [kk] (tense) and [x] (lax). In nominal morphology, masculine nouns normally begin with a vowel, whereas feminine nouns both begin and end with a t-morpheme. In the verb, aspectual oppositions (unmarked, intensive, perfect) are conveyed by prefixes, the subject being indicated by a prefix (first person plural and third person singular), a suffix
(first person singular and third person plural), or a discontinuous affix consisting of a prefix and a suffix (second person). The unmarked order of the sentence, which can be modified in presence of pragmatic stress, is VSO.

(4) Cushitic, a family of languages spoken by at least fifteen million people in eastern Africa, from the Egyptian border in northeast Sudan to Ethiopia, Djibouti, Somalia, Kenya, and northern Tanzania. The existence of the Cushitic languages has been known since the seventeenth century. While this family does not seem to be documented in the ancient world – Meroitic, the still imperfectly understood language used and written in the Kingdom of Napata and Meroe between the third and the sixth century of the Nile from the third century BCE to the fourth century CE, was a Nil-Saharan language – one of its languages, Beja, shows close etymological and typological ties with Ancient Egyptian. Cushitic languages are divided into four major groups: (a) Northern (Beja, in coastal Sudan); (b) Central (Agaw, in northern Ethiopia); (c) Eastern, further subdivided into Samo-Afar in southern Eritrea, Somali in Somalia, Oromo in central Ethiopia, Highland East Cushitic in central and southern Ethiopia, and various other languages in Ethiopia, such as Dullay and Western Omo-Tana, and in northern Kenya, such as Rendille; (d) Southern (Alagwa, Burunge, Iraqw, etc.), spoken in southern Kenya and Tanzania.

Cushitic languages are characterized by the presence of a set of glottalized consonants and in some cases, such as Somali, by vowel harmony. Although they display tonal oppositions, these are, unlike for example in Chinese, morphosyntactically determined. In the area of morphology, Cushitic languages tend to be very synthetic; there are two genders (masculine, often covering the lexical areas of “greatness” or “importance”, and feminine, often used for the semantic realm of “smallness”), a complex system of plural formations, and a varying number of cases: the Proto-Cushitic binary system with nominative in 1 or 3 and absolutive case in 2 has either been abandoned, as in southern Cushitic, or has evolved into a more complex system with numerous cases derived from the agglutination of postpositions. The verbal system tends to replace the Afroasiatic prefix conjugation (still present in Beja and Saho-Afar, with remnants in other languages as well) with a suffix conjugation based on the auxiliary verb “to be”; it is very rich in tenses, which are often derived from the grammaticalization of conjunctions and auxiliaries. Cushitic languages grammaticalize pragmatic oppositions such as topic or focus, while the preferred syntactic order is SOV.

(5) Chadic, a family of about 140 languages and dialects spoken by more than thirty million speakers in sub-Saharan Africa around Lake Chad (Nigeria, Cameroon, Chad, and Niger). They are currently subdivided into the following groups: (a) Western (Hausa, Bole, Ron, Bade/Warji, Zaa, etc.); (b) Biu-Mandara (Tera, Bura/Higi, Mandara, Daba, Bata, etc.); (c) Eastern (Somrati, Nancere, Kera, Dangla, etc.); (d) Masa. The most important language of this family, Hausa, enjoys the status of first language in northern Nigeria and Niger and of second language and regional lingua franca in the entire West Sahara. Chadic languages have a very rich consonantal inventory: like Cushitic, they display glottalized consonants, and they are often tonal. There is no gender distinction in the plural: verbal forms are normally not conjugated for person. The unmarked word order is VSO.

(6) Omotic, a family of languages spoken by approximately one million speakers along both shores of the Omo River and north of Lake Turkana in southwest Ethiopia, formerly thought to represent the western branch of Cushitic. It is still a matter of debate whether Omotic really belongs to the Afroasiatic language family. Characteristic features of the Omotic languages are the absence of emphatic phonemes and the almost total loss of gender oppositions.

1.2 History of the Egyptian language

Ancient Egyptian shows the closest relations to Beja (Cushitic), Semitic and Berber, more distant ones to the rest of Cushitic and Chadic. With its more than four millennia of productive history (3000 BCE – 1300 CE), Egyptian proves an ideal field for diachronic and typological investigation. The history of Egyptian can be divided into two main stages, characterized by a major change from synthetic to analytic patterns in the nominal syntax and the verbal system. Each of these two stages of the language can be further subdivided into three different phases, affecting primarily the sphere of graphemics.

(1) Earlier Egyptian: the language of all written texts from 3000 to 1300 BCE, surviving in formal religious texts until the third century CE. Its main phases are:

(a) Old Egyptian, the language of the Old Kingdom and of the First Intermediate Period (3000–2000 BCE). The main documents of this stage of the language are the religious corpus of the “Pyramid Texts” and a sizeable number of so-called “Autobiographies,” which are accounts of individual achievements inscribed on the external walls of the rock tombs of the administrative elite.

(b) Middle Egyptian, also termed Classical Egyptian, from the Middle Kingdom to the end of Dyn. XVIII (2000–1400 BCE). Middle Egyptian is
the classical language of Egyptian literature, conveyed in a variety of texts that can be classified according to four main genres: (1) Funerary texts, especially the "Coffin Texts" inscribed on the sarcophagi of the administrative elite. (2) "Instructions," i.e. wisdom texts normally addressed to a father to a son, which conveyed the educational and professional expectations of Egyptian society. The most renowned examples are the "Instructions of the Vizier Ptahysept" and the "Instructions for Merikare." Some of these moral texts, such as the "Admonions of Ipu-Wer," are in fact philosophical discussions ex eventu on the state of the country taking as a point of departure the political evolution from the Old to the Middle Kingdom, the historical phase generally referred to as First Intermediate Period. (3) "Tales," which are narratives relating adventures of a specific hero and representing the vehicle of individual, as opposed to societal concerns. The most famous specimens of this genre are the "Tale of Sinuhe" and the "Shipwrecked Sailor." (4) "Hymns," poetical texts with religious contents, written in praise of a god or of the king. Famous examples are provided by the "Hymn to the Nile" and by the cycle of "Hymns to King Sesostris III." Some texts, such as the story of Sinuhe and especially the "Eloquent Peasant," combine features and contents of all main genres. Besides literary texts, the Middle Egyptian corpus comprises administrative documents, for example the Kahun papyri, and historical records.

(c) *Late Middle Egyptian*, the language of religious texts (rituals, mythology, hymns) from the New Kingdom to the end of Egyptian civilization. Late Middle Egyptian, also called *égyptien de tradition*, coexisted with later Egyptian (see below) for more than a millennium in a situation of diglossia. From a grammatical point of view, Late Middle Egyptian maintains the linguistic structures of the classical language, but on the graphemic side, especially in the Greco-Roman period (Ptolemaic Egyptian: third century BCE to second century CE), it shows an enormous expansion of the set of hieroglyphic signs.

Linguistically, earlier Egyptian is characterized by a preference for synthetic grammatical structures: for example, it displays a full set of morphological suffixes indicating gender and number: m. s. ntr. a "god", f. s. ntr.t "goddess", m. pl. ntr.w "gods", f. pl. ntr.wt "goddesses"; it exhibits no definite article: mn."the man, a man"; it maintains the VSO order in verbal formations: sdfm-k ntr.f "may you listen to him."

(2) *Late Egyptian*, documented from Dyn. XIX down to the Middle Ages (1300 BCE - 1300 CE):

(a) *Late Egyptian* (1300-700 BCE), the language of written records from the second part of the New Kingdom. It primarily conveys the rich entertainment literature of Dyn. XIX, consisting of wisdom and narrative texts, for example the "Tale of the Two Brothers," the "Tale of Wenamun," or the "Instructions of Ani" and the "Instructions of Amenemope," but also of some new literary genres, such as mythological tales or love poetry. Late Egyptian was also the vehicle of Ramesside bureaucracy, such as the archival documents from the Theban necropoleis or of school texts, called "Miscellanies." Late Egyptian is not a completely homogeneous linguistic reality; rather, the texts of this phase of the language show various degrees of interference with classical Middle Egyptian, with the tendency of older or more formal texts, such as historical records or literary tales, to display a higher number of borrowings from the classical language ("literary Late Egyptian"), as opposed to later or administrative texts, where Middle Egyptian forms are much rarer ("colloquial Late Egyptian").

(b) *Demotic* (seventh century BCE to fifth century CE), the language of administration and literature during the Late Period. While grammatically closely akin to Late Egyptian, it differs from it radically in its graphic system. Important texts in Demotic are the narrative cycles of Setne-Khamwase and of Petubastis, and the instructions of Papyrus Insinger and of Onkheshonqui.

(c) *Coptic* (fourth to fourteenth century CE), the language of Christian Egypt, written in a variety of Greek alphabet with the addition of six or seven Demotic signs to indicate Egyptian phonemes absent from Greek. As a spoken, and gradually also as a written language, Coptic was superseded by Arabic from the ninth century onward, but it survives to the present time as the liturgical language of the Christian church of Egypt, which is also called the "Coptic" church.

Besides displaying a number of phonological evolutions, later Egyptian tends to develop analytic features: suffixal markers of morphological oppositions tend to be dropped and functionally replaced by prefixal indicators such as the article: Late Eg. and Dem. ps-ntr. Coptic p-nouè "the god," Late Eg. and Dem. ntr.t) "the goddess," ntr.w "the gods"; the demonstrative "this" and the numeral "one" evolve into the definite and the indefinite article: Coptic p-ôme "the man" < "this man," ou-ôme "a man" < "one man"; periphrastic patterns in the order SVO supersedes older verbal formations: Coptic ma-re pek-kan ouop, lit. "let-do your-name be-pure" = "your name be hallowed," as opposed to the synthetic classical Egyptian construction w'âb.w m-k, lit. "shall-be-purified your-name."
Due to the centralized nature of the political and cultural models underlying the evolution of Ancient Egyptian society, there is hardly any evidence of dialect differences in pre-Coptic Egyptian.16 However, while the writing system probably originated in the south of the country,17 the origins of the linguistic type represented by earlier Egyptian are to be seen in Lower Egypt, around the city of Memphis, which was the capital of the country during the Old Kingdom, those of Later Egyptian in Upper Egypt, in the region of Thebes, the cultural, religious and political center of the New Kingdom. Coptic displays a variety of dialects that do not vary very profoundly: they differ mainly in graphic conventions and sporadically in morphology and lexicon, but hardly at all in syntax.

1.3 A brief look at Egyptological linguistics

Since the decipherment of the Egyptian writing systems during the last century (section 2.5), the grammatical study of Egyptian has been treated primarily within four successive approaches: (a) the Berlin School and the recovery of Egyptian morphology; (b) A. H. Gardiner and the fixation of the canon for the study of the Egyptian language; (c) H. J. Polotsky and the "Standard theory" of Egyptian syntax; (d) a contemporary shift to functional linguistic models.

(a) To A. Erman and the so-called "Berlin School" modern Egyptology owes three major contributions: (a) the division of the history of Egyptian into two main phases19 (called by Erman [Alt]egyptisch and Neuägyptisch, roughly corresponding to "earlier" and "later" Egyptian respectively); (b) the basic identification of the morphosyntactic inventory of all the stages of the language; (c) the monumental Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache (1926–53), as yet the most complete lexicographical tool available for Egyptian. The approach of Erman and his followers over three generations (K. Sethe, G. Steindorff, E. Edel, W. Westendorf) was in fact modeled upon a historical-philological method similar to the one adopted in contemporary Semitic linguistics, which also conditioned the choices of the Berlin School in terms of grammatical terminology or transliteration.

(b) Although very much in Erman's "neogrammatical" tradition, the contribution by scholars such as A. H. Gardiner20 and B. Gunn21 brought to the study of Egyptian a pragmatic approach derived from their Anglo-Saxon tradition; the characteristics of Egyptian are checked against the background of the grammar of the classical languages and of what has come to be referred to as "Standard European": if Erman and the Berlin School were methodologically "ethnocentric," Gardiner and the linguistic knowledge he represented were "eurrocentric," in the sense that the grammatical study of Egyptian was seen at the same time as the study of the differences between Egyptian and Western "mind."22 and its main purpose becomes the correct translation of Egyptian texts.

(c) The problem of the adequacy of an Egyptian grammar based on the theoretical categories of standard European languages became acute in the 1940s with the work of H. J. Polotsky,23 whose broader reception did not begin before the late 1960s, and found its most complete treatments by Polotsky himself in 1976 for classical Egyptian and in 1987–90 for Coptic.24 The basic feature of Polotsky's "Standard theory"25 is the systematic application of substitutional rules for syntactic nodes such as nominal phrases (NP) or adverbial phrases (AP): most Egyptian verbal phrases (VP)26 are analyzed as syntactic "transpositions" of a verbal predication into a NP- or an AP-node. But this syntactic conversion affects dramatically their predicative function. In case of a nominal transposition, they lose their predicative force altogether; for example, on the basis of the paradigmatic substitution between an initial verbal form (jnw m nltj "I came from my city") and a noun in initial position (m nltj "The scribe is in my city"), the structure of the former Egyptian sentence should be analyzed as "The-fact-that-I-came (is) from-my-city." In case of an adverbial transposition, they acquire the value of a circumstantial predicate: in the sentence z3-nb.t ddt-f "Sinuhe speaks," because of the possibility of paradigmatic substitution between the VP "speaks" and any AP (z3-nb.t m nltj "Sinuhe is in my city"), the underlying structure is taken to be "I came from my city."27

(d) In recent years, due to a certain extent to the increased awareness among Egyptologists of the idiosyncrasies of the Polotskyan system and of methodological developments in the field of general linguistics,28 the Standard theory seems to have exhausted its innovative potential, being superseded by more verbalistic approaches, i.e. by interpretations of Egyptian syntax in which verbal phrases, rather than being "converted" into other parts of discourse, maintain their full "verbal" character.29 The present writer understands himself as a member of this latter generation of Egyptological linguists. Although much of the recent production on this topic aims at clarifying the differences between the Polotskyan model and more recent trends,30 which tend to pay more attention to discourse phenomena and to pragmatics, in this book I have tried to refrain from delving into the historical debate, preferring to suggest in each individual case the solution to a linguistic problem of Egyptian grammar that I find most appealing from a general linguistic as well as diachronic standpoint. In this respect, this book is
probably best understood as a historical grammar of Egyptian within the theoretical models provided by the recent tendencies in Egyptological linguistics.

Further reading
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Faulkner, R. O. *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* (Oxford University Press, 1962) [A lexicographical aid for the translation of Middle Kingdom texts].

Gardiner, A. *Egyptian Grammar, Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs* (Oxford University Press, 1927; third edn 1957) [A detailed tool for the philological study of the classical language].


Lambdin, Th. O. *Introduction to Sahidic Coptic* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983) [The standard academic handbook for teaching classical Coptic].
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Egyptian graphemics

2.1 Introduction

The basic graphic system of the Egyptian language for three fourths of its life as a productive language, i.e. from about 3000 BCE to the first centuries of our era, is known as "hieroglyphic writing." This term has been used since the Ptolemaic period (323–30 BCE) as the Greek counterpart (ἰερογλυφικά γράμματα "sacred incised letters") to the Egyptian expression mdw.t-ntr "god's words." Throughout Egyptian history, hieroglyphs were used primarily for monumental purposes, their main material support being stone or, less frequently, papyrus. For cursive uses the hieroglyphic system developed two handwriting varieties, called "Hieratic" (ἱερατικά γράμματα "priestly writing"), documented from the Old Kingdom through the third century CE, and "Demotic" (δημοτικά γράμματα "popular writing"), from the seventh century BCE to the fifth century CE. In a process beginning in Hellenistic times and concluded with the complete Christianization of the country in the fourth century CE, hieroglyphs and their manual varieties were gradually superseded by alphabetic transcriptions of words, and then of whole texts, inspired by the Greek alphabet with the addition of Demotic signs to render Egyptian phonemes unknown to Greek. The final result of this process is the emergence of "Coptic," the name given to the Egyptian language and its alphabet in its most recent form, which remained in productive use from the fourth century to the end of the first millennium CE, when it was superseded by Arabic as the common language of the country.

Unlike other writing systems of the Ancient Near East, for example Mesopotamian cuneiform, hieroglyphs were never used to write down any language other than Egyptian, except for their later adoption in Meroitic. However, the so-called Protosinaitic inscriptions of the second millennium BCE show that hieratic signs may have inspired the shape of Northwest Semitic alphabetic signs. As for Demotic, some of its sign-groups were adopted and phonetically reinterpreted in Nubia for the writing of Meroitic (third century BCE to fourth century CE). This language is still imperfectly
understood in both its grammar and its lexicon, but it certainly did not belong to the Afroasiatic phylum.

2.2 The basic principles of hieroglyphic writing

Egyptian hieroglyphs are a variable set of graphemes, ranging from about 1000 in the Old Kingdom (third millennium BCE) down to approximately 750 in the classical language (second millennium BCE), then increasing to many thousands during the Ptolemaic and Roman rule in Egypt, from the third century BCE to the second century CE. They are pictographic signs representing living beings and objects, such as gods or categories of people, animals, parts of the human or animal body, plants, astronomical entities, buildings, furniture, vessels, etc.

But these pictograms are not organized within a purely ideographic system; rather, they represent a combination of phonological and semantic principles. An Egyptian word usually consists of two components:

(1) A sequence of phonograms, each of which represents a sequence of one, two, or three consonantal phonemes; hence their label as monoconsonantal (such as [a] /m/), biconsonantal (such as [t] /p-t/), or triconsonantal signs (such as [t] /h-t-p/). Phonograms convey a substantial portion of the phonological structure of the word: normally all the consonants, less regularly the semiconsonantal or semivocalic glides /j/ and /w/, vowels remaining for the most part unexpressed. Biconsonantal and triconsonantal signs are often accompanied by other phonograms, mostly monoconsonantal, which spell out one or two of their phonemes, allowing in this way a more immediate interpretation of the intended phonological sequence; these phonograms are called "complements." The phonological value of the phonograms is derived from the name of the represented entity by means of the rebus principle, i.e., by applying the same phonological sequence to other entities semantically unrelated to them. For example, from the representation of water ḫนมw is derived the phonological value of this sign as /m-w/. It needs to be stressed that frequently, in this process of derivation, only a segment of the original sequence of phonemes of the represented entity, usually the strong consonants (consonantal principle), is isolated to function as general phonogram: for example the sign for a house [t] *pmr, is used for the sequence /p-t/. In later times, the consonantal principle was expanded by the so-called acrophonic principle, i.e., by the derivation of a phonological value from the first consonantal sound of the represented entity.

(2) The sequence of phonograms is usually followed by a semagram, called in the Egyptianological custom "determinative," which classifies a word according to its semantic sphere: for example, a sitting man [*psmw] expresses the lexical realm of "man, mankind," a sitting man touching his mouth [*pmw] the domain of "eating, speaking, thinking, sensing," a scribe's equipment [*t] the area of "writing," a stylized settlement [*t] identifies the word as a toponym.

While some words of common use (pronouns, prepositions, a few nouns and verbs such as m "name" or dd "to say") are written only phonologically, i.e., only with a combination of consonantal signs [t] + [n], [d] + [d] indicating the sequences [r-n] and [l-d] respectively, many items of the basic vocabulary of Egyptian are expressed by semagrams which indicate their own semantic meaning. They do this iconically (by reproducing the object itself), through rebus (by portraying an entity whose name displays a similar phonological structure), or symbolically (by depicting an item metaphorically or metonymically associated with the object). These signs are called logograms (also labeled ideograms by Egyptologists): for example, the hieroglyph which represents the enclosure of a house [*] is used to indicate iconically the concept "house" (*pmw); the sign representing a duck [*x] means "son" (*zi) by virtue of the phonetic identity between the Egyptian words for "duck" and for "son"; the cloth wound on a pole [*], a sacred emblem placed on the pylons of Egyptian temples, through symbolic association means "god" (*nafs). In order to distinguish the logographic use (*nafs = *pmw = "house") from the phonological use of the same sign on the basis of the rebus principle (*t = /p-t/, without any semantic connection to the word in which it appears), logographic uses are often marked by a stroke following the sign.

Egyptian writing also displays a set of twenty-four "alphabetic," i.e., monoconsonantal signs (table 2.1). Although these cover almost completely the inventory of consonantal and semiconsonantal phonemes of the language — the two exceptions being the etymological /l/ and /l/ which remained unexpressed, and the /i/, originally conveyed by the graphemes [n], [r], and [r], for which an autonomous sign, derived from the hieroglyph [*], appears only in Demotic — hieroglyphs never developed into a genuine alphabet, but always maintained the original combination of word-signs (logograms) and sound-signs (phonograms). Also, unlike most other systems of pictographic origin, such as Mesopotamian cuneiform or Chinese ideograms, Egyptian hieroglyphs kept their original iconicity throughout their entire history without developing stylized forms. On the contrary, in later periods
the iconic potential of the system was further unfolded by the addition of new signs and of idiosyncratic phonetic values for existing signs.

This shows that, historically, the development of alphabetic writing is not, as often assumed, the predictable outcome of a non-alphabetic system; but the result of an underlying difference in the "philosophy of writing," with the breakthrough of the Hellenistic cultural koine and, eventually, with the final victory of Christianity in Egypt during the second and third century, when a changed cultural and religious setting favored the adoption of an alphabetic system, hieroglyphs were completely superseded by the Coptic alphabet, which was written from left to right and consisted of the Greek letters and of six (in some dialects seven) Demotic signs for the indication of phonemes absent from Greek. These supplementary letters are in all dialects η = /h/, η = /f/, ζ = /l/, ζ = /k/, ζ = /l/, plus Bohairic Δ/Akhmimic ζ = /l/. In good Coptic manuscripts in Sahidic – the dialect of classical literature – a superlinear stroke (called in German Vokalstreich) marks a syllable which does not display a full vowel in the Greek sense of the word (i.e., ι, ο, ο, (ο), or ο), but rather a schwa or the syllabic pronunciation of a consonant; for example ꝝ = /hotb/ or /hotb/.

Beginning with the late Old Kingdom, from about 2150 BCE, Egyptian developed a subsystem of hieroglyphic orthography to express a sequence of "consonant+vowel." From its beginning, but especially in the New Kingdom, this subsystem was used for the writing of words of foreign – mostly Northwest Semitic – origin, but at times also for the graphic rendition of Egyptian words. This procedure, known as "syllabic orthography," allowed the rendering of vowels by combining Egyptian monoconsonantal or biconsonantal hieroglyphs displaying a sequence of strong+weak consonant (such as k+s, r+j, p-w) in sign-groups with specific syllabic values. Thus, glides ('aleph, yod and waw) were used to express vowels, in a procedure similar to the use of matres lectionis in Northwest Semitic. While regular correspondences are still elusive and disagreements concerning the vocalic values of specific sign-groups, therefore, are doomed to persist, the general characteristics of syllabic orthography are well understood. The system combines three principles: the so-called "Devanāgarī principle" (from the name of the Indian writing system), according to which the unmarked vocalic value of each basic sign is "consonant+/a/" within a word or "consonant+/o/" at its end (for example 3 for /ba/ or /ba/), with the optional additional glide read vocally (i.e., j for /j/ and w for /w/); the "cuneiform principle," according to which the sign-group is to be read with the vowel phoneme it has in the underlying Egyptian word from which this sign is borrowed (for example the foul /k-/ for /k/ or the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Entity depicted</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Phonological value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vulture</td>
<td>3 (aleph)</td>
<td>earlier /a/ &gt; later /a/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flowering reed</td>
<td>3 (1) two reed flowers (2) two strokes</td>
<td>earlier /a/ &gt; later /a/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human forearm</td>
<td>3 (iyin)</td>
<td>/a/ in Arabic ka’ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quail chick</td>
<td>w (waw)</td>
<td>/w/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stool</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horned viper</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owl</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human mouth</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>/r/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reed shelter</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>/h/ in English he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twisted wick</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>/b/ in Arabic abnad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>placenta</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>/b/ in German Buch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal’s belly</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>/b/ in German Ich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bolt</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>/z/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>folded cloth</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pool or lake</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>/s/ in English she</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hill slope</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>/q/ in Arabic qur’ān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basket with handle</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>/k/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stand for jar</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>/g/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bread loaf</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tethering rope</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>/f/ in English choke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human hand</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snake</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>/d/ in English jole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hare over the water \( \frac{3}{2} \) wn for /wan/); the "consonantal principle" of the conventional hieroglyphic system, in which the sign-group stands only for the consonantal phoneme regardless of the accompanying glide, i.e. it is a mere graphic variant of the consonantal sign (for example \( \frac{3}{4} \) bw for /bn/).

Table 2.1 displays the set of Egyptian monoconsonantal signs, accompanied by their pictographic content, their Egyptological transliteration, and their phonological value. The "alphabetic" signs cover the entire set of consonantal phonemes of the classical language, which will be discussed in section 3.4. The only exception is /l/, a phoneme conveyed by different combinations of signs (see above). In the conventional Egyptological "reading" of an Egyptian text, which does not pay attention to the original pronunciation of the words, a short vowel [\( \varepsilon \)] is inserted between the consonants of a word (htp = [hetep]); semivocalic glides are mostly read like the corresponding vowel (jnn = [imen], prw = [peru]); pharyngeal /\( \text{?} /\) and laryngeal /\( \text{?} /\) are both read as [a].

The writing system also had a set of hieroglyphic signs used to convey logographically the numbers 100...1000 and the fractions 1/2, 1/3, and 1/4. To indicate natural numbers, signs appear repeated and organized sequentially from the highest to the lowest (\( \frac{3}{4} \) = 3x100, 3x10, 3x1).

Here follows a specimen of how the hieroglyphic system worked. The same text is presented in the four ways in which a hieroglyphic text could be written. Numbers indicate the sequence of the individual signs; phonograms are indicated in italic, logograms in SMALL CAPITALS, determinatives in SMALL CAPITALS and "quotes"; additional phonemes necessary to complete the grammatical structure of the corresponding words are added in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{3}{2} ) MDW ( \frac{3}{2} ) jn gb ( \frac{3}{2} ) hnn</td>
<td>( \frac{3}{2} ) MDW (w) jn gb hnn</td>
<td>&quot;To say the words by Geb with his Ennead&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>GOD</em> ( \frac{3}{2} ) hnn</td>
<td><em>GOD</em> (w) hnn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{3}{2} ) PS;</td>
<td><em>GOD</em> (w)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hieratic of Dyn. XII (Pr. 4.2-4) with hieroglyphic transcription

Hieratic of Dyn. XX (Pr. 5.1-3) with hieroglyphic transcription

Demotic of the third century BCE (Dem. Chron. 6.1) with hieroglyphic transcription
The hieroglyphic system was used mainly for monumental purposes, more rarely (in a cursive form) for religious texts in the Middle and the New Kingdom. During their history, however, hieroglyphs developed two manual varieties: Hieratic (2600 BCE to third century CE) represents a direct cursive rendering, with ligatures and diacritic signs, of a sequence of hieroglyphic signs; Demotic (seventh century BCE to fifth century CE) modifies radically the writing conventions by introducing a shorthand-like simplification of Hieratic sign-groups. Table 2.2 shows a sample of Hieratic and Demotic writing followed by a hieroglyphic transcription.\(^{14}\) It should be noted that the conversion from Demotic into hieroglyphs is a purely artificial exercise of modern scholars and was never practised in antiquity.

The basic orientation of the Egyptian writing system, and the only one used in the cursive varieties, is from right to left, with signs facing the right; in monumental texts, as in the example above, the order may be inverted to left to right for reasons of symmetry or artistic composition.

### 2.3 Connotational devices in the hieroglyphic system

One should observe that, whatever its primary function within its linguistic system, a pictogram is bound to maintain a figurative immediacy which may have an impact on its perception as a sign, i.e., on its connotative potential. Here lies, as suggested above, a major difference between Egyptian hieroglyphs and other graphic systems which made use of ideographic principles: eventually, they tend to develop stylized forms and to break, as it were, the semiotic directness of the sign, favoring its non-ideographic use. But this final divorce between represented entity and its linguistic function never took place in monumental hieroglyphs, with the consequence that the conventions described in section 2.2 could be modified to the advantage of the figurative content of the sign. This happened in Egyptian in a threefold way:

(a) First of all, the hieroglyphic sign could become the vehicle for the expression of a cultural attitude vis-à-vis the entity it represented. For example, signs referring to the divine or royal sphere usually preceded in the writing any other sign belonging to the same compound noun, independently of their actual syntactic position: the word \(\text{hm-ntr} \) "priest," lit. "servant of the god" is written with the logogram for \(\text{ntr} \) "god" preceding the phonogram \(\text{hm} \) "servant."\(^{14}\) This device is called "honorific anticipation." Conversely, a sign referring to a negatively connotated entity (such as a dead person, an enemy, a malevolent god) could be modified by means of graphic deletion, substitution with a less loaded sign, or mutilation of one of its features, in order to neutralize apotropaically its negative potential:\(^{15}\) in \(\text{Py}r.\)

\(566w\)\text{wym-f} \ "he eats," the determinative of a bodiless man who touches his mouth is apotropaically used instead of the more usual \(\top\), in order to prevent the sign of a man from harming the referent of the third person pronoun, i.e., the dead King.

(b) Secondly, specific sequences of hieroglyphic signs could acquire a function as recitational instruction about the preceding phrase. This happens, for example, in the case of the expression \(\top \) \(\text{zpr} \) 2 "twice," "two times," which means that the preceding phrase should be read (i.e., recited) twice: \(\text{j-gr} \) \(\text{zpr} \) 2 "be silent, be silent."

(c) Thirdly, the array of functional values of a specific sign could be expanded beyond the limits of the fixed convention: a sign could be given a different phonological value from the traditionally established one(s), especially by using it to indicate only the first consonantal phoneme of the corresponding word (acrophonic principle). The idiosyncratic use of the sign was bound to attract the observer's attention to the sign itself, opening the way to symbolic interpretations of its figurative content. This second type of connotational expansion of the hieroglyphic system is found sporadically from the Old Kingdom onward, with the emergence of "cryptographic" solutions,\(^{16}\) but developed dramatically in Ptolemaic times, leading to a radical change in the laws regulating the use of hieroglyphs.

### 2.4 The historical development of Egyptian writing

The principles described in section 2.2 and the devices discussed in section 2.3 characterize the entire hieroglyphic writing and its manual derivatives in their historical development. They represent the common denominator of this system from its onset at the end of the predynastic period (about 3100 BCE) to the final disappearance of hieroglyphs and Demotic in the fourth and fifth century CE. But in these 3500 years a number of typological evolutions affected the Egyptian writing systems; they correspond to slight modifications or adjustments in the underlying "philosophy of writing." While the principles described above basically apply to each of these typological stages, innovations concern the historical emergence of changes in their distribution; these changes are sufficiently meaningful to justify a treatment of the resulting graphic form as a new "type" of hieroglyphic or derivative writing. What is even more significant is that these typological changes take place in concomitance with specific historical events which themselves represent major turning points in other aspects of Egypt's cultural life as well. Accordingly, one can observe a succession of six typological phases in the
The history of Egyptian writing: (a) the archaic period, (b) the Old Kingdom system, (c) the classical model, (d) the Ramesside orthography, (e) Demotic, (f) the Ptolemaic system.

(a) The archaic period. The historical emergence of writing in Egypt is traditionally associated with the gradual development of a centralized system of government covering the entire country, at least a large portion thereof: this is the so-called "unification" of Egypt and the parallel emergence of an Egyptian state. Although the details are by no means clear, this historical phase runs simultaneously with the development of a writing system from the last kings of the predynastic period at Abydos (Scorpion, Iri-hor, Ka, Narmer) at the end of the fourth millennium to the establishment of a rather complete set of mono- and biconsonantal phonograms by the end of Dyn. III (about 2700 BCE). In these early inscriptions on seals, seal impressions, palettes, short funerary stelae and other monuments pertaining to the royal or administrative sphere, phonologica and semantic principles are already intertwined, with a high number of signs functioning as logograms. For example, the name of the last predynastic king Narmer (about 3000 BCE), in Egyptian nfr-mr "striking catfish (?)" is written with the logogram nfr "catfish" followed by the biconsonantal sign k documenting the two phonemes /m/-/r/: this latter sign is a pictogram representing a chisel and bears no transparent etymological connection to its use as phonogram in the word mr "sick": the reading is derived by means of the rebus principle. In the archaic writing, the notation of each word allows a degree of flexibility and a variety of options, with more than one concomitant writing for one concept: a possible example is offered by the rosette ḫrtt and the falcon ḫrw, which are both used as alternative writings for the word ḫrw "Horus," i.e. "the king.

(b) The Old Kingdom. With the emergence of a society strongly founded upon what has been described as "the bureaucratic mind," the quantity and the complexity of written documents expands dramatically (Dyn. IV–VI, 2650–2150 BCE). From this period we have a wealth of texts exhibiting a full-fledged writing system based on a systematic, rather than random application of the principles described in section 2.2. The inventory of signs is slightly over a thousand and the possibility of substitute writings for the same word is reduced in the case of logograms, but maintained for the phonetic signs: /sdm/, /s-d-md/, /s-d-mdm/, /s-d-mdm/, /s-d-mdm/, /s-d-mdm/ are all alternate options for /sdm/ "to hear." Frequent use is made of phonetic complementation both preceding and following the main sign. Texts from this period are mainly documents pertaining to the administration of royal funerary domains, legends on the walls of private tombs of the elite in the necropoleis of the Memphite area, autobiographies on the external walls of the rock-cut tombs in Upper Egypt, and the theological corpus of the "Pyramid Texts" in the burial chambers of the royal tombs from the end of Dyn. V (about 2330 BCE) through the end of the Old Kingdom.

(c) The classical system. In the Middle Kingdom (2050–1750 BCE), the authority of the royal court is reaffirmed after about a century of centrifugal tendencies towards provincial centers of power ("First Intermediate Period," 2150–2050 BCE). A newly developed school system for the education of the bureaucratic elite fixes Egyptian orthography by reducing the number of graphic renditions conventionally allowed for any given word: while in the Old Kingdom the spectrum of scribal possibilities was relatively broad, only one or two of the potential options are now selected as the received written form(s) of the word. This conventional orthography of the word usually consists either of a logogram (for the most basic nouns of the lexicon) or of a sequence of phonograms, often complementized, followed by a determinative: for example /sdm/, /m/, /det. "ABSTRACT" for /sdm/ "to hear." When compared with the Old Kingdom system, logograms have become less common and slightly varying hieroglyphic shapes have been reduced to one basic form, for a total of about 750 signs. The classical principles remain in use for monumental hieroglyphs as well as for manual Hieratic until the end of Dyn. XVIII (ca. 1300 BCE).

(d) Ramesside orthography. During early Dyn. XIX (from about 1310 to 1195 BCE), major changes affected the writing conventions of hieroglyphs and especially of Hieratic. In monumental texts, the space units within which sequences of hieroglyphs are formally arranged, i.e. the so-called "ideal squares," undergo an aesthetic readjustment: while in earlier epochs signs would contain either one larger sign (such as the owl /m/ or else two rows of flat signs (for example a snake over a human mouth /m/, /f-t/), two columns of narrow signs (such as a seat followed by a loaf of bread and a house for the word /sdm/, /s/. "seat"), with a maximum of four flat narrow hieroglyphs (as in the sequence /sdm/, /sdm/, /sdm/, /sdm/), they are now reorganized within a three-way structure, each "ideal square" containing now up to nine smaller fields: see the following example from a private tomb from Dyn. XIX, where the small numbers indicate the order in which individual signs should be read.
Changes are even more significant in manual writing. Ramesside and late New Kingdom hieratic orthography is the product of two conflicting tendencies: on the one hand the need to guarantee the recognizability of words by maintaining in many instances their received orthography, on the other hand the desire to partially render in writing the conspicuous phonetic evolutions that had affected Egyptian since the fixation of classical conventions. The result is a constant interaction of the "ideographic" (i.e. historical) and the phonetic level, often within the same word: while the word *dr.t* "hand" is still written with the logogram "HAND" followed by the phonetic complement */f/ and the stroke which usually accompanies ideograms  in spite of the fact that by that time the word had lost the final */f/ (as in Coptic *toupe*), when it is followed by the third person possessive pronoun the received writing is completed by an additional */f/ (written *tw*) to indicate its permanence in the pronunciation:  "his hand" (as in Coptic *touqa*). Similarly, the classical spelling of  *hpr* "to become," in which the phonetic complement */f/ accompanies the triliteral */h-p-r/, is now often followed by a new phonetic complement */p/ (</bpr-r>) which mirrors more closely the contemporary pronunciation */[bop]/. The verb  *bpr* "to walk" (Coptic *mouge*) is written in pAnastasi I 22,1 with a new determinative, which is in fact nothing else but the traditional writing of the verb */sm* "to go" (now pronounced */[ba:pa]*, see Coptic *we*) employed in a new function:  <tw> + */m* + */smt* = */[maʔa]*. For the broader use of syllabic writing, which is now applied to the writing of Egyptian words, see section 2.2 above.

(e) Demotic. With the decay of a powerful centralized government in the first millennium BCE, centrifugal tendencies affect writing conventions as well. During Dyn. XXVI (seventh century BCE), a new form of cursive writing called "Demotic" (section 2.1) develops at first in the north of the country, where the royal residence was located, and is gradually extended to the southern regions, where a form of Hieratic survives for about a century ("abnormal Hieratic"). Unlike Hieratic, whose sign groups mirror the shape of the original hieroglyphs rather closely, Demotic signs break away from this tradition and adopt a relatively small set of stylized, conventional forms, in which the connection to the hieroglyphic counterpart is hardly perceptible, and which are therefore more likely to be used in purely phonetic function. Determinatives have now lost to a large extent their function as lexical classifiers. While the demotic system was neither syllabic nor alphabetical, and precisely because the limited number of shapes it used to represent the language required a high degree of professional training on the part of the Late Period scribes, its development marks for Egypt the beginning of a divorce between monumental and cursive writing which will have a dramatic impact on the evolution of the hieroglyphic system as well.

Demotic remained in administrative and literary use until the end of the Roman period; the last dated text gives the year 452 CE.22

(f) The Ptolemaic system. The increasing consciousness of the symbolic potential inherent in the relation between the signs used to write words and the semantic meaning of the words themselves led already in the Late Period (from Dyn. XXI, ca. 1000 BCE) but particularly in Ptolemaic and Roman times (fourth century BCE to third century CE) to the development of previously unknown phonetic values and also of so-called cryptographic solutions.23 This evolution, which originated in priestly circles and remained until the end the monopoly of a very restricted intellectual community, threatened on the one hand the accessibility of the system, favoring a dramatic increase in the number of signs, which now reaches many thousands;24 on the other hand, it exploited the full array of potential meanings of the individual hieroglyphs, making the system more perfect as a pictorial-linguistic form (see section 2.3). And it is exactly this radical change in the nature of the writing system in the Greco-Roman period which is at the origin of the view, held in the Western world from Late Antiquity to the emergence of modern Egyptology (and still surviving to the present day in some aspects of popular culture), of the "symbolic", rather than functional character of the hieroglyphic writing: one need only think of the decorative use of Egyptian hieroglyphs during the Renaissance and the Neoclassical period in Europe.25

Unlike earlier conventions, the Ptolemaic system makes abundant use of orthographic, rather than phonetic puns, i.e. of associations of meaning based upon the writing of a word rather the identity of pronunciation between individual hieroglyphs: for example, the signs  and  were used in the classical system only to indicate the phonograms */g-s/ and */f/ respectively, in Ptolemaic Egyptian, they are creatively combined to represent the two verbs */q* "to enter" (with the f-snake "entering" the gs-sign) and */pr* "to come out"
(with the snake "coming out" of the gs-sign): ꝕœ - "q" to enter" and ꝕ - prj "to exit." The most fundamental criterion followed in this functional expansion of the classical system is the "consonantal principle,"26 according to which pluriconsonantal signs may acquire a new value: this new value is either based upon the phonetically strongest consonants of the sign (for example the triliteral sign ꝕ mbf may acquire the values /b/ or /b/) or upon the coalescence of homorganic sounds (such as the labials /p/ and /b/ in the sign ꝕ jb, which can be used to indicate /pb/) or of neighboring consonants (for example ꝕ jmn for /b-m/). However, the so-called "acrophonic principle," according to which only the first consonant of a pluriconsonantal sign is kept, regardless of its phonetic strength, was applied in some religious contexts27 and played a higher role in the development of Ptolemaic "cryptography,"28 i.e. of a form of figurative writing in which the name of a god is written with (and at the same time his theological qualities iconically evoked) specific hieroglyphic signs used alphabetically. Let us take for example the sequence 𓊟𓊢 for the name of the god Khnum.29 Here the scarab, which is usually read bpr, is used with the acrophonic value b, the lizard (unusual in this shape in the classical system)30 with the value n, and the feather, originally mš', with the acrophonic value m; at the same time, this combination of signs evokes specific qualities of the god: his assimilation to the sun god Re through the scarab, to the funerary god Nehebkau through the reptile, and to the principle of Maat (truth, justice) through the feather. Cryptography, which had been sporadically used in religious contexts from the Old Kingdom onward,31 is culturally similar to the "isopsephy" of classical antiquity and to the Jewish qabbalah, i.e. to a numeric value attributed to alphabetic letters. With very few exceptions,32 the Ptolemaic system was applied solely to monumental writing.

25 The end of the system and its rediscovery
We saw above that already in Hellenistic times there are sporadic instances of a Demotic text accompanied by Greek transcriptions; aimed at favoring a correct pronunciation, these reading helps are the sign of a divorce between Egyptian culture and its traditional writing systems. Gradually, the use of Greek transcriptions became more frequent: the first two centuries of our era saw the development of a whole corpus of mostly magical Egyptian texts in Greek letters (with the addition of Demotic signs to supplement it when phonologically required), known in the literature as "Old Coptic." To this cultural milieu we must also ascribe the only lengthy Egyptian text in Greek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Conventional transliteration</th>
<th>Phon. value (section 3.6)</th>
<th>Coptic name of the letter (of Greek or Demotic origin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>/hl, /f/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ꝕ</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ꝕ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
characters, namely pBM 10808,33 in its grammatical structure a Late Middle Egyptian text, but displaying contemporary phonological outcomes. The pressure to adopt an alphabetic system increased with the christianization of the country, when religious reasons contributed to the divorce between Egyptian culture and its traditional writing system(s). In this respect, the third century CE represents the turning point: hieroglyphic texts exhibit a progressive decay both in their grammatical structure and in the formal appearance of the signs: the last dated hieroglyphic inscription is from the year 394 CE.34 Demotic texts substantially decrease in number, Egyptian being replaced by Greek as a written language.35 In the following century, the new convention, which we call “Coptic,” appears completely established: the Egyptian language is now written in a Greek-derived alphabet, presented in table 2.3.36 By the fifth century, the Egyptian elite had lost the knowledge of the nature of hieroglyphs: the Hieroglyphik of Horapollo,37 a hellenized Egyptian, offer a “decipherment” of the hieroglyphs fully echoing the late antique symbolic speculations.38

While the interest in matters Egyptian remained vivid in the West for the following centuries, it was only in modern times that the knowledge of the true nature of the writing system was recovered. In the seventeenth century Athanasius Kircher recognized the linguistic derivation of Coptic from the language of the hieroglyphs (which he still took to be a symbolic writing), and in the eighteenth century Jean Barthelemy suggested that the cartouches which surround some hieroglyphic words contain divine and royal names – an assumption which turned out to be correct. In 1799, during Napoleon’s expedition to Egypt, the discovery of the so-called Rosetta Stone, a trilingual (Hieroglyphic, Demotic, and Greek) document from the Ptolemaic period found in the Egyptian town of Rosetta, provided the possibility to compare a text in two unknown writing systems (Demotic and hieroglyphs) with the same text in Greek; this event opened the way to the actual decipherment.

First methodological contributions were made by Silvestre de Sacy (1802), who laid down the criteria to be followed, and more substantial results were reached by Johan David Akerblad for the Demotic section and especially by the English physician Thomas Young, who, however, did not progress beyond the royal names. The most decisive contribution to the decipherment of the hieroglyphs39 was achieved by the French scholar Jean-François Champollion in his Lettre à M. DACIER (1822), and especially in the Précis du système hieroglyphique (1824). On the basis of the writing of Greek names in the hieroglyphic text, Champollion was able to establish the presence of a phonetic component in the system, breaking away from the traditional symbolic approach that had prevailed in the West since the knowledge of this writing was lost in the first centuries CE. His point of departure were Ptolemaic royal names, traditionally written in hieroglyphic texts within a rope called “cartouche” ( ). After identifying the name of Ptolemy (Greek Πτολεμαῖος) in the sequence of signs ( ), he was able to establish a correspondence between the phonetic values he had ascribed to each hieroglyphic sign, namely <p-t-o-l-m-y-s>, and the values they displayed in royal names on other Ptolemaic monuments, for example Cleopatra (Greek Κλεοπάτρα), spelled <c-l-i-o-p-t-r-t-r-t>s. Thus, he was able to achieve the major breakthrough for a complete decipherment of the system.

With the adoption and expansion of Champollion’s work by Richard Lepsius from 1837 onward40 the decipherment can be considered completed: scholarly attention is now directed towards the study of the features of the Egyptian language. Subsequent generations of students of the language could concentrate primarily on the treatment of Egyptian grammar in terms of both its synchronic features and its historical development (section 1.3).

Further reading
Davies, W. V. Egyptian Hieroglyphs (London: British Museum, 1987) [An introductory presentation of the writing system with many examples and references].
Gelb, I. J. A Study of Writing (Chicago University Press, revised edn 1963) [An idiosyncratic, but fundamental text for the study of Egyptian writing within a comparative frame].
Schenkel, W. “Schrift,” in Lexikon der Ägyptologie V, 713–35 [A systematic presentation of the features of the hieroglyphic system].
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Egyptian phonology

3.1 Introduction

At the present state of our knowledge, a discussion of Egyptian phonology must be addressed primarily as an issue of diachronic, rather than synchronic linguistics. While it is possible to recognize regular patterns of sound change in the history of the Egyptian language as a whole, including in many cases Afroasiatic antecedents, the synchronic systems of phonological oppositions at any given time in the four millennia of the productive history of this language often defy a clear analysis. Furthermore, our models of historical phonology tend to hide many uncertainties behind the regularity of the reconstructed paradigm, conveying the misleading impression that for each of the different phases of the language (Old, Middle, and Late Egyptian, Demotic, and Coptic) we are able to establish a discrete phonological system.

The actual phonetic realities underlying the abstract reconstructions are even more elusive: the traditional pronunciation and transliteration of many Egyptian phonemes rest upon hardly anything more than scholarly conventions, and even for the relatively well-known Coptic, in which Egyptian sounds are rendered in a Greek-based alphabet, it is difficult to assess reliable phonetic values for some of the Greek signs and the Demotic graphemes that were added to the Greek alphabetic set.

In fact, the main reason for the difficulties in reconstructing the phonology of Ancient Egyptian lies in the nature of the writing system: Hieroglyphs, Hieratic and Demotic represent the mere consonantal skeleton of a word (and sometimes only a portion thereof), followed by indicators of lexical classes, the so-called "determinatives." Semivocalic phonemes are rarely indicated, vowels practically never. As for Coptic, in which vowels are indeed rendered, one should not downplay the methodological difficulty inherent in the widespread assumption of a phonological or phonetic identity between a specific Coptic sign and its original value in the Greek system.

Therefore, the reconstruction of the phonological inventory and of the phonetic values in any period of the history of Egyptian is bound to remain hypothetical, which motivates the constant use of an asterisk (*) before vocalized forms. The full phonological or phonetic shape of an Egyptian word can be reconstructed through a procedure in which three dimensions are checked against each other and mutually verified: the comparative Afroasiatic reconstruction,¹ the information drawn from contemporary sources in other (mostly Semitic) languages with a better investigated phonology,² and the laws of phonological evolution leading from earlier Egyptian to Coptic.³

3.2 Heuristic criteria

In spite of these difficulties, the study of Egyptian phonology has achieved significant progress since its inception in the late nineteenth century both in the assessment of sound values and in the reconstruction of prosodic rules. Scholars mainly rely on four procedures of linguistic reconstruction:⁴

1. Comparative Afroasiatic linguistics. Egyptian is a language of the Afroasiatic phylum, and the presence of established etymological equivalents offers a fundamental source for our reconstruction of phonological values. For example, since Eg. <qab> corresponds to Sem. qrb meaning "interior part," one can confidently establish that Eg. <q> = /q/ and that <c> = /ṭ/.

2. Contemporary transcriptions in foreign languages. Many Akkadian texts, especially from the archives of el-Amarna (fifteenth-fourteenth century BCE), contain Egyptian words and phrases in cuneiform transcription. Although the phonology and the graphemics of Akkadian are themselves by no means fully decoded, these transcriptions provide a valuable insight into the contemporary pronunciation of Egyptian. For example Eg. <stpnr> "the-one-whom-(the-god)-Re-has-chosen" (royal name of King Ramesses II) appears in cuneiform as š-t-e-em-p-na-r-i-t-a-a, a form on the basis of which one can both posit the contemporary Egyptian pronunciation as */sæpna'risa/ and observe the correspondence Eg. <s> // Akk. <t>, both of which were probably realized as [s] or as a sound very close to it (at least in some dialects).⁵

3. Egyptian renderings of foreign words, especially of Northwest Semitic origin. This criterion, the symmetrical counterpart to the preceding one, provides an insight into the phonology of contemporary Egyptian while at the same time offering the possibility to verify scholarly assumptions on Semitic phonology. For example, Northwest Sem. *sōpēr "scribe" => Eg. št-pa-r-ː on the one hand, this piece of evidence raises questions about the phonological status and the phonetic realization of Eg. /s/, which is the palatal pheme usually transcribed ⟨t⟩ by Egyptologists, while on the other, it can also be used to shed some light on the value of the phoneme ⟨s⟩ (samekh), which originally must have been an affricate ⟨ṣ⟩ in Semitic.⁶
The evidence provided by Coptic. The latest stage of Egyptian provides the broadest basis for the study of the phonology of older linguistic periods. For example, the three Eg. words spelled uniformly */wabw/ "pure," */wab/ "to be pure," and */priw/ "priest," appear in Coptic in the lexemes */wabw/ "holy," */waw/ "to be pure," */waw/ "priest." This enables us to reconstruct three different vocalization patterns underlying the same graphic reality of hieroglyphic Egyptian: the stative */wabw/ "he is pure," the infinitive */wab/ "to become pure," and the noun */wab/ "priest" (sections 3.4–3.6). At the same time, this piece of evidence raises questions of consonantism, i.e., the fate of the phoneme /s/ and the reason for the alternance of /s/ vs. /s/ in the Coptic forms as opposed to */sb/ in both cases in their Egyptian antecedents.

In the practice of Egyptian phonological reconstruction, these criteria appear constantly combined: while each of them, if considered individually, proves largely inadequate in order to determine a synchronic stage, together they convey a relatively homogeneous picture of the fundamental laws of Egyptian phonological development. What follows in sections 3.3–3.6 is a presentation of the historical phonology of Egyptian from its Afroasiatic roots to Coptic. Transcriptions from Egyptian and Semitic follow the convention of the respective discipline and are rendered in italics; transliterations of graphemes without reference to their phonological status are indicated in angle brackets (<x>); phonemes (/x/) and tentative phonetic values ([x]) according to IPA conventions, exceptions being the use of */s/ for IPA /s/ and of */h/ for IPA /h/. The sign */v/ indicates a short vowel whose color cannot be reconstructed with any reasonable degree of accuracy.

At this point, a methodological warning is necessary: in the case of Ancient Egyptian and of many other "philological" languages known only through written records, the distinction between the phoneme as the distinctive minimal unit of the language (<x>), and the often much larger inventory of sounds ([x]) representing its physical realizations is less significant than in languages with a better known phonology: while scholars can strive for the reconstruction of the sound units of the language, the technical assessment of their phonological status, which would require in each case the minimal pair test, often proves a very problematic endeavor: on the other hand, our only source of information is represented by a complex writing system in which phonetic and semantic principles are combined; on the other hand, because of the restrictiveness in the use of writing in Egyptian society, our knowledge of certain areas of the lexicon, and especially of their functional evolution throughout Egyptian history, is doomed to remain far from exhaustive.

3.3 The prehistory of Egyptian phonology

Before the emergence of Egyptian as a written language, a few adjustments within the stock of phonemes inherited from "Afroasiatic" 9 seem to have taken place. Three major evolutions from the original phonological stock characterize the Egyptian domain as it begins its recorded history:

(a) In the apical and interdental series, voiced */t/ and */d/ develop into the pharyngeal phoneme */h/, probably going through an intermediate stage with pharyngealized lateral: */t/, */d/ > */h/ > */h/. For example, Eg. */t/ "portal," Sem. */tal/ "door"; Eg. */s/ = */to speak a foreign language," Sem. */l̩/ (Ar. */laya/"to speak enigmatically," Hebr. */l̩/ "to speak a foreign language"); Afroas. */c̩/ */c̩/ > Eg. */f/ */f/ */f/ Coptic */q/, see Sem. */jb/ (Akk. */dubbu/), Ar. */dubba/ Hebr. */dubba/).

(b) Among the liquids, the original opposition between nasal */n/ and velar */l/ and vibrant */r/ underwent a profound reorganization, not yet fully understood in its specific details, in which a role was also played by dialectal variants. Afroas. */n/ and */r/ were kept as Eg. */n/ and */l/—the latter being the phoneme conventionally transcribed */n/ by Egyptologists and traditionally taken to be a variety of glottal stop */h/, but in earlier Egyptian probably a uvular trill;11 Eg. */n/ */n/ 12 Sem. */n/ */n/ first person independent pronoun, or Eg. */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ */n/ }
At the beginning of its written history, i.e. during the historical period known as the Old Kingdom (2800-2150 BCE), one can assume that Egyptian displayed the phonological inventory indicated in Table 3.1. Here, x indicates the traditional Egyptological transcription, [x] the posited phoneme, [ka] a tentative phonetic reconstruction (different from [x]), [la] the traditional Egyptian transcription, [ka] the posited phoneme, [ka] indicating the phonetic conventionally transcribed by Egyptologists.

### Table 3.1 The consonantal phonemes of earlier Egyptian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSONANTS</th>
<th>BILATIAL</th>
<th>DENTAL</th>
<th>ALVEO-PALATAL</th>
<th>PALATAL</th>
<th>VELO</th>
<th>UVALAR</th>
<th>PHARYNGEAL</th>
<th>GLOTTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLOSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td>p /p/</td>
<td>t /t/</td>
<td>k /k/</td>
<td>q /q/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>b /b/</td>
<td>d /d/</td>
<td>g /g/</td>
<td>h /h/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRICATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td>f /f/</td>
<td>s /s/</td>
<td>z /z/</td>
<td>h /h/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>m /m/</td>
<td>n /n/</td>
<td>r /r/</td>
<td>j /j/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIBRANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLIDE</td>
<td>w /w/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. In very early Egyptian, the glottal stop [ʔ] was probably limited to few words and not expressed by an independent iconic graphic; later on, presumably during the Middle Kingdom (2000-1750 BCE), [ʔ] represents on the one hand the result of the evolution of [l] > [ʔ], and on the other hand the outcome of [j] > [ʔ] between two vowels in post-tonic position ([ʔbajw] > [ʔbajw] "bad") and before an unstressed vowel in initial position ([ʔjw] > [ʔjw] "to turn") (Kamermans, in Gedenkchrift Peter Behrens, 186-87 and Lingeg 2 (1992), 169-75 prefers a different interpretation of [j] as palatal glide [j] rather than as glottal stop [ʔ]).
b. In the later stage of early Egyptian (i.e. probably during the Middle Kingdom), the uvular trill [w], which is the Eg. form of Afros. [r], progressively tends to acquire the realization as glottal stop [ʔ] - an evolution which appears almost completed in the later New Kingdom (1550-1050 BCE); see, however, note 11.
c. In the hieroglyphic system, the phoneme [ʔ] is not indicated unambiguously; it is frequently conveyed by [⟩⟩] and [⟩⟩], see above.
d. For the writing of this phoneme, the following rules apply (with exceptions): [j] is rendered by [j] in initial position: [j] = */jatj/* "father," and immediately following a stressed vowel: [bajj] = */bajj/* "bad," by [j] within a word, if [j] immediately precedes the stressed vowel: [j] = */jatj/* "you will appear," by [⟩] at the end of a word: [⟩] = */jatj/* "father."
borne in mind and accounted for: on the basis of both comparative evidence and diachronic signals, Egyptian mediae appear to have indeed neutralized the feature [+VOICED] and to have been realized - together with the uvular plosive /q/- as ejective stops. The feature [-EJECTIVE], whose existence can be inferred through Coptic evidence (section 3.6), brought these phonemes in the phonetic proximity of Semitic emphatics: most likely /ɬ/ = [t'], probably also /ʃ/ = [ʃ'] and /q/ = [q']. A possible explanation of this phenomenon of (especially initial) devoicing is that the feature [+VOICED] must have become redundant under the competition of the optional aspiration which, at least in some varieties of the language and specific environments, characterized Egyptian voiceless stops: /p/ = [pʰ] and /t/ = [tʰ], probably also /ʃ/ = [ʃ'] and /q/ = [q'].

This is shown by the fact that Eg. /p/ and /t/ are rendered in the Greek transcriptions by Ψ and Θ respectively: pth */ptah/ "(the god) Ptah" > ΘΘ, and Eg. /ʃ/ and /q/ often by Χ and Ψ respectively: tb-ntr */caḥnaxar/ > "(the city of) Sebennytos" > Σεβεννυτος, bsk-n-mf */baxak-vn-rwjv/ > "Bocchoris" (lit. "servant-of-his-name") > Βοξορις, Βοξορις, Βοξορις. This aspersion is exhibited by the Bohairic dialect of Coptic (section 3.6).

In the sibilants, Old Kingdom Egyptian displays three phonemes, usually transcribed z (or s), (or š), and ʒ. When subject to palatalization, this last phoneme corresponds etymologically to Afroas. *x (which, as a rule, evolves to Eg. b = /b/; Eg. ḥmn, ḥmn "to become hot," see Sem. *ḥmn. This seems indeed to indicate an articulation /b/ for Eg. ʒ, although both Afroas. *ʒ and ʒ are continued by Eg. s (s), i.e. by the second phoneme in the series listed above: see Afroas. *sw: "he" > Eg. sw */sw/;23 Sem. *swa: Afroas. *ṣapat "lip" > Eg. sp.t */ṣapat/;24 Sem. *ṣapat. It is possible, therefore, that Eg. s /s/ was characterized by a supplementary feature [+PALATAL], with an articulation close to [ʃ]. Eg. z, on the other hand, is the heir of Afroas. *t̩ and *s, as shown for example by jw */ḥnw/ "bamarik," see Sem. *ḥn or Afroas. *salam "locust" > Eg. ḥnw */ḥnw/;25 see Hebr. sol'ām. For systematic reasons, and in order to keep the symmetry with the ejective articulation of voiced plosives, I reconstruct this phoneme as /s/ = [ʃ];26 the phonologial opposition between /s/ and /ʃ/ was neutralized by the beginning of the Middle Kingdom, at which time <s> and <ʃ> had become graphic variants of the same phoneme /s/. However, the articulation and the phonological status of sibilants in the whole phylum remains a thorny issue of Afroasiatic linguistics.

The Eg. phoneme /ʃ/ represents the outcome of Afroas. *ʃ (Eg. jmn "right side") > "west," the point of reference being represented by the sources of the Nile, i.e. the south, vs. Sem. *ṣmn "right side" > "south." The reference point being the place where the sun rises, i.e. the east) and of Afroas. *t (Eg. jmn "color," see Sem. *lwn) when subject to palatalization. By the beginning of the Middle Kingdom, as part of the global reorganization of liquid phonemes which took place in Egyptian, with /h/ > /f/ and the neutralization of the opposition between /f/ and other sonorants, /h/ turned into a laryngeal glide /h/ before an unstressed vowel in initial position (jw */jw/ > *jw/"color") and in postvocalic position following the stress (for example, ḥjpw */ḥjpw/ > ḥjpw/"[the god] Apis").

Among the guttural fricatives, <θ> = /h/ is the heir of Afroas. *x (Afroas. *xānām > Eg. ḫmnw ["the ram-god") Khnum"). Ar. *yamān "sheep), whereas <b> = /q/ is the outcome of Afroas. *y (Afroas. *wsw "wide") Eg. ws[h, Ar. ws'), and <b> = /h/ derives from Afroas. *s when not subject to palatalization (Afroas. *sulmān "locust") > Eg. sulmaw, Hebr. sol'ām). The phoneme <θ> = /h/ does not display any unequivocal Afroas. cognate.

### 3.4.2 Vowels

The vocalic system of earlier Egyptian can be reconstructed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRONT</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>/i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL</td>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>/u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACK</td>
<td>/ə/</td>
<td>/ə/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three vowels posited for earlier Egyptian are inherited directly from its Afroasiatic prehistory. While never spelled out in writing, vocalic phonemes can be reconstructed with a sufficient degree of systematic reliability on the basis of the four criteria formulated in section 3.2. For the earliest phase of the development of the Egyptian phonological system we do not assume the existence of the vocalic phonemes /e/, /o/ and /schwa/, which on the contrary play an important role in the phonology of later Egyptian (sections 3.5–3.6).
3.4.3 Syllabic structures

As a general rule, the opposition between short and long vowel is not phonological, but determined by the respective syllabic structure: long vowels appear in open stressed syllables, and short vowels in closed syllables and in open unstressed syllables. Major exceptions are represented by the presence of a long vowel in a closed stressed syllable in the infinitive of bicconsonantal verbal roots and the possibility of long ($cvcc$) or doubly-closed syllables ($cvcc$) in final position. It is known that in many languages word-final position represents an ideal environment for "licensed extrasyllabicity," i.e. for the presence of a supplementary segment in addition to the standard constituents of a syllabic skeleton: $cvcc$ and $cvcc$ are in fact analyzable as $a + c1_0$, where $a$ indicates the syllable and $c1_0$ the word edge. Accordingly, the following seven patterns of syllabic distribution are licensed in earlier Egyptian words ($v$ = stressed long vowel, $u$ = stressed or un-stressed short vowel, $c$ = consonant, $\#$ = word boundary, $S$ = syllable boundary, = syllable affected by tonic stress):

1. $cvcc$
   jnn/*ja:n:n/ "we"
2. $cvcc$
   rny/*tramæ/ "man"
3. $cv$
   hpt/*hatp:/ "pleasing"
4. $cv$
   tpf/*ta pi:/ "first"
5. $cvcc$
   mn/*ma:n/ "to stay"
6. $cvcc$
   mdw.w/*ma:duww/ "words"28
7. $cv$
   stp.k(w)/*svptpu:k/ "I chose"29

A type of "contingent," rather than "licensed" extrasyllabicity can be invoked in order to explain another problematic feature of the earlier Egyptian phonological system as posited by current scholarship, namely the presence of final semiconsonantal glides /j/ and /w/ in bisyllabic and trisyllabic nouns much in excess of what is even remotely documented by written hieroglyphic or hieratic sources: for example <j> = */ja:t(v)/ "father," <hwr> = */harwuw/ "day," etc. It is advisable to take these glides to be extrasyllabic additions to final $cvcc$ syllables

\[(cv)0 + w/j]10\]

"Contingent" upon specific phonetic requirements, such as the presence of a new syllabic rhyme following it, for example a suffix pronoun added to the basic form of the word: */jat(v)/ "father," but */jatji/ "his father," or an older morphological marker of subject case: */mib/ "lord," but */mibv/ */mibuw/ "the lord subj."30

Table 3.3 summarizes the syllabic paradigms licensed in earlier Egyptian. Doubly-closed stressed syllables characterize only a certain number of plural forms of bisyllabic nouns; open unstressed syllables in final position are only found in the endings of specific verbal forms and personal pronouns—hence the use of parentheses to indicate these patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYLLABIC STRUCTURES</th>
<th>PRETONIC</th>
<th>TONIC</th>
<th>POSTTONIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td>$cv$</td>
<td>$cv$</td>
<td>$cv$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSED</td>
<td>$cvcc$</td>
<td>$cvcc$</td>
<td>$cvcc$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUBLY CLOSED</td>
<td>($cvcc$)</td>
<td>$cvcc$</td>
<td>$cvcc$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG</td>
<td>$cvcc$</td>
<td>$cvcc$</td>
<td>$cvcc$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent of morphological patterns, the stress falls in Egyptian on either the ultimate (oxytone) or the penultimative (paroxytone) syllable of a word. The oxytone patterns are $cvcc$ (wbh */wa:ba:/ "to become white" > wntb.), $cvcc$ (jfdw */ja:daw/ "four" > qt00), $cvcc$ (jd */ja:di/ "to say" > xw), $cvcc$ (mdw.w */ma:duww/ "words" > h:kt). The paroxytone patterns are $cvcc$ (stp.w */satap/ "is chosen" > c0tn), $cvcc$ (stp */satap/ "to choose" > c0tn), $cvcc$ (bpr.w */jippyaw/ "transformations," Akk. transcription (a)b-pu-er-en), $cvcc$ (psdw */pisjyw/ "nine" > q1), $cvcc$ (wpr.tj */wapwutjw/ "messengers," Akk. transcription (t)pu-i (t)pu-at), $cvcc$ (wpw.tj */wapwutj/ "message," borrowed in Meroitic as apote33).

Since the stress can only affect the last two syllables of an Egyptian word, the governing rule of syllabic patterns is known with the German term Zweisilbengesetz ("law of the two syllables"). For the prehistory of the Egyptian language, some scholars posit a situation in which, as in the related Semitic languages, the stress could also affect the antepenultimate syllable (Drei­silbengesetz, i.e. "law of the three syllables"). Following the loss of the short vowel in the open posttonic syllable, words displaying this syllabic pattern were subsequently integrated into the regular patterns with penultimative stress: */jippyaw/ */jippyaw/ "transformation." Generally speaking, tonic stress played in the history of Egyptian a much more crucial role for the development of prosodic patterns than is the case in related Afroasiatic languages, for example Semitic, for which one could easily posit an original "free" stress. It would be preferable, therefore, to posit the "lost,"35 rather than the individual word as the basic stress unit in Egyptian.
The phonological system of later Egyptian

3.5 The phonological system of later Egyptian

By the end of the New Kingdom (1550–1000 BCE), the phonological system described in the preceding section had undergone a certain number of developments which modified all its components. The phonology of later Egyptian is known to us more precisely than the hypothetical reconstruction of earlier Egyptian thanks primarily to the cuneiform transcriptions of Egyptian words and phrases. The major changes can be delineated as follows:

3.5.1 Consonants

From the velar to the dental series, oppositions between voiced and voiceless phonemes become gradually neutralized: t3wjt /*tserwjt/ > Akk. transcription -ta-aw- "the Two Lands" vs. dbn /*diciban/ > Akk. transcription ti-ba-an "dnb-weight." 36

While palatal phonemes are regularly kept in a number of lexemes, they often move to the frontal portion of the oral cavity and acquire a dental realization: psdjw /*pišizyaw/ > Akk. transcription ps/eš-ši-it "nine." 37

The dental phonemes /l/ and /r/ and the glides /j/ and /w/ undergo a process of lenition to /l/, at the end of a stressed syllable, and eventually to /r/ at the end of a word: 38 pdj /*pijat/ > Akk. transcription -pi-ia "bow"; hw /*himarw/ > Akk. transcription hi-na-"jar"; mjsw /*marjiw/ > Akk. transcription ma-‘ia-, ma-a-i- "beloved." 39

The uvular trill /r/ completes its evolution to glottal stop /r/, merging with /r/ < /j/ (see section 3.4); indirect evidence of this evolution can be drawn from the fact that while in the execution texts of the Middle Kingdom the writings <kam> and <jism> render the Sem. anthroponym *‘akram (Hebrew ‘okrān) and toponym *yarmuta (Hebrew yarmūl) respectively, 40 in the syllabic writing of the New Kingdom <3> has come to indicate the a-vowel. 41

3.5.2 Vowels

Major developments alter the vocalic system of Egyptian during the late New Kingdom, after the reign of Ramses II. i.e. from around 1200 BCE onward. Parallel to the so-called "Canaanite vowel shift" in contemporary Northwest Semitic, long stressed */rai/ becomes */ri:/ "(the god) Horus" */haruwa/ > */hara/ (Akk. transcription -hara/). 42 This sound change provokes other adjustments within the system, notably the change of long stressed */rai/ to */rei/; sinj /*sinwji/ > */sena/ (Akk. transcription -sena/). 43

In the early New Kingdom, short stressed */ri:/ had become */re:/; see the anthroponym mnj "Menes" */mnjat/ > */mnjat/ (Akk. transcription mnjat-); at a later date, probably around 1000–800 BCE, short stressed */re:/ < */ri:/ and */ra/ merged into */re:/; see the toponym d’n’t "Tanis" */tanut/, borrowed in Hebrew at a time when the original vocalization was still productive (*/su:n/ > so’an), but transcribed as se-e-’muΣa-a-’mu in the Neo-Assyrian period. 44

Unstressed vowels, especially in posttonic position, merged into the mid central */a/ (the so-called schwa): */r’sw/ "(the god) Re" */trufaw/ > */trufa/ (Akk. transcription -ti-ia, -re-e), nfr "good" */mafr/ > */nafa/ (Akk. transcription -ma-’a-pa), ma’si "truth" */mnafat/ > */mu afat/ (Akk. transcription -mu-a-). 45

A phonetic evolution which probably did not affect the phonological level is */i:/ > */e:/ in proximity of */ri/ and */j/: w’w "soldier" */wiXiw/ (Akk. transcription -i-ia) > */wefa/ (later transcriptions -e-e, -e-e, -e-ø); mbi "Northwind" */mafiXiwi/ > */ma fi:i/ (Akk. transcription -ma-be-e). 46

One can, therefore, posit for later Egyptian around 1000 BCE the vocalic system presented in table 3.4. While at the phonetic level the vocalic sounds have indeed evolved from the earlier system presented in section 3.4, the number of phonemic vowels (six) remains unchanged.

3.5.3 Syllabic structures

Because of the loss of the final dentals and of the semivocalic glides caused by a strong tonic stress, the prosodic system underwent a partial reorganization, with the emergence of previously unknown or poorly documented syllabic patterns.

The syllabic structure $cv$ could now occur in plurisyllabic words (in earlier Egyptian, this pattern had a restricted functional yield, see section 3.4.3): mbi "(the goddess) Mehit" */mafiXiwi/ > */ma fi:i/, Akk. transcription -ma-’a-’u, Greek -uxhs (with */ri:/ > η); bmmw "eight" */xa manw/ > */xa manu/, Akk. transcription -bu-men. 47 The same development affects the pattern $cv$#, previously limited to some plurals of the type "maduww: 3sjyw-tj"(the city of Asyut) */sXiwa/; Neo-Assyrian cuneiform 3-ia-a-u-tu. 48

The fall of final consonants increases the presence of unstressed open syllables of the pattern $cv$, which in earlier Egyptian were limited to the endings of specific verbal forms and personal pronouns: hjay-pd.t "overseer of the troop" */haxpiXiwi/ > */haxpi/, see cuneiform a/i-Nh-ri-pi-ia. 49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.4</th>
<th>The vocalic phonemes of later Egyptian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOWELS</td>
<td>SHORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT</td>
<td>/e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL</td>
<td>/a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACK</td>
<td>/a/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new patterns of later Egyptian allow for the possibility of the presence of unstressed open syllables of the pattern $cv$, which in earlier Egyptian were limited to the endings of specific verbal forms and personal pronouns: hjay-pd.t "overseer of the troop" */haxpiXiwi/ > */haxpi/, see cuneiform a/i-Nh-ri-pi-ia. 49
3.6 The phonological system of Coptic

Unlike earlier stages of the language, Coptic, written in an alphabetic system derived from Greek, is documented in a number of closely related dialects. These dialects, however, do not necessarily reproduce local varieties of the language: they represent, to a large extent, discrete sets of mainly graphic conventions for rendering Egyptian in an inadequate foreign script.

Table 3.6 The consonantal phonemes of Coptic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSONANTS</th>
<th>LABIAL</th>
<th>DENTAL</th>
<th>PALATAL</th>
<th>VELAR</th>
<th>GLOTTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLOSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless52</td>
<td>/h/</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>/ʔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejecive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Voiced]</td>
<td>/h/</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>/ʔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Voiced]</td>
<td>/h/</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>/ʔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRICATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless2</td>
<td>/f/</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>/z/</td>
<td>/ð/</td>
<td>/h/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Voiced]</td>
<td>/f/</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>/z/</td>
<td>/ð/</td>
<td>/h/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASAL</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>/n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIBRANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATERAL</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>/l/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLIDE</td>
<td>(o)/w/</td>
<td>(e)/w/</td>
<td>(a)/w/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two major Coptic dialects are Sahidic, normally considered to reflect the Theban, upper Egyptian variety of the language, documented from the fourth century CE and representing the language of classical Coptic literature, and Bohairic, the dialect of the Nile delta, documented from the fifth century CE and progressively established as the dialect of the liturgy of the Coptic church. For the basic presentation of Coptic phonology I have chosen Sahidic, which is the dialect of classical literature. However, I shall refer to other dialects, especially Bohairic, whenever such references become necessary for the purpose of an historical or a typological analysis. Dialects are indicated by small capitals in superscript preceding the Coptic word: S = Sahidic, B = Bohairic, A = Akhmimic, L = Lycopolitan (alternatively called Subakhmimic and abbreviated A), F = Fayyumic. Where no indication is given, the dialect is Sahidic.

3.6.1 Consonants

During the first millennium BCE and the first centuries CE, Egyptian continued to undergo a number of phonological changes. In the consonantal system, the tendencies described in section 3.5.1 led to a neutralization of voiced plosives in the dental, palatal, and velar series: the phonemes /b/, /g/ and /d/ are present only in Greek borrowings, the rare exceptions to this rule being the result of sonorization in proximity of /n/ (for example, *km6 vs. *km6 = *jm6 "I", *jnhb vs. *jnhb "an enemy", *hmp "servant," *n3m6 "ibis," *t3a "ten thousand"), and in final position whenever it did not immediately follow the tonic vowel of a closed syllable in the earlier stages of the language, although this may indeed be synchronically the case in Coptic: *nmpn < *nmpnaw "gold." If /b/ followed the tonic vowel of an etymological closed syllable, whether in monosyllabic or multisyllabic words, it became in Coptic voiceless /p/; *mpnm < */mpmpab/ "to be pure," *mmp < */mpmb/ "horn."

Guttural fricatives of earlier Egyptian (especially /h/) merge in Sahidic either into /w/ (for example *hnaw "thousand" *kharaw > *χαρω < wɔ), or into /q/ (mostly /q/ and /k/; sometimes also /γ/; for example *h3t "beginning" *h3waγ > *h3waγ, *h3wq "body" *h3waγ > *h3waγ, *h3wq "voice" *h3waγ > *h3waγ), but other dialects appear more conservative: Bohairic and Akhmimic keep a velar fricative /x/ (written Σ in Bohairic and Σ in Akhmimic, for example *h3pooγ, h3pooγ "voice"). Finally, the glottal stop /ʔ/, which represents on the one hand the regular development of /k/ and /k/, and on the other hand the result of the fall of final /l/, /l/, /l/, and /u/ after stressed vowel, is not expressed by an independent grapheme, but rather rendered by <a> at the beginning and at the end of a word (for example a for *h3naγa < *h3naγa, t for *h3naw "land" < *h3naw) and, except in Bohairic, by the reduplication of the vocalic grapheme when immediately following the stressed vowel of a word (for example *mooγ *mooγ, *mooγ *mooγ "to be" < bpr *bpraw "has become").
Bohairic spelling conveys a traditional feature of Egyptian phonetics, namely the aspirated realization of stops, which are expressed by the corresponding aspirator of the Greek alphabet: voiceless stops become aspirated when immediately preceding a tonic vowel, semivowels, and sonorant consonants (including $\Phi$):

\begin{align*}
|p|, |v|, |c|, |k| & \to \Phi \ |p'|, \sigma \ |c'|, \chi \ |k'| / \_\_\_\_, |b|, |m|, |n|, |l|, |w|, |j| \end{align*}

Examples: $\text{Sin}$ vs. $\text{Ps}$ "the sun," $\text{Ta}$ vs. $\text{Ba}$ "this (fem.)," $\text{Sa}$ vs. $\text{Bo}$ "lord," $\text{Kota}$ vs. $\text{Boata}$ "you are holy." This phonetic rule proves that $\sigma$ represents in Bohairic the aspirated variety of the palatal plosive $\zeta$ /$l/$; the value of the sign $\sigma$ in this dialect, therefore, differs from all other Coptic conventions, where it indicates the palatalized velar $\partial/l/$.

The Bohairic rule of aspiration, however, exhibits interesting properties: when $|n|, |c|$ and $|k|$ represent the outcome of voiced $|d|/|\partial|$, $|d|/|\partial|$ and of uvular $|q|/|q'|$, no aspiration immediately preceding the tonic vowel takes place; $60$ $\text{Sitan} "\text{horn}" < \text{Ed.} \mathit{db}*/\partial\text{th}/, \text{Bo}\text{p}\text{r} "\text{hand}" < \text{Ed.} \mathit{dr}.t \* /\partial\text{th}/, \text{Bek} "\text{to find}" < \text{Ed.} \mathit{gmj}/, \text{Bo}\text{nan} "\text{bone}" < \text{Ed.} \mathit{qs}/|\partial|/; in pre-sonorant environments, on the other hand, the rule is upheld: $\text{Bope} < \text{dj-jj}/, \text{Boja} "\text{ten thousand}" < \text{dj}/|\partial|/\text{w}/, \text{Bpe}\text{ma} "\text{downy}" < \text{gmj} /\text{gmj}\text{w}/, \text{Bo}\text{no} "\text{to become cool}" < \text{q}b\text{b}\text{q}b\text{w}/.$

This forward movement of their point of articulation which took place in later Egyptian (section 3.5) from the palatal to the dental ($|d| > |\partial|/), from the velar to the palatal ($|g| > |l|/), and from the uvular to the velar region ($|q| > |q'|/), these three phonemes of earlier Egyptian preserved in fact in prevocalic position their ejective articulation down to Coptic: $<\phi = |l|/|c| > |d|/|t|; <\sigma = |q| > |q|/|k| > |g|/|c| > |d|/|t|; <\chi = |g|/|k| > |g|/|k| > |g|/|k| > |g|/|k|$. This justifies the use of $<\chi$ and of the Greek tenucs, rather than of the Greek medieae to indicate them in the writing: $\tau$ for $|d|/|t|$, $\chi$ for $|c|/|c|$, $\kappa$ for $|q|/|k|$. On the contrary, etymological $|t|/|l|, |c|/|c|$, and $|k|/|k|$, which were not ejective but aspirated stops ($|l|/|l|$, and $|k|/|k|$, respectively), maintained the aspiration in the environments described above. Once again, we can consider this aspiration graphically rendered only in Bohairic and displayed by the presence of minimal pairs such as $\text{To}\text{pi} /\partial\text{or} /|\partial|\text{or}" "\text{hand}" < $|d|/|t|$, $\text{To}\text{pi} "\text{willow}" /\partial\text{or} /|\partial|\text{or}" < $|d|/|t|$, $\text{Bo}\text{m} "\text{dish}" /\text{He}/|c'|/|c'| > $|d|/|t|$. $\text{Bo}\text{m} /\partial\text{or} /|c'|/|c'| "\text{quince}."

An indirect, but very cogent proof of their actual phonetic articulation as ejectives is offered by the fact that these phonemes behave phonologically as a sequence of "plosive + glottal stop" such as $\text{Bo}\text{m} "\text{the account}" (consisting of the definite article $\text{Bo}$ followed by the lexeme $\text{nu}$), in which no aspiration of the plosive labial is displayed ($\text{nu}$) because $|p|/|l|$ here does not immediately precede the stressed vowel $|\partial|/|l|$, but rather the first consonant of the lexeme, i.e. the glottal stop $|d|/|l|$: $\text{nu} = \text{l}/|d|/|l|$. Indirect evidence of the ejective character of voiceless stops in Bohairic is also provided by a late medieval Arabic version of the Apophthegmata Patrium in Coptic script. While in Arabic transcriptions of Coptic words voiced $|d|/|l|$ and pharyngealized voiced $|d|/|l|$ are used as a rule to indicate $<\tau$, as in Copt. $\text{Tent}\text{m}\text{a} > \text{At.} \text{dandara} "(\text{the city of}) \text{Dendera}"$ — meaning that $<\tau$ was neither articulated like $\text{At.} \text{h}$, which was aspirated, nor like $\text{At.} \text{h}$, which was pharyngealized — $<\tau$ and $<\kappa$ are used in this text to render Ar. $|d|/|l|$ and $|q|/|q'|$, and also $<\kappa$ and $<\tau$ for Ar. $|h|/|l|$ and $|k|/|k'|$ respectively. Since the feature "aspirated" is neutralized in final position (for example $\text{Ed.} \text{zj}\text{w} * /\partial\text{n} /\text{nu} > /\partial\text{n} /\text{nu} > /\partial\text{n} /\text{nu} > \text{Copt.} \text{cniej} > \text{Ar.} \text{asuy} "(\text{the city of}) \text{Asyut}"").$66$ is not surprising that at the end of a word $\text{Ar.} |\partial|/|l|$ is sometimes rendered by Copt. $<\tau > \text{At.} |\partial|/|l|$ as a rule by Copt. $<\kappa$. On the other hand, the letter $<\kappa > /|\partial|/|d| = |d|$, which in standard Coptic appears only in lexical items borrowed from Greek, is used in this text to transliterate $\text{At.} |\partial|/|l|$. This asymmetric state of affairs seems to point to the fact that the letter $<\tau$, at least in a number of cases, stood for a phoneme exhibiting a specific phonetic feature in addition to voicelessness and lack of aspiration: both diachronically (section 3.4) and synchronically (see above), glottalization appears here to be the most likely candidate.

Therefore, as in the case of its Egyptian antecedent, the phonology of Coptic may actually exhibit a higher degree of complexity than is betrayed by a superficial graphemic analysis.$67$ In our concrete example, we probably have to posit for the entire Coptic domain (although graphemically mirrored only in Bohairic) the presence of three stops in the dental, palatal, and velar region: (a) a voiceless series $|l|/|l|$, characterized by an optional aspiration; (b) a voiced series $|v|/|\partial|/|l|$, limited to Greek borrowings — with the exception of $|v|/|l|$ and of secondary sonorization due to the proximity on $|v|/|l|$; (c) an ejective series $|l| = |t|$, $|c| = |c'|$, and $|q| = |k'|$, which never exhibited aspiration and therefore resisted a merging with voiceless phonemes. Therefore, the voiceless series is conveyed by the Greek tenucs.
syllable words ending in /drj/. The treatment of the glottal stop /?/ also deserves attention. As was pointed out in section 3.5, later Egyptian /l/, /l/, /l/ and /w/ are dropped in final unstressed position, but become /?/ when closing a syllable, often representing the only remnant of an unstressed final syllable of earlier Egyptian dropped in the later phase of the language. However, especially in final position after stressed vowels, glottal stops deriving from the development of final /l/, /l/, /l/ and /w/ are not treated exactly like etymological /?/; one also finds slight differences in the treatment of /?/ as opposed to /?/.

Different graphic solutions for /?/ are adopted in the dialects. All of them display /?/ = /<o>/ in initial position (see /<sB>mon /<shn/; /<AlF>anak /<shn/ = /<?/jarnak/ = /<?/)). To express a glottal stop following the tonic vowel in plurisyllabic words, all dialects except Bohairic exhibit the reduplication of the vowel's grapheme, whether the glottal stop belongs to the same syllable — the vowel being in this case short: /<cv>/ = /<cvv/>; for example /<T>oty/ /<S>oty/ /<F>oty/ /<d>oty/ /<?/jartv/ “his hand.” /<sB>o>ic, /<B>o>ic /<m>ic /<?/>s/ “to walk” — or to the following syllable — the tonic vowel being here long: /<cv>/ = /<csv/>; see /<w>h/ /<w>h/ /<w>h/ “priest.” In this last case, i.e., if /?/ is the first phoneme of a final syllable of the type /<v>v/ following a stressed syllable of the type /<v>v/; this phoneme is conveyed in most dialects by the reduplication of the tonic vowel, and in Bohairic by /<o>/: /<sB>o>ic, /<B>o>ic /<d>otz/ /<?/>javn/ “book.” But the presence of a glottal stop in this position must be assumed for Bohairic as well, since there seems to be a rule in this dialect that the phoneme /?/ is always rendered by /<o>/, regardless of its syllabic surroundings: examples such as /<sB>o>ic (rather than /<B>o>ic) /<v>z/ “day” show that the phoneme /?/ determines here the appearance of the vowel /<o>/ rather than /<o>/, as would be expected in the presence of a diphthong /<ow/; see Eg. /<maw/> “water” /<sI>xic, /<A>ic, but /<B>o>ic.

In most words displaying the phonological sequence /<v>v/, the glottal stop /?/ derives from an etymological /<v>/ or /<y>/ through metathesis: /<sB>o>ic, /<B>o>ic /<d>otz/ /<d>otz/ /<o>/ “<?/javn/” “to seal.” /<sB>o>ic, /<B>o>ic /<v>v/ “to be strong” /<v>oty “he is strong.” The reason for this metathesis in bisyllabic words ending in /<v>/ or /<y>/ is found in the “contact law,”71 which provides that a syllable contact ASB is the more preferred, the less the consonantal strength of the offset A and the greater the consonantal strength of the onset B: voiceless plosives display the strongest, low vowels the weakest consonantal strength.72 Since Eg. /<v>/ was originally an ejective plosive /<d>/ = /<t/> (section 3.3), its degree of sonority, which is the reverse of the consonantal strength, was lower than that of a preceding fricative or sonorant phoneme; by turning into a voiced fricative /<v>/ in msS, it acquired, like the glide /<w>/ in /<v>oty, a higher degree of sonority, favoring in this way the metathesis by virtue of the contact law. Let us consider the examples msS “<m>aSdvj” and /<v>oty “<v>artj”. The syllable contact ASd is rather stable, since the consonantal strength of /<v>/ is greater than that of /<v/>. When the sound change /<s>/ = /<v/> took place, “<m>aSdvj” became “<m>aSdvj”, which is the form we posits for classical Egyptian. The syllable contacts ASd and AR, however, are rather unstable, because the degree of sonority of B (the voiced pharyngeal fricative /<v>/ and the glide /<v>/) is higher than that of A (the voiceless fricative /<v/> and the sonant /<v/> respectively). As a consequence, an adjustment of the phonetic environment through metathesis occurred, leading to the Coptic forms /<m>oiS/ and /<o>it/. An evidence in this sense is offered by the presence of a Demotic verb mSd “to wander,” regularly kept in Coptic as mSd “to examine,” most probably a Late Egyptian etymological doublet73 of msS in which the original Afroasiatic phoneme is maintained: at least in a few instances mSd occurs with the same meaning of mSd,74 a fact which strengthens the hypothesis that the metathesis was caused in similar cases by the “contact law” of phonological environments.

The phonetic contact law can be invoked to explain other cases of metathesis which affected the development of Egyptian and Coptic phonology: one of the plural forms of nrg “/mancat/” “god” was “/mancarw/”.75 A syllable such as ScwrS, however, in which the consonant of the nucleus (/<v>/ = A) has a lower degree of sonority than the semiconsonantal coda (/<w>/ = B), is unstable. This instability favored the metathesis of the two phonemes -rw- > -wr- > -r-, documented by the Coptic forms mtrf /ntar/ or mtrf /ntafr/ “gods” > “mtarfr/”. In this way, we can posit a relative date for the sound changes involved in this evolution: the metathesis must have occurred before the sound change from the glide /<w>/ or /<v>/ to the glottal stop /?/ took place.

This analysis of the phonological status of /?/ in Coptic is confirmed by two facts: (a) The interesting graphemic opposition found in Bohairic between the writing /<c>/ to express a final syllable /<c>/, as in /<b>um/ /<ro/> “man” or /<B>o>ic /<m>oiS/ “to walk,” as opposed to the writing /<c>/ to express /<c>/, as in /<B>um/ /<m>oiS/ “crowd,” whereas in Sahidic both environments are graphically rendered by /<c>/: /<B>um/, /<B>o>ic. /<B>o>ic. (b) The two graphic
rrenditions exhibited by the unstrressed syllabic structure */ravj/ in Sahidic, namely */AOvE/ as in */AavEa/ /ravj/ and */aoav/ /ravj/ instead of */avE/ as in */avEa/ /ravj/.

There can be no doubt that these two patterns are phonologically identical: see on the one hand the Sahidic variant with final -e (*/AvEa/), on the other hand the identical treatment of the two structures in the other dialects: see */AvEa/ /AvEa/, */AvEa/ /AvEa/.

A last problem is represented by the fate of the phoneme /l/. Its existence, although not excluded, is in fact very doubtful. The graphic distribution of etymological /l/ is identical with that of etymological /h/, including /h/ < /h/, /h/, /hl/, and /hl/, and scholars generally maintain 76 that it had merged with the glottal stop in later pre-Coptic Egyptian, leaving traces in Coptic vocalism, especially in the anteriorization of its vocalic surrounding: unstrusted a instead of e or o (as in */AvEa/ < *AvEa/ *AvEa/ *AvEa/ "to become many" vs. */AvEa/ < */AvEa/ */AvEa/ */AvEa/ "to write"), stressed a instead of 0 (as in */AvEa/ < */AvEa/ *AvEa/ *AvEa/ "10000" vs. */AvEa/ < */AvEa/ *AvEa/ *AvEa/ "ambush"),?

3.6.2 Vowels

Table 3.7 captures the vocalic system of Sahidic Coptic around 400 CE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOWELS</th>
<th>UNSTRUETED</th>
<th>SHORT</th>
<th>STRESSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRONT</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /e/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /a/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /u/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /i/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /o/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /n/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /m/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /m/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /l/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /l/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /f/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /f/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /r/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /r/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /l/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /l/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /m/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /m/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /n/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /o/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /u/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACK</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /e/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /a/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /u/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /i/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /o/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /n/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /m/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /m/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /l/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /l/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /f/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /f/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /r/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /r/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /l/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /l/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /m/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /m/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /n/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /o/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /u/</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;e&gt; /u/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When compared with the preceding phases in the history of Egyptian, the vocalic system of Coptic exhibits the further consequences of the Late Egyptian sound change. Later Egyptian stressed */AvE/ becomes */AvE/ in the two major dialects: Eg. */AvE/ */AvE/ "brother" > */AvE/ */AvE/ following the pattern of */AvE/ > */AvE/: Eg. */AvE/ */AvE/ "man" > */AvE/ > */AvE/ */AvE/ which had already taken place around 1000 BCE (section 3.5). Moreover, Late Egyptian */AvE/, whether from original */AvE/ (as in */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ "Hurrantian" > */AvE/ "servant"), becomes */AvE/ in Sahidic and Bohairic, but is kept as */AvE/ in the other dialects: */AvE/, */AvE/, */AvE/, */AvE/.

These two developments in the quality of the short stressed vowels display a number of exceptions of phonetic (sometimes purely graphic) character, generally motivated by specific consonantal surroundings. Thus, */AvE/ is kept as */AvE/ in the two major dialects and is rendered as */AvE/ in Fayyumic before etymological gutturals fricatives */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ < */AvE/ "10000"; conversely, */AvE/ becomes */AvE/ also in Akhmimic and Lycopolitan before etymological */AvE/ and */AvE/ (*/AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/) respectively: */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ "the river". Also, the diphthongs */AvE/ */AvE/, which regularly yield */AvE/ */AvE/ in Sahidic and */AvE/ */AvE/ in the other dialects, appear written in Bohairic as */AvE/ (except in final position) and */AvE/ (in all positions) respectively: */AvE/, */AvE/, */AvE/, */AvE/, */AvE/ */AvE/ "to me, to them." As for */AvE/, which, as we saw, regularly turns into */AvE/ */AvE/, the main exceptions are: (a) it is kept also in Sahidic and Bohairic as */AvE/ before */AvE/, whether derived from an etymological */AvE/ or from the lenition of a */AvE/, */AvE/ and */AvE/ in the coda of a tonic syllable: */AvE/, */AvE/ */AvE/ "truth" > */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ to you (fem.) > */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ to you (masc.) > */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ "net" > */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ "to wash"; (b) it is written before sonorant phonemes (including */AvE/) as */AvE/ */AvE/ in Sahidic, Akhmimic and Lycopolitan, as */AvE/ in Bohairic, and as */AvE/ or */AvE/ in Fayyumic: */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ "to worship." If the following sonorant is not followed by another consonant, it undergoes reduplication in all dialects except Bohairic: */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ "to become fat." Also, in proximity of sibilants one often finds the outcome */AvE/ > */AvE/ or */AvE/: for example, */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ "breath," */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ "half." Diphthongs display slight irregularities as well: instead of the paradigmatic form */AvE/ (as in */AvE/ */AvE/) */AvE/ two," */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ "to cry," */AvE/ occasionally yields */AvE/ and */AvE/ in Akhmimic in final position: */AvE/, */AvE/ */AvE/ "elder." The outcome of */AvE/ is even more complex: it develops as expected into */AvE/ */AvE/, but it keeps a vocalization closer to the original in */AvE/, */AvE/: Bohairic exhibits a difference in treatment, depending on whether the original vowel was */AvE/ (i.e. */AvE/ */AvE/), in which case it goes with */AvE/ in */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ "physician," */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ */AvE/ "consecration."

Coptic long vowels display no major phonological development from Late Egyptian. But at the phonetic level, the following phenomena take place: (a) All dialects exhibit the evolution */AvE/ > */AvE/ */AvE/ instead of */AvE/ > */AvE/ after nasal consonants, and occasionally following other consonants as
well: ntr "macar/ nonte/ 'god.""[^80] Akhmimic displays <$cv$> in final position or when followed by the glottal stop, i.e. by a reduplication of the vocalic grapheme: $\text{SOWM}, \text{AOTOWM}$. We shall see below that these two phonological contexts are in fact identical, final stressed vowels being regularly followed in Coptic by an extrasyllabic $/I/$. That $/u/$, however, has acquired phonemic character in Coptic is shown by the presence of minimal pairs such as $\text{Sawm}/ \text{honi}/ < \text{hun}/ *\text{kanan}/ "to approach" vs. $\text{Sowm}/ \text{huni}/ < \text{hun}/ *\text{kanaw}/ "inside." (b) The outcome <$e>/ [i] instead of $/ei/$ from etymological *$a/i*$ *$e/i*$ (3.5) is frequent in proximity of $/l/$ and after etymological pharyngeals: $\text{Sgrp}, \text{Bgrp}, \text{Agirp}, \text{Fgrl} < */\text{jir}/ "street," a loanword from Semitic. As in the case of $*/a*/ > *$cv$*$ (u), Akhmimic displays here $<$$ei/$ in final position or if the vowel is followed by $/l/$: $\text{STHRH}, \text{AEIRB} $"finger." This same $*/a*/ > *$ei/$ occasionally appears as $<e>$ before pharyngeal phonemes: $\text{Ske}$ < */tappuh/ "apple," also a Semitic loanword. (c) We had already observed in Late Egyptian (section 3.5) the phonetic outcome $*/a*/ > *$ei/$ in proximity of $/n/$ or $/j/$.

Most Coptic dialects have two unstressed vocalic phonemes, depending on the phonetic context of the original structure of the word: as a general rule, pretonic and posttonic vowels have developed into $/a/$, $/e/$, $/i/$, and by positing the insertion of an extrasyllabic glottal stop $/I/$ as "default consonant" in the final position on the skeletal tier $<$cv(c)$>*: thus $<e>$ = $/pe/?$, $to = /no/?$, $\text{RAle} = /sa/?$, and $\text{eio}e = /jop/?$, parallel to the cvc-pattern pan $= /ran/ and to the cvcc-pattern cotn $= /sop/ "chosen."$[^85] When this final $/I/$ appears in closed syllables, it is mostly indicated in the writing by $<e>$; in doubly-closed syllables, it is represented graphemically by $<e>$ in the dialects of Upper Egypt and by $<e>$ in those of Lower Egypt: $\text{Sioe}, \text{Bjoe}, \text{jop}, \text{Aleioe}, \text{AlRD}, \text{FjoR}, \text{hjaa} = /\text{hijamw}/ "women."$[^86]

To understand the pronunciation of Coptic, we should note that there are two environments in which an etymological $*/a$/ to $<e>$ or sometimes $<e>$ (instead of the regular outcome $<e>$), of etymological $*/a$/ to $<e>$ (instead of the usual $<e>$), and of etymological $*/i$/ to $<e>$ (instead of $<i>$) in final position and before reduplication of the vowel: $\text{SAOT}, \text{POTTY}, \text{ppo} "$his hand"; $\text{SALET}, \text{PET} "$you" (fem.), $\text{SIF}, \text{ST}, \text{W}, \text{hjaa} = /\text{hijamw}/ "women."$[^87] It is evident that these two environments were perceived as sharing a common feature, which is precisely the presence of a $/I/$

### Table 3.8 The syllabic structures of Sahidic Coptic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYLLABIC STRUCTURES</th>
<th>PRETONIC</th>
<th>TONIC</th>
<th>POSTTONIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSED</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUBLY-CLOSED</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;$cv$&gt;$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At first sight, a pattern of tonic open syllable with short vowel $<$cv$>$ is documented in words such as $\text{RAle} "$heaven" < $pt$/*piu$/, to "$land" < $ts/*tah$/, $\text{RAle} "$to tell" < $sd/it$/*sidit$/, or $\text{eio} "$occupation" < $wpw$/ /*waww*/ in a stressed syllable in later Egyptian (section 3.5). Within an autosegmental approach to Coptic phonology, these syllables can be analyzed as closed $<$cv$c/> or doubly-closed $<$cv$>$ by positing the insertion of an extrasyllabic glottal stop $/I/$ as "default consonant" in the final position on the skeletal tier $<$cv(c)$>*: thus $<e>$ = $/pe/?$, $to = /no/?$, $\text{RAle} = /sa/?$, and $\text{eio}e = /jop/?$, parallel to the cvc-pattern pan $= /ran/ and to the cvcc-pattern cotn $= /sop/ "chosen."$[^85] When this final $/I/$ appears in closed syllables, it is mostly indicated in the writing by $<e>$; in doubly-closed syllables, it is represented graphemically by $<e>$ in the dialects of Upper Egypt and by $<e>$ in those of Lower Egypt: $\text{Sioe}, \text{Bjoe}, \text{jop}, \text{Aleioe}, \text{AlRD}, \text{FjoR}, \text{hjaa} = /\text{hijamw}/ "women."$[^86]

Two important elements in favor of this analysis are: (a) the graphic rendering of this glottal phonoeme in dialects other than Sahidic as final $<e>$ (in Akhmimic and Lycopolitan) or $<e>$ (in Bohairic and Fayyumic), and occasionally in Sahidic itself: see $\text{Ske}, \text{Ake}, \text{SALE}, \text{Ake}, \text{PAHI}, \text{AHI}, \text{FAKI}, \text{AEI}, \text{AHI} "$truth," to be analyzed in all cases as */m/"; (b) the Akhmimic (and partially Lycopolitan) raising of etymological $*/a/ to $<e>$ or sometimes $<e>$ (instead of the regular outcome $<e>$), of etymological $*/a/ to $<e>$ (instead of the usual $<e>$), and of etymological $*/i/ to $<e>$ (instead of $<i>$) in final position and before reduplication of the vowel: $\text{SAOT}, \text{POTTY}, \text{ppo} "$his hand"; $\text{SALET}, \text{PET} "$you" (fem.), $\text{SIF}, \text{ST}, \text{W}, \text{hjaa} = /\text{hijamw}/ "women."$[^87]
after the tonic vowel: in Akhmimic /t' mùa/ = [t' o bouts], /t' aµ/ = [n(t') o?], /t' o/ = [k(t') o?], /t' o? an/ = [t' o e? am]. That this final glottal stop is not expressed in the writing should hardly be surprising, since this is the regular fate of /r/ in Coptic in all initial and final positions, unless it represents the last phoneme of a doubly-closed syllable of the type we considered above (e.g. nene = /jo pi/). Accordingly, a structure such as toe “part” < *dnj l */danjul * should probably be analyzed as /do pi/, the sequence of two glottal stops at the end of the doubly-closed syllable being the reason for the variety of spellings of this word: TOE, TO, to, just to mention the Sahidic forms.

Conversely, the apparent and utterly un-Egyptian presence of patterns with long unstressed vowel (pretonic as in owaS “fruit” or posttonic as in a'cow "price") is easily removed from the phonological system of Coptic by interpreting aov in these cases not as syllabic /a/!, but rather as semiconsonantal /w/: owaS /wa dah/, pattern *cvcc# < wad */wa dah/, pattern #cvcc# and a'cow /swa/!, pattern #cvcc# < jsw. l */jswa l/, pattern #cvcc#cvcc#. In both cases, the hypothetical [u] (*ur' atah) or [a:julris] would represent the phonetic realization of /w/ and /aw/ in those specific environments.

Further reading
Fecht, G. Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur. Ägyptologische Forschungen XXI (Gülcns-stadt: Verlag J. J. Augustin, 1960) [The standard analysis of the syllabic patterns of Egyptian].


Osing, J. Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen, 2 vols. (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1976) [The fundamental reference work on the vocalic patterns of the language from Middle Egyptian through Coptic].


4

Elements of historical morphology

4.1 Introduction

Ancient Egyptian is a language of the flectional or fusional type, with a diachronic tendency to replace VSO-synthetic structures by SVO-analytic constructions and to move toward the polysynthetic type which characterizes Coptic, its more recent phase. Egyptian morphemes are unsegmentable units combining grammatical functions. Morphological forms exhibit a number of correspondences with the patterns of word formation and of flection in other Afroasiatic languages. But although Egyptian is the oldest language of the phylum documented in written form (at least seven centuries before Akkadian), its morphological repertoire differs to a great extent from that of Semitic and of other Afroasiatic languages. This morphological variability can be accounted for in many ways: (a) by suggesting that, in spite of its archaic date, Egyptian had undergone already before its emergence as a written language a considerable number of changes which modified the genetic inventory inherited from Afroasiatic; (b) by considering Afroasiatic a relatively loose language continuum, whose individual branches came to share linguistic features through intensive contact, but were not necessarily derived from a common ancestor; (c) by rejecting the prevailing "semitocentric" approach to Afroasiatic linguistics, proposing that the regular patterns displayed by Semitic, and above all by Arabic, represent a typologically late result of a series of grammaticalizations which created its rich phonology and morphology, rather than the original situation inherited from the Unsprache.

In fact, all these approaches have their strong points and contribute to explaining in part the emergence of historical forms. To give one example for each of them: (aa) Egyptian developed already in prehistoric times rigid syntactic forms which favored the neutralization of the function of the original case endings and the loss of vocalic endings. In this respect, Egyptian is typologically more recent than classical Semitic languages such as Akkadian or Arabic, where case endings are kept and productive, although not to the extent in which they played a role in classical Indo-European languages. This
is an interpretation according to the first approach. (bb) Conjugational patterns vary considerably within Afroasiatic, displaying prefixal or suffixal forms, but with few regularities beyond the boundaries of a language family. Thus, the presence of two types of suffix conjugation in Egyptian can hardly be regarded as the result of a development following an original state in which prefix and suffix conjugations coexisted, since the Afroasiatic prefix conjugation forms are themselves a fusion of a pronominal clitic anticipating a coreferential NP to a verbal stem. This is an interpretation according to the second model. (cc) Egyptian exhibits a high number of biradical (and possibly monoradical) roots, in contrast to the quasi-universal, although over-estimated Semitic triradicalism. Egyptian probably represents the original state preceding the regularizations which took place at a typologically later stage in Semitic. This interpretation follows the third approach.

In spite of the underlying theoretical problems, Egyptian morphology is nonetheless conveniently described within the Afroasiatic frame, which is capable of clarifying both the synchronic structures of the language and the remnants of earlier stages. In addition to the Afroasiatic background, attention must be paid to the patterns of evolution from Egyptian to Coptic. As we saw, the general trend in the history of Egyptian is to replace synthetic structures, such as the morphemes of gender and number in the noun and the suffixal deictic markers in the verb, by analytic constructions; nominal suffixes are superseded by the definite and the indefinite article, grammatical indicators of specialized semantic functions are replaced by lexicalized expressions, synthetic verbal forms give place to juxtapositions of a conjugational head followed by a verbal lexeme.

### 4.3 Root, stem, word

The basic structure of an Egyptian word is a lexical root, an abstract phonological entity consisting of a sequence of consonants or semiconsonants which vary in number from one (for example 1-rad. j “to say”) to four (4-rad. znh “locust”), with an overwhelming majority of biconsonantal (2-rad. dd “to say”), triconsonantal (3-rad. rm “man”), and so-called weak roots, which display a semivocalic (“infirm”) last radical (11-inf. zj “to go away,” III-inf. mj “to love,” IV-inf. bmj “to sit”) or a gemination of the second radical (II-gem. m32 “to see,” III-gem. st32 “to land”).

Superimposed on the root as a separate morphological tier is a vocalic or semivocalic pattern, which together with the root forms the so-called stem, the surface form acquired by the root; the stem determines the functional class to which the word belongs. It is transformed into an actual word of the language by means of inflectional affixes (in Egyptian for the most part suffixes), which convey deictic markers and other grammatical functions such as gender, number, tense and aspect, and voice. Table 4.1 offers common examples of derivational patterns of Egyptian words from roots and stems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>AFFIX</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>WORD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sn</td>
<td>*san-</td>
<td>.at</td>
<td>m.s</td>
<td>*san “brother”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“brother”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*san-</td>
<td>.aw</td>
<td>m.pl.</td>
<td>*sana “sister”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sbsd</td>
<td>“month”</td>
<td>.s</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>sbsd “month”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“god”</td>
<td>.aw</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>sabd “brother”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snjg</td>
<td>.o</td>
<td>sing.</td>
<td>*san “to be friendly”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*san-</td>
<td>.aw</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>*sanaw “god”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“god”</td>
<td>.aw</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>*san “to be friendly”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sanaw</td>
<td>.o</td>
<td>sing.</td>
<td>*sanaw “god”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ns</td>
<td>“to hear”</td>
<td>.s</td>
<td>3 p.f.s.</td>
<td>ns “to hear”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sadum</td>
<td>.s</td>
<td>Subject = NP</td>
<td>*sadum “that she hears”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to hear”</td>
<td>.f</td>
<td>3 p.m.s.</td>
<td>*sadum “may NP hear”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sadum</td>
<td>.s+</td>
<td>Past + 3 p.m.s.</td>
<td>*sadum “may he hear”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to hear”</td>
<td>.s</td>
<td>Passive participle</td>
<td>*sadum “he heard”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to hear”</td>
<td>.iw</td>
<td>Passive participle</td>
<td>*sadum “the one who hears”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to hear”</td>
<td>.iw</td>
<td>Passive participle</td>
<td>*sadum “the one who is heard”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dd</td>
<td>“to say”</td>
<td>.s</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>dd “to say”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to say”</td>
<td>.at</td>
<td>Passive part. + f.s.</td>
<td>*dd “what has been said”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to say”</td>
<td>.at</td>
<td>Past rel. + 2 p.m.s.</td>
<td>*ddd “which you said”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to say”</td>
<td>.at</td>
<td>Causative infinitive</td>
<td>*dd “to tell”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to stand”</td>
<td>.wat</td>
<td>Ep.</td>
<td>*man “the tomb(s)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mn</td>
<td>“to be”</td>
<td>.s</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>*man “to be stable”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to be”</td>
<td>.s</td>
<td>Causative infinitive</td>
<td>*simn “to establish”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to be”</td>
<td>.s</td>
<td>Nominal ending</td>
<td>*jarnin “(type of) vessel”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to enter”</td>
<td>.uw</td>
<td>Nominal ending</td>
<td>*aqw “income” (&gt; “food”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to enter”</td>
<td>.uw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“bread”</td>
<td>.st</td>
<td>f.s.</td>
<td>*saper “field” (&gt; “bread”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vocalic skeletons generally determine the structure of nominal patterns and of basic conjugational forms, whereas semivocalic suffixes convey the expression of the plural, of adjectival forms of the verb (participles and relative forms), and of some conjugational patterns. The feminine marker is a t-suffix added to the basic masculine noun (sn "brother" vs. sn.t "sister"); the most common derivational pattern of adjectives is a j-suffix (ntj "divine" from njt "god"). A j- or w-prefix can be added to biconsonantal roots to form triradical nominal stems; conversely, a triconsonantal root may lose a semivocalic glide and be reduced to a biradical stem. Examples of consonantal additions to a root are s- for causative stems, t- for singular nouns and reflexive verbs, and m- for nouns of instrument, place, or agent. While many of these morphological features are indeed shared by other Afroasiatic languages, Egyptian stems resulting from the addition of a consonantal phoneme to a root tend to be lexicalized as new autonomous roots rather than treated as grammatical forms of the basic root: Egyptian, therefore, does not possess a full-fledged paradigm of verbal stems conveying semantic nuances of a verbal root similar to the ones we know from Semitic.

The most common modifications of the root are: (1) the reduplication of the entire root or of a segment thereof. This pattern affects the semantic sphere, creating new lexemes: from sn "brother" ssn to be "friendly with," from gnij "to find" ngmgm "to be gathered" (with the n-prefix of reflexivity), from snb "to be healthy" snbh "to suit"; and (2) the gemination of the last radical, which affects the grammatical sphere: 2-rad. ḏḏ to say ḏḏḏḏ: what has been said, III-inf. mj "to love" ṭmrj "that I love," II-gem. mss "to see" > mssf "while he sees," 3-rad. sgfm "to hear" > sgmmf "he will be heard."¹⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLIER EGYPTIAN</th>
<th>LATER EGYPTIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOUN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sn &quot;(a, the) brother&quot;</td>
<td>ou-ssn &quot;a brother,&quot; p-son &quot;the brother&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sn.t &quot;(a, the) sister&quot;</td>
<td>ou-ssne &quot;a sister,&quot; t-son &quot;the sister&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mfr &quot;good&quot;</td>
<td>p-et-nano-t &quot;good&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERB</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgfm.f &quot;he heard&quot;</td>
<td>aw-fom &quot;he heard&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mjrj.f &quot;may be loved&quot;</td>
<td>me-nor-merimf &quot;may be loved&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of a strong expiratory stress led in late prehistoric times to a change of the inherited syllabic patterns from the prehistoric Dreisilbenzersetzung to the historical Zweisilbenzersetzung (section 3.4.3) and to the reorganization of nominal stems. Following its analytic tendency, later Egyptian morphology displays a variety of inflectional prefixes deriving from the grammaticalization of earlier Egyptian patterns,¹⁸ which have been phonologically reduced and are now followed by the lexeme, as shown in table 4.2.

4.3 Nominal morphology

4.3.1 General features

In our discussion of phonology (section 3.4.3), we saw that one of the major features of Egyptian in its early stages was the absence of a strong aspiratory stress, which eventually caused a reduction to /a/ of short vowels in posttonic position, with the resulting change from the Dreisilbenzersetzung to the Zweisilbenzersetzung (**sadjmat > sadjmat "the who hears"). A very important effect of this reduction of short posttonic vowels was the loss of the old Afroasiatic case markers (nominative *-u, accusative *-a, genitive-possessive *-i, possibly locative *-i):¹⁹ thus, a prehistoric **san-u became the form we posit for earlier Egyptian: *san "brother."

The case markers, however, left traces in the morphological behavior of the corresponding nouns. An example was already given in table 4.1 s.v. *san: the old case marker *u, which was dropped in the singular form, reappears in the formation of the plural, attracting stress and vocalic length, developing a glide before the morpheme *-aw, and generating the form *san узнaw. Also, the ending *-u is still preserved, although functionally reinterpreted, in the forms of some singular patterns as well: when the original stem ended in a vowel, for example *san in *ḥūrw ("the god Horus," *-a in *ḥupraw "form," or *-i in *masqiw "enemy," the ending was maintained as a glide, often written in good orthography as <w> in the case of *-aw as opposed to <w> in the case of *-iw or *-uw.²⁰ The most pervasive survival of the nominative ending was discussed in section 3.4.3 as a form of "contingent extrasyllabicity": there are instances of two variants of the same word, one with consonantal nominal stem (for example Proto-Eg. *nib-u > Upper Eg. *nib > *nīb- "lord," *nibf > Greek -νιζως "his lord") and one in which the old ending *-u develops an extrasyllabic w-gl ide and keeps the original bisyllabic structure (for example **nib-u > Lower Eg. *nibuw > ΘΗΒΑ "lord," *nibwil > Greek -νιζως).²¹

Remnants of the accusative (or "absolutive") case in *-a will be mentioned in sections 4.6.3.2 and 4.7. As for the genitive and possessive *-i, a survival in historical times is offered by the i-pattern before prenominal suffixes (for...
example Proto-Eg. nominative **ḥar-ụ > br ḥarr > go ḥal/ "face," genitive + f-suffix **ḥar-ī-f > ḥarrī > ɢpla ḥarrī/ "his face"), and by the vocalization of the adjectives derived from nouns by means of the pattern known as nisbation, from the Arabic noun นิษะ "relation": a morpheme 诔 is affixed to the genitive of a noun in order to derive the corresponding adjective: nominative **ḥar-ụ > br ḥarr > go ḥal/ "face," genitive + j-suffix **ḥar-ī-j > ḥarrīj > ɢpla jharrīj/ "related to the face"; nominative ʷaza6-ụ > ṭaš *Azas > ṭoγ/ "border," genitive + j-suffix ʷaza6-ī-j > ṭašī ḥaškīj > ṭaš ṭaš ṭašī /"related to the border"> "neighbor"; ḥašmin-ụ "the right side" > **hašmin-at > jmn.t */jmn.t/ "the right side" > jmn.tj "jḥašminij"/* cara /"East/ "West."\(^{12}\)

Egyptian adjectives are syntactically treated as substantives. Nouns can function as appositions to a preceding noun: 23-j hrw/*ziwaj ḥarruwl/ "my son Horus"; when used attributively, adjectives follow the modified noun: 23-j ṭmr/*ziwaj ḥarruwl/ "my beautiful son." The main innovation in the phonology of later Egyptian nouns is the lenition and the progressive loss of final vocalic and semivocalic endings (section 3.5), which at times provoked the disappearance of the entire final syllable of the word: consonantal stem ḥmr/*Hamnakat */ nmr nmr "god"; u-stem hrw*w/*izarwul/ "a day," e-stem ḥmr/*zarwul/ "a god/ "snake"; i-stem ṭmrw*/*izarwul/ /"gardener." On the syntactic level, this phenomenon is paired by the development of an overt marker of determination represented by the definite and indefinite article π3 > n- , ne- and w > ə̄n- respectively: Late Egyptian π3-nt > Coptic πον-满满的 "the god," w-hrw > ə̄n-zn "a day," π3-ṃm > ṭe-ə̄n "the gardener," w-ḥf > ə̄n-ghu "a snake." But unlike what happens in the Semitic languages which possess a definite article, where the determined modifier is introduced by a determinative pronoun (for example Hebrew  י-ב has gaddoli "the great man"), later Egyptian displays no such morpheme: Late Egyptian π3-ṃt * "the great man."\(^{23}\) In later Demotic and Coptic, however, the determinative pronoun n (Coptic R-) acquires this function: Coptic ḫrwyk ə̄n "the great man." The morpheme n is also used in all stages of the language to express the indirect genitive (section 4.4); earlier Egyptian π3-ṣnt n j.j kmt. Late Egyptian π3-ṃt n kmt, Coptic ḫrwyk ə̄n "the Egyptian man" < "the man of Egypt."\(^{24}\)

4.3.2 Compound nouns

Like many other Afroasiatic languages, earlier Egyptian exhibits a pattern of nominal determination characterized by the direct juxtaposition of a regem and a return, originally in the genitive case; this form of direct genitive is called "construct state" (status constructus): ḥb jmysīl "possessor of veneration" > "venerable." The direct genitive was a productive device in classical Egyptian, although not as frequent as in Akkadian, Hebrew or Arabic, and tended to be replaced by the analytic construction with the determinative pronoun n(j): 药业 aj kmt. "a man that-of Egypt" > "Egyptian." However, the structure of a set of Egyptian words known as "compound nouns" shows that already in early historical times these compounds were lexicalized and treated as a single lexical item;\(^{24}\) while in the genitival construction and in the pattern "noun + adjective" the stress falls on the regem (mhd. rmy */madara неск. ← "the thing of man" > ⲧⲟtⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ (manner) /mantrono/ "mankind"; rmy */ja-rmtwn/ "great man" > πrɑɑo /ramma/ "rich"), in the compound nouns it falls on the regem: ḥmr-nts */ḥamnakat */ goṅt /hont/ "servant-of-god" > "priest"; 23-ṣa */ziwajt/ ("son of the earth") > "snake" > ḥmt*/sītər/ "basilisk." The same pattern is shared by a few instances of adjectival or participial constructions, such as 낸f */tawnef/ "stable of beauty" (the reference is to King Pepi I) > ቘጉጉ, ⲁⲣጉ/pt> /men/ /"West/ "Zawiya /"Harem/, originally the name of the king's pyramid, metonymically extended to the whole city of "Memphis," the first capital of Egypt.\(^{25}\)

Compound nouns are rare and their etymology often unclear; however, they point back to a phase in the history of Egyptian, which probably lasted until the end of the Old Kingdom, in which the old tonic pattern with antepenultimate stress (Dreisilbengesetze, section 3.4.3) was still productive.

4.3.3 The feminine

The feminine singular ending of earlier Egyptian was marked by a suffix -t preceded by a vowel, frequently *at, also *it for the i-stem and *ut for the u-stem. The vowel can be reconstructed with a degree of certainty only if it was stressed or – less reliably – if it can be inferred on the basis of Akkadian transcripts or derivation patterns. A stressed feminine ending is documented by examples such as ḫb.j. */ḥaškut/ > ḥm-*e/*e affiliation */arkbit/; *pi */pi/ > ṭe */p/ "heart," *pi */pi:mu/ (e)ba./ (e)ba/ "seed"; transcripts and derivation patterns show the ending *at in 23.t */p3tajt/ > ḥn t/pa:ta/ "bow," see Akk. transcription /-t, the feminine adjectival ativa ending *-it as in jmn.tj */j/f"mijtij/ "servant," see msc. jmn.tj */j/f"mijtij, or the ending *-at in wwp.t */wipwaat/ > *wipwaat/ > /wipwaat/ "occupation," see wwp.tj */wipwattsij/ "messenger," Meroitic apote.\(^{26}\) In general, posttonic vowels were dropped in later Egyptian (section 3.3); in most cases, therefore, the vocalic color of the feminine endings is retrievable only on systematic grounds. Parallel to the masculine forms discussed above, Egyptian shows cases of feminine words derived from a stem originally ending in
The formation of the plural is more complex. A semivocalic morpheme *-w or *-aw, possibly derived, like the corresponding Semitic plural in Arabic qalb “heart,” between singular and a longer form of the /za@tarwawl/.

The formation of the singular form triradical nouns often display the vocalic pattern rarely the only marker of the plural form, but rather coexisted with other although a few nouns may have possessed a plural or collective form without suffiies.

Another suffix \( *\text{wt} \), morphologically feminine but applied to masculine nouns, is often used in the formation of collectives: from \( *\text{rd wt} \) "plant" the collective noun \( *\text{rdwt} \) "flora," from \( *\text{sbs}\text{wt} \) "star" the collective \( *\text{sbs}\text{wt} \) "constellation."\

The main features of earlier Egyptian nominal morphology are captured in Table 4.3. The reconstructions refer to the formal ("prehistoric") structure of the words, and not necessarily to their actual phonological realization in historical Egyptian.

Earlier Egyptian possessed a recessive morphological category "dual," in classical times limited to the human body occurring in pairs (eyes, ears, feet, legs, etc.) and semantically related lexemes: the two sundals, the Two Gods. Masculine duals display a semivocalic addition \( /j/ \) to the plural form: \( *\text{sj wj} \) /stnuw3w/ > /h333/ /snaw/ "two (masc.)," \( *\text{ph wj} \) /ptaww/ > /nawaw/ /paww/ "buttocks." Feminine duals also exhibit the ending \( /j/ \), but it is not clear whether this ending was affixed to the singular (as generally assumed), or rather to the plural (as required by the symmetry with the masculine paradigm), since, as we saw, it is difficult to assess in which nominal classes the plural feminine morpheme \( *\text{wt} \) was used.\(^{43}\) In Coptic, as in earlier Egyptian, the development of the definite article \( *\text{wt} \) was a progressive full of difficulties: from \( *\text{wt} \) to \( *\text{wt} \) or of an adjective is retained in Coptic as an autonomous lexeme together with its masculine counterpart: the "brother" vs. the "sister," etc.

The shift from the dual to the plural form is regular, and is attested in both Egyptian and Coptic. In Egyptian texts, the plural form is generally, while only a limited number of identifiable feminines and an even smaller number of duals (usually reinterpreted as singulars or plurals)\(^{46}\) is kept in later Egyptian, the number of plural patterns is much higher, with the loss of final vowels and semiconsonants favoring the emergence of new oppositions based on internal apophonic alternations between singular and plural forms: Late Middle Egyptian sing. \( *\text{ge s} \) vs. pl. \( *\text{ge s} \) "power," Coptic \( *\text{eb t} \) /ebel/ vs. \( *\text{eb n} \) /ebel/ "month," Coptic \( *\text{ka f} \) /ka f/ vs. Coptic \( *\text{gear} \) /geq/ "bone," Coptic \( *\text{da} \) /da/ vs. Coptic \( *\text{da} \) /da/ "town," Coptic \( *\text{maw} \) /ma\(w\)/ vs. Coptic \( *\text{maw} \) /ma\(w\)/ "oath."

The state of affairs in later Egyptian raises questions about the features of the earlier Egyptian system. While justified within the conjectural Afroasiatic comparative frame and supported to a certain degree by the scanty Coptic evidence, the reconstruction of the nominal system faces nonetheless two methodological difficulties. On the one hand, earlier Egyptian morphological oppositions often appear redundant: for example, if the system did have apophonic alternations between singular and plural forms (as in \( *\text{sab ed} \) vs. \( *\text{sab ad} \) in the word for "month"), and if, moreover, this is often the only opposition surviving in the corresponding Coptic forms (\( *\text{eb t} \) vs. \( *\text{eb n} \)), do we always have to posit the concomitant presence of an external plural suffix in earlier Egyptian? On the other hand, the presence of these morphemes is not always supported by the actual evidence of hieroglyphic texts: the plural \( *\text{sbd w} \) "months" is regularly written like the singular \( *\text{sbd} \) "month," with an ideographic (the three strokes for "plural"), rather than phonetic indication (\( *\text{w} \)) of the presence of the plural morpheme.

This divorce between methodological requirements and philological evidence has urged modern scholars to draw a distinction between two realities underlying our historical study of Egyptian: (1) the linguistic system resulting from a regular application of the morphophonological rules of derivation of Coptic forms from Egyptian antecedents, conventionally called "pre-Coptic Egyptian"; (2) the forms which emerge from the actual reality of Egyptian texts, i.e. "hieroglyphic Egyptian."\(^{47}\)

The reasons for the fact that "hieroglyphic Egyptian" appears much less regular than "pre-Coptic" are twofold. First and foremost, as recognized by all students of the field, the Egyptian graphic system, while not as irregular or inconsistent as suggested by traditional Egyptology, prevents us from acquiring a reliable insight into the underlying morphological patterns (sections 2.2, 3.2). There is also another aspect to this issue: to follow Hjelmslev's terminology, no linguistic code displays a total identity between underlying system and historical norm.\(^{48}\) The reconstructed "pre-Coptic Egyptian" is an idealized linguistic system: even if the rules for its recon-
struction were all correct, which is in itself very doubtful, this redundant system would still not be the mirror of an actual historical reality. Nor can the hieroglyphic evidence be trusted to provide access to the synchronic norms of Egyptian: the use of hieroglyphs, Hieratic and Demotic is highly controlled by social conventions, therefore doomed to convey a constant dialectics between traditional orthography and underlying phonology (section 2.3). Thus, actual historical manifestations of Egyptian were probably less regular than reconstructed “pre-Coptic,” but more diversified than is betrayed by “hieroglyphic Egyptian.”

To give just some examples of how these methodological concerns may modify the paradigms of nominal morphology given above, I would like to argue that the “systematic” singular and plural ending of *-w (in the singular patterns *-vw and in the plural patterns *-w and *-aw respectively) may have been actually realized as /s/ in words in which the presence of *-w was redundant, i.e. where there was no opposition between two homophonic realities: for example *r'(w) *sun/ rather than the commonly assumed */sun/. The historical shape of /hrw/ was probably from the very beginning */harw/ rather than */harwuw/; this would fit better both the traditional hieroglyphic writing of this word as <hrw> and its Coptic outcome goor /haw/. This hypothesis implies, however, that the apophonic alternation may have sufficed in some cases to mark the opposition between a singular and a plural form already in earlier Egyptian: sing. /hrw/ vs. pl. /hrw/ *haruww/, which again suits perfectly the hieroglyphic writing of the plural as <hrw> and the Coptic form *gaw /haw/. Similarly, there is no need to suppose that one of the two plural forms of /a*b/ “month” ever displayed a semiconsonantal ending: while a w-plural *abudw is documented by Coptic *e4a:te /ræbat/, the aw-plural *abudaw was probably always *arbaduw, from which both the hieroglyphic writing with <s> and the Coptic form *a4aw /robæt/ are readily derivable. In the word /hsw/ *haw/ and generally in the a-stem, on the other hand, the presence of a semiconsonantal ending is supported not only by the orthographic frequency of <w>, but also by the fact that the w-glide was eventually palatalized to j in the plural pattern, i.e. in an environment in which /w/ was intervocalic: */hafawaww/ *hafajy, as suggested by the presence of the two spellings <hsw> (the older form) and <htsw> (the recent form) and by the Coptic outcome goor /haw/. What seems less probable is that this word had in fact two plural forms, one ending in -w and one ending in -aw, or that the realized form ever included the second w, i.e. the actual ending of the plural aw-morpheme: the hieroglyphic evidence does not support it, and its presence also appears functionally redundant. If this hypothesis is correct, the Egyptian norm will be found to display a significantly lower number of semiconsonantal endings than the system posited by contemporary research. The evolution of nominal morphology is presented in table 4.4, which captures the later Egyptian counterparts — reconstructed on the basis of Akkadian transcriptions, Late Middle Egyptian evidence, and Coptic — of the lexemes treated in table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.4 Later Egyptian nominal morphology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MASCULINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLURAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMININE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLURAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Pronouns

4.4.1 Personal pronouns

Earlier Egyptian exhibits four sets of personal pronouns, which share many elements with the pronouns of other Afroasiatic languages.

(1) Suffix pronouns. They are used to indicate the possessor in a direct genitive construction (prw = “my house”), the prepositional complement (jm = “in”), the subject of a verbal form, whether active (sdm = “you hear”) or passive (sdm,n,tw = “it was heard”), including participles and relative forms (mrij = “his beloved”), and the highest argument of an infinitive, mostly the agent, but in the case of a transitive verb often the patient (dd,k = “your saying,” rdj,ts = “to put him”).

The morphological structure of the suffix pronouns is similar to that of their Semitic equivalents: (1) first person -s (probably -*aj); (2) second person
masc. ≠ k (Proto-Eg. **-ku; the final vowel does not appear in historical Egyptian: ≠ k), fem. ≠ NJ (Proto-Eg. **-ki; the final vowel was also dropped, but left a trace of its earlier presence in the resulting palatalization of the plosive velar: */kI/ > */kI/ > *q, i.e. the palatal plosive /-c/); (3) third person masc. ≠ / (Proto-Eg. **-su; the back vowel /I/ led to a labialization of */I/ = */su/ > */s/ > */θ/ > *θ), fem. ≠ / (Proto-Eg. **-si, with the dropping of the front vowel /I/ = */si/ > */s/ > *ε).62 The plural forms, common to masculine and feminine, show the addition of an element n (in the dual nj) to the singular: (1) first person plural ≠ n (*-ina > *-in); (2) second person plural ≠ n (from **-kina; the front vowel led to a palatalization of the velar stop: *-inj), dual ≠ n (/*-tinj); (3) third person plural ≠ sn (*-sina > *-sin), dual ≠ sn (/*-sinj).

(2) Enclitic pronouns, called by Egyptologists "dependent pronouns." They are used as object of transitive verbal phrases (m33-j sw "I see him"), as subject of adjectival sentences (nfr sw "he is good"), and as object of initial particles in subject (or better "topic") of a nominal sentence in the first and second persons singular (masc. = t, fem. = t), or of infinitives (sdm-f "hearing him") and of the pronominal subjects of intransitive or adjectival verbs — once again in finite forms (nfr sw "he is good") as well as in infinitives (ptj-i-r "his coming"). These remnants of an earlier ergativity appear integrated into the nominative-accusative coding (section 4.6.3.3) of historical Egyptian.

(b) A deictic element k (in the first persons) or t (in the second and third persons), etymologically connected with the pronominal endings of the stative, see (4) below.

(c) A partially modified form of the corresponding suffix pronoun.

The first person pronoun is jnk *i/ja'nak/, see Akkadian anāku, Hebrew anāḵ.69 In the second and third person singular there are two sets of independent pronouns, an Old Kingdom form displaying an element t following the corresponding form of the enclitic pronoun (second person masc. jw; fem. jm, third person masc. sw; fem. stt); and a more recent one, from the late Old Kingdom onward, built according to the pattern described in (a)–(c): second person masc. ntr *i/ja'naka'/, fem. ntr *i/ja'nakata', third person masc. ntr *i/ja'naka', third person fem. ntr *i/ja'nakata'. The plural forms are common to masculine and feminine: first person jmn *i/ja'nam/ (documented only in postclassical times), second person ntrn *i/ja'nam/ (documetned in the Semitic counterparts: first person jmn *i/ja'nac/ (section 4.6.3.3) of historical Egyptian.

4.4 Pronouns

(4) Stative endings. The paradigmatical subject endings of personal endings added to the conjugation pattern called stative (or old perfective, or prassubjunctive)70 exhibits close kinship to the suffix conjugation of Semitic and Berber, with the addition of a suffix jI/w to the consonantal endings:71 first person kj > .kw (Akk. -šku, Berber -y), second person j (Akk. masc. -štu, fem. -štu), third person masc. j > .w, mostly written <ku> (Akk. -a), fem. j (Akk. -a); the plural forms show the addition of a morph n, which is also found in the independent pronouns and in the Semitic counterparts: first person .w(j)n (Akk. -štnu), second person .twjn (Akk. masc. -štnu, fem. -ština), third person masc. .wj (Akk. -a), fem. .j (Akk. -a). A dual form with the addition of an ending j to the plural is documented for the second and third person.

The functional array of the Egyptian stative matches the corresponding forms in Semitic and Berber.72 Although Egyptian stative endings, unlike
the Akkadian permissive, cannot be applied to nouns (šarrāku "I am a king"); the stative finds its semantic origin in a nominal construction with a conjugated "middle" participle following its subject: zḥaw jij.w "the scribe has gone." The later evolution is characterized by two features: on the one hand, the form maintained its original function with intransitive verbs but was reinterpreted as passive when used with transitive verbs, passive being a semantic subset of the aspectual category of "perfectivity" (zḥaw sḏm.w "the scribe was heard"); on the other hand, the stative was integrated into non-stative paradigms such as the narrative use of the first person perfect (ijj.kj) "I did", the optsative use of the second person prospective (snb.tj) "may you be healthy" > "Farewell!", CT VI 76 bc ṣtn.tsn r bzd.j pn "Keep yourselves removed from my soul!", or the use of the third person jussive in eulogies (ṃw-bzd X ṣnb.w wḥzt.w snb.w "the King X - may he be alive, prosperous, and healthy").

All these uses represent a typologically predictable evolution from the original semantic spectrum of the stative as a conjugated nominal form, with a close historical and typological kinship to the grammaticalization of the suffix conjugation form qataš-a in Northwest Semitic. Syntactically, the stative is found in classical Egyptian in paradigmatic alternation with the construction "subject + preposition hr + infinitive" in the so-called pseudo-verbal sense (zḥaw hr sḏm "the scribe is on hearing").

### 4.4 Pronouns

#### 4.4.2 Personal pronouns in later Egyptian

In principle, forms and functions of personal pronouns do not change in later Egyptian, the only exception being represented by the form of the third person plural suffix and of the corresponding independent pronoun, which are now -w instead of -sn and stw instead of ntsn. However, because of phonological evolutions and of modified syntactic patterns in adverbial and verbal sentences, four simultaneous phenomena take place:

(a) Vocalic and semivocalic suffixes tend to be dropped. This is particularly the case for the first person suffix *aŋ; Gretj */jataj> Coptic TOOT /dɔt/ "my hand."

(b) The use of enclitic pronouns becomes restricted, until they gradually disappear; while Late Egyptian and Demotic develop a new set of object pronouns (section 4.6.5). Coptic exhibits the grammaticalization of a new pattern for the pronominal object, consisting of a prepositional phrase with m "in," followed by the direct nominal object or by the suffix pronoun: a=f-sḏm mno-i "he heard me" < jrw-f-sḏm jm-j "he did the hearing in me."
4.4.3 Deictic, interrogative and relative pronouns

Earlier Egyptian displays four morphological series for the formation of adjectives with deictic function. In these series, each of which conveys a different demonstrative meaning, morphemes consist of a pronominal base (generally p for the masculine, f for the feminine, j and jpt for the plural patterns), followed by a deictic indicator: n for closeness (rmt pn "this man"), f for distance (bjm.t tf "that woman"), w (originally j) also for closeness (nfr.w jpw "those gods"), 3 for vocative reference (ps mtj "O beloved one"). The development in Middle Egyptian displays a tendency for the pw-series to be superseded by the pn-series in the demonstrative use and to be restricted to demonstrative pronouns, in which a demonstrative base n is followed by the masculine plurals when accompanied by participles and relative forms, but as development in Middle Egyptian displays a tendency for the pw-series to be

Earlier Egyptian

adjectives

feminine singulars when referred to by a resumptive these pronouns were originally unmarked in gender and number (nn, np, nw, ns "this," "these things") and were treated syntactically in earlier Egyptian as masculine plurals when accompanied by participles and relative forms, but as feminine singulars when referred to by a resumptive pronoun, they replace in Middle Egyptian the old plural adjectival forms and appear in pronominal constructions with the determinative pronoun n(j): nn n(j) sjrw.w ("this of officials") » "these officials." As in the case of the singular adjectives p3 and t3, the anaphoric pronoun ns eventually becomes the plural definite article in later Egyptian: Middle Egyptian ns n(j) 'wt "the aforementioned rooms," Late Egyptian ns-nmt.w, Coptic n-tome "the men."

Table 4.6 Deictics in earlier Egyptian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADJECTIVES</th>
<th>PRONOUNS</th>
<th>ADVERBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC.</td>
<td>FEM.</td>
<td>MASC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p3 &quot;this&quot;</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>j3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p3 &quot;chat&quot;</td>
<td>tf</td>
<td>jpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p3 &gt; gw &quot;this&quot;</td>
<td>t3 &gt; jw</td>
<td>jpw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p3 &quot;the said&quot;</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p3 &quot;this&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;f&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paradigm of demonstrative elements is completed by a set of adverbs characterized by the formant ' (ayin) followed by the deictic marker: the most common is 'a "here." Post-classical Middle Egyptian of Dyn. XVIII also documents the adverbs 'n and 'f, which can be pronominalized by means of the derivational morpheme tj: 'ntj "the one here," 'ftj "the one there."83

Table 4.6 visualizes the paradigms of earlier Egyptian demonstratives; the most common morphemes or those which play a role in the later diachronic development are underlined.

In later Egyptian, the picture changes considerably. While the pn-series is kept in Late Egyptian only in a few bound expressions (h3w pn "this day"), the deictic paradigm is reorganized on the basis of the pa-series. The bare morphemes p3 "jpi/i, t3 - n3 - acquire the function of definite articles,84 whereas a derived form with suffix j (p3j, t3j, n3j) is used as adjective when it follows the noun it qualifies (p3j rmt, ne p3-wale "this man"), as pronoun in independent use (p3j > n3,j, n3 "this one") or as copula, in which case it follows a predicate introduced in Coptic by a definite or indefinite article (rmt p3j, ov-wale ne "this is a man," bm.t n3j, ov-cqale te "this is a woman"). Unlike in earlier Egyptian, where the masculine copula pw is used regardless of the gender and number of the antecedent, in later Egyptian the copula p3j > ne, t3j > te, n3j > ne agrees in gender and number with its antecedent. In Coptic bipartite cleft sentences, however (section 4.9), the copula is assimilated to a definite article p3 preceding the second nominal phrase; in the Bohairic dialect, it is invariably the masculine ne. The deictic adverb is now dy > t3, most probably an Upper Egyptian doublette of the earlier Egyptian form '3, in which the outcome of Afroasiatic "d is /d rather than /n (section 3.6.1).85
In accordance with the analytic tendency discussed in section 4.1, later Egyptian demonstratives may also control pronominal possessive suffixes to form complete adjectival and pronominal paradigms: *jm-k-j.t > *mn-k-em-nep* "your mission," *pj-fk pjy > htsw-k njr* "this is yours." In the same pattern, the p3-series followed by the determinative pronoun *n(j)* is used with a nominal, rather than pronominal possessor: *p3-n s nb* "what belongs to every man" (sections 4.5, 4.10). Structures and functions of deictic morphemes in later Egyptian are summarized in Table 4.7.

The most common morpheme for the formation of interrogatives is *m* (Arabic *man* "who," *md* "what"), originally a pronoun "who?," "what?" (CT VI 314b *jw t tr m* "who are you then?") but used most frequently in prepositional compounds (*tr-m* "why?", *mj-m* "how?") or with the "ergative" particle *jn* (section 4.4.1) which indicates a focalized subject (*jn-m > nm, nm*: Sh.S. 69 (*jm-j njn jw* "who brought you?") Other interrogative pronouns are *jb* > *dm* "what," in earlier Egyptian also *pw, p(w)-tr, zj, jbs*t, and in Late Egyptian the interrogative adjective *jt* "which?" as focalized subject of a cleft sentence: *jt *jns p3-jj *n-k* "which messenger is the one who came to you?"

Determinative and relative pronouns are formed by means of a base *n*, which builds the determinative series masc. sing. *n(j)*, fem. *n.t* pl. *n.w*, used as genitival marker: *jw n(j)* km.t "the king of Egypt," *n.t* *n.t* nbh "the city of eternity." A morph *t(j)* is affixed to the pronominal base *n* to form the relative pronouns *ntj, ntj, ntj.w*, used in adverbial and verbal sentences and resumed by a resumptive element in the oblique cases: *bw* *ntj nj*n-w jm* "the place in which the gods are," lit. "that the gods are there"; *jr-wj-kj* *ntj m33-k jm=sn(j)" your eyes with which you see," lit. "that you see with them." The relative pronoun is used only when the antecedent is either morphologically determined or semantically specific; non-specific antecedents are modified by asyndetic constructions without overt expression of the relative pronoun, labeled in Egyptian literature "virtual relative clauses" (section 6.3.3).

Parallel to the positive relative pronoun *ntj, ntj, ntj.w*, Egyptian also possesses a negative series *jwjt, jwtt, jwttj.w* "who not, which not." These relative pronouns are functionally equivalent to a positive relative pronoun *ntj* controlling a negative predication: Pt. 23586 *jw*t sdmjf *n dd bj-t*f "who does not listen to what his belly says," semantically equivalent to a clause *ntj nj sdm-nf *n dd bj-t*f.97 Urk. 1 192.14 *jw* *jw* *w njf 22%f "who does not have a son," equivalent to *ntj nj *zj-f.

Save for the expected phonological developments, determinative and relative pronouns survive unchanged in later Egyptian; the use of the genitival pronoun *n(j)* is gradually expanded, the old construct state being limited in Coptic to few bound constructions. Also, in the later stages of the language a new genitival marker *fte*, originally a prepositional construction (later Eg. *m-dj* > earlier Eg. *m-w* "at, by"),88 is used in presence of an indefinite, possessive, or compound antecedent: *hlwrf *toms* *fte-toms* "the living (et-onh) water (moou) of the light (nte-pouon)."

### 4.5 Numerals

Numerals have often – although by no means always – been considered to be a conservative part of speech: it is not surprising, therefore, that Egyptian words for numbers90 show a wide array of correspondences with other Afroasiatic languages, most notably with Semitic and Berber. The following table shows the basic forms of Egyptian numerals, each of them accompanied by its fullest hieroglyphic writing, by a phonological reconstruction, and by a comparative reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.8 Egyptian and Coptic numerals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Egl. = Egyptian numerals; Copt. = Coptic numerals; Sem. = Semitic numerals; Berb. = Berber numerals; Ma. = Hausa numerals; Morn. = Morn. numerals; see Morn. 7p; see Sem. 7p; see Sem. 7p.
4 Elements of historical morphology

The study of the syntactic behavior of numerals is complicated by the early tendency to write them ideographically, using for that purpose a set of hieroglyphic signs expressing the numbers 10^0...10^6 (section 2.2). It is clear, however, that "1" and "2" were adjectives following the noun they modify (in the singular or the dual), whereas the other numerals represented an autonomous part of speech. The numbers "3" through "10" were originally treated as singular substantives, agreeing in gender with the plural noun they refer to, which followed them appositionally: "psjw zp.w "nine times," /tj.w "his seven snakes." When written ideographically, which becomes the rule in Middle and Late Egyptian, numbers are written after the noun they refer to; this may appear in the plural form (ps hrd.w 3 "the three children," probably "ps-hntw n(j) bsd.w in the underlying segment of speech), but from Middle Egyptian onwards more often in the singular.

In later Egyptian, the appositional noun is regularly in the singular and it is often introduced by the genitival marker n (Coptic ḫi): ps 77 n ntr "the seventy-seven gods," nncq tibwσ "the seven days."

In earlier Egyptian, ordinals from 2 to 9 are formed by means of a suffix nw added to the corresponding cardinal, which may be written as an ideogram: "hntnw zp "the third time," m zp-f 3.nw sāb-sād "in his third jubilee," probably "m hntnw zp-f (n) sāb-sād in the underlying segment of speech. The word for "first" is the nisba adjective tpt "/*āpil from tpt "*āpil/ "head." In later Egyptian, the derivational pattern for ordinals is a construction with the active participle of the verb mb "to fill": "psjw zp mb-5 "their fifth time," /ptw w /ptw/ "their fifth time," /ptw w /ptw/ "their fifth time," /ptw w /ptw/ "their fifth time," /ptw w /ptw/ "their fifth time," /ptw w /ptw/ "their fifth time," /ptw w /ptw/ "their fifth time," /ptw w /ptw/ "their fifth time," /ptw w /ptw/ "their fifth time." In later Egyptian the adjective "first" is usually ḫh.jy /h/hjyq (Coptic gswf) from h3.t /h/wjyq/ "front," in Coptic also ḫhjy /h/hjyq/ "to lead."

Distributive numbers are formed through a reduplication of the basic cardinal: w'w w'w "one each," ḫhjy /h/hjyq "two each."

4.6 The verb

4.6.1 Introduction

The verbal morphology of earlier Egyptian is one of the most intricate chapters of Egyptian linguistics.

(a) First of all, the vocalic patterns for verbal stems are less easily inferred than their nominal counterparts, mainly because the verbal morphology of later Egyptian, which replaces the synthetic verbal forms of earlier phases through periphrastic constructions with a verbal prefix followed by the infinitive, fails to provide a reliable basis for the understanding of vocalic alternations. Akkadian transcriptions, Late Middle Egyptian texts in Greek alphabet and Coptic do provide valuable information, but their paradigmatic value, i.e. the likelihood for individual witnesses to be extended to other verbal classes, remains debatable.

(b) The second difficulty is posed by the relevance of semivocalic affixes and their paradigmatic representativeness. Many verbal forms exhibit a suffix j or w in some verbal classes, especially those with final weak radical, but not in others. Whether one takes this to be a purely graphic phenomenon or the sign of morphological oppositions affects the general interpretation of verbal morphology.

(c) A third difficulty is that while in the nominal morphology the differences within the main stages of the history of the language (Old Egyptian, Middle Egyptian and Late Middle Egyptian for earlier Egyptian vs. Late Egyptian, Demotic and Coptic for later Egyptian) are marginal, in the morphology and syntax of verbal forms a major evolution takes place between Old and Middle Egyptian on the one hand and between Late Egyptian and Coptic on the other hand. The picture is, therefore, rather complex.

(d) Finally, work on verbal morphology (as opposed to syntax) has been partially neglected in modern approaches to Egyptian grammar (section 1.3), due to a certain extent to the difficulties discussed above, but also to the impression that, because of the rigid syntax of Egyptian, little contribution to our understanding of the language as a whole could be expected from the study of morphological alternations in the verbal system. Only in recent times one can observe a new wave of interest in verbal morphology.104

4.6.2 General features of verbal morphology

Egyptian verbal forms105 can be classified according to whether they convey the indication of the subject, in which case they are finite (the basic conjugation sdm-t "he hears") and a variety of affixal forms, or they represent subjectless nominal phrases, in which case they are non-finite (the participle sdm "the hearer," the infinitive sdm "to hear" and the so-called negatival complement NEG-sdm.w "not-to-hear"). Finite verbal forms, which can be treated as predicative VP, as NP (after prepositions), as AdjP (relative forms), or as AP (in clauses of circumstance), are composed of a verbal stem, derived from the lexical root with the addition of suffixes (including .s), followed by the subject, which can be nominal (sdm mγ "the man hears") or pronominal (sdm-m-f "he hears"). Thus, unlike verbal formations in other Afroasiatic languages (Arabic yasma'ī "he hears," yasma'ī 'l-ragulu "the man hears"),
the Egyptian suffix conjugation does not display the pronominal affix of the third person in the presence of nominal subjects, a feature which is relevant for our understanding of the origin of this morphological pattern. Non-finite verbal forms are also built on the basis of a verbal stem; they convey the indication of gender and number, and in the case of the participles also markers of tense, aspect, mood, and voice.

Table 4.9 The basic patterns of Egyptian verbal morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>SUFFIX CONJ.</th>
<th>STATIVE</th>
<th>NON-FINITE FORMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sgmn</td>
<td>(jw-wj) sdm.kw</td>
<td>&quot;I heard&quot;</td>
<td>INFinitive: sdm &quot;to hear&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>sgmn-k</td>
<td>(jw) sdm.tj</td>
<td>&quot;I was heard&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>sgmn-l</td>
<td>(jw-l) sdm.tj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. pron.</td>
<td>sgmn-f</td>
<td>(jw-l) sdm.w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m. nom.</td>
<td>sgmn</td>
<td>(NP) sdm.w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. pron.</td>
<td>sgmn-s</td>
<td>(jw-s) sdm.tj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f. nom.</td>
<td>sgmn hjm.t</td>
<td>(NP) sdm.tj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sgmn</td>
<td>(jw-wj) sdm.wj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sgmn-si</td>
<td>(jw-wj(NP) sdm.wj)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>sgmn si</td>
<td>(jw-wj) sdm.wj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sgmn</td>
<td>(jw-wj) sdm.wj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sgmn</td>
<td>(jw-wj) sdm.wj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pron.</td>
<td>sgmn</td>
<td>(NP) sdm.wj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 nomin.</td>
<td>sgmn</td>
<td>(NP) sdm.wj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these two categories of forms, Egyptian displays a suffix conjugation pattern which follows the subject and is marked by a different set of pronominal endings, called stative on the basis of its primary semantic function, old perfective since it displays similarities with the Semitic suffix conjugation, or pseudoparticiple because of its syntactic behavior, which to a certain extent is analogous to that of the participles.

Table 4.9 shows the morphological structure of Egyptian verbal morphology, using as an example, as is the custom in Egyptology, the conjugation of the verbal root sdm "to hear" in the unmarked stem with suffixes, usually called sdm-f and conventionally pronounced [sejse'mef], together with the stative and the non-finite patterns (participles and infinitive).

In general, finite Egyptian verbal forms display a morphologically overt indication of (a) tense and/or aspect, (b) mood and (c) voice.

(a) As far as the first category is concerned, while the traditional assumption, largely derived from the "semitocentric" interpretation of the Egyptian verbal system shared by the Berlin School and its followers (section 1.3), has been that the fundamental reference of Egyptian verbal forms is aspectual, i.e. that they present a predication according to its contextual completeness (perfective aspect), or lack thereof (imperfective aspect), regardless of the temporal location vis-à-vis the speaker, the trend is now to take them as temporal forms which assess whether the verbal predication takes place before (past tense or preterite), in concomitance (present or unmarked tense), or after (future tense) the time reference of the speech act. Apart from terminological quarrels which often overshadow the issue, it seems that Egyptian, like many other languages, combined in its verbal morphology these two temporal dimensions, i.e. the internal composition (aspect) and the external location (tense) of a verbal predication. Egyptian verbal forms are "relative tenses" or "aspects"; their semantic reference can be determined only within the syntactic context of their appearance: while in initial position they tend to be primarily temporal, fixing the time location of the verbal predicate in reference to the moment of the speech act (I come," I have come" vs. j-wj "I come"), in non-initial position, i.e. within a string of discourse, they derive their temporal reference from the initial form and are more likely to convey aspectual features: mk wj m j.j t "look, I am coming" vs. mk wj m j.j kI "look, I have come."

(b) A similar analysis applies to the category of mood in general, the speaker's attitude to a verbal predication - whether neutral ("indicative") or marked ("epistemic" or "deontic" mood) - applies to events which have not yet taken place, mood will, therefore, apply most frequently to future events. Besides the imperative, modal oppositions affect in Egyptian the temporal/aspectual category usually called "prospective."

Since these verbal categories overlap in actual strings of discourse, where they are combined with semantic references provided by the context and by the lexical choices of the speaker, it is more predictable - obviously not on the theoretical level, but rather in terms of the likelihood for a form to actually occur in spoken or written discourse - for a preterite predication to be perfective, i.e. presented as completed, for a temporally unmarked form to be imperfective, i.e. not (yet) completed, and for an action expected to take place in the future to convey the attitude of the speaker to this expected predication, i.e. to exhibit modal features.

(c) A true passive voice with overt expression of the agent is relatively rare in Egyptian, and, according to a cross-linguistic tendency, develops grad-
ually out of the paradigm of perfective forms: for example, from an original *sdm.tw=f* "he has been heard," two forms *sdm.tw=f* "he has heard" vs. *sdm.tw=f* "he is heard" were eventually grammaticalized (section 4.6.3.3).119 Much more frequent is the "middle," intransitive use of transitive verbal lexemes in the perfect (*jw=f* *sdm.w* "it has been heard")120 or in the prospective (*sdm.waf* "it will be heard") to indicate the actual or expected result of an action in reference to its subject.

The three semantic categories of tense and aspect, mood, and voice were conveyed by morphological oppositions and superimposed on the lexical structure of the verbal lexeme, which in its turn provides a further temporal dimension, called Aktionsart, treated in some linguistic schools as a form of aspect.121 This is the temporal structure inherent to the verbal lexeme; it specifies, for example, whether a verbal predication consists of a single act (*wpj* "to open," punctual Aktionsart), or is extended over time (*sdr* "to sleep," durative Aktionsart), whether the existence of the argument(s) is affected by the predication (*gd* "to build," a transformative verb) or not (*sdm* "to hear," a non-transformative verb), whether the predication presents the result of a process (*gmj* "to find," an achievement), or entails a phase preceding the goal itself (*nj* "to fetch," an accomplishment), whether it conveys an action by a subject (*md* "to walk," an activity), or a state (*sdm* "to be pleasant").122 Rather than on the grammatical, these temporal features depend on the ontology of the described situation, i.e., on the internal semantic structure of the lexeme, and remain constant in all its forms; they do, however, bear heavily on the spectrum of semantically acceptable combinations for each verbal root, restricting the number of choices by the speaker. Accordingly, punctual verbs will appear more frequently in the perfective aspect (*wpj.nj=f* "I opened") focusing on the verbal action, whereas durative verbs will be more frequent in the imperfective (*sdrf-f* "while he sleeps") and less salient within the flow of discourse;123 transformative verbs will be more likely than non-transformative verbs to be found in passive constructions (*jw prw gd.w* "the house was built"); verbs of achievement are unlikely candidates for imperfective uses (*gmj=f-j* "I am finding"), which on the contrary are frequent with verbs of accomplishment (*q.w=f-j* "I am writing"); verbs of activity will display a much larger inventory of temporal or aspectual references than stative verbs, which in turn are preferably used as adjectives, etc. No verbal root, therefore, will exhibit a complete paradigm of verbal forms: rather, the morphological patterns discussed in the next sections and conventionally applied to the verb *sdm* "to hear" and *nj* "to do" represent a purely grammatical inventory of the Egyptian verb.

### 4.6.3 Verbal morphology in earlier Egyptian

#### 4.6.3.1 Tense and aspect. The main temporal and aspectual opposition is between (a) "past" (perfect and perfective) and (b) "temporally unmarked" (imperfective and aorist) forms.

(a) The basic preterit form exhibits a suffix *n* after the verbal stem, followed by the nominal or pronominal subject: *sdm.na=f* "he heard." The stem was vocalized *(ca)cic-* in biradical (2-rad.) and triradical roots (3-rad.), and *(cacci-jy)* in weak verbal classes (III-inf.);124 *sdm.na=f*/*sa*jimna=t* "he heard," *sdm.na mt=f*/*sa*jimna=tام* "the man heard"; *dd.na-f*/*tjimna* "we said," *dd.n bhm.t*/*sidna:jimna=t* "the woman said"; *nj.n=f*/*mjarnak* "you made," *nj.n=f*/*mjarnaka* "my father made." The *sdm.n=f* form appears in a variety of syntactic patterns: as the main predicate of a verbal sentence (Urk. I 280 3f.n=f "he has bought a field of 200 aouras"),125 as topazalized VP in initial position (always with verbs of motion: Urk. I 103,7 *j.j=f* *m=f* *jn m=f*... "this army has returned in peace..."), or in subordinate use as contextual VP (Urk. I 103,7... *bht=f* *tj;j=wr*... "...after it had ravaged the sand-dwellers' land").

Originally, the temporal and aspectual reference of the *sdm.n=f* may have been the present perfect rather than the past perfective:126 in the early texts it does not appear as a narrative tense, but belongs to the paradigm of the present. Accordingly, the *sdm.n=f* can also display other functions within the range of the present, especially the gnomic use, i.e., the general present in performative expressions (*nj.n=f* *nj=f* **tj;j=wr*... *herewith I give you all lands") or in the negative construction *nj sdm.n=f* "he does not / cannot hear."127

In addition to the present perfect *sdm.n=f*, Old Egyptian possessed two real preterites. The first one is a form in which the verbal stem is followed directly by the nominal or pronominal subject: it is called indicative *sdm.m=f* and is well attested in the texts of the Old Kingdom (Urk. I 124,17 *hsb wj bm=f* "his Majesty sent me"). The stem was probably vocalized *(e)cic*/*cic-*/*w=w* "he sent."128 In classical Egyptian, this form is functionally replaced by the *sdm.n=f* and is limited to archaic uses and bound constructions, such as the negative form *nj sdm.n=f* "he did not / cannot hear.

The second form, the *stative*, originally a conjugated verbal adjective,129 is used in Old Egyptian as first person counterpart to the indicative *sdm.m=f* (Urk. I 100,7-9 *rj;j wj bm=f m smr w*... *nj.n=f* *bj=lj=t* "I acted so that His Majesty would praise [me]").
subordinate perfective VP following its subject as predicative complement (Urk. I 125,15–16 gmt.n=f :end jm.jm.w rt r 3-sjm “I found that the ruler of Yam had gone off to the land of Tjemeh” < “I found the ruler of Yam having gone off to the land of Tjemeh”).

The stem was *(ca)cv-c* in the strong classes and *(caci)-j* in the weak-inf.: first person spt.kj “I was chosen” (“*sattpakvja*-f”) > *sattpakvja*, second person masc. spt.dj “you are sharp” > *sattpidvja* > *sasptedn* > Late Middle Eg. <sp>, fem. bzt.j “you have been introduced” > *btbtjvja* > Late Middle Eg. <best>, third person masc. qd.w “it was built” > *qdaw* > Sd. “to be built,” spt.w “it was chosen” > *sattpaw* > sdm.n-f “he was born” > *masjnw* > nocce “to be born,” fem. jwrt.j “she is pregnant” > *jwrttvja* > *saptatja* > /saptptj/ “to be pregnant,” spjt.j “she is ashamed” > *sajtptvja* > *sajptjtja* > /sajptptj/ “to be ashamed.”

The development from Old Egyptian past forms to the Middle Egyptian paradigm is marked by an increasing preference for textually bound oppositions between predicative forms (sdm.n=f and stative) introduced by a particle or by a topologized VP and topologized verbal forms in initial position (only sdm.n). The indicative sdm-f and the narrative use of the first person stative become sporadic, the only licensed syntactic position of the stative being now the non-initial position, either as main predicate or as subordinate form in pseudoverbal sentences. Periphrastic constructions referring to the past, such as “and they foretold a storm before it had come”) and “when following the initial particle jrj=f “to do” from the verb jrj “to do”), appear already in the First Intermediate Period, superseding the indicative sdm-f and the first person stative and joining as periphrastic forms the predicative sdm.n=f introduced by a particle: Sh.S. 67 jrj wpjn=f r3=f r1j “he opened his mouth toward me”; Sh.S. 2–3 mk ph.t=f hwn “look, we have reached the residence.” The difference between the perfective form in the former sentence and the present perfect in the latter is an example of lexical constraints: wpjn “to open” indicates an accomplishment, ph “to reach” an achievement.

The perfective paradigm also exhibits a pattern with affix .t, the so-called sdm.t-f. This form is in earlier Egyptian a linguistic remnant with a restricted range of uses: as subordinate negative perfective form after the particle nj (Sh.S. 97–98 sr-swn d1 nj j.jw “they foretold a storm before it had come”) and after prepositions implying completion, such as r “until” or dr “since” (Sin. B 247 r ph.t=f dmj nj(j) jr w “until I reached the town of Itju”). In spite of its occurrence only in buildings, this form shows a surprising stability, surviving until Coptic.

A contingent form sdm.jn=f “then he heard,” built with the particle jrj, was used in earlier Egyptian to refer to preterital events whose occurrence was directly dependent on the situation described in the preceding context: Peas. R 1.5 *jd.in shtj pn n bjm.l-f in “then this peasant said to his wife.”

(b) Unmarked forms indicate the general present of *aorist* and derive their temporal or aspectual reference from the syntactic context in which they appear. To this category belongs the basic pattern of the Egyptian conjugation system, the sdm=f. This form, however, is morphologically ambiguous, consisting of at least two distinct patterns. The first one shows a reduplication of the second radical in the III-inf. (jrj=f from jrj “to do”) and of II-gem. verbs (ms3=f from ms3 “to see”), and in Old Egyptian a j-prefix in the 2-rad. (jdb=f from gdb “to say”) and in a few weak classes; it is used as topologized VP in initial position (Sin. B 263 jrrh-m k m.tj “your Majesty acts according to his wish”), as nominalized VP in nominal environments (Pyr. 1223a jr wdtj mhr=f n n pn... “if it is delayed that you ferry the ferry-boat to this King...”), or in headings or titles (CT V 28c b’ jnm.t nfr.m jntw zj pn “this is how the Beautiful West rejoices in welcoming this man”). Because of its formal connection to similar Afroasiatic forms (see Akk. iparras), this form was traditionally called “imperfective sdm=f,” although its use in Egyptian, rather than by aspectual features, is determined primarily by its syntactic function as topologized or nominalized VP; hence its modern label “emphatic or nominal sdm-f.” Like its Semitic equivalent iparras, the nominal sdm=f is based on a nominal stem and was probably vocalized *cacam-; sdm z3-j *sajamziri* “my son listens,” jrj=f *jasvrw* “she does.”

The second sdm=f pattern is used in non-initial position, i.e. when preceded by a particle or a topologized element. In this case, the temporally unmarked aorist form is the non-reduplicating sdm=f-form, for example jrj=f “he does” from the verb jrj “to do.” When following the initial particle jrj, with or without topologized subject, the aorist indicates a general or gnomic present (Sh.S. 17–18 jrj rjnj (j) njh.m=sf sw “a man’s speech can save him”). This form was previously called “perfective sdm=f,” a label encompassing not only this type of sdm=f, but also the indicative sdm=f discussed in (a) above and the prospective (section 4.6.3.2). But the Standard theory, in its tendency to generalize the role of substitutional equivalents in similar syntactic environments, adopted the term “circumstantial sdm-f,” interpreting all non-initial VP as functionally adverbial. While this form, like the sdm.n=f and the stative, can indeed be used adverbially as a subordinate clause when controlled by a higher syntactic node, such as the main verbal phrase (Hatnub 4.3–4 *jd.in nd=k rbb ssn brr w.m.3 “Eighty men returned north, going forth on the road”), it functions nonetheless as true verbal predicate in many patterns, for example when it is introduced by particle Sh.S. 18–19 jrj mlw=sf lwn=jm.
functions as non-initial however, remains opaque.

wpj.n-f presented, “on” (or m “in” with verbs of motion) and hear,” lit. *“he is toward hearing.” These constructions indicate a “progressive reference with adjective verbs when it follows the subject of pseudoverbal pattern with stative good.”

The stative is also used with temporally unmarked, periphrastic constructions: see the adjectival pattern nfr sw (section 4.4.1) vs. the pseudoverbal pattern with stative jw=f nfr.w (section 5.2), both with the meaning “he is good.”

Corresponding to the sdm,jn=f for past events, a contingent form sdm.hr=f, built with the preposition hr, is used in explicative or diagnostic discourse to refer to general events whose occurrence depends on a condition defined in the preceding context: “If the condition X is fulfilled, the event Y occurs”: pSmith 9,19-20 jr sw=w=f mw stp.hr=f “if he drinks water, he chokes.”

Table 4.10 Tense and aspect in earlier Egyptian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENSE</th>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>RELATION TO THE CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ABSOLUTE/ RELATIVE/ CONTINGENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFECT</td>
<td></td>
<td>INITIAL/ NON-INITIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFECTIVE</td>
<td>1 pers.  Stative</td>
<td>sdm.m=f sdm.jn=f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 pers. sdm.f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AORIST</td>
<td>sdm.f/jw=f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-PAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERFECTIVE</td>
<td>jw=f hr=m sdm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSPECTIVE</td>
<td>jw=f fhr=f sdm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 presents the verbal forms of earlier Egyptian according to their temporal or aspectual distribution. In Old Egyptian, the “relation to the context” depends primarily on semantic choices (context), whereas in the classical language it is largely dictated by the syntactic environment (context).

Also, the categories of “perfect” and “perfective” merge in Middle Egyptian into a single sdm.m=f-paradigm (initial and non-initial), first person stative and third person indicative sdm=m=f being reduced to rare historical remnants.

4.6.3.2 Mood. The verbal category of “mood” defines the attitude of the speaker vis-a-vis the event described in the predication and is conveyed in earlier Egyptian by three forms: (a) the imperative sdm, (b) the prospective sdm=f, (c) the subjunctive sdm.f. Prospective and subjunctive are formally different verbal forms in Old Egyptian but merge into a unitary paradigm in the language of classical literature.

(a) The imperative has a singular sdm/jf=f and a plural sdm(w)f/jf=f with an ending .w/y, mostly indicated only by the plural strokes in the hieroglyphic writing. In Old Egyptian, the weak classes display a j-prefix. The imperative had a stressed *i between the prefinal and the final radical: *cv(c)cic, “ja.cic: shdp “jashhip/ pacify” > Late Middle Egyptian <shtep>, jnj=f “fetch!” > Old Coptic <dadj, jdd=f “say!” > dadj, and probably an opposition between a masculine -a and a feminine -i form in irregular imperatives consisting of only one consonant followed by a stressed vowel: m “comel,” masc. *(f)(am)=a?/ > amat, fem. *(f)(jm)=a?/ > amat.

(b) The prospective sdm(w)=f/jf=jf=f represents originally the mood of use, used as independent verbal form (Pyr. 1687a hrj=w-k n=ak m wj=f sw n=f “you will go aboard that bark of Re”), as topazalized VP in paradigmatic alternation with the “emphatic” sdm=m=f, especially in the first and third person when indicating events expected to occur (Pyr. 193 Nt zj.w=N pn zj=f “this King N will perish if you perish”), in cleft sentences referring to future events (Pyr. 123d jn bm nft=f-nw=f n=rf=j=s t2 n=N “It is indeed the beautiful one who cares for the King who will give bread to the King”), in other focal environments such as questions (CT V 92f smn.y=j sw jf hr=j “so, to what shall I fasten it?”), in the protasis of conditional sentences after the particle jf, of as object of verbs expressing an expectation, a wish or a desire (Pyr. 1712a23 dd jw=f sfj=m=w jf=f “Horus says that he will glorify his father”). Morphologically,147 it displays the gemination of the stem in 11-gem. roots (msm “he will see” from mss), often a semiconsonantal suffix -w/y in the intrans roots (as in jf=f/jfr=f “he will do” from jf) and in the causative classes with prefix s- (sf=jw=f “he will release” from sf), and a full stem in the anomalous verbs (for example rdf=m=f “he will give” from rdf).

The prospective was probably vocalized *cv(c)cic(jf), as shown by the Greek transcription Epw=s for the demotic anthroponym hrj=w *horjewl, lit. “may-they-be-content” or by the Late Middle Egyptian form <shtep > *horpet/
The modal contingent tense corresponding to the preterit *sqm.t=f* and to the general *sqm.t=f* is the form *sqm.k3=f* "then he will hear," where the particle *k3* is probably connected with the root *k3j* "to think, devise." 155 Pyr.

**Table 4.11 Mood in earlier Egyptian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOOD</th>
<th>RELATION TO THE CO(N)TEXT</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE/INITIAL</th>
<th>RELATIVE/ NON-INITIAL</th>
<th>CONTINGENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WISH (OPTATIVE)</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td><em>sqm.t=f</em></td>
<td><em>sqm.t=f</em></td>
<td><em>sqm.k3=f</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMAND (JUSSIVE)</td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td><em>sqm.t=f</em></td>
<td><em>sqm.t=f</em></td>
<td><em>sqm.k3=f</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.6 The verb**

The verbal category of "voice" defines the role of the syntactic subject in the predication conveyed by the VP. 157 In the unmarked voice (active), the subject is the highest argument of the verbal predication on the agentivity scale, 158 i.e. the AGENT in the case of transitive verbs (Urk. I 104,9 *jaf.j-1a=f* "*his majesty* praised me for more than for anything else"). In the middle voice, the agentive role, although semantically present in the underlying proposition, is not overtly conveyed by the syntactic structure of the sentence: the subject of the verbal form, therefore, indicates the PATIENT (with first-order entities) or the GOAL (with places) of the verbal predication (Urk. I 124,15 *hj;j.t=1a=f* "*his majesty* praised me for more than for anything else"). In the passive voice, the role of AGENT or of CAUSE is introduced by the preposition *jn* (Sh.S. 39-41 "*then I was brought to the island by a wave of the sea*"). We saw in section 4.4.1 that this morpheme may have an ergative origin, since it is also used to indicate the focal subject of cleft sentences (section 4.4). In this respect, Egyptian occupies an intermediate position between a "nominative-accusative" and an
"ergative-absolutive" coding: while subjects of finite suffix conjugation forms behave according to the former pattern, with an identical coding for both transitive and intransitive verbs \( (sgm.w) f \) "he hears" and \( pji.w f \) "he comes"), the syntax of infinitives and of adjectival sentences displays "absolutive" features: pronominal subjects are coded exactly like direct objects of transitive verbs (infinitive transitive \( sdm.f \) "hearing him" vs. intransitive \( pji.tw f \) "his coming," transitive verbal phrase \( sdm.f sj \) "he hears her" vs. adjectival sentence \( nfr sj \) "the is good"); moreover, logical subjects of transitive infinitives, focal subjects of cleft sentences, and overt agents of passive predicates are all introduced ergatively by \( jn \) (Siut I,68 gmj.tw \( jn \) bm=\( f \) "finding him by His Majesty"; \( jn ngr mrj.m.w \) "\( it \) is god who loves people"; \( jw \) mrj.w \( rmj.w \) \( jn \) ngr "people were loved by god").160

Middle and passive (henceforth for convenience just "passive") voice is conveyed either by synthetic stems (for example \( mrj.w=\( f \) "he will be heard"), or by means of an infix \( .tj > .tw \) between the stem (example the temporal markers) and the nominal or pronominal subject (for example \( mrj.tw=\( f / \rmr.tw \) mrj "he/the man is heard").

(a) The synthetic expression of the passive is conveyed in earlier Egyptian by several forms: the \( stative \) and the \( perfect \ passive \) \( sdm.(w)=\( f \) as passive equivalents of the non-initial \( sdm.n=\( f \), the \( perfective \) \( sdm.tw=f/jjr.tw=f \) as counterparts of the active form \( sdm.tw=f \), and the \( prospective \ passive \) \( sdmn.jjtw=f/jjr.tw=f \) corresponding to the prospective active form \( sdm.(w)=\( fjjr.w=\( f \). On the theoretical level, the passive function of verbal forms conveying the perfective or prospective aspect is predictable, since they semantically "entail," as it were, a passive feature: on the one side, perfect(ive) and prospective, unlike imperfective forms, both localize an event outside a reference frame, the event preceding the reference frame in the former, and following it in the latter; on the other side, the passive, privileging the patient or the goal over the agent of a verbal predicate, is bound to convey the completeness of an action, shown cross-linguistically by the connections between perfective and prospective aspect on the one hand and passive voice on the other.161

In Old Egyptian, the perfect passive \( sdm.(w)=\( f \) is used as independent VP with dynamic verbs (Pyr. 942a jmj.(w) \( n-k \) bs.w p dmj \( n-k \) bs.w \( nbn \) "the souls of Buto have been brought to you, the souls of Hierakonpolis have been united to you"), whereas the middle or passive stative is introduced by a topicalized subject and is preferred for the expression of a state (Pyr. 1405a1 \( os qis(w) \) br mw.t \( jn \) \( .w=jn \) tjt "the earth has become high under Nut by virtue of your arms, Tefnut"). In Middle Egyptian, the use of a main VP not introduced by a particle or by the topic of the utterance is restricted to modal uses, and the difference between perfect passive \( sdm.(w)=\( f \) and stative becomes grammatical: the pseudoverbal stative is used with pronominal subjects, the verbal passive \( sdm.(w)=\( f \) with nominal subjects162 – an exception being the first person, whose high position on the hierarchy of topicality allows the use of a perfect passive \( sdm.(w)=\( f \) (CG 20518 a,1 mty-\( f \) mn tpz-p 1 \( n(j) \) z3-\( t \) \( w \) N "I was born in the first year of the Son-of-Re the King").

(b) Aspectual and modal forms which do not semantically entail a passive feature, namely the initial \( sdm.n=\( f \), the \( sdm.w=\( f \), the subjunctive, and the contingent tenses, form their passive counterparts by means of the perfective infix \( *t > .tj \) (in Old Egyptian) \( > .tw \) (in the classical language): (1) \( sdm.n.tw=f \) "he was heard," which is always used as topicalized VP, the passive \( sdm.(w)=\( f \) functioning as its complementary form in non-topical positions (Louvre C 286,18 gmj.tw \( tw \) brw \( hrw=f \) m\( s \)w rdj.w n=\( f \) jn.t \( n.t \) \( "Sj=\( f \) "Horus was found justified and his father's office was bequeathed to him"),163 (2) the form \( sdm.tw=f \) "he is heard" corresponding to the various active patterns (topicalized Urk. IV 19,6 ddg.tw=f \( jn \) t\( r \) \( w \) \( \( wbn=\( f \) "he is looked at like Re when he rises," circumstantial Sin. B 52 \( nm \) \( tw \) \( m\( s \)t.\( w =f \) \( "there is no one like him when he is seen," subjunctive Pyr. 1161b-\( s \) \( ndj-tj=f \) "he shall be greeted"), (3) the contingent tenses \( sdm.jn.tw=f \), \( sdm.br.tw=f \), \( sdm.kz.tw=f \).

In table 4.12, for the sake of an immediate identification of the morphological patterns involved, the forms from irregular verbal classes have been added in certain cases. It should be remembered (see table 4.11) that the opposition between prospective passive \( sdmn.jjtw=f \) and subjunctive passive \( sdm.jjtw=jj: dd.tj=f \), originally one of modality (wish vs. command), is dictated in Middle Egyptian by the syntactic position of the form within the sentence (initial vs. dependent), with a noticeable tendency for prospective passive forms to appear limited to archaic uses in religious texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENSE</th>
<th>ASPECT/MOOD</th>
<th>RELATION TO THE CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABSOLUTE/INITIAL</td>
<td>RELATIVE/INITIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>PERFECT</td>
<td>( sdm.n.jj=f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERFECTIVE</td>
<td>( *sgm.tw=jjr.tw=f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>UNMARKED</td>
<td>( jj.jj=f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE</td>
<td>WISH</td>
<td>( sdmn.jjtw=( f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMAND</td>
<td>( sdm.jn.jj: dd.tj )=( f )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6.3.4 Relative forms. A feature of Egyptian verbal morphology is the presence of synthetic adjectival forms of the verb, called "relative forms," which are used as predicate of a restrictive relative clause whose subject is different from the antecedent: rmjt mrjw=f "the man whom he loves." For relative forms of the verbs to be used, the antecedent must be specific; it is resumed in the relative clause by a resumptive morpheme.

Earlier Egyptian exhibits at least three relative forms: perfective jjir.t=f "which he made" for the past (fem. jjir.tn=f, pl. jjir.wn=f), aorist irsr=f "which he makes" for the general present (jrr.tw=f, jrr.ww=f), prospective jjirw=f "which he will make" for the future, also sometimes used as aorist: "which he would make" (jjir.jf, jjir.w=f). In addition, Old Egyptian may have possessed a relative equivalent of the indicative sdm=f for the preterite, usually referred to in the literature as "perfective relative sdm=f," again a general label which comprises both indicative and prospective base. Alternatively, one can interpret the preterit uses as examples of the prospective form in its "perfective" function.

The main morphosyntactic feature of the relative forms is their agreement in gender and number with the antecedent. The agreement is shown by the affixation of the nominal endings (masculine *s or *w in the weak classes, fem. *t, pl. *w) to the verbal stem: CVT 321c-d mbj.t n.t wn jfrw nfn=f "the balance of Re in which he weighs Truth." Verbal classes which show a *s-prefix in the Old Egyptian "emphatic" sdm=f (section 4.6.3.1b) display the same feature in the aorist relative form: Pyr. 628e jfr hr nj N hrf=f "one on whom the King's face falls," lit. "he-who-falls the face of the King on-him."

A morphological relation between relative forms and passive participles is often assumed, and in fact relative forms appear to be distinct from their indicative equivalents: (a) the vocalic pattern of the temporal affix of the relative sdm=f may have been *nu, rather than *na ("didnak "which you said" vs. *didnak "you said"); (b) the relative aorist, jrr=f, which corresponds to the emphatic sdm=f, may have had a pattern *mararuf rather than *mararaf; (c) the Late Middle Eg. prospective-relative sdm=f shows a vocalic pattern reminiscent of the relative sdm=f. *dasif, sada3naf, *jar3naf.170

4.6.4 Non-finite verbal forms

Non-finite verbal forms, i.e. verbal formations which do not convey the overt expression of their subject, are morphosyntactically treated as nouns derived from a verbal root. They can indicate: (a) agents or patients of a verbal action, in which case they are "participles" or nomina agentis; (b) the action evoked by the verbal root itself, usually referred to as "infinitive" or nomina actionis.

(a) The formation of participles in earlier Egyptian shows connections with Semitic.171 There are two main participles, usually called "perfective" and "imperfective," for each of the two verbal voices; being [+N], participles display the feminine and plural agreement with the antecedent: sdm "someone who hears," feminine sdm.t, plural sdm.w. Participal patterns, especially in the passive voice, show a considerable degree of morphological similarity to the corresponding relative forms, which are — at least in part — etymologically derived from them. From a syntactic point of view, participles represent the counterpart of relative forms (section 4.6.3.4) when the subject of the relative clause is coreferential with the antecedent, the perfective participle corresponding to the relative form: Sin. B 126 nfr hm snf.t=f "a god who ignores (participle) what he has ordained (relative form)," the imperfective participles corresponding to the aorist relative form: Louvre C 1.4 jfr hazz.t-sn "one who does (participle) what they praise (relative form)."

Partitive participles indicate the action viewed as a whole and are often found in reference to singular nouns (for example the passive mjwl jfr=f "beloved of his father"). The patterns for the active form are: 2-rad. and II-gem. *cic, fem. *caccat: mn */min "stable" > Mej-.173 II-gem. also *cacc: wn */wan "being" > ffr.174 3-rad. and transitive III-inf. *cacc, fem. *caccat < *cacc-aio: nfr */na:fir/ "beautiful" > mhpk, faj.t */fajat/ "carrying" > ffr/tj (3.6.3) > voc "canal," lit. "that which carries (water)." 175 4-rad. and IV-inf. *caccic, fem. *caccicat. Their passives are: geminated 2-rad. *cjcjv3w:f, gjddw "said," otherwise *cacciwj > *caccat: 3-rad. sjddw */sdjdw/ "told" > */bdjje/ > /bdjje/ "gossip"; III-inf. h3jw */h3jw/ "praised" > */h3jje/ > gaca. 176 They are either *caccat/ *caccicat (< *caccat-act) or *caccicat: msjg.f */msjg/ "hated" > */msatw/dw/ > mctn.

Imperfective participles imply a notion of repetition and often refer to plural nouns (for example the passive mjw njw=f "beloved of the gods"). Since none of them has survived through Coptic, the vocalic patterns are difficult to establish: active sdm/jfrf "who is hearing/doing," passive sdm(jf)jrw "who is being/heard-done": Khakhperre'seneb vo 2-3 dd ht m gjdw n+t hr "one who would give orders (active participle dd from rjy "to give," lit. "a giver of orders") has become one to whom orders are given (passive participle gjdw, lit. "one given to-him orders," section 7.7).
participles from 2-rad. and some weak classes are preceded by the j-prefix: j+j. 178

While earliest Egyptian had a prospective participle sdm/tjy, feminine sdm/tjy, tjy, 179 this form becomes obsolete in the classical language. The future participle is conveyed by an inflected form with infix .tj is of general use: masc. sdm/tj=f, fem. sdm/tj=s, pl. sdm/tj=sn "he/she/those who will hear." This form is frequently labelled "verbal adjective" and often appears followed by an additional <j> in the singular forms (sdm/tj=j, sdm/tj=s). Its morphological origin is controversial: it may represent either the conjugated form of a nisba adjective of the type ksw,tj "worker" from kst.t "work," or a nominalized prospective form specialized in the participial use. In fact, both its morphology and its function display prospective features, for example the rare writing of a glide .w in the 2-rad. and III-inf. verbs (Siut 3,1 bdw.tj=sn "who will sail downstream") or the sporadic use with passive function (Siut 1,314 zft.tj=f "which will be slaughtered").

(b) The Egyptian infinitive, which is the basic nomen actionis of the verbal root, is neutral in respect to tense, aspect, and voice: it generally implies the unmarked tense and the active voice, but it can also be found with preterital patterns and is neutral in respect to tense, aspect, and voice: it generally implies the

Table 4.13 Participles in earlier Egyptian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECT AND VOICE</th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>PASSIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERFECTIVE</td>
<td>2-rad. mn *min/ *stable</td>
<td>g×d×w/ *yvδνδνwf/ &quot;said&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II-gem. wn *wan/ *being</td>
<td>b×w/ *mīnwf/ &quot;been&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-rad. sdm *masjimi/ *hearing</td>
<td>sρ/ *τασαπ/ &quot;chosen&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III-inf. pj *pisaj/ *come</td>
<td>mjuw/ *mṣja/jw/ &quot;beloved&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERFECTIVE</td>
<td>2-rad. mn</td>
<td>gdw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II-gem. wma</td>
<td>hsw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-rad. sdm</td>
<td>sρ(w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III-inf. prr</td>
<td>msw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSPECTIVE</td>
<td>sdm/tj=f/jrw.tj=f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 The verb

4.6.5 Negative verbal forms

Negative constructions with the particles nj (Late Egyptian bwr > Coptic 4π) and mn (Late Egyptian bwr > Coptic R-1) will be treated in the chapters devoted to the syntax of the sentence types. Here I would only like to discuss a peculiarity of the Egyptian negative system, i.e. the presence of verbs which convey in their semantics the feature [+NEGATIVE]. These are called "negative verbs." The most common negative verb is the 2-rad. tm, originally "to complete" (see Semitic *tmm), which acquires the conjugated form of the corresponding positive pattern and is used for the negation:
(a) of all nominal or nominalized verbal forms, such as participles (m sdm.w "someone who does not hear" vs. sdm. a hearer"); tm nfr "that was not said" vs. gdd. "that was said"), infinitives (CT II 131 d tm q r rmm.t nfr "Not to enter the god's place of execution"), and relative forms (Louvre C 15 nn s.t nb.t tm.t-jn.f jw.f mn.w jn.f-s "there is no place at all in which I failed to build monuments" vs. jw.f-t-n.f mn.w jn.f-s "in which I built monuments").

(b) of verbal forms in syntactic dependency: topicalized "emphatic" sdm-f (Peas. B1,211 tnm-k tm sdm.w hr-m "why don't you listen!"); positive sdm-k hr-m, West. 11, 11-22 tm.tw mnj.f hr.m hr-m "why aren't you brought!"; positive jrn.f tw mnj.f hr-m), also used in object clauses (Merikare E 53 rj.n-k tns=sn sdm.w "you know that they are not clement"); the subjunctive sdm-f (Pyr. 675b jtm-k sdm.w n-f sdm-k sb.w-f jn.f tj.k-f "should you fail to listen to him, you shall hear his sb.t which is on your head"); the protasis of a hypothetical clause (Pyr. 277b jr tnm-k jw.s sb.j ksb.n sb.w-f tnm.f-t-jn.f jrj.k-f sb.f "if you don't make a place for the King, the King will make a sb.t on his father Geb"); the circumstantial use of modal forms (Peas. B1,244-45 m khs bft wsr-k tm spr.w bw-dw r k-f "do not except when you exercise power, lest trouble befall you"); and VP introduced by conjunctions (Sisit 1,229 sgr qjy.f hrw t tm.f md.w-f "to silence the vociferous, that he may cease to speak").

Other negative verbs followed by the negativical complement are the III-inf. jn.f "not to do," used in the imperative m and in the subjunctive jn.f to express a negative command (Sh.S. 111 m snj.f-w "do not fear!"); Peas. B1,162 jn.f thumb "you should not go astray!"), and the 2-rad. bm-f "not to be able to," whose participle appears mostly in nominal compounds (jbrn.w-skj.w "those which cannot perish," i.e. the Circumpolar Stars). Especially in the Old Kingdom, the substantivized participle of other verbs, the most important of which is nfr "to be complete," is used in grammaticalized negative patterns: nfr n X 3 "it is complete to X" 4 "it doesn't happen that X," nfr pw X 3 "X is complete" 4 "there is no X." 183

4.6.6 Verbal morphology in later Egyptian

In this paragraph, the reader will find a general description of the historical patterns that govern the development of verbal morphology from earlier to later Egyptian. More detailed information on the functional reorganization within the linguistic system of Late Egyptian and Coptic will be provided in the discussion of verbal syntax. 184

(a) The main evolutive tendency underlying the development of the verbal system is the well-known change from synthetic to analytic patterns of conjugation. Parallel to the loss of final vowels and to the tendency to have prefixes carry the morphological functions formerly signalled by suffixes (sections 4.1, 4.6.1), later Egyptian develops periphrastic verbal forms based on the verb jn.f "to do" (sdm.w-f "he heard") 6 jw.f-sdm, lit. "he did the hearing" > Coptic yw=crw. The inflected form is eventually grammaticalized as a new conjunctival marker and supersedes the old synthetic construction; the infinitive — and gradually the stative as well — become lexical indicators, the nucleus of the predication being represented by the conjunctival base followed by the subject: earlier Egyptian prospective wq.s-f "may he become prosperous" > Coptic ws.o.rw (conjunctival base of the third person masc. Fut. III-Infinitive) "may he be safe"; earlier Egyptian stative jw=s.kw "I am/have become prosperous" > Coptic w.sf (conjunctival base of the first person Pres. I + Stative) "I am whole." This change from synthetic to analytic patterns in the verbal system leads to a progressive move from the earlier VSO toward a SVO word order.

(b) Later Egyptian allows the transformation (or "transposition") of the basic verbal forms into their nominalized and subordinate (adverbialized) counterparts by means of a periphrastic verbal form with jn.f "to do" for the nominalized use and of the participle jw-f "while" — morphologically identical to the Middle Egyptian marker of initiality jw, but used in a new, and in a certain sense opposite function — for the adverbialized use: thus, the earlier Egyptian opposition between the initial jn.f and its non-topicalized counterpart jn.f, rather than by different morphological sdm-f-patterns, is conveyed in later Egyptian by the use of the two distinct forms jn.f-sdm, lit. "(the fact) that he does a hearing" > yeqwetw vs. jw-sdm, lit: "while he is on hearing" or yeqetetw. These formats are eventually grammaticalized as converters, i.e. as free morphemes jn. and jw prefixed to the basic form. Later Egyptian displays a whole set of such converters, for example wn, originally the perfective base of the verb wn "to be," which ascribes to a verbal predicate a perfective value, or the relative pronoun nj, which transforms it into a relative form: for example, the so-called Present I sw hr sdm "he hears" (> Coptic yw=crw, section 4.4.2), the functional heir of the Middle Egyptian construction jw=sdm-f, can be converted into a nominalized jn.f-sdm "that he hears" (> Coptic yw=crw, yeqetetw, the so-called Present II), into an adverbial form jw=sdm "while he hears" (> yeqetetw, yeqetetw), into a preteritual wn-f hr sdm "he was hearing" (> yeqetetw), and as a relative form nj hr sdm "who hears" (> yeqetetw). (c) The later Egyptian verbal system displays so-called "sequential" forms; these are the narrative jw-f hr sdm "and he heard" for a sequence of events in
the past - limited to Late Egyptian - and the conjunctive mtw=f sdm "and he will hear" for a concatenation of expected events - also shared by Demotic and Coptic (Ryεγωτάκ). They are used in non-initial position in order to keep the temporal, aspectual, and modal references of the preceding section of discourse. This evolution is mirrored by a similar development in the verbal system of the Northwest Semitic languages such as Hebrew.

(d) Already in Late Egyptian, and increasingly in the more recent phases of later Egyptian, verbal patterns tend to be organized within a tripartite sequence of conjugation base (often derived from a conjugated form of jwj "to do"), nominal or pronoun subject, and infinitive, and to acquire autonomy as main sentences or dependent clauses: for example, the earlier Egyptian construction with the negative particle nj followed by the past form nj sdm=f "he cannot hear" becomes in later Egyptian the form bw-jw=f-sdm, in which bw is still recognizable as the negative morpheme but is not used productively in the language, being found only in a few bound verbal constructions, and in Coptic Μεγαλώνεται, which is not even any longer segmentable into discrete units, but rather represents a functional equivalent to the morphologically quite positive positive form Μεγαλώνεται "he hears."

This evolution had a profound impact at the typological level, causing Egyptian on the one hand to grammaticalize dependent clauses as paradigmatic units (for example the temporal m-dr jw=f-sdm > Απερευγωτάκ "when he heard" or the conditional Demotic jw=f-bn-sdm > Απερευγωτάκ "if he hears"), on the other hand to move from the fusional nature of its earlier phases (section 4.1) to the polysynthetic type:186 in Coptic, sentence and clause conjugation, often followed by the verbal object, are combined into a single prosodic unit, i.e. into one word: Ps 68,22 ἄδειαλεμετάσωσα (α-υ-τεσ-του-ου-όμης) /fawissowheme/ "they let me drink vinegar" < Late Egyptian "jw=f-dj.t sw=f w'-h announcer, lit. "they did (jw=f) causing (dj.t) that I drink (sw=f) vinegar" < earlier Egyptian (jw) dj.t sn sw=f etc.; Lk 23,35 Απερευγωτάκ (μαρτυρά-του-του) /marτυραιωτάκ/ "let him save himself" < *jw=f-dj.t ws=f-li, lit. "let him do (jw=f) causing (dj.t) that he be safe (ws=f-l)" < earlier Egyptian dji=f ws=f-l "may he cause (dj.t) that he be safe." This change from the fusional to the polysynthetic type represents a major typological evolution in the history of Egyptian and is unparalleled in other families of the Afroasiatic phylum.

4.6.6.1 Tense and aspect. The sdm=f is maintained in Late Egyptian only in formal texts, the productive form for the past being the preterit sdm-(f) (and the typologically more analytic form jw=f-sdm > Coptic Μεγαλώνεται):187 Ucr. VI 133,20 m8=k jrm n3-sb,j w "you have gone with the rebels"; Jn 17,1 ἄδειαλεμετάσωσα et "the hour (το-ουνου) came." Its negative equivalent is bw sdm=f, replaced from the end of Dyn. XIX by bw-pw=f sdm (> bpwp-jr=f-sdm > Απεκαταστάκ), a periphrastic construction derived from the grammaticalization of the verb psw "to have done in the past":188 RĀD 80,2-3 bw jw=f sdm=f t-8n.t: "he didn't bring any of these to the granary"; Jn 1,10 Απερευγωτάκ "the world (p-kosmos) did not recognize him."

The form sdm-t=f, which already in earlier Egyptian was limited to few bound constructions, is found in later Egyptian in the same productive environments, i.e. after the negative particle bw-sdm-t=f "he has (or had) not yet heard" (> bw-jw=f-sdm > Απερευγωτάκ): KRI I 238,14 pbr bw-dj.t ok jn-tw=f "look, you have not yet caused that it be brought"; Jn 2,4 Απερευγωτάκ: "my hour has not yet come," and controlled by the conjunctions r and wa until = t bw-sdm-t=f (for the sequence of cursive, see page 187): pAnastasi IV 3,3 r ph.t=k r jw=f "until you have reached the privilege"; Mt 2,9 εἰς τοὺς ἑως "until he comes."

The sequential jw=f br sdm and its negative counterpart jw=f br tm sdm are used in a narrative chain after an initial preterit form, a syntactic environment in which the classical language used the regular sdm=f in "continuative" function: LRL 32,5-8 jw=f-br t-8n.f jw=f (br) dj.t=s n jw=f (br) γℓ = "I wrote the letter and gave it to X and I said to him". The contingent tense sdm-f in "then he said" is limited in Late Egyptian to the verb γℓ "to say" and to the periphrastic construction with the past converter να.190

In the present tense, the basic paradigm is the Present I sw br sdm/sdm.w (negative form bn sw br sdm/sdm.w), a pseudocollaborative construction in which the subject precedes the predicate, which is either the infinitive governed by the preposition br or the static: pAnastasi IV 3,5-6 n3-nb=jw sdm sbr=bj.t "the Nubians run in front of you"; 2 Cor 5,1 τοῦ προσώπου "we know."191 If the subject is pronominal, the Late Egyptian and Demotic third person dependent pronouns sw and st are replaced in Coptic by the old suffixic pronouns f- and s- under analogical pressure: sw br sdm > Μεγαλώνεται, whereas the new proclitic pronouns built from the particle tij (section 4.4.2) appear in the first and second persons (tw*tj br sdm > Μεγαλώνεται, κοτάται). The Present I is negated by means of the morpheme bn, the heir of the classical mn (sections 4.7, 4.11), which in later Demotic and in Coptic is often reinforced by the adverb jw=f > ΝΔ.192

In addition to the Present I, which is used for the specific indication of the imperfective aspect, later Egyptian possesses a form bn-br=f sdm (> br-jw=f sdm > Μεγαλώνεται), which corresponds morphologically to the contingent present sdm-br=f, but functionally to the construction jw sdm=f of the classical language: it acquires the function of an "aorist," i.e. of a general or gnostic
present: In 8,47 "He who is from God hears and knows what God's words."

The expression of future tense and perspective aspect experiences some changes. While the pattern *jw=f r sdm* becomes grammaticalized as a bound form in Late Egyptian and represents a temporal "objective future" (LRL 20,12 *jw j t*), its Coptic outcome, the so-called future III *e+e=costh*, is no longer an aspectual form, but has invaded the domain of mood, superseding the prospective *sdm=f* (as *amen*, "may it happen"). In the presence of a nominal subject, rather than the

Table 4.14 Tense and aspect in later Egyptian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENSE/ASPECT</th>
<th>POSITIVE FORM</th>
<th>NEGATIVE FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td><em>sdm=f</em> &gt; <em>af=f-sdm</em></td>
<td><em>bw-pw=f-sdm</em> &gt; <em>mpae=f-af=f-sdm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jw=f r sdm</em></td>
<td><em>jw=f r tm sdm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF.</td>
<td>&quot;UNTIL&quot;</td>
<td><em>bw=je</em> &gt; <em>sdm</em> &gt; <em>wnm=f-af=f</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;NOT YET&quot;</td>
<td><em>bw=f r tm sdm</em> &gt; <em>mpae=f-af=f</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>IMPF.</td>
<td><em>bw br sdm</em> &gt; <em>sdm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AORIST</td>
<td><em>bw br sdm</em> &gt; <em>i-f-af=f</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>bw=f r sdm</em> &gt; <em>sdm</em> &gt; <em>cf=f-af=f</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROSP.</td>
<td><em>jw=f r sdm</em> &gt; <em>af=f-af=f</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBJECTIVE &gt; MODAL</td>
<td><em>bw=f r sdm</em> &gt; <em>af=f-af=f</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Late Egyptian imperative is regularly preceded by a *j-* prefix (Coptic *j-*), in the later phases of the language, while the morphological imperative is kept in lexicalized remnants, the jussive function is fulfilled by the infinitive: Late Egyptian *jdd, j.nw* "say, look" > Coptic *n=dd, n=at*, but Late Egyptian *jdm* "hear" > Coptic *costh*.

Connected with the imperative is the Coptic sentence conjugation *as=fcosth*, derived from the paradigmatization of a construction with the imperative of *jst* "to cause to" followed by a periphrastic prospective *sdm=f* > *jw=f-af=f*, lit. "cause that he hear.") This form is used independently or in conjunction with the imperative when the scope of the injunction is a person other than the second: Lk 11,2 *apertostou wunte* "thou will (pe-k-oudh) be done (mare...tdpe)"; Judg 14,15 *apitat *apitoj *apitoj* eph *apertitaj* eph *apertitaj* "deceive (ari-hal "do a deception") your husband, that he may explain (auo ma-re=t-tuo "and may he explain") to you the riddle.

The basic modal form, the prospective *sdm=f* and its nominalized counterpart *jdm=f*, was already in classical Egyptian a suppletive paradigm derived from the merging of the Old Egyptian initial prospective *jst,jw=f* and of the subjunctive *sdm=f* (section 4.6.3.2). However, a major change can be detected in Coptic: here, the prospective *sdm=f* has disappeared and the modal function is delegated to *e+e=costh*, the old "objective future" of Middle and Late Egyptian: for example, Late Egyptian KRI VI 520,10 *hwy twm jmn.r* "may Amun-Re, King of the gods, praise you," but Coptic Mt 19,19 *thibertupi* + *apikrpt* + *apikrpt* "you shall love your neighbor (ek-e-men-er-k-tpheh) like yourself (m=pe-k-rtht)." In its use as main sentence, the prospective *sdm=f* is negated by the form *bn sdm=f* (*cn sdm=f*) and in dependent clauses by the prospective of the verb *tm* (section 4.6.5) followed by the negativ complement or by the infinitive, once the former is reduced to a mere survival in few verbs. Also, the contingent form *ks sdm=f* (*ks sdm=f*) is still found in Late Egyptian, but disappears in the later stages.

A significant change from earlier to later Egyptian is the emergence of a sequential pattern *mtw=f-af=f* > *as=costh*, called "conjunctive," a non-initial form which makes a chain of events dependent on the initial form: Wen. 1,44-45 "Do you not say: Stay one more night," r *dj.t* *wd* *tj-br* *jgm-j* *mtw-k* *jj* to cause the ship that I found to depart, so that you may return?"; Pistis Sophia 121,18 *tehtu t-nw* eph "where is he, that I may see him?"; Jn 1,39 *apn* *nep-t-n* eph "come and see." The conjunctive, therefore, appears to be the modal counterpart to the temporal *jw=f r sdm* (section 4.6.6.1). It's morphological origin lies in an ergative pattern, known from Middle Egyptian, in which the preposition *bn*
"with" is followed by the infinitive and a pronominal or (rarely) nominal subject, reinterpreted as consisting of a morpheme n·- followed by the suffix pronoun: bmt sdm jchhj fja NP > bmt·-m·-ntj fntj NP sdm > mttw·-/mttw·-/mtw NP sdm > taccatÁ, RycatÁ, Rte-NP cattÁ.

While the syntax of these forms will be dealt with extensively in chapter 7, here we need to stress the connections between the Coptic conjunctive and the clause conjugation form (R)tapeycatÁ < dj·j jrm·f sdm "(I will cause) that he may hear." We just saw that the morphological evolution of the conjunctive led to a form taqatÁ in the first person singular. In later Demotic and in Coptic, however, the formant ta· < dj·j: "I will cause" is grammaticalized in another construction, the clause conjugation (R)tapeycatÁ,202 in which the base ta· is followed by the periphrastic prospective sdm·f form; but the original personal reference appears neutralized, causing the expression to acquire an optative or promissive meaning: "I will cause that he hear" > "(I will cause) may he hear:" Mt 7,7 wntj tappj+f mhpt.p whnte tappj+jscm tappj+jscm nhpt "ask, and it will be given you; seek, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you." Symmetrically to what happens in the case of the sentence conjugation apeycatÁ, which because of its derivation from an imperative form ma· < jmj "let" is excluded from the second person use, the first person origin of the conjugational base ta· < dj·j prevents the form apeycatÁ from being used in the first person; in this case, the promissive future is replaced by the first person conjunctive (R)ta·-catÁ < mttw·-sdm.

Table 4.15 Mood in later Egyptian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOOD</th>
<th>INITIAL FORMS</th>
<th>NON-INITIAL FORMS</th>
<th>CONTINGENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WISH (OPTATIVE)</td>
<td>Prospective sdm·f</td>
<td>1 pers.: mttw·-sdm</td>
<td>k3-sdm·f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Future III epeycatÁ</td>
<td>&gt; (R)tapecatÁ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other persons:</td>
<td>dj·j-jrm·f sdm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; taccatÁ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMAND (JUSSIVE)</td>
<td>2 pers.: j.sdm &gt; catÁ</td>
<td>Conjunctive mttw·-sdm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other persons: jmj jrm·f-sdm</td>
<td>&gt; RycatÁ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.6.3 Voice. In the preceding paragraphs, we observed many cases in which the verbal system of later Egyptian displays verbal patterns consisting of a conjunctival base followed by the subject and the infinitive or the stative, resulting in the latters' tendency to function as lexical indicators rather than as grammatical forms. While this evolution did not affect heavily the morphology of the infinitive, it had a profound impact on the stative, the endings of which gradually became redundant (section 4.4.2): during Dyn. XX, the tw-suffix begins to be applied to the first person forms; in the Third Intermediate Period (tenth-seventh century BCE), only two forms survive, one with a e· (primarily for the third persons) and one with a r-suffix,203 until in Coptic each verbal root displays only one form of the stative: xoce/cos?/ "to be exalted" vs. cnaot "to be established" vs. feminine smntj */samantivj/ "she was established."

Major semantic as well as morphosyntactic changes affect the expression of voice in later Egyptian. While both the simple sdm·f and the infixed sdm.tw·f forms are documented in Late Egyptian, the main innovation in the semantics of passive forms is the grammaticalization of the original perfective infix tw as indefinitive pronoun "one" (French on, German man) and the ensuing tendency to interpret the infixed passive sdm.tw NP "NP was/is/ will be heard" as an active construction with the indefinite pronoun "one heard/hears/will hear NP." In Demotic and Coptic, the indefinite pronoun .tw is superseded by the third person plural pronoun .w.

Late Egyptian keeps the perfective passive sdm·f/jfrj·f (< sdm·f/lj·f·w·f): pAnastasi V 17,7-18,1 gmy mw·-t h·b·w·-m jpt. "their name was found in order to send them on a mission," the topicalized past passive sdm.tw·f as the heir of the earlier Egyptian sdm·f/sdm·w·f form: KRI IV 80,12 jf.s.tw·f n pJj·f bnt-nr "it is for his priest that it was stolen," the passive of the sdm·f form, documented only in the negative construction bwn smntj NP: KRI II 911,9 bw jny·t nJj·f·w·f bwt "their answer has not yet been brought," the nominalized prospective passive (j.)sdm.tw·f: pAnastasi II 6,1 jdd.tw n·k sjt n ts nb jw·-k hip·t·j m "the plan of the entire land will be reported to you when you rest in your palace," and the subjunctive passive sdm.tw·f: Florence 2616,10 (Khonsuemhab) dj·j jry·tw·f n·k "I shall cause that it be done for you."204 Within the synchronic perspective of Late Egyptian, as we saw above, one also needs to posit a form sdm.tw NP belonging to the paradigm of the preterital sdm·f (section 4.6.6.1), in which the passive infix .tw is grammaticalized as indefinite subject pronoun tw "one": KRI VI 695,7 jn.tw NP nj m wsf "one brought NP who was idle."
In Demotic and Coptic, the indefinite pronoun *twj has been replaced by constructions with the third person plural pronoun, for example in the prospective *sdm-t: Onchsh. 4.10-11 *mj *jn.w =ntj *w'-gst jrm *w'-dm* "let a palette and a papyrus roll be brought to me," lit. "that they bring to me," or in the preterital *ntj: Lk 1,13 *wjt-kntj *ntj-*nk-*wntj "your prayer has been heard," lit. "they heard your prayer." However, when the passive predication conveys an overt agent expression, this is rendered by a prepositional phrase with Demotic *m-dr > Coptic *grfrlt-*kntjtwj, lit. "through the hand of". pRyl. IX 5,1 *hwj-w stj prjsj *wj - *m-dr *ntj *nsj-w'b:w "my house has been set in fire — By whom? By these priests" (preterital *sdm-f). 1 Cor 14,24 ce-*wE-*kntjtwj *grfrlt-*kntjtwj nia "he will be blamed by everyone" (Future I). This means that the passive form, in spite of its formal identity with the third person plural, always maintained a distinct paradigmatic autonomy: the semantic structure of a sentence with a third person plural subject was different depending on whether it belonged to the active or to the passive paradigm: in the former case, the overt subject was introduced by the particle *frjw,206 in the latter by a prepositional phrase with *grfrlt: Mt 2,16 *frjw twj *frjw *frjw *frjw "he was ridiculed by the magicians" (passive) vs. *frjwtwj *frjw *frjw *frjw "the magicians ridiculed him" (active).

4.6.6.4 Relative forms. In later Egyptian, synthetic relative forms tend to disappear and to be replaced by analytic constructions with the relative pronoun *twj > *twj-, etc.-, *frj-. The only survivals of synthetic relative forms in Late Egyptian207 are the relative perfective *sdm-n-f and imperfective *jrs-f as archaisms inherited from the classical language, and the relative past *jsdm-t, which — like its earlier Egyptian ancestor (section 4.6.3.4) — can only modify a specific antecedent, determined by a qualifier, a quantifier, or a determinative pronoun: Doomed Prince 6,13-14 *wn- *jpw *wwp.tj *br *smj *br *smj < *md-t > *ntj *jds-n prjsj *twj "then the messenger went to report everything she had said to her father," Two Brothers 1,10 *ntj *sdm *p3-*jds-nb *ntj "and he would hear everything they said."

Otherwise in Late Egyptian, and regularly in Demotic and Coptic, relative forms are rendered analytically by means of the relative converter *twj, which converts a main predication into a relative clause: Lk 15,6 *ntj-*epochs *ntj-*epochs *ntj-*epochs *ntj-*epochs *ntj-*epochs *ntj-*epochs *ntj-*epochs "my sheep that had gone astray."208

4.6.6.5 Non-finite verbal forms. Participles, as adjectival forms of the verb (section 4.6.4), show evolutionary patterns that are predictably similar to those of the relative forms: except for a few archaizing instances of the imperfective participle, the only forms in productive use in later Egyptian are the perfective active and passive simple *jsdm and periphrastic *jrs- *jrsdm, a remnant of which survives until Coptic *grfrlt-*jrs-*jrsdm "he who did."209 As a rule, participles are superseded in later Egyptian by verbal or pseudoverbal patterns with the relative converter *twj, the only trace of synthetic participles in Coptic being the so-called "conjunct participle" in construct states: *ntj-*epochs "pious" < *ntj *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs "who loves God."

In the *nomina actionis, the negatival complement has disappeared from later Egyptian and survives only in the negative imperative of *jig "to do": *jig *jm *jm < *jm *jm > *jm < *jm *jm > *jm *jm > *jm *jm > *jm "he who did." As for the infinitives,210 the main changes from earlier to later Egyptian are phonetic: in general, they are motivated by the different forms of the infinitive in periphrastic patterns, depending on whether it was used absolutely or followed by a noun or a pronoun. This is very evident in the III-inf. verbs which, in the phonological reorganization caused in later Egyptian by a strong tonic stress (section 3.5.3), lost the ending that in the absolute state (*ntj "to be love" > Late Egyptian *ntj *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs "to love") — Late Egyptian *ntj *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs > Coptic *ntj, *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs > Coptic *ntj, *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs in non-sonorant environments, such as in the nominal state, where the infinitive is followed by a noun, i.e. inevitably by a consonantal phoneme (*ntj), but maintained it in a sonorant environment, for example when it was followed by the short vowel of the suffix pronoun (*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs "to love") > *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs "to love them" > Late Egyptian *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs "to love them" > Late Egyptian *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs "to love them" > Late Egyptian *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs "to love them" > Late Egyptian *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs "to love them" > Late Egyptian *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs "to love them". The Late Egyptian marker *jtw, which was originally the graphic signal of this permanence of *jtw in the pronunciation before suffix pronouns, soon came to be perceived as an autonomous morpheme and was also sporadically applied to forms where it was not justified at the etymological level, such as in the infinitive of strong verbal classes (*jtw "to be numerous") > *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs, or introducing the object pronouns of the new type (*jtw, *jtw, *jtw, etc.) even when not governed by an infinitive.211 Heirs of this new suffix pronoun are the unusual Coptic suffix pronouns used after consonants and glottal stop: first person *ntj (ka*ntj "to place me" < *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs "to place you") and second person feminine *ntj (ka*ntj "to place you" < *ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs/*ntj-*epochs).

4.7 Prepositions, conjunctions, particles

Earlier Egyptian exhibits a considerable number of prepositions, whose emergence, often from the absolute use of an etymological substantive, was
probably favored by the early decay of the case system in prehistoric times. Prepositions can be followed by a noun or a suffix pronoun, in which case their stem shows a tonic vowel (*a (f(">f* /jarn/*j e> epo "to him"), probably the heir of the Afroasiatic absolutive case (section 4.3.1). They can often function as conjunctions introducing nominalized verbal phrases.

The most important simple prepositions are: m "in, by, with, at," etymologically related to Sem. *b; r (r jr) "toward, more than (comparative)," see Sem. "j; n "to, for," see Sem. *t, "for" (with agent, section 4.4.1), etymologically connected with Arabic 'inna; br "/nati "on, because, through," see Sem. *nt; br "together with," see Ar. 'inda, replaced in later Egyptian by jm, Coptic ΜΑί (< r-jm "at the side of"); br "/kat/ "under"; br, used with the meaning "to, for" in the presence of a difference of status between the two speakers, for example dd br "to speak to a superior or inferior"; hlt "in front of, according to"; mj (m m) "like, as"; dr "since"; br "behind"; br "in front of"; tp "upon" (tp *hpa "head"); br "through"; jmjw "between," from the nisba adjective of the preposition m "which is in." Nisba adjectives are frequently derived from simple prepositions: for example jmjw "which is in," jr "concerning," jrjw "which is in front of." Compound prepositions of nominal or adverbial derivation are also frequent: n-jh-nj "for the sake of" (< "for the heart of"), m-sn-sis "in the back of"; m-brw "in the interior of," wpw-br "except" (< "separated from"), etc. Some of these are used most frequently as conjunctions: n-mrw.t in "in order to" (< "for the love of"), n-s-t.t inasmuch as (< "for the greatness of"), etc.

Besides the use of prepositions to introduce verbal clauses, Egyptian also possesses "true" conjunctions, the most important of which are wnt and nnt before noun clauses as object of verbs, as in English "that." Pre. 1862a-b dd-jn br r wnt-f jj. w m ntr "you shall say to Re that he has come as god." Urk. IV 835,16 rj.kw ntt btp-f br-s "I knew that he would be happy with it." Etymologically, both these conjunctions are nouns: wnt is a feminine derivative from the root wnt "to be"; nnt is the feminine, i.e. neuter form of the relative pronoun nnt, according to a pattern of evolution in Indo-European languages: see Greek οία, Latin quod, English that. Similarly, compound conjunctions built with preposition and nnt (r-nnt "so that," br-nnt "because," dr-nnt "since") introduce adverbial clauses. In later Egyptian, nnt is replaced by r-nd (Coptic ζε), originally derived from the preposition r followed by the infinitive of the verb gd "to say" (lit. "in order to say").

Two other conjunctions introducing verbal or adverbial clauses are jsk/sk (> jst/sk) "while" and jr "as for, if." The former (sk) is used in earlier Egyptian in clauses of circumstance, mostly following the main clause and conveying background information necessary to the understanding of the context: Urk. I 101,2-3 jnk jr(j) m z'h w'tk kw hnt' zsb jy-nnt w'j st j.r-tj m jnt-jn hntj.w-s prw-\$ "I alone put it in writing together only with a senior warden of Nekhen, while my office was Supervisor of the royal tenants." In later Egyptian, it becomes grammaticalized in the new set of personal pronouns used as subject in an adversative sentence: twj, twk, etc. (section 4.4.2). The conjunction jr is also used in the protasis of hypothetical verbal clauses: Pyr. 1252e-d jr pj=r-f m sbs pw jnn.t n(j) j.j t jn n-f sbs pw nj= n(j) j.j "if he comes out of this western gate of heaven, bring him this southern gate of heaven," or introducing topicalized adverbial clauses (section 5.3): Hatnub 22,2 jr m wnt-j m bntj m smr "when I was a child, I was already a Friend," lit. "as for me in my being as a child, I was already a Friend;" 8j.1.2 Kahun 22,8-9 jr m-nt spr=sn kj-tw sgm=tw-f (?) m-bntj jyj "after they arrive, he should be confronted with this," lit. "as for after he arrived, he should be heard as concerns related matters."

As in the case of the relative pronoun (section 4.4.3), earlier Egyptian also possesses a conjunction jwt "that not" as negative counterpart of ntt. This conjunction is semantically equivalent to ntt followed by a negative predicate: CT I 170g-i jw grt sgm=n-nt mdw...jwt mtt=sn nwtt snj "I have indeed heard the word...that I shall not die for them a swift death."

Apart from prepositions and conjunctions, Egyptian exhibits a certain number of morphemes, generally subsumed under the heading "particles," which may be prosodically enclitic or proclitic: the negative particles nj and nn, adverbs (for example nhmn "surely" or smwn "probably"), interjections (j "oh"), and especially conjunction auxiliaries (jw, mk, jr, "'n", etc.). Since the latter behavior bears heavily on the structure of the sentence type, their patterns will be discussed in the treatment of the syntax of verbal sentences.

Further reading
Doret, E. The Narrative Verbal System of Old and Middle Egyptian. Cahiers d'orientalisme XII (Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1986) [Verbal morphology of the stage of the language immediately following the Pyramid Texts].
Nominal syntax

5.1 Introduction

Throughout its history, Egyptian displays a variety of patterns for sentences with nominal predicate. The predicate of such a sentence can be a nominal (NP) or an adjectival phrase (AdjP). For example, “it is a man (NP)” vs. “he is good (AdjP).” At the syntactic level, bipartite patterns consist only of predicate and subject, as in the above sentences, whereas tripartite patterns display a copula as carrier of the nexus (e.g., “Sinuhe is a man”). Finally, considering also the pragmatic dimension, the typology of Egyptian nominal sentences shows a further distinction between unmarked structures, in which third person subjects follow the predicate (e.g., “I am a man,” “you are good”), and marked patterns, which display a generalized preference for the specific subject to occupy the first position in the sentence (e.g., “you are Horus,” “it is god who loves mankind”).

The nominal constructions to which this chapter is devoted are captured in table 5.1. We shall first consider the nominal patterns (section 5.2) and the syntactic structure in which an entire clause is embedded as predicate of a nominal sentence (section 5.3), and then move to the adjectival sentences (section 5.4). We will then devote some attention to the more complex nominal patterns such as possessive, interrogative, and existential sentences (sections 5.5–5.6) and to the impact of negation on nominal patterns (section 5.7). The last few sections will deal with the evolution of all types of nominal sentence in Late Egyptian, Demotic and Coptic (sections 5.8–5.11).

Since the part of speech noun is [+N] but [-V], i.e. it has nominal but not verbal properties, patterns with substantival predicate will be insensitive to the typically verbal tense/aspect dialectics, and will always adjust to the contextual frame of reference, expressing a so-called relative present. The adjective, on the other hand, is [+N] and [+V], i.e. it combines nominal and verbal properties; patterns with adjectival predicate will therefore be able to convey a certain extent temporal or modal references.
Table 5.1 Patterns of nominal sentences in Egyptian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPOLOGY</th>
<th>MORPHOSYNTAX</th>
<th>Predicate = NP</th>
<th>Predicate = AdjP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNMARKED ORDER</td>
<td>CLASSIFYING SENTENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject = 1–2 person</td>
<td>jnk rmj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I am a man&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rmj pw (z3w)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;He (the scribe) is a man&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject = 3 person</td>
<td>QUALIFYING SENTENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jnk nfr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I am good&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKED ORDER</td>
<td>IDENTIFYING SENTENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject = adjectival phrase</td>
<td>rmj pw txy ntf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The one whom he praised is a man&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject = pronoun</td>
<td>SPECIFYING SENTENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nfr hrw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;He is Horus&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject = noun</td>
<td>IDENTIFYING SENTENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nfr htw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;It is he who praised me&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>njm pw htw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Your scribe is Horus&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jnk htw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;He is the man who praised me&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>njm htw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Your scribe is Horus&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jnk htw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;It is the man who praised me&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Bipartite vs. tripartite patterns

5.2.1 Classifying and identifying patterns

The sentence rmj pw "he is a man" represents the core of an Egyptian nominal sentence, with a bare or referential predicate\(^4\) followed in bound constructions directly by a nominal subject:

(1) Pryn. 1434b  
\[\text{wrmj m nj jin.k} "\text{Your father's name} \]  
\[\text{is wrmj"} \]

otherwise by an enclitic pronoun, most commonly the demonstratives pw or less frequently nn (originally "this"),\(^5\) together with the predicate they build a bipartite sentence with classifying function:

(2) CT VI 155f B1Bo  
\[\text{h3m.t pw} "\text{He} \]  
\[\text{is its ruler"} \]

(3) Sin. B 23  
\[\text{dp.t mwi nn} "\text{This} \]  
\[\text{is the taste of death"} \]

As an enclitic, pw tends to move to the position after the first prosodic unit of the sentence, regardless of its position in the semantic structure, even in cases when this leftward movement breaks the surface unity of a phrase.\(^6\)

(4) CT IV 410 (220a)  
\[\text{w3t pw n.t sjt jsw} \]
\[\text{"This is (pw) the way (w3.t) of (n.t "that-of") the Fields of Rushes (sjt jsw)"} \]

(5) Sin. B 81  
\[\text{rs pw nh} "\text{It was} \]  
\[\text{(pw) a good land (rs nh)"} \]

The bipartite nominal sentence consisting of predicate and subject appears expanded into a tripartite pattern when a nominal subject follows the pronoun pw, which in this case loses here its original deictic force and acquires the function of a semantically empty copula ("this [is]" > "is"):\(^7\)

(6) Disp. 38  
\[\text{dnj.t pw jnn.t} "\text{The West is (pw) a place of residence (dnj.t)"} \]

(7) Pryn. 1620a  
\[\text{z3=k pw wjfr N} "\text{"The Osiris N is (pw) your son (z3=k)"} \]

When the subject of a nominal sentence, rather than the delocutive third person, is the interlocutive first or second person, which occupy a higher position than the third person on the hierarchy of salience,\(^9\) the independent pronoun is used instead of the dependent pronoun. This pronoun, however, requires the more topical initial position; thus, in the first and second person, the nominal sentence displays the pattern S \(\rightarrow [\text{Subject pronoun} \] \rightarrow \text{Pred}]:

(8) Peas. B1,93  
\[\text{ntk jin nnhw} "\text{You (ntk) are a father (jin) to the orphan"} \]

(9) CT III 321c  
\[\text{jnk wjfr} "\text{I (jnk) am Osiris (wjfr)"} \]

an example which also displays a version in the "delocutive" third person:

(9') CT IV 192–3b  
\[\text{wjfr pw} "\text{This (pw) is Osiris"} \]

In "presentative" contexts, in which a specific subject is introduced deictically, the function of predicate of a bipartite sentence S \(\rightarrow [\text{Pred-pw}] \) is fulfilled by the independent pronoun:

(10) CT IV 24c  
\[\text{jnk/N pn pw} "\text{That is me! this N"} \]

(11) Sin. B 268  
\[\text{ntf pw m-ns't} "\text{This is really (m-ns't) he (ntf)"} \]

More rarely, a nominal subject can appear topicalized, i.e. dislocated to the left of the nexus "Pred-pw," in which case the subject is presented as the communicatively salient, pragmatically given argument within the flow of discourse,\(^10\) followed by a regular bipartite nominal sentence pattern. In this case, the topic is resumed by the enclitic pw in the main sentence:

(12) Pryn. 133f  
\[\text{hpw 33.wt tsw.tsw pj} \]
\["\text{Thigh and loins - these are (pj, older form of pw) his meal (sw.tsw)"} \]

This pattern is frequent in aetiological, i.e. explicative discourse, where the subject is often topicalized and introduced by the particle jr "as for":

(13) CT IV 318c–d  
\[\text{jr jnw.t-jn.t wjfr nkn.t qrs wjfr pw} \]
\["As for the "Unification of the Two Lands" (jnw.t-jn.t wjfr), this means (pw "it is") the attribution (dnj.t) of Osiris' tomb (qrs wjfr)" \]

In the bipartite or tripartite nominal sentences with interlocutive "jnk/ntk-Pred" or delocutive "Pred-pw" discussed so far, the nominal predicate
classifies the subject, i.e. it defines one or more of its semantic properties. This applies to all cases of pw-sentence in which the subject is a noun or a pronoun. If the subject of a nominal sentence is an adjectival phrase, i.e. a participle or a relative form (section 7.7), it agrees in gender and number with the predicate, the congruence being carried by the appropriate adjectival ending:

(14) CT VI 75g B3Bo N mwy mkmn s dtm t
"The one (fem.) whom the wrongdoers protected (mkmn s dtm t) is this N (N t)"

(15) Peas. B1,21 jmy-rs pw pw sdp y=jk
"But the one (masc.) whom you mention (sdp y=jk) is the High Steward (jmy-rs pw)"

(16) CT IV 228b jnk pw hpr jmn=jn
"I am the one who has become you (hpr jmn=jn, participle)"

(17) CT VII 250m jnk pw npr (w) j=r
"I am the one whom they followed (npr (w) j=r, relative form)"

(18) Pyr. Nt 712 "Who is the one who will survive? jnk pw zjdp j=r
"I am the one who will survive (zjdp j=r, prospective participle)"

Although this pattern is syntactically identical to the classifying nominal sentence with nominal or pronominal subject, its semantic or pragmatic function differs from it to some extent: because of its status as object or relative form, the converted verbal clause. Thus, the structure of this pattern becomes close to that of a relative form (section 7.7).

In the specifying sentence [Subj pronoun-Pred], the subject and the predicate referring to one and the same referent. When the subject is nominal or a pronoun, the independent form of the personal pronouns will be used in all persons, yielding a pattern [Subj pronoun-Pred] formally similar to the nominal, the independent form of the personal pronouns will be used in all persons, yielding a pattern [Subj pronoun-Pred] formally similar to the nominal.

(19) Peas. B1,35 psjt pw jyj mn=f r bhw
"What he did (jyj mn=f) is (pw) to go up (psjt) higher (r bhw)"

(20) Sin. B 236 jwy t pw jyj r bsk jmn
"This servant has indeed been sent for (jyj) is (psjt) to send for (jwy) to come (r)" this servant (bsk jmn "the-servant-there")"

5.2.2 Specifying patterns

In the nominal patterns we discussed so far, the distribution of subject and predicate is readily retrievable on syntactic and semantic grounds: a set of properties which we define as the predicate - "the taste of death" in (3), "Osiris" in (9), "his meal" in (12), "to go up" in (19), etc. - is ascribed to a subject usually more determined and semantically more specific than the features predicated of him ("this," "I," "thigh and loaf," and "what he did"). But there are Egyptian sentences of the type that cannot be convincingly analyzed as S = [Pred (psjt)-Subj], but rather as S = [Subj (psjt)-Pred].

This happens when the subject and the predicate are coextensive: rather than classifying the semantic sphere of the subject, the predicate specifies it; in a technical sense, it exhaustively characterizes its subject:

(21) CT II 120g S1,1 C bpr hps y=f
"My flood (hps y=f) is the Great Flood (hps y=f)"

(22) CT I 277c-d Jbk-p w bhw j'sy jk pw sdy
"Your scribe (sbk-p) is (pw) Horus, your interpreter (j'sy jk) is Seth"

(23) CT V 59c S10,1 C bws y=f pw q r rnm r sn
"My flood (bws y=f) is Seth"

(24) Ibid. B4Bo bws N t q r rnm r sn
"My life this N's abomination is to enter the gods' place of execution"

Similar to these from a structural point of view are instances in which a topicalized VP, i.e. a clause nominalization functioning as pragmatically “given” within the communicative flow of discourse (section 7.5), is the subject of a specifying pw-sentence whose predicate is an infinitive, followed by a suffix pronoun indicating its agent:

(25) CT I 207c-d Jbk-p w bws y=f rs-pd t
"He rejoices when engaging in archery < that-he-rejoices (sbk-p) is (pw) his-engaging-in archery (bsk-p)"

In the specifying sentence [Subj (psjt)-Pred], the subject and the predicate share the same extension: in example (22), the subjects “your scribe” and “your interpreter” are specified by the predicates “Horus” and “Seth,” subject and predicate referring to one and the same referent. When the subject is pronominal, the independent form of the personal pronouns will be used in all persons, yielding a pattern [Subj (psjt)-Pred] formally similar to the one we encountered with classifying predicates in the first and second person:

(26) CT IV 37f Sq2,1 C ns zst sn wnr "He (ns) is Osiris’ son"
the subject wsjr N "the Osiris N" is presented as a predictable host for the predicate wsrk "your son." This is much less the case for the subject ntf "he" in (26): instead of a classifying statement "he is Osiris' son," which would be rendered by the bipartite sentence wsrk wsjr pw, this is a sentence with thematized subject: "he is Osiris' son." Pragmatic salience, i.e. the subject's role as theme of the utterance, and semantic performance, i.e. the predicate's specifying, rather than classifying function, go hand in hand in this pattern, and it would be pointless to determine which one represents the primary strategic goal of the sentence type. The interesting point is that the linguistic hierarchies of salience, with interlocutives being conversationally more salient than delocutives and inanimate subjects, are kept in the distribution of the Egyptian classifying sentence, in which the first or second person is more likely to be topicalized than the third person, as in (28) vs. (28')17 but are neutralized in the specifying sentence, where both nominal (with copula pw) and pronominal subjects (without pw) appear topicalized, as in (29) vs. (29'):

(28) CT 1 44b SqoC swt hwj pej <m> nw.t
(28') Ibid. B130 hwj pej <m> nw.t
"You are (wr) he is (pw) Horus who came out (pw) of the battle"

(29) Pyr. 1441cP Npw wj jm=jn mtr.w
(29') Ibid. 1441cM swt wj jm=jn mtr.w
"N/he is the (only) one (w) among you (jm-tna). O gods (mtr.w)"

Therefore, the opposition between classifying and specifying patterns, which also plays a role in the syntax of adjectival sentences,18 was in Egyptian not only semantic, but also morphosyntactic. Copitic shows two forms which differ in their prosodic realization: the subject pronouns are unstressed when used with classifying or qualifying function: proclitic first and second person sing. *(j)janak > وأن, *(j)jintak > أين, *(j)jintac > أين, pl. *(j)janan > ومن, *(j)jintacan > فيته, and enclitic third person *pww > ن, *w-n, but keep their full prosodic form when functioning as specifying or identifying elements: sing. *(j)janak > ليون, *(j)jintak > اين, *(j)jintac > أين, *(j)jintaf > أين, *(j)jintaw > أين, *pww, *(j)jintas / Late Egyptian *(j)jintaw > أين.19

Focal pronouns provide a transition to the study of the sentence pattern with the focal particle jm, a morpheme which will play a central role in our discussion of adjectival sentences. The first sentence type is an archaic variant of the specifying pattern [Subj-Pred], in which the subject is introduced by the particle jm and functions as pragmatic focus of the utterance:

(30) Pyr. 1370a jm ppp pn z3 smo3 jdt wrt
"It is this Pepi (ppp pn) who is the son of the Great Wild Cow (smo3 jdt wrt)."

Early Middle Egyptian examples of alternation between a pattern with independent pronoun in one text and with a bare nominal subject in a variant seem, if they are not the result of a mechanical change on the part of the scribe,21 to point to the possibility of conveying the indication of focality through suprasegmental features rather than by means of the particle jm:

(31) CT VI 253d SqoC ntf 5t "He is Eternity"
(31') Ibid. SqoC Npw 5t "This N is Eternity"

But this pattern is already extremely rare in early Egyptian and disappears altogether in the classical language. The particle jm remains nonetheless the most common Egyptian marker of the function of a subject NP as focus, being also etymologically entailed in the independent pronouns of the jnk-series.22

Finally, mention should also be made of a specifying presentative pattern corresponding to the classifying jnk pw (section 5.2.1), in which the independent pronoun is the predicate of a first person subject expressed by a coreferential dependent pronoun:

(32) CT VII 495i Npw mj/N mj/jnk mj zp 2
"I am really (zp 2 "twice," section 2.3) this N/N/myself"

or two pronouns appear in immediate juxtaposition, forming a kind of focalized "balanced sentence":23

(33) CT VII 157c jnk pw jm st pw mj 3-pw
"I (jnk) am really it (jm) and it (st) is really me (jm), and vice versa (3-pw)."24

5.3 Entire clauses as predicate of pw: "thetic" statements

We saw above that any NP can act as subject or as predicate of a nominal mpt pw-sentence: not only substantives, but also infinitives and adjectival transpositions of the verb such as participles and relative forms. An interesting peculiarity of Egyptian syntax, however, is that not only nominals, but entire sentences can be nominalized and embedded as predicate of a higher classifying pw-sentence. This is not surprising when the clause acting as predicate of such a sentence is overtly marked as nominal, for example by means of a nominal converter such as the conjunction mpt "that" (originally the neuter of the relative adjective mpt) which merges with the enclitic pw to form nt-pw, the head of this pattern:

(34) pEbers 99,5 nt-pw mtrw=tmj nt-nw jw. z jh.3
"This means (nt-pw) that it speaks out of the liquids of each limb"
This pattern seems semantically to resemble the adverbial clause introduced by the conjunction hr-itt “because”; in fact, example (35) offers the context immediately preceding (34) in the original text:

(35) pbthers 99.4 (hr-itt) m.w.t f n.t f nb.t
“For each of his limbs (‘t=f nb.t) has its liquids (m.t=w=f)”

But complications arise from the use of this construction applied not only to overt, but also to formally unmarked nominalizations of entire verbal or pseudoverbal sentences embedded as predicate of bipartite pw-sentences.25

(a) Verbal sentences:

(36) CT IV 187d wbn=f pw m jst.b p.t
“This means (p.w) that he rises (wbn=f) from the Eastern part (jst.b) of the sky (p.t)”

(37) Sin. B 311 jw=f pw b.st=f r ph.w=f=f
“This is how (p.w) it comes from its beginning to its end.”

(b) Pseudoverbal sentences (i.e. with stative or proposition + infinitive):

(38) Urk. V 53.1–2 wbn sw pw stj i jms.t-pw n gbb
“This means (p.w) that Shu is making (br stj) a testament (jms.t-pw) in favor of Geb”

To define the semantic nature of these clauses properly, I would use the term “thetic”.26 Unlike the more common “categorical” statement, in which a predicate affirms or denies a property of a well-defined and recognized subject, a thetic statement displays no clear-cut internal distribution of subject and predicate; rather, a state of affairs is presented as a whole, usually with a semantically insignificant “dummy” subject, if its presence is required by the morphosyntactic pattern: “there is water,” “it rains,” etc. Thetic sentences are in fact assertions containing one global message, which is not easily segmentable into discrete semantic components:

(39) Peas. R1.1 stj pw wn.w bwn j-st-pw m=f
“(Once upon a time) there was a man named Khueninanup” < lit. “It is that (p.w) a man was (stj wn), Khueninanup (being) his name.”

The thetic nature of these clauses is the reason for their extensive use in medical and in “aetiological” contexts which explain the development of a mythological frame: diagnoses and aetiology present global circumstances as the result of previous statements introduced by categorical sentences:

(40) pbthers 855s “If his heart is flooded, mbb jbt f pw mj nb hr sbs.t k t m=f this means (p.w) that his heart is oblivious (mbb jbt) like (mj) the one who is thinking (hr sb.s) of something else”27

(41) CT IV 412 (162.5a) jnk mjw sw s ntj i jwen nh.w sw i s t=f nh.w mjw sw m ns ntj hr-itt jrs-t f pw n.t mjw
“I am this great cat who is (ntj) in Heliopolis.” This (ntj) is what Re says (dpt w) to his son (r z=f t) Horus. He is cat-like (mjw sw) in this goodness (ns ntij hr-itt) which he does (jrs-t). This is how (nh.w) his name of ‘cat’ (ms.t nj mjw) comes about about (jrs w)”}

Egyptian also displays a similar pattern which has often been associated – by the present writer as well28 – with thetic sentences, but which in fact differs from them syntactically and semantically. Let us consider contrastively examples (41) above and (42) below:

(42) CT II 334b r’w pw dd=m f n hrw

It would be somewhat counterintuitive to argue that this clause, in which a well-defined subject (r’w “Re”) is not only extraposed, but also expanded by the verbal sentence following the pronoun pw (dd=m f n hrw “he said to Horus”), conforms to the characteristic of the thetic statement, which is precisely the inadequacy of a separation between topic and comment as parts of a global judgment on a state of affairs. Yet, since this pattern can hardly be a form of tripartite nominal sentence (which would yield “he-said-to-Horus is Re, syntactically and semantically impossible in Egyptian as much as in English), the sentence r’w dd=m f n hrw must in fact represent the predicate of pw. What we have here is the embedding of a verbal clause with topicalized subject as predicate of a hierarchically higher bipartite pw-sentence. In the case of verbal sentences, which have a VSO typological order, the fronted topic will be resumed by a coreferential pronoun in the main sentence; conversely, in the case of pseudoverbal or adverbial sentences, in which the subject precedes the predicate, there is no need for a resumptive pronoun, the noun followed by pw functioning both as extraposed topic (because of the “break” represented by pw) and as syntactic subject of the sentence. The strategies for the translation of this construction will necessarily differ from case to case, ranging from explanatory devices to the use of actualizers.

(a) Verbal sentences:

(43) CT V 110g dpt t sw aj pr.w=s m qsb.w=s
“It is so that this ship (dpt t pw) is not equipped (aj pr.w=s) with its spars”

S = [[[dpt t ]pr.w=s m qsb.w=s]j.w=s]v.eh=sh]v.sh]j.w=s pr.w]pw [pw]suw

(44) CT II 342b sbh pw jjn+t prw r t m=f jk km
“As for Seth, it happened (sbh pw) that he transformed himself (jjn+t prw) into a black pug (jkh km) against him”

(b) Pseudoverbal sentences (i.e. with stative or proposition + infinitive):

(45) West. 6.4–6 “I asked her: ‘Why don’t you row?’ And she answered: sbh pw mj mtrak t m=f jw hr sw. ‘Because (pw) a jewel of new malachite (mjthk t mjw) fell into the water’ (jpr w hr sw)”

“It is so that this ship (dpt t pw) is not equipped (aj pr.w=s) with its spars”
S = [[[abhij wj mkx.t msf]Ntopic [sw tr w he mw]pseudoeventsNPred [pw]sub] ]

(46) Neferti 57-58
new pw a gi t nrj
"But a king (new pw) will come from the South (t gi t nrj)"

(c) Adverbial sentences:

(47) Prt. 763a-b
"O King N! Let your soul stand among the gods and among the spirits, snf=k pw jr hstj.w=sn that the fear of you (snf=k) be (pw) to their hearts (jr hstj.w=sn)"

While we could take the AdvP "will come from the South" in (46) or "to their hearts" in (47) to be mere adverbial adjuncts of the head noun, the resulting semantic yield ("this is a king who will come from the South," "this is your fear to their hearts") does not properly satisfy the requirements of the contexts, which call for an explanation of the events described in the preceding context rather than for general statements of categorical character.

Since it lies in the nature of this pattern that the noun followed by pw is not only the subject of the nominalized clause, but also the topic of the nominal pw-sentence in which it appears embedded, it is not surprising that the well-known hierarchies of topicality (according to which the first person is a more likely topic than the second, and the second more likely than the third) favor a frequent use of this pattern with first person subjects:

(48) Sh.S. 89-91
jk pw hsoj.kw t hsoj m wpw.t jy
"What happened is that I (jk pw) had set out (hsoj.kw) to the mines on a royal mission"

S = [[[jk]Ntopic [wj]hsoj.kw t hsoj m wpw.t jy]pseudoeventsNPred [pw]sub]

5.4 Sentences with adjectival predicate and cleft sentences

5.4.1 Qualifying patterns

If the general frame of the discussion of nominal sentences with substantival predicate can be directly applied to the study of adjectival sentences, this latter syntactic type displays a number of distinctive features, such as a more extensive use of focalizations and nominalizations of verbal clauses, which justify its treatment under a separate heading. In the unmarked pattern, a nominal subject regularly follows the adjectival predicate:

(49) Sin. B 155
awr prw=k wjg t s-tj
"My house is good, my place of dwelling is large"

The subject can be any part of speech which is also [+N], including infinitives and nominalizations (substantival or adjectival) of verbal phrases:

(50) Sh.S. 182
mk nfr sdm n nmg t
"Look (particle mk), it is good for people (n nmg t) to listen (sdm, infinitive)"

(51) West. 9,22
qan mss-s
"Her delivery (mss-s "that-she-delivers," nominalized VP) was difficult (qsn)"

(52) Sh.S. 124
r-t wj sdd dpt.t-n=f
"How (enclitic particle wj) happy is the one who can relate (sdd, participle) what he experienced (dpt.t-n=f)"

(53) Pt. 629
afr-wj sbw=n wj jyt=f
"How fortunate (nfr) is he whose father instructed him (sbw=n jyt=f) whom his father instructed, relative form as adjectival VP"

The main difference vis-à-vis the vis-à-vis the main sentence lies in the use of the dependent pronoun masculine sw, feminine sj/st, plural sn/st instead of the invariable demonstrative pw to express the pronominal subject. Moreover, since adjectival predicates are not only [+N] but also [+V] - as opposed to substantival patterns, which are [+N] but [-V] - the unmarked form of the predicate is maintained with feminine (sj) or plural subjects (sn, st), without agreement with the subject:

(54) Ens. Loy. 2,10
sbw=wj sw et.wj t jm
"How he illuminates (sbw) the Two Lands (w.w) more than the solar disk (t jm)"

(55) Sin. B 66
b'j sj/sj jm=f t nfr=sn
"It ("the city," fem.) rejoices (b'j) in him (jm=sn) more than in the local god"

(56) Urk. IV 99,15
fr st t hpst m p.t
"They were more splendid (frst) than what happens in heaven (hpst m p.t)"

When the subject is thematized, a frequent construction when the subject is an entire nominal phrase rather than a single noun, the syntactic sequence is reversed to subject-predicate. In this case, however, the pattern acquires the features of the pseudoverbal sentence (section 6.2), the adjectival predicate being expressed not by the adjective, but by the stative, i.e. the conjugated pseudoverbal form of the root of which the adjective represents a pseudoparticle:

(57) Urk. IV 944,1
(bn-nit) jw=swk nj 'nb sdm w m sr t-wj
"Because your breath of life (jw=swk nj 'nb) is sweet (sdm w) in my nostril (m sr t-wj)"

(58) Pt. 20-21
jst jsw n nrg hhn(w) m b.t nbt
"What old age does (jst jsw n nrg hhn(w) m b.t nbt) to people is bad (hnn w) in every respect"
or the relative form (60), which in Middle Egyptian also fulfills the function of "neuter," i.e. of a semantically unspecified noun:

(59) CT VI 286a _wd t wsj pw "This is what is ordered (wd t) to you (wsj)"

(60) B.1, 77 _mk jtr-tnw pw "Look (mk), this is what they do (jtr-tnw)"

Rather than as exceptions to the rule, therefore, instances of an adjectival predicate followed by a pronominal subject _pw should be analyzed as substantivized uses of the adjective:

(61) R.7.4 _has pw nj wsj jw pw "It was a narrow one (has, scil. "path"), not a broad one (wsj)"[30]

Interlocutory subjects generally behave as in the nominal pattern. The tendency of the first person is to be expressed by the independent pronoun:

(62) CT VI 335b _jk jf yrw m _fj w "I am someone who turned (jf yrw "who made a transformation") into _fj-spirits"

but whereas in the second person the use oscillates between a pattern with independent pronoun _S = _[Pronoun-Pred] and a pattern with dependent pronouns _S = _[Pred-pronoun], the former being syntactically a main clause, the latter a subordinate clause:

(63) Sin. R 55 _nfr jw bn _njw "For you (jw) are happy with me (bn _njw)"

(64) CT VII 22n _jtr yr jmj _mjw "You are the greatest one among the children"

The tripartite pattern corresponding to the tripartite nominal sentence is also documented, though not as much as with substantival predicates, and only in exclamatory sentences with the particle _wj:

(65) Urk. IV 1166, 10 _wd _wjr _tn _njw _mpy _wjr _tn _ahrk "How bright are they (njw) - the (njw) years (mpy) which God has granted (wd _ahrk) you!"

Examples of adjectival sentences with extraposed topilized subject resumed by a coreferential pronoun in the body of the sentence are also rare:

(66) Pt. 25 _mpy njw _mpy _s _sj "You are the same one (mpy njw) as it (s) is lost (sj)"

5.4.2 Identifying (cleft) sentences

If qualifying adjectival patterns, therefore, can be said on the whole to closely resemble qualifying nominal sentences, some structural differences emerge when turning to the typologically marked types, which in Egyptological literature are usually subsumed under the headings "participial statement" and "cleft sentence."[32] We already observed that the combination of the two main features [+N] and [+V] characterizes in Egyptian a certain number of morphosyntactic structures: (a) infinitives, (b) topicalized VPs, (c) participles, (d) relative forms. While infinitives represent verbal substantives, what Arabic grammarians call the _masdar of a verbal root, and thematized VPs can be generally said to acquire substantive-like _masdariyya functions within the verbal clauses in which they appear, participles and relative clauses are adjectival nominalizations of a verbal sentence (section 7.7). In fact, "pure" adjectives, i.e. qualificative nouns not derived from a verbal root, are relatively rare in all Afroasiatic languages, and Egyptian is no exception to this rule. Thus, the most frequent morphosyntactic structures acting as adjectival predicates will be the participle and the relative form, the former being coreferential with the noun they modify, the latter representing the adjectival conversion of a VP whose subject is different from the antecedent. We will observe in section 7.7 that in all cases other than as object of the relative form, the antecedent of an adjectival phrase is resumed by a coreferential pronoun in the relative clause. The distinction between participles and relative forms, however, is morphologically fluid and is justified only on the basis of syntactic considerations:

(67) CT III 351c _jk _mry _jyt _mrw _jyt _wrt _yjw "I am someone beloved of his father (mry _jyt _mrw _jyt _wrt) and whom his father loves (mrw _jyt _wrt), imperfective passive participle) and"
the adjectival predicate. When it is a pronoun, the independent series—which in its classical form etymologically "entails" the particle *jn*—is used:

(69) Sin. B 308 *jn bм=k иj jy(w)w* 
"It is Your Majesty (jn bм=k) who caused (ыj) that it be done (jy(w)w)"

(70) Pet. 51.116–17 *atf dd n=f st*
"It was he (atf) who would give (dd) it (at) to him (n=f)"

In restricted cases,33 the independent pronoun is followed by the enclitic *pw*, thus creating not only a semantic, but also a formal identity with the identifying pseudocleft sentence (section 5.2):

(71) Pet. 51.51–52 *jnк pw mdw n=k "I am the one who speaks (mdw) to you"

The marker of focality can be omitted when the focalized subject is a personal name of high contextual prominence, such as the name of the owner or a funerary text or of the author of a letter:34

(72) CT VII 464a–b *сdт ткв jn jn.k N psjfn jn N ps sgr mw "It is [subj.] that pacifies the water"

Following the seminal work by Polotsky,35 this construction has been labeled by Egyptologists "cleft sentence" on the basis of its similarities with constructions of the pattern *c'est ... qui* in French or *it is ... who* in English. In fact, its "cleft" character, i.e. the relative autonomy of the second part of the sentence vis-a-vis the first, shown for example by the lack of gender and number agreement between the subject and the cleft predicate, appears in Egyptian to result from a diachronic development: while in early Egyptian the adjectival predicate sometimes still agrees in gender and number with the nominal antecedent:

(73) CT VI 258e Sqj.C *nš nš jy ть w=q=j "It is the (мк) who took (ть) his breath" in the classical language the unmarked form of the adjective is regularly employed, pointing to a phenomenon of progressive grammaticalization of the clefting with the resulting "break" between focalized subject and presuppositional predicate:

(74) Adm. 12.14 *jn tš.t smš rш.t "It is the majority (тš.t) that kills (smš) the minority"

(75) pEbers 100.8–9 *nš nš dd n=s mw "It is they (nš) that give (dd) water to it"

The pragmatic function of the subject as focus, i.e. as promoted element dominating the communicative salience of a demoted predicate, is particularly evident in the use of the *jn*-construction in contrastive contexts such as in questions (complective focus):

(76) West. 9.7–8 "His Majesty asked: 'Who then will bring it to me?' And Djedi answered: *jn wš яs pt brд w 3 njy i bš иn t (t šrd) jy(w)jy(w) n=k njy "The eldest (wš) of the three children (njy i bš) who are in Rudjedjet's womb will bring (jy(w)jy(w) n=k)"

or in order to correct an earlier contextual assumption (replacing focus):

(77) CT VII 464a–b "I did not order that they perpetrate evil. *jn ёn.w sm hš dd t.n=s j nj (dd t.n=s j)"

In the cleft sentence, which is originally an ergative construction (section 4.6.3.3), the use of relative forms or of passive participles, i.e. of adjectival conversions of the verb with a different agent from the antecedent, is not documented.36 This restriction is due to the universal semantic hierarchy of salience whereby the subject is by far the most likely argument to be exposed to pragmatic promotion, i.e. to be topicalized or focalized.37 In transitive verbal phrases, therefore, agents will be much more likely than patients or other arguments to become the focus of the utterance. The reader will recall that when the element assigned pragmatic focus is the patient (or less frequently any other argument), rather than the cleft sentence, Egyptian displays the pseudocleft pattern "Pred-pw-Subj" discussed in section 5.2. The most widespread of these constructions is the periphrastic *sqm pw jy жj нs*jy "what he did (jy нs*jy) what was done (жj) was (pw) to hear (sqm)*. The noun phrase indicating the patient of the verbal phrase is assigned in these instances the role of syntactic predicate and fronted (with or without contrastive stress) to the head position of the sentence. Examples (15) and (71) above offer good evidence for the choice of the tripartite pattern with pw when the pragmatically emphasized element is the patient of the verbal phrase: 'Then this Neminakht said: 'Is this the proverb that people say: A poor man's name is pronounced on account of his master? *jnk pw mdw n=k jmъ+тр pw pw sšyнк k йои sмш" that one who speaks to you, but the one whom you mention is the High Steward.'"38

Being [+V], adjectival predicates can also convey the expression of temporal or aspectual features, with the imperfective participle in the preterite:

(78) Urk. IV 766.5 *jn bм=j ry жw w=q=т "It is My Majesty who caused (ry) that he be powerful (жw w=q=т)"

the imperfective participle in the unmarked tense (i.e. the relative present):

(79) Pt. 184 *jn tr tr жр "It is God who brings about (жр) excellence"
For the reference to the future, earlier Egyptian still shows cases of prospective participles acting as predicate of a cleft sentence, but in the classical language a prospective verbal form is found as presuppositional predicate:

(80) Pyr. 537c  jn ge N w3j=N sw "It is N's hand that will raise (w3j=N) him."

This evolution is similar to the grammaticalization of the masculine singular form of the participle for all genders and numbers in the cleft sentence: in presence of the verbal category of modality, the adjectival forms are replaced by a finite "that-form" in agreement with the antecedent.

5.5 Possessive and interrogative patterns

Egyptian constructions with possessive or interrogative predicate represent a semantically specialized and syntactically regular subset of adjectival or adverbial sentences. In the case of patterns which indicate possession, the possessive indicator acts as predicate of an adjectival sentence and is followed (in the unmarked sequence Pred-Subj) or preceded (in the marked sequence Subj-Pred) by a nominal or pronominal subject. As in the basic sentence type, the distribution of marked and unmarked constructions depends on the qualifying or identifying function of the adjectival predicate.

5.5.1 Possessive constructions

In their basic form, possessive constructions are normally conveyed by an adverbial sentence $S = [\text{SubjNP} \cdot \text{PredSubj}]$ in which the predicate is introduced by the preposition "to" (see section 6.2):

(81) Pyr. 2030a  bk33=f nk3 k bk3 n N wnl "You have your magic, the King has his magic," lit. "Your magic (bk33=f) is to you (nk3); the King's magic is to him."

(35) pEbers 99,4  (tm.wf) m$t.nf n tef nb.t "For each of his limbs (:tef nb.t) has its liquids (mt.wf)"

A few bound constructions, especially personal names, show an adjectival pattern consisting of the determinative pronoun $nj$ "that-of" as predicate (thus invariable in gender and number, see section 5.4), immediately followed by a first NP indicating the argument to which the quality is ascribed and forming together with the determinative pronoun $nj$ the predicative unit of the sentence, and then by a second NP as subject: the name of Amenemhat III (eighteenth century BCE) as King of Upper and Lower Egypt is

(82) $nj$-ms' $i$-w

"Re belongs to Maat" i.e. "Re is that-of-Maat," i.e. the sun god Re conforms to the principles of order, justice, etc.

Complications, however, arise from the tendency of the Egyptian writing system to have divine names graphically precede any other noun in the NP—a phenomenon which is referred to as "honorific anticipation" (section 2.3)—and from our own tendency to read as a relation of possession what is in Egyptian a predication of features. The result is our perception of a semantic looseness in the mutual distribution of the NP functioning as subject and the NP acting as predicative complement, which often becomes a matter of extralinguistic, i.e. cultural interpretation: example (82) could just as well be read $nj$-$t$-w-3m3-ti and interpreted as "Maat belongs to Re" ("Maat is that-of-Re," justice derives from the sun god Re), an alternative analysis which would also perfectly fit the religious background of the name.

This ambiguity vanishes in the more regular use of adjectival sentences with $nj$ "that-of," when the subject, i.e. the entity displaying the features indicated by the predicate, is expressed by a pronoun. The pattern consists of the determinative pronoun $nj$ immediately followed by the dependent pronoun indicating the subject: being an enclitic, it has to be appended to the first prosodic unit of the sentence, i.e. to the determinative pronoun itself. The dependent pronoun is followed by a NP indicating the quality ascribed to the pronominal subject and forming together with the determinative pronoun $nj$ the predicative unit of the sentence: $nj$-$w$-NP ($<$ $nj$-NP$>$ pred-$w$ $\text{Subj}$) "I am that-of-NP," "I belong to NP."

(83) CT III 31 la Tj.Be  $nj$-$w$-$jw$-$w$-gjr "I (njw) belong to the House of Osiris (nj$w$ $jw$-$jw$ "that-of-the-House-of-Osiris")"

(84) Sh.S. 62  $nj$-$w$-mb $30$ "It (sw) was thirty cubits long (nj$w$ $mb$ $30$ "that-of-thirty cubits")"

Syntactically, this type of adjectival sentence behaves like a qualifying pattern, allowing the subject to undergo pragmatic extraposition. In example (85), the fronted topic ("this N") is resumed by the copherential subject pronoun in the body of the sentence (sw):

(85) CT IV 82p  $N$ $jw$-$jw$-$jw$-$gjr$ "As for this N, he belongs to the Great Shrine (gjr $jw$)"

whereas in example (86) the thematic subject is indicated by a dependent pronoun with cataphoric function, dislocated to the end of the sentence as "tail," witness the first person variants of the same text (for the construction with $nnk$ see below):

(86) CT IV 340a $L$ $jw$-$jw$-$jw$ $N$ $tm$ "It, i.e. the Whole (tm), belongs to N (nj$w$ $N$)"

(86) Ibid, B3C  $nnk$-$tm$ "To me belongs the Whole"
But when both the subject and the predicative complement are pronominal, we are confronted with the same semantic problems raised by the sequence "you + NP1 + NP2" above, i.e. with a substantial difficulty in determining which quality is ascribed to whom, for example in (87) whether a subject "it" (in this case "it" forms "Horus' Eye," a feminine word) is predicated of "you" or else a subject "you" of "it":

(87) Pyr. 2033 "Formula to be recited: 'O Osiris N, take for yourself the Eye of Horus; nj(j-w nj) it belongs to you""

The close syntactic tie between the adjectival head nj and its predicative complement makes it clear, however, that if the two arguments are conveyed by an identical morphological pattern, in this case the dependent pronoun, the original order is maintained: "it (ij) is that-of-you (nj-tw)."

This is confirmed by the existence of another possessive pattern. When the pronounization affects the nominal complement of the adjectival predicate (NP1), two different constructions are preferred, corresponding to an unmarked and to a marked adjectival pattern. In the unmarked pattern, which has qualifying function, the possessed entity is conveyed by a nominal or pronominal subject, whereas the possessor is indicated by a predicate "belonging-to," consisting of the preposition nj followed by the suffix pronoun of the possessor and by the nisba jmj from the preposition mj:

(88) Urk. IV 96.7 awk-njmj br "Silver (ht) belongs to you (awk-njmj "belonging-to-you")"

(89) Sin. B 222-23 awk-jmj(1) sti mst tmw +k "It (st) belongs to you (awk-jmj "belonging-to-you"), like (mj, it) your dogs (tmw +k)"

In (89), the subject is expanded by an apposition following it, but it can also be topicalized and resumed by a coreferential subject in the main sentence, as in (90):

(90) Sh. S. 151 "njw mj-njmj(1) sw "As for myrrh (njw), it belongs to me (mj-njmj "belonging-to-me")"

As the adjectival nisba of the preposition mj, nj-k-jmj can also be used non-predicatively, i.e. as an adjective following the NP that refers to and agreeing with it in gender and number; the resulting construction expresses in a prosodically stressed form the relation normally conveyed by suffix pronouns:

(91) CT III 224c sgm-nk m pr1-htw m-nk jmj t "May you control (sgm-nk mj) the funerary offerings (pr1 -htw, fem) that are meant for you (m-nk jmj, feminine adj. "your")"

In the marked construction, which has an identifying function, the determinative pronoun nj is followed by the independent pronoun m, and often appears combined with it into a single prosodic unit: nj-jnk > nmk. jnk; nj-nf > nft.

In the same paradigmatic identity with nominal and adjectival patterns is displayed by interrogative constructions in which the interrogative pronoun is the subject or the object of the verbal predicate. As a general rule, interrogative pronouns behave like focalized subjects or objects of nominal predicates. The focalized subject pronoun (jn-m) "who?" (< "ergative" particle jn + interrogative pronoun mj "WH") occupies the position of the independent pronoun in a specifying pattern:

(95) CT IV 243a B2C2 (jn-m r rh.wj) "Who (jn-m) are then (r) the Two Companions (rh.wj)?"

or in the cleft sentence:

(96) Sh. S. 69-70 (jn-m inj sw bj) "Who brought you, little one?" (< "who?" the-one-who-brought (jn) you (sw)?"

(97) CT V 110e Mj3C (jn-m r sfm-t m fnj w) njk "Who then will have power over (sfm-m) that which won't bring (it) to you?"

The interrogative pronouns mj, sji, or pw "who?" "what?" are found in the predicative position of an adjectival sentence with the usual hierarchies of topicality, i.e. preferably with a sequence "subject-predicate" in the case of interlocutive subjects, and with a clear preference for the sequence "predicate-subject" in the third person:

(98) CT III 59b wtm-t "Who (tm) are you (t) then (particle t)?"

(99) BD (Budge) 241.14 (jn-m r sw njk sk) "Who (jn-m) are you (sw) then, who (sk) are you (njk)?"

(100) CT IV 188b p-tr sw r hpr go "Who then (p-tr < "pw r) is he, the great one who came into existence by himself?"

(101) Sin. B 261 p-tr dkm jmaj "What is your lord say to me?" (< What is what-my-lord says (dkt, obs.) to me?"
5.6 Existential sentences and temporal-modal features

Existential sentences are those in which a nominal predicate fulfills the function of stating the existence of a subject.46 When the existence of a nominal subject occurs absolutely – an extremely rare case in the classical language47 – existential sentences are treated as a nominal pattern introduced by the particle jw (originally an auxiliary verb) as overt existential predicate:

(102) CT IV 29c  jw # stp gdl N  jw # knh gdl N
"There is light (stp),' says the Deceased; 'There is darkness (knh),' says the Deceased"

(103) Disp. 123–24  jw # kw m 'q-jb
"There is a lack of close friends (kw m 'q-jb "lack of one-who-enters-the-heart")

In the much more frequent cases in which the existence of the subject is accompanied by a beneficiary or by an adverbial circumstance, the resulting sentence is adverbial. Adverbial sentences will be dealt with in the next chapter, so that just one example will suffice here:

(104) Peas. B2, 65–66  jw # wk s dt jw # qsw=k m sn
"Your plots of ground (sx=wk) are in the field, your estate (qsw=k) is in the nome, your income ('qsw=k) is in the storehouse"

But when the existence of the subject is a function of temporal or modal features which project it to the realized past or to the potential future, the predicate of Egyptian existential sentences is a verbal form of the verb wnn "to be," "to exist," which is normally not used in the general present tense. In (105), the subject "my wife" and the adverb "there" are both arguments of the verbal predicate indicating existence:

(105) pKahun 12, 13  wnn tsj mj t jm
"My wife will be there" (< "There will be my wife there")

While from a syntactic point of view the present paragraph should find its place in the treatment of adverbial and verbal sentences, the semantic kinship of the predication of "existence" with states of affairs otherwise expressed by nominal patterns justifies their presentation in this chapter. We discussed in sections 5.2 and 5.4 the basic expression of nominal (mfr pw) and adjectival (mfr sw) existence respectively, in section 5.3. the thetic presentation of a state of affairs by means of the demonstrative pronoun pw used as "dummy" subject, and in section 5.5 possession as a specialized form of adverbial or adjectival predication qualifying a subject. Rather than the absolute "being" of the subject, these patterns describe the latter's relation to the concomitant circumstances of its being. In this case, Egyptian does without any overt morphosyntactic expression of the idea of "being," choosing to shift attention to its semantic environment. But when a crucial component of the semantic environment of this "being" is represented by its temporal or modal setting, its overt expression is delegated to verbal sentences with a sdm-t form of the verb wnn as predicate, which in classical Egyptian completely supersedes the simple construction jw NP: they display the non-geminated form (section 4.6.3.1b) in the aorist wnn-t "he is/ was" (106) and in the subjunctive wnn-t "that he be," which is used after verbs of wish or command (107), and the geminated form in the thematicized wnn-t "(the fact that) he is" (108) and in the prospective wnn-t "he will be" with modal functions (109):

(106) West. 6, 26–7, 1  jw wj nds jw m jw-t
"There is (jw wj, VP jw sdm=fl a well-off citizen (nds) whose name is Djedi"

(107) Pryr. 638b  adj=n-s wnn=k m nfr
"She caused (adj=n-s) that you be (wnn=k) a god (m nfr "as a god")"

(108) Sin. B 43–44  wnn jw=t # pt mj=m m gmn=fl
"But how (mj=m) is that land (pt) without him (m gmn=fl)"

(109) Sin. B 72  mj m=wnn=b nfr
"Now (mk) you are here (tw 3) and you will remain (VP wnn=fl) with me"

We will observe in section 6.4 that in the classical language adverbial sentences such as tw 3 in (109) have to be introduced by a particle of initiality when they function as initial clauses – a rule which applies to many categories of verbal sentences as well. This is the function fulfilled by mk in (109). Of these particles, which are syntactic complementizers and each of which represents a different proposition operator,48 the most complex and at the same time the most germane to our discussion of existential clauses is the particle jw, which, if it is related to Sem. hwy "to be" or to Eg. jwj "to come,"49 could etymologically mean something like "there exists." Whenever jw introduces an adverbial sentence with the preposition m "in" indicating a transitory, rather than an essential quality of the subject:

(110) Adm. 2, 10  jw m jw m zfr
"The Nile (jw) is really (m) blood (zfr)"

i.e. it has become like blood as a result of the many killings, it appears in complementary distribution with the wnn-t form of the type we encountered in (108)–(109). Compare the subjunctive wnn-k m nfr "that you be a god" in (107) with example (111), where the same message is rendered first by an unmarked adverbial present and then by the prospective tense:

(111) CT I 55b  jw=wnn=k m nfr
"You are divine (m nfr "as a god") and you will be divine"

In the syntactic model of the Standard theory, these sentences have been interpreted within an adverbial understanding; both sentences are seen as
adverbial, the predication of existence in the second being emphasized by the topicalized VP \textit{wnn-k} "that-you-are." In this perspective, the second sentence would emphasize the unmarked adverbial predicate of the first: "you are divine, you are (or: will be) divine"; the construction with \textit{wnn-f} is taken to be the syntactic device that converts unmarked adverbial sentences introduced by \textit{jw} into pragmatically marked ones with promoted comment.

However—and I shall return to this point in my discussion of adverbial and verbal sentences—one of the main functions of a topicalized VP is precisely the definition of the diachronic, temporal or modal features governing the higher predication; in other words, since the thematized VP is assigned all the verbal features of the utterance, the inevitable consequence of the concentration of semantic functions on the head VP is the pragmatic emphasis on the theme, such as the interrogative adverb \textit{mj-m} "how?" in example (108). The complementary distribution of \textit{jw} and \textit{wnn} in existential clauses shows in an ideal way this interface between syntax and semantics at work: while the unmarked attribution of a quality to a subject in the general present is conveyed by nominal and adverbial predicates, the semantic complexity generated by temporal or modal features requires the resort to a verbal pattern; and symmetrically, the transformation of an adverbial sentence into a verbal clause expands the pragmatic potential of the non-verbal components of the sentence, such as what used to be the adverbial predicate of the first: "you are (or: will be) divine"; the construction with \textit{wnn=f} is taken to be the syntactic device that converts unmarked adverbial sentences introduced by \textit{jw} into pragmatically marked ones with promoted comment.

In this perspective the second sentence would emphasize the unmarked adverbial predicate of the first: "you are (or: will be) divine"; the construction with \textit{wnn=f} is taken to be the syntactic device that converts unmarked adverbial sentences introduced by \textit{jw} into pragmatically marked ones with promoted comment.

In this way we can properly interpret the role of \textit{wnn} as the pragmatic emphasis on the rheme, such as the interrogative adverb \textit{mj-m} "how?" in example (108). The complementary distribution of \textit{jw} and \textit{wnn} in existential clauses shows in an ideal way this interface between syntax and semantics at work: while the unmarked attribution of a quality to a subject in the general present is conveyed by nominal and adverbial predicates, the semantic complexity generated by temporal or modal features requires the resort to a verbal pattern; and symmetrically, the transformation of an adverbial sentence into a verbal clause expands the pragmatic potential of the non-verbal components of the sentence, such as what used to be the adverbial predicate of the first: "you are (or: will be) divine"; the construction with \textit{wnn=f} is taken to be the syntactic device that converts unmarked adverbial sentences introduced by \textit{jw} into pragmatically marked ones with promoted comment.

In this way we can properly interpret the role of \textit{wnn} as the pragmatic emphasis on the rheme, such as the interrogative adverb \textit{mj-m} "how?" in example (108). The complementary distribution of \textit{jw} and \textit{wnn} in existential clauses shows in an ideal way this interface between syntax and semantics at work: while the unmarked attribution of a quality to a subject in the general present is conveyed by nominal and adverbial predicates, the semantic complexity generated by temporal or modal features requires the resort to a verbal pattern; and symmetrically, the transformation of an adverbial sentence into a verbal clause expands the pragmatic potential of the non-verbal components of the sentence, such as what used to be the adverbial predicate of the first: "you are (or: will be) divine"; the construction with \textit{wnn=f} is taken to be the syntactic device that converts unmarked adverbial sentences introduced by \textit{jw} into pragmatically marked ones with promoted comment.

In this way we can properly interpret the role of \textit{wnn} as the pragmatic emphasis on the rheme, such as the interrogative adverb \textit{mj-m} "how?" in example (108). The complementary distribution of \textit{jw} and \textit{wnn} in existential clauses shows in an ideal way this interface between syntax and semantics at work: while the unmarked attribution of a quality to a subject in the general present is conveyed by nominal and adverbial predicates, the semantic complexity generated by temporal or modal features requires the resort to a verbal pattern; and symmetrically, the transformation of an adverbial sentence into a verbal clause expands the pragmatic potential of the non-verbal components of the sentence, such as what used to be the adverbial predicate of the first: "you are (or: will be) divine"; the construction with \textit{wnn=f} is taken to be the syntactic device that converts unmarked adverbial sentences introduced by \textit{jw} into pragmatically marked ones with promoted comment.

The later stages of the development of existential constructions in classical Egyptian, which anticipate the situation in later Egyptian (section 5.8), see a grammaticalization of \textit{wn} and \textit{wnn} as "converters," i.e. as free morphemes added to the sentential patterns in order to embed them into verbal clauses: in (112) and (113), the temporal converters \textit{wnj}, \textit{wNN}, originally the conjunctural base of the contingent \textit{sdm} \textit{jN}-f-form, and \textit{wnn}, originally the base of the prospective \textit{sdm}-f-form, assign the scope of the adjectival \textit{nfr} \textit{sw}-patterns to the past and to the future respectively.

(112) KagemmT 2.6 \textit{wnj nfr st br jw=su su} "This was good in their heart" < "It was [it is] good in their heart"

Strategies of semantic readjustment also occur in the syntax of adjective verbs, i.e. of those verbs whose participles constitute the adjectives referred to in section 5.4: \textit{nfr} "to be good," \textit{ja} "to be great," \textit{Sa} "to be numerous," etc. These roots express temporally unmarked situations when used in the adjectival construction \textit{nfr sw/jnk nfr} and in the pseudoobaral construction \textit{mk sw nfr} with thematized subject followed by the stative. The same applies to their substantival conversion \textit{nfr=f} used after verbs of perception such as \textit{ms3} "to see" or \textit{jH} "to know" (section 7.6):

(114) Urk. IV 363,6 \textit{jw bm.i=f jH=y nfr=f} "My Majesty (\textit{bm=i}, fem.) knows that-he-is-divine (\textit{nfr=f} < \textit{nfr} "to be divine")"

but not to their prospective \textit{nfr=f}, i.e. to their verbal form appearing after verbs of volition or in main optative clauses, which displays a semantic shift from the static to the dynamic meaning ("he will become good"):

(115) Pyc. 618a "O Osiris N: may your heart be raised to him, "ja \textit{jw=k} may your heart become great, may your mouth be opened, may Horus revenge you: it cannot last that he does not revenge you"

In other words, the acquisition of true verbal features, for example the expression of tense, aspect, or mood, causes semantic readjustments that bear consequences for the syntactic environments in which a form appears.

5.7 Negative patterns

When compared with similar patterns in related Afroasiatic languages, Egyptian negative constructions display a high degree of complexity both from a syntactic and from a semantic point of view. While no separate chapter of this book is devoted to a global treatment of negation, I shall discuss in each section the pertinent negative patterns and try to show how they display a surprisingly high degree of uniformity in spite of the syntactic differences among the underlying positive patterns.

Earlier Egyptian shows two main negative morphemes: the first one is indicated by a logogram of two human arms in gesture of negation \textit{kw} and is conventionally transliterated \textit{n} or \textit{ja}, but from an comparative point of view it is more likely to have displayed a bilabial \textit{ml}/\textit{s} the second one shows the same logographic sign accompanied by the phonogram \textit{n} \textit{m} \textit{i} and is conventionally transliterated \textit{mn}, although it probably exhibited just a single \textit{ml}/\textit{s} in addition, there is a negative pattern in which \textit{ja} (in the later stages of earlier Egyptian \textit{mn}) is combined with the subordinating particle \textit{js} (section

(113) pKahun 3.36 \textit{mk wnn sdm su br jw=f} "Look, it will be pleasant in his heart" < "It will be [it is] pleasant in his heart"

These roots express temporally unmarked situations when used in the adjectival construction \textit{nfr sw/jnk nfr} and in the pseudoobaral construction \textit{mk sw nfr} with thematized subject followed by the stative. The same applies to their substantival conversion \textit{nfr=f} used after verbs of perception such as \textit{ms3} "to see" or \textit{jH} "to know" (section 7.6):

(114) Urk. IV 363,6 \textit{jw bm.i=f jH=y nfr=f} "My Majesty (\textit{bm=i}, fem.) knows that-he-is-divine (\textit{nfr=f} < \textit{nfr} "to be divine")"

but not to their prospective \textit{nfr=f}, i.e. to their verbal form appearing after verbs of volition or in main optative clauses, which displays a semantic shift from the static to the dynamic meaning ("he will become good"):

(115) Pyc. 618a "O Osiris N: may your heart be raised to him, "ja \textit{jw=k} may your heart become great, may your mouth be opened, may Horus revenge you: it cannot last that he does not revenge you"

In other words, the acquisition of true verbal features, for example the expression of tense, aspect, or mood, causes semantic readjustments that bear consequences for the syntactic environments in which a form appears.

5.7 Negative patterns

When compared with similar patterns in related Afroasiatic languages, Egyptian negative constructions display a high degree of complexity both from a syntactic and from a semantic point of view. While no separate chapter of this book is devoted to a global treatment of negation, I shall discuss in each section the pertinent negative patterns and try to show how they display a surprisingly high degree of uniformity in spite of the syntactic differences among the underlying positive patterns.

Earlier Egyptian shows two main negative morphemes: the first one is indicated by a logogram of two human arms in gesture of negation \textit{kw} and is conventionally transliterated \textit{n} or \textit{ja}, but from an comparative point of view it is more likely to have displayed a bilabial \textit{ml}/\textit{s} the second one shows the same logographic sign accompanied by the phonogram \textit{n} \textit{m} \textit{i} and is conventionally transliterated \textit{mn}, although it probably exhibited just a single \textit{ml}/\textit{s} in addition, there is a negative pattern in which \textit{ja} (in the later stages of earlier Egyptian \textit{mn}) is combined with the subordinating particle \textit{js} (section
6.3.1) to form a continuous morpheme *nj-js (later *mn-js) and a discontinuous
morpheme *nj-.js (later mn-.js), depending on the construction in which they
appear. In general, the functional distribution of these three negative
patterns may be defined as follows:

(a) *nj is a nexal, i.e. propositional negative particle indicating simple
contradiction,\footnote{1} for example of a nominal *nj pw-pattern (section 5.3):

(116) Sin. B 266–68
"Then they said to His Majesty: *nj mtj pw m ms' s
'This (pw) is not (nj) really (m ms' s) he, Sovereign my Lord!' But His Majesty said:
*mtj pw m ms' s: 'Yes, this is really he'"

The negative particle *nj is also rarely used for the nexal contradiction
of adjectival nfr sw-sentences, although the positive counterpart of (117) is
more likely to have been a possessive *jw n-k 'ntjw wrj "you have much
myrrh" (section 5.5) than an adjectival *wrj n-k 'ntjw "myrrh is great to you"
(section 5.4):

(117) Sh.S. 150
*ntjw n=k 'ntjw
"You don't have much myrrh" < "Myrrh (*ntjw) is not (nj) great (wrj) to you (n=k)"

A much higher degree of productivity is displayed by the nexal negation
of sentences with verbal forms of adjectival verbs. The rules for the negation
of verbal sentences apply unchanged to these sentences, with *nj nfr.sn.f
negating an unmarked present state (118) and *nj nfr.sn.f used for the negation of a
past quality (119):

(118) Siut I,280–81\footnote{2} *nj ntm.n n=f *bmt jm
"The reverse thereof (*bmt jm) is not pleasant (*nj ntm.n) to him (n=f)"

(119) Urk. IV 1082,15 *nj qmd-x [hr jz nj] swm
"I did not become angry (*nj qmd-x) at the appeal of a petitioner"

Older texts show cases of contradictory negations of existential patterns
(section 5.6) corresponding to positive constructions with *jw (wn) (120), of
adverbial sentences (121), or of *wnn-f in prospective verbal sentences (122):

(120) Pyr. 1322c *nj pps-t *nj mgb=t
"There is no (nj) bread of his (pp=t), there is no fan of his (mgb=t)"

(121) Pyr. 2293b\footnote{3} *nj jy*jk m mth "You father (jy*jk) is not (nj) a man (m mth)"

(122) BH I 25,98–99 *nj wnn zn=t br ns=t
"His son will not be (nj wnn zn=t) on his seat (br ns=t)"

But as a general trend, *nj-patterns are diachronically recessive in nominal
sentences, tending gradually to disappear and their function to be assumed by
existential patterns with *nn – see under (b) – or by focalized patterns with *nj-js
– see under (c) below.

(b) *nn is a predicative negative particle, denying the existence of a subject:

(123) Disp. 121–22 "To whom shall I speak today? *nn m*n: yw
There are no righteous people"

(124) Sin. B 309 *nn *wsw jy* f nj nh
"There is no commoner for whom the same has been done (jy "who-was-done," nj nh "the same," n=f "for him," relative clause modifying the subject *wsw "commoner," see section 7.7.2)"

From an etymological point of view, *nn is presumably the result of the
addition of an intensifier to the nexal *nj, much in the same way in which
similar predicate denial operators developed in Indo-European languages:
Latin non = *ne-oeum "not-one," English not, German nicht = *ne-wicht
"not-something," etc.\footnote{4} And in accordance with the complex interface displayed
by existential statements (section 5.6) between nominal or adverbial
sentences on the one hand and verbal sentences with the verb *wnn "to be" on
the other hand, *nn can also appear combined in a construction with the
perfective participle of *wnn to form a new predicative form *nn-wn "there is
not," which in later historical phases of the language will become the regular
operator for the negation of existence: *nn-wn Subj "there is no Subj":

(125) Disp. 130 *nn-wn ph.wj=f
"There is no end to it" < "Its end (ph.wj=f) does not exist"

Once "intensified" morphemes of the kind of Latin non or Egyptian *nn
are created, the basic original marker of contraction tends to fall under its
pressure and either to disappear altogether, as in many Indo-European
languages, or to become restricted to bound constructions, which is the case in
Egyptian: in an evolution beginning in early Egyptian, then investing gradu-
ally different spheres of the classical language, and finally concluding its
development in Late Egyptian, *nn (and its later Egyptian heir conventionally
transcribed bn) will emerge as the only unbound negative morpheme of the
language and take over many domains originally covered by *nj, such as
adverbial or existential sentences:

(126) Pyr. 638b *nn *bny=k m msk nj nh
"You have no enemy (nn *bny=k) in your name of 'God'"

(127) Sh.S. 100–101 *nn *wbs m-br: jw sn
"There was no idiot (nn *wbs) among them (m-br: jw sn)"

(c) *nj-js and *nj-.js represent focal negations indicating contrariety: *nj-js
immediately precedes the negated syntagm, which is often an adverbial
adjunct or an adverbial clause (128), more rarely the focalized nominal
subject of a cleft sentence (129):\footnote{5}
"If you find a disputant in action, m hw t nj js mn sw k who is poor (m hw as a poor), and not (nj js) your equal (mj tw k)"

CT III 336f-i  nj js jn jw njwj swk nj js sw t njw jw swk "Not my father (jw) gave it to me; not my mother (m tw swk) gave it to me, but this heir (jw), the great one ('a) of Kenret - he (swk) is the one who gave it to me"

The discontinuous nj js, on the other hand, wraps the first prosodic unit of the sentence:

CT VI 332k-n  jrwk pw nj jrwj pw 'smk pw nj 'smuj js pw "This (pw) is your form (jrwk), it is not (nj js) my form; this is your image (s'mk), it is not my image"

Rather than the nexus between the subject pw and the predicate jrwk or 's'mk, which remains unaffected by the insertion of the negative marker, the scope of the negation in these examples is represented by the focus of the utterance, which is the predicative complement in (128), the subject in (129), and the suffix pronoun in (130). The scope of this negative pattern is internal to the proposition in that the truth of the predicative nexus of existence (pw) of a certain jrw "form" or of a certain s'm "image" is shown by the preceding positive sentences to be upheld and not modified by the insertion of the negative operator. What the focal negation performs is the creation of a polarity, of a pragmatic contrast to its explicit or implicit positive counterpart; rather than its contradictory, it represents its marked contrary.58 It appears in nominal and adjectival patterns to negate one of the semantic or syntactic components of the predicate, such as its intensional meaning:

Disp. 31-32 "This is what my soul said to me: nj nkt js j jw k w jk that one lived. You are not (nj nkt js) a real man (j), although you are indeed [...] alive"

the indication of possession in the patterns nj sw and nj njk:

CT III 390e  nj njw jw zps I do not belong to the district (zps)"

BD (Naville) II.40/8 nj njk jwk swk "Your spell (rsw k) is not mine"59

or an adverbial modifier, for example a "virtual" relative clause (section 6.3.3, 7.3):

CT II 160b-c nj jnk swd swj f jnk swd p jn m nh t "I am not a passing-by (swj f) which passes by") swd-amulet; (rather, I am a swd-amulet coming forth from mankind (p jn m nh t)"

The construction nj js supplies the negative counterpart to all patterns involving focality, such as the subject of a specifying sentence S = [Subj-pw-Pred] in (135) or of a cleft sentence S = [jn-Subj-Pred] in (136):

N pw dhwy nj fo nj jk jn js pw stt jy (nj)

"N is Thoth who protects (nj) you, N is not Seth who takes (jy) it ("Horus' Eye")"

In accordance with the so-called O > E drift,60 which is the general trend of "weak" contradictory negations to move to the "strong" contrary pole of oppositional negations, the pattern nj js will tend on the one hand to be historically replaced by nn js (nj > nn), on the other hand to assume functions originally fulfilled by the simple nj (nj > nj js); examples from a non-literary text of the First Intermediate Period (137), a post-cassical literary text (138) and from a later copy (Dyn. XVIII) of a literary text of the Middle Kingdom (139) are:

Nag ed-Dér 84, A6-761 "I am a successful citizen who lives out of his own wealth, mn js m gyn t m j m jy j and not out of (m) what was bequeathed to me by (gyn t m j m jy j what I found from?) my father"

West, 9,6 njk njk jnk jnk nswk njk "Look, it is not I (jnk) who bring (jnk) it to you"

Pt. 213-14 (L2) nj nj jnk jw ps nj mjs nj tw f js njk "He is not your son; he wasn't born (mjs nj tw f js) to you"62

One may then compare the typologically innovative nn js in (137) with the classical nj js in (128) above, the function of nn js in (138) with the nj js in (131)-(132), and nn js in (139) with the older nj js in a similar semantic environment in a monumental text of the classical period (140):

"As for any son of mine who will keep this border which My Majesty made, this (nj) he is my son, born to My Majesty... But as for him who abandons it, who will not fight for it, nj (nj) he is not my son, he was not born to me"63

Negative patterns with the basic morpheme nj will therefore be exposed to two types of diachronic pressure: morphosyntactically, to the tendency for the simple negative to be replaced by a "intensified" version (nj > nn) more likely to acquire predicative status and to function as negative existential operator; semantically, to the tendency for propositional contradictories to be reinforced into focal contraries (nj > nj js, nn js); the original morpheme will be maintained preferably in bound, especially verbal constructions.

A last observation pertains to a semantically interesting peculiarity of the verb mfr, whose basic meaning is "to be complete" and which is mostly in the positive sense of "to be good," but which is also integrated into the negative system of Egyptian because of the opposite connotation "to be finished" it can acquire in specific contexts. This appropriation of the lexical potential of
a verb into the morphosyntactic system of negations occurs rather often in verbal patterns, the most paradigmatic example being the verb *tm* "to be complete," from which the negative counterparts of nominal verbal patterns, the most paradigmatic example being the verb into the morphosyntactic system of negations occurs rather often in formed and which will be discussed in chapter 7. But a tripartite pattern with a substantivized participle of the verb *nfr* as predicate of a *S = [Pred-pw-Subj] should find its mention here:

(141) Adm. 4.11–12  
*afr pw pbr.wt jfj*  
"There are no appropriate (*jfr*) remedies (*pbr.wt")

That this pattern is grammatically treated exactly like a positive sentence is proved by its possibility to be integrated into the system of converters (section 5.6) in less formal Middle Egyptian texts.

(142) pKahun 22.7  
*jf wnn afr pw dtd t mts (jps)*  
"If (j) there should be (was) nothing that has been said (dtd) about it..."

From what we have seen so far in this paragraph, we can obtain the Egyptian version (b) of the traditional square of semantic oppositions (a) applied to the negation of nominal patterns:

![Diagram of semantic oppositions]

We shall see very similar developments at work in the later phases of the language, and an identical distribution of semantic and pragmatic functions of negative morphemes and patterns applied to the other syntactic types as well - verbal, pseudoverbal and adverbial.

5.8 Nominal sentences in later Egyptian

While semantic principles and macrosyntactic structures of the nominal sentence in later Egyptian still follow the models of the classical language:

(143) pChester Beatty I vo C 1.4  
*bbsd m*3 *tnj*n3*  
"Her hair (tnj-n3) is true lapis lazuli (bbsd m3)"

(144) Two Brothers 1.10  
*nfr ps-smw n ts hmn.  
"The grass (ps-smw) of such-and-such a place (n ts hmn.) is good (nfr)"

both of which are examples of the well-known pattern "Pred-Subj," distribution and frequency of the morphosyntactic patterns undergo a higher degree of change. In general, following a trend we already observed in the less classical forms of Middle Egyptian, movements of topicalization and focalization tend to play a more crucial role in the later phases of the language - which probably finds its justification both in the cross-linguistic tendency towards the grammaticization of pragmatic phenomena and in the different cultural setting of the texts in Late Egyptian, Demotic, and Coptic. Late Egyptian and Demotic are less bound than the classical language to the religious and monumental sphere, which remained the domain of the postclassical form of Middle Egyptian often referred to as "Late Middle Egyptian" or *égyptien de tradition*. Coptic is the vehicle of a different religious world altogether. Thus, later Egyptian as a whole is more scholastically less fixed and therefore more open to the communicative needs of contemporary speech. For example, while both the nominal patterns *mt* *pw/jnk* *nfr* and the adjectival sentence *nfr* *sw/jnk* *nfr* are indeed maintained:

(145) Doomed Prince 4.9  
*tsm psj* "It (psj) is a dog"

(146) Onchsh. 16.23  
*jnk psj wk sn "I (jnk) am your brother (psj-wk sn)"

(147) Ps 5.5  
*nfr otnw fte "You (nk) are a god (ou-nwte)"

(148) Heb 11.4  
*nfr otnw fte "He (psj) is just (ou-otw fte) a just man"

the closer ties exhibited by later Egyptian to the spoken registers of discourse are evident in its preference for patterns with topicalized subject, including its frequent recourse to dislocated pronominal subjects, i.e. to topicalized arguments placed outside the body of the sentence:

(149) Wen. 2.8  
*rkt jf pw-k wk jf jnk"But (psj) you, what (j) have you brought me?"

(150) Cant 1.5–6  
"But as for true (ank de), I am (ang) black (ou-kam.. that (se) I am black"

of negative morphemes and patterns applied to the other syntactic types as well - verbal, pseudoverbal and adverbial.
In these examples, the subject is fronted as pragmatic topic (nkt, anok) and resumed by a coreferential pronoun in the relative clause "that which you have brought" in (149) and in the nominal sentence "I am black" in (150). Both examples also exhibit a rear extraposition of the indirect object in (149) and of the subject in (150) respectively, resumed as thematic "tail" (jnk, anok) and cataphorically anticipated by the suffix pronoun of the prepositional phrase n=j "to me" in (149) and again by the subject of the nominal sentence ang ou-kamā "I am black" in (150).

It is therefore surprising that, although the topicalized bipartite pattern with extraposed subject resumed by the demonstrative pronoun or copula pw > psj after the predicate is indeed maintained in Late Egyptian:

(151) oDeM 437,2–3  ps-hs.t j.jnw bs[kw psj
"Your coming down was work-related" < "The coming down which you did (ps-hs.t j.jnw) - it was work (bs[kw psj)"

it is not as frequent in this phase of the language as the later Egyptian propensity for the use of topicalizations would lead one to assume; that did, however, remain a productive pattern in the language is shown by its vitality in Demotic,71 where S = [Subj-Pred-copula] has become the most common form of nominal sentence, and in Coptic, especially in Bohairic:72

(152) Onchsh. 27,13  rmt jw=f mhj jrn psj-f t mj sbjn psj
"A man (rmt) who vilifies (jw=f mhj) his fellow citizens (psj-f t mj) those of his city"

Coptic psj-f-tm (psj) is despicable (sbjn); forever (t mj)

(153) Cant 1,15  NOBSAT GERHATIPOSTN.AHEE ME
"Your eyes (nou-bal) are (ne) eyes of a dove (ne-bal n-croome)

Turning to the specifying patterns, the balanced sentence [Subj-Pred] documented in examples (21)–(23) in section 5.2 is alive and well in Late Egyptian and Demotic:

(154) pBM 10052, 5,8–9  "I didn't see anything else: ps-pw=ps -qdo-e what I saw (ps-pw=ps)"

(155) pRyl. IX 3,7–8  ps-hp j.jnw nw djt ps= s[m=s] n lw 50
"The judgment (ps-hp) that they will get (j.jnw nw djt) 'that they will do to them' is to have them receive (djt ps) fifty blows of whip"

(156) Onchsh. 13,7  j.jt sm-gw sm-gw
"The friend (j.jt) of an idiot is an idiot (himself)"

(157) pWien KM 3877 I,3–4  n= j.jn=f sn a hs 3f
"All he has done (n= j.jn=f sn) as singer (a hs < m hs) is vice (3f)"

The tripartite specifying sentence [Subj-psj-Pred], on the other hand, is not productive in Late Egyptian,73 a stage in the history of the language in which tripartite patterns generally appear to be under pressure (section 5.9). But this sentence pattern displays renewed vitality in Coptic,76 where the construction [Subj-pe-Pred] maintains the specifying functions it had in the older phases of the language:

(158) 1 Cor 15,56  'PA]N DE $HAB0T HE NAW6 BOC]A DE XN00 HE NHOAOE
"But (56) the sting (p-ien) of death (m-p-mou) is the sin (p-nobe), and the power (p-iieom) of sin is the law (voioq)"

As in the corresponding patterns of the classical language, the subject of a later Egyptian nominal sentence can also be an adjectival form of the verb, coreferential with the antecedent (participle)77 as in (159) and (160) or controlled by a different subject (relative form) as in (161) or (162):

(159) Two Brothers 15,4  bhsit 's.t taj-bpr.t
"What happened (bpr.t) is (taj) a great wonder (bhsit 's.t)"

(160) 1 Thess 5,24  ONIKTOC HE XNMRATASCHE\R
"He who has summoned us (p-ent-a-tahe=m=) is (pe) trustworthy (o-nirom)"

(161) pBM 10052, 14,7  'psps j.dk-f snb
"Everything he said (psps) is (psj) wrong (s)"

(162) Ex 35,10  $HEATIIOCHE HE MMAMAT MAN
"What I shall do (n-ent-i-nw-a=aa) for you (n=) are (a) wonders (bea-zsps)"

One should pay attention here to the change in the syntax of the copula pw > psj > ne. Unlike the Middle Egyptian pw, which is invariable both in classifying and in specifying patterns, in later Egyptian the situation is more complex. While the Coptic specifying sentence [Subj-pe-Pred] maintains the invariable copula, later Egyptian classifying and qualifying sentences display gender and number agreement of the copula with its antecedent: masc. psi (ne), fem. taj (re) pl. nj (ne). In this way, an original [Pred-psj-Subj] is reinterpreted as a bipartite pattern in which an adjectival form, introduced by the so-called prosthetic yad, i.e., by the initial j which in Late Egyptian regularly precedes participles and relative forms, functions as the subject preceded by the newly created definite article ps (n), s (re), nj (r):-what used to be typologically a tripartite [bhsit 's.t] [taj] [bpr.t] "what happened is a great wonder" is therefore treated in Late Egyptian as a bipartite [bhsit 's.t] [taj-bpr.t] "a great wonder is (that)-which-happened." We will see in the next section that this reinterpretation of the structure of the tripartite nominal sentence has important consequences for the overall distribution of nominal patterns in later Egyptian.

5.9 Old and new cleft sentences
Quite expectedly, Late Egyptian maintains in full productivity the Middle Egyptian cleft sentence, the pattern in which the subject of the adjectival
predicate is the focus of the utterance and is introduced by the particle *jn* (written *m* in less formal texts) – sometimes omitted in specific pragmatic environments78 – or by the independent pronouns:

(163) Horus and Seth 6.14–7.1  

```
In this construction, the dislocated patient occupies the role of
```
 pragmatically promoted predicate of the sentence. The new later Egyptian
 gradually

(164) LRL 70.14–15  

```
It is your own mouth (Iz=k *g3=k) that said (jy) it, your own intelligence (Iz3 *br=k)
```
 that judged (wp) you (nw)

But this pattern survives through Coptic only in functional remnants (table 5.2).79 The parentheses in the last row symbolize the vestigial status of the construction *bn-Focus-Pred* (written *bn-Focus-subj*).

The reason for the decay of this pattern in the later stages of the language lies in the threat represented by the emergence of a new syntactic pattern in Late Egyptian. This new construction is a second type of cleft sentence, occurring in Late Egyptian when the focalized argument is not the subject, but rather the object or one of the adverbial adjuncts of the verbal predicate, and gradually expanding in Demotic and Coptic to subjects as well. One will recall that in Middle Egyptian nominal sentences, the pragmatic prominence of an argument different from the agent was not conveyed by the cleft sentence S = *[jn-Focus-Pred]*, but rather by the pseudocleft pattern S = *[Pred-pw-Subj]*. In this construction, the dislocated patient occupies the role of pragmatically promoted predicate of the sentence. The new later Egyptian

5.9 Old and new cleft sentences

cleft sentence type is in fact nothing else than the heir of this earlier Egyptian tripartite pattern; but while in the Middle Egyptian pseudocleft construction the contrastive stress was simply an additional, optional feature of the predicate, in later Egyptian the pattern is completely reinterpreted as a bipartite cleft sentence, in which focalization was the primary function of the pattern: S = *[Focus-pw-Subj]*. The originally predicative head noun has now become the focus of the utterance; the old copula *pw* is reinterpreted as a definite article *pw* defining the second nominal phrase, which is now a presuppositional predicate conveyed by a participle (165) or a relative VP (166), which in the later stages are replaced by a relative clause introduced by the converter *ntj* (167):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>TENSE</th>
<th>PROSPECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARLIER</td>
<td><em>jn NP sdm</em> (perf.)</td>
<td>&quot;It is NP who heard&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jn NP sdm</em> (imperf.)</td>
<td>&quot;It is NP who hears&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jn NP sdm</em> (prosp.)</td>
<td>&quot;It is NP who will hear&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE EG. 1</td>
<td><em>m NP sdm</em></td>
<td>&quot;It is NP who heard&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>m NP jjr sdm</em></td>
<td>&quot;It is NP who hears&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>m NP jjr=k sdm</em></td>
<td>&quot;It is NP who will hear&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE EG. 2</td>
<td><em>NP jjr sdm</em></td>
<td>&quot;It is NP who heard&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>NP njt br sdm</em></td>
<td>&quot;It is NP who hears&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>NP njt=nt sdm</em></td>
<td>&quot;It is NP who will hear&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM. 2</td>
<td><em>anok p-et-sdm</em></td>
<td>&quot;It is I who heard&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>anok p-et-sdm</em></td>
<td>&quot;It is I who hears&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>anok p-ci-na-sdm</em></td>
<td>&quot;It is I who shall hear&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any argument of the cleft sentence can appear topicalized and resumed by a coreferential pronoun:

(168) Khaemwaset 4.21–22  

```
As for these sayings (n3-jy), it is Siosiri who is doing (n3-jy) them (n3-jm-w).
```

But here, of course, a question arises: how can we discern whether later Egyptian did in fact maintain a functional difference between the new form of cleft sentence shown in examples (165)–(168) and a formally identical heir of the tripartite nominal pattern [Pred-pw-Subj] displayed by examples (159)–(162)? How can one confidently state that the first position in (165)–(168) is occupied by the focalized subject or object, whereas the same slot in (159)–(162) is taken by the predicate, pragmatically promoted as it may be? How should we decide whether

(169) Horus and Seth 14.5–6  

```
is an adjectival sentence "What Thoth said to the Ennead is absolutely true," or rather a cleft sentence "It is the absolute truth that Thoth said to the Ennead"?
```

The answer to this question represents one of the thorniest issues of later Egyptian grammar and must be sought in the diachronic observation of the morphological form and the syntactic behavior of the copula *p3(j)*, *t3(j)*, *n3(j)* and, at least to a certain extent, in the study of the corresponding negative
patterns (section 5.11). As one will recall, the cleft sentence with jn was reserved in earlier Egyptian to the focalization of the agent, whereas the pseudocleft pattern S = [Pred-pw-Subj] was used when the focalized element was the patient of the VP: the emphasized element became the syntactic predicate, whereas the VP underwent adjectival conversion as the subject of the sentence. In fact, Late Egyptian itself exhibits no formal differences between the vestiges of this tripartite pattern and the new bipartite cleft sentence, and we can only infer that, if there was any difference between the two constructions, suprasegmental features must have played a role in conveying it. The history of the language shows that in Late Egyptian the linguistically more productive construction was clearly felt to be the cleft sentence: in Roman Demotic and especially in Coptic, only the cleft sentence pattern is kept and a new tripartite nominal pattern with congruing copula he, te, ne is added to the syntactic inventory of the language.82 In this new pattern, the first position is taken by the predicate followed by the copula, the original determinative pronoun having completed its functional evolution and become the definite or possessive article of the subject:

(170) ḫw CB y ẖd nh

"The one who hates (p-em-mose < ḫw-nj) is a reproach (ne-jiša) is (pe) senseless (ṣat-het "without mind")"

whereas Bohairic shows a marked preference for the topicalized pattern:

(171) ḫw CB y ẖd nh

"The one (ṣet) who hates (et-mons) a reproof (n-em-soh) is (pe) senseless"

Now again, as in earlier Egyptian, the language exhibits a clear opposition between a bipartite cleft sentence with only one pronoun of the p-series (in Sahidic net-, tet-, net- congruing with the focalized antecedent;83 in Bohairic net-/he et- invariable in gender and number), morphologically undistinguishable from the definite article of the following noun but syntactically serving as nesal copula preceding a NP without demonstrative morpheme,84 and a tripartite nominal pattern with two pronouns of the same series (in Sahidic ne net-, te tet-, ne net-, in Bohairic ne ḫw et-, te ḫw et-, ne ḫw et-), the first of which is a true copula and the second of which precedes the subject as demonstrative pronoun (nbj, nby, νον), as definite article (if the subject is a simple noun phrase), or as determinative pronoun (if the subject is a relative clause).

The evolution from the earlier Egyptian tripartite pattern S = [Pred-pw-Subj] to the situation in Coptic is summarized in table 5.3. Parentheses indicate that the pattern is not formally distinguishable; its paradigmatic existence, therefore, cannot be established with certitude. In Demotic and Coptic, the use of the new cleft sentence pattern observed in table 5.2 is extended to the construction with focalized subjects,85 leading to the decay of the old cleft sentence.

Table 5.3 The evolution of the pattern NP1-pw-NP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>PSEUDOCLEFT SENTENCE (WITH OPTIONAL FOCUS)</th>
<th>CLEFT SENTENCE (WITH REGULAR FOCUS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARLIER EG.</td>
<td>ḫw CB y ẖd nh</td>
<td>ḫw CB y ẖd nh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE EG. 1</td>
<td>ḫw CB y ẖd nh</td>
<td>ḫw CB y ẖd nh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE EG. 2 - DEM. 1</td>
<td>ḫw CB y ẖd nh</td>
<td>ḫw CB y ẖd nh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM. 2 - COPTIC</td>
<td>ḫw CB y ẖd nh</td>
<td>ḫw CB y ẖd nh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.10 Interrogative, possessive, and existential patterns

In later Egyptian, one of the frequent uses of specifying (with substantival predicate) or identifying (with adjectival predicate) bipartite sentences occurs with interrogative pronouns such as nm ( criterion) "who?" (Coptic nma) or jy "what?" (Coptic am, αυ) or with the interrogative adjective jy (which?)86 as predicates, occupying the first or the second position in the pattern, depending on whether the subject is delocutive, i.e. third person, or interlocutive, in which case it complies with the hierarchies of salience discussed in sections 5.2-5.4:

(171) Truth and Falsehood 5,3 nmk y ẖd nh "Whose son (y ẖd nh) are you?" (172) Horus and Seth 2,13 jy ḫw CB y ẖd nh "What shall we do?" (Coptic y by "which-which") (yp y ẖd nh) "we-shall-do-it (yp y y ẖd nh)"

(173) pBM 10052, 13,7 jy ḫw CB y ẖd nh "Which one of N's messengers came to you?" (Coptic j y y by "which") (Coptic y y by "which") (N's) "is the one who came (yp y j) to you?"
In the possessive patterns, later Egyptian follows rather closely the constructions of the classical language. While the frequent fusion of the head NP nj-swj nj-st "he/she is one-of" into ns-, which is a frequent formative for personal names (ns-mnw "He-belongs-to-Min"), is primarily a phonetic and graphic phenomenon,87 the most relevant evolution concerns the identifying pattern with pronominal determinative: in Late Egyptian, independent pronouns are used in this function without the introductory determinative pronoun nj, keeping until the end of the second millennium BCE the old form of the second and third person pronouns (ntk sw, twt sw "it belongs to you"; ntt sw, swt sw "it belongs to him"). A good example of Late Egyptian possessive patterns at work is:

(174) Wen. 1.20-21

"But the thief who robbed you- he is yours, he belongs to your ship!"

where the subject of the sentence is topocalized and resumed by the dependent pronoun sw and where the indication of possession is conveyed by the identifying independent pronoun ntk ("belonging to you") in the first sentence, and by the qualifying adjectival morpheme nsn in the second.

In the more recent stages of later Egyptian, the situation changes. While Demotic still maintains the use of stressed pronouns in adjectival sentences to indicate possession:

(175) Siut 8.268  

"Your property (nj-k nsn) above (nj-ho "which is above") is yours (ntk)"

in Coptic the older indicators of possession of type nj-sw and nj-ntf have disappeared and been superseded by a new set of possessive pronouns deriving from the independent use of the determinative pronoun nsn- < p3 n- "that-of" (with nominal referent) and of the possessive article (with pronominal referent); these have replaced in later Egyptian the older synthetic indication by means of the suffix pronoun, still kept in a few lexical items referring most frequently to the sphere of the human body: earlier Egyptian snf "his brother" > later Egyptian p3juf sn (Coptic ps=tm), in pronominal use p3w=fn (Coptic nsw) "his, of his":

(176) Ex 19,5

"For (ydp) the entire world (p3knh tefnt "the earth [to] its entirety") belongs to me (pswn pe is mine")

As for existential clauses, we have already discussed the diachronic tendency exhibited by Egyptian to move away from the expression of existence conveyed by simple adverbial or adjectival sentences towards an increasing use of constructions with forms of the verb wnt "to be," originally limited to the expression of temporal, aspectual, or modal features of the predicated existence, but soon regularly used in negative patterns and gradually extended to the indication of absolute existence. This historical trend appears concluded in late Egyptian, where the existential predicates wnt "there is" and mn (< mn-w) "there is not," often combined with the preposition m-dj "by, with" (< m-"in the hand of")89 precede the indefinite subject, adverbial constructions being maintained for specific subjects (pattern p3-ntf m pr "the scribe is in the house," section 6.6):

(177) Two Brothers 3.5-6  

"There is great strength (ph bj 's) in you (jmn-k)!

(178) LRL 10.8-9  

"But you still have time" < "But there is day (wn hrw) here (dy) before you (r-hs lw m)n"

(179) LRL 3.6

"They have no damage (hes)" < "There is no damage with-them (m-dj=w)"

(180) RAD 53.16-54.1

"There are no clothes, no ointment, no fish, no vegetables"

The later developments90 see a combination of two phenomena: (a) first, a permanence of the opposition between the predication of existence for definite subjects by means of an adverbial sentence introduced by the prepositions m-pr.t < m-dj-lat "in the hand of," m-ntf < m-dj-lat "by," m-dj=M "in," eprtf=to indicating the locative, the beneficiary or any other adjunct and the verbal or adjectival predication with otn- and m- in the case of indefinite subjects:

(181) Ps 134.17  

"They have feet" < "(There are) their feet (nsw=n-weret) in them (mnhbs.wmn)

(b) second, a grammaticalization of the possessive patterns wnt m-dj and mn m-dj as otn=, otn=, and m- respectively. Conforming to the cross-linguistic tendency for prepositional compounds indicating possession followed by their subject to be semantically (and eventually also syntactically) reinterpreted as predicative phrases controlling a direct object,91 these constructions are treated in Coptic (regularly in Sahidic, less so in Bohairic, where the original construction is maintained together with the reinterpreted pattern) as VPs with the meaning "to have" followed by their original morphosyntactic subject, now treated as a direct object; the latter is often accompanied by a localistic92 indicator, namely the adverb m-wa "there, and
introduced by the preposition ר- שדטפ when the pronominal beneficiary is prosodically stressed (שדטפ, שדטטפ):

(183) Jn 4,44 שדטפ נscape נscape שדטטפ שדטטפ שדטטפ שדטטפ "A prophet receives no honor in his own village" ≠ "There is not by (ממשטפ) a prophet (שדטטפ) honor (נscape) in his village (גפפ נscape-פפ) his own (גפפ ממשטפ)

(184) 2 Cor 4,7 שדטטפ נ/recite נ/recite שדטטפ שדטטפ שדטטפ שדטטפ "But we have this treasure" ≠ "But (ב) there-is-by-us (וגפפ-נ) there (גפפשדטטפ) this treasure (גפפ ממסה, object)

5.11 Negation in later Egyptian

Nominal negative patterns regularly display the morpheme bn (Coptic RN) as the heir of Middle Egyptian nn, which is still used in the literary register and with which bn was also phonetically identical,93 the grapheme bn serving presumably only as a semantic indicator of negation, much like the sign of the open arms conventionally transliterated nj in Middle Egyptian:

(185) Wen. 2,11-13 25 fmy-milk 25 fmy-nw w jf-f k n psj-j jf kr jnk nkn jnk jnk jnk kbn "What they did for my father (a psj-j jf) was not a royal gift (25 fmy-milk), and as for myself (jf kr jnk), I am not your servant either (an jnk jnk jnk kbn)"

One will recall that in the presence of pragmatic focality, such as in a cleft sentence, the negation tends to become one of contrariety rather than one of negation. In this case, the later Egyptian negative pattern is the discontinuous bn...jwns (Demotic bn...jwns, Coptic RN...nn), which corresponds functionally to the Middle Egyptian nj...nj (>& nj...nj):

(186) Wen. 2,23 bn nfr swgs jwns nn-nj twj jwnw "It is not foolish travels (mn swgs) that I am engaged in!" ≠ "Not foolish travels (are) the-(ones)-that-(nn-nj) I-am-in-them"

The pervasive O > E drift discussed in section 5.7 above, however, caused not only the negative morpheme bn to invade further than the postclassical Middle Egyptian nn domains previously covered by the simple propositional negation nj (& Late Egyptian bn, limited to bound verbal patterns), but also the originally focal negative marker to be used in non-focal constructions, such as in nominal and adjectival patterns:

(187) oBerlin 10627,6 bn nfr jwns
(187') pRyl. IX 1,18 bn nfr jn "You are not a (real) man"94
(188) LRL 2,1 bn jnk psj-in nfr bn jnk psj-in bn jwns "For I am (to) your benefit (psj-in nfr), and not (to) your disadvantage (psj-in bn)
(189) pBM 10052, 11,21 bn nsj jwns ns "This (nsj) is not true (nsj)"

We observed in section 5.7 that this phenomenon corresponds to the cross-linguistic tendency for focal negations of contrariety to progressively invade semantic spheres and syntactic patterns previously negated by "weak" contradiction: in fact, more formal or literary Late Egyptian texts show instances, such as example (185) above, in which nominal patterns are negated by the simple morpheme without the focal reinforcer. Comparing (189) with the same adjectival pattern in (190), one will observe a number of signals of a higher linguistic register:95 the absence of jwns, the use of older nn for bn, and the topicalization of the subject resulting in the tripartite pattern [Topic-Pred-copulas,ζο], otherwise rare in Late Egyptian:

(190) pAnastasi 1 18,2 bn psj-j-nk k nfr psj-nfr "The fact of bringing you (psj-nfr) to punish us (k nfr) is not good"

This gradual invasion of bn...jwns into the semantic domain of the simple nn > bn can be observed in the side-by-side coexistence, sometimes as variants of the same text, as is the case in (193)—(193'), of identical constructions with and without jwns, showing that it would be artificial always to ascribe to the negative pattern with jwns a higher degree of focality:

(191) LRL 6,8 bn nfr psj-j-w "What you have done (psj-j-w) is not good"
(192) Ani 8,11 bn nfr jwns nn-lm w bjt-f "The behavior (nn-lm w) as his superior (bjt-f) is not good"
(193) KRI II 53,4 bn rmy pw psj-nj m-baww "The one who is among us (psj-nj m-baww) is not (just) a man (bn rmy pw)"
(193') KRI II 53,5 bn rmy w jwns nn-pnj m-baww-n "Those who are among them are (nn-pnj) not (real) men (bn rmy w jwns)"

Although the version displayed by (193') probably represents an error in the scribal transmission, since the text is concerned here with King Ramses II’s military bravery rather than with the enemies’ cowardice, the correspondence of a nominal rmy pw-sentence built according to the classical pattern with a rare example of the later Egyptian tripartite pattern negated by bn...jwns shows that, if originally the cleft sentence exhibited jwns whereas the marked nominal sentence did not, the O > E drift led to a progressive merging of the two negative patterns.96 The later evidence confirms these evolutionary lines: Demotic bn...jn and Coptic RN...nn are the only morphemes used in the negation of nominal patterns, with a tendency in Coptic, shared once more by similar patterns in other languages,97 to drop the actual negative marker (n) and to keep only the reinforcer (nn):

(194) pKral 23,1198 bn jw shj jn psj ps-rm "The man is (psj) not a reed (bn jw shj jn)"
And according to the later Egyptian preference for topicalized patterns, the negation bn...jwnw is also regularly applied to the predicate of a tripartite sentence [Topic-Pred-copula_3sg], in which it follows the extrapoosed subject:

(198) Dem. Krug A 11^100  ps-hl (n) m=f bn-jw ps-j= tsj jn psj
"The said young man (ps-hl n m=f) is not (bn...jwnw) my son (ps-j= tsj)"

(199) Jn 8,13  tekaitet rewe an te
"Your testimony (te=k-mat-matre) is not (n...an te) genuine (ou-me "a truth")"

Finally, the passage below from the "Tale of Wenamun," the last known literary text of the New Kingdom (around 1070 BCE) should offer a short summary of some of the main points treated in the last sections (sections 5.8–5.11):

(200) Wen. 2,23–24  mn jm n br-ip j(e) jm bn ns-jmn nft ps-jm bn nft ps-3bhn
"There is no ship (mn jm) on the waters (br-ip jm) which does not (jm bn) belong to
Amon (ns-jmn). To him belong the sea (nft ps-jm) and also Lebanon, of which you
say: it belongs to me (jm bn)"

Further reading


Adverbial and pseudo verbal syntax

6.1 Introduction

The adverbial sentence represents one of the most frequent patterns from Old Egyptian to Coptic. In this syntactic type, a nominal or pronominal subject (NP), which can be bare or preceded by a particle, is followed by an adverbial phrase (AP) as predicate:

\[ S = [(\text{Particle-})\text{NP}]_{\text{subj}} \cdot \text{AP}_{\text{pred}}. \]

The adverbial predicate can be an adverb proper, as in (1), or a prepositional phrase, as in (2):

1. Sin. B 77: mk tw 's "Look (particle mk), you (rw) are here (‘s)"
2. Sin. B 156: sb3, yr-m h "The memory of me (sb3,yr-m) is in the palace (m ‘h)"

Similarly to what we observed in the treatment of nominal sentences (section 5.4), any type of NP, for example a relative verbal form in (3), can be found in a prepositional phrase functioning as the predicate of an adverbial sentence:

3. (3) Pt. 216: wdi r=k m bbd.n=sn
   "He who acts (wdi) against you (r=k) is one whom they have rejected (bbd.n=sn, relative sb3.m=n-l)"

In rare cases, all of them belonging to the earliest phase of the language and mostly in interrogative environments, the AP appears dislocated to the left of the NP:

4. (4) Prt. 681a: jfr brw prj m lqj
   "Where (jfr) is Horus who came forth from the serpent?"

but this pattern disappears from the syntax of the classical language.³

Since the part of speech "adverb" is [-N] and [-V], i.e. it has neither nominal nor verbal properties, patterns with adverbial predicate will draw their temporal reference from their context: the time setting of adverbial sentences is determined by the contextual tense.⁵ Some prepositions, however, naturally evoke a time reference associated with their semantic scope; this is the case with m "in, as," which expresses a simultaneous situation of the subject, as in (3) and in (5), or r "toward, bound to," which often implies a prospective reference, as in (6):

5. Neferti 54: s3 ‘= r=nb.
   "The former weak-of-arm (s3 ‘=) is now (r=nb) a strong-of-arm (nb-)," lit. "the broken-of-arm (is) as lord-of-arm"⁶
   "He (jw=f) will be (r) a Friend (smr) among the officials (m3 jw)," lit. "truly he (is) toward a Friend among the officials"

Adverbial sentences of the type represented in (5)–(6) represent a bridge to the common syntactic pattern in which the predicate is not an AP in the narrower sense, i.e. an adverb or a prepositional phrase, but rather a form of the verbal paradigm used in a syntactically adverbial environment. Such an environment can either be a prepositional phrase with hr, m (mostly with verbs of motion), or r followed by the infinitive:⁷

7. (7) Khakhpereres tenteb 12: nbhw br hpr r-w-nb
   "Dawn (nbhw) comes (br hpr "happens") every day (r-w-nb)"
8. (8) Peas. R1.2–3: mj wj m hsj.k km.t
   "Look, I am going down (wj m hsj.k) to Egypt (km.t)," lit. "I am in going-down"
9. (9) Sh. S. 117–18: mk tw r j3 j3 sbd br sbd
   "Look, you will spend (nw r j3) month after month (sbd br sbd)" lit. "you are toward making..."

or a non-initial stative following its nominal or pronominal subject:

10. (10) Peas. B1,101: m3 wj sps.kw
    "Look, I am burdened (sp5.kw)"

While sentences (1)–(6) are usually called adverbial, patterns of the type (7)–(10), in which the predicate is morphologically and semantically a form of the verbal paradigm, are ascribed by Egyptologists the label pseudo verbal sentences. We saw in section 4.6.4 that the infinitive combines nominal and verbal properties ([+N] and [+V]); the same holds true for the stative, originally a conjugated verbal adjective (section 4.4.1). This feature [+V] displayed by their predicate allows pseudo verbal sentences, in spite of their syntactic likeness to adverbial sentences, to be more sensitive to tense, aspect, or mood:

11. (11) Merikare E 93: jw=f br hpr dr r3
    "He has been fighting (lit. "he is on fighting") since god's time (dr r3)"
12. (12) pKahun 11.16–18: "Testament made by the Controller of phylé" Intef-meri, called Kebi, for his son Meri-intef, called Lu-tenteb: jw=f br hpr j3 j3 mj-nj j3 sn n sj3 my-j3. "Herewith I give my (js3 j3) office of controller of phylé (mj-nj-ss) to my son Meri-intef."
6 Adverbial and pseudoverbal patterns

We observed in chapter 4 that Egyptian displays great flexibility in the morphosyntactic variety of the subject of a nominal sentence, which can be any NP including a nominalized VP (section 5.2). The range flexibility applies to the subject of adverbial or pseudoverbal sentences. It can range from a bare noun:

(14) Pesc. B1.332 juw qw=k m sn “Your income (qw=k) is in the storehouse (sn)”
(15) Sh.S. 42 jnef m sn.nw ej “My heart (jnef) was my (only) companion (sn.nw=ej)”

to a suffix, a dependent, or (only in archaic texts) independent pronoun:

(16) Pesc. B1.249 jw=f m mjm-bst n jur “He is (jw=t) a model (mj-bst=) one who is in the front”) for the evildoer (jur “doer”)
(17) Pesc. B1.208 mk tw m mnjw “Look (mk), you (tw) are a shepherd (mnjw)”
(18) Pyr. 1114b juk jur pt’il “(juk) am toward (jur) heaven (pt’il)”

to a participle, a relative form, or rarely an infinitive:

(19) Adm. 8,3 wn m wpw=g hr hsb ky “He who used to be (wn) a messenger (wpw=g) now sends (hr hsb) someone else (ky)”
(20) Pyr. 20–21 jur jsw n mjr hmn=w m h t nhb “What old age does (jur jsw) to people is bad (hmn=w, straive) in every respect”
(21) Pyr. 1730a jws tne=k to jy N mjt km hwr n jji=f wyr

“Behold (jws, particle), this going of yours (km t=k), O father the King, is like (mj) Horus going (km hwr, nominalized VP) to his father Osiris”

The subject position of an adverbial sentence can also be filled by a complex syntagm in which the subject slot of an adverbial clause (S1) is converted into a verbal phrase introduced by wnn, a grammaticalized form of the verb “to be” (S2):

\[ S1 = \text{[Particle]}-\text{NP}_{subj} - \text{AP}_{pred} \]
\[ S2 = \text{[wnn-NP}_{subj} - \text{VP}} \]

This conversion, which was already discussed in the treatment of nominal syntax (section 5.6), allows the originally unmarked adverbial clause to acquire modal features, conveyed by the prospective wnn=f in (22), or to confer pragmatic prominence to an adverbial adjunct such as an interrogative adverb, as signalled by the emphatic wnn-f in (23):

(22) pKahun 12,13 wnn tj=sj bjm.t jm “My wife will be (wnn tj=sj hjm.t) there (jm)”
(23) Sin. B 43–44 wnn jw=f t pf jm-m m-ht=f “But (jw=t) how is that land (wnn to pf) without him (m-ht=f)”

The functional yield of the transformation of an adverbial into a verbal sentence by means of the converter wnn is particularly evident when the adverbial sentence is contextually juxtaposed to its converted verbal counterpart. In (24), an adverbial sentence indicating the general present is followed by a verbal sentence with a prospective wnn-form conveying modal features:

(24) CT I 55b jw=f m ngr wnn=k m ngr “You are divine (m ngr “as a god”) and you will be divine”

At this juncture, a short digression is in order. We just saw that any NP, including nominal forms of the verb and VP resulting from the use of a form of the verb wnn “to be” as converter, can be found as head of an adverbial sentence. Generalizing the scope of the paradigmatic flexibility displayed by the head syntagm of an adverbial sentence, the Standard theory, i.e. the approach to Egyptian grammar which developed in the footsteps of H. J. Polotsky (section 1.3), came to interpret all cases of an initial verbal form accompanied by an AP:

(25) Adm. 1,5 mms zj z=f m bry=f “a man now regards his son as his enemy”
as complex adverbial sentences in which the adverbial phrase, in this case the predicative complement *m hwj-w therapy* "as his enemy," functions as predicate of a sentence whose subject is the nominalized VP, in this case *m33 zj z3-f therapy *a man regards (z3-f) his son (z3-f) therapy. The underlying structure of (25), therefore, would be "that-a-man-regards-his-son (is) as-his-enemy." This analysis seems to be confirmed by the study of the negative patterns: in fact, these initial verbal forms are negated by the corresponding form of the negative verb *tm* followed by the negativ complement (section 7.8.5):

(26) West. 6,5 *tm-t haj(w) br-m "Why (br-m) don't you (tm-t) row (haj-w)?" which is the negative counterpart of *tun-f br-m "why do you row?"

A predictable, but problematic effect of this strictly substitutional analysis, however, was the extension of its scope to non-initial verbal forms, which – because of their paradigmatic similarity to adverbial phrases – came to be interpreted as "circumstantial" (section 4.6.3.1) predicates of an adverbial sentence:

(27) Sin. R 21–22 *bhk 'bful br-lm.wm-f* "the Falcon (bk) flies with his followers"

Here, the VP *'bful* "he flies" is perceived by the Standard theory to be functionally equivalent to (or "transposed" into) the predicate of an adverbial sentence, syntactically identical to the adverb or the prepositional phrase in (1) – (3). Following this model, the underlying structure of (27) would be "the-Falcon (is) while-he-flies." The ultimate consequence of this approach was the drastic reduction in the inventory of verbal sentences posited for Classical Egyptian and the dramatic growth of the category "Adverbial Phrase," which was believed to encompass the vast majority of predicative structures.

In recent years, the limits of this approach have become evident. First of all, the restricted inventory of sentence patterns licensed in Middle Egyptian seems to be at odds with the variety of stylistic forms and devices documented in the classical literature; examples are the semantics of tense and aspect and pragmatic topicalization or focalization phenomena – two areas which are not adequately addressed in the Standard theory. Secondly, while relevant in the assessment of syntactic properties, paradigmatic substitution does not justify by itself a homogeneous treatment of such different morphological and semantic realities as adverbs (which are [-N], [+V]) and nouns ([+N], [-V]) on the one hand vs. verbal forms ([+N], [+V]) on the other. In particular one should be careful not to confuse the pragmatic notion of *topic* such as *m33 zj z3-f* "a man regards his son" in (25), *tm-t haj(w)" the fact that you don't row" in (26), or *bk "the Falcon" in (27), with the syntactic and semantic concept of subject, as is the noun *zj "a man" in (25), the second person feminine pronoun in (26), and the third person pronoun in (27). Also, a circumstantial VP behaves like any other independent sentence in that it can build a main clause when introduced by a pronominal particle (section 7.3):

(28) Sh.S. 2–3 *mk ph-n-n hnw "Look (mk), we have reached (ph-n-n) the residence (hnw)"

whereas this is not the case with a bare adverb (*'mk 'a "look here"), with a prepositional AP (*'mk m prw "look in the house"), or with an adverbial clause of the type discussed in section 6.3 (*'mk br-nnt... "look, because...").

There does exist a sentence pattern in which an AP follows an initial particle:

(29) Sin. B 225 *jw-s mj sm rww "It was like ( mj) the situation of a dream"

But these are instances in which the underlying non-specific nominal subject ("it," i.e. the entire event described in the preceding context) has been omitted under relevance (section 6.3.3). Thirdly, although very powerful from the point of view of the internal description of grammatical structures, the Standard theory is more vulnerable at the level of an adequate explanation of linguistic phenomena, creating a model of Egyptian syntax where a great variety of verbal patterns is idiosyncratically balanced by a marginal role assigned to verbal predication as opposed to its nominal and especially adverbial conversions. It seems appropriate, therefore, to stick to a verbalistic approach to Egyptian syntax and to treat patterns with verbal predicate as verbal sentences. Attempts aimed at expanding the inventory of sentence types licensed within the Standard theory by means of adjustments of the theory itself will be discussed in the next chapter (sections 7.4–7.5).

From a purely syntactic point of view, what we call a "pseudo-verbal" sentence is in fact nothing other than an adverbial sentence in which the NP of the prepositional predicate is an infinitive, the stative being – as it were – the surface structure acquired by an underlying prepositional phrase "in the state of." But on the other hand, the choice of a verbal root allows pseudo-verbal patterns to become much more sensitive than adverbial sentences to semantic features, such as the expression of tense, aspect, or mood. In fact, pseudo-verbal sentences are best understood as grammaticalized constructions in which the preposition has lost its original semantic scope and has acquired a new status: the locative function of *br* or *m* is reinterpreted as indicating the "position" of the actor within the predication expressed by the verbal infinitive. This "position" of the subject is in fact the main feature of verbal aspect as defined in section 4.6.2 above: while prepositions like *br "on" or m "in" will express different nuances of imperfectivity depending on the
6 Adverbial and pseudo verbal syntax

6.3 Adverbial conversions

6.3.1 Adverbial clauses

Any type of Egyptian sentence — nominal, adverbial, or verbal — can be converted into an adverbial clause by means of a subordinating conjunction. This conjunction is often the pronominal morpheme *nn* "that" (see Greek ὅτι, Latin *quod*), already referred to in section 5.3, introduced by a preposition, for example *hr-ntt* "because" followed by a nominal sentence in (34), *r-ntt* "to the effect that" with a pseudo verbal sentence in (35), and *dr-ntt* "since" with a verbal sentence in (36):

(34) Siut 1,288 hr-ntt jnk z3 w·b ny w·j jm-w·n nb "because I (jnk) am the son of a priest (z3 w·b) like (ny) anyone among you"

(35) pKahun 27,8–9 "This is a letter to my lord (may he be alive, prosperous, and healthy) r-ntt bhw nb n(j) nhr-hj nb nb wdb3.w snb.w d·w w3f·w m s·w=sn nb to the effect that all the affairs (b3w nb) of my lord (may he be alive, prosperous, and healthy) are safe (d·w, static) and well (wdb3.w, static) in all their places (s·w=sn nb)"

(36) Berlin 1157,11 dr-ntt sdn nbj r hr n(j) r "since the Nubian (nbj) listens to a verbal attack (jr n(j), lit. "a fall of mouth")"

A certain number of prepositions can also function as conjunctions, for example *n* "for" — "because," *m* "in" — "when," *n-mw·t* "for the sake of" — "in order to," *r* "toward" — "so that," and control an embedded verbal sentence converted into an adverbial clause. A particular perfective verb form, the *snt-m-t* (section 4.6.3.1), is used only after prepositions implying completion, such as *r* "until" or *dr* "since" and as subordinate negative perfective form after the particle *nj* (section 7.8):

(37) Turk. I 101,4–7 "Never before had one like me heard the secret of the King's harem, but His Majesty made me hear it n gwr(j) br jb n(j) bnsf r sjawj-f nb r sb-f nb t bsk-f nb because I was worthy (gwrj) in His Majesty's heart more than (n) any official of his, more than any noble of his, more than any servant of him"

(38) Turk. IV 897,11–13 rph.l=j nb nb jb jw m zjt m mms.wt jfj=j "I knew your character while I was still (nwj, section 6.6) in the nest (m zjt), when you were (m w=sn k "in you-are") in my father's following"

(39) Sin. B 247 r pb·tj daj njy jw "until I reached (r pb·tj) the town of Itju"

Under the control of a conjunction one also finds adverbial or pseudo verbal sentences that have been converted into verbal sentences by means of a verb form from the root *wnm* "to be"; from a pseudo verbal sentence *jw m·w=sn mn w "their names are established," we obtain:

(40) Meir III,11 jfinjw nb m-mw·t jw m·w=sn mn(w) n d t "I did this so that their names (m·w=sn) be established (mn(w), static) forever"

In some cases, especially with the prepositions *m* "in" and *m-bt" after," the adverbial clause is topicalized (section 5.4) and positioned to the left of the main sentence, with or rarely without the introductory particle *jr* "as for":

(41) Habnub 22,2 jr m wjn m bnd wj nj mnw "When I was a child (lit. "as-for in my-being as a child"), I was (already) a Friend"

(42) West. 8,22–23 hr m-bt swnf w·j r w·j h·n p sm w·w hr giw "And so (hr), after the one had reached the other (lit. "as-for it reached the one to the one"), the goose stood (h·n p sm w·w "in you-are") cackling (hr giw)"

The main function of *jr* "as for," however, is to introduce hypothetical verbal clauses. In Egyptian as well as in many other languages, the protasis of a conditional sentence is treated as an adverbial topicalization of a verbal sentence. Depending on the semantic message conveyed by the hypothetical
sentence,17 the verbal predicate of the converted protasis can be a preterital sdm=n=f implying an unfulfilled condition (43), an aorist sdm=f conveying the idea of possibility (44), a subjunctive (45) for deontic modality, or a prospective (46) in temporal contexts ("when"):18

(43) Adm. 12,6 jrs zm.n=nw=nn j njg.m=mr

"If we had been fed (passive sdm=n=f), I would not have found you"

(44) Peas. B1,85-87 jrs hjs=kJ t j njg.n=nn sdn=kJ jmn=mr m ms.w mn kj nby.t bs=f=kJ

"If you go down (hjs=kJ) to the sea of righteousness (ms.w) and sail on it (sdn=kJ jmn=mr) with the right wind (ms.w), no storm (nby.t) will strip away (kjy) your sail"

(45) pKahun 6,24 jrf sdn=kJ =s jyj jnj=mr m njy=mr

"If indeed you see (msn=kJ, 4.6.3.2c) something on her eyes, she will never (r njy) give birth"

(46) Pyr. 1252e-f jrf prj=f m sbs pw jstb t njg.n=nn p t jn=mr sbs pw mh.t(nj) njg.n=nn

"If/when he comes out (prj=f) of this eastern gate of heaven, bring (jn) to him this northern gate of heaven"

Adverbial sentences can be converted into hypothetical clauses by transforming them into verbal sentences governed by a grammaticalized form of the verb wmn "to be," mostly the "emphatic" sdm=f. For example, the adverbial sentence jyj=f=kJ m ssmy "you are a leader" is converted into the verbal sentence wmn=f=kJ m ssmy and introduced by jr when functioning as adverbial protasis in hypothetical discourse:

(47) Pt. 264-65 jrs wmn=f=kJ m ssmy hr sdm=f=kJ msw sswr

"If you are a leader, be pleasing (hr) when you hear (sdm=f=kJ) the word of the petitioner"

In other cases, the element indicating the semantic tie to the main sentence, rather than a preposition or a prepositionally derived conjunction, is a "particle," i.e. a morpheme which functions as complementizer outside the sentence boundary.19 In these cases, one does not deal with syntactic subordination, but rather with a linkage between two main clauses; the clause introduced by the particle provides contextual background information, and is in this respect semantically dependent upon the main clause, but remains syntactically a nominal, adverbial, or verbal main clause. The most important particles indicating contextual dependence are jsk=kJk (> jst/jt > jst/st),20 which often follow the foreground segment of discourse, and jgfr/br, which usually precede it. Both of them have a temporal or circumstantial meaning:

(48) Sin. R 22-24 jsk 'h=f bn' lms.w=f see example (27) - nn njg.t rhp st ms'=f jst hjs=f r ms.w=nnb wsw.m m bswf m ms.p

"The Falcon flies with his followers, without letting (nn njg.t, section 6.5.2) his army (ms'=f) know it. Meanwhile (jst), the royal children were (wn w) with him (m-
In these sentences, js presents the explanatory sentence as a "thetic," i.e., global object of the verbal predication, as the metalinguistic content — as it were — of "saying" or "knowing": "My Majesty knows: jfr.nj=st sb wr jr.f=1.did-this-according-to-his-order," parallel to the use of a nominal sdm=f (section 4.6.3.1b) in the first explanatory clause: "My Majesty knows: njtr=f=that-he-is-divine."

(b) At the discourse level, js represents a symmetrical counterpart to jfr or jsk, in that it grants pragmatic prominence, rather than background function, to the sentence in which it appears. The utterance marked by js does not convey the discourse topic, i.e., the background against which the new information is presented as relevant, but rather a contrastive focus, i.e., a contextually unexpected argument or state of affairs:

(54) Sh.S. 149–54 "Then he laughed at me for what I had said as something he deemed foolish, and he said to me: 'You don't have much Myrrh, although you now own incense, jsk js bps pw.t snjw m=ns-jnj sw bkw pv pf dd.m=k jn.ow lw bw pw n jw psw js jwd=k jw r s t n njzp m=sk jw psw hpr=sw m swy l. On the other hand (js), am the ruler of Punt: Myrrh — it belongs to me (ns-jnj sw); this oil which you mentioned (dd.m=k) you were going to send (ns=ts, lit. "to send it") — there's plenty on this island! And (js) when it happens (hps) that you depart from this place, you'll never see (njzp m=sk) this island again, since it will have turned (hpr=sw, stative) into water".

(55) Adm. 12.1 mnjw pw nj=st bnb h n bsh m jnsf nd jdn=f jnj=st ls hbrw n wrd=lw=st "He is the shepherd (mnjw) of everyone (bwbh); there is no evil in his heart. His herds (jdn=f) are few, but (js) he spends the day (jnj=st hbrw) taking care of them (r wrd=lw=st, lit. "to take care of them") "

The clauses with js convey contextually unexpected information: in (54), the first js allows the speaker to emphasize the contrast between the interlocutor's powerlessness and his own prominence, whereas the second instance of js presents a pragmatic opposition between the present and the future situation; in (55), it is assumed that, if herds are few, the shepherd would not be expected to spend the day herding them — a contrast which attracts the attentional focus of discourse.

(c) At the syntactic level, js is a marker of dependency (section 6.4). In early texts, any sentence type (nominal, adverbial, or verbal) accompanied by this particle is converted into a dependent clause, either nominal (in the case of the object clause of verbs of saying, hearing, or knowing) or adverbial (in the other constructions). What follows are examples of nominal (56), adverbial (57)–(58), pseudoverbal (59), and verbal sentences (60) converted into dependent clauses by means of js. In the case of adverbial embedding, the clause is often introduced by an explicit marker of subordination, such as a conjunction (n, hr=ntf, etc.). The translation techniques may vary, but they should aim to render the interplay of semantic theticity, discourse focality, and syntactic dependency that constitute the functional array of this particle.

(56) Pfr. 543c ndr n=st f nd n jn js pw ntr z ntr "The King has seized (ndr=n) for himself your tail, for the King is a god (ntr), son of a god"

The subordinate clause is an embedded nominal sentence introduced by the conjunction n "since, for" (= preposition n "to, for").

(57) Pfr. 884 rfj=sw=st nuf=sw nw=ntf bl=st wj=sw js m st wj=sw=st "Arms (>wj) have been given to you, ritual dances (rjn=st) have come down to you, food (jfr=sw) has been given to you; the Great Reviver (m=j=st wj=sw) has cried (shb) for you — Osiris being in the place of his arms."

Following the pattern observed in section 6.2, when a main adverbial sentence is transformed into a dependent clause accompanied by js, it undergoes the usual conversion into a verbal sentence introduced by a topicalized form of wnn "to be"; from an underlying adverbial sentence *jw N p=sn. "the King is among them," we obtain:

(58) Pfr. 1489b–90a dmsg wnn js N cpns m=fts sn ndx=f wj=sw=st p=st "You will say (dmsg) that this King is among them (m=fts sn), namely the gods who are (imj=sw) in heaven"

In pseudoverbal sentences, however, the conversion does not take place:

(59) CT VII 475i–j dmsg sn jw=sw js rj=k=sw n sm wnn w=sn "They said that I know them in their behaviors"

Finally, example (60) shows the particle js converting a verbal sentence into a dependent clause. In this case, the contrast between main and dependent clause evoked by js is probably best rendered in English by breaking the discourse continuity:

(60) Pfr. 777c jw=sw js ndn=st dsm=f z=f=sw jw=sw js bms=st wj=sw=st "You have come (jw=sw, fem.) that you may hide (dsm=f) your son — you have come that you may join (bms=st) this Great One."

6.3 Adverbial conversions

As a rule, Egyptian adverbial phrases — whether they represent a pragmatic focus of the utterance or a mere predicative adjunct — follow the main predication. We saw in sections 5.2.1 and 6.3.1, however, that the particle jr "as for," etymologically the full form of the preposition r "toward," is used for the topicalization of a phrase (jr "as for") or of a clause (jr "if"); the
resulting AP is dislocated to the left of the main clause. In rare instances, bare adverbial phrases can also be extrapoled to the left of the main clause:

(61) Adm. 14, 14 mj-ny nph nj nb hr sms smn-w
"How can any man (nj nb) kill (sms) his fellow?"

In specific semantic environments, a bare noun phrase can be used as adverbial adjunct, as introduced by a preposition.26 This pattern is rather frequent with indications of time:

(62) Pt. 186 sms jpl-k tr n(i) smn-w
"Follow (sms) your heart as long as you live (tr nj smn-w, lit. "time-of-your-being")"

and in the colophon formula of a literary text:

(63) Sin. B 311 jwn-f pw hmr tw-fo f phw+wj=m mj qm yr m zbs
"This is how it comes (jwn-f pw, section 5.3) from its beginning (hmr tw-fo, lit. "its beginning") to its end (tr phw+wj=m) as found (qm yr) in writing".

Nominal phrases are not the only syntactic formations capable of acquiring adverbial function. Verbal and pseudoverbal sentences can also appear embedded as AP without overt markers of adverbialization:

(64) Sin. B 233-34 mw m jwr zwr tw-at m sij-k
"The water in the river (mwr m jwr) is drunk (zwr tw-at) when you wish (sij-k)"

While the semantic meaning of this type of adverbialization (whether temporal "when you wish," causal "because you wish," hypothetical "if you wish," etc.) remains similar in the cases in which the embedding of a sentence into an adverbial clause is explicitly signalled by a conjunction, its adverbial character is shown by its treatment as adjunct under the control of another phrase,27 for example the verbal phrase zwr tw-fo "it is drunk" in (64). In this environment, the adverbialized VP belongs to the same substitutional category of a simple AP, as shown by a comparison of (64) above and (27) below, an example we already considered in the preceding section:

(27) Sin. R 21-22 bjk 'b-at t hnt smn-w-f "The Falcon flies with his followers"

The treatment of a VP as adverbial adjunct occurs frequently, but not exclusively, as oblique complement of verbs of perception such as m33 "to see" or gmn "to find." In the case of a verbal form, for example the circumstantial sgmr tw-f in (65)-(66), the controlling element, usually the logical object of the main predication, is resumed by the suffix pronoun of the subordinate adverbial VP;28 in the case of a pseudoverbal sentence, for example hr + infinitive in (67), the subject is omitted under agreement if coindexed with the subject of the main predication:

(65) Sin. B 52-53 prj-3 mn ttw m33 ttw-w hmr tw-at bmrtw f rnsbmg
"He is a fighter (prj-3) "one whose arm is stretched") without peer (nn twt m33 "without likeness to him") when he is seen (m33 ttw-w) charging down upon (hmr tw-at) the Boumen and approaching (bmrtw) the opponents"

(66) pKHuhn 30.30 gmrj-nj nbsj 'nh w qms w smb w bmrtn-f
"I found (gm-nj-nj) my Lord (may he be alive, prosperous and healthy) travelling southward (bmrtn-f)"

(67) Adm. 8, 5-6 mn mbl tr hr wam k3-m
"Look, a man is happy (mn tr) when he eats (hr wam) his food (k3-m)"

This last example shows that the coreferential subject of a subordinate pseudoverbal clause is omitted when it is not governed by a verb of perception. But when the subject of the adverbial clause is different from the controlling NP, it remains overt, as is demonstrated by the different treatment of the two adverbial phrases in (68); the coreferential second person subject is omitted before the stative dj-ij, whereas the non-coreferential jh-w, i.e. the subject of hr + infinitive, is overt:

(68) Sin. B 193-9 pt jw m jnpt f jwj-w hr jh-jn k
"The heaven (pt) is above you (jw k), while you are placed in the hearse (jnpt f jwj-w) and (while) oxen (jwj) pull you (hr jh-jn k)"

The transformation of a verbal or pseudoverbal sentence into a controlled AP is, therefore, a different phenomenon from the use of a VP in a main clause following a noun, a topicalized verbal form, or an introductory particle (section 6.2).29 the former is a truly adverbial conversion, the scope of the VP being restricted to the adverbial phrase, whereas the latter is a pattern in which the VP functions as the main predicate of a verbal clause. This difference is not recognized by the Standard theory.

Instead of an entire clause (section 6.3.2), the particle js can also control a lower adverbial node, i.e. a simple adverbial phrase. In (69), the predicative complement introduced by m is further expanded in the two APs controlled by js, with the preposition m omitted under relevance; in (70), the two adverbial adjuncts introduced by js convey the emphasized goal of the state of affairs expressed in the main nominal sentence:

(69) Puk. 727b- c hrj m k m sm k md m jwr jw js hr hmr tw-at jwij js pm jwwn
"Go down for yourself (m k) as Jackal of Upper Egypt (m sm k) -- as Anubis on his belly (hr hmr tw-at), as Opener (jwij) in front of Heliopolis (jwwn)"

(70) Urk. I 222, 18-223, 2 jnk jw w r c Bj w sj h m jn hr jntr js jnhr fxntr c js
"I was the one who opened (jwij) this area -- on the one hand, in order to react against (r sjh tr) whoever was in the Necropolis, on the other hand, in order to do (r jnj) what I cherish (jr fxntr c js)"
6.3.3 Converted vs. unconverted relative clauses

Relative clauses are embedded subordinate clauses used to modify a nominal antecedent. Egyptian syntax exhibits two types of relative clause. The more common one, the “true” relative clause, represents the conversion of a main sentence into a subordinate clause. In the case of a verbal sentence, this syntactic transformation is performed by adjectival forms of the verb, i.e. participles and relative forms; the corresponding patterns will be dealt with in section 7.5. In the case of adverbial (71) or pseudoverbal sentences (72), and only very rarely of verbal sentences, the subordinating morpheme is the relative adjective *ntj* or an adjectival conversion of the verb *wn* “to be”:

(71) Sin. B. 33-34

mr.n wj rj.m w km.t njj.w jm bn’w.t

"The Egyptians *(mr.n km.t) who *(njj.w) were there *(jm) with *(bn’w.t) having borne witness for me"

(72) Urk. IV 386.4-10

hw-t mj psj gos wt.w rj. j j r.j...sfs.n=s j s

"The temple of the lady of Cusae *(nh.t qst) which had fallen *(wt.w rj.j) "which was having-fallen," participle + stative into ruin... = I rededicated *(sfs.n=s j s) it"

In these sentences, when the subject of the relative clause is coreferential with the antecedent, it is omitted under agreement and replaced by the relative converter (73); if it differs from it, it is resumed by a pronoun in the relative clause (74):

(73) Penn. B. 1,287

nj rj.n tw wms t m j k

"That which is in the heart *(wms t m jk) cannot be known"

(74) West. 11.10-11

ps.py ns sn n j j.w m s

"What *(ps) is the reason *(sn, lit. "this") for *(nh.j.s) we *(sn) have come *(ji.wa, stative)?"

The use of these converted relative clauses, however, is limited to specific antecedents: non-specific NPs are modified in Egyptian by adverbial clauses. The adverbial pattern which modifies a non-specific antecedent is called *virtual* or *unconverted* relative clause. Any sentence type (verbal, pseudoverbal, adverbial, or nominal) can be embedded into the main clause as an adverbial phrase modifying a non-specific antecedent; syntactically, these clauses behave exactly like the ordinary adjuncts we discussed in section 6.3.2, as is shown by the identical treatment of the pseudoverbal relative clause *jw=t m j j.t* which modifies *htw* “a serpent” in (75) and the similar pattern *jw=t hi m d.t* controlled by the main verbal clause *sgm.m=t hrw=t* “I heard his voice” in (76):

(75) Sh.S. 61-62

sgm.n=s j htw jw=t m j j.t

"I found that it was a serpent which was coming"

(76) Sin. B 1-2

sgm.n=s [j]jw=t htw jw=t m d.t

"I heard his voice while he was speaking"

Thus, any unconverted main sentence can be embedded as adverbial ad-junct into a higher syntactic node. When the controlling element is a noun, the AP functions as unconverted relative clause modifying the noun; when the controlling node is an entire clause, it functions as adverbial adjunct modifying the predication. That a virtual relative clause is in fact a sentence embedded as AP modifying a noun clause, is shown by the different possible interpretations and translations which can often be given to a sentence in which this pattern appears, depending on whether one takes the embedded AP to modify the noun, in which case it is a “virtual” relative clause, as in (a) in examples (77)–(80), or the entire predication, in which case it functions as ordinary adjunct, as in (b) in the same passages.

(A) Embedding of a verbal sentence:

(77) p[bers 91.3

kt n t msdr dj=f mw

lit. “Another (remedy) of an ear it-gives water”

(a) Sb = [kt n t [msdr dj=f mw]Np] [jw=Sub]

“This is another remedy for an ear that gives off water”

(b) Sb = [kt n t msdr [dj=f mw]Vp] [jw=Sub]

“This is another remedy for an ear that it off water”

(B) Embedding of a pseudoverbal sentence:

(78) Merikare E 51

ms.m=s j jw=k rj.j s b t w s

lit. “Do not kill a man you-know his-worth”

(a) Sb = [m ms=m=s [j jw=k [rj.j s b t w s]Vp]

“Do not kill a man whose worth you know”

(b) Sb = [m ms=m=s j jw=k rj.j s b t w s]Pseudoverbal

“Do not kill a man if you know his worth”

(C) Embedding of an adverbial sentence:

(79) Sh.S. 119-21

jw dpt s r j j t m b w sqd.w j m=s r b m=n k s

lit. “A boat is toward-coming from-the-residence sailors in-it you-know”

(a) Sb = [jw [dpt sqd.w j m=s r b m=n k]Vt] [j j j t m b w]

“A boat in which there are sailors whom you know will come from the residence”

(b) Sb = [jw dpt s r j j t m b w [sqd.w j m=s r b m=n k]A]

“A boat will come from the residence, with sailors in whom it you know”

This last sentence offers an example of a “virtual” relative clause (i.e. the unconverted verbal predicate *rb.m=n k “you know” with the omission of the resumptive object pronoun "st "them,” see below) embedded into a higher pattern of the same type (*sqd.w j m=s*).
In converted, i.e. true relative clauses, resumptive pronouns are omitted under agreement when they immediately follow the agreement-carrier.34 This is most often the case when the resumptive element is the subject of the relative clause, whether verbal, in which case the agreement is carried by a participle:

(81) Disp. 78–79 mhj=t br mj=s sd.w = m swh:t
"I shall grieve (mhj=t) for her children who have been broken (sd.w) in the egg"
or adverbial, in which case one finds a relative converter:

(82) Sh.S. 170–71 't=nhj br jas m nhj=t m dpt.t ta
"Then I called out to the crew (mt) which was in 'this boat"

Omission of the resumptive pronoun can also take place, however, when it indicates the object of the verbal action, provided it immediately follows the agreement-carrier, as in (79) above as opposed to (83) below, where the resumptive object pronoun (st) is overt:

(83) Sin. B 144–45 kdt.nj=t jij=tnw wj.t=nhj=t nhj=t m ref
"That which he had planned (k3.t.n=ref) to do (jij=tnw "to do it") to me, I did it to him"

"Virtual" relative clauses, on the other hand, are unconverted; they do not display any adjectival element, whether participle, relative form, or converter, as carrier of the agreement. This explains why their subject always needs to be overt: in the abovementioned "That which he had (mhj=t) which was in 'this boat" the subject is non-specific, which allows for omission of the resumptive pronoun. As opposed to the omission of the subject in (84), where the object of the verbal predication is a specific noun phrase immediately followed by the starive, i.e. by the pseudo verbal predicate:

(84) Uruk. 1 125,15–16 gmj=nj=t bpa jam tins (w) = t t=tmb
"I found that the ruler of Yam had himself gone to the land of Libya"
S = [gmj=nj=t bsa jam [sw tw w = t t=tmb]]
*I [found] [serpent it-is-coming] (a) [this]]
as opposed to the omission of the subject in (84), where the object of the verbal predication is a specific noun phrase immediately followed by the starive, i.e. by the pseudo verbal predicate:

(85) Sin. R 11–12 jst rj bzh jn=t msn m t=tnhy w zsw smsw m bj jy
"Meanwhile (jst rj, section 6.3.1), His Majesty had sent off (bzh jn=t) to the land of the Libyans an army (mt) whose leader was his elder son," lit. "his elder son as a leader (m bj) thereof"

Thus, both converted and unconverted relative clauses exhibit resumptive elements which point back to the noun phrase they modify. When omission of the resumptive element occurs, it is not caused by grammatical agreement, but by semantic relevance.36 Unlike mandatory omission under agreement, omission under relevance is an optional device sensitive to the hierarchies of animacy and salience, with subjects that are low on either of these hierarchies more likely to be deleted. An example of optional subject omission under relevance in "true" relative clauses is provided by contrasting (86), where the omitted subject is animate, with (87), where it is inanimate and overt:

(86) Neferti 26 nj zrs=nhj=p nj jy=*
*I cannot foretell (nj zrs=nhj=p) that which (nj) has not yet come about (nj jy=*)"

(87) Peas. B2,80 m phe (w) nj nj psw=tw
"Do not attack (m phe (w)) one who (nj) has not attacked you"

The same distribution characterizes the subject omission under relevance in virtual relative clauses; while in both cases the subject is non-specific, which justifies the use of an unconverted relative clause, it is omitted under relevance in (88), where it is inanimate, but maintained in (89), where it is human:

(88) Adm. 7,1 mzn jst jw=nhj=t brj nj psw=nhj=p bpr
"Look now, things have been done (jw=nhj=t) which did not use (nj psw=nhj=p) to happen"

(89) Peas. B1,204–5 m tw m brj la=nhj=t nj rfs=nhj=tw sws sm brj
"Look, you are (like) a storehouse supervisor (brj-la=nhj=t) who does not let (nj rfs=nhj=t) a poor man (sws) pass in (sws) at once (brj=*)"
6.4 Initial vs. non-initial clauses

6.4.1 General features

In our discussion thus far, we have considered examples of adverbial sentences regardless of the function of the proclitic particle by which they are sometimes introduced. The presence or absence of this morpheme, however, is an important feature in the syntax of adverbial sentences, and its function has been the subject of intense discussion among students of Egyptian.

The general rule is that adverbial and pseudoverbal patterns of the type:

\[ S = \text{Particle} + \text{NP} + \text{AP} \]

are *initial* main sentences, whereas bare patterns of the type:

\[ S = \text{NP} + \text{AP} \]

are *non-initial* clauses, either paratactically juxtaposed to the initial predication as non-initial main clauses or controlled as subordinate clauses by another phrase, according to the patterns described in section 6.3 above. This flexibility displayed by sentence patterns, which can appear both as independent main sentence or as subordinate clause, depending on the syntactic environment, is a common feature of Egyptian syntax, being shared by nearly all patterns, whether nominal, adverbial, or verbal.

The dialectics between the initial (main) sentence introduced by a particle and the non-initial (coordinate or subordinate) bare adverbial clause is captured in the following passage:

(90) Sin. R 8-11  jw haw m sgr jb.w m gm.w rw-tj-wr tj  bwm.w (bkly, h m [tp]-hr-mss.t p.t m jnw

"The residence was in silence (sgr), the hearts in mourning (gmw), the Two Great Portals were shut (bwm.w), the courtiers head-on-knee (tp-hr-mss.t), the nobles in grief (jnw)"

Here, the past reference is obviously not an inherent quality of the adverbial or pseudoverbal sentence, but rather a feature derived from the preceding context, which in this case is determined by a narrative infinitive (section 4.6.4b), followed by a series of main verbal or pseudoverbal clauses:

(91) Sin. R 5-8  rchip-sp 30 sbd 3 sbt sw 7 'r njt r zb.wf nzw-bjt sbtp-jb.t  shm=t t p.t bmn(w) m jnm h'.w-njr sbp(w) m jnj sw

"Regnal year 30, third month of the Inundation, day 7: Ascending (r) of the god to his horizon (r sbp.wf); the King of Upper and Lower Egypt (nzw-bjt) Sekhertepibis flew (shm=t) to heaven, having become united (bmn.w) with the sun-disk; the god's body (h'.w-njr) merged (sbp.w) with the one who created (jnj) him"

It is important to appreciate the difference between "initiality" as a property of *discourse* and "independence" as syntactic features of the *clause*. In (90), all adverbial and pseudoverbal clauses are main clauses, in the sense that - if taken individually - they all represent well-formed Egyptian sentences paratactically organized within a chain of discourse. Only the first sentence, however, is introduced by a particle of initiality (jw), which indicates that the corresponding adverbial sentence (jnw m sgr) opens a new segment of discourse. In (91), the discourse setting is provided by the date and the narrative infinitive. The following sentences depend on it from the point of view of the narrative sequence; within this context, the verbal sentence with topicalized subject "the King flew to heaven" and the pseudoverbal sentence "the god's body merged with the one who created him" are both non-initial main clauses paratactically linked to the initial form; the pseudoverbal adjunct "having become united with the sun-disk," on the other hand, is controlled by the preceding VP shf=fr p.t "he flew to heaven"; not only is it non-initial, but it is also syntactically subordinate.

The difference between the linguistic levels of clause vs. discourse has not played any tangible role in the *Standard* theory, which - as one will recall - was primarily interested in the sentence level. Thus, scholars working within that frame have oscillated between three positions: (a) considering adverbial and pseudoverbal clauses not introduced by a particle to be subordinate clauses, the initial sentence introduced by the particle being the only main sentence;\(^{38}\) (b) as a variant thereof, taking the proclitic particle to apply to all subsequent sentences, but to be - as it were - omitted under relevance;\(^{39}\) (c) taking bare adverbial and pseudoverbal sentences not introduced by an initial particle to be main clauses which in a chain of discourse become hypothetically linked to the initial sentence; in this case, the particle is thought to convey the syntactic/pragmatic "theme" (or "subject," or "figure") of the entire macrosentence and to function, therefore, essentially as a nominal element, similar to the initial verbal forms *sdn=t* and *sdn=n=f* in emphatic function (section 4.6.3.1).\(^{40}\)

None of these analyses, however, is entirely satisfactory. If option (a) were true, Egyptian discourse would display a strikingly low number of main clauses and an equally surprisingly high number of subordinate clauses, which is linguistically *rather unlikely*. The difficulty with option (b) is that all forms of omission, including omission under relevance, seem to require in Egyptian specific environments or conditions, whereas in this case the scope of the introductory particle would lack clear boundaries; option (c) requires the assumption of a thematic function for a particle, i.e. for the lowest syn-
tactic element in the hierarchy of animacy and salience.\(^4\) This assumption is equally not convincing.

The analysis presented here draws a distinction between the level of clause and the level of discourse, and thus provides a satisfactory account of adverbal and pseudoverbal syntax. Adverbal and pseudoverbal sentences introduced by a particle are always main clauses; non-initial patterns may be paratactically linked main clauses or embedded subordinate clauses. The difference between forms with and without introductory particle lies on the discourse level, in that sentence introduced by an initial proclitic particle opens a segment of text.\(^2\) This discourse opening function need not be filled by a particle; it can also be assumed by a temporal setting, as in example (91) above, by an initial noun phrase, as in (92), or by a verbal sentence, as in (93):

(92) Pt. 7–19 jty nbej wj brpr(w) jsb hsj.w wgg jw.w jtw hr msw sqd n=f hbr(w) r‘w-nb jrtj ngs.w ‘nq,jm.jm.r w gph ‘hr br sq w wrj-jb rs ge(tj) nj mdw.n=f jh bm.w nj sjs x n sf qs amn.w n ef nww bw-mdw brpr(w) m bw-bhm dp t mb t lm(i)

"Sovereign (jty), my lord! Age (mj) has showed up, old age (jw) has arrived; weakness (wgg) has come, feebleness (jb) grows; if one tries to sleep, one is in discomfort (lit. "the one who sleeps is discomforted") all day; eyes (jrj) are dim, ears (nq,jm) deaf, strength (ghbr) is declining because of exhaustion (wgr,wj); the mouth is silent and cannot speak (nj mdwn), the heart (jb) is finished and cannot recall (nj sjsx) the past (of "yesterday"); bones ache (lit. "the bone has been aching") completely (n-ww); good has turned (brpr) into evil; all taste is gone (bnj.t).

(93) Wtp. B1, 135–37 jw jn sp t pi pn (bsw nww) ts n w br sjs x n tbn y sbs n=f kh hr bs hsw=f stn t lhp w b wj w’ntl

"Then the peasant said: 'He who measures (bsw) the corn-heaps cheats (hr sjsx) for his own interest (ntj); he who fills (mj) for another steals (hr bsg) the other's property; he who should rule (stn) according to the laws (r lhp) orders theft (hr wj 'wts).’"

The initial vocative phrase "Sovereign my lord" in (92) and the narrative tense "then the peasant said" in (93) both display the feature [+INITIAL]; they open a discourse unit which is expanded by means of main adverbial or pseudoverbal clauses which lack the initialality feature of the first discourse nucleus,\(^4\) but are paratactically annexed to the initial NP or VP. We also saw that in contexts of syntactic dependency, the same bare patterns can appear embedded as subordinate clauses – a flexibility shared by nearly all Egyptian sentence patterns. Example (94) provides a sequence of two statives, the first of which is the predicate of a non-initial main clause paratactically linked to the initial verbal sentence introduced by the particle mk "look," whereas the second functions as subordinate adverbial phrase controlled by the first form, which immediately precedes it:

(94) Sh. S. 2–7 mk ph.n=n bsw... jw mdw.n=f gjy 'd jy "Look, we have reached (ph.n=n) the residence (bsw)...and our crew (jw mdw.n=f) has arrived (gjy) safely ('d jy "it being safe")"

Since they provide the discourse setting by opening a new textual unit, initial particles offer an ideal insight into the interface of syntax, pragmatics, and semantics. Most of them can also introduce verbal sentences, following a pattern of syntactic distribution similar to the one we just discussed: sentences introduced by an initial particle are initial main clauses, bare verbal sentences function either as non-initial main clauses or as embedded subordinate clauses.

Thus, all particles, not only markers of initiality such as jw or mk, but also the hypotactic jsk, jtr or jrs referred to in section 6.3.1, are ideal examples of what contemporary X-bar theory calls "complementizers," i.e. constituents added to a bare sentence in order to generate a specific clausal unit.\(^4\) In this respect, rather than operating with the traditional two levels of clausal linkage (parataxis vs. hypotaxis or coordination vs. subordination), it seems particularly suitable to analyze Egyptian syntactic phenomena positing three "cluster points," representing three different stages of grammaticalization:\(^5\)

(a) Parataxis, i.e. the linkage between main clauses. This linkage remains usually unexpressed in Egyptian syntax, as in the case of bare adverbial, pseudoverbal or verbal sentences which follow an initial main clause within a chain of discourse. A specimen of paratactic chain was provided in (90):

(90) Sin. R. 8–11 jw bsw m sgr jtr m gmw rw sj-wj-tj bsw m [bsy.l.l-m jtr-rj] m jnt p‘m m jns

"The residence was in silence, the hearts in mourning, the Two Great Portals were shut, the courtiers head-on-knee, the nobles in grief"

(b) Hypotaxis, i.e. a semantic, rather than syntactic dependency of a sentence on the discourse nucleus. Hypotactically linked clauses are usually introduced by particles such as jsk, jtr or jrs; their semantic scope and their pragmatic setting can be properly understood only in reference to the message conveyed in the textual nucleus, as in (85), the passage which in Sinuhe's text immediately follows (90):

(85) Sin. R. 11–12 jst jf bsb jnt l phn=f ml’ r z-s mbp jw zw=f smsw m bjy jy "Meanwhile, His Majesty had sent off to the land of the Libyans an army whose leader was his elder son"

(c) Subordination, i.e. the syntactic dependency of a clause on a higher node, which itself can be a main or a subordinate clause. Subordination is
usually signalled by morphological markers such as prepositions (for example *m "in" > "when") governing nominalized verbal phrases, conjunctions (such as *hr-nit "because"), or particles (if "if"):

(38) Urk. IV 897,11-13  
`tf(n)j prj twj m zstj m wn=f m wn=k m wnt.w njy=f

"I knew your character while still in the nest, when you were in my father's following"

In the absence of an overt marker of dependency, subordination can also be determined by syntactic control. In this case, one speaks of "embedding," as in the case of adverbial or verbal sentences functioning as virtual relative clauses or controlled by a verb of perception:

(66) pKahun 30,30  
gmj.nj nbj prj w wdd.w nb.w lprj=f

"I found my Lord (may he be alive, prosperous and healthy) travelling southward"

In fact, it is well-known that more explicit devices of clause linkage, such as conjunctions, signal a lower degree of syntactic, pragmatic, or semantic integration than less explicit markers, or no markers at all.46

I think that this tridimensional approach can account for most of the uncertainties faced by students of Egyptian in dealing with issues of parataxis vs. hypotaxis.47 The historical development in later Egyptian is for markers of adverbial hypotaxis to become grammaticalized as introductory particles of a main clause pattern or as signals of syntactic subordination.48 An example of the former is provided by the evolution of the Present I pattern (section 6.6.1), and of the latter by the grammaticalization of conjunctival forms of the verb *wnn "to be" as converters (past *wnn, nominal *wnn, and relative *wnn, *wnn.t, *wnn.w, section 7.9) or as conjunction (*wnn "that"

6.4.2 The proclitic particles *jw and *mk

The most important and complex proclitic particle is *jw, examples of which we already encountered throughout this chapter.49 Its semantic scope can be defined as an overt assertion of truth ("truly," "indeed," and the like), i.e. as the explicit positive counterpart to a negative statement (section 6.5); pragmatically, it relates the event described in the verbal or adverbial sentence to the speaker's situation or personal experience — without necessarily implying his direct involvement:

(95) Sin. B 81-84  
[Sinuhe describes the beginnings of his stay in Asia and the generosity displayed by the chief of Upper Retjenu. He is allowed to choose for himself the best available land, a place named Yaa.

"In it (m=f), there were figs (dsh w) together with grapes (jwrt.t)... and there was barley (mj) together with emmer (bd.t)"

When compared with other initial particles, however, the complexity of *jw becomes apparent when we consider its two other uses, which will play a key role in conditioning its functional development in later Egyptian (section 6.6). Unlike other particles, *jw can also function as mere morphological carrier of the subject pronoun in a bare sentence S = Pronoun + AP, i.e. as semantically and syntactically neutral morpheme which only serves to support the subject of a subordinate adverbial clause. Morphologically, such a sentence will look exactly like an initial main clause introduced by the particle *jw; syntactically, however, it will appear embedded into the sentential nucleus. We have already encountered this use in examples (75), where *jw functions as carrier of the third person subject in an unconverted relative clause ("who was coming") — since an interpretation as initial main clause would yield no convincing meaning — and (76), where it introduces the subject of an embedded circumstantial clause ("while he was speaking"). Here are two further examples in which the pronominal subject of an embedded clause (in the first case as a free adverbial-adjunct, in the second as object of a verb of perception) is carried by what we might call the "void" *jw:

(97) Sh.S. 32-33  
`d prj.w] wnn.w =f cswj wnt.wrj

"A storm (d') came (prj.w) while we were at sea (wnt.w)" "the Great Green"

(98) Sh.S. 72-73  
`d prj.k tw jw wnt.k ss ltrj m mj nj ms.m.w=f

"I shall cause (nj=ff) that you find yourself (cht.k tw) in ashes (jw=kk ss) "you being in ashes", having turned into (ltfrj m) someone who (mj) cannot be seen"

It will be argued in section 6.6 that this particular function of *jw is at the root of the functional change this particle experiences in later Egyptian.

We saw in section 5.6 that, in extremely rare cases,50 *jw can introduce the subject of an absolute existential sentence consisting only of one element:

(99) CT IV 29e  
*jw s stp qd N jw s knh qd N

"There is light (stp)," says the Deceased. 'There is darkness (knh),' says the Deceased"
in the formative period of the language, leaving only sporadic instances of its earlier, semantically fuller use.

The other frequent initial particle is mk "look, behold," which we have already met in many passages above. It too can introduce adverbial, pseudoverbal, or verbal sentences, conveying a "presentative" function (see Hebrew hinneh), i.e. relating the event described in the predication not, like jw, to the speaker's sphere, but rather to the moment or the situation in which the speech act is performed:

(100) Sh.S. 106–8 "Then the boat fell apart, and of those who were in it no one was left except the mk jw r-ns-h and look, I am now by you"

Etymologically, mk and its variants fem. mj, pl. mjt are grammaticalized prospective forms of a verb meaning "to see" followed by a second person suffix pronoun: "you may see."

6.5 Negation in adverbial and pseudoverbal patterns

6.5.1 Negation of adverbial and pseudoverbal sentences

Negative patterns for adverbial and pseudoverbal sentences follow rather closely the syntactic paradigms and the semantic evolution we observed in dealing with nominal sentences (section 5.7). In early periods, the negation of an adverbial sentence was obtained by placing the basic negative particle n before the sentence:

(101) Pyr. 890b nj sw jr ts jw N jr p.t "He is not towards the earth (n): the King is towards heaven (p.t)"

In this earliest stage of the language, the scope of the negative particle can also be a sentence introduced by jw:

(102) Harhotep 67–68 nj jw=k m p.t nj jw=k m ts "You are not in heaven, you are not on earth" or

the converted counterpart of the adverbial sentence, which we observed in examples (22)–(24) above:

(103) BHI 25,98–99 nj wnm z3=f br ns:twf "His son will not be (nj wnm z3=f) on his seat (br ns:twf)"

But the situation changes in classical Egyptian. While the pattern with the particle nj is kept alive in the Middle Kingdom for the negation of adverbial sentences with a topicalized subject resumed by a coreferential independent pronoun in the comment:

6.5.2 Negation in adverbial and pseudoverbal patterns

(104) Sin. B 185 sbr jr nj m brj=s jk nj m jw=s] nj m nj=s k "This plan (sbr) which took away to itself (nj m s) your heart - it was not in my heart against you (r=k)"

(105) Sin. B 255 bkn jk nj m brj=s jk "And my heart (bkn j) - it was no longer part of myself (m brj=s) "in my body"

the basic morpheme for the negation of adverbial sentences becomes now the operator of denial an n, etymologically the result of the addition of an intensifier to the basic particle nj (section 5.7). Rather than simply negate the propositional nexus, the predicative operator nn affects the "verifiability" of the state of affairs described in the sentence, which is the reason for the use of this particle in the negation of prospective verbal forms as well (section 6.4). Thus, together with the replacement of the contradictory nj by the existential nn, classical Egyptian documents the exclusion from the scope of negative adverbial and pseudoverbal sentences of the particle jw, i.e. the morpheme which conveys an explicit assertion of truth:

(106) Sh.S. 100–1 nn wgt m-brj=s sn "There was no fool among them"

the negative counterpart of "jw (wn) wgt m-brj=s sn "there was a fool among them," or

(107) Sh.S. 131 nn wj m-brj=s sn "I was not among them"

the negative equivalent of a sentence "jw j m-brj=s sn "I was among them."

Similarly, pseudoverbal patterns are also negated by nn:

(108) Sh.S. 75–76+ jw m=m=s jw=s jk nn wj br sdm=sn "You talk to me (jw m=m=s) to me, but I am not hearing it"

(109) Merikare E 48 m sq(w) nn sn 3b(w) m=k "Do not kill: it is not useful (m sn 3b(w) to you)"

These constructions, however, are rare in classical Middle Egyptian, the usual form for the negation of a pseudoverbal construction being a negative verbal form:

(110) Peas. B2,113–14 mk wj br spr s n=k nj sdm=m=k st "Look, I petition you, but you do not hear it"

Only by the end of the classical period, with the syntactic reorganization of the function of jw, the pseudoverbal patterns develop full-fledged negative paradigms corresponding to the positive forms jw=f br sdm and jw=f r sdm: nn sw br sdm > nn jw=f br sdm "he is not hearing," nn sw r sdm > nn jw=f r sdm "he will not hear."54

(111) Paheri 7 mt nn jw=s jw=s ny mn kw "Look (mi), I am not going to leave you"
6.5.2 Negation of adverbial phrases

Rather than an entire adverbial sentence, however, negation can also invest an adverbial phrase as well of one of the syntactic constituents of a sentence. As we observed in section 6.3.2, an adverbial phrase can function in Egyptian either as a predicative complement, focusing information prominently within the utterance, or as an adverbial adjunct, providing background information for the understanding of the main predication.

(A) If the adverbial phrase represents the pragmatic focus of the utterance, negation is conveyed – as in the case of nominal phrases, see section 5.7c – by the morpheme \( \Langle \) nj-js, which immediately precedes the phrase it refers to, or by its discontinuous counterpart nj...js, which wraps the first prosodic unit of the sentence. Rather than the predicative “contradiction” conveyed by the simple nj, negative patterns involving js indicate “contrariety”: the negation does not affect the predicative nexus of the sentence, but is internal to the proposition, the scope of the negation being limited to a phrase. The continuous nj-js is used with true adverbial phrases involving sharp contrast and is immediately prefixed to the scope of the negation:


\[ \text{jw}=k \, \text{sbx.t}(j) \, \text{jw}=k \, \text{hmw.t}(j) \, \text{nj}=k \, \text{w}(\text{w}t.t)(j) \, \text{nj}=s \, \text{n} \, \text{nm} \, \text{w} \]

“You are educated, you are skilled, you are accomplished, but not (nj-js) for the purpose of (a) robbing!”

(113) West, B1.12-17

“Then His Majesty said: ‘Is the rumor true that you can join a seived head?’ And Djedi answered: ‘Yes, I can, O sovereign my Lord.’ Then His Majesty said: ‘Have a prisoner brought to me from the prison; that he may be executed!’ And Djedi said: nj-js n m\,t\,w ‘Not to people, O sovereign my Lord! Look, it is forbidden to do such a thing to the Noble Cattle’

Unlike its continuous form nj-js, the discontinuous nj...js does not follow the positive portion of the sentence, but rather surrounds it, with the particle js located before the scope of the negation. Besides being of regular use in the negation of a nominal focus (section 5.7), nj...js can refer to simple adverbial phrases:

(114) Pyr. 475b-c

\[ \text{zh} \, \text{N} \, \text{m} \, \text{gb} \, \text{wj} \, \text{nj} \, \text{sh3}=f \, \text{j} \, \text{m} \, \text{gb} \, \text{t} \, \text{fr} \]

“The King writes (\text{zh}z \, \text{N}) with a big finger: it is not with a little finger (\text{m} \, \text{gb} \, \text{t} \, \text{fr}) that he writes”

(115) Pyr. 333a-c

\[ \text{mk} \, \text{N} \, \text{pjt} \, \text{w} \, \text{mk} \, \text{N} \, \text{pjt}=f \, \text{nj} \, \text{w}t=\text{t} \, \text{js} \, \text{dw}=f \, \text{js} \, \text{gw} \, \text{w}t \, \text{w} \, \text{zn} \, \text{pjt} \, \text{sw} \]

“Look, the King has arrived! Look, the King is coming! But he has not come (\text{jw} \, \text{w}t=\text{t}) by himself (\text{dw}=f) – it is your messages (\text{gw} \, \text{w}t \, \text{w} = \text{m}) that have fetched (\text{pjt} \, \text{sw}) hint”

or to pseudoverbal and verbal phrases embedded according to the patterns discussed in section 6.3.2: as predicative complement, such as the \text{sdm} \, f of the stative in (116)–(116), and of the complementary in infinitive in (117):

We observed in section 5.7 the impact of the so-called O > E drift, i.e., the tendency for “weak” contradictory negations to move toward the “strong” contrary pole of semantic oppositions. The same trend is documented in adverbial and pseudoverbal patterns as well: just as the simple nj is functionally superseded by its intensified counterpart nn in the language of classical literature (section 6.5.1), in non-literary or more recent Middle Egyptian the patterns nj-js/nj...js tend to be replaced by nn-js/nm...js. Examples of nn-js are already found in non-literary texts of the First Intermediate Period (119), and the discontinuous nn...js is documented in a Dyn. XVIII copy of a literary text of the Middle Kingdom (120):

(119) Nag ed-Dér 84.A6-7

“I am a successful citizen who lives out of his own wealth nn-js m \text{gmnjt} \, \text{lwt}=f; \text{jj} \, \text{js} \, \text{and} \, \text{not} \, \text{out} \, \text{of} \, \text{m} \, \text{what} \, \text{was} \, \text{bequeathed} \, \text{by} \, \text{my} \, \text{father} \, \text{jj} \, \text{js} \]

(120) Pt. 213-14 (L2)

\[ \text{nn} \, \text{zw}=k \, \text{js} \, \text{pn} \, \text{mn} \, \text{mjnt} \, \text{tw} \, \text{f} \, \text{js} \, \text{ns} \, \text{k} \]

“He is not your son; he wasn’t born (mn \, \text{mjnt} \, \text{tw} \, \text{f} \, \text{js} \, \text{ns} \, \text{k})”

This evolution leads in later Egyptian (section 6.6.1) to a generalized use of nn...js > bn...jwns > \text{n}...\text{nn}...\text{nn}...\text{nn} for the negation of all adverbial patterns.

(B) If the negation affects an adverbial adjunct deprived of pragmatic prominence, functioning as background information for the understanding of the main predication, the older phases of earlier Egyptian make use of a negative circumstantial operator \text{nm}56 before the embedded verbal phrase:

(121) Pyr. 244b-c

\[ \text{nn} \, \text{dn} \, \text{N} \, \text{t} \, \text{zh} \, \text{bn} \, \text{bn} \, \text{bn} \, \text{yn} \, \text{y} \, \text{rnf} \]

“The King trod (\text{nn} \, \text{dn} \, \text{N}) unknowingly (yn \, \text{rnf}) on the glideway of Horus (hr \, \text{zh} \, \text{bn} \, \text{bn})”

(122) Uruk. I 232,10-11

\[ \text{sk} \, \text{dn} \, \text{bn} \, \text{bn} \, \text{bn} \, \text{f} \, \text{mry} \, \text{n} \, \text{m} \, \text{bn}=f \, \text{f} \, \text{w}t \, \text{f} \, \text{w}t \, \text{f} \, \text{w}t \, \text{f} \, \text{w}t \, \text{f} \, \text{w}t \, \text{f} \, \text{w}t \, \text{f} \, \text{w}t \, \text{f} \, \text{r} \, \text{n} \, \text{s} \, \text{nn} \, \text{r} \, \text{f} \]

“Meanwhile (sk), His Majesty said: ‘It is My Majesty’s wish (mry \, \text{m} \, \text{bn}=f) “the-desired-one of My Majesty”’57 that he be very prosperous (\text{w}t=f \, \text{w}t, \text{w}t), without having conducted military actions (ny \, \text{nn} \, \text{r} \, \text{f} “while-not he-made-warfare”)’
The morpheme ny stems from the addition of the morpheme y, i.e. the same element we encountered in the prepositional adverbs and possibly in the ending of the circumstantial forms of the stative, to the negative particle nj (sections 4.6.3.1, 5.3.3). In classical Middle Egyptian, the tendency for contradictory negations to acquire contrary functions leads to the obsolescence of ny and to its replacement by “strong” constructions with nn + Infinitive (when the subject of the embedded AP is coindexed with the subject of the main predication) or with nj-js (when the subject of the embedded AP is different):

(123) Sh. S. 16–17

wšb-k nn nj±jr "You shall answer without hesitating (nn nj±jr)"

(124) BD 1257, 28

mn dj-n ‘q-k br=n jn bšk w (w) jn nj–js dt bšk m nn

"We shall not let you enter (mn dj-n ‘q-k) through us' — said the jambs of this gate 'unless (nj–js) you have pronounced our name’

In the history of Egyptian, therefore, negative patterns built with the basic morpheme nj are exposed to two types of diachronic pressure: morphosyntactically, to the tendency for the simple negative to be replaced by a “reinforced” version (nj > nn) more likely to acquire predicative status and to function as negative existential operator; semantically, to the tendency for simple propositional contradictories to become focal contraries (nj > nj–js > nn–js). The original negative morpheme nj > bw will be maintained only in bound verbal constructions.

6.6 Adverbial sentences in later Egyptian

The evolution of adverbial patterns in later Egyptian exhibits three major changes vis-à-vis the classical stage of the language:

6.6.1 The Present I and its conversions

The old hypotactic clause controlled by the conjunction jsk/sk > jst/st > jst/st (section 6.4) develops into an initial main sentence introduced by a bare nominal subject or a new series of pronouns resulting from the grammaticalization of the conjunction st > st > tj (section 4.4.2) followed by the adverbial predicate. While its hypotactic origin is evident in the classical language and in its use as circumstantial clause in the Middle Egyptian of Dyn. XVIII:

(125) Sin. R. 11–14

"Meanwhile, His Majesty had sent off to the land of the Libyans an army whose leader was his elder son, the good god Sesostiris. tj–sw hšb.(w) r bhwj tj bšk w r sqr jmj-w fšl w. Now, he had been sent (tj–sw hšb.w) in order to smite (r bhwj) the foreign countries and to punish (r sqr) those who are in Tjemenu"

(126) Urk. IV 890, 10–12

šms.j=±jr nb=j r nmr.w=±f be hšš.w sštt.t jmj–f jw=j m jjr nj–js±f (t) tj–sw be jsj fh=±f wšf

“I followed my lord (šms.j=±jr nb=j) in his footsteps in northern (sštt.t) and southern (jm–f) foreign countries, because he wanted (jm–f) me to be following him closely (jw=j m jjr nj–js±f) while he was (tj–sw) in the battlefields of his victories”

(127) Urk. IV 1823, 17–18

[mn–nj±jr] kj±fr ts f pšy±jr ts±f šm jw m sw mn±t mšk±f:

"I saw that he made captures (kj±fr) on the battlefield (šm), being (ts±f) like Min in a year (mšk±f, section 6.3.2) of distress (mšk±f ‘stroke of hand’)

this construction has become in Late Egyptian the paradigmatic pattern for the expression of the main adverbial or pseudoverbal clause, conventionally called the Present I.58 In the construction br or m + Infinitive, the preposition is kept in Late Egyptian during early Dyn. XIX,59 but disappears in recent phases. This phenomenon is the result of the final grammaticalization of the pseudoverbal pattern: the preposition has lost its original semantic value completely, and the bare infinitive has now come to build a paradigmatic class with the stative and the “true” adverbial sentence:

(128) Dem. Mag. Pap. 16, 26

twj aw r pš–wn m šs±t±nr pš–hn[s]

"I see (twj aw r) the light (pš–wn) in (šs±t±nr) the flame of the lamp"

(129) 2 Cor 5, 1

ṯnššwfr ‘We know’

One will recall that the conjunction sk/sk was followed in classical Egyptian by the nominal subject or by a dependent pronoun. Its grammaticalized later Egyptian successor, however, displays the suffix pronoun in the first and second persons: *tj–wj > Late Egyptian twj > Coptic 

*tj–wj > Late Egyptian twj > Coptic 

*tj–wj > Late Egyptian twj > Coptic 

*tj–wj > Late Egyptian twj > Coptic

(130) LRL 12, 5–6

twj m šs twj šb.kw "I am in order, I am healthy"

(131) Horus and Seth 16, 2

twj m šw m šf "You are a good king"

In the third person, the Late Egyptian Present I shows a bare specific noun or a bare dependent pronoun (sing. sw/st, pl. st > tj–e–), thus appearing to be the morphological heir of the non-initial main clause of earlier times:

(132) pAnastasi IV 3, 5–6

šš–ššš.w m ššš.fr tw–ššš tw–ššš "The Nubians (šš–ššš.w) run (m ššš.fr) in front of you"

(133) pAnastasi II 1, 2

sw r–ššš frššš r–ššš "It (sw) lies between (r–ššš . . . ) Palestine and the Beloved Land"

In more recent later Egyptian, i.e. in Demotic and Coptic, the syntax of nominal subjects remains unchanged, but analogical pressures lead in the second person masc. and in the third person sing. forms to the use of the suffix, and not the dependent pronoun: e±k > k–, e±f > Š–, e±s > C–.
his thefts” questioning” innocent (138)

patterns (delegating to the lexicon, expression of nuances). These three patterns are: provisional phrase by morphemes of the tw-series (section 6.6.5). The morphological marker "is used, as it were, "absolutely." dent pronouns and their replacement as indicators of the object of a verbal

The morphological suppletion exhibited in the later Egyptian paradigm of the Present I, combines in fact the syntactic features of the so-called Future III (see section 6.6.2), the outcome of the initial particle jw discussed in section 6.4.2. This means that this jw is formally, but not functionally identical to the subordinating later Egyptian jw > c- which will address in section 6.6.3. With the gradual obsOLEtE0 of the dependent pronouns and their replacement as indicators of the object of a verbal phrase by morphemes of the tw-series (section 4.6.6.5), the use of the classical third person pronouns sw/st was progressively restricted: while in Demotic the morphological marker c- is still spelled out, in Coptic the suffix pronoun is used, as it were, "absolutely."

The morphological suppletion exhibited in the later Egyptian paradigm of the present I between the first and second persons, which make use of a pronoun subject derived from the grammaticalization of the particle tj followed by a pronoun (trw/jtwk hr sdm > 4-cwt, and the third persons (both nominal and pronominal), which still maintain the bare sentence pattern (ps-rmt/sw hr sdm > npwke/l-4-cwt), finds an easy historical explanation in our discussion in section 6.4 above. The later Egyptian adverbial sentence, i.e. the present I, combines in fact the syntactic features of three earlier Egyptian patterns (delegating to the lexicon, i.e. mainly to additional particles, the expression of nuances). These three patterns are:

(a) the initial main sentence, introduced in Middle Egyptian by jw or mk:

Doomed Prince 7.2–3 pr twk m-dju-m bjt
"Look, you are for me (m-dju) "by me") like a son"
(b) the bare, i.e. "paratactically" annexed non-initial main clause:

PBM 10052, 4.12–14 gdw = sw wbn m smjt m 3bd 4 twsw 10 sw gmy w'b (m) as-yj-s.w
"He said: [....] He was questioned again (sw wbn m smjt "he was repeated in questioning") in the month 4 of the summer, day 10 and was found (sw gmy) innocent (w'b, static controlled by the preceding static gmy, see example 94) of these thefts"

(c) the "hypotactic" adverbial clause:62

(139) pMayer A 6.21–23 [pr-jw twj m jr r-hj jw=j qm(t) A B
"While (pr-jw) I was going (twj m jy) down (r-hj), I found (jw=j gm, sequential past form) A and B""

In other words, later Egyptian syntax neutralizes the opposition between paratactic and hypotactic linkage in adverbial63 main clauses: while the morphosyntactic successor of the initial, the non-initial, and the "hypotactic" adverbial clause, the present I is used in later Egyptian as the only adverbial and pseudoverbal main clause pattern.

Relative clauses. This evolution finds an interesting parallel in the morphology of later Egyptian relativization of adverbial sentences. The syntactic behavior of relative clauses does not experience any change in the transition from earlier to later Egyptian: "virtual" relative clauses are still treated as subordinate adverbial clauses (section 6.6.3), while "true" relative clauses are introduced by the relative converter ntj (section 6.3.3). By the end of the New Kingdom (eleventh century BCE), however, the morphological patterns of the true relative clause begin to show a very intriguing feature: when introducing a pronominal subject, the converter ntj is followed – interestingly enough, at first in the second person masculine and in the third person forms, from Demotic onward in all persons – not by the series twj, twk, sw, etc., but by a suffix pronoun supported by jw: ntj twj > ntj-jw > et, ntj twk > ntj-jw-k > et, ntj tr > ntj-jw-t > et, ntj st > ntj-jw-s > et, ntj tw > ntj-jw-n > et, ntj twa > ntj-jw-t > et, ntj st > ntj-jw-w > etn. Here again, although this element jw is formally identical to the indicator of subordination and has often been taken to be the same morpheme, it represents in fact nothing other than the outcome of the old initial particle further reduced to the role of mere indicator of a vocalic schwa, as documented in the transition from Late Egyptian sw hr sdm to Demotic e= f smm and Coptic qcw wA and their relative counterparts ntj sw hr sdm > ntj-e= f smm > etq cw wA.

Existential and past converters. In the treatment of nominal sentences, we observed that Egyptian shows a tendency to delegate the expression of the existence of indefinite subjects to verbal sentences in which the predicate is a form of the verb wnn "to be" (section 5.6). In later Egyptian, non-specific subjects of adverbial predicates are introduced by the existential predicates wnn > ep or t most commonly and "there is not," often combined with
the preposition m-dj "by, with" (< m-‘w "in the hand of") > ṣwirat < (section 5.10), the use of the Present I being limited to specific subjects:

(140) Wen. 1,58
jn wn m-dj-r jst ḫbrw
"Does he have (jn wn m-dj-r) "is there with him") a Syrian crew?"

This morpheme represents the grammaticalization of the aorist sdm-£ of the verb ḫbr; it is therefore etymologically related to, but functionally different from the past converter ḫbr > ḫbr=nepe-, which turns any adverbial or pseudoverbal (or verbal, see section 7.3) sentence into its preterital counterpart, often called in Coptic grammar "Imperrfect":

(141) pBM 10052, 14,18
wn n apprentices bn w (hr) nh£r w
Their (mn w) things (bn w) were on their backs (nh£r w)"

(142) LRL 2,8
ɔy ḫbr jmr kw "Indeed (ɔy) I was ill"

(143) Jn 2,1
mepetadn mhr šan "The mother (mhr šan) of Jesus (n-IS) was (mhr šan) there (mmau)"

The Future I. From Dyn. XX (twelfth century BCE) onward, later Egyptian exhibits a Present I construction in which the preposition m is followed by the infinitive of the verb of movement n’j "to go," controlling for its part an infinitival phrase with r:.

(144) LRL 35,15
ɔw iw n’j n’j-mt aj iw n’j jw t
"You know this expedition which I am going to do"

This construction is the antecedent of a Demotic and Coptic paradigm, the "Future I" (also called progressive or Instant),65 in which a morpheme -mo- is placed between the subject of a Present I construction and the predicate, which can be an infinitive or a stative. In Coptic, this form supersedes the Late Egyptian and Demotic prospective sdm-£ for the expression of the temporal (i.e. non-modal) future:

(145) Job 13,17
mepetadn mhr šan "Indeed (mhr šan) it was (mhr šan) there (mmau)"

6.6.2 The fate of pseudoverbal patterns
The second major evolution in later Egyptian is brought about by the disappearance of the pseudoverbal sentence as an autonomous syntactic category. We observed in the preceding paragraph that the distinction between the true adverbial phrase, the stative, and the prepositional construction hr/m + infinitive is neutralized in later Egyptian, with all patterns merging in the Present I and in its converted forms. The other pseudoverbal construction of Middle Egyptian, namely the objective future jw=f r sdm (section 4.6.3.1), is integrated into the verbal conjugation, where it bears the label Future III:66

(146) KRI I 238,14
jw=f r jst jn-tw=f "I shall cause that it be brought (jn-tw=f)"

In spite of its pseudoverbal origin, this form is synchronically treated as a grammaticalized bound pattern: while the preposition r is frequently omitted in Late Egyptian, it is usually expressed in Demotic67 and is mandatory in the parallel Coptic conjugation pattern with pronominal subjects: e-ne e-cwtk. This unexpected revival of the preposition begins with increased frequency during Dyn. XXV (around 700 BCE), and is probably due to the need to distinguish between the Future III and the Present I, once the second and third persons of the latter paradigm became expressed by suffix pronouns supported by jw (section 6.6.1).

In the presence of nominal subjects, the introductory particle of the Future III is not jw, as in its Middle Egyptian ancestor:

(147) Sh.S. 119,20
jw jsr r jst m bnw "A ship will come from the Residence"
but rather jr > Coptic epe-68 which is originally a grammaticalized prospective form of the verb jst "to do," reanalyzed as converter and suppletively integrated into the paradigm of the Future III: jst p3 rnt sdm > jr p3 rnt (r) sdm "the man will hear":

(148) KRI II 229,4
jr p3 rnt sdm > jr jst jn-tw f jr rnt (r) sdm "The Great Chief of Hatti (bn) will let (jr rnt) them be brought (jn-tw f) to the King"

Interestingly enough, in the corresponding Coptic pattern epe-pwke cwtk the preposition remains unexpressed:69

(149) Ps 19,2
epitwth twn cwtk epok "God (p-nwe) will listen to you"

One wonders, therefore, whether the rare Late Egyptian writings of the preposition are not in fact hypercorrections due to the merging of two originally different patterns, i.e. the pseudoverbal jw=f r sdm with pronominal subjects and the verbal jst p3 rnt sdm with nominal subjects, into the suppletive paradigm of the Future III.

On the semantic level, with the progressive obsolescence of the prospective verbal form and its functional replacement through the Future I in later Demotic (section 6.6.1), the Future III acquired in Coptic — where it is also known as "energetic future"70 — modal features:71

(150) Ex 23,7
epitwth eboi ḫbr ne pa mhr rhmnh "You shall distance yourself (eboi ḫbr) from (eboi) any iniquitous judgment (hap sim n-jancen "any judgment of doing-evil")"
Following a general trend in Egyptian, the Future III can be preceded by syntactic converters such as the subordinating jw (section 6.6.3), the past converter wn, and the relative adjective nti (section 6.6.1).

### 6.6.3 Main vs. subordinate clauses

Thus, from being a marker of discourse initiality, the unbound morpheme jw has become in later Egyptian a signal of syntactic dependency, following a readily retrievable grammaticalization path the origin of which must be sought in the use of jw as mere morphological carrier of the pronominal subject of an embedded adverbial clause in classical Egyptian. As we saw above, the direct functional successor of the Middle Egyptian jw still survives in the more recent stages of the language, but only in bound, i.e., unsegmentable constructions: (a) in the second masculine and third person singular forms of the Demotic and Coptic Present I (section 6.6.1); (b) in the Future III (section 6.6.2); (c) in the so-called “circumstantial” narrative jw=f hr sdm “and he heard” (section 4.6.6), which we will consider more closely in section 7.9.3. In these three constructions, jw is an integral component of the adverbial or verbal phrase. But as a free morpheme, capable of being prefixed to any sentence type, jw has become in later Egyptian the indicator of adverbial subordination. When prefixed to an adverbial sentence, the pattern is known as “circumstantial present”:

(151) KRI IV 388.4

abd 2 m jw=f hr 3m=sw hwr 3m br 3m-n 3m-ab
“Second month of the Inundation (abd 2 sb), F17, with Ipi and Khonsu working (‘while Ipi and Khonsu are working’) for the lord”

(152) Two Brothers 15.10–16.1

pr jw=f ntw sur m r ‘jw=f jw=f k3
“Look (per), I am still (m r)’ alive as a bull (jw=f jw=f k3 ‘I being as a bull’”

(153) Tab 3.11

AMT SACTEP CARGARH 3MTJH
“And (and) she prayed (aw=f sorrh) while being (e=s) beside (hs-hm-m, lit. ‘under the heart of’) the window”

As a subordinate pattern, the circumstantial form competes with its main sentence equivalent, the Present I, in the protasis of hypothetical sentences: initial particles such as jr, the more classical morpheme, or jmn, the more colloquial one, for “if” control either a Present I (154) or a subordinate clause with jw (155). Thus offering an example of the decay of the “hypotactic link” in later Egyptian (section 6.6.1) and its replacement by main or subordinate clauses:

(154) LRL 69,15–16

jmn ntwk shn w 3m r=kn bn jw=f(r) r=kn 3m=sw hwr 3m-n 3m-ab
“Even if your orders are too numerous (jw=f r=kn) for you, you will not be able (bn jw=f(r) r=kn) to go away (3m=sw) from this order of Pharaoh (may he be alive, prosperous and healthy)”

(155) LRL 68, 9–10

jr jw=f jw=f m tsw tbn jw=f(r) hwr 3m-n 3m-sn 3m-tw
“Even if you become vizier (jw=f m tsw) ‘you are as a vizier’), I will not go down (bn jw=f(r) hwr) to your ships”

Much like the subordinate adverbial sentence of classical Egyptian, the later Egyptian circumstantial present can also be embedded into a syntactic pattern, for example as oblique complement of verbs of perception:

(156) Wen. 2,66

pr sr jw=f hr l3 m w=k3
“Look at (pr) them as they go (jw=f hr l3 m w=k3) toward the coolness (l3)”

or as virtual relative clause (section 6.3.3):

(157) Doomed Prince 4,6–8

“Now, after the youth had grown, he went up to his roof, jw=f hr gmj w-tsm jw=f m-s2 w-n sj-ta jw=f hr l3 m t3-ta jw=f he n3m.t he m-jr, and he saw (jw=f hr gmj, sequential past form) a dog which was after (jw=f m-s2) an adult (sj-ta ‘big man’) who was walking (jw=f hr l3 m t3-ta) on the road”

As suggested above, this later Egyptian use of jw as indicator of circumstantiality derives from the twofold function of this particle in the classical language (section 6.4.2), namely on the one hand its main function as marker of initiality, and on the other hand its role as syntactically neutral morphological carrier of the pronominal subject in embedded adverbial clauses. It can be argued that this Middle Egyptian use of jw was itself the result of a weakening of its original semantic or pragmatic function as an overt sign of the truth value of the predication.72

With the reorganization of syntactic patterns leading to the neutralization of the classical opposition between initial and non-initial patterns and the emergence of the Present I and of new unconverted verbal forms (section 7.9.2), this morphological jw, the use of which was restricted in Middle Egyptian to subordinate adverbial clauses, was reintroduced in Late Egyptian as the syntactic marker of the adverbial nature of the sentence. In this way, the morpheme jw experienced a transition from its original semantic function (“indeed”), which was predominant in classical Egyptian but was neutralized in subordinate adverbial clauses, where jw acted as mere morphological support, to its later Egyptian nature as marker of adverbial subordination: “while.” Reanalyzed, therefore, as carrier of subordination, jw > e- is freed from its narrow scope in the adverbial clause and extended to all sentence patterns, including nominal sentences, as in (158–159), and verbal sentences, as in (160–161):
6 Adverbal and pseudoverbal syntax

(158) pAbbott 6.1.2 “You have rejoiced at the entrance of my house. yr j# jw jnk pt hj tj-3d smj n p bs "nb w3s snb Why so (yr j#), since (jw) I am the mayor who reports (gd smj "who says reports") to the Ruler (may he be alive, prosperous and healthy)?”

(159) 2 Cor 8,9 ανάμνησις ετε τυφτά εφάπαξ η “Although (e-) he was rich (ou-μακαρι πε), he became poor (α=τρ θήκη) for you (ετέ τυφτά)”

(160) KRI VI 243.7 jw=j r dj.t n-w bn 2 (jw=) 3 jw jw=f r (dj.t) "I shall give him 2 khar and 3 npr when (jw) he gives (jw=f r dj.t) an oath by the lord (may he be alive, prosperous and healthy)”

(161) Mk 16,2 απενεπάργασεν εκείνα τα ἴδια “They went up (α=υ-εί έχρια) to the tomb (πε-μπάσου) after (e-) the sun had risen (α-πε-τέ ήα)”

6.7 Later Egyptian negative patterns

We observed in section 6.5 the effects of the so-called O > E drift on the development of negative patterns in adverbial sentences: on the one hand, the simple particle nj displays the early tendency to be superseded by its reinforced counterpart mn; on the other hand, propositional contradictory negations move toward the focal contrary pole, with nj > nj...js > mn...js.

The Late Egyptian negative adverbial and pseudoverbal patterns follow this historical model. The Middle Egyptian morphemes nj and mn are now written 3n=fj (a morpheme limited to bound verbal phrases; section 7.9.2) and 3n=fj (the only free negative morpheme in this stage of the language). Adverbial and pseudoverbal sentences, which used to be negated by mn, now display the pattern bn + Present I:

(162) pDeM 8, 374 bn nj=f jz mj r-f=jw “Your colleagues (nj=jk jz) are not all of them (r-f=jw) there (jm)”

(163) LRL 34, 10-11 “I carried out all my lord’s missions and orders which were assigned to me. bn nj=j (bn nj I am not negligent)”

The negative Present I is syntactically analogous to the positive pattern: it too can appear in relative (nj) and adverbial conversions (jw):

(164) Doomed Prince 7,8 jw=f bn bj hr swj pj=js haj r-jgr sp 2 jw bn nj hr dj.t pr=f r-br “And she began (bjr "happen") to watch (swj) her husband very closely (r-jgr sp 2 “twice excellently"), without allowing him to go out (pr=f r-br "that he go out")”

or in the protasis of a hypothetical sentence (section 6.6.3):

(165) oWien NB, H975 br jw bn sw hr dj.t=jk=n jw jk hr nj= pj=js f hn “And (b) if he does not give it (dj.t=jf) to you, you bring me (nj=) his hn”

Negation by means of bn is also typical for the Future III. It should be remembered that in Middle Egyptian (section 6.5.1) pseudoverbal patterns do not usually exhibit a specific negative counterpart, but rather use instead the corresponding negative verbal form, which in the case of jw=f r sdm is the prospective sdm-f preceded by mn:76

(166) pKahun 6.24 j# mn=k b h br j# tj=sj mn j#=j r bbb “If you detect (mn=k, subjunctive) something on her eyes (j# tj=sj), she will never (r bbb) bear”

With the syntactic reorganization of the function of jw at the end of the classical period, the pseudoverbal patterns develop negative paradigms modeled upon the positive forms:77 the rare negative pseudoverbal construction mn sw r sdm “he will not hear” is now grammaticalized as mn jw=f r sdm, which supersedes mn sdm=f as the negation of the Future III and represents the direct ancestor of Late Egyptian bn jw=f jz p3-rrt (r) sdm and of Coptic ṭḥmṣqɛtā:

(167) pBerlin 3038, 195 j# mn (t) w res mn jw=jj r sdm “If it doesn’t happen to her (r=s), she will not bear (msj=r)”

(168) pBM 10052, 610 bn j# jz=jj n (r) dj.t nqjtw sw m=ds-j “My brother will not allow that one interfere (ndsw tsw “that one talk”) with me”

(169) Ex 23, 7 ṭḥmṣqɛtā ṭḥmṣqɛtā ṭḥmṣqɛtā “You shall not kill (mn=k-nouw st) an innocent (μμο-νο “without sin”) and (mn) a righteous”

A focal adverbial phrase is negated by the operator of contrariety bn...jw=s, which is the functional heir of classical Middle Egyptian nj...js (> post-classical mn...js). The only syntactic difference between the two patterns is that, unlike its Middle Egyptian ancestor js, the Late Egyptian reinforcer jw=s usually follows the negated focal element:

(170) pMayer A 3,25 bn jw=s jw=s jw=s “He was not with me”

(171) LRL 49,1 nmt j jw bn jw=m-dsj=jf jw=s “He is a man without any experience at all,” lit “who does not have (jw bn...m-dsj=f, virtual relative clause) his maturity (j=)” at all (jw=s)”

The later development follows predictable lines: the contrary negation with bn...jw=s will progressively invade the domain of the simple particle bn and will become in Coptic (多种形式) the paradigmatic negative form of all adverbial and pseudoverbal patterns, i.e. of the Present and Future I and their conversions, which supersedes all adverbial negations of earlier times:79

(172) Jn 9,21 ṭḥmṣqɛtā sāk “We (m-) do not (n...an) know (sowun)”
Verbal syntax

7.1 Introduction

The treatment of verbal phrases has experienced an ironical dichotomy in contemporary Egyptological linguistics: on the one hand, the variety of morphological forms and semantic functions has been analyzed in detail for all the phases of the language; on the other hand, the dominant approach to the study of Egyptian syntax, the so-called "Standard theory," has downplayed the role of the "verbal phrase" (VP) as a syntactic category, viewing most of the instances in which a verbal form appears in an Egyptian text as conversions of the verb into the syntactic functions of a noun phrase (NP), an adjective phrase (AdjP), or an adverbial phrase (AP). The study of verbal phrases as predicate of the sentence, therefore, has played a relatively minor role in Egyptological linguistics from the late sixties onward, being rather superseded by a syntax of verbal on-verbal functions.

This approach, however, has been challenged in recent years and is now being replaced by more verbalistic accounts of Egyptian syntax (section 6.2). The fundamental contribution of the Standard theory to our understanding of Egyptian syntax remains the recognition of the extreme functional versatility of Egyptian VPs when compared with their equivalents in European languages: while in most syntactic environments verbal forms do keep their function as clausal predicate, they also exhibit a proclivity to be embedded into syntactically higher units. We have already considered the use of a participial VP in the focalized cleft sentence in section 5.4 and the conversion of a VP into an adverbial phrase in section 6.3. Egyptian verbal phrases can also be embedded via topicalization (section 7.5) or relativization (section 7.7). Here, the subordinate character of the VP is signalled by the use of morphologically distinct patterns, namely the so-called "emphatic" and "relative" forms respectively. Verbal phrases can also appear embedded as noun phrases when governed by a verb of perception (for example mwy "to see"), of wish (mrj "to desire"), or of command (wdf "to order") (section 7.6). Egyptian verbal phrases, therefore, can appear in the following syntactic environments:
(a) the independent verbal sentence (section 7.2);
(b) the initial and the non-initial main clause (section 7.3);
(c) the embedded adverbial clause and the virtual relative clause (section 7.4);
(d) the sentence with topicalized predicate (section 7.5);
(e) the object clause of a verb of perception, wish, or command (section 7.6);
(f) the "true" relative clause (section 7.7).

Finally, we shall consider the impact of negation on verbal patterns (section 7.8) as well as the evolution of verbal syntax in later Egyptian (section 7.9).

My analysis offers no separate treatment of interrogative sentences.3 The reason is that any nominal, adverbial, pseudoverbal, or verbal sentence type can be converted without any syntactic change into a YES-NO interrogative sentence by prefixation of the particle jn, i.e. the same "ergative" morpheme found in the structure of independent pronouns (section 4.4.1), as marker of the agent of a passive predicate (section 4.6.3.3), and in the cleft sentence (section 5.4.2).4

7.2 The independent verbal sentence

We saw above (section 4.6.3) that classical Egyptian possesses a verbal system of the VSO-type which conveys through infixes oppositions of tense, aspect, mood, and voice. A basic syntactic environment of a verbal form is the independent verbal sentence, in which a VP predicate can function alone as nucleus of the sentence (section 6.4), without being necessarily accompanied by adverbial adjuncts. Independent verbal sentences tend to become rarer in the history of Egyptian: while in Old Egyptian this pattern still displays a VSO-type which conveys through infixes oppositions of tense, aspect, mood, and voice.

Like all initial patterns, the independent verbal sentence may be followed by an introductory particle, for example before a prospective form. Therefore, when an initial particle such as mh appears, it may introduce a converted construction with the subjunctive jm=f, thereby replacing what you wish (jm=f, prospective relative form, section 7.7).

In colloquial and post-classical Middle Egyptian, the contingent form is replaced by a converted construction with the sdm=fn of the verb wnn followed by a verbal (10) or pseudoverbal clause (11) as grammatical subject of the contingent tense:5

Finally we shall consider the impact of negation on verbal patterns (section 7.9), as well as the evolution of verbal syntax in later Egyptian (section 7.10).

We saw above (section 4.6.3) that classical Egyptian possesses a verbal system of the VSO-type which conveys through infixes oppositions of tense, aspect, mood, and voice. A basic syntactic environment of a verbal form is the independent verbal sentence, in which a VP predicate can function alone as nucleus of the sentence (section 6.4), without being necessarily accompanied by adverbial adjuncts. Independent verbal sentences tend to become rarer in the history of Egyptian: while in Old Egyptian this pattern still displays a VSO-type which conveys through infixes oppositions of tense, aspect, mood, and voice. Therefore, when an initial particle such as mh appears, it may introduce a converted construction with the subjunctive jm=f, thereby replacing what you wish (jm=f, prospective relative form, section 7.7).

In colloquial and post-classical Middle Egyptian, the contingent form is replaced by a converted construction with the sdm=fn of the verb wnn followed by a verbal (10) or pseudoverbal clause (11) as grammatical subject of the contingent tense:5

Like all initial patterns, the independent verbal sentence may be followed by a paratactic non-initial main clause, for example the subjunctive in (13), or control an embedded subordinate clause, as in (14):
7.3 Initial vs. non-initial main clauses

In treating the adverbial sentence, we observed that the presence or absence of an introductory particle such as jw "truly" or mk "look" is the syntactic feature which discriminates between initial and non-initial main clauses: while the sentence jw hn(w m sgr "the residence was in silence" occupies the first position in a chain of discourse, the clause jb w m gynw is parasitically linked to the preceding context: "(and) the hearts were in mourning" (section 6.4).

A similar distinction applies to verbal sentences. The modal sdm=f can be used indiscriminately as an initial and a non-initial form, but when the predicate of a verbal sentence is an办事 sdm=f (active) sdm tw=f (passive) or a past sdm n-f (active)/sdm(w)=f (passive), the distribution is identical to that of adverbial and pseudo-verb patterns:

A. The sentence pattern "Particle + VP" is an initial main clause:

(15) Sh.S. 73-75 jw mdw=k n=a n wj bi sdm st
"You speak (mdw=k) to me, but I am not hearing it (section 6.5.1)"

(16) Sin. B 181 mk jnj.(w) n=k wj pn m nj new
"Look, this royal order is being brought (jnj tw) to you (m nj)"

(17) Sh.S. 81-82 jw wj ppm=f n3=f nw jnj (w) bi jw m bsm=f
"He opened (wjp:mm) his mouth towards me while I was (w:wj, section 6.4.2) on my belly (bi b:nj) in front of him (m bsm)"

(18) CT II 201a BtC jnj wj m jw k3 m bsm k3=m
"Briefly has been given (nj:w j3) to you, an order has been issued (w:jw w: if it has been ordered) to this family of yours (sh:b:nj)"

Besides jw and mk, Middle Egyptian initial verbal clauses can be introduced by particles derived from the grammaticalization of the sdm=f or, more frequently, the sdm n-f of particular verbs. The most important of these particles is 'bn(n-f) "then", originally the grammaticalized preterite of the verb 'bn "to stand." The third person pronoun subject is usually omitted under relevance (section 6.3.3):

(19) Sh.S. 76-77 'bn n sb=jf wj m r=f
"Then he placed (nb=jf) me in his mouth"

(20) Peas. R8.1 'bn s sb jf sw hr mzn ts m nj r=jf r wa t
"Then he spread it out (sb=jf sw) on the interment (mzn-ts) at the edge of the road"

(21) West. 5.13 'bn w jnj(w) m nj wj t bnt bw-f
"Then it was done (jnj w m, passive sdm w=f) with omission of the subject under relevance, sections 6.2, 6.3.3 according to (mj) everything his Majesty had commanded (wjt bnt bw=f), relative form, section 7.7)"

While not used with adverbial patterns, the particle 'bn is frequently found in pseudo-verbal sentences with the stative (22) or with hr + Infinitive (23), which in post-classical Middle Egyptian tends to periphrastically replace the synthetic sdm n-f:

(22) Sh.S. 39-41 'bn nj sjw jkx w jw jn wj wj n=m nj wj
"Then I was brought (bn nj sjw jkx) to the island by (jn, section 4.6.3.3) a wave of the sea"

(23) Urt. IV 2.12 'bn nj hjt wj wj d=f n3 jw m nj sm m hsw ab nj hjt n b-f nj hjt wj m
"Then I became a soldier (bn nj hjt wj) in his stead on the ship (jmw) 'The Ragging Bull (nj sm) in the time of the Lord of the Two Lands (ab nj hjt) Nebheithre, justified (nj sm=f)"

B. When not introduced by an initial particle, the bare verbal sentence – i.e. the bare active sdm=f/sdm n-f and their passive counterparts sdm tw=f and sdm w=f – functions as non-initial main clause, parasitically linked to the preceding section of discourse. This pattern is very common in past contexts, where the bare sdm n-f sets forth the rhythm of narration, as in example (24), but is much less frequent with the aorist sdm=f, such as psj-f in (25).

(24) Sin. B 5-9 jnj=w lsm t m hmr t nj k-wj spj hsw p m hmr t hjt aj djk nj kj n=f aj spj spj nj (j=nl nj=j=nl nj) anj nj m hsw hmr t zj=nj m nj=sl
"I made a journey (jnj=w lsm t, narrative infinitive) southward (m hmr t "against the river flow"), and I did not plan (nj kj=w, section 7.8) to reach (spj) the residence; I thought (nj=kj=w, non-initial main verbal clause) that there would be (psj=turmoil) and I did not expect to survive (aj djk nj=aj=nl) "I did not say that I would live" after it; I crossed (nj=kj=w, non-initial main verbal clause) the lake Maaty in the Sycamore neighborhood and I arrived (zj=nj, non-initial main verbal clause) at Senefer Island".

(25) Sin. B 26-27 'bn nj m jn spj nj hjt t
"Then he gave me water (mj) and boiled (psj=aj) for me milk (ij t)"

Rather, the aorist sdm f is used when the subject of the sentence is topicalized and resumed by a coreferential pronoun in the verbal phrase; in this case too we observe a contrast between the initial construction "jw-Topical+VP" on the one hand and the non-initial main clause "Topic+VP" (27) or the hypotactic clause "particle-Topic+VP" (28) on the other:

(26) Sh.S. 17-19 jw rj nj zj sdm=f sw jw msw=f djk jf jn wj
"A man’s mouth (rj nj zj) saves (sdm=f) him, his speech (mdsw=f) causes (djk) him to be forgiven (jzn w=f), lit. "that the face be veiled for him")"

(27) Sin. B 109-14 Then, a hero of Rejetnu came, and he challenged me in my tent. He was a winner without peer, who had subdued it all. He said that he would duel me, and he thought that he wouldransack me: he meant to plunder my castle under the counsel of his tribe. bsp pj sdm=f hnr=aj. But the ruler (bsp pj) conferred (mdsw=f) on me"

7.3 Initial vs. non-initial main clauses
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when the subject of a passive preterital form is "perfect" with the stative is used instead:

(31) Sin. (passive). While in the case of the latter the restriction is due to the fact that, dislocated to the left of a main clause (verbal, adverbial, or nominal) and resumed by a coreferential element.

It should be observed that in the classical language, subject topicalization rather than to the simple "look, the unknown pronoun in the main clause:

(29) Sh.S. 10-11 mk f n j(w)w in btp tw-n pt-n sw "Look (mk), we have arrived (n j(w)w, pseudoverbal sentence) in peace; our land (tw-n) – we have reached it"

(30) Adm. 7.4 mnj stbs n(j) w bmm dr.w=f sh3.w "Look, the unknown (bmm) secret of the land – it's limits (dr.w=f) have been revealed (sh3.w)"

In this respect, the structure of the pattern "(Particle-)Topic+sqt=f" rather than to the simple adverbial or pseudoverbal sentence of the type S = (Particle-)Subject+Pred as held by the Standard theory, is to be equated to the topicalized adverbial sentence with extraposition of an argument different from the subject (section 6.2). - the initial subject being the "default" topic of a sentence – and the topicalized nominal sentence often introduced by jr (section 5.2.1): in all these three patterns, the topicalized argument is dislocated to the left of a main clause (verbal, adverbial, or nominal) and resumed by a coreferential element.

It should be observed that in the classical language, subject topicalization is not licensed with the preterital forms sqtm.n=f (active) and sqtm.w=f (passive). While in the case of the latter the restriction is due to the fact that, when the subject of a passive preterital form is topicalized, the pseudoverbal "perfect" with the stative is used instead:

(31) Sin. B 307-8 jw twf sgr(w) m nbw "My statue was overlaid with gold"

The obsolescence of this pattern in standard Middle Egyptian may have been caused by the universal tendency of preterites to organize the flow of discourse around the action, or better the nexus between the action itself and its agent, rather than around the subject, which for its part tends to acquire pragmatic prominence with predicates conveying a state. Thus, if in a preterital frame the discourse attention is directed towards the subject, the result is not a topicalization, but rather a focalization, which is achieved by "cleaving" the subject and demoting the predicate to the role of presupposition (section 5.4.2). In Old Egyptian, the predicate of a cleft sentence can still be a finite verbal form:

(33) Prv. 1428d-E Nj tj N mwn.t-f tj=t tj.tn=f jn nw.t msj=n=f N bN wsr "The King does not know (nj tj N mwn.t=f) his initial mother (jn nw.t Msj=n=f) whom he used to know; it is Nut (jw nw.t) who has given birth (msj=n=f) to the King together with Osiris"

whereas Middle Egyptian generalizes the use of the participial statement as the only cleft sentence pattern. The passage above from the "Pyramid Texts" as transmitted in King Pepi's pyramid already exhibits the participial cleft sentence (jn nw.t msj=t):

(33') Prv. 1428d-E Nj tj N mwn.t-f tj=t tj.tn=f jn nw.t msj=n=f N bN wsr

We will discuss in sections 7.5.1–3 the devices displayed by Egyptian verbal syntax for the pragmatic focalization of arguments other than the subject.

7.4 Verbal clauses embedded as adverbial phrases

In section 6.4, we established a tripartite distribution of linkage patterns: parataxis as a linkage between juxtaposed main clauses, hypotaxis as a textual, rather than syntactic dependency of a clause on the main discourse unit, and subordination as the syntactic dependency of a clause on the main sentence, whereby embedding represents a form of subordination not signalled by morphological markers. As we observed in the two preceding chapters, Egyptian syntax makes abundant use of embedding: nominal, adverbial and pseudoverbal sentences which otherwise function as main clauses, can also appear "embedded," i.e. controlled by a higher syntactic node.

rare examples of jw=f sqtm.n=f are still documented in the Old Egyptian and in the Coffin Texts:
Predictably, this possibility of being syntactically embedded into a higher syntactic unit also applies to verbal sentences. Let us consider the following narrative sequence from the tale of Sinuhe, which immediately follows the passage given in example (25) above:

(34) Sin. B 9–11

"I spent the day (wr$t.nj3) at the border of the field. I set forth at dawn (hd.n=j "[I dawned") when it was day (wn hrrww), and I encountered (hpj.n=j j zj 't) a man standing at the edge of the road: he greeted (ar.n=fn) me in fear (snjd.n=fn "he feared")"

While the forms wr$t.nj3, hd.n=j, hpj.n=j, and tr.n=fn are non-initial main clauses paratactically linked to the independent verbal sentence jy=f-+ j snjd.t m ynt.yt "I made a journey southward" which opens the narrative sequence in Sin. B 5, the two verbal forms wn hrrww "when it was day" (aorist sdm=fn) and snjd.n=fn "he feared" (sdm.n=fn), although morphologically identical to their main clause equivalents, do not provide narrative foreground information; rather, they supply additional background information to the predicate and function, therefore, as adverbialized VP. In Egyptian literature, the use of VP embedded as AP is usually called "circumstantial" sdm=fn, sdm.n=fn, or passive sdm.(w).n=fn. As suggested in section 6.3.2, the Standard theory did not fully recognize the opposition between non-initial main clauses and embedded subordinate clauses, considering all non-initial sdm=fn and sdm.n=fn forms circumstantial, i.e. functionally adverbial. But the difference between paratactically linked main clause and subordinate dependent clause lies in their temporal and aspectual setting: the predicate of the former is a foreground main tense ("I set forth at dawn," "he greeted," etc.), whereas the latter exhibits a background dependent tense which does not modify the flow of events, but only the predicative node it refers to ("when it was day," "since he was afraid," etc.).

One of the functions of an embedded adverbial clause in Egyptian is that of modifying a non-specific noun, i.e. of serving as "virtual" relative clause (section 6.3.3), "true," i.e. converted relative clauses being limited to specific antecedents. It is not surprising, therefore, that a verbal sentence with bare sdm=fn or sdm.n=fn can be embedded in such an environment:

(35) Peas. B1, 262–63

"Do not rob (wn) a pauper (hryww) of his things, a weakling (fn) whom you know"

In the following example, different types of embedded sentences share the function of unconverted relative clause:
7.5 The verbal sentence with topicalized predicate

7.5.1 General characteristics

One of the most striking features of the Egyptian verbal system, first discovered by H. J. Polotsky and eventually raised to the role of keystone of the "Standard theory" which is derived from Polotsky's work, is the possibility for verbal phrases to be topicalized so as to occupy the clause initial position. This phenomenon of topicalization of an entire predicative phrase consisting of the verbal form accompanied by its arguments occurs in three syntactic environments:

(a) Most frequently when the topicalized predicate is the theme of a focalized adverbial adjunct:21

(42) West. 12.21  b&w.t-j jrw=f pr=f bhr-m
"O my mistress (b&w.t-j), why (bhr-m "on what") are you in this mood (jrw=f pr=f "you make this heart")?"

(43) Peas. B.298-99  nkt b&w n(j) t rtw=f shdd t pt w=fbk
"You (nkt, section 5.2.2) are the rudder (b&w) of the entire world; it is by your command (pt w=fbk) that the land sails (shdd t)"

(b) When the topicalized predicate provides a clausal topic dislocated to the left of the main sentence, creating a semantically correlative pattern.22 The main sentence acting as comment of the topicalized VP can be verbal (44), adverbial (45), or nominal (46):

(44) CT III 24a-25b B.Bo  h3s.s=r t=j m b&w=s.w hwy=j m qsb.w=sn prw=s=r t=j m bjk.w pr(y)=s bhr gnw=s
"If they go down (h3s.s=r) to the earth as snakes, I shall go down (hwy=j, prospective) in their coils; if they go up to heaven as falcons, I shall go up on their wings"

(45) CT III 100h-101b  prw=s=r t=j m bjk.w jw=j bhr gnw=s h3s.s=r t=j m b&w=s.w jw=j bhr gnw=s
"If they go up to heaven as falcons, I am on their wings (jw=j bhr gnw=s=h3s.s=r); if they go down to the earth as snakes, I am on their coils"

(46) CT VI 295a-96 B.Bo  p=sn N pr=m bjk sbk pw N pr=nng.n N pr=m bjk sbk pw N pr=nng.n N pr=m qsb.s nb qrs.t
"Since the deceased (N pr=m) flew up (p=sn) as a falcon, the deceased is Sobek; since the deceased screeched (nng.n) as a falcon, the deceased is Sobek; since the deceased flew (p=sn) as a vulture, the deceased is Anubis, lord of the tomb"

(c) In headings of chapters, where the entire text of the spell functions in fact as comment of the topicalized predicate:23

7.5.2 Conversion into a topicalized VP can affect the following verbal forms:

(1) In the aorist tense, the unmarked sdm=f is converted into the so-called nominal or emphatic form, characterized by the reduplication or gemination of the second consonant in the infirm and geminated classes (section 4.6.3.1). Its passive counterpart displays the tw-suffix:

(48) Urk. IV 1111,6-7  jnk tw=f jmj-t-prw nb nft hmr sn
"It is to him that all testaments (jmj-t-prw nb) are brought; he is the one (nft) who seals them"

(2) In the past tense, the "emphatic" sdm.n=f (section 4.6.3.1) and its passive form sdm.n-tw=f (section 4.6.3.3) are used. While the emphatic sdm.n=f is morphologically undistinguishable from the non-topicalized form we encountered in the preceding sections, in the past tense we have not only sdm.n-f (section 4.6.3.1) and its passive form sdm.n-tw=f, but also a passive counterpart displays the tw-suffix:

(49) Sin. B.148-49  bkw=fl ct xst.t jw=m pr=f b=p+y=fl jw=fl
"While he previously traveled (bkw=fl) to another country, today (mpr) his heart is appeased"

(50) Urk. IV 365,11  jnk.tw mn bhr-m
"Why (bhr-m) has this been done (jmj-tw mn)?"

Sporadic examples of topicalized uses of the passive with morphological gemination in post-classical Middle Egyptian must be understood as hypercorrections resulting from the gradual obliteration of the first person independent use of this form (section 7.2) and its subsequent inclusion into the regular paradigm of initial nominalized forms:

(51) Urk. IV 119,10  qds.kw b pr=n "I have been placed (qds.kw) on the balance"

(3) In modal contexts, the prospective form is used (section 4.6.3.2). In Old Egyptian, this form exhibits both an active sdm(=w)-f=fjr w=f and a passive sdm=f=fjr w=f. In the classical language, prospective and subjunctive have merged into a single paradigm: the passive form of the Middle Egyptian suppletive prospective sdm=f displays the analytic pattern with tw-suffix, which is originally the form of the subjunctive:
(52) CT V 93c-d

waktiv w jw sw jef jm(w) wjk=f jw m wdwjr

"Where shall I put (waktiv w jw) it?" - You should put (adp-k, emphatic)26 in her bilge-water.

(53) Pyr. *1960b–c

jw N r gs jbh tj(n) nw t jwjr N jm msj w N jm

"The King is directed toward the east of Nut: it is there (jm) that the King shall be conceived (jwjr N), it is there that the King shall be born (msj w N)"

(54) Sin. B 202

jej tw n m mj=m n bsk tj(n) jbh=fr t bsw w dfr yr

"How mj=m "like what?" can this be done (jej tw n m) for a servant (bsk) whose heart lured him to foreign countries (bsw w dfr yr)?"

(4) One will recall that when the expression of the subject of an adversial or pseudosentential sentence is accompanied by temporal or modal features projected into the realized past or to the potential future, the predicate of these sentences is a verbal form of wnn "to be," for example the unmarked aorist wnn=fr and its topicalized equivalent wnn=fr "he is," the prospective wnn=fr "will be," or the subjunctive wnn=fr "that he be" (sections 5.6, 6.2). The same conversion into a verbal sentence preceded by wnn applies to adversial and pseudosentential sentences in the same environments in which verbal clauses undergo topicalization by means of "emphatic" forms:

(a) when an adversial adjunct enjoys pragmatic salience:

(55) CT V 54c–55a B3C.

jn jnN=f r jj=c t bsw tj jn(n) yb w

"Have you come (jn jnN=f) in order to take away (r jji) this heart of mine (bsw tj jn) that belongs to the Living One (yb w)?"

(b) when the topicalized clause predicated by wnn is extraposited as topic of a correlative main sentence:

(56) Sin. B 252–54

wnk w wrf dwn kw br b sw jm wj(n) wj m bsw w

"Although indeed stretched out on my belly (topicalized form of *jw rz=r wsw=j dwn kw "I was stretched out"), still I did not recognize myself before him (non-initial main clause)"

(c) in headings or titles:

(57) CT VI 333a

wn jf m m nj b w

"[This spell describes] how a man will be (wn jf) among (m-m) the living (nj b w)"

Initial clauses predicated by wnn, therefore, are the syntactic equivalent of adversial sentences introduced by an indicator of syntactic initiality such as jw (jw=fr m prw "he is at home") vs. wnn=f mj=m "how is he?", jw=fr br rj=fr "you give" vs. wnn=k br rj=fr in nj=fr "it is without knowledge that you give"), according to a syntactic pattern similar to the conversion of otherwise unmarked verbal clauses into a sentence with topicalized predicate (jw mdw=fr mj=jw=fr "he speaks to me" vs. jm=f m mj=t fr=fr "he acts according to his wish").

7.5.2 Topicalized vs. adversialized verbal forms

A frequent pattern with a topicalized verbal form is one in which the pragmatically emphasized adversial slot is occupied by a verbal phrase embedded as "circumstantial" form, indicating an action simultaneous (aorist sdm=fr "in that he hears/heard"); anterior (active past sdm=fr "after he has/had heard," passive sdm=fr=w=fr "after he has/had been heard") or subsequent (prospective sdm=fr "that he may hear") to the one conveyed by the initial verbal form. In these sentences, which are labeled in Egyptological literature "complex adversial sentences," two concomitant conversions take place: the topicalization of the main predicate of the sentence, and the adversial embedding of the verbal phrase which occupies thematic position:

(58) Pt. 366

mdw y=k rj=N=f jw=N=f

"You should talk (mdw y=k, prospective) only when you know (rj=N=f) that you understand (jw=N=f, section 7.6)"

(59) Manchester 3306, 827

jej mj=fr mj=fr t tw ssku tj smkh sas=fr r rwg ntr=fr

"I made for myself this magnificent tomb (mj=fr t tw ssku tj "this tomb, it being beautified, statical"; after its location had been perfectly set (smkh sas=fr) at the terrace of the Great God"

At this point, however, a question may be raised: since the sdm=fr, unlike the aorist sdm=fr, does not exhibit, with the exception of the verb rj=fr "to give," a morphological opposition between its topicalized and its main clause uses, how is it possible to discriminate between a non-initial main clause in a narrative sequence of the type we discussed in section 7.3 on the one hand and a topicalized sdm=fr-predicate on the other?

The following is a frequently discussed passage from "Sinuehe":

(60) Sin. B 26–34

"Then he gave me water and boiled milk for me. I went with him to his tribe: what they did was good. Land passed me to land: I set out to Byblos and reached Qedem. jej mj=fr qm=fr jm wj wmm mon jw N jm mj=fr km=fr km=q] sdm=fr N mj=fr os=fr m nj=fr m rj=fr m rj=fr m kj=fr m km=fr m nj=fr m bn=fr. I spent (jw mj=fr) a year and a half (rj=fr m ka) there; Ammuneshni, the ruler of Upper Retjenu, took me (mj=fr wj wmm) and said to me (sdm=fr os=fr) "You will be happy (njw y=fr you are good") with me, and you will hear (sdm=fr rj=fr) the language of Egypt." He said this (sdm=fr os=fr) because he knew my character (rj=fr os=fr rj=fr) and had heard of my skills (sdm=fr os=fr wmm); the Egyptians (rj=fr wkm=fr) who were (nj=fr wj) there with him witnessed for me (mj=fr rj=fr)"
nenshi took me” and “he said to me” provide background information for the understanding of Sinuhe’s stay, and are therefore embedded as AP into the main clause predicated by “he said this.” The form sqm.n=f “he said this,” on the other hand, which opens a new narrative segment after a direct speech, offers a paradigmatic example of topicalized VP: it thematicizes Ammuneneshi’s words, and its use is syntactically justified by the presence of the three following embedded sqm.n=fs which explain the background of Ammuneneshi’s speech. Rather than by a simple past, these adverbial sqm.n=fs should be rendered in European languages by a perfective past form: since fmm.n=f “he said this,” verbal phrase embedded as AP) the land of the Sand-dwellers (section 7.2) me for it beyond measure (r
“it brought,” verbal phrase embedded as AP) from there very many troops as they represent a past background to a preterital main VP, they acquire the function of pluperfect forms in English: “because he knew (= had learnt),” “and had heard,” “having witnessed.”

Thus, the opposition between topicalized and adverbalized sqm.n=f in Egyptian discourse is not a feature of morphosyntax, since the same verbal form can be used as paratactic main clause, as initial topicalized form, or as embedded adverbialized VP, but a matter of tense-aspect dialectics, of sequence of tenses,28 of organization of temporal and aspectual features in discourse. In fact, the interplay between the main clause verbal predicate, the foreground topicalized VP, and the embedded verbal forms in adverbial function is a frequent device of Egyptian literary style. The main difference between the non-initial main clause and the so-called complex adverbial sentence lies in the syntactic and pragmatic status of the verbal phrase: in the former case, the VP is a paratactically linked verbal clause which carries the discourse sequence (foreground); in the latter, the topicalized VP (theme) controls a subordinate VP embedded as adverbial adjunct (background):

(61) Urk. I 103.7–104.4
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7.5 The verbal sentence with topicalized predicate

of the predicative nexus in each of the two portions of the sentence, with a direct temporal or logical dependence of the second predicate upon the first, i.e. “if... then,” or “as soon as... then”:

(62) Pyr. 798a

“If you go, Horus goes – if you speak, Seth speaks”

(63) Berlin 1157.12

“No sooner is he attacked (nb.m n=f “one attacks him”), he turns (bb.n n=f “he gives”) his back”

(64) Urk. IV 348.9

“As long as heaven exists, you (fem.) shall be with me (pp.n=f)”

(65) pTurin 5406531

“As soon as I came into existence, Being (pp.t) came into existence; each being (pp.t nb) came into existence after (m-p) my coming into existence”

While different from both the pattern in which a topicalized VP is dislocated to the left of a main sentence with unconverted verbal predicate (section 7.5.1b) and the “complex adverbial sentence” in which the thematicized VP signals the pragmatic focality of an embedded “circumstantial” VP (section 7.5.2), the balanced sentence nonetheless shares with both of them a semantic correlation between the two verbal phrases.32 Let us consider the following textual variant of (44) in which the topicalized VP is not extraposed to the main sentence, but rather correlates with another “emphatic”

(44) CT III 24a–25b S2C

“...If they go down to the earth as snakes, I shall go down on their coils; they go up (pp=-sn) to heaven as falcons – I go up (pp=-sn) to their wings”

In the first of the two sentences, the topicalized VP h3a=sn is extraposed, and the predicative sentence functioning as its comment is an independent verbal form, namely a prospective h3a=sn; the second is a balanced sentence with two “autofocal” VPs (pp-t sn – pp-t). In the balanced sentence, both correlated VPs are integral constituents of the sentence; the topicalized VP dislocated to the left of a main clause, on the contrary, is an extraposed subordinate clause and entertains a paradigmatic relation with extraposed nominal topics (section 7.3) and with adverbial phrases in topical extra-

position, which also appear in similar patterns:

(44”) CT III 24a–25b B1Be

“...If they go down to the earth as snakes, I shall go down in their coils; as for their going up (pp-t sn, infinitive) to heaven as falcons, I shall go up on their wings”
Also in the so-called "complex adverbial sentence" the topicalized (or better thematized, since no real extrapolation occurs) VP is a mandatory component of the sentence pattern; rather than a contingent event, however ("if they go down, I shall go down"), the scope of the emphasis it conveys is here a circumstance determining, accompanying, or resulting from it ("you should talk only when you know that you understand").

7.5.4 Other focalizing uses of the topocalized VP

Thus, the use of topicalized verbal forms allows the pragmatic stress to be laid on a phrasal or clause-based comment. The pattern "Emphatic form+AP" is in fact the most common device for the focalization of an argument other than the subject of a verbal clause, which, as one will recall (sections 5.4.2, 7.3), is focalized by becoming the subject of a participial statement (or cleft sentence). When the focalized element is the patient, i.e. the object of a verbal predicate (section 5.2.1), Egyptian has recourse to the conversion of the verbal clause into an identifying (pseudocleft) sentence in which the object of the VP becomes the pragmatically focalized predicate of a tripartite nominal construction "Pred-pw-relative form," for example NP pw hzy.m-sn "[The one whom they praised] is NP."

There exists, however, a rare, but linguistically sophisticated focalization pattern for the object of a VP, in which the object is converted into a prepositional phrase introduced by m "as":33

(66) Pes. B.1,168 in bm=k s m h3.w=j
"Are you ignorant (in bm=k) only of my problems (h3.w=j)?"

The verb bm "not to know, to be ignorant of" is transitive; it should, therefore, display a direct object. But in order to emphasize the pronominal referent ("only of my problems"), here the syntactic slot of the direct object is left empty (m) and a prepositional phrase with m "as" used instead, lit. "are you ignorant (of it) as my problems?" The syntactic structure of these sentences, the most common of which is the formula "The King N jlj.n-f e m mnw-f n jlj.f..." frequently inscribed on royal monuments,34 involves a form of omission under relevance (section 6.3.3) of the object of the verbal predicate and its resumption, as it were, by the prepositional phrase introduced by m: "As for King N, it is as his monument that he made this for his father..." Interestingly enough, this focalizing pattern with the raising to AP of an object NP is not limited to grammatical objects, but can be applied to logical objects of a VP, for example the subject of a passive verbal predicate (see also section 7.5):

(67) Adm. 12.13-14 jm bm zj 3 br wa.t grnm.tw=s m zj 2 "if (we) three people leave (bm zj 3) on a road, only two are found"

In order to mark the contrast between the active subject of the protasis ("three people leave") and the passive subject of the apodosis ("only two are found," one of them having been the victim of the other two’s violence), the latter’s slot is left empty under relevance in the main clause grnm.tw=s "(it) is found" and resumed in the prepositional phrase m zj 2 "(only) two people."

In a similar vein, one observe the following example:

(68) Uruk. IV 897.11-16 rj n(j) qd=k twj m zj m wn=k m lsmsw jlj=uj dj=j e m brc-k m jst.t t jst-k n mst mj qd tj=s srj=k qm yr nzw "I knew your character (qd-k) while I was still in the nest (wn=k m zj), section 6.3.1), when you were (m wn=k "in you-are") in my father’s following. I shall indeed give you the office of the Royal Table (jst.t t), so that you become for me lieutenant of the Army (jdn=k nsw mst) under my command (mj qd tj=s) "according to what I will say", and supervise (srj=k) the Royal Guard"

Here, the predicate of the clause dj=j e m brc-k m jst.t t is an objectless prospective form of the verb rj "to give," modified by the prepositional phrase m brc-k "in your face" to yield "I shall give you in your face as the office of the Royal Table." The omitted object is resumed by the prepositional phrase m jst.t t as "(the) office of the Royal Table," which is the focalized element of the utterance. The English translation "I shall indeed give you the office of the Royal Table" attempts to identify the prepositional adjunct as discourse focus.

7.6 Verbal clauses embedded as noun phrases

In the topicalized verbal sentence which we considered in the preceding section, the initial VP serves as the "theme" or "topic" of the sentence, i.e. it assumes a function which is usually performed by a noun phrase. In other syntactic environments, however, these converted forms, i.e. the emphatic past qdm.m=f, the aorist qdm.f, the prospective qdm(.w)=f, and the conversion of an adverbial or pseudoverbal pattern by means of wnn do not appear dislocated as pragmatic topic of a complex sentence, but rather embedded as noun phrase into a higher syntactic node. These environments are: (A) the use of a topicalized form embedded into a higher nominal or verbal sentence, and (B) its syntactic control by a verb, by a preposition, or by the genitive marker, i.e. the determinative pronoun nj "that of."

(A) The topicalized verbal form functions as the predicate of the embedded clause in "thematic" statements (section 5.3), i.e. in bipartite nominal
sentences in which an entire verbal clause appears as predicate of a higher pw-sentence:

(69)  pEb  855z  mnh  jw=f  pw
"This means (pw) that his heart is oblivious (mnh  jw=f)"
(70)  Urk. V 53,1–2
wnw  sw  pw  br  hjj  jmj-t-pw  n  gb3
"This means that Shu is making (sw  br hjj) a testament (jmj-t-pw) in favor of Geb"

The nominalized VP can also be converted into the subject of a higher nominal or verbal clause, for example a qualifying adjectival clause (section 5.4.1) or a subordinate verbal clause (section 6.3.1):

(71)  CT VI 194c  B1 3a  3ss-w(j)  ddpm-k
"How secret (3ss) is the way you look (ddpm=k "that you look")!
(72)  Pyr. 1223a
jr  wdi  ds3=jn  mnh  t  N  np  ddks  N  np  mnh.w  p  rj  sw  (w)=f
"If it is delayed (wdi) that you ferry the ferry-boat to this King, this King will say (ddks N np) your name to the people whom he knows"

In these sentences, the entire clause predicated by the reduplicated sdjm=f, whether consisting only of the verbal form as in (71) "the way you look," or of a more complex predicate as in (72) "that you ferry the ferry-boat to this King," is the subject of the adjectival or verbal predicate.

(B) A clause predicated by an "emphatic" form or construction can appear embedded as the noun phrase object of a verb of perception such as rb "to know" or gd "to say":

(73)  Urk. IV 363,6–7  jw  bm.3r(j)  dm(j)  ngq-j  dm(j)  jk  (br  wnl-f
"My Majesty (bm.3r=f) knows (ngq-j) that he is divine (njrm=f, erist of njrm "to be divine") and that I did this (njrm=f) st, emphatic sdjm=f) according to his order"
(74)  Urk. I 162,12  rj  np(j)  bm  mr  w(j)  r  br  rj  t  n(j)  jw
"I know for sure (bm) that Re' loves me, because he has given (br rj t=f "on his having given") you to me"
(75)  Pyr. 1490a  gd=f  km  nw  jn  (np  m  bm  mrm  njrm  w(j)  jm(j)  w  p  t
"You will say that this King exists among them, namely the gods who are in heaven"
(76)  Pyr. 1862a  nN  gd=f  km  br  r  wnl  f  jj(j)  w  m  nr
"You shall say to Re that he has come as god"

Unlike in (73) and (74), where syntactic dependency is conveyed only by the use of a nominal VP (njrm=f and mr  w(j) r  w),35 in the last two examples the object clause controlled by the verb gd "to say" is identified by explicit markers of subordination, namely the particle js in (75) and the conjunction wnt in (76). As we observed in sections 6.3.1 and 6.4, the difference between the two patterns is that the presence of js evokes not only syntactic dependency but also pragmatic focality, whereas the latter feature is absent from the unmarked sentence introduced by the conjunction ntr or wnt (section 4.7).

The pattern in which a clause predicated by a nominalized VP represents the embedded object of a verbal predicate is particularly frequent under the control of verbs of wish or command such as mnr "to wish," rj "to give" or mnt "to cause," or wnl "to order." The predicate of these clauses is usually the subjunctive sdjm=f:

(77)  Pyr. 1295a
wyl  jw  jm(j)  np  njrm  b3  m  nts  m  nr  dm(j)
"Anubis, who presides over the god's booth (njrm-npt), has ordered that you descend (b3-npt) as star (nts), as the Morning Star (nr dmw) "the morning god"
(78)  Urk. IV 132,16–17
rj  wnl  wnt  jk  wnl  rj  ntr  njrm
"He caused that I be (wn-wj) in the people's heart and that I be loved (mrj  wn-j) by my god"

There are instances, however, in which an entire complex adverbial sentence predicated by the "emphatic" sdjm=f can appear embedded as object of a verb of wish or command or controlled by a preposition:

(79)  Urk. I 301,3–5
jw  wyl  jk  wnl  jr  np  qd  m  sps  w(j)  jprn  lnl  wnl  jk  m  wnl  wnl
"My Majesty commanded that he become an official (wnl=f) and acquire a good reputation (jr qd) in these districts according to (jprn) your command that he become (jr qd) your herald"
(80)  pKahun 1,7
"(Hail to you, Khâ[k]akre')... sj  ssr  mj  jrm  sdjm=f  b3  m  jmr  wnl  wnl
who shoots the arrow as does Sakhmet (mj  jrm=f), killing (sdjm=f "as he kills") thousands as people who ignore (jmr) his might"
(81)  Peas. B1,109–10
sdjm=f  wnl  dmr  sbr=f  wnl  qd  mrw  rj  sj  b3  m  jmr
"If you wish (sdjm=f "in that you wish," section 6.3.2) to see me (mrw=f, infinitive + suffix pronoun) happy (sbr=f, stative), you should keep (sdjm=f) him here without answering (mrw=f) to anything he may say (sdjm=f, section 7.7)"

But since Egyptian prepositions can often function as conjunctions (see section 4.7), it is difficult to draw a morphological distinction between a VP embedded as NP under the control of a preposition and a VP which keeps its verbal features in a subordinate clause introduced by a conjunction. This is notably the case with the verbal pattern used only in the negative form (section 7.8) or as an adverbial clause introduced by the prepositions or conjunctions r "until" and jr "since," namely the sdjm=f (section 6.3.1). In this form, the morpheme .f can be taken as nominal marker related to the feminine ending of the substantivized relative form, in which case the form would be an embedded NP (r sdjm=f "to that-he has heard"), or more probably, as marker of definiteness (r sdjm=f "until he has heard").37

(82)  Pt. 126
m  mdw  w(j)  m  f  rj  np  fn
"Do not talk to him until he has invited you to (r jnt=f)"
Finally, the "emphatic" form is also used as NP after the determinative pronoun nj, i.e. as the nomen rectum of a genitival construction:

(83) Pt. 186  

"May she give (it) to anyone she likes without antecedent)\(\)43 among her children whom she may bear (msj.w=s, pl. relative prospective "whom-she-may-bear") to me"

The link to the antecedent in the main clause can also be carried by a resumptive pronoun in an embedded subordinate clause:

7.7 Converted relative clauses

7.7.1 General features

Egyptian possesses two types of relative clauses, depending on whether the antecedent is non-specific or specific (section 6.3.3): In the former case, it is modified by a "virtual" relative clause, i.e. an unconverted verbal clause embedded as adverbial adjunct; in the latter case, it is modified by a relative converter or by adjectival conversions of the verb. When the subject of the relative clause is coreferential with the antecedent it modifies, the active or passive participle is used:

(87) Urk. IV 74,9-11  

"May the king give an offering (to) Nekhbet, the White One of Hierakonpolis, that she may give (dj=s) all good and pure things which go up (p3t, imperfective active participle of p3t) on her altar (w3t=s) during each festival of Beginning of Heaven to the ka of..."

(88) Urk. IV 132,9-10  

"May she give (it) to anyone she likes without antecedent)\(\)43 among her children whom she may bear (msj.w=s, pl. relative prospective "whom-she-may-bear") to me"

In the Old Kingdom, there are cases in which a relative verbal clause is introduced by the relative adjective nj.\(\)39 This type of conversion is more frequent in negative sentences (section 7.8.6), since in these patterns the predicate does not immediately follow the antecedent, but is separated from it by the negative morpheme. Positive examples are rare:

(89) Siut 1,295  

"the bread and beer... which I gave to you"

But the most frequent relative conversion of a verbal clause whose subject is different from the modified antecedent is fulfilled in earlier Egyptian by special forms of the verbal conjugation, usually called relative forms.\(\)40 Etymologically, these forms are probably connected with participles (section 4.6.3.4) and display the usual nominal endings (masc. j > w, almost never expressed, fem. t, pl. w) in agreement with the specific antecedent they modify; they appear, however, fully integrated into the finite conjugational system of the sgjm.m=f for the past (90), of the geminated or reduplicated sgjm.m=f for the aorist (91), and of the prospective sgjm.w=f for modal uses (92). The link to the specific antecedent in the main clause is established by a "conversational element in the case of the object pronoun, the resumptive element may be omitted under relevance, if local to the agreement-carrying predicate:"\(\)42

(90) Sin. B 101-2  

"Every foreign country (past nb.t) against which I advanced (rwj.t=nj) is federal. relative past "which (fem.)-I-advanced against-it" - I made my attack (bdj) against it, it being driven (drj, static) from the pastures of its well (nnm.w=s)"

(91) Pyr. 36a-b  

"Oasis the King! Take to yourself the Eye of Horus which escaped from Seth (bjt, fem. participial coreference with the antecedent jrt bjt), which you should take (jqi=k, fem. relative prospective) to your mouth and with which you keep opening your mouth (wpp.t=k rs=k jm=s, fem. relative aorist "which (fem.)-you-open-your-mouth-wit-it")"

(92) Urk. IV 420.1  

"You shall eat your bread according to your wish (r mrw=k, sec (c) above), as when you were on earth ("according to your custom of you-were-on-earth")"

"You shall eat your bread according to your wish (r mrw=k, sec (c) above), as when you were on earth ("according to your custom of you-were-on-earth")"
When used without explicit antecedent, the feminine form of a relative verbal form is often substantivized in the "neuter" meaning ("that which"). It mostly appears as object of a verbal phrase or under the control of a preposition:

(94) Sin. B 213

w.fhn-k lnn.t jm

"You have subdued that which the sun-disk encircles (lnn.t jm)"

and also as subject or as predicate of a nominal sentence, in the syntactic environments we analyzed in section 5.2.

Thus, the relativization of a verbal clause involves the entire clause, and is morphologically marked by the conversion of the predicate into an adjectival form of the verb, i.e. the participle when its subject is coreferential with the antecedent:

(96) Sin. B 304-5

h'.tw nb dd.w n rwj jjw.j nbr n.f n.f

"All the equipment (h'.tw) that is to be put (dd.w "which is given") into a shaft — its management was then (jm "there") taken care of (jjw.j nbr n.f)"

and the relative form when it differs from it:

(97) Urk. 19,14-16

jjw.t.n=f nw a jjw.t sk sw bjhj(w) jf mns.h br w.w.n ftr.wt

h(jhj(w) jm bbr w bbr sn "which (from.sg.pl.) the deceased go on them")"

7.7.2 Relative conversion of agentless sentences

In the examples of relative verbal forms we discussed so far, the converted predicate, whether transitive or intransitive, is always in the active voice and displays an overt subject. On the basis of these constructions, conjugated relative forms might be viewed as semantically equivalent to passive participles of transitive (jrj.t jjj.tk "the eye which you should take" = "the eye taken-by-you") or intransitive verbs (bhr.t rwj.t.n=f "the country against which I advanced" = "the country advanced-by-me against it"), and in fact one of the most adhered-to theories about their origin viewed them, exactly like the indicative forms of the suffix conjugation sdm.n=f, sdm.n=f, etc., as derived from passive participles followed by their subject, later grammaticalized as finite verbal forms. This functional correspondence between passive participles and relative forms is particularly explicit when the substantivized passive participle of verbs such as mj" to love" or nhj "to praise" is used instead of the relative form (mjy "beloved one," nhjy (jy "praised one"):)

(98) Pt. 137

jmj$t n nhj y=f

"He will give to the one whom he praises (nhj.j y=f "his praised one")"

Let us now turn, however, to the relative conversion of two semantically more complex sentence types, namely (a) the subjectless intransitive predicate whose subject is omitted under relevance, and (b) the passive constructions with or without explicit subject. In these clauses, the adjectival agreement is not carried by a relative form, but by a passive participle, although their overt or omitted subject differs from the antecedent it modifies. Let us consider example (99):

(99) Urk. IV 269,7-8 (King Thutmose I)

h$.tw lh.n w m-qsb km.t "it is there (km.t) Egypt, over all whose deeds one rejoices"

In the first portion of this verse, the underlying verbal sentence which has undergone relative conversion is *h$s+r lh.n w m-qsb km.t "he drives troubles away from Egypt"; its subject (=km.t) being coreferential with the antecedent (the King), the adjectival agreement is carried by the active participle. In the second part, however, the subject of the underlying clause is not the King, but rather an indefinite pronoun "one," which has been omitted under relevance:5 h".tw m jje.t.n=f nb t "one rejoices (h".tw) over all that which he has done (jje.t.n=f, substantivized headless relative form)." Here, the indefinite subject of the relative clause and the adjectival agreement with the antecedent is carried by the passive participle h".tw *"rejoiced": Egyptian uses the passive participle in spite of the fact that the logical subject of the relative clause is different from the antecedent.

Similar to these constructions are the examples in which the subjectless predicate, rather than an intransitive verbal form, is an objectless transitive verbal phrase:

(100) Urk. 1184,1

sm=s(j) t p m3.w n.w wjs 'r tw ddj(w) $ jm [r ts]

"And I followed the sterns (m3.w) of the great bark to the place (bw) where one lands"

where the underlying main clause which has undergone relative conversion is *ddj(t) $ jm [r ts] "it is there (jm) that one lands (ddj(t) $ r ts "one gives $ to land")"
The same type of agreement applies to the relative conversion of a passive predicate with overt subject in the aorist *jw jjr-tw=f - when topicalized - or *jw jjr-tw=f - when functioning as main clause - and in the prospective *jw jjr-tw=f. In these constructions, the converted relative clause is headed by a perfective or imperfective passive participle rather than by a relative form, although the overt subject is different from the modified antecedent. The semantic reason for this syntactic behavior is the divorce, typical for passive predications, between grammatical and logical subject: while the overt grammatical subject is usually the object of the verbal action, the logical subject (i.e., the agent) remains in most cases unexpressed. In view of this semantic weakness of the grammatical subject of a passive predicate, which, being a "patient," scores lower than the antecedent on the hierarchy of case-roles, it is the antecedent, whether implicit, as in (101), or explicit, as in (102), which takes over the subject function in the relative clause as well, creating a bifrontal pattern in which the participle in congruence with the antecedent is followed by the grammatical subject (and logical patient) of the relative clause, i.e., a pattern structurally similar to the syntax of the relative verbal forms:

(101) pebers 247
\[ jw jrj.w n=f nb pbr.t \text{tn} \]
"As for everyone for whom this remedy is made (jrr.w n=f pbr.t m) "made [masc. passive participle] to-him this remedy..."

which represents the relative conversion of *jw jjr-tw=f pbr.t m "this remedy is made for him," or

(102) CT I 70d
\[ jrj njf(w)=k m bbb.w qbb.t sbj.w jnn=sn \]
"You shall not be put (section 7.8) in the place of execution (bbr.6b) in which the rebels are put (qbb.t sbj.w jnn=sn "put (fem. passive participle)-the rebels in-it")"

from a main clause *qbb.tw sbj.w jnn=sn "the rebels are put in it." It is interesting to observe that in the presence of a pronoun subject, the suffix pronoun in the underlying verbal clause ([+V], [-N]) becomes a dependent pronoun in the converted adjectival relative clause ([+V], [+N]):

(103) Uke IV 1116,7-8
\[ mff tzj \text{'}b.w t tzj w nb n=f sw mff zbb wppw tijw nb n(w) pw-nwnw s zbb.w nb nfw=m \]
"It is he (mff) who assigns boats (\text{'}b.w) to everyone to whom it should be assigned, it is he who sends all royal messengers (wppw tijw nb) to everyone to whom they are sent"

In a cleft sentence, the verbal predicate is converted into a participle predicate which represents the presupposition of the focalized subject (section 5.4.2). In the two cleft sentences in (103), the verbal clauses undergoing conversion are the prospective *szj.tw=f n-f "it (i.e., a boat) should be assigned to him" and the aorist *jw zbj.tw=sn n-f "they are sent to him." Since the predicates resulting from the relative conversion are the perfective passive participle *szj.w "assigned" for the prospective and the imperfective passive participle *zbb.w "sent" for the aorist, a second morphological conversion takes place: the dependent pronoun, which conveys the subject of adjectival sentences, is used instead of the suffix pronoun characteristic of verbal sentences: *szj.w nb n-f sw "everyone (nb) to whom (n-f) to him") it (sw, i.e., the boat, subject of the converted clause) is assigned (*szj.w, predicate of the converted clause), *zbb.w nb n-f st "everyone to whom (st) subject are sent (*zbb.w, singular "bifrontal" predicate of the relative clause).

Finally, let us consider the relative conversion of the perfective passive *jw sgm(w)=f (verbal form) and *jw=f sgm(w) (stative). In even cases when their grammatical subject is overt, sentences predicated by this verbal form share with the other patterns discussed in this section the agentless feature: their grammatical subject is the patient of the verbal action, the logical subject, i.e., the agent role, remaining mostly unexpressed, but if necessary conveyed by the "ergative" marker jn (section 4.4.1). We would, therefore, expect the relative conversion of these sentences to be conveyed by the same pattern, i.e., by an adjectival clause predicated by a past passive participle in congruence with the antecedent. This is indeed the case both in headless (104) and in regularly headed (105) relative clauses derived from an underlying perfective passive *jw sgm(w)=f=f sgm(w):

(104) Pyr. 1699a
\[ jw jrr.t jn jn=f st jn=sn jn=sn(j) n fw=sn \]
"He to whom (m-f) pain (mr.t) was inflicted (jy "made") by his brother Seth "comes to us," say the Two Enneads (j=sn jn=sn(j) n fw=sn) "they say - the Two Enneads")"

from a main sentence *jw jrr.w r=f mr.t jn jn=sn st8 "pain was inflicted to him by his brother Seth," or

(105) Pyr. 276c
\[ jw zj r=\text{'b} nm f \]
"O Great God whose name (m-f) is unknown"

from a main sentence *jw m-f jn m.w "his name is unknown." The predicates of the converted clauses are the passive participles jy "made" and $jnm "unknown,"52 their subjects mr.t "pain" and m-f "his name" respectively. The latter case is an example of the so-called babawurhi-construction, typical for the expression of physical or moral qualities, in which an asyndetic adjectival or pseudoverbal sentence modifies an animate antecedent.53

With pronominal subjects, however, rather than the expected dependent pronoun, this pattern displays the suffix pronoun, making it appear a relative verbal form sgm(y)=f in all respects similar to the relative conversions
of the active sdm.n=f for the past, of the geminated or reduplicated sdm.f for the aorist, and of the prospective sdm.(w)=f for the future:

(106) Pyr. 27d

\[ rsw \ n(j) hbr \ jst.1 \ htw \ msjyw=f \ jm \]

"Your mouth (rsw=f) is the mouth of a suckling calf (hbr jst.1 "a calf of milk") on the day in which it was born"

(107) CT I 248e

\[ jpr=f \ pw \ msyj=f \ n=f \]

"He is your father (jpr=f) to whom you (fem.) were born"

The underlying sentences before relative conversion are assumed to be 

\[ "Look, you have acquired power (strn=f) in the body (p.d) of your mother Tefnut, before you were born" \]

(108) Pyr. 779b

\[ sdm.\ n=f m. \ t m\ jsy=f \ tbt \ n(j) \ msyj=f \ n=j \]

"You have acquired power (sdm\ n=f) in the body (p.d) of your mother Tefnut, before you were born"

(109) CT V 124a-b MyC

\[ mkt \ n(j) \ jbr \ mrj.3 \ m=l \]

"Look, she is at the wharf (wpr.3), without having been cut out yet"

Alternatively, instead of positing the presence of a special verb form, and in order to keep the symmetry with the other cases of agentless or passive relative conversion, one can analyze the predicates in these sentences as conjugated participles (msyf=f "born-he," msyf=f "born-you"), in which the use of the suffix pronoun instead of the independent subject is a signal of the progressive assimilation of passive relative clauses to their active equivalents, before the global reorganization of relative patterns which takes place in later Egyptian and which will be discussed in section 7.9.4.

Thus, the general rule of relativization of Egyptian verbal clauses can be formulated in the following way: verbal clauses in which the overt agent of the verbal predicate is different from the modified antecedent are converted into relative clauses by means of a finite adjectival form of the verbal conjugation, i.e. a relative VP; verbal clauses in which the agent of the predication is either coreferential with the modified antecedent or remains unexpressed are converted into relative clauses by means of a non-finite adjectival form, i.e. a participle.

The crucial typological point is that the negative patterns of natural languages are not always the result of a simple juxtaposition of a negative morpheme to the positive statement; rather, they often appear grammaticalized as bound constructions, and their evolution runs independent of the historical changes experienced by their positive counterpart. In this respect, it is likely that the structure of the negative aorist nj sdm.n=f "he cannot does not hear" goes back to an early use of the sdm.n=f as present perfect "he has heard" (section 4.6.3.1):

(110) Pyr. 1466b-c

\[ msj.w \ N \ pt \ jpr=f \ msyj=f \ sdy \ m=pr \ jpr=f \ tbt \ msyj=f \]

"This King has been generated by (msj.w N pt jpr=f) his father Atum before heaven had come into existence (sdyn=f pt "and heaven had not yet become"), before earth (msyj=f) had come into existence"

(111) Manchester 3306,4

\[ nj \ sdm.n=f \ sdy \ m=pr \ jpr=f \ tbt \ msyj=f \ n=f \]

"Not turn (nj sdm.n=f) a "saw"

(112) Pt. 13-14

\[ nj \ yrj.3 \ n(j) \ m=pr \ m\ tnr \ nj \ sdm.n=f \ n=f \]

"The mouth (nj) is silent, and cannot speak (nj m=pr nf)" the heart is dumb, and cannot remember (sdyn=f) the past (nf "yesterday")"

This polarity in the behavior of the negative main clause patterns has been variously explained. The crucial typological point is that the negative patterns of natural languages are not always the result of a simple juxtaposition of a negative morpheme to the positive statement; rather, they often appear grammaticalized as bound constructions, and their evolution runs independent of the historical changes experienced by their positive counterpart. In this respect, it is likely that the structure of the negative aorist nj sdm.n=f "he cannot does not hear" goes back to an early use of the sdm.n=f as present perfect "he has heard" (section 4.6.3.1):

(113) Pyr. 18c

\[ wpr \ jpr=f \ nj \ m=pr \ n(f) \ hbr \]

"Osiris the King! I give you herewith (dj n(f) n(f)k "I have just given you") the Eye of Horus"
The corresponding contradictory pattern, therefore, was originally something like "he has not heard," from which the meaning as negative aorist "(and thus) he cannot does not hear" is easily derivable on semantic grounds. Similarly, the sdmn=f-form negated by the morpheme nj in the negative past "he did not hear" is in fact nothing other than the Old Egyptian indicative sdm=f, which is the usual preterital form "he heard" in the early stages of the history of the language (section 4.6.3.1). That the sdmn=f-form used in the negative pattern is in fact the indicative is shown by the full writing of the verbal form as njfrj=f (rather than as aorist njgj=f)58 in examples (112) and (114):

(114) Urk. I 83.13–14

"Since His Majesty praised me (section 6.3.1), His Majesty caused (njfrj=f) that I enter the 'Privy Chamber'"

In this case, the negative patterns outlived their positive equivalents: the sdmn=f-form maintained in the negative construction the "gnomic" function in which it was gradually replaced by the aorist sdm=f for positive statements, and the indicative sdmn=f was still used in the negative past form even after it had been superseded by the sdmn=f for the expression of the preterite tense in positive sentences.

7.8.2 Modal negation
One will recall that the history of Egyptian morphology displays the trend to reduce the inventory of sdmn=f-forms (section 4.6.3) – probably concomitant with the development of a strong word stress and the progressive decay of unstressed vowels (section 3.4.3) – to the advantage of a more rigid syntax and of infixed, and later periphrastic verbal forms. This tendency is particularly evident in the negative patterns for future or prospective main verbal clauses. In Old Egyptian and in the religious texts of the Middle Kingdom (Coffin Texts), both the prospective sdm(w)=frjw=f and the subjunctive sdm-ffrj=f appear negated in main clauses by the particle nj.59

(115) CT II 225c-e

"I do not come (nj jw=j) to you, I will not come (nj jw=j, prospective) to you until I have become (r jw=rj, section 6.3.1) a fighter (?)"

(116) Pyr. 1753

"I am Horus, Osiris the King: I shall not cause (nj jw=j, subjunctive) you to suffer (wwn=k)! Come, awake to me: I shall protect (jw=j, subjunctive) you"

The same applies to the corresponding passives sdmnn=f/jfrjw=f (117) and sdmtn=f (118):

(117) Pyr. 1323

"He will not wash (nj jw=f) himself in a bowl, he will not smell (nj sn=f) a foreleg, he will not pass (nj jw=f) a piece of meat, the earth will not be hacked up (nj hbs=f) for him, offerings will not be laid down (nj sn=f) for him; this King will go forth (prj) and ascend (swh) himself (rj=f) to heaven!"

(118) Pyr. 243

"The White Crown will come forth (prj prj=st) after it has swallowed (p,sn=f, section 7.5.2) the Great One (wj=f), after the tongue of the White Crown (as hbd=f) has swallowed the Great One; but the tongue will not be seen (nj jw=f)"

Although the functional opposition between prospective and subjunctive in the negative patterns is probably even thinner than in the corresponding positive constructions, it is the subjunctive, the originally more deontic form, that already in Old Egyptian displays a sporadic tendency to be negated by the "intensified" form of the negative particle (section 5.7) written with the overt indication of the phonomeme — nj:n:

(119) Pyr. 444cW

"O nj:n=ja, I shall not be opposed!"

This evolution is completed in the Middle Egyptian suppletive paradigm (section 4.6.3.2), whose negative equivalent is nn sdmn=f.60 In the preceding chapters, we already observed that weak contradictory operators in verbless sentences exhibit the tendency to be gradually superseded by stronger, contrary negation. In the case of the classical Egyptian subjunctive, the choice of the operator of denial — nn appears motivated by the lack of verifiability (or of "jw-hood") inherent to the semantics of modal predicates:

(120) Siut IV,79

"His name shall not be on earth; he shall not be buried," i.e. *it is not verifiable (nn) that his name be on earth (wn m=f) and that he be buried (qrs tw=f)

(121) Sim. B 279

"The eye which sees you will not be afraid," i.e. *it is not verifiable (nn) that the eye (jw) looking at you (dji mrk) be afraid (sn)

The subjunctive sdmn=f is also used to negate the very possibility of the occurrence of an event in the construction nj zp sdmn=f "never did he hear," in which zp is a grammaticalized form of the verb zp "to happen."61 This form is usually the indicative sdmn=f for the expression of the negative past (section 7.8.1), lit. "it did not happen (indicative) that he would hear (subjunctive)"

(122) Urk. I 106.3

"Never (nj zp) since the beginning (dn bsh) had this office been held (jfrj=f) by any servant (jr bsh n=f)"
but also the aorist after the negative relative converter jwty "one who not" (section 7.8.6) or the subjunctive for the future, lit. "it will not happen (subj.) that he hear (subj.)":

(123) Urk. 147.5  jwty zp jyr=f lmt t rmw w nby
"One who never did what people would suffer from (lmt t rmw w nb)"

(124) Herdsman 6  rnrn zp jyr=f ldt t nws
"I will never do what she said (ldt t nsw)"

However, the use of the negative prospective or subjunctive in clauses of wish or expectation, where it is sometimes accompanied by intensifiers such as h3,212 negative or subjunctive form of the negative verb jmj "not to do" (section 4.6.5), i.e. m and jmj=f respectively, followed by the negatival complement of the negated verb:

(125) Pt. 476  m wth w m zp n(j) ths
"Do not answer (m wth w) with an attitude (zp) of hostility (ths)"

(126) Pec. Bl162  q3 nj=f jmk t lw w
"Straighten (q3) your tongue and do not (jm=k) go astray (mm w)"

When the subject of the negative clause is a noun, it appears affixed to the negatival complement, rather than to the conjugated imperative or subjunctive form; this pattern is particularly frequent in the so-called bahawirib construction, i.e. the pattern in which a physical or moral quality is predicated of an animate antecedent:

(127) Sh.S. 111-12  m wth(w) zp nfs m n(j)lw w nb
"Do not fear, do not fear, little one (ndn), do not be coward (lit. "do-not be-pale your-heart")"

This type of negative construction must have experienced a much wider use in earlier times, because one still finds cases in which not only nominal, but also pronominal subjects appear controlled by the negatival complement rather than by the negative verb:

(128) Pyr. 1267a-b  jm jw(w) wjyr m jw=f lw dw t lw w(w) t=wb jy=k ; wjy=k(j) n=f
"Let not Osiris come in that evil coming of his (jw=f lw dw t); do not open your arms to him"

In the first of these two sentences, the subject of the subjunctive form jm is the noun "Osiris" placed after the negatival complement: jmj=f jw w "let him not come" vs. jm jw w wjyr "let not Osiris come." In the second sentence, however, the implicit subject of the negative imperative m lw w "do not open" appears resumed, as it were, by the overt second person suffix pronoun *k under the control of the negatival complement.

In post-classical Middle Egyptian and in later Egyptian, the synthetic negative imperative m is replaced by its periphrastic expansion m jty w > m-jr "do not do" > "don't," discussed more closely in section 7.9.2 below.

### 7.8 Negation in verbal clauses

In our treatment of verbal syntax, we noticed that Egyptian makes abundant use of topIALIZED and adverbialized verbal phrases, embedding them into a higher sentence node. The most common of these environments is the clause in which the verbal predicate is converted into the "emphatic" form in order to isolate an adverbial adjunct in pragmatic prominence (section 7.5). These sentences differ from unmarked clauses ("I came here") in that the attentional flow of the utterance shifts from the verbal predicate to an adverbial modifier ("I came here from London.") The negation of these patterns, therefore, will not involve contradiction of the predicative nexus ("I didn't come here"), but rather contrariness, i.e. a restriction of the negative scope to the focalized element: "I didn't come here from London," implying "but from somewhere else"; the nexus remains unaffected by the negative operator: "I did come here, but not from London."

In Egyptian, the operator of contrariness is nj-js with its discontinuous form nj js. This negation, although based in verbal clauses, actually affects an adverbial element rather than the verbal predicate, and was discussed at some length in section 6.5.2. Two examples will suffice here. In the first one (129), the adverbial adjunct given pragmatic focus is an adverbial phrase consisting of preposition + noun; in the second (130-130'), the focalized element is an adverbialized VP (or a stative), i.e. an unconverted verbal or pseudoverbal form embedded as adverbial phrase into the verbal main clause:

(129) Pyr. 475b-c  ths N m dby wjy nj dby=s jy m dby sr
"The King writes (ths N) with a big finger (m dby wjy); it is not (nj js) with a little finger (m dby sr) that he writes"

(130) Pt. 473a  m wth=f nj=f jy m wth=k
"You have gone away (m wth=f) alive (nj=f, aorist sdm=f/nb tj, stative), you haven't gone away dead (m wth=f/nb tj)"

The language, therefore, makes a distinction between contrary negation by means of nj js, in which the scope of the negation is limited to the adverbial focus, and simple contradiction of a predicative nexus by means of...
nj. In (131), an example of contradictory negation of the type analyzed in section 7.8.1, the discourse interface between the initial cleft sentence, which focalizes the third person subject (section 5.4.2), and the following negative verbal clause shows that what is being denied in the latter is obviously the entire predicative nexus "the King goes against him," rather than the propositional phrase alone:

(131) Pyr. 232a

swj jmrN nj sмотрN rnf

"He is the one (swj) who came (jj) against the King – the King did not go (nj sмотр N) against him"

7.8.4 Negation of verbal predicates embedded as AP

The discussion of negative patterns in nominal, adverbial, and verbal clauses has shown us that the distribution of negative forms is dictated in Egyptian primarily by semantic or pragmatic, rather than syntactic factors. Further evidence of this tendency is provided by the study of the negation of verbal forms embedded as adverbial phrases into a higher sentence. These are regularly negated by nj...js when functioning as focus, as in (132), where the scope of the negation is the "virtual" relative clause modifying a non-specific antecedent as predicate of a classifying sentence ("a wsd-amulet"):

(132) CT II 166b-c

nj jak js wsd jsjruk jak wsd jprj im nbj.

"I am not a wsd-amulet which passes by (wsd jsjs); I am the wsd-amulet which came (jprj participle) from mankind (nbj)."

However, a non-focalized embedded VP is negated in Old Egyptian by the "circumstantial" negative nj (section 6.5.2) followed by the aorist verbal form:

(133) Urk. I 16,15-17

z3-dzw nj-кz.w-c'w[... ] jprj=td wsd.t-mdw.w 'nj(w).hbr rd.wj=td(j)

"As for the royal son Nkaure' [...], he made a testament (wsd.t-mdw.w "a command of words") being alive (nj w).hbr on his feet, while not suffering (nj mw=t) in anything"

(134) Urk. I 43,5

(...) hbsn(j) gmn ny zp jprj(j) mjtt n bsk) nb ụję pwsw t iz

"(...) sealed ebony, no similar thing having ever been done (ny zp jprj(j) mjtt, section 7.8.2) for any servant since the beginning of the world (ụję pwsw t iz)"

We also observed that the O > E drift, i.e. the tendency for contradictory negations to acquire contrary functions, led in classical Egyptian to the obsolescence of nj and its replacement by "strong" constructions with nn + infinitive, when the subject of the embedded AP is coindexed with the subject of the main predication, or with nj...js followed by a finite verbal form, when the subject of the embedded AP is different:

7.8 Negation in verbal clauses

7.8.5 Negation of verbal predicates embedded as NP

Topicalized verbal forms. Let us return for a moment to the analysis of negations in the sentence with topicalized predicate. Since in this utterance the pragmatic focus shifts from the verbal predicate to an adverbalized or adverbial element, the scope of its negative counterpart with nj...js is the focalized element itself: rather than a contradictory negation of the predicative nexus, these sentences display a contrary negation of the focus.

This redistribution of the pragmatic focus is achieved by means of a conversion of the verbal predicate into a "topicalized" form: while it is only in the aorist that this conversion results in a morphologically different form from the parallel main verbal pattern (jrm=f vs. jrm=ft), the syntactic transformation equally applies to the sdmn=f and the prospective sdm=ft. When the scope of the negation does not invest the pragmatic focus of a sentence with topicalized predicate, but rather the presuppositional predicate itself – a frequent environment in the case when the focalized element is an interrogative adverbial, Egyptian has recourse to a construction with the verb tm to "complete" nj...js not to do" as a finite verbal form followed by the negative complement (section 4.6.4) of the negated verb:

(137) Peas. B1,211

sdm.n=ft nj sdm.m=k tm=k at sdm(w).hbr.m

"Hearer (sdm.w), you don't really (.) hear! So (.), why (br-m) don't you hear (ms=m sdm(w))?"

(138) West. 6,5

m=s bnj(w).hbr.m "Why (br-m) don't you (ms=.) row (bnj(w))?"

In these two examples, the negative verbal patterns correspond to the positive sentences *sdm-m br-m "why do you hear?" or *bnj-f br-m "why do you row?" The construction with tm is also used to negate a contingent tense (139) or in headings or titles, with the nominal subject placed after the negativ complement, as in the case of jnjf (140):

(139) Pyr. 696f-g

mj njjf(w).sj hdn=fs r N tm.brf.jnjf(w).sj hdn=r N

"Do not bring the smell of the hdn-plant to the King! Therefore, you do not bring the smell of the hdn-plant to the King"

(140) CT VI 384h

tn hw3.w sjm nj

"[This spell describes] how a man does not putrefy (tm hw3.w sj) in the Necropolis"
Nominal conversions. The use of a conjugated verbal form of *tm* followed by the negatival complement (and in later times by the infinitive)⁶⁴ represents the common syntactic device for generating the negative equivalent of any nominal or adjectival conversion of the verb, whether finite or non-finite. According to this construction, the negative is found in all the patterns we considered in sections 7.5–6. Let us consider first the "balanced sentence" with two topicallyized VPs (section 7.5.4) and its interface with the protasis of a conditional clause:

(141) CT V 326g–h

"You come to me, I'll speak to you; you don't come to me, I won't speak to you."⁶⁵

(142) CT V 323h–i

"You come to me, I'll speak to you; if you don't come (tm=k jw.w) to me, I won't speak (tm=k jw.w) to you."

A contrastive analysis of (141) and (142) provides interesting insights into the historical syntax of the balanced sentence. While in the former example both the positive and the negative statement are treated as balanced sentences, in the latter the use of different negatival patterns shows that these are clauses with a topicalized VP (*jwj=k tm=k jw.w*) extraposed to the left of a main sentence with prospective *sgr* (*dd=j – tm dd=j*).⁶⁶

In the more usual form of conditional clause in classical Egyptian, in which the protasis is introduced by the conjunction *jr* (section 6.3.1), a negative condition is expressed by the conjugated form of *tm*:

(143) Pähaka 7.53–55

"If it (i.e., the bull) does not recover (tm=f snb.w), it is heavy (wdw=f) under your fingers, and his eyes do not close (tm), you shall surround (snb. br=−k) his eyes with a potsherd (psq.t) heated with fire, in order to remove (at) the beri-disease"

or treated as an adversative clause under the control of a noun clause:

(144) Ebers 49,8

"This (is) another (remedy) for putting right (sms.t) the water (mwy.t) if it is not right"

Furthermore, the negative verb *tm* is commonly found in "thetic" statements for the negation of the verbal clause embedded as nominal predicate of a classifying *pw*-pattern:

(145) Psmith 4,2–3

"If his mouth (r=−f) is tied... this means (pw) that he cannot open (tm=f dw.w) his mouth to speak (mdw=f "that he may speak")"

or as the object of a verb of perception in the aorist (146) and of verbs of wish or command in the subjunctive (147):

(146) Psth. 998

"Listen, I am not taking away your speech (tm=w) in order that you may know.

"Look at what you said, gods, (namely) that the King is not (tm=N wnn.w) before you: look, the King is now established (N mwn.w) before you as a victorious bull (jmnn.w)"

(147) Harhotep 396–97

"Geb, Osiris' father, has commanded (tm=f) that I not eat (tm=f jnn.w) excrements and that I do not drink (tm=f jw.w) urine"

Like its positive counterpart (section 7.2), the negative subjunctive with *tm* is also used as a non-embedded subordinate clause (corresponding to English "lest") after the imperative:

(148) Peas. B1,245

"Do not be ruthless (sgr) as a result of (pm=f) your power, lest disaster (pw=f gw.w) befall you"

Finally, the negative nominal conversion by means of *tm* is also used after prepositions or conjunctions, in the *sdjm.t=f*-form, and in the negation of the infinitive:

(149) Siut I,229

"To silence (sgr) the loud-voiced one so that he may not speak"

(150) Pr. 465–66

"Solve the problem (pm=f) with him alone (w=f, stative), until you don't suffer (tm=k ma.w, transitional) any more because of his situation (pm=f t=f)"

(151) CT VI 303r

"Not to walk (tm=ma.w) while being upside down (sdjm.w, stative)"

### 7.8 Negation in verbal clauses

#### 7.8.6 Negation of adjectival conversions

Adjectival conversions of the verb are treated like nominal VPs: participles and relative forms are negated by the corresponding form of *tm* followed by the negatival complement:

(152) Urk. IV 780,10–13

"All the secret lands (tm=n.b) of the limits of Nubia... which were not trodden upon by any other kings except His Majesty"

(153) Urk. IV 1074,4–5

"He is Thoth (pm=f) in everything: there is nothing which he does not understand"

In (152), the participial form of *tm* is the one displayed by the negated verb in the positive pattern, i.e. in this case the perfective passive "*bnd=f*...
"those which were trodden upon" vs. *tmm.w bnd.w "those which were not trodden upon"; the form *tmm.w shows the gemination of the second consonant typical for the 2-rad. roots (section 4.6.4). In (153), the past relative form *tmm.t.n=f *rq.w "which he does not understand" is the negative equivalent of a relative clause *rq.t.n=f "which he understands" and modifies the feminine antecedent *md.l "a thing," i.e. the subject of a nominal sentence predicated by *mn (section 5.7), resumed by the object pronoun sj if it."

One will recall (section 6.3.3) that in Egyptian the use of adjectival relative clauses introduced by a converter of the series *nj is restricted to specific antecedents, non-specific nouns being modified by unconverted adverbial clauses. The same opposition is present in their negative counterparts: in (154), the specific noun sj "the man" is modified by a "true" negative relative clause introduced by *nj, whereas in (155) the non-specific participle wnn "an eater" is modified by a "virtual relative clause," i.e. by an unconverted negative verbal sentence embedded as adverbial phrase:

(154) pEbers 12.15 sj *nj *sbn.n=f "the man who cannot defecate"
(155) Stut 1.272 wnn sj *sbn.n=f "a beneficiary (wnn "an eater") who cannot withdraw from the principal (*nj *sbn.n=f "he cannot cut down")"

A different set of negative relative clauses, however, displays an interesting feature: the presence of a negative converter *jwtf (fem. jwtt, pl. *jwjt.w) "which not," paired by a rare negative construction *jwtt(t) "that not." These morphemes represent a semantic fusion of relative object (*nj) plus negative operator (*nj for verbal sentences, *mn for nominal and adverbial sentences):

(156) Pt. 234-37 kfrطب *jwtf*jwtt(ph(b,w) m *b.t.f *b.m.w f m *sbn w*n=f "The trustworthy man (phbjt "he whose heart is clear") who does not vent (phb) what is said in his belly (p.b.f - he will himself (b.m.f) become a leader (jw)"
(157) Urtk. 1.122.6-8 *jw tf*jwtt*n=f t b*n bba hwb kbs hwb bsm.n=sj*t=b m *jwtf*jwtt m.w=b.t.f "I gave bread (jw) to the hungry (bhb), clothes to the naked (hwb). I ferried across (b.s.m.w=f t) with (m) the boatless (*jwtf *m.w=b.t.f = *nj *b.m.w=b.t.f "he whose boat does not exist")"
(158) Urtk. IV 68.3 *jwtf *b.m.w=f b* w=m.n.w "One whom people do not blame," lit. one-who-is-not (*jwtf) his blame (w=m.n=f) by the people (*b w=m.n.w"

Historically, verbal and adverbial clauses controlled by *jwtf tend to be superseded by analytic equivalents with *nj negative form (159):67 this trend was probably inaugurated in cases in which the nominal antecedent modified by the negative relative clause is the object, rather than the subject of the main clause (160):

(164) Sh.5.72-73 *nj *f* jw=wk m *sbn 3hps nj *m.t.n=m.w=f.f "I shall cause that you see yourself in ashes (ss), having turned into someone who cannot be seen," instead of a typologically more archaic "... *m *jwtf m.t.n=m.w=f, or"
(165) Peas. B1.347 *mn ph.w *nj *ph.w=f. "Do not attack him who (*nj) cannot attack (nj *ph.w=f)."

It needs to be stressed that negative verbal clauses controlled by *jwtf (or by its more analytic version *nj *nj) are proportionally more frequent than positive verbal clauses introduced by *nj. The reason is obvious: while in the positive relative clauses the predicate, whether participle or relative form, immediately follows the antecedent it modifies, in the negative equivalents the presence of the negative morpheme breaks this contiguity between modified NP and VP. In terms of their semantic performance, constructions with *jwtf and negative forms of adjectival conversions are, therefore, quite similar to each other. However, they differ syntactically: while participles or relative forms negated by *tm are conversions of a relative clause, i.e. S = NEG[AdjP], constructions with *jwtf or *nj-negative form represent the conversion of a nominal, adverbial, or verbal negative clause, i.e. S = Adj[Neg S]. One may compare the functional equivalence vs. the syntactic variety in the two examples below, where the same quality is rendered by a negated participle (*tn bnr.w) in (161) and by the relative conversion of a negative sentence (*jwtf *gkb.l-f) in (162), or the sequence of attributes in (161) is alternatively conveyed by a negative conversion of an adjectival phrase (*tm bnr.w = NEG[bnr]) and by relative conversion of a negative sentence (*jwtf *gkb.l-f = Adj[*nj *gkb.l-f]):

(161) Urtk. IV 959.15 *tn bnr.w= bph *nj *f* t b*n bnr hwb *jwtf *gkb.l-f m *ggb hpr *nj *tp "One who is not fatigued in (performing) what has been entrusted to him (rty: m b*n=f "what has been put to his face"), one who does not sleep at night (gwb), a vigilant leader"
(162) Urtk. IV 410.5-6 *jwtf *gkb.w=f *m *b.m.w n nb *gkb.w "One who is not fatigued (in building) the monuments (m.w.w) of the Lord of the gods"

A proof of this variance in the hierarchy of conversions affecting negative equivalents of relative clauses is provided by the behavior of verbal predicates: while in the constructions with *tm and *nj *nj the morphosyntactic idiosyncrasies of the forms before conversion are always kept — for example the morphological features of a perfective passive participle bnd.w are transferred to *tmm.w in (152), those of a past relative form *rq.t.n=f to *tm.t.n=f in (153), and the bound negative aorist pattern *nj *ph.w=f follows Gunn’s rule (section 7.8.1) even when controlled by the relative adjective *nj in example (160) — relativization by means of *jwtf provokes a global reorganization of the syntactic
structure of the sentence: the verbal form controlled by jwtyj is always a converted nominal VP, i.e. the aorist jrs-t for the general present and the sdm.m-f for the past: in (161), jwtyj qdl-f represents the adjectival conversion of an underlying negative verbal sentence *nj qdy.n-f m gr/h"he does not sleep at night."

This usage, however, is probably itself the result of an evolution from a more synthetic stage, still documented in the Pyramid Texts, in which Gunn's rule also applies to jwtyj followed by a sdm.m-f with aorist function:

(163) Pryr. 2057-58

N pw w'm m (j)sdw jpw wan.w msj.w sm msj.w nw.t jwtyj w
bww.n snj w'w w N jwtyj jnk.m sn njk N jwtyj br.m sn jr m pt w'w jhr N jr m pt

"The King is one of these four beings (j)sdw jpw wan.w) whom Atum bore (msj.w sm) and whom Nut bore, who cannot putrefy (jwtyj w bww.m sn = ntj.w nj bww.m sn) - the King shall not speak! - who cannot decay (jwtyj w jnk.m sn = ntj.w nj jnk.m sn) - the King shall not cast down! - who cannot fall (jwtyj br.m sn = ntj.w nj br.m sn) to the earth from heaven - the King shall not fall to the earth from heaven!"

7.9 Verbal syntax in later Egyptian

7.9.1 General features

When compared to the classical language, the verbal system of later Egyptian is characterized both by a great richness of morphological forms and by a simplification of syntactic patterns (section 4.6.6). From a typological point of view, earlier Egyptian synthetic forms in which a predicative base consisting of verbal stems plus affixes is followed by the subject (V-S), are replaced by periphrastic equivalents with the verb jir to do" sdm.m-f = sdm.f + jr-f-sdm "he heard." These forms are reanalyzed as analytic patterns with a predicative base consisting of verbal prefix plus subject followed by the infinitive, i.e. the verbal lexeme: jrs-t sdm.m-f "he did the hearing" > sdm.m-f jr-f-sdm "he heard." This evolution, favored by the exspiratory stress which reduced the functional yield of unstressed vowels, eventually led to the adoption of sentences with subject, predicate, and adverbial clauses, periphrastics and periphrastic conjunctions on the other hand, with an increased presence of preverbal constructions with preposition-infinitive and static replacing simple verbal patterns, for example wnw.m+t br sdm.m-f, br.m-t sdm.m-f "then he heard."m8 The following sections presuppose a familiarity with the formal evolution of verbal patterns in later Egyptian as described in section 4.6.6.

7.9.2 Initial verbal clauses and parataxis

In the transition to the later Egyptian main clause patterns, the initial particle of the classical language has ceased to be a functionally relevant component of the sentence: positive and negative verbal forms are now autonomous patterns often labeled sentence conjugations,n9 which can also appear paratactically linked to the preceding segment of discourse. For example, the Late Egyptian form sdm.m-t > Demotic jrs-t-sdm > Coptic Perfect 1 st-sdm is the successor of the Middle Egyptian preterit pattern jw sdm.m-t:70

(164) LRL 57.7

sdm.m-n md.wt nh "I heard all matters"


jrwjr jrb.3 w.mn.w jr,j 71 jr.j sd.w jr,.3

"He hit him (jw)n.m-f "he did the beating of him") on his head with three spells (r) in the Cushite language (md.t-ja3 "the thing of Kush")"

(166) 1 Jn 2.11

(sdm.m-t) closed (sdm.m-t) his eyes (n-nwt-f-bb)

The indicative sdm.m-f in the earlier Egyptian negative past nj sdm.m-f (section 7.8.1) is now replaced by a periphrastic construction with theverb bww "to have done in the past":71 nj sdm.m-f > bww.m-sdm "he has/had done in the past" nj sdm.m-f > bww-nj sdm.m-f > sdm.m-f jr in the Coptic sentence conjugation sdm.m-f.

One will remember that the use of the negative morpheme bww > k, the helb of the Middle Egyptian particle nj, is now restricted to bound verbal phrases, i.e. to sentence conjugations:

(167) Deut 1.43

(sdm.m-f + hnh.n) hnh.n sdm.m-f nor

"I spoke (awt-s) to you (numm-n) but (aw) you did not listen (numm-n-sdm) to me"

A similar periphrastic evolution is characteristic for the perfective negative form nj sdm.m-t (section 7.8.1) "he has/had/will have not yet heard," which develops into the Late Egyptian bw sdm.m-t > bw jw jr.f-sdm and the Coptic sentence conjugation sdm.m-f:

(168) KRI III 160.14

bw jr.f st-bbr jr.sdm "Sathor has not yet reached (spr) me"

(169) 1 Jn 2.4

(st-bbr jr.sdm "My hour (st-bbr) has not yet come (nume..e)"

For the general present jw(-t) sdm.m-f, Late Egyptian originally uses the adverbial construction known as Present I (section 6.6.1), but later develops a new verbal aorist bbr sdm.m-t "he hears" from the contingent pattern sdm.m-t "then he hears."72 In Demotic and Coptic, sdm.m-f, i.e. the sentence conjugation derived from it, is used with "gnomic" meaning:73
(170) KRI II 88,1-5
"As to anyone who sets out (3m) to approach him (3m=f), its blast of fire (hhs=n b.h) comes (jn) to consume (wgh) his body."

(171) Myth 3,29-30
"He flies (br br=f) to heaven with (jm) the birds everyday (br brh); he is (br br=f) in the water with the fish daily (n-ma)."

(172) Lk 4,6
"I give you all this power (e0e=voia) and (mn) their glory (pe=uu-ouo)… and (aot) I give it (pe=uu-ouo-f, aorist) to whomever I want (pe=uu-ouo-f) the one whom I want him)."

The negative sentence conjugation corresponding to \( \text{γαςωτα} \) is Middle Egyptian \( nj \text{ gsmf} > bw \text{ gsmf} > bw \text{ jrf} \text{ gsmf} > j\text{ σεα-ς-cwta.} \)

(173) KRI II 65,1-4
"If I attack (ph=fj) thousands of them, their feet cannot (bw jrf w) remain stable (smn), and they run away (br w=fj)."

(174) Jn 4,9
"Jews do not mix (merr… tnh) with Samaritans."

In the future tense or prospective aspect, the situation is in some respects similar to the aorist. As we saw in chapter 6, the objective future is expressed in Middle Egyptian and early Demotic by the adverbial pattern \( jw=f \text{ r gsmf} \), and in later Demotic and Coptic by the "progressive" form of the Present I, i.e. by the Future I \( \text{γαςωτα} \) (section 6.6.1). The modal future, on the other hand, is conveyed in Late Egyptian by the prospective \( \text{gsmf} \), the heir of the classical prospective \( \text{gsmf}. \)

(175) Horus and Seth 5,3-4
"May you cross (dsyn=m) to the island in the middle!"

Although the bare \( \text{gsmf} \) is still found in Demotic in modal contexts, the more recent phases of later Egyptian show the emergence of two patterns conveying epistemic or deontic connotations. The first is the old objective future \( jw=f \text{ r gsmf} \text{ jrf ts-mt (r) gsmf} \), which — together with its negative equivalent \( bn jw=f \text{ r gsmf} > j\text{ σεα-ς-cwta} \) — is now the Future III, completely integrated into the paradigm of verbal sentence conjugations.

(176) Gen 3,16
"You shall bear (3m-iπaπ) your children (3m-nou-bhe) in (bn) sorrow (stahm)."

(177) Ex 23,7
"As you keep (e0e=voia) the commandments of the LORD your God and do not add anything to them or subtract anything from them."

You shall distance yourself (e-k-e-sab=α) from any word of falsity (jinsco); you shall not kill (nee-k-3mouoq) an innocent (n-ou-at-node) and a just, and you shall not justify (nee-k-καεροι) a culprit (ωαβη) because of (ebe) a gift (bapov).

The second modal pattern of Demotic and Coptic is etymologically a causative construction in which \( mj \), the imperative of the verb \( jrf \) "to give, to cause to," is followed by a prospective verbal form periphrastically built with the verb \( jrf \) "to do": \( mj jrf \text{ gsmf} > \text{σεα-ς-cwta} \), lit. "cause that-he-do hearing" — "let him hear." This form is labeled "optative" and is used in complementary distribution with the imperative.

(178) Dem. Mag. Pap. 2,26
"Let creation (gsm) fill the earth with light (jyn)."

(179) Mt 6,9
"May your name (pe-k-ran) be hallowed (mep… 0o0p)"

The imperative itself undergoes some changes: in Late Egyptian, one can observe the early tendency towards the grammaticalization of \( jmj > mj \), i.e. the imperative of \( rdj \), as verbal prefixes in lexicalized units; in Demotic and Coptic, the imperative is replaced by the infinitive in the majority of verbs, its existence as an autonomous morphological category being gradually limited to the 2-rad. (jfrd from \( g\) "to say") and the III-inf. roots (jfr from \( jfr \) "to do"), until in Coptic it only survives in a few remnants (\( mj > \text{σεα-ς-cwta} \) "give!").

In the negative, both imperative and optative display a periphrastic form of causative origin, with the imperative of \( jmj \) followed by the negative complement of the verb \( jrf \) (jfr w > \( \text{σεα-ς-cwta} \)) and by the simple infinitive in the case of the imperative (\( \text{gsmf} > \text{σεα-ς-cwta} \)) or by the causative infinitive in the case of the optative (\( jfr \text{ jrf} \text{ gsmf} > \text{σεα-ς-cwta} \)).

(180) Lk 23,28
"Greek: "Do not (mpe-κ-ran) cry," vs. \( \text{πια-ς-cwta} "cry"")

(181) Jon 1,14
"Greek: "Let us not (mpe-κ-ran) die," vs. \( \text{πια-ς-cwta} "let us die""

The causative infinitive is a productive form of the Coptic conjugation system, being used not only in the negative optative, but also as a counterpart of the simple infinitive in prospective clauses controlled by the preposition \( e \), when the subject is different from that of the main clause.

(182) Lk 7,6-7
"Greek: "For (επι) I am not worthy (mpe-i-mpta) lit. "I am in-worthiness") that you should enter (ε-ei) of-cum (και) causative inf.) under my roof (nou-παπ) my addition-of-ears; for this reason (ebe pai) I too (r) did not consider myself worthy (mp=π-e-ei-i-n-παπ "I did not make myself in worthiness") of coming (e-ei, simple inf.) to you (και-κ)."
and in sentence conjugations in order to convey causative meaning. This
infinitive form represents the grammaticalized equivalent of the infinitives
of the type di. t swa-> thio "to make sated" or di. t `hp-> sqw "to keep
alive," in which the final vowel a derives from the stressed *a of the Middle
Egyptian subjunctive stem (section 4.6.3.2). In the verse "he made the hungry
sated with good things," the causative preterite is rendered in Sahidic by the
Perfect I of the causative verb thio "to make sated," in Bohairic by the Perfect
I of the causative infinitive ep-o xe ci "to cause that they be sated":

(183) Lk 1.53
Sxcthentepiaxet xataeio
"He made sated-those-who-are-hungry (=f-thr=ou-er-kae) good things (=ou=ov)"

(183') Ibid.
Bmr estompj xapote eaxataeio
"Those who were (ou et) hungry, he caused that they be sated (=f-thr=ou-ou) good things"

We saw in section 4.6.6.3 that a common form of topicalization in the
latest phase of Egyptian consists in resuming the subject of a conjugation
pattern by means of the particle *xk. In this respect, the use of the
causative infinitive generates ambiguity, since the topicalized element can be
the subject of the sentence conjugation, as in (184), or the subject of the
causative infinitive, i.e. the object of the conjugation pattern, as in (185):

(184) Ps 83, 12
Bnepofoper xa.m iunataeio xae xere
"The Lord (ou=ov) will not let the good things be in want (=f-thr=ou-er xae "he
will-not-cause-they-do-end")"

(185) Ps 102, 12
Bnepofoper xa.m xae nepepaxax.
"He let our wrongdoings (=ou=ov) be far (=f-thr=ou-ou) from us (mm=nnm)"

This ambiguity is solved in the case of passive constructions. While Late
Egyptian maintains the synthetic passives of the classical language (past
sdr.ENCIL, aorist and prospective sdm,tm=fr),85 with the tm-infex as indefinite
pronoun, in Demotic and Copitic passive forms are superseded by analytic
constructions with the third person plural (section 4.6.6.3).84 When topicalized,
the logical subject, i.e. the grammatical agent, of a passive construction
is introduced by the preposition (fr-dtr n t) xetai "by means of, through"
rather than by *xk. Contrast example (185) above, where the third person
plural pronoun refers to a specific noun ("our wrongdoings") and is topicalized
by xae, with (186), where it conveys the grammatical subject of a passive
construction "they become stronger than you" = "you are overcome,"
whereas the agent ("evil") is topicalized by means of xetai:

(186) Rom 12, 21
Xupbrsapa epor xetai xetai pneutopo
"Do not be overcome by evil," lit. "do-not-cause-that-they-become-strong (mpr.
ere=ou=ou) upon-you (en=ou) through that-which-is evil (p-per=ou)"

### 7.9 Non-initial verbal clauses and hypotaxis

In sections 6.4 and 7.4, we analyzed the types of linkage between Egyptian
sentences according to a tripartite distribution: parataxis as the linkage
between main clauses, hypotaxis as the textual dependency of a main clause
on a discourse nucleus, and subordination as the syntactic dependency of a
converted (i.e. morphologically marked) or embedded (i.e. morphologically
unmarked) clause on a higher node. This tripartite model proves very useful
in trying to understand the syntactic evolution faced by non-initial patterns:
while in Middle Egyptian non-initial main clauses are paratactically linked
to the initial sentence, Late Egyptian develops two hypotactic "sequential"
forms,85 which follow an initial main clause or sentence conjugation. The
first one is the narrative form jw=f hr sdm "and he heard" (section 4.6.6.1)
with its negative counterpart jw=f hr tm sdm, which sets forth a sequence of
events in the past (187) and fulfills the function of a non-initial main clause
sdm,(n)=fr in Middle Egyptian (section 7.3). The second form is the non-
narrative conjunctive mtw=f sdm "and he hears/will hear" (section 4.6.6.2),
negative mtw=f tm sdm, which describes a mostly modal concatenation of
events subsequent to the one conveyed by the initial main clause (188), and is

### Table 7.1: From initial verbal clauses to sentence conjugation patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Middle Egyptian</th>
<th>Late Egyptian I</th>
<th>Late EG. II - Demotic I</th>
<th>Demotic II - Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERFECTIVE</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>jw=f sdm</td>
<td>rntw=f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRETERITE</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>jw=f sdm</td>
<td>rntw=f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AORIST</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>br=f sdm</td>
<td>br=f sdm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>t/w and sdm</td>
<td>t/w and sdm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODAL</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>t/w and sdm</td>
<td>t/w and sdm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>sdm.(n)=fr</td>
<td>jw=f sdm</td>
<td>jw=f sdm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
therefore the functional height of the Middle Egyptian subjunctive $sdm=f$, see section 7.2 and example (13) above:

(187) Two Brothers 4.6-9

$\text{jm-n=f hr jn-jy(t)}'d\text{ pbr jw=f hr hpr mj nj jg qn} ij n-\text{gš n šbw} \text{d n} \text{ psx=f} hwy m \text{ psx=f k sn br jf} qn(jy(f) jw psx=f hwy wr} \text{w} \text{ mn w rhs m psx=f sfr mj r'-nb jw=f hr spr r} \text{ psx=f pr jw=f gbr gj(jy(t)) sfr m t sgrj mj n-} \text{gš jw=f hr tm d}j_{1} m \text{ br} \text{ d}t=f m \text{ psx=f sfr}$. 

"Then she took (wn.$\text{jm-n=f hr jn-jy(t)}$) fat and grease and she became (jw=f hr bpr) as if she had been beaten (l.it. "like who had been beaten falsely"), wishing (n $\text{šbw}$) to say to her husband: 'It was your younger brother who beat me (jw=f qn(jy(f)))). Her husband returned (jw psx=f hwy wr) "and her husband returned") in the evening according to his daily habit; he reached his house (jw=f hr spr r psx=f pr) "and he reached his house") and found (jw=f hr gny h) his wife lying down (jgr sjy) as if she was ill (mj jn-ns) "being ill falsely"); she didn't pour water (jw=f hr tm d}j_{1} m \text{w} "and she didn't pour water") on his hands according to her habit..."

(188) RAD 54,8-12

$j\text{m-n=f hr jn-jy(t)} n3y=m h\text{wr} w\text{ miw=m tnm n3y=m xbs} h\text{wr} \text{ miw=m jn sgtw} jn sgrj. w\text{ miw=m jn} nj=j\text{m tj} sgrj \text{ tnm tnm m} n3y=m hr spr r$.

"Go up (j$\text{m-n=f hr jn-jy(t)}$), gather (mtw=m n3y=m) your tools, seal (mtw=m tnm) your doors, take (mtw=m jn) your wives and children, and I will go (mtw=m j3m) before you to the temple of A and cause you to settle (mtw=j d}j_{1} tnm=m) there tomorrow".

While these two forms are only used after an initial syntagm ("then she took" and "go up" in the two passages above), they are not syntactically subordinate to, but rather semantically dependent on it. For the past sequential, the hypotactic nature of the linkage to the initial pattern is shown by the fact that the latter need not be a main verbal clause, but can also be a simple adverbial phrase:

(189) Two Brothers 10.4

$\text{hr=j3 m-h}t \text{ hrw=m qn} w \text{ hr ss n} jw \text{ hbr} \text{ hr sm} t r \text{ bhs m psx=f sfr mj r'-nb}$. 

"Many days thereafter, Bata went hunting (jw hbr hr sm t r bhs "and Bata went to hunt") according to (m) his daily habit"

or even a subordinate clause, such as the temporal (i.e. adverbial) clause in (190) or the relative (i.e. adjectival) clause in (191): because of their topicalized position in discourse, these subordinate clauses perform the function of the semantic nucleus of the sequential form, which in this case is the only main clause:

(190) Doomed Prince 4.6-7

$\text{hr=j3 m-h}t \text{ pr } s-g \text{ ty jw=f hr tpy r ty} s f p b w t$. 

"When the youth had grown, he went up (jw=f hr tpy "and he went up") to his roof (p b w t "head of the house")"

(191) p$\text{Turin jud. 4.7}$

$\text{j}m-n=f hr t3-m d w t s d m=f jw=f (hr) bpes=t$. 

"He was brought in (j$\text{m-n=f hr t3-m d w t}$) because of the things (t3-m d w t) which he had heard (j$\text{m-n=f hr}$ and hidden (j$\text{m-n=f hr}$ bpes=t "and he hid them")"

It is this close connection between the past jw=f br sdm and the preceding clause which allows one to understand its later functional development: in Demotic and Coptic, the hypotactic sequential form is replaced by the asymmetric juxtaposition of preterital sentence conjunction patterns (Perfect 1);86 the language has lost the hypotactic pattern for the expression of the sequential past and replaced it with a paratactic form of linkage:

(192) NHC VI,4 44.26-29

$t\text{ot ejwek ljtq wb} \text{ ejwetq eb} \text{ ejwetq ejth wj} \text{ ejwetq ejth wj}$. 

"Then he became angry (as-f-btik), he revealed himself (a-f-awth ebol), and he desired (a-f-awth) to go up (e-tala, preposition + infinitive) and to pass (a-f-awth, conjunctive) beyond that place (\text{tneb})"

On the other hand, as shown by this last example, the non-narrative conjunctive not only survives down to Coptic, but even extends its array of use in the most recent phase of Egyptian.87 The hypotactic, rather than subordinate character of this form is shown by the observation of some of its semantic and syntactic properties. Semantically, the conjunctive refers to events whose occurrence is so intimately linked to the main nucleus that they represent in fact a necessary constituent of the entire message, rather than an independent action. The nucleus itself is not properly speaking an independent clause, since its meaning is as closely connected with the concatenated event expressed by the conjunctive as the latter is with it.88 The distribution of negations89 in the following two examples helps elucidate this point:

(193) NHC VI 15 5.791 $\text{mrnr \text{wpr sj} t\text{mpra hjhrr hjhrr ehrh ebo}}$.

"Do not see me (m$\text{pr-nau evr=et}$) on the dungheap, and then go (n$\text{-tem-k\text{a}=a}$) and leave me (n$\text{-tem-k\text{a}=a}$) cast aside (\text{w=et=et ebo}, section 7.9.5)"

(194) RAD 57.9-10 $\text{bn sdm=st b n} p w j \text{ tpy m n3 xsw \text{ jy w} w t s d w m} \text{ tnm} b p s=t$.

"I will not hear (bn sdm=st) anything or see (bn p w j "I will not see") any wrongdoing in the great deep places and then hide it (mtw=j b p s=t)"

Taken individually, the initial pattern in both examples appears to be an independent sentence conjunction, i.e. the negative imperative in example (193) ("do not see me on the dungheap") and the negative modal future in (194) ("I will not hear anything," "I will not see any wrongdoing"). Semantically, however, both initial sentences are opaque, since the actions they evoke do not yield by themselves any satisfactory sense: the action of "seeing" in (193) seems unlikely to fall under the jurisdiction of a negative imperative, and the denial of "hearing" and "seeing" in (194) is hardly what the speaker is promising per se. rather, the scope of the negation invests in both cases the predicate of the initial as well as the non-initial verbal form: "do not
do the following: [you see me on the dungheap and then you go away and leave me cast aside], "I will not do the following: [I hear something or see a wrongdoing in the great deep places and then hide it]."

Thus, it would be more appropriate to argue that, in presence of the conjunctive, the only independent clause is in fact the entire macrosentence encompassing both the conjunctive and the form by which it is controlled: both are main clauses hypothetically organized within a chain of *predicted* or *predictable* events. Even in the rare instances in which the conjunctive seems to display narrative function, it actually follows a relative present, i.e., aorist tense, the past temporal reference being in this case a feature of the context in which the forms are embedded rather than of the form itself. In example (195), the younger brother’s "loading himself" and "driving the cattle" are not presented as a narrative sequence, but as a concatenation of events that together constitute the concept of "being after the cattle," conveyed here by the circumstantial conversion (section 7.9.5) of an adverbial sentence:

(195) Two Brothers 4.3-5

"Now in the evening (hr nj a nmsg), the elder brother returned (wkh') to his house, while (jw) the younger brother tended his cattle (nmsg jw h), loaded (mtw=f jw) his cattle before him, in order to let them sleep (r djw=f jw in) in their stable in the village (ps-dmj)."

To its hypotactic linkage the conjunctive also owes the possibility of being embedded into a sentence with topological predicate (section 7.5) or into the protasis of a hypothetical clause introduced by *jr* (section 6.3.1), and thus share with the VP by which it is controlled a focalized adverbial adjunct or a main clause apodosis respectively. Once more, while the conjunctive does not function *per se* as topological VP, it adopts the syntactic environment of the nucleus to which it is joined:

(196) pLeiden I 361,4-5

"If your condition (*wk*) and your health (*nh*) that I am inquiring (jry=j nh) that you should write (mtw=k nh) to me."

(197) pBM 10052, 8.21-22

"If another comes (jw ky bj jw) and accuses you (mtw=f s'h-k), I shall act (jry=j)."

But it is perhaps in its rare independent uses that the conjunctive shows most clearly its *contextual* form of dependency. The conjunctive can be used absolutely, i.e., without being joined to any preceding form, in formulae of prayer and oath, even if the initial text of the prayer or the oath itself is omitted, i.e., it is taken to be contextually "given":

(198) LRL 51,15-52.2 [The author of the letter says that he prays daily the gods to grant the addressee life and old age, saying:] mtw=f pr nw 'dd-bj, w jr=3 jr w=f jw "I expect you to take care of the small children. Do not do them any harm"

### Table 7.2 Initial vs. non-initial main clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAUSE</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>EARLIER EGYPTIAN</th>
<th>LATE EGYPTIAN</th>
<th>DEMOTIC - COPTIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INITIAL MAIN</td>
<td>NARRATIVE</td>
<td>jw sjm=t</td>
<td>sjm=t</td>
<td>nj=f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAUSE</td>
<td>MODAL</td>
<td>sjm=t</td>
<td>sjm=t</td>
<td>nj=f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-INITIAL</td>
<td>NARRATIVE</td>
<td>sjm=t</td>
<td>jw=f br sjm</td>
<td>nj=f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN CLAUSE</td>
<td>MODAL</td>
<td>sjm=t</td>
<td>sjm=t</td>
<td>nj=f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.9.4 Dependent clauses and subordination

The evolution of subordinate clauses in later Egyptian shows similarities with the historical development of initial and non-initial main clauses discussed in sections 7.9.2-3. The main distinction to be drawn is between Middle Egyptian dependent clauses introduced by an explicit marker of subordination on the one hand and "embedded" clauses on the other. As a rule, subordinate clauses originating in a pattern "preposition (or conjunction) + periphrastic verbal form" become in Coptic bound patterns, which — because of their subordinate character — are called *clause conjunctions* and are negated by *rk* or *t*. From the Middle Egyptian protasis of a hypothetical clause introduced by *jr* (section 6.3.1), later Egyptian first derives a variety of patterns in which the particle *jw* or *jnn* controls a verbal predicate (199), a Present I (200), a Future III (201), or a subordinate circumstantial form (202), then reduces all these options to a clause conjunction pattern in which the circumstantial prefix is frequently followed in the positive form by the morpheme *wan* (203-204).
Likewise, the construction *r sdm.twf* (section 6.3.1) is gradually replaced in Late Egyptian by the periphrastic *j.jr.twf sdm*, where the preposition is written as a prothetic *yod*, and in the more recent phases of later Egyptian by a similar construction in which the grammaticalization of *j.jr.twf sdm* causes the original *r* to be reinforced by the preposition *k* “until,” leading to the Coptic clause conjunction *wwant qeyta* “until he hears”.98

(205) Wen. 2,36

*jin jn.twf k3'-j.jr twf j w r nj*

“Let him be brought (jin jn.twf “cause that he be brought”) until I have gone (tj < sm.t) to the South”

(206) NHC VI 40,16–20

*ntw nntwmw sm.qw sm.tw sm=kjw*n+*n+ntw jntj tw m ctw* 3

“And it will become (t.na.tpe) incorporeal (smqtnov) and bodiless (at-ctqna) and burn (n=f.tokh, conjunctive) the matter (ctk), until it purifies (lq-ctf-re tw pqtwyn) the universe (p-sttwf “the its-entirety”) and all the evil (cktia = qiktia)”

The other clause conjunction with a somewhat symmetrical temporal meaning, *ntevicei* “when he heard,” derives from the prospective *sdm.twf* following the conjunction *dr* > Late Egyptian *m-dr* “when, since.” This subordinate clause can precede the main sentence, in which case it appears introduced in Late Egyptian by the topicalizing particle *jr* and followed by a hypotactic sequential past as main clause, or follow it:

(207) Two Brothers 5.1

*jr m-dr jw.twf (slly y+3 m=k ptt jw.twf (jlz gmj.j+jy) bms.kw <cm> w.t “When he came (jw.twf) to fetch (jy) for you seed, he found me (jw.twf br gmj,lw) sitting (bms.kw) alone”*

(208) Khaemwaset 5.35

*stan jw r mn-nfr bld=tj f nwhy jw.n drr gmj+jy st j “Sene came (jw, stative) to Memphis and embraced (bld=tj) his children when he found (gmj+jy) them alive (wn, stative)”*

(209) Mt 14,23

*ntsewma de ebo, tlaemj w nqane cewl efa epl bnt “But (bn) when he released (k6 ebo) the crowd (ntsele), he went up (a-fale ephd) to the mountain (emj p-ttwf “to the head of the mountain”)*

Finally, mention should be made of the clause conjunction *taseewma* “so that he will hear,” which is the subordinate equivalent of the sentence conjunction *taseewma* “let him hear” and of the hypotactic conjunctive *ntsewa* “and he shall hear.” This pattern, often called *promissive future* or *conjunctive future*,99 is mostly used in Sahidic and consists of an invariable grammaticalized form of the first person subjunctive *dj-j* “so that I shall cause” > *t-a*; followed, as in the case of the sentence conjunction, by a periphrastic prospective *jn-tw sdm*;100 it conveys the speaker’s commitment that the event expressed in the clause conjunction will result from a fulfillment of the main predicate from which it is syntactically controlled:

(210) Mt 7.7

*ntse wnt wnt wnt wnt “Ask (qinwv), and it will be given to you (tar=ou-ti ne=mt and they will give to you”). Seek, and you will find (tara=tm-cine). Knock, and it will be opened to you (tara=ou-ouw “and they will open”) to you”*

The difference between conjunctive and promissive101 is twofold: at the syntactic level, the former is a *hypotactic* non-initial main clause, whereas the latter is a *subordinate* pattern; at the semantic level, the control exerted by the preceding verbal form is *objective* in the case of the subjunctive, which serves to join two actions intimately linked to each other, and *subjective* in the case of the promissive, where it is the speaker who assures the semantic dependency of the second event on the first. But there are indications that the opposition between the two forms was perceived to be weak and tended to be neutralized. On the one hand, the promissive, which predictably lacked an etymological first person *dj-j jr-tw sdm* “so that I cause that I hear,” borrowed into its paradigm the first person conjunctive *ntseewma*, causing the pattern to grammaticalize the promissive meaning regardless of the etymological origin of the introductory morpheme: “and I will cause that he hear” > “(and I will cause) may he hear” > “that he may hear” (section 4.6.6.2). On the other hand, promissive and conjunctive tend to gradually merge into one functional paradigm: examples of this tendency are the promissive function of the conjunctive nominal conjugation base *bty* in post-classical Sahidic and the sporadic use of the Bohairic conjunctive for the Sahidic promissive (211–211):

(211) Lk 6.37

*5aw ebo, tareas twf nhtw ebo,*

(211) Ibid. *8aw ebo, otoj nhtw ebo*

“Forgive, and (btoou) you will be forgiven (tar=ou-k6 ne=mt ebo, promissive vs. btoou-k6 n=mt ebo, subjunctive)”

The most substantial evolution from earlier to later Egyptian is surely the one that concerns *embedding*, i.e. clausal subordination not signalled by an explicit marker of syntactic dependency. In the preceding chapters and sections, we devoted some attention to the syntactic behavior of nominal, adverbial, and verbal main clauses converted in specific syntactic environments into subordinate clauses controlled by a higher sentence node. In classical Egyptian, this conversion usually follows a synthetic or fusional type: for example, nominal conversion into a topocalized VP is carried by specific verbal forms in the aorist or by the unconverted form in the past and the prospective (section 7.5), adjectival conversion into a relative VP is signalled
by the adjectival endings of the verbal form (section 7.7), while adverbial conversion into a circumstantial VP is realized by the unconverted form of the basic VP controlled by the main predicate (section 7.4).

In later Egyptian, earlier synthetic constructions are replaced by analytic patterns in which the nature of the syntactic dependency is specified by an initial morpheme usually called converter. While converters are already found in earlier Egyptian, where they are mostly applied to nominal and adverbial sentences – for example the converters from the verb wnn “to be,” which allow a nominal or adverbial sentence to acquire the temporal, modal, or pragmatic features of a verbal sentence (sections 5.6, 6.2), or the relative converter njj used for the relativization of adverbial clauses with specific antecedent (section 6.3.3) – their number and uses increase dramatically in later Egyptian. As a general rule, the embedded constructions of the classical language, whether verbal (A), substantival (B), adjectival (C), or adverbial (D), have been replaced in later Egyptian by explicit patterns of subordination marked by syntactic converters.

(A) Past converter. In the treatment of nominal and adverbial sentences (sections 5.6, 6.6.1), we observed the historical tendency of Egyptian to delegate the expression of the existence of indefinite subjects to verbal sentences in which the predicate is a form of the verb wnn “to be,” grammaticalized in Late Egyptian as converter wnn, as well as the ties between this morpheme and the past converter wnn > re = repe-, which turns any adverbial or pseudo-verbal sentence into its preterital counterpart, called in Coptic “Imperfect.” As a converter of verbal sentences, the morpheme wnn is relatively rare in Late Egyptian, but becomes quite frequent in Demotic and Coptic (ne), where it converts any verbal form into a background preterite.


“Then the messenger (ps-wpw.t) went to report (smj) to her father (psy=s nj) all the things (nde wr nd.l) she had said (jdd=s)”

whereas the relative aorist (apart from archaisms) and the prospective relative form have already been replaced by analytic constructions with njj followed by a pseudoverbal pattern sw br sdm-f (Coptic ἡβατομάτη ἡλιός, etere πυράκτη κόλασις ἡλιός in section 7.9.2) respectively:

(218) pBologna 1094, 6.4 

And you shall make a report (mwe=k smj) to the vizier (bs.t) concerning the quantity of silver (ps-hd) the many silver) which the servant lay says: ‘Give it! (mju tw-f, see 4.6.6.5)”

(B) Topicalized verbal forms. Late Egyptian, apart from archaic uses of the classical forms, possesses two topicalized verbal patterns: the general j.jj-f sdm “that he does/did the hearing” or “that he hears/heard,” etymologically the topicalized form of the periphrastic j.jj-f sdm “he hears,” which had replaced the topicalized aorist sdm=f and sdm.n-f, and the prospective-modal j.sdm-f “that he will hear” as the heir of the emphatic prospective sdm=f of Middle Egyptian. Coptic, where topicalized VPs are usually referred to as “second tenses,” has returned to a tripartite division, with a Perfect II ἡβατομάτη (213), etymologically derived from the relative conversion njj-jj-f sdm, a Present II κακοποιοί,ἀφικνοι (214) from j.jj-f sdm, and a Future II ἡβατομάτη (215) from *j.jj-f-n-f-sdm, i.e. from the analogical use of the converter j.jj applied to an original pseudoverbal pattern (section 6.6.1). The syntax of these converted sentences follows the classical Egyptian model:

(213) Ps 117.23 ἀναπτείχθη ἥλιος ἐκόλ.

“It is through (ebol him-) the Lord (p-poie) that this happened (na-pai ὁδε)”

(214) Jas 1.13 ἀναπτείχθη εὐγενεῖς ἥλιος ἐκόλ.

“It is by God (ebol him p-noute “through the god”) that I am being tempted (e-o-περιπλησίαν ἀνθω “that-they-tempt me”)

(215) Judg 6.15 ἀπεκτείνα μεγαλάγης ἤλιον.

“How shall I save Israel?” lit. “Israel – that-I-shall-save-him (e-i-na-nahm=ef) (is) through-what (bn-ou)”

Second tenses are negated in later Egyptian by the functional heir of classical j.jj... js (section 6.7), i.e. Late Egyptian bn... jw= > Coptic (h)... an:


“This matter (pei-h6b) didn’t happen (na-pai ὁδε an) secretly (km p-h6b “in the secret!”)

(C) Relativization. Synthetic adjectival conversions, i.e. relative forms, experience in Late Egyptian a progressive functional decay: only the perfective relative forms sdm.n-f as a Middle Egyptian archaisms and j.sdm-f as the more recent pattern are regularly used:

(217) Doomed Prince 6.13-14 ἀναπτείχθη εὐγενεῖς ἥλιος ἐκόλ.

“The governor (hre=jm) used to (ne=se...) release (ko ebol) one (oua)”

(218) pBologna 1094, 6.4 

“And you shall make a report (mwe=k smj) to the vizier (bs.t) concerning the quantity of silver (ps-hd) the many silver) which the servant lay says: ‘Give it! (mju tw-f, see 4.6.6.5)”

In 6.42 ἀναπτείχθη εὐγενεῖς ἥλιος ἐκόλ.

“Isn’t this (m-pai an pe) Jesus, the son of Joseph, the one (pai) whose father and mother we ourselves (anou) know (e-ou-noun m-pes=ef-wt mn lef-masau “that we know his father and his mother”)?”

(Coptic)”
(220) RAD 56,15–16 jw=f (t) dj.t 'thesis is that you will go to it' in any tribunal (qnb.t) to which you go ("that you will go to it")

(221) Rom 4,6 kata de os έκφαρασθέναι jw λείακαρικοίκος Νάδωρε ηι ητέρη πινιτής πάνω ενος θεών Φωτονίκηταις διήνυσθεν "In the manner (kendi-t-he) in which (e-) David too (on) proclaims blessed (hare... jö m-p-ωρακατολοκούσκα ευ... 'says the proclamation of blessedness to') the man (ψ-ròmò) to whom God (ψ-ναυτέ) will count (σπ justice (δρασμον) without the works (ψ-με-κακείν)"

In Demotic and Coptic, the perfective relative form too gives way to the analytic pattern (πας-) nj jw=f sdmt=f > (πιν-τα-κα) "whom he heard." One will recall that an identical analytic evolution also affects the participial relative clauses, i.e. those clauses whose subject is identical to the antecedent they modify (section 5,9):109 only the perfective participle keeps in Late Egyptian a synthetic structure j.wsdm, but it too is replaced during Dyn. XXV (eighth-seventh century BCE) by the periphrastic j.jr sdm and eventually by the verbal clause introduced by the relative converter (πας-) nj jw=f sdmt=f > (πιν-τα-κα) "who heard." The imperfective participle acquired very soon in Late Egyptian the periphrastic form j.jr sdm, which in Dyn. XXV is replaced by a relative pseudoverbal clause with (πας-) nj j.jr sdm > (πας-) nj hr sdm > (πιν-τα-κα) "who hears"; the prospective participle sdmt=j.f is rare in Late Egyptian and is progressively replaced by the converted relative Future III nj.jw=f r sdm, and in later Demotic and Coptic by the Future I (πας-) nj m nj'r r sdm > (πιν-τα-κα) "who will hear."

(D) Adverbial conversion. We saw in the preceding chapter that the morpheme jw, from being a marker of discourse initiation in earlier Egyptian, became in later Egyptian a signal of syntactic dependency, following a grammaticalization path which finds its origin in the use of jw as mere morphological carrier of the pronominal subject of an embedded adverbial clause in classical Egyptian (section 6.6.3). We also observed that the direct functional successor of the Middle Egyptian jw survives in the more recent stages of the language only in bound, i.e. unsegmentable constructions, such as the Future III (section 7.9.2) or the sequential past form (section 7.9.3). But as a free morpheme, capable of being prefixed to any sentence type, jw functions in later Egyptian as indicator of adverbial subordination.

We already discussed in section 6.6.3 the impact of this functional change on the syntax not only of adverbial clauses, but also of nominal and verbal clauses. Here, I shall only stress that the later Egyptian converter jw can control the entire functional spectrum of subordinate verbal clauses, from those functioning as backgrounding adverbial adjunct (section 7.4):

(222) LRL 45,10–11 twm nj jw=f pwy=n nb njnd jwn n r pr nj tw=t mjw dj=f njnj=n w.sjt' "We have arrived (Present I); it is our lord who caused (πας-) perfective participle) that we come (jw-n, prospective sdmt=f) to the (place) where you are (πας- nj tw=t mjw "the one that you are there"), having let (jw dj="while he caused") us bring a letter to the emphasized AP of a sentence whose main VP is topicalized (section 7.5.2):

(223) LRL 56,12–13 jw=jk sp sp dj.t jwn nj jw=f rbgrk=jm jw="Only after you are finished (jw rbgrk) with it will you succeed in (πας- jw sp) causing me to come back (dj.t jw=f) from the Southland (πας- pr nj)"

(224) Job 1,21 ἤταιες ε vids ἐν ἑνίκῃ ἀμήτη εἶναι ἐνδαπήκατον ἐν εἴκοσι ἀμήτη "Naked (ε-η-κέκ-αθμεν "while I am stripped naked," stative) I came out of (ntw=ει εβολ η) my mother's womb (βεσ=ης τοιασία "her-womb-of-my-mother"), and naked shall I go (ει-να-μοκ) back (there) (on)"

to its function as "virtual" relative clause modifying a non-specific noun:

(225) Two Brothers 8,2 jst jr sby=s w'n bhn jst jr=s k sby=s w'n ntr m-3s jw w'n nkt jw yre=j sw n-k. "Now, if you remember a bad thing (w'n bhn "one of evil"), can't you remember a good thing (w'n ntr "one of good") or anything at all (w'n nkt "one of thing") that I have done (jw yre) sw for you?"

(226) Lk 10,39 ἐφωτίτησε ὲσωμα δὲ ἐκ ἐκάσαλιτοι ἐροί ὧδε ἐκάσα "And she had (ε-νουτ-ες ακοτι, preterital possessive construction, see sections 5.10 and 7.9.5A) a sister (ου-σωμε) who was called (ε-σα-ανουτ-ες εροί "while they call her") Mary"

In Sahidic Coptic, one also finds the "virtual" relative clause introduced by ε- instead of the expected ntj > ετ(ε) documented by πας-ntj > πετ(ε) after specific nouns or demonstrative pronouns used appositionally:111

(227) Ps 32,12 ἕνοκος ἑμοίος ἐκ ἐμπότης ἐπε παράστασις παράστασις εἰς τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ "The people (ε-παράστασις whose) God is the Lord (ε-παράστασις pe παράστασις "its god being the Lord," section 5.9)"

(228) Lk 19,30 τῆισα εἰς τόπον ἔρχονται ἐκείνοι ἐνεργάται Πάντας ἐκείνοις καὶ ἐν πάσαις "You will find (ε-τος ακοτι) a tied colt (ον-τες εκ-μετρεῖται, one on which no man ever (ετακτεί) set (ε-τακτείς ito-μετρεῖται) "while any man didn't sit on it")"

The use of the adverbial conversion by means of jw ε- is also found in a variety of other patterns, for example της ε- in (221),112 and especially under the control of verbs of perception such as gmj "to find" or nw "to see," which in classical Egyptian were followed by a pseudoverbal or adverbial construction (section 6.3.2).
and as predicative complement of the verb *saw* "to be, become":

(230) 1 Tim 3,12  ** реализон сарготмомен катонос ап ойциас натсу "The deacons should marry (mar-o-u-thpe e-u-siu e-at-he "may-they-be having-married") only one woman (ou-shame n-oudo)"

Further reading
Collier, M. "The circumstantial *sdmt.f*/*sdtn.f* as verbal verb-forms in Middle Egyptian," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 76 (1990), 73–85.
Colliner, M. "The relative clause and the verb in Middle Egyptian," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 77 (1991), 23–42.

**Epilogue**

Throughout this book, we have observed the extraordinary vitality of a dead language. Although one of the latest languages to have been deciphered and analyzed from a linguistic perspective, Ancient Egyptian proves to be an ideal field for linguistic investigation. Its most appealing feature, the hieroglyphic script in which the language was mainly expressed, is a complex but flexible pictographic system suited to convey the phonological, morphological, and lexical oppositions of the language as perceived by its users. By the same token, the history of the system and of its manual varieties (Hieratic and Demotic) offers the opportunity to observe the various functional pressures to which it was exposed: while preserving a certain degree of immutability during three millennia, the hieroglyphic script expanded or restricted its phonological and semantic potential depending both on the social composition of the scribal elite and on the cultural nature of the texts. Finally, the interface between changes in the religious Weltanschauung from the emergence of Hellenism to the rise of Christianity on the one hand and the "alphabetic revolution" which caused Egyptian to be rendered in a Greek-derived script (Coptic) provides a comprehensive basis for the study of the relationship between language, writing system, and cultural ideology: firstly, in Egypt and elsewhere, it is the script, rather than the language, that becomes a symbol of "heathendom," of the old religious order which a new revealed religion aims to overcome; secondly, the alphabetic system is not an inevitable outcome of a writing system which privileges the phonological level: although it possessed from the beginning a set of monoconsonantal signs, the hieroglyphic system never departed from its complex fusion of semagrams and phonograms, but on the contrary expanded in its final stages the number and the functional role of its iconic elements.

Egyptian phonology also proves to be a revealing area of linguistic research. In spite of certain limits, such as the lack of indication of vowels, some irregularities in the correspondences with other Afroasiatic languages, the ambiguities in the graphic rendition, which prevent a thorough assessment of the underlying phonetic reality, one can nonetheless observe at work a broad spectrum of phonological oppositions and evolutions from the Afroasiatic prehistory of the language down to Coptic: the vocalic sound shifts, the fate of the emphatic series, the tendency to move the point of articulation of velar and palatal
consonants to the apical region, and the devoicing of voiced phonemes provoke, as we saw, wide-ranging effects of structural as well as comparative relevance.

On the morphological side, Ancient Egyptian exhibits a high number of features common to other Afroasiatic, and particularly Semitic languages, especially in the domain of nominal morphology: feminine and plural patterns, pronouns, some numerals. But it also shows a substantial degree of autonomy in the area of verbal forms, which are not easily interpretable within a traditional genealogical model. How should the language historian deal with this variety of forms and patterns? Is Egyptian more archaic or more innovative than the related languages? How related to each other are Afroasiatic languages after all? It is not surprising, therefore, that Egyptological linguists have rediscovered morphology, which had been somewhat neglected in the second part of this century in the wake of the "Polotskian revolution" that prompted an increased attention to the structurally more promising domain of syntax.

To the modern linguist, syntax and its extensions, such as typology or pragmatics, still represent in fact the most challenging aspect of Ancient Egyptian. On the one hand, the language displays a rigid sentence structure with a rather limited number of basic nominal, adverbial, and verbal patterns; on the other hand, it also licenses, as we saw, an extremely wide array of syntactic conversion (or "transformation," depending on the linguistic obedience) or embedding (or "subordination") and a frequent recourse to pragmatic movements of topicalization (or thematicization) or focalization (or thematicization). Even in the absence of a complete reconstruction of the morphological patterns involved, this interplay between syntactic rigidity and pragmatic flexibility provides an ideal documentary basis for the student of Egyptian philology and of general linguistics alike: the former will benefit from a more thorough understanding of the discourse structures of the language by applying it to the textual diversity of more than 4000 years of written history—from literary to religious texts, from private to administrative corpora, from the registers of the pyramid towns in the third millennium BCE to the liturgy of the mediaeval Christian church; the latter will observe the synchronic reality vs. the diachronic evolution of syntactic survivals and innovations drawn from the "spoken language"—an unknown entity, yet in constant dialectics with the codified forms of written Egyptian—elementary verbless patterns vs. multi-tier embeddings of verbal predicates, the idiolect of a specific author vs. the impact of the linguistic policies enforced by the Egyptian state in a linguistic domain whose historical and typological variety can be compared to Latin and the Romance languages or to Classical Arabic and its present-day dialects.

If after reading this book, therefore, linguists will decide to have frequent recourse to Ancient Egyptian, and Egyptologists will discover that the study of the linguistic structures of their language of expertise provides useful insights into the overall understanding of Egypt as a cultural entity, the book will have fulfilled part of its original goal.
1 The language of Ancient Egypt


Notes to pages 7–9

15. The term "Coptic" probably derives from the Arabic rendition of the Greek adjective ἀιγυπτικός "Egyptian," although a similar form of the word (Hebr. גלט) is known from two Talmudic passages (Shabbat 115a, Megilla 18a) from no later than the third century CE: M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Babli, Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: Judaica Press, 1971), 241.


19. See his *Ägyptische Grammatik* (Berlin, 1894; fourth edn 1928) and *Neuägyptische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1880; second edn 1933).


27. The copula ("it") is not expressed in Egyptian.


29. M. Coller, "The circumstantial sdm(n)/sdm.n(n) as verbal verb-forms in Middle Egyptian," *JEJ* 76 (1990), 73–85; a modern handbook which expanded version in English is going to replace Gardner's *Egyptian Grammar* as a standard reference work is J. F. Borghouyt, *Egyptisch. Een inleiding in taal en schrift van het Middenaarab* (Leuven: Peters, 1993).

30. For the former see for example F. Junge, "Emphasis" and "Sentential Meaning in Middle Egyptian," Göttinger Orientforschungen IV/20 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989), reviewed in a verbalistic sense by M. Coller, "Predication and the circumstantial sdm(n)/sdm.n(n)," *LingAeg* 2 (1992), 17–65.
2 Egyptian graphemes


2. Because of the formal similarities with Egyptian hieroglyphs, the term "hieroglyphs" has also been applied to the writing system of Luwian, an Anatolian language related to cuneiform Hititite spoken and written during the Late Bronze and Iron Ages (between ca. 1500–700 BCE) in southern and southwestern Anatolia and northern Syria: hence the misleading definition "Hititite hieroglyphs" with which they are often referred to: see the discussion in I. J. Gelb, A Study of Writing (Chicago University Press, revised edn 1963), 81–84.


5. For the most complete treatment of the principles underlying the Egyptian writing system, their history, and their recovery see W. Schenkel, "Schrift," in LA V, 713–35.

6. We shall see in section 3.3 that the phoneme conventionally transcribed "glottal stop" by Egyptologists (a) was originally a uvular trill /q/, which already in earlier Egyptian evolved into a glottal pronunciation and was assimilated to etymological /q/. A parallel evolution to /q/ affected the original initial /j/.


8. I borrow this term from S. Sauneron, L‘écriture figurative dans les textes d‘Esna. Esna VIII (Cairo: IFAO, 1982), 47–80 ("La philosophie d‘une écriture").


11. For a list of examples and table see ibid., 492–501.


13. Adapted from Gardiner, EG, 25.

14. Table 2.2 is drawn from ibid., pl. 2.


17. A major contribution to this problem can be expected from the excavations in the dynastic and early dynastic cemeteries at Abidos: G. Dreyer et al., "Umm el-Qaab. Nachuntersuchungen im frühzeitlichen Königsfriedhof. 5/6. Vorbericht," MDAIK 49 (1993), 51–56 and table ?
For a presentation of the decipherment in its cultural milieu see Iversen, The Myth of Egypt, 124–45.

"Letter à M. le Professeur H. Rosellini... sur l'alphabet hiéroglyphique," Annali dell'Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica 9, Rome 1837, 5–100.

3 Egyptian phonology

1. For the reconstruction of the phonological evolution from Afroasiatic to Egyptian see Schenkel, Ägyptische Sprachwissenschaft, 48–57; F. Kammerzell, review of Les langues dans le monde ancien et moderne, Linguæg 2 (1992), 157–75; J. Zeidler, review of Petrécek, Vergleichende Studien, Linguæg 2 (1992), 189–222.


7. What is often referred to as "rules of decorum": see Chr. Eyre and J. Baines, "Interactions between Orality and Literacy in Ancient Egypt," in K. Schousboe and M. T. Larsen (eds.), Literacy and Society (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1989), 91–119.

8. "Afroasiatic" is here used as a conventional term to indicate the set of linguistic features which Egyptian shares with a certain number of other language families (Semitic, Berber, Cushitic, Chadic), without implying the belief in the existence of an actual proto-language ancestral to these families. The different theoretical models are discussed in A. Loprieno, Das Verbalystem im Ägyptischen und im Semitischen. Zur Grundlegung einer Aspekttheorie. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV/17 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1986), 1–12, 187–90.


10. See the comparable evolution from Proto-Semitic *t̚-rām. *q̚<t̚> *q̚<n̚> <c̚a̚>s̚ "earth": C. Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, vol. 1 (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1908), 134.

11. A possible remnant of the early pronunciation of this phoneme is perhaps its outcome as Coptic /t̚/ in specific phonetic surroundings: /kt̚a/ "sickle" < *kt̚a-t̚ < *kt̚a-t̚a-t̚ (?), with [k̚] > [k̚]. See the references in W. Westendorf, Koptisches Handwörterbuch (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1965), 67. An etymological glottal stop /h/, however, was probably present in the original phonological inventory of Egyptian, as shown by words such as mīt < *mt̚w-t̚ "city" (> Hebr. n̚t̚ > Akk. transcription n̚t̚-e-t̚ /n̚t̚-i-t̚ "Thebes") or m̚f̚w-t̚ "m̚f̚r̚t̚"/ "mother" (< Coptic a̚a̚m̚m̚al̚w̚).
in which the feature [+voiced] was presumably kept because of the difficulty of maintaining in a linguistic system a glottalized [p], due to the distance between glottis and lips: see the discussion by Schmalstieg ibid., 363-64. For a discussion of the relationship between voice and types of phonation in general see J. Durand, Generative and Non-linear Phonology. Longman Linguistics Library (London--New York: Longman, 1990), 55.


22. An excellent analysis of the relation between three different types of stops (voiceless-aspirated, voiceless-aspirated, and voiceless-unaspirated) is provided by Worrell, Copit Sounds, 17 ff.; while Egyptian "voiceless" plosives are aspirated, their "voiced" counterparts, which were probably articulated as ejectives, correspond rather to Worrell's "half-voiced" (i.e. voiceless-unaspirated) stops.

23. Kammerzell, in Gedankenchrift Peter Behrens, 190 ff.


25. Ibid., 454.

26. W. Schenkel, "Das Wort für 'König (von Oberägypten)'," GM 94 (1986), 57-73 suggests the interpretation of [z] as affricate [ts], among other reasons because it stands for /t/ in the word "new "king," whose more traditional writing is new. Whether an affricate (as suggested by Schenkel and by the equation with Afroas. *z*) or an ejective (as suggested here on the basis of the historical evolution to a voiceless counterpart which it shares with voiced plosives), it is not surprising that this phoneme should be used to indicate a sibilant immediately following a nasal, a phonetic surrounding which often tends to generate affection: /nts/ < <nts> or <nz> = [nhs] (Schenkel) or else <ez> = [znss] > [nts] = /nts/ (as suggested here): for "consonantal epenthesis" (as in the case of [znss] > [ntts]) see Hock, Principles of Historical Linguistics, 117 ff.


31. In the following examples, the reconstruction of the phonological structure of a specific word in early Egyptian is accompanied by the later evidence (Akkadian transcriptions from the New Kingdom, Meroitic borrowings, or the Coptic form of the word) on which this reconstruction is based.

32. Ossing, Nominalbildung, 558 ff.

33. Ibid., 532-33. For Meroitic see sections 1.1. and 2.1.

34. Fecht, Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur, §§ 325-347.


37. Ibid., 463.

38. This process of lenition may appear surprising if one sticks to the phonetic classification of /t/ as a "glottal stop," but becomes quite understandable within a generative phonological frame, in which /t/ is classified as "laryngeal glide," sharing the same features [+CONS, +SON] as the bilabial glide /w/ or the palatal glide /j/: Durand, Generative and Non-linear Phonology, 42, 102.


40. Hoch, Semitic Words in Egyptian Text, 492-93.

41. Ibid., 495-500.

42. Fecht, Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur, § 172.

43. Ibid., § 172: Ossing, Nominalbildung, 148.

44. Schenkel, Altagyptische Sprachwissenschaft, 87-88; Ossing, Nominalbildung, 377.

45. Ibid., 20, 605-6, 149.

46. Ibid., 20-21. This is probably a case of phonetically motivated suspension of the contrast between /t/ and /ts/: see Durand, Generative and Non-linear Phonology, 57.

47. Ibid., 730, 476.

48. Ibid., 477.

49. Ibid., 463.

50. For recent accounts and literature on Coptic dialectology see the corresponding entries in Aziz S. Atiya (ed.), The Coptic Encyclopedia, vol. VIII (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1991) on Akhmimic (pp. 19-27, by P. Nagel), Bohairic (pp. 53-60, by A. Shisha-Halyev), Fayumic (pp. 124-31, by R. Kaiser), Lycopolitan (pp. 151-59, by P. Nagel) and Sahidic (pp. 194-202, by A. Shisha-Halyev).


52. Voiceless stops were articulated with aspiration in specific phonetic environments. This feature was probably common to the entire Coptic domain: while most dialects do not indicate this feature in their graphic conventions, Bohairic uses the corresponding Greek aspirata, θ, φ, χ (for n, τ, κ) and the Coptic sign σ (for z). The voiced phonemes (plosives θ, φ and ζ/θ/ and fricative γ/θ/) are realized as voiceless stops. "Ejective" phonemes, on the contrary, are characteristic for the vocabulary of Egyptian stock and are realized as ejective stops. They are written with the corresponding Greek tenuis.

53. In Sahidic and in most other dialects, the phoneme /t/ is rendered by <ts> in initial and final position, and by the reduplication of the vocalic grapheme (<tv> = [tvv]) when immediately following the stressed vowel of a word. In Akhmimic and Lycopolitan, /t/ in final position of monosyllabic words is rendered by <ts>. In Bohairic, /t/ is expressed by <ts> in any nonfinal position; at the end of a monosyllabic word, etymological /t/ (primary or secondary) has evolved into <ts> (this feature being shared by Fayumic).
54. The phoneme /p/ is rendered by an independent grapheme in Akhmimic (q) and in Bohairic (θ), but not in Sahidic; however, its presence in the underlying phonological inventory left traces in internal vocalic oppositions of the type /ɔɛt/ < /ɔeθw/ "leprosy" vs. /ɔɛt/ < /ɔeθw/ "weaver."

55. The existence of a phoneme /n/, which I subsume here under the heading "glottal" because of its historical merger with /m/, is doubtful; however, its presence in the underlying phonological inventory left traces in final vocalic oppositions of the type /mɑ/. "wool" < /mɑ?u/ < /mɑ?u/ vs. /mɑ . "to be hungry" < /mɑq/ < /mɑq/.

56. Fayyumic is known for its "lambdacism". /ə/ appears in many words in which the other dialects display /p/. The ratio between the two phonemes in all other Coptic dialects is 70% to 30% in favor of /p/, whereas Fayyumic has a proportion of 80% to 20% in favor of /ə/: R. Kasser, "Fayyumic," in Coptic Encyclopedia VIII, 125.

57. The most up-to-date account of Coptic phonology is by F. Hintze, "Zur koptischen Phonologie," Enchoria 10 (1980), 23–91, to which the reader is referred for a generative treatment of an underlying phonological system of Coptic shared by the dialects independent of their different graphic conventions.

58. See its frequent alternation with /p/, /p/, Stnorsb - mba > nbw /nbaw/ "gold," Seine - Toqazs < bnt.s /baw/ "hair."

59. However, final /n/ is expressed by /æ/ in Sahidic and /æ/ in Bohairic in doubled syllables, see below.


61. See the discussion of these phonetic properties in Worrell, Coptic Sounds, 17–23.

62. The reason for rendering aspirated stops in the majority of dialects with the corresponding Greek tenuis would be that Greek aspiratae generally represent in Coptic the combination of the corresponding voiceless phoneme followed by the glottal fricative: /q = pʰ/ (rather than /pʰ/), /o = bʰ/ (rather than /bʰ/), /ɔ = bʰ/ (rather than /bʰ/).

63. As generally assumed by scholars (see R. Kasser, "Phonology," in Coptic Encyclopedia VIII, 184–86), except for Bohairic σ, which some linguists consider phonemically distinct from α; see A. Shisha-Halevy, "Bohairic," ibid., 54.

64. Hintze, Enchoria 10 (1980), 50.


67. For the older assumption that Coptic displays an exact correspondence between graphemic appearance and phonological structure see R. Kasser, "Syllabication," in Coptic Encyclopedia VIII, 207 ff.

68. This is a general context for the development of aspiration, called "delayed voicing onset," also present in Modern English and German: Hock, Principles of Historical Linguistics, 121.

69. Background information, discussion and examples in Oising, Nominalbildung, 15–17, 403–48.

70. Oising, Nominalbildung, 11; Hintze, L’choria 10 (1980), 49.


73. A very plausible case has been made by F. Kammerzell, "Ueber die Verschiedenheit von gesprochenem und gesprochenem Sprache," paper read at the Sixth International Congress of Egyptology (Turin, 1–8 September 1991) and by Zeidler, Linguæg 2 (1992), 207–10 for the interpretation of a few lexical doublets which display /n/ in their Old and Middle Eg. and /i/ in their Late Eg. form as two dialectal variants of a common Afroasiatic ancestor with etymological /n/.


75. Oising, Nominalbildung, 754; Schenkel, Pluralbildung, 197 ff.; Zeidler, Linguæg 2 (1992), 195, and section 3.3.3 below.


77. For other possible signals of a preservation of the phoneme /n/ in final position see the discussion on the glottal stop /n/ in section 3.4.3 below.

78. As we saw above, /e/ = /æ/ in Sahidic, Akhmimic and Lycopolitan, /æ/ in Bohairic, and /æ/ or /æ/ in Fayyumic before sonorant phonemes (including /i/).

79. The presence of a short vowel /a/ is indicated in most dialects by a supralinear stroke (called in German Vokalstreich) over the following consonant.

80. This is yet another case of phonetically motivated neutralization of a phonological opposition.


82. If the stressed syllable of earlier Egyptian was of the type c, the first consonant of the posttonic syllable /w/, /j/, or /i/, Egyptian posttonic vowels in syllables of the type c, c, and c have left different traces in the final long vowels or diphthongs of Coptic: Schenkel, Ägyptische Sprachwissenschaft, 91 ff.


85. See Goldsmith, Autosegmental and Metrical Phonology, 92, 107–8. Needless to say, the phonetic realization of these phonological strings may very well have been [əp], [jop], or [sop], but in this instance the phonetic dimension is both impossible to reconstruct and irrelevant within the context of our discussion.

86. Many scholars would interpret the syllabic structure of these words somewhat differently, namely as /xo/ = /to/, /jw/ = /jo/. From the point of view of the economy of a linguistic system, however, this phonological analysis presents the drawback of positing the existence of a stressed open syllable /xw/ in a plural-syllabic word, which is not documented throughout the history of the Egyptian language and is unnecessary at the purely synchronic level as well: see section 3.4.3.
From the different methodological approaches to the study of Afroasiatic see Loprieno, Verbalism, 1-12.

This is the approach adopted by a majority of scholars working within the "semitocentric" genetic model: for example O. Rössler, "Verbalbau und Verbalflexion in den semitohamitischen Sprachen". Vorstudien zu einer vergleichenden semitohamitischen Grammatik, ZDMG 100 (1950), 461-514.

This is the so-called "allolectic" theory of G. W. Tsereteli, "Zur Frage der Beziehung zwischen den semitischen und hattischen Sprachen," MIO 16 (1970), 271-80.


A good example of an extreme triradical approach to Arabic verbal morphology is offered by R. M. Voigt, Die inneren Verbsystemen des Arabischen und das Biradikalismus Problem. Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission XXXIX (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1988).

In more recent times, attention is being paid to the witnesses of prehistoric contact between Egyptian and Indo-European; see for example J. Ray, "Are Egyptian and Hittite related?" in A. B. Lloyd (ed.), Studies in Phanerotic Religion and Society in Honour of J. Guyn Griffiths (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1992), 124-36 and F. Kummerzellel, "Zur Erythologie des ägyptischen Zahlworts '4' in Crossroads III Preprints.


For a formal analysis of morphological derivation in Egyptian see Ch. Reiniger, "Formal and functional aspects of the Egyptian root lexicon," in Crossroads III Preprints.

From the root *mr "to tie" see mr(w) */mnrAw > ḫmr "river bank" vs. jmr.wt */jmnAw > ḫmr "induration": Oising, Nominalbildung, 196.

From *mr to "to blow" see ḫmr */xrAw > ḫmr "blow of the wind": Oising, Nominalbildung, 97.

See mn */mi(w) > mwn vs. smnt */snnt "to establish" > rtmn, smnt */snnt > ḫmr "be stable": Oising, Nominalbildung, 54 ff.
As Akademisk including Osing, the presence of a posttonic syllable division in Egyptian characterizes only this plural pattern; in other cases, the outcome is 

\[ S^\text{-cat}, B^\text{-cat} \rightarrow \text{nom} \].

For a phonological, rather than morphological interpretation of the reason for the frequent presence of semiconsonantal endings in Egyptian words (contingent extrasyllability) see section 3.4.3.

56. For the CT see ibid., 228; the writing \( h\text{3jiw} \) in the Book of the Dead (mentioned by Oxing, Nominalbildung, 488) is more easily interpreted as a hybrid form which combines at the graphic level the old (\( w \)) and the new (\( j \)) plural morpheme.

57. Oising, Nominalbildung, 554.

58. Ibid., 558 ff.

59. From the nisba adjective \( ty \) "relative to the head."

60. A treatment of personal pronouns in earlier Egyptian which takes into account the Afroasiatic perspective is Kammerzell, in Gedenschrift Behrens, 177–203.


62. A similar phenomenon is known from Japanese, where \( \text{nu} \text{w} = [\text{pu} \text{w} \text{nu}] \); see Schenkel, Syntax und Sprachnorm, 103–12. The Egyptian phonomes \( i/s/i \) was probably characterized by a phonetic feature of palatality.


64. Early texts show examples of preterital cleft sentences \( jn+NP+ngr.mm/j \) see B. Gunn, Studies in Egyptian Syntax (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1924), 59–60; J. P. Allen, "The Infection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts," Bibliotheca Aegyptica 2 (Malibu: Undena, 1984), § 408. A rare example of cleft adverbial sentence is Heqaib 9 (Malibu: U), see P. Vernus, "Le rhème marqué: typologie des emplois et effets de sens en Moyen Egyptien," LingAeg 3 (1991), 337: \( 3s.t \text{jm}.\text{wj} \text{m} \text{wj} \text{br} \text{br} \text{tbj jn jmj-ra 'bnw tj n(j) hjm-f = s-r jy' } \) It was two precious ships \( (\text{jm}.\text{wj} \text{m} \text{wj} \text{br} \text{br} '\text{two ships of desire}') \) and His Majesty’s Chamberlain \( (\text{jmj-rj 'bnw tj hjm-f}) \) that were delegated to that \( (\text{m-s r jy} [\text{who were afterwards}]) \).

65. The first person independent pronoun is also used in adverbial and pseudoobverb clauses embedded into a higher nominal sentence, see section 4.3.

66. See Kammerzell, in Gedenschrift Behrens, 192 ff.

67. Within an "ergative" understanding of the focus marker \( jn \) one may think of examples such as CT V 27d-c \( \text{Sg}q\text{C} \text{sm} \text{pa} \text{w} \text{n} \text{N} \text{pn} \text{br} \text{br} \text{skr jn jn s-s nmn-s N pn jn} \text{3s.t} \text{br} \text{br} \text{skr m nfr 'n'b} \) "The sands of this N will be established \( (\text{smn}) \) on Earth by Isis \( (\text{jm} \text{3s.t}) \); it is Isis \( (\text{jm} \text{3s.t}) \) who will establish \( (\text{smn-s}) \) this \( N \) on Earth as a living god," where in the first instance the particle \( jn \) introduces the agent of a passive verbal form, in the second it marks as focus the subject of an active verbal form cataphorically anticipated by the suffix pronoun in the verbal predicate. A similar syntactic type is shown in the frequent quotation formula in Late Egyptian letters: \( jn \text{.t m} \text{mask n} \text{br} \text{so said our lord}, \) where the subject is extraposited to the right and introduced by the focal particle \( m \) (\( jn \)), lit. "so he said, indeed our lord." See Gardner, EG, § 227.5.

68. See the insightful and prudent discussion by Zeidler, LingAeg 2 (1992), 210–21.

69. The variant with ending \( jn \) documented in the Old Kingdom and frequently in the Coffin Texts (Kammerzell, in Gedenschrift Behrens, 192) is probably just a writing of \( jn \) followed by a reinterpreted first person determinative "\( i/s + \text{MAN} \)."

70. See Schenkel, Altägyptische Sprachwissenschaft, 105–8.
71. The semiconsonantal suffix \( .w > j \) is adverbial in origin: see for example the negative marker of circumstance \( wj \). G. Moess, “Freie Varianten oder funktionell gebundene Morpheme? Zu den Graphien der ägyptischen Negation \( n\).”, *LingAeg* 3 (1993), 33–58, § 2.1. It is mostly found in the earliest texts when the static is used adverbially, especially as predicative complement: F. Kammerzell, “Funktion und Form. Zur Opposition von Perfekt und Pseudopartizip im Alten und Mittelägyptischen,” *GM* 117/18 (1990), 181–202.


75. Ibid., 160–78.

76. An exception is the survival of the third person plural -cow, -ce in Coptic constructions after a certain number of infinitives (for example \( z8.s \) \( \sim o8.s \) “to write”), of imperatives (\( jij \) \( \sim o8.s \) “do it”), and in patterns indicating possession (\( w \) \( m-dj-i \) \( \sim o8.s \) “he has them”): Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, § 200, 292–93; Polotsky, *Grundlagen*, 76–78.


79. In Demotic and Coptic, analogic pressures will lead to the adoption of the third person suffix pronoun in this pattern (masculine \( -e\), feminine \( -e\)).

80. This diachronic process is analyzed by Winand, *Etudes de néo-égyptien*, 103–49.

81. A few Demotic verbs have kept the first, rather than the third person singular form of the static, for example \( bms.k \) “to sit”; only one of them (\( bkrk \) “to sleep” \( < j-nqdy.k \) survived down to Coptic. See Winand, *Etudes de néo-égyptien*, 139.

82. Gardiner, *EG*, § 511.3.

83. See Kammerzell, *LingAeg* 2 (1992), 165.


85. F. Kammerzell, “Ueber die Verschiedenheit von geschriebenen und gesprochenen Sprache,” paper read at the Sixth International Congress of Egyptology (Turin, 1–8 September 1991) and Zeidler, *LingAeg* 2 (1992), 207–10 argue convincingly for the interpretation of a few lexical doubles which display \( h\) in their earlier Egyptian and \( n\) in their later Egyptian form as two dialectal variants of a common Afroasiatic ancestor with etymological \( *n\).


87. The use of the past form \( sgm.n\text{-}s\) after the particle \( nj\) to negate the general tense is a phenomenon known in Egyptianological literature as “Gunn’s rule” (section 7.8).

88. The earlier and later Egyptian forms are in fact etymologically identical; the opposition between \( d\) and \( *\) is based on the “Upper Egyptian” (\( d\)) vs. “Lower Egyptian” (\( *\)) outcome of the Afroasiatic \( /d/\), see section 3.6.1.


92. From an underlying root \( sj\) “to be round” \( > \) “the round number.”

93. See \( sr\) “brother.”

94. The word is not documented in hieroglyphic Egyptian, but can be reconstructed on the basis of puns. It represents the dual of \( mwj\) “10” (‘‘\( mwj\) = \( 5\) + \( 5\)’’), see the same derivational process in Semitic (for example Arabic ‘\( l\)\( in\) “20” vs. ‘\( st\)‘ “10” and in Indo-European ‘\( w\)\( k\)\( θ\)\( oj\)\( s\)\( w\) “20” < ‘\( d\)\( w\)\( j\)\( s\)\( w\)’ “two tens”): O. Szemerenyi, *Studies in the Indo-European System of Numerals*, Indogermanische Bibliothek (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1960), 129.

95. Probably a dual form of “100.”

96. From the root ‘\( b\)’ “to be complete.”

97. Coptic shows that the numerals “300”–“900” were built with a genital construction of the corresponding unit and the word for “100.”

98. The word is not documented in hieroglyphic Egyptian, but can be reconstructed on the basis of puns: it is possibly connected with the root ‘\( b\)\( w\) “to be skilled.”

99. Probably derived from an Afroasiatic word for “hand,” see Sem. ‘\( x\)\( y\)\( d\)\( j\) (‘\( x\)\( y\)\( d\)\( j\)\( w\)\( s\) “hand-like”). See the etymology of Indo-European ‘\( t\)\( e\)\( k\)\( o\) “10” < “two hands”: Szemerenyi, *Studies*, 69. However, the etymology of Egyptian ‘\( s\)’ from an older word for “hand” presents phonological difficulties: J. Zeidler, “Nochmal zur Etymologie der Handhieroglyphe,” *GM* 72 (1984), 39–47; Schenkel, *LingAeg* 3 (1993), 137–49.

100. The numerals “50”–“90” are not documented in full writing, but can be reconstructed on the basis of the Coptic forms as derived from the corresponding units with the addition of a \( w\)–(plural) suffix.

101. This numeral is written as a rebus with the sign for ‘\( w\)’ “finger” (see Sem. ‘\( w\)’). The etymology is unclear.

102. Rather than “one million” in the numerical sense, this word refers to a generally “limitless” quantity.

103. The root ‘\( p\)\( d\)’ is probably tied to the semantic realm of “new,” see ‘\( p\)\( w\)’ “sunrise” and ‘\( p\)\( d\)\( n\)\( w\) “new moon,” IE ‘\( new\)’ “9” and ‘\( new\)’ “new”: Szemerenyi, *Studies*, 173.


106. Ibid., 115–21.


112. In fact, the earlier tendency to consider the Semitic verbal system as tenseless has itself been challenged: R. I. Binnick, *Time and the Verb: A Guide to Tense & Aspect* (Oxford University Press, 1991), 434–44.

113. An excellent study of the interface between these two categories is provided by Binnick, *Time and the Verb;* see the summary 452–61.

114. Ibid., 44.


117. Ibid., 339 ff.


121. Ibid., 139–49.


123. Ibid., 371–434.


125. Already in Old Egyptian and increasingly in the classical language, the form *sfn.n-t* is introduced in the indicative use by an initial particle such as *jw, mk* etc. See chapter 6 for a detailed analysis.

126. The difference between "perfect" and "perfective" aspect is that in the former the event time (E) precedes the reference frame (R), in the latter E is included in R. See Binnick, *Time and the Verb*, 207–14, 295–300.


130. W. Schenkel, "sfn·t-Perfekt und sfn·t-Stativ: die beiden Pseudopartizipien des Ägyptischen nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte," in H. Behler (ed.), *...Querentes Scientiam. Festgabe für Wolfhart Westendorf zu seinem 70. Geburtstag übereicht von seinen Schülern* (Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie, 1994), 157–82 suggests that the preterital ("Perfekt") and the subordinate ("Stativ") use of the statives are in fact two distinct morphological forms, the former corresponding to the Northwest Semitic suffix conjugation, the latter to the Akkadian stative.


132. The reconstruction of the first person stative pattern is based solely on comparative evidence: see Kammerrzell, in *Gedenkschrift Behrens*, 191–92; Schenkel, in *Festgabe Westendorf* has *św·tpkw:ši (perfect) vs. *św·tpkw:ši (stative)*. For the syncope of the posttonic short vowel due to the change from the Dreisilbengest to the Zweisilbengest see Ficht, *Wortschatz und Silbenstruktur*, §§ 348–50 and section 3.4.3 above.


134. For the third person feminine, Coptic survivals allow a reconstruction of the two patterns *ca·cic·osc* vs. *cic·osc* in the earlier Egyptian form: transitive *nn·j", *sn·nn* "she is established" > *cic·osc* "to be stable" vs. intransitive *nn·j", *sn·nn* "she is hungry" > *cic·osc* "to be hungry." Schenkel, in *Festgabe Westendorf* pleads for a vocalization *św·tpkw:ši (perfect) vs. *św·tpkw:ši (stative)* for the masculine, *św·tpkw:ši (perfect) vs. *św·tpkw:ši (stative)* for the feminine form.


not be "the man whose face is beautiful" but "the man — the face is beautiful." This pattern is similar to the so-called balbusti constructions in Indo-European languages and to Semitic patterns such as the Arabic adjectival phrase ‘ar-ragulu ‘i-hasanu ‘i-waﬁti: "the man whose face is beautiful," lit. "the man — the one beautiful of the face" (K. Jansen-Winkeln, "Exozentrische Komposita als Relativphrasen im älteren Ägyptisch," ZAS 121 (1994), 51–75), and in part also to the Indo-European and Semitic "relational accusative" of the tamya-type: see W. Wright, A Grammar of the Arabic Language, third edition revised by W. Robertson Smith and M.J. de Goeje, vol. II (Cambridge University Press, 1898).

§ 44. In Egyptian, the relational accusative is found in lexicalized constructions consisting of a verbal root followed by its object, for example in the participial eulogy dj-‘nt who is given life," from adj-‘nt "to give life," see W. Schenkel, Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schriften (Tübingen, 1991), § 7.55.


W. Westendorf, Der Gebrauch des Pastus in der klassischen Literatur der Ägypter, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Orientforschung XVIII (Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1953).


In Old Egyptian, this form displays a j-prefix in the 2-rad. and in a few weak classes: j-sdm-t "which he says": Allen, Inflection of the Verb, §§ 631–36.

For the ending ‘nt in the feminine prospective relative form see Gunn, Studies, 1–25.

Gardiner, EG, §§ 380–89.

For general discussion and references in W. Schenkel, Dieälägyptische Suffixkonjugation, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen XXXII (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975) and Oising, in Festschrift Fecht, 356–60.

See the form zinnak as Akkadian transcription of the relative form dd.nak which you said: “Zediler, Lingeg 2 (1992), 214–16.

J. P. Allen, "Form, function, and meaning in the Early Egyptian verb," Lingeg 1 (1991), 4. In Coptic, emphatic forms are marked by morphemes of relative origin, such as the relative pronoun m- in masons "the fact that he heard." Oising, Papyri BM 10808, 38–40, 179–86. If the reconstruction of a vocalization "nt for the temporal affix of the relative form sdm.n.t is correct, one would be tempted to pour ‘nt (rather than ‘nt, as assumed by Oising) for the relative sdm.w.t as well.

For a full account see Oising, in Festschrift Fecht, 337–50.

P. Allen, "Form, function, and meaning in the Early Egyptian verb," Lingeg 1 (1991), 4. In Coptic, emphatic forms are marked by morphemes of relative origin, such as the relative pronoun m- in mason "the fact that he heard." Oising, Papyri BM 10808, 38–40, 179–86. If the reconstruction of a vocalization "nt for the temporal affix of the relative form sdm.n.t is correct, one would be tempted to pour ‘nt (rather than ‘nt, as assumed by Oising) for the relative sdm.w.t as well.

For a full account see Oising, in Festschrift Fecht, 337–50.

Ibid., 358–60.

See the toponym mn-nfr "*ninnakvet > Mepnfr, Shps and the Akkadian transcription of mn-mu-a-t > Re is stable of truth" (the royal name of King Seth I) as mn-mu-a-t or corresponding to a later Eg. form *mnmu-nfr; Oising, in Festschrift Fecht, 341.
This pattern is frequent when the participle is substantivized, as in ouden "someone."

III-inf. verbs of movement show the pattern *cicañ (prj *purajj 'one who has come out'), adjectival verbs the patterns 2-rad. *cacc ('a *arkj 'big'), 3-rad., 11-gem. and III-inf. *cacc (grj *qwayj 'narrow'), *cacc (hr *nlarj 'small') and *cacc (wj *wunijj 'great') as well. Schenkel, Alägyptische Sprachwissenschaft, 86-92.

Substantivized participles belonging to this pattern also display the forms 3-rad. *cacc, II-gem., III- and IV-inf. *caccij (rather than *caciwi): see Osing, in Festschrift Fecht, 348-50.

For the tendency of unmarked participles to be associated with singular nouns and of marked participles to refer rather to plural referents see W. Schenkel, "Determinatives und 'pluralisches Partizip,'" MDAIK 29 (1965), 110-14.

This pattern is frequent when the participle is substantivized, as in ouden "someone."

III-inf. verbs of movement show the pattern *cicañ (prj *purajj 'one who has come out'), adjectival verbs the patterns 2-rad. *cacc ('a *arkj 'big'), 3-rad., 11-gem. and III-inf. *cacc (grj *qwayj 'narrow'), *cacc (hr *nlarj 'small') and *cacc (wj *wunijj 'great') as well. Schenkel, Alägyptische Sprachwissenschaft, 86-92.

Substantivized participles belonging to this pattern also display the forms 3-rad. *cacc, II-gem., III- and IV-inf. *caccij (rather than *caciwi): see Osing, in Festschrift Fecht, 348-50.

For the tendency of unmarked participles to be associated with singular nouns and of marked participles to refer rather to plural referents see W. Schenkel, "Determinatives und 'pluralisches Partizip,'" MDAIK 29 (1965), 110-14.

These VP's could also be seen as nominalized forms controlled by prepositions (section 6.3.1).

See Gardiner, EG, §§ 351-52.

The best and most complete account of the verbal morphology of Late Egyptian is provided by Winand, Etudes de nio-égyptien; for Demotic one will refer to J.H. Johnson, The Demotic Verbal System, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 38 (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1976); for Coptic H. J. Polotsky, "The Coptic conjugation system," Orientalia 29 (1960), 392-422 and id., Grundlagen. Incidentally, the phonological shape of the verb sand in Coptic (smd) shows that in this word the palatal sound had been dentalyzed (see section 3.5.1). This is why, for later Egyptian, I adopt the transcription smd.


Comrie, Language Universals and Linguistic Typology, 45-51.

Winand, Etudes de nio-égyptien, 179-98.

Ibid., 198-208.

Ibid., 289-97.

Ibid., 441-57, 190-91.

Ibid., 401-39.

Ibid., 231-41.

Polotsky, Grundlagen, 194-97; Depuydt, Conjunction, Contiguity, Contingency, 208 ff.

Winand, Etudes de nio-égyptien, 481-517.

Polotsky, Grundlagen, 213-16.

Winand, Etudes de nio-égyptien, 151-78.

Polotsky, Grundlagen, 165-68.

Winand, Etudes de nio-égyptien, 209-58, 265-79; P. Cassonnet, "Modalités énonciatives et temps seconds 1s.n.m. en nio-égyptien," in Coursinals III. Preprints.

For the Coptic functional heir *nbusu (as opposed to the prospective simple *nbusu) see Depuydt, Conjunction, Contiguity, Contingency, 244-46.

Ibid., 1-116, also J. Borghouts, "A new approach to the Late Egyptian conjunctive," ZAS 196 (1979), 14-24. While the conjunctive can indeed join events in the past, specifically when a focalization is at play and the events themselves are framed within a general present, its primary function is modal: see the use of the English verb "would" in narrative discourse, when the consecutive "unwinding of events" rather than their past reference is stressed.


This form is variously called "Final," "Future conjunctive," or "Promissive future": Polotsky, Grundlagen, 163-65; Depuydt, Conjunction, Contiguity, Contingency, 75-93. The sporadic initial h is not justified at the etymological level and probably represents the result of analogic pressure from the conjunctive.

Winand, Etudes de nio-égyptien, 103-49.

Ibid., 299-341.

Discussion and references in Polotsky, Grundlagen, 181-84.

Ibid., 179.

Winand, Etudes de nio-égyptien, 375-98.

Polotsky, Grundlagen, 45-62.

Ibid., Grundlagen, 59-60; Winand, Etudes de nio-égyptien, 343-73.

Ibid., Etudes de nio-égyptien, 41-101.

In Late Egyptian, the ending of the infinitive of the III-inf. verbs is still written <e>, but frequently also a <u>, which is probably a writing of the vowel after ibid., 56-60, 100-101.

Ibid., 95-100; Osing, Nominalbildung, 333-38; Borghouts, OLP 11 (1980), 99-109.

For the tendency of linguistic functions originally conveyed by morphological oppositions to be gradually replaced by syntactic devices such as a more rigid word order or a development of adverbial constructions see Hock, Principles of Historical Linguistics, 309-79.


See the treatment of this particle in Doret, Narrative Verbal System, 25, passim.

See the treatment of this particle in Doret, Narrative Verbal System, 25, passim.

5 Nominal syntax

2. For the difference between "interlocutive" first and second persons and "declarative" third person see Polotsky, Grundlagen, 19-20.

3. G. Gazdar, E. Klein, G.K. Pullum, and I. A. Sag, Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar (Oxford University Press, 1985), 20-21; Hengeveld, Non-verbal Predication, 26-30. In the following discussion, I use the term "substantive" to indicate the "noun" in the narrower sense, i.e. to the exclusion of the adjective.

4. Ibid., 75-77.

5. In early Egyptian there are still traces of gender and person congruence between nominal predicate and pronominal subject, in being used with feminine and in with plural nouns: Doret, Rede 40 (1989), 50.

6. See Wackernagel, IF 1 (1892), 333-436.


9. As a general remark to the many parallel variants in the CT here and in many of the examples quoted in this chapter, one should reckon in many cases with "mechanical," i.e. not always grammatically correct alternations between pronominal and nominal subjects. See Schenkel, Thüginger Einführung, § 6.1.1.1.


12. Other than the cleft sentence (section 5.4.2), which always displays a contrastive stress on the fronted noun, the pseudocleft sentence shows only an optional focalization of this NP: T. Givón, Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction, vol. II (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990), 704-5.


14. Because of its similarity to a verbal sentence with two topicalized forms (section 7.5), nominal patterns with lexically identical subject and predicate are labeled "balanced sentences."


17. See the opposition perceived by Arabic grammarians between al-mutakallim "the one who speaks" (first person) and al-mušabbah "the interlocutor" (second person) on the one hand vs. al-ya'laib "the absent one" (third person) on the other hand.

18. For adjectival sentences, I adopt a slightly different terminology, i.e. "qualifying" for the unmarked type (corresponding to the classifying pattern in nominal sentences) and "identifying" for the cleft (and the pseudocleft, see above) sentence. See the discussion in Doret, Rede 40 (1989), 50 ff. 16. See also E. Jungheinrich, "Nominalsatz und Cleft sentence im Ägyptischen," in Studien Polotsky, 431-62; W. Schenkel, "Fokussierung. Über die Reihenfolge von Subjekt und Prädikat im klassisch-ägyptischen Nominalasatz," in Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens zu Ehren von Wolfhart Weidendorf, vol. I (Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie, 1984), 157-74.

19. A rare evidence of the presence of this difference in tonic patterns for older Egyptian could be conveyed by the writing of the first person independent pronoun as jn instead of jnk before a word beginning with k in CT IV 21c BHSc jnk k3 ma', i.e. "I am the bull of Maat." J. Burghouts, "Prominence constructions and pragmatic functions," in Crossrow, 62.


23. For these constructions M. Gilula, "An unusual nominal pattern in Middle Egyptian," JEA 62 (1976), 160-75.

24. See similar formulations in later texts: BD 64.5 ntw jnk nk k3 ntw ntw "He is really I and I really he" or BD (Lepsius) 162.8 ntw ntw "He is you" quoted by Gilula, JEA 62 (1976), 173 and corresponding to the Coptic pattern with double thematic pronoun n3 k3 at3 k3 n3 k3 n3 n3 k3 n3, see Polotsky, Grundlagen, 33-34 and sections 5.8-5.9 below.


26. The best treatment of this issue is H. J. Sasse, "The thetic/category distinction revisited," Linguistics 25.3 (1987), 511-80 who offers a theoretical analysis as well as many examples from a variety of languages.

27. It might be useful here to point out that any verbal form can appear in these sentences, irrespective of its temporal or modal features: we have a so-called "stative" form in example (40), which may be contrasted for example with a "prospective" form in PrAvm. IV C 18: If he vomits it, m3w-n tuw "this means (pu) that he will die (m3w)-0."


29. The cleft is also used to express the adjectival predicate in the so-called bahwurhi construction, an asyndetic clause modifying a specific antecedent and predicing a physical or moral quality of his: CT III 370b jw b3j-w-p.t j3-3n n3m.w "the heart of those who are in heaven is happy," lit. "those who are in heaven (b3j-w-p.) - their heart is happy (j3-3n n3m.w)." See Jansen-Winkeln, ZAS 121 (1994), 67 ff. and section 6.2 below.

30. The existence of a construction NP + sw is advocated by E. Doret, "Cleft sentence, substitutions and contrasting semantic configurations in egyptian of the first phase (V-XVIII Dynasty)," Linguaeg 1 (1991), 59; the pattern may be documented in the CT - see example (41): CT IV 412 (164a) m3w sw "he is cat-like" - and could be the symmetrical counterpart of AdjP + pu, being used in marked contexts in which NP, rather than a noun, represents the set of qualities associated with it. It is more probable, however, that m3w is here in fact a nisba adjective
mjw "cat-like," a frequent pattern with nouns of animals in the CT. If this is the case, the construction NP * sw does not exist. I thank Wolfgang Schenkel for calling my attention to this point.

31. For the very rare cases of AdjP-wj see A. H. Gardiner, The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage from a Hieratic Papyrus in Leiden (Pap. Leiden 344 recto) (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1909), 104, and EG, 425; the example is Khakheperere sendeb 13 mn wj hr b-wj "and I am sad (znn) in my heart." Rather than an initial main clause, the adjectival sentence function here as a dependent clause.


34. P. Vernus, "Etudes de philologie et de linguistique (VI)," R/E 38 (1987), 175-81; Doret, R/E 41 (1990), 42 ff.

35. H. J. Polotsky, Etudes de syntaxe copte (Cairo: Société d'Archéologie Copte, 1944), 21-98.

36. Vernus, LingAeg 1 (1991), 338. See also Gunn, Studies, 59. A possible, but doubtful example of a relative form as predicate of a cleft sentence is Pt. 173-74 jn wj sbr.nwr ntr nj nb whjt nbjt-s bsm-s1."It is the lonely one whom God causes to become the head of a family who wishes to follow him": see G. Fecht, "Crucis Interpretum in der Lehre des Prähistor (Maximen 7, 9, 13, 14) und das Alter der Lehre," in Hommages à François Daumars, 2 vols. (University of Montpellier, 1986), 233-35. But the morphosyntactic segmentation of this passage is far from established.


38. We saw above that, because of their pragmatic salience, in the pattern "Independent pronoun-pw-NP" they combine, as it were, the role of syntactic predicate of the proposition (belonging formally to the tripartite pattern Pred-pw-Subj) and that of pragmatic focus of the utterance (alternating functionally with the cleft sentence S = Focus-AdjP). In this passage from the "Eloquent Peasant," moreover, the choice of the pattern jnk-pw-AdjP is also motivated by stylistic requirements, such as the need to create a contrastive parallelism between the two sentences.

39. The archaic cases of jn+NP+sdmt.jj+wf and jn+NP+sdmt.jj are discussed by Doret, R/E 40 (1989), 61-62.

40. Some authorities posit the existence of a cleft sentence pattern in which the successive form does not agree in person with the antecedent: see BM 614,8 jnk mj-sj ntr tj mdj-sj gw.1."There is only me (jnk) who will always cherish (mj-sj) good and hate (mdj-sj) evil." This is, however, a different pattern with an adverbial VP modifying as virtual relative clause an indefinite antecedent omitted under relevance. For a discussion see Gunn, Studies, 60-61; A. Shisha-Halevy, "The narrative verbal system of Old and Middle Egyptian," Orientia 58 (1989), 253; J. Borghouts, "jnk mtr+jj, an elusive pattern in Middle Egyptian," in Crossroads III Preprints. This pattern will be analyzed in more detail in section 7.4.


43. The same determinative pronoun in apposition to the head noun, and therefore agreeing with it in gender, number, and person (fem. a.t pl. n.), is in fact the usual marker of the indirect genitive.

44. "Maat" is the most fundamental concept of the Egyptian encyclopedia, involving cosmological order, moral truth, administrative justice, and social cohesion between the members of Egyptian society. See J. Assmann, Maat: Gerechtigkeit und Unsterblichkeit im Alten Ägypten (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1990).

45. For interrogative patterns in which the scope of the question invests an adverbial adjunct see sections 6.1-2; for so-called "YES-NO" interrogative sentences, in which the scope of the question is the predicative nexus itself see sections 7.1-2, 7.5.1.

46. Hengel, Non-verbal Predication, 103-29.

47. Schenkel, Tübinger Einführung, § 6.4.2.1.


49. Gardiner, EG, § 461.

50. For a thorough discussion see Vernus, Future at Issue, 46-51. See also the alternation between "subjunctive" wn in its older functions as "mood of command" (Loprieno, LingAeg 1 [1991], 210-17) and "prospective" wn in its use as "mood of wish" as in example (1111): CT III 300-b-d "May your (fem.) head be raised, your forehead be revived, may you speak to your own self: wn+s m ntr wmn+s m ntr you shall be a god. you will be a god."

51. For a general treatment see A. Loprieno, "Topics in Egyptian negations," in Gedenkschrift Behrens, 213-35.


54. L. R. Horn, A Natural History of Negation (Chicago University Press, 1989).


57. This happens when the presuppositional predicate is demoted to the level of a textually recurring theme: Loprieno, in Gedenkschrift Behrens, 219.

58. Horn, Negation, 6-14 passim.

59. Gunn, Studies, 170; Gilula, R/E 20 (1968), 61.

46. Horn, Negation, 10 and passim, to whom I refer for a detailed explanation of the properties of the four corners Affirmo and NegO.


51. This morpheme is kept as pw only after the interrogative jpt: jpt-pw "what?"


55. H. J. Thissen, "Bemerkungen zum demotischen Hafner-Gedicht," in Studies Lichtheim, vol. II, 992. See the regular pattern Onchsh. 8,23mm.1 mmnt-t jpt, "The wealth (mm.t) of a wise man (mmnt-t) is his speech (jpt)."

56. Theoretically, sentences such as example (154) could indeed be analyzed as a tripartite pattern in which the determinative pronoun preceding the second relative form is taken to be the old copula pw > psj. This typological problem has diachronic implications as well (section 5.9).

57. Polotsky, Grundlagen, 36–43. This construction is much more frequent in Sahidic than in Bohairic, where it appears to be replaced by the tripartite sentence with topicalized subject resumed by the pronominal copula after the predicate, as in example (153) above: the Bohairic version of example (158) is jpt-sou ("the string") = gw m-ph-mou [ps-nobi] [pt] (r-jom de m-ph-nobi) [pt-nomos] [pt].

58. Although one will remember that in Middle Egyptian too the indicator of focality can be deleted when the subject is the author of a letter or the owner in the frame of a funerary text, Late Egyptian shows an expansion of the pattern S = NPfocus + AdjPron: Truth and Falsehood 6,6 psaj-j sn k6 jkm (wj) "It was my younger brother who blinded me," particularly frequent in circumstantial clauses: Vernus, RdE 38 (1987), 175 ff. The reason for the higher frequency of the pattern without introductory particle in Late Egyptian when compared to the preceding stages of the language is most probably to be sought in the contemporary emergence of the new type of cleft sentence, for which see below.

59. Polotsky, Grundlagen, 59–61 (for cp as remnant of the perfective participle jpt 'who did'), 121 (for et-nj j6), A. Shisha-Halevy, "Bohairic-Late Egyptian Diaclosses: A Contribution to the Typology of Egyptian," in Studies Polotsky, 314–38, especially 322–23 sees the higher frequency of this pattern in Bohairic, where it is used not only, as in Sahidic, with personal pronouns, but also with proper names, interrogative pronouns, demonstratives, and numerals as one of the typological features linking Bohairic to Late Egyptian as opposed to Middle Egyptian.


61. pe-to-i-j6 < ps-nj-i-j6 br gd.


63. There are, however, cases in which Sahidic and other dialects also show an invariable pe as copula of the cleft sentence: see Polotsky, Grundlagen, 119–21 and example (157).

64. That this is actually the function of the jpt-pronoun is shown by the congruence in gender and number displayed by any resumptive pronoun in the presupposition with the focalized antecedent, with which it still builds a tight syntactic unit even beyond the copula itself (pou-me te-i-i j6 mmo-ss), as opposed to the agreement of a resumptive pronoun with the new
419 ou-me

A similar contraction can be observed in the case of the Middle Egyptian enclitic particle of aspiration wj, which in Late Egyptian appears to have merged with the dependent third person pronoun into the new particle wj "how...!": Amenemope 2.6 das-wj ps-tlw m hni-f "how concerned is the heated man in his heart!" < *das-wj sw ps-tlw "how concerned is he, (namely) the heated man (ps-tlw)!"

85. Onchsh. 14.4 nsl tji rsj-wf (* < fr tji-sf) "This is what seizes him," Ps 22.1 Pluzo i metaone (fern.) "It is the Lord who tends (p-et-moone < *ps-nj hr mnjt) me."

86. Of Semitic origin: see Hebrew 'ez-eth "which".

87. A similar contraction can be observed in the case of the Middle Egyptian enclitic particle of aspiration wj, which in Late Egyptian appears to have merged with the dependent third person pronoun into the new particle wj "how...!": Amenemope 2.6 das-wj ps-tlw m hni-f "how concerned is the heated man in his heart!" < *das-wj sw ps-tlw "how concerned is he, (namely) the heated man (ps-tlw)!"

88. Sir H. Thompson, A Family Archive from Siut from Papyri in the British Museum (Oxford University Press, 1934).

89. Rather than a true phonetic change, this is a case of lexical doublings in which Middle Egyptian shows the regular Eg. outcome of Afroas. */d/, whereas Late Egyptian keeps a variant with the ejective dental inherited from its Afroas. prehistory; see Zeidler, LingAeg 2 (1992), 208 and the discussion in section 3.6.

90. Polotsky, Grundlagen, 68-78.

91. Compare the fate of the construction yst ls-X in Modern Hebrew: originally meaning an impersonal existential "there is X," it is now frequently followed by the preposition et indicating a definite direct object: see for example H. Rosén, Good Hebrew. Meditations on the Syntax of the "Proper" Language (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Kiyarat Sepher, 1966), 34-35; T. Givón, "Topic, pronoun and grammatical agreement," in Subject and Topic, § 9.2.


94. Compare this sentence with nj nk je jz in example (131).


96. Satzinger, in Studies Polotsky, 489 suggests that while the unmarked nominal sentence was negated by a pattern in which bn. jwns isolates the NP, in the cleft sentence the same discontinuous morpheme wraps the entire sentence. While this would indeed make perfect sense from a linguistic point of view, since the cleft sentence represents a tighter unit than the unmarked nominal sentence, his example pBM 10052, 5.20 (w) bn ps-jwi 's jps-n jmv-f jwm 'andr it was not the big stone with which we had divided" is not conclusive: here the context proves that this is not an example of a negated cleft sentence, but rather of a negation of a NP followed by a relative clause functioning as its modifier: the expression "with which we divided" is not the presuppositional predicate of the sentence, but an apposition to "the big stone," which is the actual scope of the focal negation.

97. See in French the frequent colloquial use of the bare original reinforcing pas instead of the whole discontinuous morpheme ne pas: Je t'ai pas vu < je ne t'ai pas vu "I haven't seen you."


99. We observed that after Late Egyptian had displayed the tendency to reduce original tripartite patterns to bipartite sentences, Demotic and Coptic reintroduced the tripartite structure by "recreating" a copula immediately following the predicate, both in the topicalized pattern [Subj-Pred-psj] and in the more "classical," but rarer [Pred-psj-Subj]: Johnson, in Studies Polotsky, 414 ff.

100. For the text see W. Spiegelberg, Demotische Texte auf Krügen. Demotische Studien V (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1912), 14.

6 Adverbial and pseudoverbal syntax

1. A basic treatment of the adverbial sentence in classical Egyptian can be found in Gardiner, EG, §§ 116-124; for later Egyptian, the substitutional "Standard theory" of adverbial forms is presented in Polotsky, Grundlagen, 260-63.

2. For the general linguistic perspective see Hengeveld, Non-verbal Predication, 237-56.


6. This type of adverbial sentence, in which a nominal subject expressing a former (positive) situation is contrasted to an adverbial predicate conveying a later (negative) state of affairs, is a frequent stylistic device in the classical literary genre of "Lamentations"; in Egyptological literature, it is known as the "Then-Now-Scheme," see W. Schenkel, "Sonst-Jetzt. Variationen eines literarischen Formelementes," Welt des Orients 15 (1984), 51-61.

7. See the discussion in Vernus, Future at Issue, 5-15, 143-93.

9. This particular form of the Standard theory is defended by Junge, *Syntax der mittelägyptischen Literatursprache* and id., *Emphasis* and Sentential Meaning.


12. The "omission under relevance" is studied by M. Collier, "The relative clause and the verb in Middle Egyptian," *JEA* 77 (1991), 23–42.

13. For the difference in the analysis of a scientific hypothesis between the criteria of the "lack of internal contradiction" vs. the "adequate explanation of the phenomenon" see W. Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominbildung der Ägyptischen*. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV/13 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983), 2–4.

14. For a general treatment see Hopper and Traugott, *Grammaticalization*, for the reanalysis of grammatical features leading to grammaticalization phenomena see ibid., 40–62.


16. For a general linguistic treatment of this issue see J. Haiman, "Conditionals are topics," *Language* 54 (1978), 564–89.


18. Prospective and subjunctive merge in classical Middle Egyptian, see section 4.6.3.2.


25. This cryptic passage refers to the fact that the deceased king, who is the addressee of the funerary cult (evoked by the offering "arms"), is magically equated to the god Osiris, revived by his sister-wife Isis.

26. See the use of the accusative with adverbial function in Arabic, for example *ya'uman* "one day, once": Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, vol. I, § 364.


28. There are, however, sporadic cases of omission of the resumptive pronoun under relevance: see Adm. 7.1 in example (87) below.

29. See examples (22)–(23) and the discussion in 6.2.

30. A translation of *ja* with German "und zwar," although within a slightly different understanding of the passage, is given by Depuydt, *GM* 136 (1993), 22.


60. See Johnson, Domastic Verbal System, 32-48.
62. Ibid., 408-9.
63. But not verbal, see the sequential forms in chapter 7.
64. See the discussion by Winand, *Etudes de néo-égyptien*, 427-39. In Coptic there are still remnants of the linguistic situation which preceded the adoption of the jw-paradigm, as shown by the third person plural prefix ḫtīw- (vs. Sahidic ḫw-.) in the so-called "Middle Egyptian" dialect: ibid., 437 with bibliography.
66. Winand, *Etudes de néo-égyptien*, 481-517. There are rare Late Egyptian examples of a stative or a prepositional phrase as predicate of a Future III-like construction (513 ff.); these sentences indicate a state in the future, and are probably the remnants of the linguistic stage which immediately preceded the grammaticalization of the Future III as a bound verbal pattern.
68. Examples of the construction with jw followed by a nominal subject, however, do exist in Late Egyptian, and become more numerous in the Theban texts of the Third Intermediate Period (roughly from 1000 to 700 BCE). Since a Future III with nominal subjects preceded by jw > a- is also exhibited by Akhmimic (a-θαυμάζω a-κοιτάζω), Winand, *Etudes de néo-égyptien*, 502-4 suggests that the opposition between the patterns jw NP (r) sǎn and jw NP r sǎn was originally dialectal, the former being of Lower Egyptian, the latter of Upper Egyptian origin.
69. The form ḫtīw- at ḫtīw- is documented in the Middle Egyptian dialect of Coptic, see A. Shisha-Halevy, "Middle Egyptian" gleanings: grammatical notes on the 'Middle Egyptian' text of Matthew,” *CAE* 58 (1983), 314.
71. This reanalysis of modally unmarked verbal forms as syntactically distinct modal verbs is a well-known linguistic phenomenon documented, for example, in the history of English (in Old English, and partially in Middle English, may, shall, can, etc. were still regularly conjugated verbs; Hopper and Traugott, *Grammaticalization*, 45-48) or in the Romance development of the future (fr. aimer) and conditional (fr. aimerait) from modally neutral periphrastic constructions in Vulgar Latin ("amare habeo vs. amare habuī): see E. Cecchi, *Synchronie, Diachronie und Geschichte*. Internationale Bibliothek für allgemeine Linguistik III (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1974), 132-51.
72. For similar phenomena Hopper and Traugott, *Grammaticalization*, 177-84.
78. Corresponds to a positive form jw w r mût: Westendorf, *Grammatik der medizinischen Texte*, § 399 bb.

79. Including the construction an + infinitive, now analytically replaced by a negative circumstantial form: see the forms eítqonq an "without his knowledge" or eítqan an "without speaking" in Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, § 404.
80. See in French the frequent colloquial use of the bare original reinforcing pas instead of the whole discontinuous morpheme ne. pas: j'ai pas mangé < Je n'ai pas mangé "I haven't eaten."

7 Verbal syntax
3. For nominal and adverbial arguments as scope of the question see sections 5.5.2 and 6.1-2.
5. In Late Egyptian, this construction is replaced by its periphrastic variant un jw = sût: "then he was on hearing" > then he heard." See discussion and examples in section 7.9.
7. See example (13) for a non-initial use of the subjunctive following the imperative.
8. Omission of the subject under relevance occurs fairly frequently with the passive sQm w JN, see Gardner, *EG*, § 422. The reason for this frequency is to be sought in the low relevance of impersonal subjects ("it") in establishing the context of a passive predication; see Collier, *JEA* 77 (1991), 36-37.
10. A similar phenomenon of grammaticalization led in Biblical Hebrew to the use of the preterite of the verb qâm to "stand up," i.e. wayyqôm, lit. "and he stood up," to express the beginning of an action in a narrative sequence, with a gradual neutralization of the original meaning of the verbal form indicated by qâm: 2 Sam 19.9, wayyqôm hamnetek wayyešeb bašaru, "and the king stood up and sat at the door." > then the king sat at the door."
11. And then in Late Egyptian: see discussion and examples in section 7.9.
14. For example Adm. 7,7 qy byt ht hmjn (b)tj=f "As for the brave man, the coward steals his property."
15. For example CT IV 318c-d jr zms.t-42.wj thh 1 qrs wjpr pw "As for the 'Unification of the Two Lands,' this means the attribution of Osiris' tomb."
16. See the discussion by Loprieno, in Crossroad, 265-68 and id., JEA 1 (1988), 33-35. Passives and perfects, i.e., states, reduce the number of arguments involved in discourse, privileging the grammatical subject as semantic "goal" of the predicate, see B. Comrie, "Aspect and voice: some reflections on perfect and passive," in Syntax and Semantics, vol. XIV: Tense and Aspect, ed. by Ph. J. Tedeschi and A. Zaenen (New York: Academic Press, 1981), 65-78. Thus, the subject acquires in this case the role of "emergent" out of a "ground": see Borghouts, in Crossroad, 46.
17. See Gunn, Studies, 59-60 and Allen, Inflection of the Verb, § 408.
18. See now the thorough analysis by J. Borghouts, "jn mri=t=f: an elusive pattern in Middle Egyptian," in Crossroads III Preprints, from whom I have drawn the following examples.
19. Polotsky, Etudes de syntaxe cpte.
24. An exception is the verb rj=j to give," which displays the form rj=n=t when topicalized and gj=n=t in the non-topicalized uses: see Polotsky, JOS 1 (1976), 18-23.
25. For an example in which the passive is extraposed as topic of a main sentence see example (56) below.
26. For the suppletive relationship between the first person prospective and the second person emphatic in local environments see Loprieno, Ling 1 (1991), 210-17.
27. Stela of Khuisobek, see J. Barnes, "The Stela of Khuisobek: private and royal military narrative and value," in Festschrift Ficht, 43-62.
28. See Junge, "Emphasis" and Sentential Meaning, 56-60.
29. See for a general treatment Schenkel, Altgägyptische Sprachwissenschaft, 177-79; id., Tübinger Einführung, 249-50.
30. For this term see Shisha-Halevy, Captive Grammatical Categories, 72-74.
31. This passage was first quoted by A. Roccati, see P. Vernus, "Formes 'émphatiques' en fonction "émphatique" dans le processus d'un système correlative," GM 43 (1981), 73-88 and since then has often been the object of grammatical analysis, see the latest discussion in Junge, "Emphasis" and Sentential Meaning, 17, 54.
32. The explanation of this contingency between two sgm.n=t the second of which does not indicate an event preceding, but rather following the first, has been a traditional problem of the "Standard theory," which tended to view any verbal form preceded by an emphatic VP as adverbial in function. Solutions have been offered by Vernus, GM 43 (1981), 73-88 with the suggestion of a "second scheme" in which the event indicated by the first (subordinate) VP conditions the event indicated by the second (main) VP, and Depuydt, Conjunction, Contingency, Contingency, 117-200, who posits a correlation between the "emphatic" and the "adverbial" VP similar to the one existing in English between events correlated by the expression "no sooner... than." This contingency between the two verbal events is not a problem, however, for the approach presented here, since the first of the two VPs is viewed as an extraposed topicalized VP, and the second as a main clause verbal pattern. See Sin. B 200 jds.n.tu=f mrj=gj=n=j wj br b.tw "When it was read to me (extraposed topicalized VP), I fell on my belly (main clause)."
34. K. Jansen-Winkeln, "Vermerke. Zum Verständnis kurzer und formelhafter Inschriften auf ägyptischen Denkmälern," MDAIK 46 (1990), 146-50 and bibliography. This author interprets the sgm.n=f in this case as a relative form referring to the monument itself as antecedent omitted under relevance.
35. For a discussion of this type of embedding see J. P. Allen, "Form, function, and meaning in the early Egyptian verb," Ling 1 (1991), 3-10.
36. In Old Egyptian, verbs of wish (such as mj) controlled the prospective, whereas verbs of command (such as nj) were followed by the subjunctive, see Loprieno, Ling 1 (1991), 210-17. In the classical language, however, prospective and subjunctive merged into one suppletive paradigm, see section 4.6.3.2.
37. See Loprieno, Verbal system, 38-50.
38. The use of the demonstrative adjective pa is here a sign of its gradual loss of deictic reference and its drift towards a function as definite article. The same evolution affected the pronouns of the pa-series, which eventually developed into the definite article of later Egyptian, see section 4.4.3.
39. See Edel, Altgägyptische Grammatik, § 1058.
41. In fact, the emphatic aorist jmr=f could be etymologically identical to the relative form, see Allen, Ling 1 (1991), 3-10. This would imply that the sentence with topicalized predicate (section 7.5) is a form of proposed REL/topic sentence, see Givón, Syntax, 222-23.
42. Collier, JEA 77 (1991), 36-42.
43. See Givón, Syntax, 683-86.
44. This is the so-called "passive theory" of Gardiner, EG, § 386 and Westendorf, Der Gebrauch des Passiv, according to whom the difference between indicative and relative forms lies in the fact that in the former the subject of the passive participle would be explicit, resulting in the object of the verbal predicate (mj=r=f jr "I am a beloved-of-him" > "he loves me"), whereas in the latter it would remain unexpressed (mj=rs=f "beloved of him" > "whom he loves"). Other theories about the origin of the indicative and relative forms of the suffix conjugation (the so-called "active-passive theory," according to which the indicative forms would be derived from active participles (mrj=r=f "a lover is he" > "he loves"), and the relative forms from passive participles (mj=r=f "beloved of"
him" > "whom he loves"), and the "noun of action-active participles" theory, which sees the origin of indicative forms in substantive constructions (me "the fact that he loves") and of relative forms in active participles (me "loving-him" > "whom he loves"). For a methodological assessment see Schenkel, Suffizenionivation.

45. One will recall that omission under relevance is sensitive to the hierarchies of animacy and salience, indefinite subjects being more likely to undergo this deletion: see section 6.3.3.

46. When expressed, the logical subject of a passive construction is introduced by the "ergative" proposition m, see section 4.4.1.

47. See for example Comrie, Language Universals and Linguistic Typology, 124–37; Givón, Syntax, 126–34.

48. Properly speaking, the underlying verbal clauses in these examples should not display the resumptive pronouns st and as respectively, but rather the referent nouns "someone" and bī "place of execution," but I disregard this feature for the sake of simplicity, i.e. in order to avoid the discussion of yet another syntactic conversion.

49. Here again, the underlying verbal clauses without resumptive pronoun are *ṣy tw nōw bī "a boat is assigned to him" and *y w ṣy tw wāw bī "messenger are sent to him."

50. The prospective participle sōm y w st is used mostly — although not solely, see section 4.6.4 — in the active voice. In the passive voice, the early prospective participle is gradually replaced by the perfective passive participle, pointing once more to the semantic connections between perfective aspect and prospective mood in Egyptian: Loprieno, Verbal System, 38–40.

51. For the distributional relation between these two forms in the expression of the past passive see section 4.6.3.5.

52. The gemination of the second consonant is characteristic only of perfective participles of 2-rad. roots, see section 4.6.4.

53. See chapter 4 n. 159, chapter 5 n. 29, chapter 6 n. 15.


55. See Gunn, Studies, 93–118.

56. For some of the Egyptological explanations see Polotsky, IOS 6 (1976), 44–46: R. Harnig, "Die neue Gunn'sche Regel," in Festschrift Weidendorf, 63–70; Schenkel, Tubinger Einführung, § 7.3.1.1.1–2.


58. For the morphology of this verb see Allen, Inflection of the Verb, § 391.

59. Ibid., §§ 360–63.

60. See Veranus, Future at Issue, 121–30.


63. See the excellent discussion by F. Kammerzell, "Die altägyptische Negation w: Versuch einer Annäherung," LingArch 3 (1993), 17–32. The negative particle w is used to mark the prospective sūm st as "pertinent" or "contingent" prohibitive form.

64. Gardiner, EG, § 344.

65. The irregular gemination of the 2-rad. stem in the form rmm st is probably the result of analogic pressures coming from the "emphatic" aorist of III-inf. verbs (m-m), gemination being perceived as the most typical feature of a topicalized VP. We saw in section 7.5.1 that similar cases of irregular repetition are documented for the passive as well.


67. The relative-converb ḫw survives through Coptic only as a lexicalized element in noun meaning "without the quality expressed by the controlled word," for example at-ḥw st "without sin" or at-ḥw st "immortal."

68. Winand, Études de nôf–égyptien, 474–90.

69. Polotsky, Orientalia 29 (1960), 399–422. See also id., Grundlagen, 169–202; Frandsen, Late Egyptian Verbal System, 1–78.

70. Winand, Études de nôf–égyptien, 192–98; Johnson, Demotic Verbal System, 178–203. Later Demotic and some Coptic dialects (Fayumic and Lycopolitan) document a periphrastic pattern wōt st > ḥw st kətə "he laid hearing" > "he heard." This pattern originally indicated a past background (ibid., 203–14), and thus represented the positive equivalent of kētə st (a. below), but became in Coptic a mere dialectal variant of kətə st.

71. Gardiner, EG, § 484.

72. Ibid., ibid., Études de nôf–égyptien, 231–36.


75. Ibid., 209–58.


77. Polotsky, Grundlagen, 193–94.

78. Ibid., 160–63.


81. Till, Kopistische Grammatik, § 298.

82. See Polotsky, Grundlagen, 141–59.


84. Polotsky, Grundlagen, 181–84.


86. Depuydt, Conjunctio, Contingency, 26–34.

87. For this text see P. Cheix, Le concept de Notre Grande Puissance (CG VI, 4).


89. Depuydt, Conjunctio, Contingency, 13.

90. The syntactic behavior of the later Egyptian subjunctive is similar to the Arabic pattern in which the particle ِتْبَعَsa introduces a "hypothetical," rather than subordinate clause in which the subjunctive conveys an action as result of a preceding event ("nucleus"); ِتْبَعَsa ِتَشْتَمِي ِفَا ِتْدَعِي ِشَعْنَوَأ "Pardon me, O Lord, that I may enter Paradise." See Wright, A Grammar of the Arabic Language, vol. II, § 15.

91. See the insightful discussion by Depuydt, ibid., 45–66, to whom I owe the examples.


93. See the use of the conditional *would* in English to refer to actions expected to take place after the past event which is being referred to: "he promised that he would come."


95. Id., *ZAS* 196 (1979), 14-24.

96. See Frankena, *Late Egyptian Verbal System*, 100-102, 227-32.

97. See Pottosky, *Grundlagen*, 258-60. In Coptic, the protasis of a hypothetical clause can also be introduced by the conjunction *eunest* "if," which derives from the grammaticalization of a circumstantial clause *jw* *bhr* "if it happens." See Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, §§ 447-60.

98. See Winand, *Etudes de néo-égyptien*, 292-97. In this Coptic conjugation pattern, the *is* is a purely phonetic phenomenon, probably originating in a nasal pronunciation of *is*; for a similar phenomenon in some traditions of Hebrew reading see A. Loprieno, "Observations on the traditional pronunciation of Hebrew among Italian Jews," in A. Kaye (ed.), *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leiss*, vol. II (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991), 931-48. The *is* is absent from some dialects such as Bohistic or Akhamitic, which display the form *gaseóetpert*.


100. M. Gilula, "A Middle Egyptian example for the Coptic *ūs f*.*m*., *JNES* 34 (1975), 135-36.


105. Cassonnet, in *Crossroads IIL Preprints*. Being shared by Old and Late Egyptian, the prothetic *god* could be a dialectal feature of the "Upper Egyptian" dialect, not shared by Middle Egyptian, a "Lower Egyptian" dialect; on the geographic origin of Middle vs. Late Egyptian see Schenkel, *Lingeg 3* (1993), 148.

106. The distinction between "first" and "second tenses" is traditional in Coptic grammar, but it is only with the emergence of Pottosky's model in the *Etudes de syntaxe copte* that the term "second tense" has been associated to the nominal, or topicalized function of the VP and that second tenses have been seen as the hinge of the Middle Egyptian geminating *sdmr*.


108. For this use of *is* see Pottosky, *Grundlagen*, 245-47.

109. Ibid., 343-73.

110. For vestigial remnants of the perfective participle *jfr sdm > spret* in Coptic see section 5.9 and Pottosky, *Grundlagen*, 59-60.

111. Ibid., 62-68, 245-47.

112. Ibid., 237-60.
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<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104,4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122,6–8</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124,15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,15–16</td>
<td>78, 161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184,1</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192,14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221,10</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222,18–223,2</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232,10–11</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301,3–5</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV 2.12</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57,3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68,3</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74,9–11</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96,7</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99,15</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119,10</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132,9–10</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132,16–17</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269,7–8</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341,7–8</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348,9</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363,6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363,6–7</td>
<td>153, 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365,11</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386,4–10</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410,5–6</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420,1</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766,5</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780,10–13</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835,16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890,10–12</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895,1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897,11–13</td>
<td>151, 166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897,11–16</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>944,1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959,15</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1074,4–5</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1082,15</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111,6–7</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116,7–8</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1166,10</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823,17–18</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. V 53,1–2</td>
<td>110, 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>93, 221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. VI 133,20</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenamun 1,20–21</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.44–45</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11–13</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23–24</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westcar 5.3–5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,10</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,3–15</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 1,21</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,13</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,4–6</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,11</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg 6,15</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>14,15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,26–7,1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,26–7,2</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,12–17</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,22–23</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>129, 266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,7</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,22</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,10–11</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,21–22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,21</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,21</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPTIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 26,26</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 16,2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cant 1,5–6</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 2,9</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,15</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 9,20</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,24</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,10</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,10</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor 4,7</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>93, 173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHC VI 4, 44,26–29</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1,43</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,5–7</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex 19,5</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,16–20</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,7</td>
<td>177, 181, 222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psais Sophis 121,1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov 12,1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 5,5</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 3,16</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,2</td>
<td>94, 177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 11,4</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,1</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas 1,13</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32,12</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 1,10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54,20</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,39</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68,22</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83,12</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td>Reference Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102,12</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104,7</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117,23</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134,17</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev 9,1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 4,6</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,21</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thess 5,24</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim 3,12</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tob 3,11</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDEX OF MORPHEMES**

**EGYPTIAN**

**j-prefix** (Old and Late Egyptian) 79, 81-82, 86, 88, 95-99, 232-33, 259

**jr** (later Egyptian converter) 91-92, 98, 134, 137, 222, 232-34, 267, 278

**jw** (earlier Egyptian) 74, 79, 101, 122-24, 126, 163, 165-69, 174-75, 194, 234, 271

**jw** (later Egyptian converter) 91, 174, 177-80, 234-35

**jw** + VP/stative (earlier Egyptian) 75-80, 91, 93, 123, 186-87, 207, 209, 221, 229

**jw+tr sdm** 80, 94, 169, 177, 181, 222, 225, 233, 272

**jw+tr sdm** (earlier Egyptian progressive) 80, 158, 169

**jw+tr sdm** (later Egyptian sequential) 91, 93-95, 178, 225, 227, 229

**jwns** (negative reinforcer) 93, 140-41, 171, 181, 233, 268

**jw(t)** (negative conjunction "that not") 101, 218

**jwj** (negative relative converter) 70, 212, 218-20

**jnj** (negative verb) 90, 212-13, 215, 223

**jm** (imperative of **nji**) 92, 95-96, 223, 225

**ja** (focal, "ergative" morpheme) 64-65, 70, 83-84, 89, 100, 103, 108-9, 115-16, 121, 134, 136-37, 207, 253

**jn** (interrogative particle) 184

**jnj** (later Egyptian conjunction) 178, 229

**jr** (preposition/conjunction) 100, 151-52, 155, 166, 178, 188, 216, 228-30

**jr** "to do" as auxiliary verb 91-96, 99, 177, 220-25, 230

**jb** (optative particle) 101

**jhr** (particle) 15, 154, 165

**ja** (dependency particle) 153-55, 157, 165, 181, 200

**jnkns, jk/hk** (particle) 100, 152-54, 165, 172

**b'se** + verbal form 101, 186-87, 220

**w** (indefinite article) 56, 60

**wn** (verbal form > converter) 91, 93, 123-27, 166, 175-76, 178, 194, 232, 265

**wnn** (verbal form > converter) 123-27, 147, 150, 152, 155, 158, 166, 194, 199, 232, 265

**wnt** (conjunct "that") 100, 153, 166, 200

**wn.jn** (verbal form > converter) 185, 220, 273

**bw** (negative particle) 89, 92-94, 97, 140, 172, 221-22, 225

**bw-pw** (negative particle) 92, 94, 221, 225

**bn** (negative particle) 89, 93-95, 140-42, 180-82, 222, 225, 268-69

**pa, ta, na** (definite article) 7, 60, 68-69

**pw > psy** (copula) 68-70, 103-14, 117, 131-37, 263-64, 266-67, 269

**m** (interrogative pronoun) 70, 121

**m ji/jw** (negative imperative) 99, 213, 223, 225, 260

**mb** (ordinal morpheme) 72
### INDEX OF LEXEMES

This index contains references to the lexical entries mentioned or discussed in the main text and in the notes, but not to those which only occur in the Egyptian and Coptic examples.

#### EGYPTIAN

- "to speak in a foreign language" 31
- "month" 53, 61-62
- "interjection "oh" 101
- "to say" 52
- "vegetables" 32
- "Sem. toponym Yamut" 38
- "to come" 82, 123
- "color" 31, 35
- "heart" 31, 100
- "four" 37, 71, 215
- "veneration" 57
- "which is in" 100, 120
- "not to do" 90, 212, 215
- "between" 100
- "right side" > "West" 34, 56
- "West" 56
- "West" 57
- " mình " 250
- "whom" 69, 137
- "to fetch" 76, 81-82
- "new" 36, 65, 67
- "I" 31, 41, 64, 67
- "sleep" 254
- "as for, if" 100, 151, 155, 166, 178, 188, 216, 228-29
- "concerning, thereof" 100, 161
- "to do" 76, 79, 91, 94, 106
- "Late Eg." "with" 100
- "ox" 58
- "what?" 69, 137
- "what?" 266
- "tamarisk" 31, 34
- "price" 50
- "what?" 69
- "father" 33, 36, 59
- "river" 47
- "which?" 69, 137
- "red linen" 245
- "school" 41
- "great, big" 56-57, 125, 260
- "here" 68
- "consecration" 47
- "to be complete" 255
- "there one there" 68-69
- "fly" 31
- "the one here" 68-69
- "one here" 58
- "door" 31
- "to stand" 53, 89
- "numerous" 46, 48, 99, 125
- "to enter" 53
- "Sem. toponym Akram" 38
- "green" 31-32
- "one" 56, 71-72
- "soldier" 39
- "to be pure" 30
- "legs" 60
- "to become white" 37
- "to open" 76, 78
- "occupation" 49, 57
- "messenger" 37, 57
- "except" 100
- "being" 87
- "to be" 91, 100
- "great" 260
- "to blow" 250
- "broad, wide" 35, 53
- "breath" 47
- "servant" 32
- "fruit" 50
- "to order" 183, 201
- "to be whole" 67
- "Bocchoris" 34
- "bad" 33
- "harb" 248
- "to introduce" 78
- "heaven" 49, 57, 59
- "the" 36, 68-69
- "that" 68-70
- "who, what?" 68-70
- "who" 69, 121
- "that" 68
- "to come out" 260
- "seed" 57
- "reach" 78
- "button" 60
- "sunrise" 255
- "nine" 37-38, 71
- "new moon" 255
- "half" 34
- "the god Disk" 34
- "how" 38, 57
- "carrying" 87
- "who, what?" 69
- "in, with" 68, 80, 100, 145, 149, 151, 166
- "come" 81
- "by" 71
- "in, within" 100
- "behind" 100
- "by" 71, 139, 176
- "through" 139
- "mother" 245
- "to see" 52, 54, 79, 82, 125, 156, 183
- "truth" 39
- "30" 71
- "like 100
- "how?" 69
- "to be stable" 36, 53, 87-88, 250
- "Memphis" 57, 259
- "Menes" 38
- "to tie" 250
- "to desire, love" 52, 54, 89, 98, 183, 201, 205
- "river" 250
- "to fill" 72
- "the goddess Mehit" 39
- "northwind" 39
- "the goddess" 45, 76
- "to wander" 45
- "matter, thing" 57
- "word" 36-37, 58
- "ten" 71, 25
- "for, in order to" 100, 151
- "city" 245
- "see" 94
- "these" 68
- "lord, possessor" 36, 57
- "gold" 248
- "those" 68
- "good, perfect" 39, 54, 56, 87, 90
- "these" 68, 104
- "surely" 101
- "tooth" 251
- "tongue" 31
- "thing" 251
- "to be gathered" 54
- "later Eg." "they" 66-67
- "he" 65, 67
- "she" 65, 67
- "they" 65, 67
- "thou ( masc. )" 65, 67
- "fem." 65, 67
- "god" 35, 45, 48, 53-54, 56
- "goddess" 35
- "divine" 54
- "pleasant, sweet" 32, 76
- "until, to, more than" 78, 80, 100, 145, 149, 151, 201
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index of lexemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFROASIATIC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>buppy</em> &quot;fly&quot; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *wsw&quot; &quot;wide&quot; 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *wark&quot; &quot;green&quot; 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *samam&quot; &quot;ram&quot; 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *sal&quot; &quot;on&quot; 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *tin&quot; &quot;heart&quot; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *twn&quot; &quot;color&quot; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *tis&quot; &quot;tongue&quot; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *tsm&quot; &quot;sweet&quot; 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *saluam&quot; &quot;locust&quot; 34-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *tqy&quot; &quot;seven&quot; 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *tqpar&quot; &quot;lip&quot; 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *ts&quot; &quot;he&quot; 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTO-SEMISTIC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;ti&quot; &quot;toward&quot; 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;lp&quot; &quot;1,000&quot; 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;anaku&quot; &quot;1&quot; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;rd&quot; &quot;earth&quot; 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;atii&quot; &quot;tamarisk&quot; 31, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;bn&quot; &quot;in, by, with, at&quot; 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;dash&quot; &quot;door&quot; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;qtb&quot; &quot;fly&quot; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;hwy&quot; &quot;to be&quot; 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;whd&quot; &quot;one&quot; 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;wqan&quot; &quot;leaf&quot; 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;tmm&quot; &quot;to become hot&quot; 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;tswl&quot; &quot;to be long&quot; 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;yun&quot; &quot;right side&quot; &gt; &quot;South&quot; 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;yarmut&quot; (toponym) 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;karm&quot; &quot;vineyard&quot; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;t'ito&quot; 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;tibb&quot; &quot;heart&quot; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;tawn&quot; &quot;color&quot; 31, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;tysv&quot; &quot;to speak foreign languages&quot; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;tinni&quot; &quot;tongue&quot; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;tnm&quot; &quot;sweet&quot; 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;akram&quot; (toponym) 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;atii&quot; (toponym) 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;ai&quot; &quot;on, up&quot; 32, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;yb&quot; &quot;finger&quot; 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;qrb&quot; &quot;interior&quot; 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;tqpar&quot; &quot;lip&quot; 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;ib&quot; &quot;seven&quot; 32, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;sft&quot; &quot;six&quot; 71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index of lexemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AKKadian (including transcriptions of Egyptian words)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;taww&quot; &quot;he&quot; 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;tmm&quot; &quot;to complete&quot; 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;ts&quot; &quot;nine&quot; 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;tany&quot; &quot;eight&quot; 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• *&quot;try&quot; &quot;two&quot; 71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ARABIC** |
| • *"asyui" ("the city of") Asyut" 43  |
| • *"tn" "to be complete" 89  |
| • *"tnm" "sheep" 35  |
| • *"fa" "and" 277  |
| • *"qaib" "to turn around" 32  |
| • *"qaib, pl. qaib" "heart" 58  |
| • *"laya" "to speak enigmatically" 31  |
| • *"ma" "what?" 69  |
| • *"man" "who?" 69  |
| • *"ws" "wide" 35  |
| • *"wasi" "servant" 32  |

| **HEBREW** |
| • *"'szech" ("which") 268  |
| • *"'etun" "red linen" 245  |
| • *"'asikk" 65  |
| • *"qis/" "Egyptian, Coptic" 241  |
| • *"hinneth" "behold" 168  |
| • *"zab'" 31  |
| • *"yarim" (toponym) 38  |
| • *"'l" "to speak in a foreign language" 31  |
| • *"n" "the" 245  |
| • *"so'" "locust" 34-35  |
| • *"mis" "scribe" 29  |
| • *"'okrim" (toponym) 38  |
| • *"'saw'" "Tanis" 39, 245  |
| • *"g'zter" "bow" 245  |
| • *"qum" "to stand" 273  |

| **ARAMEIC** |
| • *"'as'" 244  |

| **INDO-EUROPEAN** |
| • *"dekz" "ten" 255  |
| • *"'newp" "nine" 255  |
| • *"'newz" "new" 255  |
| • *"'wizq" ("twenty") 255  |

| **GREEK (including transcriptions of Egyptian words)** |
| • *"boteron/" "Bocchoris" 34  |
| • *"boteron/" "Bocchoris" 34  |
| • *"ei conj. "if" 270  |
| • *"Kchoaspa 27  |
| • *"Mekos" "Memphis" 57, 87, 259  |
"abnormal Hieratic" 22
absolute 55, 82, 84, 100
accent, see stress
accomplishment 76, 150
accusative 55, 65, 82-83, 259, 270
achievement 76, 150
active 63, 72, 83-88, 97-99, 186-88,
193, 199, 202, 204, 208, 253,
275-76
activity (verb of) 76, 150
adjunct, see sentence
active 54, 56-58, 68-70, 72, 76-
77, 88, 100, 103, 109, 113-16,
120, 125, 137, 145, 158, 178, 203,
219, 241, 252-54, 260, 262-63,
275
adjective or adjectival verb 65, 80,
83, 125-26, 260
adjectival clause, pattern, sentence 64,
80, 83-84, 103, 108, 112-22,
124-26, 128, 131, 135, 138, 140-
41, 150, 200, 206-7, 218, 226,
232, 258, 262, 264
adjectival construction, form, phrase
54, 57, 68, 86, 99, 103, 106, 113,
115, 118, 133, 158, 160, 204, 208,
219, 259
adjectival conversion, transposition
109, 112, 115, 117, 120, 136, 158,
202, 216-17, 219-20, 231, 233,
267
adjectival predicate 103, 112-18,
120, 122, 134, 137, 139, 200, 263
adverb 68-69, 93, 101-1, 122-24,
139, 144-45, 147-49, 161, 215
adverbial adjunct, modifier, phrase 9,
112, 122, 124, 127-28, 134, 144-
48, 155-59, 164, 167, 170-71,
176, 178, 181-84, 189, 192, 194-
97, 202, 213-14, 218, 226, 228,
234, 265
adverbial clause, pattern, sentence
64-67, 70, 80, 100-1, 110-12,
118, 122-27, 131, 138-39, 144-
82, 184, 186, 188-92, 194, 196-
202, 209, 214, 216, 218-22, 226,
228, 231-34, 253, 261, 269
adverbial conversion, subordination,
transposition (adverbalization) 9,
79, 91, 149-51, 154-57, 161,
178-80, 190, 195-96, 213, 215,
232-35, 264, 274-75
adverbial predicate 122, 124, 144,
172, 176, 269
Afroasiatic 1, 4-5, 12, 28-35, 37, 45,
51-58, 61, 63, 69, 71, 73, 79, 82,
92, 99, 115, 125, 244, 246, 249-
55, 268
agent 54, 63-64, 75, 83-84, 86, 97,
99, 107, 117, 134, 136, 184, 189,
206-8, 224, 253
agentivity 83, 258
agentless 204, 207-8
agreement 80-87, 113, 116, 118,
133, 156, 158, 160-61, 203, 205-
6, 267-68
Akhmimic 14, 25, 41, 47-50, 243,
247-49, 272, 278
Akkadian 2, 29, 31-32, 37-39, 51,
57-58, 63-66, 73, 79, 244-46,
254, 257, 259
Aktionsart
durative 76
punctual 76
allogenic 250
alphabet, alphabetic system 3, 7, 11-
16, 23-26, 28, 40, 42, 73
analytic (vs. synthetic) 5, 7, 51-57,
69, 90-92, 98, 193, 218-20, 224,
232-34, 273
anaphoric 68
See also mood
word edge 36
word order 5, 91, 261
writing 11–28, 30, 35, 38, 45, 49–50, 62, 71, 81, 88, 119, 177, 210, 242, 246, 253, 255, 261, 263

Young, Thomas 26