

Andréas Stauder

The Earlier Egyptian Passive:  
Voice and Perspective

# Lingua Aegyptia

## Studia Monographica

Herausgegeben von  
Frank Kammerzell, Gerald Moers und Kai Widmaier

Band 14

Institut für Archäologie  
Humboldt Universität  
Berlin

Widmaier Verlag  
Hamburg

Institut für Ägyptologie  
Universität Wien  
Wien

# The Earlier Egyptian Passive: Voice and Perspective

Andréas Stauder

Widmaier Verlag · Hamburg  
2014

Titelaufnahme:  
Andréas Stauder  
The Earlier Egyptian Passive: Voice and Perspective  
Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2014  
(Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica; Bd. 14)  
ISSN 0946-8641  
ISBN (PRINT) 978-3-943955-14-9  
ISBN (PDF) 978-3-943955-84-2  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37011/studmon.14>

© Andréas Stauder 2014  
This book is published by Widmaier Verlag, Hamburg,  
with open access at [www.widmaier-verlag.de](http://www.widmaier-verlag.de)



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.  
To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Druck und Verarbeitung: Hubert & Co., Göttingen  
Printed in Germany

[www.widmaier-verlag.de](http://www.widmaier-verlag.de)

*À Julie,  
en souvenir de nos années d'apprentissage  
et pour toutes celles qui ont suivi,*

*À Albane et à Isaure*



## *Acknowledgments*

The present study has its now far-away origin in a PhD thesis defended at the University of Basel on February 6, 2007, by the title ‘La détransitivité, voix et aspect. Le passif dans la diachronie égyptienne’. The thesis was directed by Antonio Loprieno, and the secondary advisor was Pascal Vernus.

Much subsequent work was done during a four-year research stay at the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations and the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (2008-2012). The research was completed at the University of Basel as a part of the project ‘The Old Egyptian Verb. Functions in Text’, also funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (2012-present).

I am especially grateful to Antonio Loprieno and Susanne Bickel for their unfailing support over this long period of time. Over the years, the research has benefited from discussions with colleagues and friends whom it is a pleasure to thank on this occasion, particularly James Allen, Mark Collier, Gene Gragg, Janet Johnson, Antonio Loprieno, Salikoko Mufwene, Wolfgang Schenkel, Anna Siewierska, Michael Silverstein, Julie Stauder-Porchet, Sami Uljas, Pascal Vernus, Jean Winand, and Christopher Woods.

I thank the editors for accepting the study in their series, and particularly Kai Widmaier for his patience and understanding. I remain indebted to Julianna Paksi and Katharina Vogt who read through the manuscript and established the index.

Little would have been possible without Julie. And thank you, Albane, Isaure, and Julie, for making life beautiful.

Basel, 8.4.2014





## Content overview

INTRODUCTION .....	1
PART I: PASSIVE MORPHOLOGY AND THE PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION .....	9
1 PASSIVE MORPHOLOGY .....	9
1.1 T-passives.....	9
1.2 V-passives .....	21
1.3 Passives associated with partial reduplication: <i>Sdmm=f</i> and <i>ddd</i> .....	44
1.4 Non-finite and originally non-finite passive formations.....	60
2 THE EARLIER EGYPTIAN PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION .....	71
2.1 The semantic condition for passivization in Earlier Egyptian .....	71
2.2 The Agent-expressing phrase.....	79
2.3 Semantically oriented constructions: <i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP</i> and <i>NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm</i> .....	108
2.4 Interim summary .....	127
2.5 Functions of the passive .....	131
2.6 The passive in interaction with transitivity alternations .....	167
2.7 Earlier Egyptian active impersonal constructions.....	183
2.8 The <i>smn sw<sub>O</sub></i> construction: Passive participles in a non-verbal construction .....	200
2.9 Part I, opening up: Earlier Egyptian and early Semitic detransitive morphology in contrast .....	208
PART II: VOICE, ASPECT, AND PERSPECTIVE .....	223
3 THE PASSIVE IN THE UNACCOMPLISHED AND IN THE FUTURE.....	223
3.1 Passive subjects in the unaccomplished.....	223
3.2 Active-passive counterpart relationships in the unaccomplished .....	227
3.3 Expressions of the passive in the future.....	230

4	THE PASSIVE IN THE ACCOMPLISHED .....	235
4.1	The complementary distribution $P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$ .....	235
4.2	V- and T-passives in the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction.....	250
4.3	Two inflectional passives in the accomplished.....	263
4.4	Setting the analysis into a broader context.....	318
4.5	Part II, opening up: Passive voice as an autonomous linguistic domain .....	343
	 PART III: THE LOSS OF INFLECTIONAL PASSIVES.....	349
5	THE RISE OF AN IMPERSONAL SUBJECT PRONOUN <i>.tw</i> OUT OF THE INFLECTIONAL MARKER OF VOICE {T} .....	349
5.1	Describing the change in the record.....	350
5.2	A rare instance of degrammaticalization.....	378
5.3	Analyzing the change in its intralinguistic context.....	384
5.4	Part III, opening up: A sketch of the longer Earlier Egyptian durée.....	403
	 APPENDIX .....	411
	Texts.....	413
	References.....	419
	Index locorum .....	439

## Contents

INTRODUCTION .....	1
Conventions and terminology .....	3
PART I: PASSIVE MORPHOLOGY AND THE PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION .....	9
1 PASSIVE MORPHOLOGY .....	9
1.1 T-passives .....	9
1.1.1 {t} and its allographs: <i>.t</i> , <i>.ti</i> , <i>.tw</i> , and <i>.tw</i> .....	10
1.1.2 T-passives as inflectional passives .....	16
1.1.3 The formation of T-passives .....	19
1.2 V-passives .....	21
1.2.1 One or two forms? .....	22
1.2.2 The loss of the prospective V-passive; prospective T-passives .....	26
1.2.2.1 Prospective V-passives in complement clauses outside Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts .....	27
1.2.2.2 Prospective T-passives in Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts .....	28
1.2.2.3 The prospective T-passive outside early funerary corpuses .....	29
1.2.3 The perfective V-passive with events yet to come .....	31
1.2.3.1 Extended uses of the perfective V-passive .....	31
1.2.3.2 Rare occurrences of the perfective V-passive with events yet to come in Pyramid Texts .....	33
1.2.4 What does the written mark <i>-w</i> stand for? .....	36
1.2.4.1 In the prospective V-passive in Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts .....	36
1.2.4.2 In the perfective V-passive in Coffin Texts .....	38
1.2.4.3 In the perfective V-passive outside early funerary corpuses .....	39
1.2.5 V-passive morphology .....	40
1.3 Passives associated with partial reduplication: <i>Sdmm=f</i> and <i>ddd</i> .....	44
1.3.1 Distributional restrictions .....	45
1.3.1.1 Inflectional classes .....	45
1.3.1.2 Tense-aspect .....	46
1.3.1.3 Distribution in the record .....	47

1.3.2 Interpretation: Partial reduplication as a morphologically conditioned process .....	50
1.3.2.1 The membra disiecta of a once more productive formation? .....	51
1.3.2.2 Previous accounts for the finite form: Reduplication more widespread in underlying forms? .....	51
1.3.2.3 A morphologically conditioned process .....	53
1.3.3 Specifying the scenario further .....	54
1.3.4 A typologically remarkable configuration .....	57
1.4 Non-finite and originally non-finite passive formations .....	60
1.4.1 Passive participles .....	60
1.4.2 Passively interpreted <i>s<sub>dm</sub>.t(i)=f(i)</i> and <i>s<sub>dm</sub>.t(i)</i> .....	62
1.4.3 Passive/passively interpreted <i>s<sub>dmt</sub>=f</i> .....	65
1.4.3.1 A morphologically distinct passive form of the <i>s<sub>dmt</sub>=f</i> ? .....	65
1.4.3.2 The <i>s<sub>dmt</sub>=f</i> : A synchronically finite category not patterning morphologically with other finite passives .....	68
2 THE EARLIER EGYPTIAN PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION .....	71
2.1 The semantic condition for passivization in Earlier Egyptian .....	71
2.1.1 Lack of semantic constraints on O .....	71
2.1.2 Passives from intransitives .....	73
2.1.3 Agentivity as a feature in text .....	77
2.2 The Agent-expressing phrase .....	79
2.2.1 <i>In N</i> and <i>m-<sup>c</sup> P</i> in the passive construction .....	79
2.2.1.1 Animacy .....	79
2.2.1.2 Pronominal Agents: The complementary distribution <i>in N ~ m-<sup>c</sup> P</i> .....	81
2.2.1.3 Secondary explicitation of the implied Agent .....	82
2.2.2 Expressions of agency and relation notions with other dynamic events oriented on a non-agentive participant: <i>M-<sup>c</sup></i> and <i>hr</i> .....	83
2.2.2.1 Dynamic events with a non-agentive subject: With an animate participant added in syntactic periphery .....	84
2.2.2.2 Dynamic events with a non-agentive subject: With an inanimate participant added in syntactic periphery .....	86
2.2.2.3 Existential constructions implying an event .....	89
2.2.2.4 Expressing the cause after all types of events .....	90
2.2.3 <i>M-<sup>c</sup></i> .....	91
2.2.4 <i>In</i> .....	95
2.2.4.1 A prepositional origin? .....	95
2.2.4.1.1 Written alternations <i>in ~ n</i> .....	95
2.2.4.1.2 Digression: <i>-n-</i> in the <i>s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f</i> .....	97

2.2.4.1.3	Against a prepositional origin of the Agent marker <i>in</i> ..	101
2.2.4.2	<i>In</i> originally an ergative morpheme? .....	102
2.2.4.3	A focal particle, originally a presentative/quotative index .....	105
2.3	Semantically oriented constructions: <i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP</i> and <i>NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm</i> .....	108
2.3.1	The pseudoparticiple .....	109
2.3.1.1	The pseudoparticiple in the passive construction: <i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP</i> .....	109
2.3.1.2	The pseudoparticiple: General background .....	110
2.3.1.3	The pseudoparticiple oriented on A .....	112
2.3.1.3.1	<i>Rh</i> and <i>hm</i> .....	112
2.3.1.3.2	In Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts: Low semantic transitivity .....	113
2.3.1.3.3	In Sixth Dynasty event biographies .....	114
2.3.1.3.4	In the Twelfth Dynasty: Textual revivals and indexical values .....	116
2.3.1.4	The semantic orientation of the pseudoparticiple .....	118
2.3.2	<i>NP r sdm</i> .....	119
2.3.3	Appendix: Nominal orientation, infinitives alternating with passives .....	122
2.4	Interim summary .....	127
2.4.1	The finite passive construction .....	128
2.4.1.1	The syntactically oriented passive construction .....	128
2.4.1.2	The semantically oriented passive construction .....	129
2.4.2	The non-finite passive construction .....	130
2.4.2.1	Pronominal O's .....	130
2.4.2.2	Passive participles from events that do not include an Agent in their semantic representation .....	132
2.5	Functions of the passive .....	133
2.5.1	Introduction .....	133
2.5.2	Passives from transitives .....	135
2.5.2.1	Agent backgrounding and discourse continuity .....	136
2.5.2.2	Passive zero-subject constructions .....	140
2.5.2.3	Active-passive alternations as a means of narrative texturing ....	148
2.5.2.3.1	The passive first .....	148
2.5.2.3.2	The passive second: <i>Sdm.n=f</i> – <i>V-passive</i> .....	149
2.5.2.4	With an expressed full noun Agent .....	153
2.5.2.5	With an expressed pronominal Agent .....	157
2.5.3	Passives from intransitives .....	158
2.5.3.1	Agent backgrounding and discourse continuity .....	159
2.5.3.2	The orientation on the event itself .....	161
2.5.3.3	Subjectless passives with an expressed Agent .....	166

2.6 The passive in interaction with transitivity alternations .....	167
2.6.1 The passive in interaction with transitivity alternations on the O .....	168
2.6.1.1 Passives from O-detransitivized transitives (/secondary intransitives) .....	168
2.6.1.2 The passive and the Mediate Construction of the O .....	173
2.6.2 Passives from S/O-ambitransitives .....	178
2.6.2.1 Ambitransitivity in Earlier Egyptian .....	178
2.6.2.2 Transitive alternants of ambitransitives in the passive .....	182
2.7 Earlier Egyptian active impersonal constructions .....	183
2.7.1 The Earlier Egyptian third person plural construction .....	185
2.7.1.1 The third person plural ↔ passive connection in Earlier Egyptian .....	185
2.7.1.2 Third person plural constructions with a non-anaphoric subject .....	187
2.7.2 Constructions with <i>s</i> ‘a man’ .....	189
2.7.2.1 In general .....	189
2.7.2.2 As a counterpart to the passive: Agents controlling anaphoric reference .....	190
2.7.3 Non-anaphoric zero-subject constructions .....	192
2.7.3.1 A brief note on active zero-subject constructions .....	192
2.7.3.2 A rare alternative to the passive: Unexpressed agentive participants in the <i>sdm.n(y)</i> construction .....	195
2.7.3.3 The counterpart of the passive with events that do not meet the semantic condition for passivization .....	198
2.8 The <i>smn sw<sub>O</sub></i> construction: Passive participles in a non-verbal construction ....	200
2.8.1 <i>Nfr sw</i> : Constructional semantics .....	201
2.8.2 <i>Nfr sw</i> not with adjectives: The active constructions <i>h<sup>c</sup> sw<sub>S</sub></i> , <i>rh sw<sub>A</sub></i> .....	202
2.8.3 <i>Nfr sw</i> with passives: The <i>smn sw<sub>O</sub></i> construction .....	205
2.9 Part I, opening up: Earlier Egyptian and early Semitic detransitive morphology in contrast .....	208
2.9.1 (Originally) perfective forms: Unmarked passive participles and the V-passive .....	208
2.9.1.1 Passive participles .....	208
2.9.1.2 The perfective V-passive .....	210
2.9.2 Earlier Egyptian and Semitic affixal detransitive morphology .....	212
2.9.2.1 The prefix <i>n-</i> .....	212
2.9.2.1.1 Morphological correlates .....	213
2.9.2.1.2 Semantics .....	214
2.9.2.1.3 The Semitic/Afroasiatic prefix <i>n-</i> .....	216
2.9.2.1.4 The Egyptian prefix <i>n-</i> in perspective .....	217

2.9.2.2 Earlier Egyptian T-passives and the Semitic T-stem .....	220
2.9.2.3 Earlier Egyptian and Semitic detransitive voice in contrast .....	221
 PART II: VOICE, ASPECT, AND PERSPECTIVE .....	223
3 THE PASSIVE IN THE UNACCOMPLISHED AND IN THE FUTURE.....	223
3.1 Passive subjects in the unaccomplished.....	223
3.1.1 $N(P) sdm=f - sdm.t NP$ .....	223
3.1.2 Marked-topic constructions in the passive .....	226
3.2 Active-passive counterpart relationships in the unaccomplished .....	227
3.3 Expressions of the passive in the future.....	230
4 THE PASSIVE IN THE ACCOMPLISHED .....	235
4.1 The complementary distribution $P_O PsP \sim V-pass non-P$ .....	235
4.1.1 $P_O PsP$ as integral to the accomplished passive paradigm.....	236
4.1.2 Non-pronominal O's: $N_O PsP \sim V-pass non-P$ .....	238
4.1.3 Dynamic events: $P_O PsP V-pass non-P$ .....	241
4.1.4 Exceptions: V-passives in lieu of an expected pseudoparticiple.....	246
4.1.5 The underlying functional basis .....	248
4.2 V- and T-passives in the accomplished 'emphatic' construction .....	250
4.2.1 $V-pass P$ (and $V-pass non-P$ in similar environments).....	250
4.2.2 Early occurrences of the $sdm.n.t=f$ in the 'emphatic' construction.....	259
4.2.3 The spread of the $sdm.n.t=f$ in the 'emphatic' construction.....	261
4.3 Two inflectional passives in the accomplished.....	263
4.3.1 Previous analyses of the $sdm.n.t=f$ .....	264
4.3.1.1 The nominal analysis.....	265
4.3.1.2 The 'abstract-relative' analysis .....	270
4.3.1.3 Contrasts in verbal morphology across the board? .....	272
4.3.2 The types of morphological contrasts associated with the 'emphatic' construction: Tense-aspect, voice, and subject affectedness.....	275
4.3.3 The semantics of the pseudoparticiple: A very brief background.....	279
4.3.3.1 Primary states, secondary states, dynamic events .....	280
4.3.3.2 Telicity, subject affectedness, and Endpoint orientation.....	281
4.3.3.3 With events oriented on an O.....	284
4.3.3.4 Semantic characteristics of the pseudoparticiple expressing dynamic events.....	287

4.3.4 The earlier situation: The pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive in contrast, resultative semantics and deviations from these.....	288
4.3.4.1 Semantic transitivity.....	288
4.3.4.1.1 Introduction .....	288
4.3.4.1.2 Semantic transitivity and accomplished passives outside the ‘emphatic’ construction.....	290
4.3.4.1.3 Semantic transitivity and the ‘emphatic’ construction .....	293
4.3.4.2 The Endpoint orientation of accomplished passives and deviations therefrom.....	294
4.3.4.3 Two equivalent accounts.....	295
4.3.5 The later situation: The <i>sdm.n.t=f</i> in contrast to the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive .....	297
4.3.5.1 The spread of T-passives in forms other than the <i>sdm.n.t=f</i> .....	297
4.3.5.1.1 The loss of the positive past tense <i>sdm.t=f</i> .....	298
4.3.5.1.2 Prospective V-passive → Prospective T-passive .....	300
4.3.5.1.3 Past tense <i>n V-pass</i> (/ <i>n sdm.t=f</i> ) → <i>n sdm.t=f</i> .....	301
4.3.5.2 The spread of the <i>sdm.n.t=f</i> in the negative unaccomplished ( <i>n sdm.n.t=f</i> ).....	304
4.3.5.2.1 <i>N V-pass</i> for the unaccomplished in earlier texts .....	304
4.3.5.2.2 The rise and spread of <i>n sdm.n.t=f</i> .....	307
4.3.5.3 V- and T-passives in contrast.....	308
4.3.5.4 The ‘perfective V-passive’ as a perfective passive .....	310
4.3.5.5 The spread of the <i>sdm.n.t=f</i> in the ‘emphatic’ construction among other processes of spread of T-passives over V-passives .....	314
4.3.5.5.1 The lower end of semantic transitivity .....	314
4.3.5.5.2 Subjectless passives: The orientation on the event itself .....	315
4.3.5.5.3 Two accomplished passives in contrast with one another .....	317
4.4 Setting the analysis into a broader context .....	318
4.4.1 Some additional notes on the Earlier Egyptian ‘emphatic’ construction .....	318
4.4.1.1 <sup>†</sup> <i>Iw V-pass P</i> ; <sup>†</sup> <i>iw sdm.n.t=f</i> ; <sup>†</sup> <i>iw ii.n=f</i> ; <sup>†</sup> <i>iw mrr=f</i> .....	319
4.4.1.1.1 Exceptions .....	319
4.4.1.1.2 <i>Iw</i> : A very brief note.....	322
4.4.1.2 Different origins of one higher-order construction: The accomplished and the unaccomplished ‘emphatic’ constructions .....	324
4.4.1.3 Formal contrasts in the ‘emphatic’ construction .....	330



4.4.2 Accomplished passives in other environments .....	334
4.4.2.1 <i>Pw</i> -markedthetic and topic-presentative constructions, <i>ir</i> -introduced conditional clauses, and clauses dependent on a noun .....	334
4.4.2.2 Accomplished passives after prepositions .....	335
4.4.2.2.1 <i>Preposition V-pass</i> .....	336
4.4.2.2.2 <i>Preposition sdm.n.t=f</i> .....	338
4.4.3 <i>V-pass</i> → <i>sdm.n.t=f</i> : Summary .....	339
4.4.3.1 Environments in which the change occurred .....	340
4.4.3.2 Environments to which the <i>sdm.n.t=f</i> did not spread .....	341
4.4.3.3 The diachronic reduction of the functional yield of the perfective <i>V-passive</i> .....	342
4.5 Part II, opening up: Passive voice as an autonomous linguistic domain .....	343
4.5.1 The non-prototypicality of passive subjects .....	343
4.5.2 Different resolutions of passive and active paradigms: Voice and tense-aspect .....	344
 PART III: THE LOSS OF INFLECTIONAL PASSIVES .....	349
 5 THE RISE OF AN IMPERSONAL SUBJECT PRONOUN <i>.tw</i> OUT OF THE INFLECTIONAL MARKER OF VOICE {T} .....	349
5.1 Describing the change in the record .....	350
5.1.1 <i>Tw</i> with events and constructions that fail to meet the semantic condition of passivization .....	350
5.1.1.1 <i>Tw</i> with dynamic events that lack an Agent in their semantic representation .....	350
5.1.1.2 <i>Tw</i> with non-dynamic events .....	351
5.1.1.3 Further semantic extensions: <i>Tw</i> with the pseudoparticiple and in situational predicate constructions .....	353
5.1.2 <i>Tw</i> with constituent status in preverbal position .....	354
5.1.2.1 <i>Wn.INFL.t hr sdm</i> .....	355
5.1.2.2 <i>(X).tw r sdm</i> .....	356
5.1.2.2.1 Early occurrences of <i>(X).tw r sdm</i> .....	356
5.1.2.2.2 <i>Tw r sdm</i> .....	358
5.1.2.3 <i>(X).tw hr sdm</i> not preceded by an inflected form of <i>wnn</i> .....	360
5.1.2.3.1 Early occurrences of <i>(X).tw hr sdm</i> .....	361
5.1.2.3.2 <i>Tw sdm</i> .....	363
5.1.2.4 Integration into the paradigm of the new subject pronoun: <i>Tw.tw</i> ..	365

5.1.3 Further diagnostics.....	367
5.1.3.1 {T} with the ‘narrative’ construction of the infinitive.....	367
5.1.3.2 Written expression of a referential content of {t}: <i>Tw<sup>PLUR</sup></i> .....	368
5.1.3.3 Regular doubling of {t}: <i>K3.t sdm.t=f</i> and <i>hr.t sdm.t=f</i> .....	369
5.1.3.4 Exceptional doubling of {t}.....	371
5.1.4 Constructions that are not, or only uncertainly, diagnostic of change.....	372
5.1.4.1 {T} with quotative expressions: <i>Hr.tw</i> , <i>k3.tw</i> .....	372
5.1.4.2 {T} with relative forms.....	373
5.1.4.3 {T} in control constructions.....	375
5.1.4.4 <i>Ib.tw r sdm</i> .....	377
5.2 A rare instance of degrammaticalization.....	378
5.3 Analyzing the change in its intralinguistic context.....	384
5.3.1 Introduction: Extension without prior reanalysis and historical contingency.....	384
5.3.2 Formal equivocation.....	387
5.3.3 Alternative construals of T-passives and discourse contexts favoring these.....	388
5.3.3.1 Different construals of the event.....	388
5.3.3.2 Imperfective environments.....	390
5.3.3.3 Passives from intransitives.....	393
5.3.4 The spread of Subject-Verb constructions.....	395
5.3.5 The circumstantial conditions and mechanisms of a rare change.....	399
5.3.5.1 The intralinguistic context of the change.....	399
5.3.5.2 The mechanisms of the change.....	401
5.4 Part III, opening up: A sketch of the longer Earlier Egyptian durée.....	403
APPENDIX.....	411
Texts.....	413
References.....	419
Index locorum.....	439

RIEN

(...)

N'AURA EU LIEU

(...)

QUE LE LIEU

(...)

EXCEPTÉ

(...)

PEUT-ÊTRE

(...)

Stéphane Mallarmé, *Un coup de Dés  
jamais n'abolira le Hasard*.

## INTRODUCTION

Although the two constructions may be viewed as equivalent in terms of the truth conditions they satisfy, the passive is not, linguistically, a mere pendant of the active. For example, the two clauses *Egyptian troops were building this enclosure* and *This enclosure was built (by Egyptian troops)* may refer to the same real-worldly state-of-affairs, yet an actual text selects the latter, not the former (Antefiker's *Girgawi Inscription*: §2.5.2.3.1, (ii)). To take another example, passives from intransitive verbs can serve to express that the perspective is on the event itself, rather than on the participants involved, with discourse-discontinuative effects. No similar expressive possibility is afforded in the active. Taking yet another example, Earlier Egyptian has only one form of the passive in the unaccomplished, standing against two forms in the active. Conversely, the accomplished has two inflectional passives standing against only one form in the active.

The passive presents an event under a perspective different from the active. In Earlier Egyptian, it differs from the active on all levels: the types of inflectional morphology, the passive construction and its functions in discourse, the complex relations of the passive with aspect (another phenomenon ultimately to do with perspective), and processes of linguistic change in part determined by the specific configuration of passive voice. At its most fundamental level, the present study

therefore engages how the Earlier Egyptian passive represents a relatively autonomous domain of linguistic function and form vis-à-vis the active.

The first chapter is devoted to inflectional passive morphology. Issues discussed include T-passive morphology as inflectional morphology, the number of morphologically distinct forms of the V-passive (*/sḏm(w)-passives/*) in different parts of the record, and the morphological contrast between these two main types of passive formation in Earlier Egyptian. The nature of passives associated with reduplication of the last root consonant (*sḏmm=f*, *ḏdd*) is addressed in turn, as are forms that either do not fall under any of the two main morphological types, or are unmarked for voice.

The second chapter concerns the passive construction, its linguistic form, its functions in text, and its interaction with other relevant phenomena of transitivity alternations. I first address the conditions under which an event can be made passive in Earlier Egyptian, the expression of the passive Agent and of related notions of agency, and the difference between syntactically and semantically oriented passive constructions (the latter including, for example, the pseudoparticiple used in the passive). I go on discussing the functions of the passive in text, with developments notably on zero-subject constructions of the passive and subjectless passives (that is, passives from intransitives). While zero-subject constructions occur in contexts of discourse continuity and represent a strategy of inter-clausal integration, subjectless passives often imply an orientation on the event itself, with discourse-discontinuative effects. Further topics addressed include the interaction of the passive with various types of transitivity alternations and the semantics of a non-verbal constructions with passive participles. Earlier Egyptian active impersonal constructions are discussed as providing either alternatives to, or standing in complementary distribution with, the passive—the latter in cases when the use of the passive is ruled out for syntactic or semantic reasons. I finally provide a summary overview of how Earlier Egyptian and Semitic voice constructions share much morphology, while associating this common formal inventory with significantly different functions intralinguistically.

In the second part of the study (chapters three and four), I address the interaction of voice and aspect, first in the unaccomplished, then in the considerably more complex domain of the accomplished. Passive subjects differ morphosyntactically from active ones in certain constructions, both in the unaccomplished and in the accomplished. In the unaccomplished, the passive has a lesser number of forms, and thereby a lesser semantic resolution, than the active. In the accomplished, the situation is reversed: the passive has a higher semantic resolution than the active, reflecting altogether different parameters. Future and modal passive events raise issues of their own.

Much attention is devoted to analyzing the functional contrast between the two inflectional passives of the accomplished in Earlier Egyptian (the perfective V-passive and the *sḏm.n.t=f*). Differing from the active, accomplished passives can have a strongly perfective profile of their own: in the passive, additional aspectual contrasts are at play in Earlier Egyptian. An important component of the problematic further resides with the diachronic processes by which in a great many environments, V-passives were superseded by T-passives during later Old Egyptian and earlier Middle

Egyptian. The discussion implies a re-evaluation of certain aspects of Earlier Egyptian morphosyntax, which is briefly outlined. I finally sketch how the higher semantic resolution of the passive over the active in the accomplished, and the higher semantic resolution of the active over the passive in the unaccomplished, reflect the fact that voice and aspect are both phenomena ultimately to do with the perspective under which events are viewed.

In the closing chapter, I discuss the remarkable diachronic process by which from the Twelfth Dynasty on, {t} is extended to environments in which it can not be analyzed as an inflectional marker of the passive anymore, leading to the rise of an active impersonal construction in Earlier Egyptian. The change, a rare instance of degrammaticalization, is described in the record in its various semantic and morpho-syntactic dimensions. It is then analyzed in relation to the highly particular conjunction of intralinguistic conditions and circumstances that made it possible. Some of these reflect the specifics of Earlier Egyptian voice as discussed in previous chapters, while others have to do with entirely unrelated processes of linguistic change that happened to be occurring at the same time.

## Conventions and terminology

Some terminology and a few sigla have proven useful. The latter only serve to provide a more synthetic expression than cumbersome paraphrases could: they do not imply any formalism in analysis itself. A summary of recurrent terms is given below, while various other technical terms are locally or contextually defined later on. Among the terms and concepts introduced below, most are redundantly defined over the course of the study, in order to keep for a continuous expository flow; the reader is therefore not assumed to have internalized these preliminary definitions. In a spirit of minimalism, definitions are kept as informal as is possible given the object of inquiry at hand. More elaborate and encompassing definitions can be found in linguistic studies that have scope over the phenomena in general, rather than over their manifestation in one particular language, here Earlier Egyptian.

### *Grammatical relations, grammatical roles, and semantic roles*

Following common descriptive practice, a distinction is made between grammatical relations, grammatical roles, and semantic roles:<sup>1</sup>

- **Grammatical relations** refer to the familiar notions of for example syntactic *subject* and *direct object*, as in traditional grammar.

---

1 For an introduction to grammatical relations, grammatical roles, and semantic roles, e.g. Palmer (1994); Lazard (1994); Dixon (1994: 6-8). The grammatical role here labeled 'O' is also found as 'P', for an equivalent definition. In the present study, 'P' is reserved to another use, for 'P(ronoun)'.

- **Grammatical roles** are defined as:

- **A**—the participant that is the syntactic subject of a transitive verb in an active clause;
- **S**—the participant that is the syntactic subject of an intransitive verb in an active clause;
- **O**—the participant that is the syntactic direct object of a transitive verb in an active clause.

Like grammatical relations, grammatical roles are thus defined on a strictly morphosyntactic level, without any reference being made to semantics. The utility of grammatical roles lies in describing phenomena of voice, alignment, and transitivity alternations.

*Voice*—The O of a transitive verb is syntactically the direct object in the active, but the subject in the passive.<sup>2</sup> The A of a transitive verb is the subject in the active, but remains unexpressed, or is expressed only in syntactic periphery, in the passive. The S of an intransitive verb is the subject in the active, but remains unexpressed, or is expressed only in syntactic periphery, in the passive.

*Alignment*—In ‘accusative’ alignment (as in English or Egyptian), the A and S are treated morphosyntactically in the same manner, as against the O; in ‘ergative’ alignment (as partly in Sumerian, more thoroughly in Hurrian, and in about a quarter of the world’s languages), the O and the S are treated morphosyntactically in the same manner, as against the A.

*Transitivity alternations*—For example *w<sup>c</sup>b* can occasionally be used transitively, as ‘purify, cleanse’: the participant ‘purified’, the O, undergoes a change-of-state, like the sole direct participant in the dynamic intransitive use of the same verb, a S: *w<sup>c</sup>b* is accordingly described as an O/S-ambitransitive (§2.6.2). Conversely, a transitive verb such as *iwr* ‘conceive’ can occasionally be used without an O: in this secondarily intransitive use of *iwr*, *iwr* is described as O-detransitivized (§2.6.1).

- **Semantic roles** (capitalized) refer to how a participant relates semantically to the event, to the role it fulfills with respect to that event. While semantic roles can in principle be differentiated almost infinitely, about ten or so have proven useful in actual linguistic description. Among these, two are mainly of interest in the present study (the Agent and the Patient), and a few more will occasionally be encountered:

- The **Agent** is the controlling and initiating participant who puts energy into a dynamic event;
- The **Patient** is the participant who registers a change of state-of-state—that is, is affected—as a result of a dynamic event;

---

2 In traditional grammar, the O is sometimes described as the ‘logical object’, yet there is nothing ‘illogical’ in the O being a subject, as is the case in the passive. While the passive is linguistically a marked construction (§2.5.1), it is not the ugly step-sister of the active, from which it differs in terms of the discourse conditions of use, of its internal organization, and of its relationships with aspect, thereby representing an autonomous domain of linguistic function.

- The **Experiencer** is a non-fully controlling participant, for example in an event of perception;
- The **Beneficiary** is the participant for whom an action is carried out. In many languages, including Earlier Egyptian, the Beneficiary is expressed formally like the Dative (*n NP*).
- The **Goal** is the Endpoint of an event of directed motion.

Semantic roles are dissociated from grammatical roles, despite prototypical correlations between the two. While the A of a transitive verb is typically an Agent (e.g. *sm3* ‘kill’), it can also be an Experiencer (e.g. *m33* ‘see’), and need not be any of these (e.g. *rh* ‘know’). While the O of a transitive verb is often a Patient (e.g. *sm3* ‘kill’), it just as often is not a Patient (e.g. *m33*: the participant ‘seen’ is not affected by the event; *rh*: the object ‘known’ is not affected by the event). These differences have morphosyntactic effects in Egyptian: for example, *rh* differs from most transitive verbs in being regularly used in an active construction in the pseudoparticiple, but not in a passive one (§2.3.1.3).

### Transitivity

Also following common practice, a distinction is made between syntactic and semantic transitivity.<sup>3</sup> **Syntactic transitivity**—which corresponds to ‘transitivity’ in traditional grammar—refers to the number of direct participants in the clause: two in the case of a syntactically transitive verb (e.g. *sm3* ‘kill’, *m33* ‘see’, *rh* ‘know’), one in the case of a syntactically intransitive one (e.g. *iwi* ‘come’). **Semantic transitivity** is defined as a bundle of properties that are observed to typically correlate with one another both in discourse and cross-linguistically. Several of these properties concern the event itself: an event scoring high in semantic transitivity is brought about by a fully controlling participant and bears on a participant referentially distinct from the first, who undergoes a change-of-state as a result of this event; the event is accordingly dynamic and implies a salient Endpoint. An event scoring high in semantic transitivity event thus has an Agent as its A, a Patient as its O, and is dynamic and telic. While syntactic transitivity is a polar category—an event is either syntactically transitive, or it is not—semantic transitivity is a scalar, or graded, category. For example, *sm3*, *m33*, and *rh* are all syntactically transitive; the first scores very high, the second lower, and the third very low, in semantic transitivity. Semantic transitivity is relevant to various issues in Earlier Egyptian grammar: §2.3.1.3.1-2; §2.3.4.1; §2.8.2; §4.3.3.2-3; §4.3.4.1; §4.3.4.3; §4.3.5.5.1.

**Detransitivity**<sup>4</sup> is a cover term referring to reductions in transitivity and/or to voice constructions other than the active. In the present study, it is occasionally used, mainly in two contexts: in relation to changes affecting {t}, to refer collectively to both the passive construction and the innovative active impersonal one; in relation to the Semitic background of Earlier Egyptian voice, to refer collectively to the passive

3 The seminal paper is Hopper & Thompson (1980); further references, §4, n.125.

4 Givón (2001<sup>2</sup>: II, 91-173).

and to other voice constructions such as the reflexive, the anticausative, and middle voice.

**O-detransitivization** (§2.6.1.1) refers to the phenomenon by which syntactically transitive verbs can be made intransitive by suppression of their O; thus, *iwr* ‘conceive (s.one)’, but also *iwr* ‘conceive’ (as a bare event, without reference to any specific participant being conceived). O-detransitivized verbs are effectively syntactically intransitive; they are here referred to as **secondary intransitives**, to distinguish them from **primary intransitives**, such as *iwi* ‘come’.

**Ambitransitivity**<sup>5</sup> refers to the phenomenon by which a verb can be used both intransitively or transitively. In addition to O-detransitivization, Earlier Egyptian ambitransitivity alternations mainly concern cases of verbs mostly used as intransitives, yet also occasionally as transitives (§2.6.2).

### *Tense and aspect*

The present author understands the primary contrast of tense-aspect in Earlier Egyptian to be between the **unaccomplished** and the **accomplished**, and thereby mainly one of relative tense. Internally to both the unaccomplished and the accomplished, the contrasts are aspectual in nature, differently so within either domain.<sup>6</sup>

The unaccomplished—which includes the *N(P) sdm=f*, *NP hr sdm*, and the *mrr=f* in the active—is the domain of relative present tense, that is, the domain of events that are partly simultaneous to some point of reference, be this the speech situation or be this some point of reference given in discourse. The accomplished—which in the active includes the *sdm.n=f* and *NP PsP* expressing a dynamic event—is the domain of relative past tense, that is, the domain of events that are anterior to some point of reference. In addition, the accomplished expresses that an event is completed, and thereby displays various effects of phasal aspect otherwise typical of perfectivity,<sup>7</sup> without, however, being itself a perfective aspect.

Internally to the unaccomplished, the contrast is aspectual, between *NP hr sdm*, a dedicated expression of **progressive** aspect (like for example English ‘continuous tenses’), and *N(P) sdm=f*, expressing the **unmarked unaccomplished**. Due to the existence of a dedicated progressive construction (*NP hr sdm*), *N(P) sdm=f* is most commonly used in text with events that support or invite a habitual or general reading, but the construction itself does not express habitual or general aspect (§3, n.4; §3.2.B). The *mrr=f*, for its part, often displays shades of meaning tightly related to **imperfective** aspect, but the form has also developed specialized uses that can only be described in relation to the constructions in which these occur; a description of the *mrr=f* as merely imperfective therefore fails to capture the complex functional profile of the form (§4.4.1.2.A-B). Internally to the accomplished, the contrast is also

5 The phenomenon is sometimes referred to as ‘verbal lability’ in other studies.

6 The primary and secondary division, and the associated labels, harken back to Vernus’ (e.g. 1986) ‘accompli’ and ‘inaccompli’, ‘extensif’ and ‘non-extensif’. For a presentation of tense-aspect in Earlier Egyptian slightly different from the one pursued here, Winand (2006).

7 Winand (2006: 194-262).



aspectual, if of an altogether different nature than in the unaccomplished. As already mentioned, the *sdm.n=f* is here understood to express an **unmarked accomplished**, not perfective aspect; this does not stand in contradiction with the fact that the form can display semantic effects otherwise found with perfective categories. The pseudo-participle, for its part, is a **resultative** category: as such, the form can only be used with certain types of events, and under strong semantic conditions (§2.3.1; §4.3.3). In highlighting the Endpoint of the event, and in correlating with high semantic transitivity, resultative aspect is tightly related to perfective aspect, of which it can be viewed as a subtype. The situation in the passive is different, because passive voice interacts with aspect, both domains having to do with perspective. In the accomplished in particular, the passive is semantically more complex than the active (§4). In the present study, the form referred to as **perfective V-passive** is labeled so to reflect an analysis as aspectually perfective (§4.3.5.3-5). Aspectually, the form has a more marked profile than both the *sdm.n=f*, a mere accomplished, and the *sdm.n.t=f*, a T-passive of the *sdm.n.t=f*, also a mere accomplished.

In non-finite forms (participles), unlike in finite ones, the primary contrast is aspectual. Active and passive forms based on the short written stem, *mr-*, are referred to as **unmarked participles**, both in a morphological sense and in an aspectual one. Active and passive forms based on the long written stem, *mrr-*, are morphologically marked and display semantics broadly to do with imperfectivity; these forms are accordingly referred to as **marked (/imperfective) participles**. (In the lack of any indication to the contrary, the contrast is assumed to carry over to inflectional classes in which no distinction is manifest in writing.)

## Sigla

**NP, N, P, non-P**—In several Earlier Egyptian constructions, the nature of the subject—a pronoun or a full noun—matters morphosyntactically. Whenever the case, this is signaled by the sigla ‘N’ for full noun, ‘P’ for pronoun, and ‘non-P’ for non-pronominal (that is, full noun, but also complement clause, or no subject at all (in subjectless constructions)). For example, ‘*P PsP*’ refers to the construction *subject – pseudoparticiple* with a pronominal subject specifically. When the nature of the subject is indifferent, no such indication is given: for example, ‘*sdm.n.t=f*’, the received label, implies that the subject could be of any sort; or, with a similar implication, ‘*V-pass*’. When ‘NP’ is written out, this means that the subject can be of any sort, and that this is worth signaling explicitly, for example ‘*m-ht V-pass NP*’.

**Subscript O, S, and A** additionally specify which grammatical role the subject of a construction fulfills. For example, ‘*P<sub>O</sub> PsP*’ refers to the construction *subject – pseudoparticiple* with a pronominal O as its subject.

~ stands for a complementary distribution. For example, ‘*P<sub>O</sub> PsP ~ V-pass non-P*’. (The grammatical role of the subject of the V-passive is not signaled, because this is necessarily either an O, or the construction is subjectless (in a passive of an intransitive).)

**Subscripts indices** (*i*, sometimes also *j*) in transcription indicate participants that have the same referent.

<sup>†</sup> stands for constructions that are ungrammatical, or attested only exceptionally. For example, <sup>†</sup>*iw sdm.n.t=f*, a construction that occurs only twice in the Earlier Egyptian record, both cases under highly specific conditions, and for which it can be demonstrated on additional grounds that this does not represent a regular construction in Earlier Egyptian.

### *Varia*

**Zero-subject** constructions (active and passive ones) are constructions in which a subject lacks a segmental representation, but remains present in the syntactic and semantic structure (§2.5.2.2; §2.7.3). **Subjectless** constructions (only in the passive in the present study) are constructions in which there is no subject in the first place: when an intransitive verb is made passive, there can be no subject, by definition (§2.5.3; §2.6.1).<sup>8</sup> Reflecting this distinction, a *ø* is set in transcription in the former type of constructions only.

The label '**emphatic construction**' is set in inverted commas throughout, to signal that this is a misnomer, kept only for historical reasons.<sup>9</sup> As I remain far from comprehending the functional profile of the construction, which is versatile, I often opt for a neutral, or direct, rendering in translation, unless a narrow-focus interpretation is evident on co(n)textual grounds.

The term **construction** is used broadly, to denote any conventional mapping of linguistic form and function.

The notions of **Endpoint** and of **orientation**, which play key roles in the analyses to follow, are gradually elaborated, and thereby defined, over the course of the study.

<sup>8</sup> Also e.g. Keenan & Dryer (2006: 345-8).

<sup>9</sup> The term goes back to the Berlin School 'emphatisch', with a significantly different extension, e.g. Polotsky (1965: 77 [7] n.16).

## PART I:

### PASSIVE MORPHOLOGY AND THE PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION

## 1 Passive morphology

Earlier Egyptian has two main formations of inflectional passives. One is marked by a morpheme {t} placed after any inflectional marks of tense-aspect-mood (stem alternations and/or affixes) a form may include—henceforth ‘T-passives’ (§1.1). The other formation is mostly indistinctive in written form and is marked by a stem alternation of some sort, excluding other inflectional marks except possibly one—henceforth ‘V-passives’ (§1.2). (The here used label ‘V-passives’, as against more traditional ‘*sdm(w)*-passives’ or ‘*w*-passives’, reflects the fact that in most cases when a written ending *-w* is associated with a V-passive, this does not represent passive morphology but something else: §1.2.4; for the prefix ‘V-’, §1.2.5.)

In addition, a third type of passive formation is commonly recognized in forms that display reduplication of the last root consonant (*s<sub>d</sub>mm=f* and the participle *ddd*); as to be seen, these do not constitute an autonomous type of inflectional passive formation on a par with the two main types, T- and V-passives (§1.3). Non-finite forms, and more marginal finite forms that seem to have had their origin in non-finite ones, are briefly evoked in turn (§1.4).

### 1.1 T-passives

T-passives—e.g. *s<sub>d</sub>m.t=f*, *mrr.t=f*, *s<sub>d</sub>m.n.t=f*—are marked by a morpheme surfacing in written form as *.t* (with the allographs *.ti*, *.tw*, and *.tw*: §1.1.1). It has been challenged that T-passives are genuine inflectional passives on a par with V-passives, synchronically and/or historically: some discussion of the morphological status of these forms is therefore required (§1.1.2). The formation of T-passives is discussed in turn (§1.1.3).

### 1.1.1 {t} and its allographs: .t, .ti, .tw, and .tw

A. In the Old Kingdom and early Middle Kingdom, the written mark of T-passives is overwhelmingly .t. The long spelling .tw becomes increasingly common from the late Middle Kingdom on. In some additional details:

#### (a) Old Kingdom

- In all types of texts other than Pyramid Texts, exclusively .t;
- In Pyramid Texts<sup>1</sup> mostly .t; a less common variant is .ti (ca. 25% of occurrences);<sup>2</sup> a singular spelling as .ṭ is possibly an artifact of textual history;<sup>3</sup>

#### (b) First Intermediate Period and early Middle Kingdom

- Only .t in many texts; in all texts most commonly .t;
- In inscriptional texts,<sup>4</sup> the spelling .tw occurs sporadically, first in broadly southern texts:
  - In the First Intermediate Period only in Mo<sup>c</sup>alla (I.β.4); as .tw in II.θ.2 (below, (l));
  - In the early Middle Kingdom in *Heqaib*, Stela #9, x+22 (h); in Hammamat 19, 11 (e); 114, 16; as .tw in *Heqaib*, Stela #10, x+16 (f); Wadi el-Hudi 10, 2 (m);
  - Even in texts that have .tw (or .tw), .t remains the more common spelling;
- In the Heqanakht letters,<sup>5</sup> .tw occurs a few times: II, ro 27 (f); II, ro 31 (f); II, vso 1 (h); .t remains relatively more common;
- In Coffin Texts, both .t and .tw are found, as well as .tw (selective illustration: (i)-(j)); no data on relative frequencies or distribution are currently available;
- Post-Pyramid Text occurrences of .ti are altogether exceptional:<sup>6</sup> *Chapelle Blanche* n°82, 2 (fragm.); n°180, 2-3 (below, F), n°245, 2 (§1.1.5, (ii)); and *Urk.* VII 48, 15 (Djehutihotep);

1 Allen (1984: §538); Kammerzell (1999: 112-3).

2 .ti is mostly realized as <U33>; less commonly as <U33-ṭ>; uniquely as <ṭ-U33> (Pyr. 1041c<sup>N</sup> (PT 486)) and as <ṭ-U33-i> (Pyr. 23b<sup>W</sup> (PT 32)).

3 Pyr. 820e<sup>N</sup> (PT 442) *ms.t N m dw3t hn<sup>c</sup> s3h* ‘N was born in the Duat with Orion.’ P and M read actively, *ms tw dw3t hn<sup>c</sup> s3h* ‘May the Duat give you birth with Orion.’

4 Data in large part from Díaz Hernández (2013: 86-7).

5 Allen (2002: 87, 288).

6 Among candidates that have been proposed, I read *irw.ti* in CT I 286b-d T2c and *ir.ti* in *Stèle Juridique* 5 not as T-passives (thus Reintges 1997: 271-2) but as a *sdm.ti* participle (§1.4.2, (ii)) and as a pseudoparticiple dependent on *t3y=i i3t* (...), respectively. Various instances of relative forms with a written .ti are best accounted for in relation to phonological and/or prosodic processes occurring in the chain (Borghouts 2010: II, §79.d, (i), (ii), and NB.3). Emhab 6, read as *dd.n.ti* by Černý (1969: 90, n.g) and Helck (1983<sup>2</sup>: 98), is to be segmented differently (Klotz 2010: 224-8).

(c) *From the later Twelfth Dynasty on*

- Over time, *.tw* becomes increasingly common; in the Second Intermediate Period and the early New Kingdom, it has become dominant; in inscriptionally published texts, the variant *.tw* is occasionally found (below, E);
- In literary manuscripts from the mid-/late Twelfth Dynasty, both *.t* and *.tw* are found, in different relative frequencies depending on individual manuscripts;<sup>7</sup> in Eighteenth Dynasty literary manuscripts, *.tw* has become dominant.

B. It has been suggested that the allographs of the T-passive would in some cases display different distributional properties, thus supporting an analysis by which they would stand for genuine allomorphs.<sup>8</sup> Only *.t*, *.tw*, and *.tw*, but not *.ti*, are thus found in constructions in which the morpheme has full constituent status in preverbal position (e.g. *iw.tw r sdm*, with *.tw* the subject in an ‘active impersonal’ construction). However, these constructions begun to emerge only from the Twelfth Dynasty on (§5); they are entirely absent from Pyramid Texts, the only group of texts in which *.ti* is found on a more than exceptional basis. Accordingly, the lack of occurrence of *.ti* in the same constructions is only expected.

As regards the relatively higher proportion of *.tw* vs *.t* in the same constructions, this is similarly accounted for in relation to time: the constructions became more common only in periods from the late Twelfth Dynasty on, first in documentary registers, that is, in places in which the allograph *.tw* was more generally spreading over *.t* in all positions alike, including in its regular and erstwhile exclusive inflectional position (e.g. *sdm.t=f*). Significantly, very early occurrences of the constructions with preverbal {t} have the short allograph alongside the long one (d); the two allographs also occur alongside one another in the same text (e), directly contradicting an allomorphic analysis of the allographs of {t} on this level as well:

(d) Antefiqer’s *Girgawi Inscription* 6 (RILN 73; temp. Amenemhat I) *wn.t hr kd hnrt pn* (...) ‘While this enclosure was being built (...)’; P. UC 32036 (Kahun Veterinary Papyrus), 21-22 *wn.hr.t hr ntš=f* (...) ‘It is to be continuously sprinkled (...)’;

alongside *Eloquent Peasant* B1 115 *wn.in.tw hr rdt* (...) ‘Then one began giving him (...)’;

(e) Hammamat 19 (Meri; temp. Amenemhat III), 3 *wn.in{.n}<.t><sup>9</sup> hr hd inrw* (...) ‘Then one began breaking the stones (...)’;

alongside 11 (...) *wn.in.tw hr sfn n3 n mnw* (...) ‘(...) and (the way for) these blocks was made smooth (...)’.

It has further been observed that *.ti* does not occur in *iw*-headed clauses. This is only because T-passives in *iw*-headed clauses are themselves not documented in Pyramid

7 Provisionally Díaz Hernández (2013: 87); Roccati (1964).

8 Reintges (1997: 273-8).

9 Emendation after Schenkel (in press: §3.5).

Texts: given their contents and expression, these texts do not include passive events with a general/habitual interpretation (the (*iw*) *sdm.t NP* construction: §3.1.1).

C. It has also been proposed that the change from *.ti* (occasionally in Pyramid Texts) to *.tw* (increasingly during later Middle Egyptian times) should be viewed as an instance of a broader ‘sound change’ *\*/i/ > \*/u/*.<sup>10</sup> In other words, the long spellings *.ti* and *.tw* would be indicative of two allomorphs of the morpheme {t}, diachronically distributed (*\*/ti/ > \*/tu/*). This hypothesis is not supported by independent evidence: it entirely relies on an interpretation of allographic variation as projecting onto morphology directly and in a one-to-one way.<sup>11</sup> I propose an alternative interpretation in terms of changed conventions of written representation. Beginning with later times, the by then increasingly common allomorph *.tw* is best interpreted as a digraph, signaling that the passive morpheme was meant (as opposed to other elements of grammatical morphology) and/or that the dental *\*/t/* was kept in speech (as differing from e.g. the feminine ending *.t*, *\*/-vt/ > \*/-v/*).<sup>12</sup> In earlier times, the marker of the T-passive is mostly written *.t*: this suggests an interpretation of the marker as *\*/-t(v)-/*, with *.ti* (occasionally in Pyramid Texts) and *.tw* (sporadically from later times on) being different conventions for the optional representation of what was probably the same vowel all along.<sup>13</sup> The marker of the T-passive is therefore reconstructed as {t}, realized as *\*/-t(v)-/* in actual forms.

NB. A very similar constellation of allographic alternations is observed in an entirely unrelated morphological category, the pseudoparticiple. In earlier texts, the ending of the first person singular is most commonly written *.k*: the short allograph is the one used exclusively in the Old Kingdom outside Pyramid Texts; in Pyramid Texts themselves, *.k* is the most common allograph and *.ki* only an occasional variant.<sup>14</sup> In earlier post-Old Kingdom times, *.k* is still the common allograph; the innovative *.kw* is attested from the First Intermediate Period on, first in southern texts.<sup>15</sup> The long allograph was to become common and ultimately dominant over time, in literary and non-literary texts alike.<sup>16</sup> Allographic alternations of the first person singular ending of the pseudoparticiple thereby compare in every detail, synchronic and diachronic, with allographic alternations of the marker of the T-passive. As has been recently argued, the first person singular ending of the pseudoparticiple was probably *\*/-kv/*

10 E.g. Edel (1955-1964: §142). In this tradition, and with further elaboration, Reintges (1997: 268-73; with the additional proposal that the allograph *.tw* should be analyzed as implying a palatalized realization of the morpheme).

11 For a more general criticism of the alleged ‘sound change’ *\*/i/ > \*/u/* in various inflectional categories, Peust (1999: §3.1.3.2).

12 More generally on ‘rules of grapho-phonemic correspondences’ as changing over time during Earlier Egyptian, Kammerzell (1999).

13 With a view on the changing written representation of the inflectional marker in another form, the *sdm.t(i)=f(i)*, Schenkel (2000b: 110; 2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.5.1.c, obs.1).

14 E.g. Edel (1955-1964: §573).

15 Díaz Hernández (2013: 103, 105, 106); Allen (2002: 87).

16 For the former, Díaz Hernández (2013: 110).

(whether the vowel was long or not is unclear),<sup>17</sup> an interpretation that also falls in line with comparative evidence (the ending of the Semitic cognate is \*/-(a:)ku/).

D. While not affecting the strictly allographic analysis of the alternations between *.t*, *.ti*, *.tw*, and *.tw* here presented, a series of additional observations can be made. The innovative allograph *.tw* displays a certain tendency to be associated with subjectless passives (f). However, the short allograph *.t* is by no means excluded from subjectless passives either, including in the same texts (g). Moreover, the long spelling *.tw* can also be found with passives derived from transitives (h). E.g.:

(f) *Subjectless passives in .tw*

- Mo<sup>c</sup>alla I.β.4 *hr.tw* ‘so one says’ (§5.1.4.1, (i)); II.θ.2 *n pr.n.tw* ‘there was no going out’; Heqanakht II, ro 31 *š3<sup>c</sup>.tw* ‘one should begin’ (§5.3.3.3, (e)); II, ro 27 *dd.tw hkr* ‘one should say “hunger”’; *Heqaib*, Stela #10, 16 *hnn.tw m imw=f* ‘who were conveyed in his boat’;

(g) *Subjectless passives in .t*

- Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.β.2 *hnd.t* ‘one treads’; II.η.2 *n pr.n.t* (in the formulation parallel to II.θ.2 *n pr.n.tw*: below, (l));

(h) *Passives from transitives, in .t and in .tw*

- Mo<sup>c</sup>alla III.1 *sh.t hpš=f* ‘His arm will be cut off’ (§1.2.2.3, (i));  
alongside *Heqaib*, Stela #9, 22 *sh.tw hpš=f* ‘His arm will be cut off’;  
- Heqanakht II, vso 2 *im grt sk3.t n=n* (...) ‘Now have cultivated for us (...)’  
alongside Heqanakht II, vso 1 *rd.n=i in.tw n=tn* (...) ‘I had (...) brought to you (...)’.

As already discussed, a similar allographic alternation is encountered in early instances of constructions in which the morpheme has full constituent status in preverbal position (above, B). More generally, no reason can be detected for the alternation *.t* ~ *.tw* in the texts in which the latter first occurs.

E. In Coffin Texts, *.tw* is observed to alternate with *.tw* and *.t* in different witnesses of the same passage (i); the three allographs are also observed to alternate in sequence within one witness, here with events that all have the same subject (j). E.g.:

(i) *.tw* ~ *.tw* ~ *.t* in different witnesses of the same passage

CT I 397b *3m.n.tw* (B1C, B1P), *3m.n.t* (B2L), *3mm.n.t* (B1Bo);

CT I 398b *s3.n.tw* (B1C, B2L; B1P), *s3.n.t* (T3C, B1Bo);

CT II 302/303d *ts.n.t* (most witnesses), *ts.n.tw* (B2Bo, B4Lb, B1C, S1Ta<sup>3</sup>), *ts.n.tw* (B2P, B17C);

17 Schenkel (2009b: 273-4); Allen (2013a: 67); Werning (forthc.).

(j) *.tw ~ .tw ~ .t in sequence in the same witness*

CT I 397b-398b B2L: *ndr.tw b3=i, 3m.n.t b3=i, s3.n.tw b3=i*.

These alternations thereby appear to be unconditioned.

In Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom inscriptions, spellings with the allograph *.tw* are not uncommon. E.g.:

(k) *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep 9 *ḳrs.tw* (§1.1.5, (iv)); Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela* 16 *iw.in.tw*; 35 *rd.n.tw*; *Stèle Juridique* 10 *sḏm.tw*; *Urk.* IV 3, 14 *smi=t(w)*; *Urk.* IV 365, 11 *ir.n.tw*; *Urk.* IV 684, 16 *ir.in.tw*.

In a time when the distinction between the phonemes represented by *t̲* and *t* had been lost, such spellings fit with other instances of hypercorrect *t̲* for *t* in the same types of texts:<sup>18</sup> this demonstrates that the alternation *.tw ~ .tw* is purely graphic, not allomorphic.<sup>19</sup> In addition, these alternations *t̲ ~ t*—of which the allographic alternation *.tw ~ .tw* (*/.t*) of the marker of the T-passive is part—can be an element of a deliberate linguistic dissimilation in the same texts; thus in two versions of one text published on the two sides of the same stela,<sup>20</sup> in parallelism within one formulation,<sup>21</sup> or within the same phrase.<sup>22</sup> The phenomenon is more general in these texts, extending beyond the written level for example to demonstratives.<sup>23</sup>

NB. A good illustration of how the allographic alternation *.tw ~ .tw* (*/.t*) specifically can be a fully deliberate strategy of linguistic dissimilation is provided by Mo<sup>c</sup>alla, Inscription #7. In this, the identical formulations in II.η.2 and II.θ.2 resonate with one another as one among several elements of a phraseological and graphic dissimilation between the two more broadly balanced constituent parts of the inscription:

(l) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.ζ.2 - II.θ.2 (Inscription #7)

Part A:

*iw(=i) ḥd.k m d3mw(=i) n mḥ-ib nḥt mni.n(=i) n imntt (...)*  
*d3mw(=i) n mḥ-ib ḥr wh3 ḥ3 ḥt (...)*  
*n pr.n.t n snd=f*

18 Thus 'genitival' *nt̲* for *nt* (e.g. Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree* 5-6, twice); *nbt̲* for *nbt* 'all' (e.g. conspicuously in Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy*: *Urk.* IV 19, 3; 19, 11; 20, 17; 21, 3; 21, 5); demonstrative *tn̲* for *tn* (e.g. *Urk.* IV 164, 2; 218, 17; 648, 12); with the *-t* ending of the infinitive (e.g. Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* ro 16 *tst̲*); with the object pronoun *st̲* (e.g. *Urk.* IV 658, 7 r *tbt̲ st̲*); in the new subject pronoun (Tija's Sehel Graffito 7 *tw=i*; reading disputed by Oréal 2011: 249).

19 Contra Reintges (1997: 270-1) who interprets the allograph *.tw* as pointing to genuine allomorphy, with a palatalized realization of the morpheme.

20 E.g. Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* vso 10 *nbt̲*, ro 8 *nbt̲*; ro 16 *tst̲*, vso 19 *tst̲*.

21 E.g. *Chapelle Rouge* V.6 ḳ3 *ir=t̲* (...) *ḥt̲ ir=t̲* (...); in Thutmosis III's *Annals*, *Urk.* IV 658, 4 *itḥ=tw st m tbt̲*; 658, 7 r *tbt̲ st̲*.

22 E.g. *Urk.* IV 165, 9 [*mdt̲*] *tn dddt ḥr=n*.

23 In details, Stauder (2013a: 114, 312-3); Verns (1996, particularly 164).



‘I sailed downstream with my trusted and victorious troops and I moored to the west of (...)  
My trusted troops were looking for engagement across (...)  
There was no going out for fear of them.’

Part B:

*iw(=i) ḥd.k mni.n=i m i3btt (...)*  
*iw<sup>sic</sup> d3mw(=i) pn<sup>sic</sup> n mh-ib ḥprw m wh3wt ḥt (...)* *hr wh3 ʿh3*  
*n pr.n.tw n snd=f.*

‘I sailed downstream and I moored to the east of (...)  
These trusted troops of mine became scoots across (...) looking for engagement.  
There was no going out for fear of them.’

An altogether different situation is afforded by cases of the allograph *tw* in innovative constructions where the allograph serves to signal that the morpheme it represents has full constituent status:

(m) *After a ‘narrative’ construction of the infinitive (§5.1.3.1)*

- Wadi el-Hudi 10, 2 *pṛt tw<sup>PLUR</sup>* (...) ‘Going out (...) one did (...)’;
- Iykhernefret (CG 20140) b.1-2 *sʿhʿ tw wd pn* (...) ‘Erecting this stela one did (...)’;

(n) *In the preverbal subject slot of a construction (X.)tw r sdm (§5.1.2.2), with tw separated from the predicate by the quantifier nb*

- *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep 5-6 (...) *nty tw nb r gmt=f* (...) ‘(...) anyone who will be found (...)’.

As to be discussed below, the texts in (m) reflect registers that are non-standard in other respects as well; in the first example quoted, the semographic complementation by the plural strokes is also significant of such (§5.1.3.2).

F. Occurrences of the allograph *.ti* outside Pyramid Texts are altogether exceptional: occurrences have been noted only in two places, *Chapelle Blanche* (n°82, 2; n°180, 2-3, n°245, 2) and Djehutihotep (*Urk.* VII 48, 15). In both these texts, they align with archaizing tendencies observed on other levels as well. In *Chapelle Blanche*, tokens of these include instances of the Old Egyptian subject pronouns *tw*/*sw*t (n°170; 253; 259)<sup>24</sup> and, in immediate collocation to *mrrt.ti* itself, an occurrence of the old demonstrative in *-w*, in a hypercorrect spelling: n°180, 2-3 *rd.n(=i) n=k ʿnh dd w3s nb r šrt=k tw<sup>sic</sup> nfrt mrrt.ti ʿnh=s dt* ‘I have given you every life, stability, and force to this your beautiful nostril of which one desires that it lives forever.’ In Djehutihotep, the conservative orthography of the text has been noted and it has been suggested that an Old Kingdom tradition is indexed by *.ti*;<sup>25</sup> remarkably, the spelling is <*t-i*>—not <U33> (and variants) as in Pyramid Texts—thus evoking an older tradition without

24 For the highly restricted distribution of these in Middle Egyptian, Stauder (2013a: 485-6); add Moʿalla IV.24.

25 Díaz Hernández (2013: 86-7).

directly reproducing it. This interpretation finds some additional support in the grammatical construction in *Urk.* VII 47, 14.<sup>26</sup> In the broader context of the tomb, the reference to the Old Kingdom extends to iconographic details.<sup>27</sup>

### 1.1.2 T-passives as inflectional passives

Various analyses of T-passives have been proposed, some implying that these are not inflectional passives at all. These proposals fall in broadly three types, of which (a) and (b) are mere variants of one another as far as the syntactic aspects are concerned.<sup>28</sup>

(a) *.t* is viewed as having its origin in a noun ‘person’ functioning as the subject of an active form; the suffix pronoun in e.g. *sdm.t=f* is viewed as the syntactic object of an active impersonal construction;<sup>29</sup>

(b) *.t* is viewed—diachronically and/or synchronically depending on authors—as an impersonal subject pronoun (like e.g. German *man*) functioning as the subject of an active form; the suffix pronoun in e.g. *sdm.t=f* is viewed as the syntactic object of an active impersonal construction;<sup>30</sup>

(c) *.t* is viewed as an inflectional marker of the passive, on a par with other inflectional marks such as e.g. *-n-* in the *sdm.n=f*; the suffix pronoun in e.g. *sdm.t=f* is viewed as the syntactic subject of a passive construction.<sup>31</sup>

Views (a) and (b) are presented by their authors to find support on three levels:

- Constructions in which *.t* is used as an impersonal subject pronoun (e.g. *wn.in.t hr sdm*);
- T-passives derived from intransitives, which result in subjectless constructions often to be translated as active impersonal ones in Egyptological languages;
- The morphology of T-passives, which can be segmented into an active stem to which {t} is appended (e.g. *sdm.n.t-* as active *sdm.n* + {t}).

Yet, these views are untenable for a variety of reasons, most of which would be sufficient alone to rule them out.<sup>32</sup>

A. When pronominal and singular, the O—the argument that would have been the direct object in the active—is coded as a suffix pronoun in the *sdm.t=f* (/mrr.t=f,

<sup>26</sup> Stauder (2014a: §3.2).

<sup>27</sup> Pieke (forthc.).

<sup>28</sup> For a fuller overview of various positions, Reintges (1996: 81).

<sup>29</sup> E.g. Westendorf (1953: 79-83); Díaz Hernández (2013: 82-5).

<sup>30</sup> E.g. Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §47); Edel (1955-1964: §462); Barta (1995); Brose (2014: 58; an ‘impersonal pronoun’ only originally).

<sup>31</sup> Most decisively Reintges (1997: 145-9; 1996); similarly e.g. Uljas (2007a: 178, n.17); Vernus (1998); Loprieno (1995: 84).

<sup>32</sup> Similarly Reintges (1996), with some of the same arguments presented below.

*sdm.n.t=f*, etc.). An apparent exception is only *Urk. IV 658, 4 (...)* *ith.tw st m tbtb* ‘so that they could be drawn up with an effort’; in the context of Thutmosis III’s *Annals*, *st* can easily be accounted for as a spelling of *sn*.

In Earlier Egyptian, the *O* in postverbal position can be realized as a suffix pronoun only in the analytic patterns of the Subject-Verb conjugation (*NP hr/r sdm*): in these, the lexical verb is in the infinitive and the syntax of the *O* is accordingly infinitival itself. In the context of the Verb-Subject conjugation—to which a form such as *sdm.t=f* belongs regardless of how it is analyzed—suffix pronouns always and exclusively code syntactic subjects. Under an active impersonal analysis of e.g. the *sdm.t=f*, the construction would therefore have two syntactic subjects: the active impersonal subject, *.t*, and *=f*, yet another subject. Put in slightly more technical terms, an active impersonal analysis conflicts with the overt coding properties of grammatical relations in Earlier Egyptian.

B. When expressed, the Agent of e.g. the *sdm.t=f* (*/mrr.t=f, sdm.n.t=f*, etc.) is introduced by *in*. Under an active impersonal analysis of these constructions (in which the Agent is already represented in subject position by *.t*), it is then assumed that *in* introduces a syntactically ‘epexegetic’ expression co-indexed with the clausal subject, analyzed to be *.t*.<sup>33</sup> However, *in* can serve to specify the reference of a subject expression only in highly specific constructions. It regularly does so in quotative constructions only;<sup>34</sup> these have a specific syntax in other respects as well. Exceptionally, *in* can also secondarily specify the reference of a cataphoric subject pronoun (§2.2.4.3, (iv)-(v)); these constructions remain exceedingly rare. In the *sdm.t=f* (*/mrr.t=f, sdm.n.t=f*, etc.), by contrast, the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase is common in text and fully regular in grammar.

Directly significant are also the innovative constructions such as *wn.in.t hr sdm*—i.e. in the constructions in which *.t* does serve as an impersonal subject of a syntactically active construction. In these, the *in N* phrase does as a rule not occur: in particular, it never occurs in any pre-Eighteenth Dynasty text. In other words, the constructions which do have the active impersonal syntax hypothesized by views (a) and (b) for the *sdm.t=f* (*/mrr.t=f, sdm.n.t=f*, etc.) do not co-occur with the *in N* phrase, in contrast with the *sdm.t=f* (*/mrr.t=f, sdm.n.t=f*, etc.) which co-occurs with the *in N* phrase regularly. This directly demonstrates that the *sdm.t=f* (*/mrr.t=f, sdm.n.t=f*, etc.) can not be active impersonal in syntax.

NB. As observed, constructions in which *.t* serves as an impersonal subject never co-occur with the *in N* phrase in any pre-New Kingdom text. Only two instances are found in the Eighteenth Dynasty:

(i) *Ptahhotep 72 L2*

*tw r wḥḥ=f in sdm.yw*

‘He will be disapproved of by the hearers.’

33 Westendorf (1953: 151-2); Díaz Hernández (2013: 84).

34 Güldemann (in press); Allen (1984: §204-10); Edel (1955-1964: §747-8); Faulkner (1935).

(ii) *Urk.* IV 1281, 14-15 (Amenhotep II's *Sphinx Stela*)

*tw sdm.tw m pr-nsu in it hr k3-nht h<sup>c</sup>-m-w3st*

‘There was hearing in the palace by the father, Horus, the victorious bull, Khaemwaset.’

The first is a secondary reading: the Middle Kingdom version P has *wr w3 in sdm.yw* ‘Great will be the disapproval by the judges.’ While the beginning of the clause was made into a morphologically more explicit expression of detransitive voice (*wr w3* → *tw r w3=f*), the remainder of the clause was kept as it stood.<sup>35</sup> The unexpected co-occurrence of a construction with preverbal *.tw* with a *in N* phrase is thereby the result of a process of partial textual alteration. The hybridity of the syntax of *Ptahhotep* 72 L2 can also be seen on other levels, such as the initiality of *tw* in the clause: bare initial *tw*’s occur only under well-principled macrosyntactic conditions (§5.1.2.2.2; also §5.1.2.3.2) which are not met in the present passage.

While not the result of a process of textual alteration, (ii) is similarly hybrid in syntax. Like in *Ptahhotep* 72 L2, the first *tw* does not fulfill the macro-syntactic conditions licensing bare initial *tw*’s. Moreover, the doubling of the morpheme does not occur in one of the constructions in which this is regularly licensed (§5.1.3.3). This demonstrates the contorted nature of the construction, beyond what grammar licenses on any of the levels evoked; the royal nature of the Agent is significant.

Very few instances of the same hybrid construction recur in Ramesside inscriptional productions (the ones the present author is aware of are *KRI* IV 19, 8; 155, 13). These are part of a variety of language that must be analyzed in relation to the then emerging égyptien de tradition.

C. There are, to be sure, constructions that must be analyzed as active impersonal with *.t* their syntactic subject (e.g. *wn.INFL.t hr sdm*, *(X.)tw r sdm*, *(X.)tw hr sdm*). These, however, are not documented before the Twelfth Dynasty, the later Twelfth Dynasty, or even later, depending on individual constructions (§5.1.2.1-3). As can be shown in philological details, this pattern of attestation does not reflect a documentary gap in the record: the early pattern of attestation of these active impersonal constructions is consistent in terms of time and register and it can be analyzed in terms of mechanisms and factors of linguistic change. What is more, it can be demonstrated that other constructions were consistently used in similar functions in earlier times to fulfill similar functions (§2.7.3.3; §3.1.1; §3.3.B). As it turns out, therefore, the constructions that have the syntax hypothesized for the *sdm.t=f* (*/mrr.t=f*, *sdm.n.t=f*, etc.) under an active impersonal analysis are historically a *secondary* development.

NB. While the arguments relative to the O and to the Agent (above, A and B) imply that hypotheses (a) and (b) are synchronically wrong, the above argument further implies that the same hypotheses can not be recast in historical terms, as describing the origins of the constructions, either. In addition, as regards (a) specifically, a noun

35 Detailed discussion: Stauder (2013a: 94-6); for related textual issues in maxim 4, also Stauder (2013a: 358-61; 2014c).

*tw/ti* ‘person’ is nowhere attested.<sup>36</sup> On typological grounds as well, both developments would be problematic. Detransitive constructions grammaticalizing from active impersonal constructions are not uncommon, but the resultant constructions only rarely seem to grammaticalize to the point of becoming ‘full passives’.<sup>37</sup> the O of such constructions tends to retain a non-promotional syntax, that is, to be coded as a direct object; moreover, such constructions generally do not develop the possibility of introducing the Agent in syntactic periphery, or only marginally so. In Earlier Egyptian, by contrast, the O of the *sdm.t=f* (*/mrr.t=f*, *sdm.n.t=f*, etc.) is coded as a syntactic subject (above, A) and the *in N* phrase is fully regular (above, B).

D. Now put in more direct terms, T-passives pattern exactly like V-passives on all here relevant accounts:

- The O is a syntactic object (above, A): with singular pronominal subjects, it is realized as a suffix pronoun in T-passives and in V-passives alike;
- The Agent can be regularly expressed by the *in N* phrase in T-passives and in V-passives alike (above, B; also §2.2);
- Passives from intransitives are regular with T-passives and V-passives alike; more generally, T- and V-passives occur with the same types of events and are subject to the same semantic constraints on passivization (§2.1).

The status of the V-passive as an inflectional passive is beyond dispute. The same analysis then extends to the T-passive.

### 1.1.3 The formation of T-passives

As far as morphological matters are concerned, T-passives can be formed as the pendant to any finite active form except two: the *sdmt=f* and the imperative. The former is arguably non-finite in origin (§1.4.3). With the latter, the reason is pragmatic: for a manipulative speech act like an order to be felicitous, the addressee

36 Among the examples adduced by Díaz Hernández (2013: 85) as evidence for the existence of a noun *tw* ‘person’, *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep 5 (ex.87) is active impersonal but the construction involved, *(X.)tw r sdm*, did not develop before the late Twelfth Dynasty (§5.1.2.2). In Wadi el-Hudi 10, 2 (ex.88), *tw* has full constituent status but the construction, which is non-standard, arose only in the Middle Kingdom in relation to the broader process of change (§5.1.3.1). *Ptahhotep* 82 P (ex.86) is to be segmented differently (Stauder 2014c). The construction *tw r sdm*, with bare *tw*, exists (*Neferti*, *passim*), but the bareness of *tw* is conditioned by macrosyntactic factors (§5.1.2.2.2). This leaves only the alleged *tw=i* in Neferhotep’s *Great Abydos Stela* 4 (ex.85): this would be the only instance of a ‘noun’ *tw*, curiously in *object* position, and curiously followed by a suffix pronoun. In view of the insecure epigraphy of the text, this is inherently suspect; that the reading is wrong is also immediately apparent when the physical disposition of the signs is considered: under the proposed reading, *tw* would here be spread over two frames (‘quadrats’).

37 Siewierska (2010; 2008); e.g., in the later history of Egyptian-Coptic itself, the third person plural construction with a non-anaphorically interpreted subject (Quecke 1987).

must in most languages be conceived of as agentive; passive imperatives are accordingly uncommon cross-linguistically.<sup>38</sup> Thus:

<i>Active</i>	<i>T-passive</i>	
<i>sdm=f</i> (unaccomplished)	<i>sdm.t=f</i>	(§3.1-2)
<i>mrr=f</i>	<i>mrr.t=f</i>	
<i>sdm=f</i> (subjunctive)	<i>sdm.t=f</i>	
<i>ir(w)=f</i> (prospective)	<i>ir(w).t=f</i>	(§1.2.2.2-3)
<i>sdm=f</i> (past tense)	<i>sdm.t=f</i>	
<i>sdm.n=f</i>	<i>sdm.n.t=f</i>	(§4.2-3)
<i>sdm.in/.hr/.k3=f</i>	<i>sdm.in/.hr/.k3.t=f</i>	

As the above table directly makes clear, a T-passive consists in an active stem—including any inflectional marks of tense-aspect-mood there may be—to which the morpheme {t} is appended. Put equivalently, T-passives are componential in morphological terms. They are also componential in a semantic sense: as {t} only serves to code passive voice, the temporal-aspectual-modal profile of a T-passive is entirely determined by the temporal-aspectual-modal profile of the stem to which {t} is appended. An exception is only with the *sdm.n.t=f* inasmuch as this contrasts with the perfective V-passive; as to be seen, this contrast reflects the fact that in Earlier Egyptian the passive is more complex than the active in the accomplished (§4).

Put in only slightly more technical terms, T-passive morphology can thus be described along the following properties:

- Singular exponence: {t} codes the sole function of passive voice; in particular, the morpheme does not have any proper temporal-aspectual-modal profile;
- Transparency: as far as morphology is concerned, T-passives stand in a one-to-one relationship to active forms (actual paradigms are evidently more complex: see part II of the present study);
- No fusion: {t} is agglutinated to the active stem; as far as can be seen in writing, no fusion occurs across morpheme boundaries, nor is there indirect evidence to suppose that there was any;
- Position: {t} is appended at the outer edge of the form, after any marks of tense-aspect-mood there may be.

<sup>38</sup> What comes closest to a passive imperative in Earlier Egyptian are periphrastic constructions based on a syntactic causative in which the governing verb, not the passive one itself, is in the imperative, e.g. P. UC 32209, II.5-6 *imi spr.tw r=f m t3 3t hr dd* (...) ‘May one get to him at once saying: (...) (lit. cause that one gets to him (...))’; Nubkheperre Antef’s *Coptos Decree* 5-6 *imi hsf.tw n=f m t3t{t}=fn<sup>stc</sup> hwt-ntr* (...) ‘May he be punished in his office of the temple (...)’.

In their correlation, these morphological characteristics of Earlier Egyptian T-passives are illustrative of a general principle in morphology, namely the principle of ‘diagrammatic iconicity in stem-inflection relationships’.<sup>39</sup> In particular, the lack of fusion and the position of {t} at the outer edge of the inflected form accord with the singular exponence of the morpheme and the overall transparency of the forms.

This morphological and semantic componentiality of Earlier Egyptian T-passives has direct relevance for two major issues addressed in the present study. As to be discussed, the semantic componentiality of Earlier Egyptian T-passives, and in particular of the *sdm.n.t=f*, is one major parameter in analyzing how this form contrasts with another form used in the accomplished passive, the perfective V-passives (§4). The other issue concerns the change whereby the morpheme {t} is extended to uses in other positions than its erstwhile exclusively inflectional ones (§5). The process, begun in the Twelfth Dynasty, concerns only the morpheme {t}, not the passive morphology associated with V-passives; as to be seen, the componential nature of T-passives is a factor that made the change possible.

## 1.2 V-passives

The second main Earlier Egyptian inflectional passive formation consists in forms that are either unmarked in writing or associated with the written endings *-w* and *-y*.<sup>40</sup> These forms are found in accomplished and future contexts,<sup>41</sup> raising the question

39 Bybee (1985: 11-2).

40 It has been proposed to interpret the forms commonly recognized as V-passives as morphologically unmarked transitivity alternations of the sort *the glass broke*<sub>INTR</sub> ~ *the man broke*<sub>TR</sub> *the glass* (Roccati 2006). This view must be rejected on the following grounds. (a) Although often indistinct in writing, the relevant forms are occasionally associated with written marks (*-y*, *-w*: §1.2.1; §1.2.4) that can not be accounted for otherwise than as representing inflection. (b) In future contexts, the V-passive alternates with the *sdmm=f*, clearly an inflectional category; the alternation depends on inflectional classes only, not on event semantics (§1.2.1.A; §1.3). (c) If the V-passives were mere transitivity alternations, these should be found in all tense-aspect configurations alike; they are not. (d) In transitivity alternations of the sort mentioned (§2.6.2.1.C, NB), the intransitive clause has anticausative meaning, expressing that the Agent is semantically marginalized to the point of not being part of the semantic structure of the event (*the glass broke (scil. by itself)* – †*the glass broke by the man*); in V-passives, by contrast, the unexpressed Agent, although often low in topicality, remains present in the semantic representation of the event (§2.1, §2.5); moreover, it can be made explicit by the *in N* phrase on a regular basis (§2.2). (e) The passive functions of the V-passive are also manifest in that the form is not subject to any semantic restriction of the sort encountered in anticausative alternations; in particular, the V-passive is regularly used with events such as *kd* ‘build’, *iri* ‘make’, etc., which necessarily imply an Agent in their semantic representation (thus: †*the monument made*<sub>INTR</sub>, †*the house built*<sub>INTR</sub>). (f) There are, to be sure, Earlier Egyptian constructions in which voice is not marked by passive morphology (*subject – pseudoparticle*; *NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm*). These, however, can not be compared with V-passives because they are semantically, not syntactically, oriented (§2.3).

41 Alleged cases of V-passives with a present tense interpretation are all to be interpreted differently: (a) as instances of the construction *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* (i.e. *nfr sw* with a passive participle as predicate: §2.6.2); (b) as displaying semantic effects due to the Endpoint orientation and perfective aspect of the V-passive (§4.3.5.4, (b)); or (c), in some Old Kingdom inscriptions, as not passive at all (Schenkel 2004: 176-7 and n.15).

whether the V-passive formation comprises one or two distinct forms (§1.2.1). The matter is made complex by changes occurring during Earlier Egyptian (§1.2.2-3). The at first confusing distribution of the written ending *-w* raises further questions as to what the written mark represents in underlying morphology in different groups of texts and in different inflectional classes (§1.2.4). The nature of V-passive morphology is discussed in turn (§1.2.5).

### 1.2.1 One or two forms?

The V-passive has traditionally been considered a morphological unity, particularly in grammars and studies primarily or exclusively concerned with Middle Egyptian;<sup>42</sup> the hypothesis has also been extended to Earlier Egyptian as a whole.<sup>43</sup> In itself, the hypothesis of a single V-passive would be perfectly plausible: in general, there need not be a parallelism between active and passive paradigms. In the case of Earlier Egyptian, very substantial differences are in fact observed between active and passive paradigms, which do not stand in a one-to-one relationship (part II). Moreover, as shall be demonstrated, there was in fact only one V-passive in most corpora that make up Earlier Egyptian as presently preserved in the record (§1.2.2-3). Finally, the distribution of the written ending *-w* is at first puzzling when Earlier Egyptian is considered as a whole: the ending can be found both in accomplished and future contexts and occurrences with verbs of every inflectional class can be exhibited.

However, detailed examinations of the written phenomenology of the V-passive in early funerary corpora—Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts<sup>44</sup>—have demonstrated that in these groups of texts the distribution of the written mark *-w* correlates in substantial ways with future contexts whenever these can be established on reasonably secure grounds. Moreover, the distribution of the mark correlates with certain inflectional classes—the same, as it turns out, that have the written ending *-w* in the prospective active. The key to interpretation then resides in the realization that the conventions of written representation vary in different groups of texts. Once these are treated separately, a coherent picture emerges.

A. The identification of two distinct forms of the V-passive in Pyramid Texts is based on the following observations:<sup>45</sup>

- (a) V-passives without any written ending are mostly found in accomplished contexts; occurrences in future contexts are uncommon;
- (b) V-passives of *III.inf* with an ending *-y* are found only in contexts where a reading as an accomplished is clear or likely;
- (c) V-passives with an ending *-w* are found only in contexts where a reading as an accomplished is clear or likely;

42 Borghouts (2010: I, §70.d); Westendorf (1953: 6-66; 1962: §248-63); Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §419-24).

43 In most details, Reintges (2004; 1997: particularly 257-62, 395-9); also Edel (1955-1964: §554-5, §559-69).

44 Allen (1984: §487-529) and Schenkel (2004; 2005), respectively.

45 In details, Allen (1984: §487-529; particularly §488.C, §529).



(d) V-passives with an ending *-w* are limited to inflectional classes that do not have a *sdmm=f* (*ult.inf* with the exception of *ndri*, *caus*, and *long*); the former and the latter thereby appear to stand in complementary distribution.<sup>46</sup>

The last point—the complementary distribution of V-passives and *sdmm=f* according to inflectional classes—is worth illustrating briefly:

(i) Pyr. 1960b-c<sup>N</sup> (PT 668)

*iw N ir gs i3b n pt*

***iwr*** *N im mstw N im*

‘N is directed to the eastern side of the sky:

N will be conceived there, N will be born there.’

Sim. e.g. Pyr. 373c<sup>WNt</sup> (PT 268) ***irw*** *n=f rrrwt t(3)zz n=f hm3tt* ‘Portals will be made for him, the coil (*scil.* of the Red Crown) will be tied for him’; Pyr. 492a-d<sup>WPAnMN</sup> (PT 310) ***snw*** *N snw tm snw N snw tm hww N hw (/hww, htw) tm hsb* *m w3t tm hsb tm* ‘Will N be cursed, Atum will be cursed; Will N be reviled, Atum will be reviled; Will N be struck, Atum will be struck; Will N be barred from this path, Atum will be barred’ (for the variance in written forms in 492c, (iv.c)); Pyr. 1651a-d<sup>MN</sup> (PT 599) *intsn rdw n=sn htp-di-nsw (...)* *intsn stpp n=sn spwt=sn intsn irw n=sn 3bwt=s[n] (...)* ‘(...) it is for them that a king’s offering will be given (...) it is for them that their choice cuts will be chosen, it is for them that their funerary provisions will be made’; Pyr. 2059a<sup>N</sup> (PT 684) ***zhnn*** *N gmw N r=sn* ‘N will be sought and N will be found in relation to them.’

With the same two verbs as in (i), passives without the written ending *-w* in *msi*, a *III.inf*, are found alongside passives without reduplication of the last root consonant in *iwr*, a *3rad*:

(ii) Pyr. 142c<sup>WN</sup> (PT 215)

***ms*** *n=k pfiwr n=k pn*

‘That one (*scil.* Horus) was born for you, this one (*scil.* Seth) was conceived for you.’

Sim. Pyr. 132a-c<sup>WTMN</sup> (PT 211); Pyr. 144a-b<sup>WN</sup> (PT 215); Pyr. 211b<sup>WTNt</sup> (PT 222); Pyr. 693c-d<sup>T</sup> (PT 398); Pyr. 1508a<sup>P</sup> (PT 576); Pyr. 2206c<sup>Nt</sup> (PT 704).

In one instance only, the above correlation does not hold:

(iii) Pyr. 1527a-c<sup>P</sup> (PT 577)

*iwr.n {iw}<sw> pt*

*ms.n sw dw3t*

***iwr*** *N pn hn=f[i]n pt*

***mstw*** *N pn hn=f in dw3t*

‘As the sky conceived him (*scil.* Osiris) and the Duat gave birth to him, this N will be conceived with him by the sky and this N will be given birth with him by the Duat.’

46 Allen (1984: §488.C, §515.A-B, §531.A, (2)); further, §1.3.1.A; §1.3.2.A-B).

Under an interpretation of the passive forms *iwr* and *msiw* as having past tense reference, this has been presented as direct evidence against the correlation by which the written ending *-w* would be exclusively associated with future tense in Pyramid Texts.<sup>47</sup> However, a future reading of *iwr* and *msiw* is vastly more likely: the first two clauses (*iwr.n sw pt ms.n sw dw3t*) thus provide a ‘mythological precedent’ to the passives (note *hn=f* in the third and fourth clauses). A similar sequence of tenses (*sdm.n=f* – prospective) recurs in the second next unit in the same spell, with the prospective (active) marked as such by the same written ending *-w* as is *msiw*: Pyr. 1530a-b *pr.n N pn m gs i3bt n pt h3w=f m 3pd w3d* ‘As this N has gone up through the eastern side of the sky, he will go down as a green bird.’ Pyr. 1527a-c does not, therefore, provide counter-evidence to the exclusive association of *-w* with future tense in Pyramid Texts. As regards *iwr* (in lieu of expected *iwrr*), an occasional mistake, or a shortened spelling, can not be excluded.

B. Written forms without the ending *-w* are only occasionally encountered in future contexts:

(iv) *Written forms without -w in future contexts*

(iv.a) As textual variants:

Pyr. 1164d (PT 512) P *s**ˁ**w=k* ~ N *s**ˁ**b=k* ‘you will be purified’;<sup>48</sup>

In textual variance with the active (marked in *-w*): Pyr. 380a (PT 269) P *ndr ˁ n N pn in it=f tm* ‘The arm of this N will be taken hold of by his father Atum’ ~ W *ndrw n=f* *it N tm ˁ n N* ‘The father of N, Atum, will take hold of the arm of N’;<sup>49</sup>

(iv.b) In cotextual variance:

Pyr. 1347a-b<sup>p</sup> (PT 548) *tz* (...) *zpiw* (below, (v));

Pyr. 1970a-c<sup>N</sup> (PT 669) *sp3w* (...) *sp3* (v);

(iv.c) As textual variants and in cotextual variance:

Pyr. 492c (PT 310) W *hww N hww tm* ~ PAn *hiw N pn hiw tm*; M *hww N hww tm* (T [...] *hww tm*; N [...] *N pn dd-mdw hww tm*);<sup>50</sup>

For the broader cotext in Pyr. 492a-d<sup>WPAnMN</sup>, (ii).

Such alternations of written forms in *-w* and without *-w* are no different from similar alternations in the active prospective.<sup>51</sup> In several cases, cotextual clues are also given within one version to identify the form. In the following sequence, for example, future tense is established by the active prospective in *-w* (*hnw*), then by the *sdmn=f* passives (*szpp*, twice); that *tz* is left endingless in writing does not hamper the identification of the form:

47 Reintges (1997: 397, ex.55; 2004), rightly taking issue with Allen’s (1984: §533.C; 2005: 183) reading of *iwr* accomplished and *msiw* as future.

48 Allen (1984: §515.A).

49 Allen (1984: §504).

50 Allen (1984: §515.A).

51 For active prospectives with and without *-w*, Pyr. 997a (PT 480) P *ndrw* ~ Pyr. N *ndr*, in the same formulation as in Pyr. 380a<sup>p</sup> (PT 269) (iv.a); after Allen (1984: §504).

(v) Pyr. 1346a-1347b<sup>P</sup> (PT 548)

*hnw* N *pn m hnbw*

*it=f hpt im ir sht nnti r hnt t3 pw n sht i3rw*

*šzpp* <sup>c=f</sup> in *r*<sup>c</sup>                      *tz* <sup>tp=f</sup> in *tm* (...)

*šzpp* {<sup>c</sup>} *h3t=f* in *3st*              *zptw* *phwt=f* in *nbt-hwt*

‘This N will row in the *henbw*-boat,

taking rudder in it to the Field of the two Underskies, to the fore of that land of the Field of Rushes.

His arm will be taken by Re, his head raised by Atum;

His prow rope will be taken by Isis, his stern rope left by Nephthys.’

Sim. Pyr. 1970a-c<sup>N</sup> (PT 669) *sp3w* <sup>r=f</sup> N *m išt in.k3.t n=k* [*hn*]w (...) *sp3=k* *im*

‘With what will N be made to fly? The *henu*-bark will then be brought to you (...)

You will be made to fly with it’;<sup>52</sup> Pyr. 492c<sup>W</sup> in the context of Pyr. 492a-d (PT 310) (ii).

C. The above establishes the existence of two distinct forms of the V-passive in Pyramid Texts. One is formed only in certain inflectional classes (*ult.inf*, *caus*, *long*) and is more often than not associated with a written ending *-w*. This form is future, as is the active prospective associated with the same written ending *-w* in the very same inflectional classes. Remarkably, this form of the V-passive (henceforth: ‘prospective V-passive’) is thereby identical—or ‘syncretic’<sup>53</sup>—in written form with the active prospective (further, §1.2.4; §1.3.3.B). The other form of the V-passive is formed in all inflectional classes and is endingless except in *III.inf* where it occasionally displays a written ending *-y*. This form is found in accomplished contexts; for reasons to be developed later, this will be referred to as ‘perfective V-passive’ (rather than merely ‘accomplished V-passive’: §4.3.5.3-4).

NB. In addition to *-y* marked passives of *ult.inf*,<sup>54</sup> passive forms of some *2rad*, *3rad*, and once of a *caus-II.red* display an ending *-y* in Pyramid Texts.<sup>55</sup> For interpretation, the following elements are relevant. (a) The subjects are dual or plural.<sup>56</sup> (b) All occurrences are strictly sentence-initial. (c) The forms are overwhelmingly from two verbs, *wn* ‘open’ and *izn* ‘draw back (bolts)’, in a recurrent formulation with variation.<sup>57</sup> E.g.:

52 Allen (1984: §518).

53 In morphology, ‘syncretism’ (e.g. Bickel & Nichols 2007: 207-8) refers to forms belonging to different paradigms yet formally identical, e.g. English *eat* – *ate* – *eaten* (present, simple past, perfect participle), but *put* – *put* – *put* (syncretic).

54 For these, Allen (1984: §513-4).

55 Occurrences: Allen (1984: §511).

56 Allen (1984: §512); Sethe (1899: §461; 1916: §81 *fine*). This correlation had been disputed by Edel (1955-1964: §554) and Gunn (2012: 75-82); however, as Gunn himself concedes (p.80), the written ending *-y* occurs with non-weak verbs only in Pyramid Texts and only with dual/plural subjects, thereby confirming the distribution.

57 For a detailed tableau of the variance in the formula, Allen (1984: §512).

(vi) Pyr. 1078a-d<sup>PNI</sup> (PT 503)

*wn pt*                      *wn t3*  
*wny tpḥwt ptr*      *wny nmtwt nnw*      *sfḥty nmtwt j3ḥw*

‘The sky is opened, the earth is opened;

The windows of the Beholding Sky are opened, the stretches of Nun are opened,  
the stretches of sunlinght are set loose.’

Based on the observation that Earlier Egyptian finite forms of the verb do not display subject agreement, it has been proposed that the constructions are participial (*nfr sw*), with a marked (/‘imperfective’ /‘plur(iaction)al’) participle as their predicate; this accounts for (a), the distribution in relation to the grammatical number of the subject.<sup>58</sup> The analysis as a *nfr sw* pattern is also supported by the exclusively sentence-initial position of the relevant forms (b).<sup>59</sup> It further accords with the restriction to a certain type of recurrent formulation (c): in contrast to finite constructions of the verb, the pattern *nfr sw* expresses that a situation is not bound in time. In the particular context, the selection of this construction, rather than a finite passive construction, would have served to present the state-of-affairs under a perspective in which that the ‘sky’ (/the ‘windows’, etc.) are eternally ‘opened’ (/‘unbolted’).<sup>60</sup>

In Coffin Texts, some changes affect the distribution of the written endings *-w* and *-y* (§1.2.4.1.B; §1.2.4.2) but the general tableau remains the same. As has been demonstrated in extensive details, this more complex distribution of written marks, slightly altered with respect to Pyramid Texts, supports an identification of two morphologically distinct forms of the V-passive, one perfective and one prospective, in Coffin Texts as well.<sup>61</sup>

## 1.2.2 The loss of the prospective V-passive; prospective T-passives

The prospective V-passive is by and large limited to early funerary corpuses. In the present section, I describe the process by which it was replaced by another form, a T-passive of the prospective, in other parts of the Earlier Egyptian record.

58 Schenkel (2005: 53-4). Schenkel evokes the possibility that the participle could be either passive (‘open(ed)’) or active (‘opening<sub>INTR</sub>’). I am not aware of any instance of *wn* with an anticausative reading (‘open<sub>INTR</sub>’) and for this reason prefer the former option. For *nfr sw* with a passive participle as its predicate, §2.8.3.

59 Schenkel (2005: 53).

60 The possibility has been evoked that some instances of *-y* marked forms with *III.inf* may also belong to this construction (Allen 1984: §513; Schenkel 2005: 54, both noncommittal). This is unlikely, as the *-y* marked forms of *ult.inf* are found with other types of events than the ones exemplified in (v); these do not easily fit the particular tensing here involved. Moreover, the written stem should be long with these in marked participles (*mrr-*). An altogether different account of passive forms with the ending *-y* is offered by Reintges (1997: 262-7) who proposes a unified analysis of all such written forms, both in *III.inf* and the ones here discussed, in terms of assimilatory processes and vowel harmony. I disagree with this analysis notably because the Coptic forms adduced as evidence for an *-i-* in the stem of certain inflectional classes (Reintges 1997: 265-6) belong to altogether different inflectional, or even derivational, categories than the V-passive; the analysis thereby presupposes stem invariance across inflection, at odds with what is otherwise known of Egyptian inflection.

61 Schenkel (2004; 2005).

### 1.2.2.1 Prospective V-passives in complement clauses outside Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts

Outside Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts, occurrences of the prospective V-passive are rare and apparently limited to complement clauses (ii)-(iv).

One possible occurrence of the prospective V-passive outside complement clauses is in a standardized formula, in alternation with T-marked forms. Based on the context, a subjunctive—and thereby a T-passive—would be expected. This makes it possible that the written forms *ḳrs=f* in this formula are in fact shortened from *ḳrs.t=f*;<sup>62</sup> alternatively, forms without *.t* could be infinitives. Either way, these are not V-passives at all, as is also independently suggested by the inflectional class of the verbs concerned, *3rad*:

#### (i) Ptahemhat, lintel, 3-5

*ḥtp-d-nsw inpw ḥnt sp3 imn swt=f*

*ḳrs=f m ḥrt-ntr pthi m zmt imntt i3w nfr m i3t=f m s'ḥ=f*

*ḥp=f ḥr w3wt nfrt ḥppt im3ḥw ḥr=sn (...)*

‘An offering that the king gives to Anubis the foremost of Sepa, the hidden one in his places,

That he (*scil.* Mereri) *will*(?! ) be buried in the necropolis Ptahi in the western desert having become old perfectly in his office and in his rank;

That he may walk on the beautiful ways on which *imakhu*’s walk (...)

Sim., also with a written form *ḳrs=s*, *Mersyankh III*, fig.7; with a written form *ḳrs.t=f*, Iunmenu; both Fourth Dynasty. In the Fourth Dynasty, the alternation between written forms with and without *.t* in the same context concerns other verbs as well: *Mersyankh III*, fig.7 *ḥtp-d-nsw w3ḥ n=s phr stp n=s <s>tpt (...)*

‘An offering that the king gives, that offerings may be laid down for her, that choice cuts may be cut for her (...); Khufudjedef, *ḥtp-d-nsw ḥwfw-dd=f tr.t o n=f m ḥ3b nb* ‘An offering that the king gives to Khufudjedef, that it may be made for him at every festival.’ Similar alternations recur later in the Old Kingdom, thus.<sup>63</sup>

Capart, *Rue de Tombeaux*, 11 *ḥtp-d-nsw (...)* *šzp 'f in ntr '3* ‘An offering that the king gives (...) that his arm be seized by the Great God’; *ASAE* 43 (1943), 490 *ḥtp-d-nsw (...)* *šzp.t 'f in ntr '3 (...)*.

Leaving these unlikely cases aside, prospective V-passives seem limited to complement clauses.<sup>64</sup> After the Old Kingdom (ii), one instance is in a Twelfth Dynasty (manuscript of a) ritual text possibly including older formulations (iii); two other occurrences in early Twelfth Dynasty letters are more remarkable (iv):

62 Also evoked as a possibility by Schweitzer (2005: §368).

63 After Edel (1955-1964: §564).

64 Díaz Hernández (2013: 100-2) interprets several passages in his corpus as including a prospective V-passive (ex.118-121, 124-6). In Siut IV, 30 (ex.118) and Siut III, 15 (ex.119), the V-passive is in circumstantial function and the form is the perfective V-passive, providing an anterior setting for the events in the main clause. Siut I, 268 (ex.121) is probably an instance of the extended uses of the perfective V-passive (§1.3.3). The negative constructions, occasionally found in literary texts (ex.124-6) and in Siut IV, 33 (ex.120), are negations of the general imperfective aspect, as variants to the by then already more common *n sdm.n.t=f* (§4.3.5.2.1, (iii)).

## (ii) Abutiu (Cairo JE 67573), 3-9

*wd hm=f krs=f rd n=f krs m prwy-hd dmr ʕ wrt sntr <sft>*  
*rd hm=f {sft}*<sup>65</sup> *hwz n=f iz in izt nt irw-iz*

‘His Majesty ordered his (*scil.* the dog Abutiu) burial: that a coffin be given him from the Double Treasury, and ritual cloth in very great amount, incense, and scented oil.

His Majesty had a tomb built for him by the crew of the tomb makers.’

## (iii) Dramatic Ramesseum Papyrus 83

*hpr.n inw ʕb3wy*

‘It happened that two *aba*-scepters were brought.’

*Passim* in the same text.<sup>66</sup> The identification as a prospective V-passive, rather than a perfective V-passive, is based on the occurrence of the prospective T-passive in the same environment, e.g. *Shipwrecked Sailor* 166-167 *hpr.n rd.tw=i* (§1.2.2.3, (vi)).

(iv) Heqanakht II, ro 42-43<sup>67</sup>

*(i)n iw hm wʕ im=tn r whd srhw n=f hmt=f*

‘Furthermore, will any of you bear having his wife denounced to him?’

Sim. Heqanakht I, ro 2 *ʕh3 tw s3ww prt it=i s3ww ht=i nb* ‘Mind you that my barley seed is guarded and that all my property is guarded.’<sup>68</sup> If correctly interpreted,<sup>69</sup> these instances of the prospective V-passive may align with other expressions in the Heqanakht letters that may offer a glimpse at a variety of language slightly different from the ones otherwise documented in the written record, and possibly Memphite in origin.<sup>70</sup>

## 1.2.2.2 Prospective T-passives in Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts

In Coffin Texts already, passages are found with T-passives in textual variance with the prospective V-passive in the inflectional classes in which the latter was formed (*ult.inf*, *caus*, *long*). At the same time, T-passives are also seen in textual variance with the *sdm=f* in the inflectional classes in which this was formed (*3rad*, *2rad*, *II.red*, *ndri*: §1.3.1.3, (v)-(vi)). As occasionally fuller written forms demonstrate, these T-passives were based on the (active) prospective stem (also §1.3.1.3, (ii)):

65 Emendation after Fischer (1966: 57, n.3).

66 Uljas (2007a: 195, n.51).

67 Allen (2002: 95). For other possible occurrences in documentary texts, all uncertain, Brose (2014: 267-8). Of these, P. Brooklyn 35.1446, pl.VI, C, 6 (ex.275) is an extended construction of the perfective V-passive and does not, therefore, require emendation.

68 For two other, more uncertain, occurrences in Heqanakht, Allen (2002: 95).

69 See the final word of caution in Allen (2002: 96).

70 Allen (2002: 86-101; 1994).

## (i) CT I 212e

B10Cb *n itw=f*, B12C *n ity=f*<sup>71</sup> (prospective V-passives)B13C, B16C *n it.tw=f*, B14 *n it.t=f*, B10Cb *n it.t[=f]* (T-passives)

‘He will not be taken (...)’

## (ii) CT I 199f

B12C *iw wd.n n=i r<sup>c</sup> rd n=k tp=k*B10Cb, B1Y, and B16C *iw wd.n n=i r<sup>c</sup> rd.t n=k tp=k*

‘Re has ordered me that your head be given to you.’

The T-passive of the prospective is already documented in Pyramid Texts, but in two instances only.<sup>72</sup> One is with *ndri*, a notoriously complex verb (§1.3.1, (iv)). The other is perhaps more significant, as it concerns *rhs*, a *3rad* (§1.3.1, (vi)).

## 1.2.2.3 The prospective T-passive outside early funerary corpuses

Outside early funerary corpuses, the prospective V-passive is not found in main clauses; occurrences in complement clauses are themselves not many (§1.2.2.1). In the Old Kingdom, no occurrence of T-passives with future passive events have been noted.<sup>73</sup> At the same time, future passive events are documented with the extended uses of the perfective V-passive and with *NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm*, both with specific semantic import (§1.2.3.1; §2.3.2). Whether this is diachronically significant remains unclear: the future passive contexts documented in the Old Kingdom typically involve the kind of semantics in which the extended uses of the perfective V-passive or *NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm* come to order, so that the lack of T-passives may also be a gap conditioned by the nature of the written record.

In First Intermediate Period and Middle Kingdom inscriptional texts and in Middle Egyptian literature, T-passives are regularly used with future events. Like in Coffin Texts, occasionally explicit written forms—*rd.t* in (iii); *gmw.tw*, *rd.t*, and *w3w.tw* in (v)—demonstrate these T-passives are based on the (active) prospective stem (in the Middle Kingdom and later at least as long as the active prospective itself remained productive, i.e. before the subjunctive took over the uses of the prospective):

(i) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.0.3 - III.1 (Inscription #8)*ir hk3 nb hk3.t=f m hf3t (...)**sh.t hps=f (...)*

71 For the alternation *itw=f* ~ *ity=f*, §1.2.4.1.B.

72 According to Reintges (1997: 391, ex.47a), a third is in Pyr. 1437a-b<sup>PaPbMN</sup> (PT 569; and similar instances in the same spell). While an interpretation of the forms as prospective T-passives (thus *msw.t spdt*) is not impossible, one as verbal noun (Allen 2005: 176) is just as likely, if not more: *hsf w mswt spdt hsf=k w N pn iw=f ir bw nt=k im* ‘As Sothis’ birth has not been barred, you should not bar this N when he will come to the place where you are.’

73 *Urk.* I 13, 9 *irw.t=s*, mentioned by Reintges (1997: 391) as a T-passive, is a *sdm.t(i)=f(i)* with a passive reading (§1.4.2).

‘As to any ruler who will rule in Hefat (...),  
his arm will be cut off (...)’<sup>74</sup>

Sim., also in apodoses of conditional constructions, *Hekaib*, Stela #9, x+21-23 *ir h3ti- nb* (...) **sh.tw** *hpš=f mi iw3 pn mn.t tsw=f mi 3pd* (...) ‘As to any governor (...), his arm will be cut off like this ox’s, his neck severed like this bird’s (...)’; *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep 6-7 *ir grt sr nb* (...) **smi.t=f** (...) ‘As, moreover, to any official (...), he will be reported (...)’.

(ii) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.α.2 (Inscription #5)

*n ms mit(=i) n ms[.t]=f*

‘Someone like me has not been born, nor will he be born.’<sup>75</sup>

On this passage in its broader context, §4.3.5.1.3, (iv). For non-negative constructions, Louvre Bowl 9-15 (*pr.t*, *ir.t*, *rd.t*: §3.3, (v.b)).

(iii) *Sinuhe* B 280-281

*iw=f r smr mm srw*

**rd.t=f** *m-k3b šnyt*

‘He will be a companion among the officials,  
he will be placed right into the heart of the court.’

Sim. B 192 (*ir.tw*); B 198 (*ir.tw*); with *3rad* similarly, B 191 (*wđ<sup>c</sup>.tw*); B 195 (*nīs.tw*); B 195-196 (*sft.tw*); continuous quotation, §3.3, (i).

(iv) *Ptahhotep* 292-293 P

*ts pw hs stt hft*

**pr.tw** *hr irt=f ib hr win=f*

‘It is a bad sentence to shoot the enemy:  
one will renounce applying it, the heart rejecting it.’

Sim., with a *3rad*, 66 P (*nīs.t=f*).

(v) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 352-353

**gmw.tw** *kft=s*

*sbw=s r im3h*

‘When its (*scil. Maat*’s) revelation is found,  
it will conduct to blessedness!’

Sim. B1 213-214 **gm.tw** *imnw m3<sup>c</sup>t rd.t s3 grg r t3* ‘The mystery of *Maat* will be found, and falsehood cast down on the ground!’; R 10.5 in **rw3w.tw=i** *rf m d3tt=f* ‘Will I then be robbed in his very estate?’ (B1 49 has the endless written stem, *rw3.tw=i*).

<sup>74</sup> For the interpretation of this passage, further Willems (1990).

<sup>75</sup> For the broader context, in a much-discussed passage, §4.3.5.1.3, (iv).



(vi) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 166-167

*hpr.n rd.tw=i hr ht=i r dw3 ntr n=f*

‘It occurred that I was placed on my belly to praise the god for him.’

Contrast with Dramatic Ramesseum Papyrus 83 *hpr.n inw* ‘b3wy ‘It happened that two *aba*-scepters were brought.’

## 1.2.3 The perfective V-passive with events yet to come

As just discussed, the prospective V-passive in main clauses is limited to early funerary corpuses; outside these, it is only marginally documented and only in complement clauses; in other parts of the Earlier Egyptian record, T-passives based on the active prospective stem are used with future passive events. In addition, V-passives are also found with events yet to occur. In all cases, these uses are made possible by the perfective profile of the form.

## 1.2.3.1 Extended uses of the perfective V-passive

Outside early funerary corpuses, the perfective V-passive is not uncommonly found with events yet to come, with a clearly discernable modal force. These are extended uses of the perfective V-passive: in using a perfective form, the speaker presents the event as if already completed, anticipating its completion in a way that leaves no room for it not to occur:<sup>76</sup>

## (i) P. Berlin 9010, 3 (Elephantine, Sixth Dynasty)

*ir 3 r 33=f šr r šrr=f*

‘The great one shall be treated (*lit.* has been treated, thus will have been treated) according to how he is great, the small one according to how he is small.’

Sim. e.g. *IÄF* III 326, c (seal of Nimaathapi) *dd(t) ht nb ir ø n=s* ‘Who says a thing and it is done for her’; sim. 325, c.

The strongly assertive force implied in such uses of the perfective V-passive can be underscored further by *iw*:

76 Similarly Westendorf (1953: 38): ‘der intensive Wunsch wird als schon erfüllt gedacht’; Allen (2002: 92). For the general principle, e.g. German *Aufgestanden!*, a perfective participle used in lieu of the imperative to express a very direct and authoritative order, with associated connotations; similarly, in an advertisement on the door of a shop, *Hereinspaziert!*, implying that the potential buyer, although still looking at the shop from the outside, should already be inside.

(ii) *Urk.* I 224, 4-6 (Pepyankh-Heryib)*ir ir.t=sn im hft ddt.n(=i) [...]**tw tr hft mrrt=sn*

‘As to those who will act on it according to what I have said [...], there shall be acted (*lit.* it has (already) been acted) according to what they wish.’<sup>77</sup>

For the construction with an O-detransitivized event (*iri* ‘acting’), implying an orientation on the event itself, §2.6.1.1, (iv); similarly below, (v), without assertion additionally underscored by *iw*. In a variant construction, future tense is made explicit by means of *wnn*:<sup>78</sup> *Urk.* I 46, 11-12 (Khuuwer) *i[r ir=tn] r nw wnn tr mitt r išt=tn in imiw-ht=tn* ‘If you act against this, the same shall be done against your goods by your descendants’; sim. e.g. *Urk.* I 70, 5-6 (Inti). In the *wḏ<sup>c</sup>-mdw* formula,<sup>79</sup> e.g. *Urk.* I 70, 15 - 71, 2 (Inti).

The above examples are from a verb of an inflectional class, the *III.inf*, that could form the prospective V-passive. In inflectional classes that in earlier funerary corpora had the *sdmm=f* (§1.3), such as the *3rad*, the perfective V-passive is used similarly. Examples are notably from legal texts or threat formulae, but not limited to these:

(iii) *Urk.* I 13, 3-7 (a legal text of possibly Kaiemnefret)*ir hm-k3 nb dt(=i) sn.t=f ht r sn-nw=f(...)**nhm <m>=f3ht rmt ht nb (...)*

‘As regards any funerary priest of my domain who shall go to law against his fellow (...), all fields, people, and things (...) shall be taken from him!’

Sim. e.g. *Urk.* I 13, 1; 37, 1 (Sennuankh, §2.5.2.2, (x)).

Similar uses recur in Middle Egyptian literary texts, both with *ult.inf* and with *3rad*. Perfective V-passives contrast with the prospective T-passives common in these texts (§1.2.2.3) by their strong assertive force:<sup>80</sup>

(iv) *Eloquent Peasant* R 8.6*trw m ddt=k*

‘There shall be acted as you say.’

77 Schenkel’s (2004: 176, n.15) proposal to read actively (*iw(=i) ir(=i)*) is unlikely in view of the speech situation and by the parallels, all passive. I agree with Reintges (1997: 417) that the future tense interpretation is contextual, but I derive this from the perfective value of the form, not from a present tense value which I do not recognize (§1.2, n.42; also §4.3.5.4, (b)).

78 Edel (1955-1964: §900); an additional example adduced by Reintges (1997: 413, ex.73b).

79 For this formula, Edel (1944: §12).

80 The following list is much reduced with respect to Westendorf’s (1953: 42-6), which includes various forms to be interpreted not as finite passives but as instances of the *smn sw<sub>o</sub>* construction (§2.6.2).

The Twelfth Dynasty versions read actively, with what based on written morphology could be either a subjunctive or a prospective: B1 34 *iry=i hst=k* ‘I will do what you favor’ (sim. Bt 40). Sim. *Cheops’ Court* 8.15 (*wd nkn=f*); 9.20 (*ir ʕkw=f*).

(v) *Sinuhe* B 212-213

**whm** *snd=k m t3w h3swt* (...)

‘Fear of you shall be repeated in the lands and hill-countries (...)’

For further analysis, §3.3, (vi).

(vi) *Ipuwer* 13.5

**nhm** *nt{y}<ɿ> hr=f*

**hnm** *m sht nt ht hdb m nβ*

‘What is on him shall be taken away  
and he be treated with blows of the stick and killed wrongly.’

Continued by two pseudoparticiples (*hnm*, *hdb*) hooked on =*f* in the preceding clause; sim. 5.12.

These extended uses of the perfective V-passive are common in particular with *iri* and *rđi* in prescriptions in medical and in legal texts, as well as in some inscriptional ones modeled on the latter, e.g.:

(vii) P. Berlin Medical III.7

**rdw** *wnmw sw s r hrw 4*

‘The man shall be made to eat it for 4 days.’

(viii) *Duties of the Vizier* R 3-4

*pr prrt nbt m pr-nsw smi* *ø n=f*

*ʕk ʕkt nbt r pr-nsw smi* *ø n=f*

‘Should whatever leaves the palace leave, it shall be reported to him;  
Should whatever enters the palace enter, it shall be reported to him.’

Sim. R 2-3 **sđm** *wʕ hr-s3 sn-nw=f nn rdt sđm hr-ph r-h3t hry* ‘One shall be heard after the other without letting the lower ranking one (*scil.* official) be heard before the higher ranking one’; *Stèle Juridique* 6 **rd** *n=f ʕkw=s* (...) ‘Its income (*scil.* the income associated with the office) shall be given to him (...)’; *passim*.

### 1.2.3.2 Rare occurrences of the perfective V-passive with events yet to come in Pyramid Texts

In Pyramid Texts, a V-passive is rarely found in future contexts with verbs of the 3*rad* inflectional class—in place, therefore, of an expected *sđmm=f*. In some cases, the phenomenon is merely orthographic: the underlying form is a *sđmm=f* with the reduplicated root consonant not written out to avoid a sequence of three identical

signs.<sup>81</sup> No such account extends to (i) (and similarly (ii)-(iii) below), which are genuine instances of V-passives of *3rad* used in future environments:

(i) Pyr. 1561-1562<sup>P</sup> (PT 582)

*rd n=f s3h ʕ=f*                      *šzp n=s spdt drt=f*  
*hbs t3 n N*                              *sk<sup>82</sup> n=f wdnt*  
*nhmhmw n=f sp3ty ntr (...)*   *hmsw=f hr hndw=f bi3i (...)*

‘Orion will give him his arm, Sothis will take his hand;

The land will be hacked up for N, an offering will be laid down for him;

The two districts of the gods will yell at him (...), he will sit down on his throne of metal (...)

These cases remain very uncommon. As occurrences are from P (i), N (iii), and Nt (ii), i.e. not from the two earliest pyramids, it has been suggested that they may relate to the extended uses of the perfective V-passive outside early funerary corpora just discussed.<sup>83</sup> However, the strongly assertive force found in the latter is here absent and a different analysis is therefore to be pursued. In (ix), a future tensing of the overall sequence is established by the active forms of the prospective (first *rd* and *šzp*, then *nhmhmw* and *hmsw*). On the other hand, as to be discussed in a subsequent chapter, the perfective V-passive tends to strongly emphasize the Endpoint of the event (§4.3.5.3-4); one common effect in text is that an event such as *hbs t3 n N* is viewed not only in its dynamic part but also in its result, and thereby as having a continuing relevance in a relative present tense (intuitively: ‘The land *has been* (/had been, will have been) hacked up (...)’ → (as a result) ‘The land *is* (/was, will be) hacked up (...)’). By default, the relative present tense in which the perfective V-passive has continuing relevance is related to the speech situation. In (i), however, it is related to the overall future tensing of the sequence as established by the active forms morphologically marked as prospectives.

A similar analysis applies to *sk* in (ii), where the future tensing of the sequence is established by the active *sd3* (a *3rad*, necessarily unmarked in written form) and subsequently confirmed by the prospective V-passive *rwmw*:

81 After Allen (1984: §515.B). In direct graphic contact with a dative, a form *wnn* could thus be reduced to *wn* in writing in order to avoid three consecutive *n*’s in the written chain; this is illustrated by the contrast between *wn* in witnesses without a determinative and *wnn* in such with one, e.g. Pyr. 485b-c (PT 307) *W n wn n=f (...)* *n wn n=f (...)* *n wdʕʕ (...)*; *P n wnn<sup>DET</sup> n=f (...)* *n wnn<sup>DET</sup> n=f (...)* *n wdʕʕ (...)*; sim. with another verb, Pyr. 716c (PT 408) *TPb rhs sbnwt*; *Pa rhss<sup>DET</sup> sb[nwt]* (Pa’ damaged). Similar in principle is the following alternation, designed to avoid three consecutive *f*’s in versions with a pronominal subject: Pyr. 1441b (PT 569) *Pa n hsf<sup>f</sup> N*; *PbM n hsf=f*; *N n hsf N* falls out of the correlation but could be an artifact of textual history, for example inheriting the short written stem from a Vorlage such as could have served for M.

82 On *sk(i) ~ sk(r)* being originally a *3rad*, Allen (1984: §736).

83 Allen (1984: §534).

(ii) Pyr. 1905c<sup>Nt</sup> (PT 665A)<sup>84</sup>

*sd3 n=k t3*

*sk n=k wdnt*

*rww n=k rwwt*

‘The earth will tremble for you,  
an offering will be laid down for you,  
there will be danced a dance for you.’

In view of the above analysis in relation to continuing relevance, it may be significant that in both (ix) and (x), the perfective V-passive is used with events of ‘laying down offerings’.

Slightly different is the interpretation of the third occurrence of a perfective V-passive in a future context in Pyramid Texts, *t(3)z=f* (twice):<sup>85</sup>

(iii) Pyr. 1965a-1967a<sup>N</sup> (PT 669)

*ms.n.t sw dn.n=t sw nh.n=t sw nhwt n rdwy=f n wy=f*

*t(3)z=f ir=f m išt*

*in.k3.t bi3 pw (...)*

*t(3)[z]=f im=f (...) snhw[=f] im=f m-hnw wy=tn in sn ntrw*

*mk r=k sw msy mk sw t(3)z mk sw hpr*

‘“You have given birth to him, you have shaped him, you have spat him out in a spitting, yet he has no legs, he has no arms.

With what will he be tied together?”

“This metal will then be brought (...)

It is with this that he will be tied together (...) It is with this that he will be made protected within your arms” – say the gods.

“See, he is born, see, he is tied together, see, he is come into being.”’

The overall tensing is future, as is implied by the prospective V-passive *snhw[=f]* and the *in.k3.t=f* form. As to the future interpretation of *t(3)z=f m išt*, this is here given by a knowledge of more general aspects of tensing in such spells, and thereby by what amounts to an element of generic convention. In a comparable section in the same spell, prospective V-passives are found, the first explicitly marked as such in written form, Pyr. 1970a-c<sup>N</sup> (PT 669) *sp3w r=f N m išt in.k3.t n=k [hn]w (...)* *sp3=k im* ‘With what will N be made to fly? The *henu*-bark will then be brought to you (...) You will be made to fly with it.’ In selecting a perfective V-passive for the events of ‘being tied’ (*t(3)z=f*), the speaker presents these as already completed (‘With what will he have been tied together?’). This perfective aspect extends over the overall sequence as is manifest in its closing part (the last line quoted): this consists in three *subject – pseudoparticiple* constructions expressing secondary states, i.e. states that imply some preceding event from which they result (for secondary states as opposed to both

84 Allen (1984: §504). On the subjectless passive in the last clause, §2.5.3.2, (iv).

85 Contrast with the *sdmm=f* of the same verb in Pyr. 373c<sup>Wnt</sup> (PT 268) (...) *t(3)zz n=f hm3tt* ‘(...) the coil (*scil.* of the Red Crown) will be tied for him.’

primary states and dynamic readings of the resultative, §4.3.3.1). One of these is with *ṯ(ḳ)z*. Another is with *msy*: this is highly significant as one very rare case in Pyramid Texts of an event of ‘being born’ not expressed by the V-passive (discussion: §4.2.1.A)

The three occurrences of the V-passive of *3rad* in Pyramid Texts (i)-(iii) therefore bear witness to the complexity of tensing and aspect in these texts. They do not represent counter-evidence to the above analysis of the V-passive of *3rad* as being always perfective, never prospective. Nor do they relate to the extended uses of the perfective V-passive discussed first (§1.2.3.1)—other than indirectly, by the fact that both these uses are ultimately made possible by the more general perfective profile of the form.

#### 1.2.4 What does the written mark *-w* stand for?

When Earlier Egyptian is considered as a whole, the distribution of the written ending *-w* associated with V-passives is confusing: the mark can be found both in future and in accomplished contexts; moreover, instances in each inflectional class can be exhibited. Given this apparent lack of principled correlations on either level, it would at first seem reasonable to hypothesize that the V-passive was a single inflected form and that the written ending *-w* represents the passive morphology associated with this form.<sup>86</sup>

This analysis is contradicted by the fact, established above, that the V-passive comprises two distinct inflected forms in Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts, a perfective V-passive and a prospective V-passive (§1.1). As regards the distribution of the written ending *-w*, this turns out to be more principled upon a closer examination. As a preliminary observation, suffice it to note that distributions of written endings must in certain forms be analyzed differently in different parts of the Earlier Egyptian record as these can abide by different scribal conventions in the written representation of grammatical morphology. Examples include the allographs of {t} (§1.1.1), the allographs of the ending of the pseudoparticiple, the distribution of the written prefix *i*., etc. In addition, the marking of written endings is in part differential, i.e. devised so as to help discriminate between various forms insofar as the writing system permits. Accordingly, the scribal conventions of written representation can vary depending on the linguistic situations that obtain in different parts of the record. In the present case, a major distinction is between Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts, which have two morphologically distinct forms of the V-passive (§1.2.1), and other parts of the Earlier Egyptian record, which do not (§1.2.2-3).

##### 1.2.4.1 In the prospective V-passive in Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts

A. In Pyramid Texts, the written ending *-w* is strictly associated with the prospective V-passive; the perfective V-passive is either unmarked in written form or, only in *ult.inf* and uncommonly, displays a written ending *-y*. What is more, the written

86 Thus e.g. Borghouts (2010: I, §70); Reintges (2004; 1997: 262-7, with an analysis of *-w* (~ *-y*) as directly representing passive morphology in the underlying forms).

ending *-w* is strictly associated with the *ult.inf*, *caus*, and *long* inflectional classes, in which its occurrence is fairly common; other inflectional classes, such as *3rad*, etc., do not form a prospective V-passive but a *sdmm=f* (§1.3).

In the active, a prospective is formed with all inflectional classes; only some, however, display a written ending *-w*, namely *ult.inf*, *caus*, and *long*.<sup>87</sup> These are the very same inflectional classes in which the prospective V-passive, also with a written ending *-w*, is formed. In other words, the prospective V-passive is identical—or syncretic—in written form with the prospective active in these inflectional classes:

*Written endings of the prospective (active and passive) in Pyramid Texts*

	Prospective active	Prospective V-passive
<i>Ult.inf</i> , <i>caus</i> , <i>long</i> :	<i>-w</i> (or no ending)	<i>-w</i> (or no ending)
<i>3rad</i> , <i>2rad</i> , <i>II.red</i> :	no ending	( <i>sdmm=f</i> )

The written identity or syncretism between the two forms implies that the written ending *-w* stands for prospective morphology, in the active and passive alike. Assuming that there were distinct active and passive forms of the prospective (discussion: §1.3.3.B), the specific passive morphology remains unrepresented in writing.

B. This analysis is confirmed by the situation in Coffin Texts. In these, the prospective V-passive commonly displays the written ending *-w* in the very same inflectional classes as in Pyramid Texts. With singular pronominal subjects (i.e. with short subject clitics), this ending *-w* alternates with an ending *-y*.<sup>88</sup> The same alternation, occurring under the exact same conditions, is observed in the active prospective.<sup>89</sup>

*Written endings of the prospective (active and passive) in Coffin Texts*

	Prospective active	Prospective V-passive
<i>Ult.inf</i> , <i>caus</i> , <i>long</i> :	<i>-w</i> (or no ending) ~ <i>-y</i> with sg. pro. subj.	<i>-w</i> (or no ending) ~ <i>-y</i> with sg. pro. subj.
<i>3rad</i> , <i>2rad</i> , <i>II.red</i> :	no ending	( <i>sdmm=f</i> )

Like in Pyramid Texts, the prospective active and the prospective V-passive are syncretic with one another in written form.<sup>90</sup> In Coffin Texts, the written ending *-w* and its alternant *-y* before singular subject clitics represent prospective morphology in the prospective V-passive just like they do in the prospective active. As in Pyramid Texts, passive morphology is unrepresented in writing in the prospective V-passive.

87 Allen (1984: §515.A).

88 Schenkel (2004; 2005).

89 Schenkel (2000b).

90 Similarly Schenkel (2005: 52, 53).

1.2.4.2 In the perfective V-passive in Coffin Texts

The perfective V-passive, for its part, is endless in Pyramid Texts in all inflectional classes except *III.inf* in which it occasionally displays a written ending *-y*. Given the association with this inflectional class in particular, the written ending is interpreted as standing for a reflex of the final ‘weak’ element of the root interacting with whatever perfective V-passive morphology may have been. Other than in *III.inf*, passive morphology is unrepresented in written form in the perfective V-passive. More generally, therefore, V-passive morphology is unrepresented in writing in both the perfective and the prospective V-passives in Pyramid Texts.

In Coffin Texts, the situation has changed somewhat: a written ending *-w* is found not only with the prospective V-passive under the conditions described above, but also occasionally with the perfective V-passive. In this, it can occur under certain prosodic conditions (before a pronominal dative expression in *3rad* and *III.inf*) and with no such conditions attached in one inflectional class (*2rad*):<sup>91</sup>

<i>The perfective V-passive in Coffin Texts</i>		<i>(in Pyramid Texts)</i>
All inflectional classes:	endless	(endless)
<i>III.inf</i> :	also <i>-y</i>	(also <i>-y</i> (uncommon))
<i>3rad</i> and <i>III.inf</i> before <i>n P<sub>sg</sub></i> :	also <i>-w</i> (not common)	
<i>2rad</i> :	also <i>-w</i> (not common)	

Descriptively, the scribal conventions of written representation have changed with respect to Pyramid Texts. Moreover, the written ending *-w* occasionally occurring in the perfective V-passive in Coffin Texts can not represent the same element in underlying morphology as the written ending *-w* regularly associated with the prospective V-passive in both Coffin Texts and Pyramid Texts. As discussed, the latter represents prospective morphology, in forms in which passive morphology is left unrepresented in writing. The *-w* occasionally occurring in the perfective V-passive, by contrast, must be interpreted as a representation of passive morphology itself:

<i>Underlying morphology represented by the written ending -w</i>		
	Perfective V-passive	Prospective V-passive
Pyramid Texts:	(none)	<i>prospective</i> morphology
Coffin Texts:	<i>passive</i> morphology	<i>prospective</i> morphology

A similar type of disjunction applies to the written ending *-y*. In the perfective V-passive of *III.inf*, with all types of subjects alike, this stands for a segment resulting from the interaction of the final ‘weak’ element of the root with whatever perfective V-passive morphology may have been. In the prospective V-passive, by contrast, the written ending *-y*, only before short pronominal subjects, stands for prospective morphology, just like it does in the prospective active; passive morphology is left unrepresented in writing:

91 Schenkel (2004; 2005).



*Underlying morphology represented by the written ending -y (PT and CT)*

- Perfective V-passive: last ‘weak’ root element, interacting with *passive* morphology;  
 Prospective V-passive: alternant to -w under specific prosodic conditions, represents *prospective* morphology.

NB. That the same written ending may represent different underlying morphological phenomena is not unparalleled in Earlier Egyptian written morphology. This may be illustrated by the case of -y in *III.inf.* In the subjunctive, this written ending stands for the reflex of the final ‘weak’ element of the root, realized as a glide at the onset of the stressed post-thematic syllable with all types of subjects and in all parts of the Earlier Egyptian record (C-Ci interacting with (C)CCá- → \*/jˤrjá-/). In the prospective in Coffin Texts and only before singular pronominal subjects, the same written ending stands for a syllable-final glide (\*/jˤra:ja-/ , alternating with \*/jˤra:wa-/).<sup>92</sup> In the perfective V-passive and in the unmarked passive participle, the same written ending -y recurs and stands for yet another phenomenon, impossible to reconstruct with similar confidence but arguably involving an interaction of some sort between the final ‘weak’ element of the root and V-passive morphology. (For an interpretation as possibly reflecting a process along the line of C-Ci + \*/-u(:)/ → \*\*/jˤriw/ > \*/jˤrij-/ , \*/jˤri(:)-/ or the like, §1.2.5.B.) As regards the written ending -w itself, this is for example regularly found in the active prospective of certain inflectional classes in Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts, but also in the marked (/imperfective) passive participle of all inflectional classes across the Earlier Egyptian record: in these two inflectional categories, and in other ones, the written ending -w necessarily stands for different things.

1.2.4.3 In the perfective V-passive outside early funerary corpora

Outside early funerary corpora, a written ending -w is occasionally found in the perfective V-passive; in all pre-New Kingdom times, this remains rare.<sup>93</sup> Unlike in Coffin Texts, no correlation with prosodic conditions and/or *2rad* is detected:

- *2rad*: Hammamat 110, 6 ḥˤ.n ṣˤw nḥbt=s (...) ‘Then its neck was cut (...)’;<sup>94</sup> Hatnub 22, 14 tmw n=i sšw (...) ‘The writings were completed for me (...)’; P. UC 32213, ro 9 [...] ḏḏw n=k [...] ‘[...] It was said to you [...]’ (the second and third with a singular dative clitic, the first without).<sup>95</sup>

<sup>92</sup> In details, Schenkel (2000b).

<sup>93</sup> Gardiner’s (1957<sup>3</sup>: §420) famous comment that ‘the ending -w is fairly common before nominal subject and in impersonal uses (...)’ is correct for the Eighteenth Dynasty only; moreover, the forms with the written ending -w to which the author is referring often concern two high-frequency verbs, *iri* and *rdi*, where they may be specific scribal conventions.

<sup>94</sup> With fuller context, §4.1.3, (viii.a).

<sup>95</sup> *Eloquent Peasant* B1 144 špw, mentioned by Díaz Hernández (2013: 95), is a pseudoparticiple.

- *III.inf*: P. Cairo JE 49623, 3 (Sixth Dynasty) *iw inw sš n t3ti s3b t3ti n b3k im* ‘A piece of writing of the chief of justice and vizier was brought to this humble servant’; *Urk.* VII 31, 10-11 (Khnumhotep II) *dw n=f tnw s'hw in hm n hr (...)* ‘A great many offices were given to him by the Majesty of the Horus (...)’; (the second with a singular dative clitic, the first without);
- *3rad*: Heqanakht II, ro 27-28 *mtn š3w m wnm rmt 3* ‘Look, one has begun to eat people here!’ (no dative expression);<sup>96</sup>
- *IV.inf*: *Sinuhe* B 300 *iw hws w n=i mr m inr* ‘A pyramid of stone was constructed for me’ (with a singular dative clitic);
- *Caus-3rad*: Wahankh Antef II’s *Dog Stela* (CG 20512), 3 *sk3hw rwdw=sn* ‘and their staircases were built.’<sup>97</sup>

In the Eighteenth Dynasty, the written ending *-w* becomes more common, both in inscriptionally published texts and in manuscripts of Middle Egyptian literary compositions.<sup>98</sup> This trend seems to have begun in post-Twelfth Dynasty texts, e.g. Neferhotep’s *Great Abydos Stela* 18 *h' n šh'w hm n ntr pn (...)* ‘The Majesty of this god was made to appear (...)’; Nubkheperre Antef’s *Coptos Decree* 6 *nhmw k'w=f (...)* ‘while his food rations (...) had been taken away.’

The possibility for a written ending *-w* to occasionally occur in the perfective V-passive is a development also observed in Coffin Texts (§1.2.4.2). Unlike in the latter, however, the occasional occurrence of *-w* in non-funerary corpora is not subject to any specific distributional restriction. The scribal conventions of written representation of perfective V-passive morphology in non-funerary corpora thereby differ from both Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts. This is plausibly related to a different linguistic situation, namely that in non-funerary corpora, unlike in Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts, there is only one form of the V-passive, the perfective one (§1.2.2-3).

## 1.2.5 V-passive morphology

A. Given the lack of any interpretable *Nebenüberlieferung*,<sup>99</sup> a reconstruction of whatever V-passive morphology may have been like must rely fully on an interpretation of the written phenomenology associated with the forms. As discussed, the *-w* often written in forms of the prospective V-passive—as well as, in Coffin

96 Heqanakht I, ro 6 *šn'w*, mentioned by Brose (2014: 263), is a pseudoparticiple (similarly Allen 2002: 25).

97 With fuller context, §2.5.2.3.2, (viii).

98 E.g. Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §420).

99 Passives are hardly ever found in personal names such as could be documented in second millennium Cuneiform transcription (this is only expected as the functions of passive voice have to do with discourse and thereby transcend the boundaries of the single clause). Rare vocalized forms of V-passives from late sources (e.g. Ray 2003: 124-5 and n.4) are from specific inflectional classes (*ult.inf* and *ult.i < ult.aleph*) and therefore involve additional complexities. Moreover, these forms are from well a millennium after the V-passive had died out as a productive inflectional category; any reconstruction based on these would be courageous.

Texts, its prosodically conditioned alternant *-y* —represents prospective morphology: active and passive forms of the prospective are syncretic with one another in writing; put differently, passive morphology remains unrepresented in the prospective V-passive (§1.2.4.1). Except in *III.inf*, the perfective V-passive is always written without any ending in Pyramid Texts; it displays an ending *-w* only occasionally and under certain conditions in Coffin Texts; the same ending remains rare in all other pre-New Kingdom texts (§1.2.4.2-3). In most cases and occurrences in text, the perfective V-passive is thereby unmarked in writing just like the prospective V-passive. Together, this makes it likely that V-passive morphology implied a stem alternation of some sort, probably different in the perfective and the prospective V-passives.

B. In the perfective V-passive, the written ending *-w* is very rare in all pre-New Kingdom times, yet occasionally found. With much caution, it has been suggested that this could stand for an ending *\*/-u(:)/*,<sup>100</sup> possibly realized as *\*/-aw-/* before singular dative clitics. This would also be compatible with written forms in *-y* of the perfective V-passive of *III.inf*, which could then be interpreted as reflecting an assimilatory process of some sort operating between the last ‘weak’ root element of these verbs and the ending *\*/-u(:)/*. Thus:

*The perfective V-passive of III.inf*

C-Ci + <i>*/-u(:)/</i>	→ <i>*j~riw/</i> → <i>*j~rij-/</i> or <i>*j~ri(:)-/</i>	<i>ir, iry</i>
C-Ci + <i>*/-u(:)/</i> + <i>*/-nif/</i>	→ <i>*j~ráwnif/</i>	<i>ir</i> in PT; <i>ir, irw</i> in CT

C. The hypothesized ending *\*/-u(:)/*—if correctly reconstructed—need not have been the whole morpheme of the perfective V-passive: it may just as well have been only the part of the morpheme that could be represented in writing, given the constraints of the Egyptian writing system.

To illustrate this possibility, a comparison with the well-understood case of the subjunctive of *2rad* is instructive. In written form, this is commonly associated with a prefix *i*. in Pyramid Texts, also found in the imperative of the same inflectional class. In both forms, the written prefix *i*. represents a segment to the left of the root, but with different morphological status. In the imperative of *2rad*, the segment is distinctive and thereby has full morphemic status. In the subjunctive, by contrast, the same segment is the secondary outcome of a morpho-phonological process serving to solve an initial consonantal cluster. The distinctive morphology of the subjunctive—the final-stressed discontinuous inflectional pattern (C<sup>~</sup>)CCá- —is of a sort that could not be represented directly in writing:

100 Suggested by Schenkel (2005: 52-3), with a long vowel. I set the indication of vowel length in parentheses, as its actual realization may have varied depending on a variety of factors that lie beyond reach. An ending *\*/-u/* had also been suggested by Reintges (1997: 256-67), but under the hypothesis of a single V-passive; the author thus interprets all instances of a written ending *-w* in V-passives as representing V-passive morphology directly. For arguments against the unity of the V-passive and against an interpretation of *-w* as directly pointing to passive morphology, §1.2.1 and §1.2.4.1, respectively.

*Two forms of 2rad with the written prefix i. in Pyramid Texts*

(Imperative: directly morphemic: \*/awán/<sup>101</sup>)

Subjunctive: inflectional pattern: (C̣)CCá-<sup>102</sup>

accommodated onto 2rad: \*/wná-/ → \*/~wná-/

NB. In a similar vein, with *III.inf*, the written forms *iry* are illustrative. In the prospective, these are limited to singular pronominal subjects in Coffin Texts and stand for a form \*/j~rá:ja-/ (sg. subject clitics: \*/j~ra:wa-fl > \*/j~ra:ja-fl ~ \*/j~ra:wa-fl; pl. subject clitics: \*/j~ra:w-s~n/).<sup>103</sup> While an alternant determined by prosodic conditions, the segment represented by the written ending -y therefore has full morphemic status in the forms that display it. In the subjunctive, by contrast, the same written ending -y, not limited to Coffin Texts and not limited to singular pronominal clitics, represents a reflex of the last ‘weak’ root element, realized as a glide under the particular final-stressed inflectional pattern of the subjunctive (C-Ci + (C̣)CCá- → \*/j~rjá-/). In the subjunctive of *III.inf*, the segment represented by -y does not have direct morphemic status, just like the written prefix *i.* does not either in the subjunctive of 2rad in Pyramid Texts.

In the perfective V-passive similarly, the underlying morphology may have been more complex than what occasionally meets the eye in written form. For example, the perfective V-passive could have involved a discontinuous morpheme of the type -V-u (where the capitalized ‘V’ stands for a vowel of some sort, morphologically distinctive), thus e.g. in 3rad, C̣CVCu-. If this were the case, written forms would look exactly like they do.

A further possibility, also suggested by the case of the subjunctive of 2rad and of *III.inf*, is then that the post-thematic vowel \*/-u(:)/—if correctly reconstructed (above, B)—may not even be the main part of passive morphology in the perfective V-passive. Rather, it could just as well be the secondary outcome of a morphophonological process of progressive assimilation. The form may then have had variant realizations depending on prosodic environments and possibly phenomena of samdhi in the chain. That these are indeed relevant parameters is strongly suggested by the written behavior of *III.inf* in Coffin Texts which affords slightly safer grounds for interpretation, thus arguably \*/j~riw/ → \*/j~rij-/ or \*/j~ri(:)/ but \*/j~ráw-nif/ (above, B). In other words, the hypothesized post-thematic vowel \*/-u(:)/ could have been present only under certain prosodic conditions and/or in certain realizations of the form. Both were probably variable diachronically (as well as along other factors such as register and geography). For example:

101 Reflected in Coptic ⲁϣⲟⲛ.

102 Reflect in Coptic ⲧ-causatives.

103 Schenkel (2000b: 52).

*An hypothetical(!) reconstruction of the perfective V-passive*

3rad:  ${}^?C\sim CuC-$  or  ${}^?C\sim Cu:C-$ ,

with possible realizations as:

${}^?*/C\sim Cu(:)C-/$ ,  ${}^?*/C\sim Cu(:)C\sim-/$ , and/or  ${}^?*/C\sim Cu(:)Cu-/$

or, interpreting the above either diachronically or in terms of deeper morphological structure:

${}^?***/C\sim Cu(:)C-/ \rightarrow {}^?***/C\sim Cu(:)Cu-/ \rightarrow {}^?*/C\sim CCu-/$

2rad:  ${}^?CuC-$  or  ${}^?Cu:C-$

with possible realizations as:

${}^?*/Cu(:)C-/$ ,  ${}^?*/Cu(:)C\sim-/$ , and/or  ${}^?*/Cu(:)Cu(:)-/$

Specifying the above in an adequate way, the distribution of the written ending *-w* in Coffin Texts could then be accounted for along the following lines, for example:

*An hypothetical(!) account of the distribution of -w in Coffin Texts*

Perfective V-passive:  ${}^?(C\sim)Cu(:)C-$

3rad:  ${}^?***/C\sim Cu(:)C-/ \rightarrow {}^?***/C\sim Cu(:)Cu-/ \rightarrow {}^?*/C\sim CCu-/$

before short dative clitics only:  ${}^?*/C\sim CCu-/ + */nifl/ \rightarrow {}^?*/C\sim CCaw-nifl/$

III.inf:  $*/j\sim riw/ \rightarrow */j\sim rij-/$  or  $*/j\sim ri(:)-/$

before short dative clitics only:  $*/j\sim riw/ \rightarrow */j\sim r\acute{a}w-nifl/$

2rad:  ${}^?*/Cu(:)C-/ \sim {}^?*/CuCu(:)-/ \sim {}^?*/CuCaw-/$

The above is of course speculative and is presented here only as an illustration of how things *might* have been: matters were probably complex and variable, also involving prosodics and phenomena of samdhi in the chain, all presently irrecoverable. Two points are worth underscoring, however: a reconstruction of the perfective V-passive as  ${}^?(C\sim)Cu(:)C-$  is just as consistent with the written forms as one whereby the form would have been marked merely by an ending  $*/-u(:)/$ . In view of the overall rarity of actual occurrence of *-w*, the former is in fact more likely than the latter.

In addition, an indirect indication in favor of an interpretation along the lines of  ${}^?(C\sim)Cu(:)C-$  is to be found on an altogether different level, namely the type of source construction in which the perfective V-passive probably has its origin (discussion: §2.9.1.2).

D. Leaving aside the details of reconstruction, V-passive morphology contrasts with T-passive morphology along the following lines:

- While T-passive morphology can be combined with any active stem other than the imperative and participles, V-passive morphology can only be combined with prospective morphology (and this, only provided that the prospective V-passive is not syncretic in underlying form with the active prospective; §1.3.3B). For example, there are no instances of the long stem

(*mrr-*) combined with V-passive morphology,<sup>104</sup> nor can V-passive morphology be accommodated with the inflectional pattern of the subjunctive ((*C'*)CCá-) or with *-n-* marking the accomplished;

- While T-passive morphology has singular exponence ({*t*} codes only voice), the perfective V-passive is marked by a portmanteau morpheme, i.e. by a morpheme that synthesizes the expression of voice and tense-aspect;<sup>105</sup>

- While T-passives can be analyzed componentially as consisting in an active stem made passive by the adjunction of {*t*}, the perfective V-passive can not be decomposed this way.

T- and V-passives also contrast in the source constructions from which they can be hypothesized to have developed (§2.9.2.2 and §2.9.1.2, respectively). As further to be discussed, these various dimensions of contrast are meaningfully interrelated with each other, with major implications on two of the main topics addressed in the present study: the functional contrast between the two Middle Egyptian passives in the accomplished, one a T-passive (the *sdm.n.t=f*), the other a V-passive (the perfective V-passive) (§4); and the changes diachronically affecting the T-passive, to which the V-passive, for its part, remains immune (§5).

### 1.3 Passives associated with partial reduplication: *Sdmm=f* and *ddd*

In addition to the T- and V-passives, Earlier Egyptian has passive forms distinguished in writing by the reduplication of their last root consonant.<sup>106</sup> Passives associated with partial reduplication comprise two forms, one finite (the *sdmm=f*) and one non-finite (the participle *ddd*). In both the *sdmm=f* and the *ddd*, partial reduplication is associated with grammatical function (voice and tense-aspect) and does not affect the lexical meaning of the event. Partial reduplication in the *sdmm=f* and the *ddd* is therefore inflectional and distinct from partial or full reduplication with derivational functions (e.g. *wni* ‘hasten’ → *wnwn* ‘sway to and fro’).<sup>107</sup> The morphological process operating in the *sdmm=f* and the *ddd* is also to be distinguished from partial inflectional reduplication in the *mrr=f*: as far as written forms are concerned, reduplication concerns only *ult.inf* in the *mrr=f*, while it is found in altogether different inflectional classes in the *sdmm=f* and the *ddd*.<sup>108</sup>

<sup>104</sup> Pace Westendorf (1959).

<sup>105</sup> Similarly Reintges (2004).

<sup>106</sup> The following discussion supersedes Stauder (2008).

<sup>107</sup> A full study of derivational reduplication in the Earlier Egyptian verb remains a desideratum. Provisionally, Edel (1955-1964: §429-39); Vernus (2009; focusing on alternations *n*-ABAB ~ ABAB); Bendjaballah & Reintges (2007; for a generative account).

<sup>108</sup> These observations are not new and implicit in most presentations. In Bendjaballah & Reintges’ (2007) account, this is captured in a description in which derivational reduplication (as in e.g. *wnwn*), inflectional reduplication in the *mrr=f*, and inflectional reduplication in the *sdmm=f* and *ddd* (there described as ‘derivational’) are placed at three different levels of generation.

Differing from T- and V-passives, passives associated with reduplication are subject to severe restrictions in the inflectional classes with which they can be formed and in their distribution in the Earlier Egyptian record; their respective temporal-aspectual profiles are also more specific than the one of either the T- or the V-passives (§1.3.1). In addition, the *sdmm=f* and *ddd* differ from one another on all three levels just mentioned. Such restrictions have been taken to indicate that the *sdmm=f* and *ddd* are the remnants of a once more productive system of passive formation by partial reduplication.<sup>109</sup> Alternatively, it has been proposed that the distinctive feature that meets the eye in written form, partial reduplication, could have been more widespread, either in the forms underlying the written forms<sup>110</sup> or even in deeper morphological structure.<sup>111</sup> In common to most discussions of the forms is thereby the assumption that the *sdmm=f* and *ddd* represent a third type of passive formation in Earlier Egyptian, alongside T- and V-passives.<sup>112</sup> I here propose a different interpretation in which morphological parameters themselves play the central role (§1.3.2-3). On this account, the *sdmm=f* and *ddd* are secondary formations and do not represent an autonomous type of Earlier Egyptian inflectional passives. The section concludes with notes on how the *sdmm=f* and *ddd* present a typologically exceptional configuration (§1.3.4).

### 1.3.1 Distributional restrictions

#### 1.3.1.1 Inflectional classes

The finite *sdmm=f* is formed with *2rad*, *3rad*, and some *IV.inf*. Instances with exponents of each of these inflectional classes are documented both in Pyramid Texts<sup>113</sup> and in Coffin Texts.<sup>114</sup> The *sdmm=f* was probably also formed with *II.red*:<sup>115</sup> perfective V-passives of *II.red* seem to have been based on the short written stem<sup>116</sup>

109 E.g. Edel (1955-1964: §556, ‘offenbar eine altentümliche Form’); Reintges (2011: 32-3, presented among ‘archaic features’ in Pyramid Texts).

110 Allen (1984: 535, n.393).

111 Schenkel (1985: 490; 2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.3.1.2.4.a, Diskussion 2).

112 Most explicitly Reintges (1997: 241-2, 247-55, 278-9; 2003), who posits three primary types of inflectional passives, labeled ‘pass1’ (V-passives), ‘pass2’ (T-passives), and ‘pass3’ (passives associated with reduplication). A similar implication is to be found in Schenkel’s (1985: 490) analysis and in Edel’s (1955-1964: §556-8) presentation. The lack of subjectless constructions of the *sdmm=f* is only a documentary gap reflecting the high specialization of the form compounded with the skewed nature of the record (§2.1.2.A, NB). It does not, therefore, provide syntactic evidence to the fact that the *sdmm=f* is an autonomous type of passive formation (pace Reintges 1997: 253).

113 Allen (1984: §772B, §757B, and §796B, respectively).

114 Borghouts (2010: I, §70.c).

115 Disputed by Edel (1955-1964: §557) and Reintges (1997: 252); left unmentioned, and thereby implicitly rejected, in Borghouts (2010: I, §70.c); cautiously accepted by Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §420); accepted by Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.3.1.2.4-5).

116 No instances of the perfective V-passive of *II.red* with the short written stem are documented in Pyramid Texts (Allen 1984: §488.A, §515.B). The short written stem is, on the other hand, sparsely documented elsewhere, thus in CT I 74b B1P *ng* ‘there has been cackling’ (for the complex textual variation in this passage, Stauder in press a: §1.9) and in Ameniseneb (Louvre C11), I *m3* ‘was seen’ (sim. Louvre C12, 16); the long stem is perhaps documented as well, in

and long forms such as *tmm* (Pyr. 230c; \*1075a-b) or *3mm* (CT I 397b S1C, T3C; CT I 398b S1C, S2C: §1.3.1.2, (ii)) are therefore in all likelihood instances of a *sdmm=f* formation. On the other hand, forms that have been proposed as candidates for a *sdmm=f* of *caus-2rad* and *caus-III.inf* are to be interpreted differently, as involving derivational-lexical reduplication.<sup>117</sup> The *sdmm=f* could not be formed with verbs of another major class, *III.inf*,<sup>118</sup> nor with derived stems such as causatives and long ones. As regards the *IV.inf*, this was probably not a homogeneous class in the *sdmm=f*, just like it was not with other inflectional categories.<sup>119</sup>

Non-finite *ddd*, by contrast, is formed with verbs of one inflectional class only, *2rad*, to the exclusion of all other inflectional classes.

### 1.3.1.2 Tense-aspect

Whenever tense can be established on reasonably secure grounds, the finite *sdmm=f* is always in future contexts.<sup>120</sup> This is illustrated in the following passage where the *sdmm=f* alternates with the prospective T-passive:<sup>121</sup>

---

CT VI 315h B1Bo *n m33* ‘while (...) had not been seen’ (Borghouts 2010: I, §70.b.2), provided this is not an infinitive.

117 *Sfh* (proposed by Borghouts 2010: I, §70.c.2) involves lexical reduplication, as is demonstrated by e.g. *snfhfh*; *sfhh* is therefore a *caus-II.red* (similarly Allen 1984: §751; 2013a: 95; Reintges 1994: 234). The same comment extends to *shdd* (proposed by Edel 1955-1964: §558.d), as is demonstrated by e.g. *shdh* (similarly Reintges 1997: 250, n.4).

118 For a proposal that the *sdmm=f* could be formed with *III.inf* in deeper morphological structure, (Schenkel 1985: 490), critically §1.3.2.B.

119 The inflectional complexities of *IV.inf* are illustrated for example by the formation of the infinitive with or without *-t* apparently depending on individual verbs, or by the subdivision of *IV.inf* into ‘prefixing’ and ‘geminating’ sub-classes in Pyramid Texts (Allen 1984: §742).

120 Edel (1955-1964: §559); Allen (1984: §529); Reintges (1997: 387-91). The interpretation of the form as marked for future tense has recently been challenged with a suggestion that ‘as in the active (...), the base and geminated forms of the passive *stp.f* (*scil.* the *sdmm=f*, AS) can be designated “perfective” and “imperfective,” respectively’ (Allen 2013a: 119; this is part of a broader reinterpretation of reduplication exposed in Allen 2013a: 95-8). Imperfective aspect and future tense can come close in text, particularly in negative examples: this is illustrated by example (i) in the main text, where *n sdmm=f* alternates with *n sdm.n.t=f*, the latter with habitual/general interpretation. The proximity between the two is illustrated by the possibility of inferences along the lines of ‘it is not done (in general)’, thus ‘it can not be done’, and thus ‘there will be no case of it being done’. As the *sdmm=f* occurs alongside and in complementary distribution to *-w* marked V-passives (Allen 1984: §487.C, §515; 2013a: 119; Schenkel 2004; 2005; illustration: §1.2.1, (i)), Allen’s (2013a) proposal is therefore contingent upon interpreting *-w* marked forms (both active and passives ones) as themselves not representing a distinct inflectional category, the prospective (Allen 2011a: 6-7). I hold to the traditional view of a distinct form of the prospective notably because of the distribution of the written ending *-w* along inflectional classes, in *ult.inf*, *caus*, and *long*, not however in *2rad*, *3rad*, and *II.red* (in details, Schenkel 2000b). Accordingly, the written ending *-w* can not be interpreted as standing for an ending *\*-/á/* as in the subjunctive: as Coptic demonstrates, the ending *\*-/á/* was regular in the subjunctive of all inflectional classes alike; if the written ending *-w* stood for *\*-/á/*, it should occur in all inflectional classes similarly; it does not.

121 In alternation with an active prospective similarly, e.g. Pyr. 1960b-c<sup>N</sup> (PT 668) (§1.2.1, (i)); CT II 260e-f (var. mss.) *pry=i mm ʕ3t=k tw r pt whʕ imyw i3hw* ‘I will go forth among this multitude of yours to the sky; those who are in the sunrays will be released.’



## (i) CT I 397b-398b B1C, B2L, B1P, B1Bo

*n ndr.w.t b3=i in bikw*                      *n 3m.n.t<sup>a</sup> b3=i in 33w*  
*n h3f<sup>c</sup> b3=i in 3krw*                      *n s3.n.t b3=i in h3k3w šnwt r<sup>c</sup>*

‘My *ba* will not be taken hold of by falcons, my *ba* can not be seized by pigs;  
 My *ba* will not be grasped by the earth-gods, my *ba* can not be retained by the  
 magic powers of Re’s entourage.’

a) B1Bo *n 3mm.n.t*.

## (ii) S1C, S2C

*n ndr.t b3=i in bikw*                      *n 3mm<sup>a</sup> b3=i in 33w*  
*n h3f<sup>c</sup> b3=i in 3krw*                      *n 3mm b3=i in h3k3*

‘My *ba* will not be taken hold of by falcons, my *ba* will not be seized by pigs;  
 My *ba* will not be grasped by the earth-gods, my *ba* will not be seized by  
 Heka.’

a) S2C *3{3}<m>m=i*.

Non-finite *ddd*, by contrast, aligns with unmarked participles.<sup>122</sup> In their temporal-aspectual profiles, the two forms do not overlap. What is more, while the profile of the *s3mm=f* is temporally defined, the profile of the *ddd* participle is for its part aspectually defined.

## 1.3.1.3 Distribution in the record

A. The finite *s3mm=f* is fairly common in early funerary corpuses, Pyramid Texts<sup>123</sup> and Coffin Texts.<sup>124</sup> It recurs in the so-called Netherworld Books documented from the early New Kingdom on.<sup>125</sup> Regardless of when these texts were composed—a hotly contended issue<sup>126</sup>—the presence of the *s3mm=f* in these texts is consistent with other linguistic features by which they linguistically relate to, and index, a tradition harkening back to ultimately Pyramid Texts. The *s3mm=f* is not, on the other hand, found in inscriptional, documentary, or literary texts of any times.<sup>127</sup>

In early funerary corpuses themselves, the *s3mm=f* is occasionally replaced by other passive formations, exceptionally in Pyramid Texts, less rarely in Coffin Texts. Once, a *s3mm=f* is replaced by a prospective T-passive in the same formulation:<sup>128</sup>

122 E.g. Allen (1984: §613); Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.5.1).

123 Occurrences: Allen (1984: §757B, §767B, §772B, §796B); Edel (1955-1964: §557-8).

124 Occurrences: Van der Molen (2005: 1315-16, 1412-13); on interpretive difficulties associated with written forms of *h3f*, Schenkel (2005: 51).

125 Werning (2013: 252-3); Quack (2000: 547); Zeidler (1999: I, 143, 308); Baumann (1998: 370-81).

126 The latest contributions are by Werning (2013) and Jansen-Winkel (2012), both with extensive references to previous discussions and contrary opinions.

127 For the alleged instances in medical texts, Westendorf (1962: 126, n.4).

128 Allen (2013a: 122, ex.9.77-78).

(i) Pyr. 658d<sup>T</sup> (PT 374)

[*n ndr*]rr=*k* in 3krw

‘You will not be taken hold of by the earth-gods.’

Sim. *Ibi* 533 (pl.11).<sup>129</sup>

(ii) Pyr. 2205<sup>N</sup> (PT 703)

*n ndr*w.t *N* in 3krw

‘N will not be taken hold of by the earth-gods.’<sup>130</sup>

NB. It is perhaps significant that this earliest instance of a *sḏmm=f* replaced by a T-passive is with a verb from the *IV.inf*, a notoriously inhomogeneous inflectional class. While e.g. *3rad* form a *sḏmm=f* but no prospective in -w and e.g. *III.inf* form a prospective in -w but no *sḏmm=f*, *IV.inf*—or at least some exponents of this class, among which *ndri*—can form both a *sḏmm=f* and a prospective in -w. That the *IV.inf* could have been among the first to replace the *sḏmm=f* is perhaps also suggested by alternations such as *n ndr*w.t ~ *n ḥf*cc (*3rad*), *n 3mm* (*II.red*) in CT I 397b-398a (§1.3.1.2, (i)-(ii)).<sup>131</sup> In the case of *ndri*, matters are made yet more complex by the fact that this verb also forms an active prospective (documented with and without the written ending -w)<sup>132</sup> and a prospective V-passive.<sup>133</sup> The alternation between a prospective V-passive of *ndri* and the *sḏmm=f* of a *3rad* is illustrated in the following passage:

(iii) CT VI 84e B3L

*n ndr=k n ḥnrr=k* in ir[*i*w] pt t3 nb

‘You will neither be taken hold of nor imprisoned by any guardians of the sky or the earth.’

While *ndri* may thus be a case for its own (see the above NB), a prospective T-passive of a *3rad* is also once found in Pyramid Texts in parallel to a *sḏmm=f* of another *3rad*.<sup>134</sup>

(iv) Pyr. 1026a-b<sup>P</sup> (PT 485)

*ntr* nb ṣd.t=f *N* pn ir pt ṣnh dd

*rḥs.t* n=f *k3w stpp* n=f ḥpšwt (...)

‘Every god who will take this N to the sky, alive and enduring,  
bulls will be slaughtered for him, forelegs will be chosen for him (...)’

In addition, V-passives of *3rad* are rarely found in Pyramid Texts in future contexts, i.e. in places where the *sḏmm=f* would have been expected: as discussed, these are

<sup>129</sup> Quoted by Reintges (1997: 354, ex.4c).

<sup>130</sup> On this passage, further Allen (1984: §553.B).

<sup>131</sup> On the variance between *ndrr* and *ndr(w).t* in Coffin Texts and interpretive uncertainties that can result from the similarity of *r* and *t* in Hieratic, further Allen (2013a: 216, n.37).

<sup>132</sup> Pyr. 380a<sup>w</sup> (PT 269), Pyr. 997a<sup>p</sup> (PT 480) *ndrw*; Pyr. 997a<sup>N</sup> (PT 480) *ndr*.

<sup>133</sup> Pyr. 380a<sup>p</sup> (PT 269) (§1.2.1, (iv.a)).

<sup>134</sup> Noted by Reintges (1997: 399, ex.57a).

probably to be interpreted in relation to the Endpoint orientation of the perfective V-passive (§1.2.3.2).

In Coffin Texts, the *sdmm=f* of *3rad* is found in textual variance with both the prospective T-passive and the V-passive:

(v) CT V 62/63b-c

- *sdmm=f* in 10 witnesses (*n nhmm*);
- prospective T-passives in B3L (*n nhm.t*, *n nhm.tw*); also 63c B1Ca and B1Cb (*n nhm.t*; these two witnesses read actively in 63b *n nhm.n=f*);
- V-passives in Sq5Sq, M22C, and K1T (*n nhm*).

The variance of the *sdmm=f* with T-passives is in line with the spread of T-passives based on the (active) prospective stem, described above (§1.2.2.2). The V-passives in such alternations could be uses of the perfective V-passive akin to the ones already rarely encountered in Pyramid Texts (§1.2.3.2) or artifacts of textual transmission, depending on individual cases.

In another passage, the T-passive is reserved to *III.inf*, in line with other signs of a then ongoing obsolescence of the prospective V-passive in these inflectional classes (§1.2.2.2). In the same passage, *3rad* display an alternation between the *sdmm=f* and the V-passive both between the two witnesses and internally to the latter:

(vi) CT III 296c-h

G1T	<i>n hskk</i>	<i>n sn{t}.tw</i>	<i>n hm</i>	<i>n h3mm</i>	<i>n nhmm</i>	<i>n sn{t}.tw</i>
A1C	<i>n hsk</i>	<i>n sn.tw</i>	<i>n hm</i>	<i>n h3mm</i>	<i>n nhm</i>	<i>n sn.tw</i>

In this case, and therefore probably in other ones as well, the phenomenon seems largely textual in nature.<sup>135</sup>

As the above also illustrates, the *sdmm=f* is more common in Coffin Texts in negative constructions (among the above, (iii), (v), and (vi)),<sup>136</sup> but occurrences in positive clauses are found as well:<sup>137</sup> whether the form underwent a differential obsolescence according to polarity is therefore uncertain. In several cases, both positive and negative, the inheritance from Pyramid Texts is clear (e.g. (iii), comparing with (i) in Pyramid Texts); in others, the form is used outside such inheritance.

B. Non-finite *ddd* is more broadly documented in the Earlier Egyptian record. Old Kingdom occurrences are in Pyramid Texts<sup>138</sup> and in other types of texts alike.<sup>139</sup> In the Middle Kingdom, *ddd* is found in a variety of types of texts such as expedition

<sup>135</sup> Similarly Wolfgang Schenkel (p.c. 1/2014): ‘In CT III 296c-h herrscht ein ziemliches Chaos. Ich weiß nicht recht, was man an der Textstelle ernst nehmen darf. Die beiden Textzeugen G1T und A1C, die generell eng miteinander zusammenhängen, sind oft problematisch, divergieren im Detail oft auch trotz des erkennbar engen überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhangs.’

<sup>136</sup> Further van der Molen (2005: 1412-15).

<sup>137</sup> E.g. CT II 260e-f, quoted above, n.121; further van der Molen (2005: 1315-16; not all *sdmm=f*s).

<sup>138</sup> Allen (1984: §760B).

<sup>139</sup> Edel (1955-1964: §640).

accounts, private inscriptions, literature, and documentary texts;<sup>140</sup> the form recurs in early Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptions, royal and private.<sup>141</sup> Unlike the *sdmm=f*, *ddd* displays no particular association with early funerary corpuses.

In the same inflectional class in which reduplicated *ddd* is formed, *2rad*, non-reduplicated forms are found as well. In Middle Egyptian,<sup>142</sup> reduplicated forms are mainly from fairly common verbs (such as, typically, *wḏ* ‘order’, *rḥ* ‘know’, *ḥm* ‘know not’, *tm* (negative verb), *dd* ‘say’); the same verbs can also have the non-reduplicated form in similar function. Less common verbs generally have the non-reduplicated form only, thus *ḥr* ‘expel’, *sd* ‘break’. The boundary between the two is fluid, as is illustrated by the case of *ts* ‘tie’ (< <sup>OEg</sup>*ṭz*), which has the reduplicated forms alongside non-reduplicated ones.

The process of obsolescence of *ddd* in *2rad* thus appears to have been gradual across the lexicon, with more common verbs keeping the form longer than less common ones. As a participial formation, *ddd* was prone to go some way toward lexicalization, thereby increasingly moving toward becoming a derivational category. Put in more concrete terms: as they became less productive over time, reduplicated passive participles were increasingly stored as individual items in mental representation, i.e. lexically, rather than as part of a regular and productive paradigm. That more common verbs would keep the form longer than less common ones is then natural.

NB. The density of occurrence of *ddd* in *Khakheperreseneb* is higher than in any other Middle Egyptian literary text. This is significant in relation to the salient morphology of the form, reduplication, which together with other elements of repetition playfully and reflexively points to one major theme concerned by the composition, ‘repetition’ (*whmmyt*, with a rare derivational pattern, itself based on partial reduplication).<sup>143</sup>

### 1.3.2 Interpretation: Partial reduplication as a morphologically conditioned process

As a background to the discussion to follow, it is convenient to preliminarily summarize the above in a table:

140 Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §360); Borghouts (2010: I, §74.d.4).

141 Stauder (2013a: 159, (ii), also 486).

142 Based on data in Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §360) and Borghouts (2010: I, §74.d.4). In Middle Egyptian, the form *ddd* occasionally comes with a written ending -y (Z4). It has been proposed that this could be a mere space filler, not standing for a morphologically significant segment (2010: I, §74.d.4). However, as Wolfgang Schenkel observes (p.c. 1/2014), the sign Z4 on top of the papyrus roll (Y1) in passive participles (thus P. Berlin 10470 I.13; I.15; I.16) contrasts with the lack of Z4 on top of Y1 in other morphological contexts in the same document (thus P. Berlin 10470 I.14; I.15). The written ending -y thus seems to stand for an actual segment of some sort in the underlying form.

143 Further discussion: Stauder (2013a: 133-4).

	<i>sḏmm=f</i>	<i>ddd</i>
Inflectional classes:	<i>3rad, 2rad, II.red, IV.inf</i>	<i>2rad</i>
Tense-aspect:	future	aspectually unmarked
Distribution in the record:	PT, CT	Earlier Egyptian

### 1.3.2.1 The *membra disiecta* of a once more productive formation?

Both the *sḏmm=f* and *ddd* are subject to severe restrictions in terms of inflectional classes and in terms of their distribution in the record. Moreover, these restrictions are different for the finite and the non-finite forms. So is their temporal-aspectual profile, future for the former, perfective/unmarked for the latter. One could then be tempted to declare passives associated with partial reduplication an archaic formation, rapidly obsolescent in early historical times already: the observed distributions would then represent the *membra disiecta* of a once more productive system.<sup>144</sup>

This interpretation is ruled out by a more detailed examination of relevant parameters in the distributions to be accounted for. Beginning with the finite form, the *sḏmm=f* expresses future tense (§1.3.1.2), as does the prospective V-passive (§1.2.1.A). The *sḏmm=f* and the prospective V-passive stand in complementary distribution according to inflectional classes:<sup>145</sup> the former is formed with *3rad, 2rad*, some *IV.inf*, and arguably *II.red* (§1.3.1.1); the latter is formed with *ult.inf, caus*, and *long* (§1.2.1.A). The *sḏmm=f* is by and large restricted to Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts (§1.3.1.3.A), i.e. to the very corpuses in which the prospective V-passive is itself productive. On all relevant parameters, the *sḏmm=f* displays a distinguished relationship with prospective V-passives. As the complementary distribution over inflectional classes shows, this distribution is principled.

As regards the non-finite form, the obsolescence of the *ddd* with *2rad* during the early/mid-second millennium is lexicon-based, with forms of more common verbs tending to survive longer (§1.3.1.3.B). This implies that, should the category have been more productive at some earlier stage in language history, at least some lexicalized forms of the *ddd* of *3rad* should occasionally be encountered; none ever are. The restriction to *2rad* is therefore original. This must be accounted for in some positive ways.

### 1.3.2.2 Previous accounts for the finite form: Reduplication more widespread in underlying forms?

Based on the relationship between the *sḏmm=f* and the prospective V-passive, two proposals have been made for interpreting the former. Both take the distinctive element in the written form of the *sḏmm=f*—partial reduplication—to have been present more broadly in underlying forms. In one proposal (a), partial reduplication would have been the distinctive morpheme of the prospective, both active and passive, in relevant inflectional classes (*3rad*, etc.). The active and passive forms would have been distinguished by syllable structure in ways that would result in

<sup>144</sup> E.g. Edel (1955-1964: §556); Reintges (2011: 32-3).

<sup>145</sup> Allen (1984: §488.C, §515.A-B, §561.a (2)).

different written forms, <ABC> in the active and <ABCC> in the passive. In the second proposal (b), partial reduplication would have been the distinctive morpheme of the prospective passive in deeper morphological structure, with the last weak root element surfacing as -w in the case of *III.inf*:

(a) *Partial reduplication as the distinctive morpheme of the prospective (active and passive) in relevant inflectional classes (3rad, etc.)*<sup>146</sup>

	underlying forms	written forms
prospective active (3rad, etc.):	A~B~CC-	<ABC>
prospective passive (3rad, etc.):	A~BC~C-	<ABCC>

(b) *Partial reduplication as the distinctive morpheme of the prospective passive in deeper morphological structure in all inflectional classes*<sup>147</sup>

	deep structure	underl. form	written form
prospective passive (3rad, etc.):		A~BC~C-	<ABCC>
prospective passive ( <i>III.inf</i> ):	**A~Bj~j →	A~Bj~w-	<ABw>

Both proposals have in common to posit a more uniform inflection than meets the eye in written forms. The first does so with a view on the prospective paradigm as a whole but in some inflectional classes only, the second with a view on the prospective passive paradigm only but in all inflectional classes. The question therefore fits into the more general issue of how uniform Earlier Egyptian verbal inflection was.

In a broad description, Earlier Egyptian has root-and-pattern morphology,<sup>148</sup> with often discontinuous inflectional patterns interacting with the equally discontinuous root structure of verbs of various inflectional classes. In some inflectional categories, such as demonstrably the subjunctive, the same inflectional pattern (here (C~)CCá-) extends across all inflectional classes, with apparently irregular surface forms being the result of regular morpho-phonological processes (e.g. in 2rad: §1.2.5.C). In other inflectional categories, however, differences in inflection in various classes can not be related to regular morpho-phonological processes: in these categories, inflection was not uniform, but flexive.<sup>149</sup> Flexivity in inflection is demonstrated perhaps most

146 Allen (1984: n.393).

147 Schenkel (1985: 490; 2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.3.1.2.4.a, Diskussion 2).

148 E.g., in a generative perspective, Reintges (1994).

149 Flexivity is defined as the property by which an inflectional category (here a ‘form of the verb’) is realized differently in various inflectional classes in ways that are not the predictable outcomes of regular morpho-phonological processes (e.g. Bickel & Nichols 2007: 184-8). Flexivity is in fact what justifies speaking of inflectional classes in the first place; if not expressed in these terms, the phenomenon has been intuited as a general property of the Earlier Egyptian verb ever since the Berlin School. With respect to the traditional presentation inherited from the latter, two distinctions must be introduced. (a) Phenomena resulting from regular morpho-phonological processes must be distinguished from phenomena that can not be related to such; only the latter represent flexivity. (b) Contrasts in written forms do not stand in a one-to-one relationship with contrasts in underlying morphological forms; accordingly, written flexivity (as defining of the inflectional classes traditionally described for Earlier Egyptian) must be distinguished from genuine, i.e. morphological, flexivity (which the current discussion increasingly concerns).

clearly in the various patterns of the infinitive, but extends to finite categories as well, for example to the pseudoparticiple<sup>150</sup> and to the prospective itself.<sup>151</sup> In the context of the current increasing realization of flexivity in Earlier Egyptian verbal inflection,<sup>152</sup> the possibility of a uniform account such as diversely attempted in proposals (a) and (b) above can not be taken for granted anymore.

Turning to the specifics of the two above proposals, the process by which the last ‘weak’ root element *-i* should surface as *-w* remains unaccounted for in (b) unless an assimilatory process with a vowel *-u-* is posited (*\*\*/j~rjuj-/* → *\*\*/j~rjuw-/*).<sup>153</sup> This would then be the marker of the prospective.<sup>154</sup>

*Proposal (b): Assimilation to -u-*

	<i>3rad</i>		<i>III.inf</i>
active:	<i>*/s~dum-/</i> (<ABC>)		<i>**/j~ruj-/</i> → <i>**/j~ruw-/</i> (<ABw>)
passive:	<i>*/s~dmum-/</i> (<ABCC>)		<i>**/j~rjuj-/</i> → <i>**/j~rjuw-/</i> (<ABw>)

However, the detailed examination of the alternations of written endings *-w* and *-y* in the prospective, both active and passive, has demonstrated that both forms ended in *\*/-a:w-/* (alternating with *\*/-a:j-/* before singular clitic subjects),<sup>155</sup> not in *\*/-u(:)w-/*. Moreover, the written ending *-w* of the prospective active and passive extends to other inflectional classes, *caus* and *long*, in which it can not be interpreted as the reflex of the last weak element of the root. As discussed above, the written ending *-w* in *ult.inf*, *caus*, and *long* stands for the marker of the prospective itself, in the passive and then active alike (§1.2.4.1). This rules out the scenario in proposal (b).

In concerning only the inflectional classes that have the *s<sub>dm</sub>m=f* in written form, proposal (a) naturally avoids all problems to do with those classes that have the written ending *-w* in the prospective. Yet, just like proposal (b), proposal (a) limits itself to the prospective: it does not account for the passive participle of *2rad*, *ddd*. A joint interpretation of these two forms must be proposed, however: the *s<sub>dm</sub>m=f* and the *ddd* are distinguished by a similar phenomenon in written morphology—the partial reduplication of the last root consonant—and this is in both forms associated with the same grammatical function, the expression of voice.

### 1.3.2.3 A morphologically conditioned process

The *s<sub>dm</sub>m=f* and the *ddd* display major differences in distribution. The differential distribution of the two forms in the Earlier Egyptian record (§1.3.1.3) is readily

<sup>150</sup> For example, the forms that can be reconstructed based on Coptic forms of *2rad* and *3rad*.

<sup>151</sup> This is a major implication of the discussion in Schenkel (2000b). Explicitly (p.61): ‘Folglich dient die fallweise Anhängung der Endung *-w* nicht der Vereinheitlichung der Flexionsformlänge, sondern hat genau den gegenteiligen Effekt: Die Formenbildung wird uneinheitlicher.’ In a similar vein, e.g. the ‘prefixing’ and ‘geminating’ sub-classes of *ult.inf* identified by Allen (1984: §61, §737, §742).

<sup>152</sup> Preliminary discussions: Stauder (in press b: §2.3, with a focus on finite forms); Schenkel (forthc., with a focus on non-finite forms).

<sup>153</sup> Schenkel (1985: 490).

<sup>154</sup> Schenkel (1985: 488).

<sup>155</sup> Schenkel (2000b: 51-2; 2005: 52-3).

accounted for in relation to the different productivity of the broader paradigms to which the *sdmm=f* and the *ddd* relate. While the *sdmm=f* relates to the paradigm of the prospective passive, itself limited to Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts (§1.3.2.1), the participle *ddd* relates to the paradigm of unmarked participles which is subject to no such limitation.

Although at first more puzzling, other distributional differences are revealing as well. The *sdmm=f* is temporally defined as future while the *ddd* is aspectually defined as unmarked (in contrast to the marked/imperfective participles (§1.3.1.2): this means that no overall semantic profile can be defined for partial reduplication as found in these two forms. If one were defined, this would have to be along the lines of ‘non-imperfective’, and thereby exceedingly abstract.<sup>156</sup> It would also fail to account for why within this very broad ‘non-imperfective’ domain, only sub-domains are actually realized, the future tense for the finite form, the unmarked aspect for the non-finite one.

This leaves only the option to interpret partial reduplication in the *sdmm=f* and *ddd* as being primarily a morphologically conditioned process. That morphology itself is the central relevant parameter is also implied by the distribution of the two forms over inflectional classes (§1.3.1.1). With the exception of *ndri*, the *sdmm=f* is formed with verbs of those inflectional classes that do not have the written ending *-w* in the prospective, passive and active. The *ddd* is formed with only one of the same inflectional classes, *2rad*. Under an interpretation in which morphology itself is the central parameter, the defining property of *2rad*, namely their shortness, appears to be directly relevant.

### 1.3.3 Specifying the scenario further

In specifying the above further, much of the relevant information is itself only partially available or insecure: the detailed morphology of the prospective, active and passive; the morphology of the perfective V-passive; the morphology of the unmarked participles of *2rad*. Unlike the argument above, the following notes are therefore of an explicitly more speculative tenor: their function is primarily to illustrate the issues at stake; no claim is made that the specific scenarios outlined are correct in details.

A. The *sdmm=f* is formed in the inflectional classes that do not have the ending *-w* in the prospective, active or passive. The active prospective of these inflectional classes was probably along the lines of <sup>2</sup>C~Cv:C- (*II.red*: <sup>2</sup>A~Bv:B-).<sup>157</sup> Due to the indistinctive written forms, any details of perfective V-passive morphology remain unknown, but a stem alternation of some sort is likely (§1.2.5.A). As discussed, the rare occurrences and distribution of a written ending *-w* in perfective V-passives suggest that this stem alternation involved a distinctive vowel melody, including relevant vocalic contrasts before the last root consonant. (One fairly straightforward interpretation is along the lines of <sup>2</sup>A~Bu:C-; other ones are possible as well: §1.2.5.B-C.) In *3rad* and *2rad*, a stem lengthening as effected by partial reduplication could

<sup>156</sup> Thus in substance if in different words (‘perfektiv-prospektiv’), Loprieno (1986: 51-2).

<sup>157</sup> Schenkel (2000b: 60).



then have served to accommodate V-passive morphology in ways that would be distinctive with respect to both the perfective V-passive and the active prospective. In a decidedly schematic representation, for example:

<i>3rad</i> :	$^?A^?BCu:C-$	as distinct from both the perfective V-passive ( $^?A^?Bu:C-$ ) and the active prospective ( $^?A^?Bv:C-$ );
<i>2rad</i> :	$^?A^?Bu:B-$	as distinct from both the perfective V-passive ( $^?Au:B-$ ) and the active prospective ( $^?Av:B-$ ).

In *Il.red*, the reduplication of the second root consonant is lexical.<sup>158</sup> In verbs of this inflectional class, prospective and V-passive morphology could have been directly accommodated with one another: V-passive  $^?Au:B-$  (or  $^?AuBB-$ ); active prospective  $^?A^?Bv:B-$ ; passive prospective  $^?A^?Bu:B-$ . It could then have been the case that the forms of the prospective passive of *2rad* and *3rad* came about through analogical extension of the ones of *Il.red* (and in *ndri*<sup>159</sup>):

<i>Il.red</i> :	$^?A^?Bu:B-$	(lexical reduplication)
→ <i>2rad</i> :	$^?A^?Bu:B-$	(→ inflectional reduplication)
→ <i>3rad</i> :	$^?A^?BCu:C-$	

Under this scenario, the *s $\underline{d}mm=f$*  of *2rad* and *3rad*, in which reduplication is inflectional, would have arisen through extension from the form of *Il.red*, in which reduplication was lexical. A new inflectional category—the *s $\underline{d}mm=f$* —would thereby have emerged.

B. In *ult.inf*, *caus*, and *long*, a *s $\underline{d}mm=f$*  is not formed, neither in written form, nor in underlying morphological form, nor in underlying deeper morphological structure (§1.3.2.2). With *long*, one possible reason is immediate: in their vast majority, long verbs are themselves the result of various processes of derivational/lexical reduplication, and it is likely that they could not be subjected to yet another process of reduplication as would be the case in the *s $\underline{d}mm=f$* . The same account does not extend to *caus* and *ult.inf*; in addition, inflectional reduplication is demonstrably possible with the latter (in the *mrr=f*). For these classes, and therefore for *long* as well, the fact that no *s $\underline{d}mm=f$*  was formed must be related in some way to the fact that the very same inflectional classes, and only these, have prospectives, both active and passive, in *-w*.

In common to all inflectional classes that have this written ending is that they include verbs with a ‘sekundäre Erweiterung’,<sup>160</sup> be this the final ‘weak’ element in the case of *ult.inf*, the prefix *s-* in the case of *caus*, or derivational/lexical reduplication, often compounded with a prefix *n-*, in the case of *long*. This points to more

158 In written inflection, the reduplication can of course be described as inflectional, inasmuch as written forms of e.g. the subjunctive (*kb=f*) inflectionally contrast with written forms of e.g. the prospective (*kbb=f*). In underlying forms, the contrast is between the inflectional patterns (C\*)CCá- and (C\*)Cv:C- (thus, with *Il.red*,  $^?A^?BBá-/$  vs.  $^?A^?Bv:B-/$ ): in either form, the second root consonant is reduplicated.

159 Possibly inflected on the same pattern as *3rad*, e.g.  $^?n^?dru:r-/$ .

160 Schenkel (2000b: 60-1).

general inflectional specificities of these inflectional classes in the prospective, of which the forms in *-w* are a reflection. In ways that can not be further specified, the lack of a *sdmm=f* in these inflectional classes is probably to be related to these same specificities.

That verbs of *ult.inf*, *caus*, and *long* do not form a *sdmm=f* then raises a subsidiary question, namely whether verbs of these inflectional classes had a passive prospective morphologically distinct from the active prospective at all. As far as written inflection goes, the active and passive forms are strictly syncretic: both not uncommonly display an ending *-w* (alternating with *-y* before singular suffix pronouns) or none (§1.2.4.1). Moreover, the alternation *-w ~ -y* strongly suggests a reconstruction *-a:w-* for both the active and passive forms.<sup>161</sup> Voice may still have been marked at some other level, for example passive *\*pura:w-* vs. active *\*p̃ra:w-*. Alternatively, there is the possibility that the active and passive prospective may have been syncretic not only in written forms but in underlying forms as well,<sup>162</sup> in other words, that voice was not marked in the prospective of *ult.inf*, *caus*, and *long*. If so, what in the present study is referred to as a ‘prospective V-passive’ would be the same form as the prospective active, used passively in complementary distribution to the *sdmm=f* with those inflectional classes (*ult.inf*, *caus*, *long*) that could not form a *sdmm=f*. The ‘prospective V-passive’ would, in other words, be a paradigmatic category, not a morphological one in a strict sense. Given the opacity of graphemics, the issue can not be decided on empirical grounds.

C. Turning to the non-finite *ddd*, the basic observation is that this is formed only with *2rad*, i.e. with the shortest of all inflectional classes (the altogether marginal *II.inf* being left aside).

The shortness of *2rad* is generally a relevant factor in inflection, as is demonstrated in categories other than participles. In various cases, the stem is made longer, for example through direct adjunction of a segment as in the imperative (*\*awán*), commonly <*i.AB*> in Pyramid Texts). The stem can also be made longer as the result of a morpho-phonological process serving to accommodate an inflectional pattern as in the subjunctive ((*C*~)CCá-: with *2rad*, *\*\*/CCá/* → *\*/~CCá-/*, often <*i.AB*> in Pyramid Texts). In both the imperative and the subjunctive, the initially added vocalic segment is found only in *2rad*. Similar in principle but with additional complexities are *i*-prefixed forms of the pseudoparticiple which are most common with, although not exclusive to, *2rad*. Difficult to interpret, but also significant of how the shortness of the stem is a parameter in the inflection of *2rad* are written forms of the unaccomplished *sdm=f* which exhibit the written prefix *i*. in Pyramid Texts, e.g. Pyr. 282c<sup>T</sup> (PT 254) *i=s i.dd=s* ‘she says’ (W *i=s dd=s*).<sup>163</sup> In the paradigm of the unmarked participle itself, the *2rad* also display particularities: in Pyramid Texts, the

<sup>161</sup> Schenkel (2005: 52-3).

<sup>162</sup> Raised as a possibility by Schenkel (2005: 53, with expressed discomfort) and Allen (1984: §561.A (2)). On other possible cases of syncretism in Earlier Egyptian verbal paradigms, some also to do with the prospective, Uljas (2011; forthc.).

<sup>163</sup> Sim., also with *dd* and a singular suffix pronoun, e.g. Pyr. 195b<sup>WTNt</sup> (PT 220) *i.dd=f*; with a plural suffix pronoun, Pyr. 356a<sup>P</sup> (PT 265) *i.dd=sn* (sim. Pyr. 1005d<sup>MN</sup> (PT 482); Pyr. 1975a<sup>N</sup> (PT 670)).

unmarked active participle is not uncommonly preceded by the written prefix *i*;<sup>164</sup> moreover, the form was probably vocalized as \*/CiC-/ at least for some members of *2rad*.<sup>165</sup>

In making the stem longer, the reduplication of the second root consonant could thus have served to accommodate the morphology of the unmarked passive participle onto the critically short stem of *2rad*, possibly to enhance distinctiveness vis-à-vis other forms, such as the active. The proposed scenario—in which the shortness of the stem is a decisive parameter—accounts for why partial reduplication is not found with marked/imperfective participles, which were longer than perfective/marked ones. Most importantly, it accounts for why reduplication of the last root consonant is found only with *2rad* in participles. This is a major explanandum, for two reasons: the restriction is original (§1.3.2.3.B); the morphological process itself would have been possible with *3rad* as well—suffice it to compare the *sdmm=f*.

A parallel for reduplication as a process serving to accommodate a distinctive inflectional pattern in a short inflectional class is found for example in Biblical Hebrew, also a root-and-pattern language. A special formation with reduplication of the last root consonant (the *polet*) is used with short verbs of the <sup>c</sup>*ayin*''*waw* class<sup>166</sup> to accommodate the inflectional pattern of the *pi<sup>c</sup>el* (e.g. *qu:m* → *qomem*).<sup>167</sup>

### 1.3.4 A typologically remarkable configuration

Earlier Egyptian passive forms associated with reduplication are typologically remarkable on two accounts simultaneously:<sup>168</sup>

- (a) While types of passive morphology are cross-linguistically diverse, reduplication has hardly ever been documented as a marker of passive voice;<sup>169</sup>
- (b) In languages with multiple types of passives, these differ from one another along cross-linguistically recurrent parameters, chief among which are subject affectedness, dynamicity, and aspect.<sup>170</sup> In Earlier Egyptian, the dimensions of subject affectedness and dynamicity concern only the pseudo-

164 Allen (1984: §612); Mathieu (1996: §4).

165 Osing (1987: 340-1).

166 The conventional label (<sup>c</sup>*ayin*''*waw*) reflects a traditional triradicalist analysis of the Semitic verb; without entering this debate, what matters here is that e.g. *qu:m* only has two root consonants and that forms of the verb such as the one cited can be monosyllabic.

167 Joüon & Muraoka (2006<sup>2</sup>: §82e).

168 Also noted, in more general terms, by Reintges (1997: 247; 2003; 2011: 33).

169 Among classical surveys, Siewierska (1984) and Keenan (1985: 251) mention no instance of a passive formation marked by reduplication, while a more recent edition of the latter work (Keenan & Dryer 2006: 333) mentions only one (Hanis Coos, Oregon). Haspelmath (1990: 28-32) notes only the reduplicated participle in Hausa (already Vycichl 1957, who submitted this as a possible cognate to the Earlier Egyptian *ddd*), but this is not passive (similarly already Reintges 2003: 184-5; 2007: §4.4.2): the Hausa reduplicated participle (Newman 2000: 19-21) is denominal as well as deverbal; when deverbal, it is stative/resultative in meaning and oriented semantically on S as well as on P; more generally, this is a derivational adjective occupying a more rightward position than passive participles on Haspelmath's (1994: 171-2) inflectional-derivational continuum of argument-oriented deverbal nominalization.

170 Keenan & Dryer (2006: 340-2).

participle as this differs from inflectional passives (§2.3.1; §4.3.3); they play no role in the contrasts between inflectional passives themselves, the *sdmm=f*, V-passives, and T-passives (§2.1). Aspectual differences revolve around perfectivity;<sup>171</sup> no language has yet been exhibited in which a specific finite passive formation would be marked for future tense, as would be the case of the Earlier Egyptian *sdmm=f* if this were interpreted as a primary passive formation.<sup>172</sup>

Cross-linguistic tendencies in typological studies are of course only as good as the sample of languages on which these descriptions are based; they are also largely dependent on the resolution and accuracy of the primary descriptions of the languages they make use of. Moreover, rare configurations do exist in individual languages (thus in Earlier Egyptian itself: §5). The above observations, however, carry some particular weight, because they both correlate with additional dimensions.

A. That passives marked by reduplication have hardly ever been documented (a) is probably not accidental. Cross-linguistically, reduplication is remarkably often associated with a set of interrelated meanings centering around the notion of ‘increased quantity’ (including, as a special case, diminutives), be this a ‘quantity of referents’ (hence various modes of plurality) or be it an ‘amount of emphasis’.<sup>173</sup> With verbs (and leaving aside ideophones), reduplication displays a strong correlation with verbal plurality;<sup>174</sup> in the Semitic domain for example, reduplication—partly in the form of gemination—is associated with various shades of verbal plurality in pluriactional derivation,<sup>175</sup> then as a later historical development also in inflection with the more abstract meanings of the imperfective.<sup>176</sup> In Egyptian, derivational reduplication is associated with pluriactionality as well,<sup>177</sup> while inflectional reduplication relates to an increased ‘quantity of referents’ in the marked/imperfective participles.<sup>178</sup> The finite *mrr=f*, based on the same long stem, has a complex functional profile, modal, and to do with information structure, but also carries typically imperfective shades of meaning (§4.4.1.2.A). To be sure, reduplication can have altogether different functions, such as category-changing or category-defining ones,<sup>179</sup> or even be associated with perfective aspect.<sup>180</sup> However, meanings and functions broadly associated with ‘increased quantity’ remain the most common by a wide margin. Such distinguished association between a type of form and a broad type of meaning is remarkable; more than other types of linguistic morphology, reduplica-

171 E.g. Comrie (1982); Keenan & Dryer (2006: 340-1).

172 Thus Reintges (1997: 387-91).

173 Moravcsik (1978: 317); Mayerthaler (1981: 115).

174 Dressler (1986); Moravcsik (1978: 316-25).

175 Kouwenberg (1997: 24-6).

176 Kouwenberg (2010a: 95-109; 1997); Zaborski (2003).

177 Edel (1955-1964: §429-39); Bendjaballah & Reintges (2007: §2.2, §4.1).

178 Schenkel (1965); Allen (1984: §609, §638-43); Jansen-Winkeln (1997); the methodology on which the initial proposal in Schenkel (1965) was based is problematic in part (Schenkel 2011), but subsequent observations seem to hold firm at least as far as the general principle is concerned.

179 Aikhenvald (2007: 24, 43, 46).

180 E.g. in the Indo-European (non-periphrastic) perfect.

tion turns out to be highly iconic,<sup>181</sup> probably reflecting the particular perceptual salience of this type of form.

Reduplication is hardly ever documented as a passive marker because the functions of the passive do not relate to any of the domains of meaning with which reduplication is typically associated. Viewed in a diachronic perspective, the cross-linguistically observed variety of passive constructions reflects the various pathways by which passives can grammaticalize,<sup>182</sup> possible source constructions for passives thereby include middle constructions of various kinds, reflexive constructions, stative/resultative constructions, impersonal subject constructions, constructions with left-dislocation, and nominalization.<sup>183</sup> None of these is functionally or semantically close to any of the domains with which reduplication is typically associated.

As initially noted, reduplication has hardly ever been documented as a marker of passive voice. In view of the above, there are good reasons—to do with the generally high iconicity of reduplication as a type of form and with the types of source constructions from which passives tend to grammaticalize—why such association should be very rare indeed.

B. The observed correlation that multiple passives in a given language differing from one another by tense-aspect will do so in relation to perfectivity (b) is not accidental either. The perfective skew of the passive has a strong cognitive basis: as a category highlighting the Endpoint of the event, the passive interacts in distinguished ways with perfective aspect, itself a category in which the Endpoint is foregrounded (§4.3.4.2; §4.3.5.3-5; §4.5.2). Directly related to this, the perfective skew of passives also has a diachronic basis: among the various source constructions from which passives can grammaticalize, most are inherently neutral as to tense-aspect; the stative-resultative source construction, on the other hand, will naturally result in perfective passives (also, §2.9.1.2). There is, on the other hand, no basis, neither cognitive nor diachronic, by which a passive formation marked for future would regularly occur. In Earlier Egyptian itself, the common correlation is observed: one type of passives—the T-passives—is inherently neutral as to aspect, while the other—the V-passives—is perfective (§4.3.5.3-5).

The participle *ddd* is aspectually unmarked. (To be sure, *ddd* contrasts with the marked/imperfective participle, but this does not make it itself marked for perfectivity.) In addition, the restriction of the participle *ddd* to *2rad* only—which is original (§1.3.2.3.B)—is problematic if partial reduplication in this form were described as directly associated with perfective aspect. As to the *sdmm=f*, always with future tense, this is even more remarkable against the above background.

C. Cross-linguistically, reduplication has hardly ever been documented as a passive marker and instances of a passive formation marked for future tense have not yet been exhibited at all. While the samples on which these observations are based on are necessarily partial—for example, they do not include Earlier Egyptian—both these correlations can be assessed as representing very strong tendencies because they each

181 E.g. Jakobson & Waugh (2002<sup>3</sup>: 198-200); Kouwenberg (1997: 39).

182 Givón (2001<sup>2</sup>: ch.6).

183 Haspelmath (1990); Givón (2001<sup>2</sup>: ch.13).

reflect and are motivated by deeper phenomena (above, A-B). The configuration afforded by the Earlier Egyptian *sḏmm=f* and *ddd* is all the more exceptional because both dimensions discussed here simultaneously apply to the same object.

It was argued above on independent grounds, strictly internal to Earlier Egyptian,<sup>184</sup> that the reduplication of the last root consonant in the *sḏmm=f* and the participle *ddd* is primarily a morphological phenomenon, to be interpreted in relation to the specifics of the paradigms of which either form is part. These specifics are, respectively: prospective morphology and V-passive morphology for the *sḏmm=f*, and passive participial morphology and the shortness of *2rad* for the *ddd*. It was argued, in other words, that Earlier Egyptian passives associated with reduplication do not represent a primary morphological type on a par with V- and T-passives<sup>185</sup> but are a secondary formation, related to V-passive morphology and participial morphology respectively.

The resulting forms are very remarkable both in their morphology and in their temporal-aspectual profile. Under the account here proposed, they represent the secondary outcomes of morphological processes determined by elements of a highly specific intralinguistic context. As the Earlier Egyptian *sḏmm=f* and *ddd* contribute to illustrate, rare and typologically counter-expected configurations can arise in individual languages given the conjunction of particular circumstances.

## 1.4 Non-finite and originally non-finite passive formations

In addition to the finite passive formations discussed so far, Earlier Egyptian has two passive participles (§1.4.1). Two other attributive forms, the *sḏm.t(i)=f(i)* and the *sḏm.t(i)*, are not marked for voice but can be passively interpreted in text (§1.4.2). The *sḏmt=f* may or may not have been marked for voice: either way, this provides an interesting case of a synchronically finite form not patterning like T- and V-passives (§1.4.3).

### 1.4.1 Passive participles

Earlier Egyptian has two passive participles, one aspectually unmarked, the other marked as imperfective. Passive participles thereby stand in a one-to-one counterpart relationship to active participles: the paradigm is symmetrical for voice. As to be discussed in a subsequent section (§2.9.1.1), this configuration is more remarkable than may seem at first. The comments in the present section limit themselves to general issues of how the written endings in passive participles might be interpreted.

A. Both passive participles can be found with a written ending *-w*, like the perfective and prospective V-passives. Moreover, a written ending *-y* is found with *III.inf* in the

<sup>184</sup> The presentation in Stauder (2008), where typological considerations are introduced first (§2-3), is infelicitous as it might wrongly suggest that typology could in itself be an argument for analyzing a configuration in any individual language.

<sup>185</sup> The present analysis thereby differs from Reintges' (1997: 241-2, 247-55, 278-9; 2003).

unmarked passive participle, as is also the case in the perfective and prospective V-passives. It has accordingly been proposed that this written ending *-w*, alternating with *-y*, should be interpreted as representing passive morphology in all these forms.<sup>186</sup> Although at first appealing, this interpretation can not be upheld. As discussed, the distribution of the written endings *-w* and *-y* in the perfective and the prospective V-passives differs in terms of inflectional classes, frequency, and prosodic conditions for the latter. The written ending *-w* commonly found with the prospective V-passive, and its prosodically conditioned alternant *-y* similarly, do not represent passive, but prospective morphology (§1.2.4.1). These written endings must therefore be dissociated from the only similarly looking *-w* and *-y* occasionally found in the perfective V-passive, which, however incompletely or indirectly, represent passive morphology (§1.2.4.2-3; §1.2.5). As regards participles, a stark contrast in frequency is observed between unmarked participles and marked/imperfective ones: in the former, *-w* is rare, while it occurs commonly in the latter.<sup>187</sup> The written ending *-w* therefore stands for different morphological segments in the two passive participles.

B. In marked/imperfective passive participles, the commonly occurring ending *-w* provides the reader with a valuable indication to identify the form as distinct both from the unmarked passive participle and from the marked/imperfective active one. This is particularly clear in cases when active and passive participles follow one another:

(i) Weha (OIM 16956), 4-5

*nn sh im nn shw im*

*nn 3h<sup>c</sup> im nn 3h<sup>c</sup>w im*

‘There was none among them who hit, there was none among them who was hit;

There was none among them who scratched, there was none among them who was scratched.’

Sim. e.g. *Khakheperreseneb* vso 2-3 *dd hr m ddw n=f hr* ‘he who used to give orders is one to whom orders are given’; in the common formula *3h st n irr st r irrw n=f st* ‘It is more beneficial to who does it than to him for whom it is done’;<sup>188</sup> *passim*.

What *-w* stood for in the underlying form remains unknown. Being located at the right edge of the inflected form, the represented segment could have been an at least originally nominal ending. This was probably only part of the distinctive morphology of marked/imperfective passive participles, namely the part that could be represented in writing given the constraints of the Egyptian writing system (for another form similarly, §1.2.5.C).

C. Written forms of the unmarked passive participle resemble the ones of the perfective V-passive: in both categories, the written forms are overwhelmingly

<sup>186</sup> Lastly Borghouts (2010: I, §74.a).

<sup>187</sup> E.g. Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §358-9); Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.5.1.c); Brose (2014: 307).

<sup>188</sup> For this formula, Vernus (1976).

endingless, an ending *-w* is only rarely found, and an ending *-y* is not uncommon with *III.inf* in Middle Egyptian. This opens the possibility that the unmarked passive participles and the perfective V-passive could be morphologically related in some way. To substantiate the hypothesis, broader consideration must be brought into play (§2.9.1).

#### 1.4.2 Passively interpreted $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$ and $\underline{s}dm.t(i)$

A. Instances of the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$  with a passive reading are rarely encountered.<sup>189</sup> Unsurprisingly, examples are typically from texts with a legal tenor:

(i) *Urk.* I 36, 6-7 (instructions for the funerary priests of Sennuankh)

(...) *hn<sup>c</sup> igr msw n msw=sn msw.t=sn <n>=sn dt*

‘(...) with, moreover, the children of their children who will be born to them forever.’<sup>190</sup>

Sim. in the same text, *Urk.* I 36, 13-14 (iii); false door of Khentika (Dakhla),<sup>191</sup> right, lower part, col.2-3 in *mrw.t=sn nsw m sšw nb šddw sš pn* (...) ‘It is the ones who will be loved by the king among all scribes who will read this inscription (...)’. In the Middle Kingdom, Siut I, 314 *k3 nb sft.t=f* ‘every bull which will be slaughtered’ (sim. 322). An instance in a Middle Egyptian literary text is possibly *Merikare* E 78-79 *m kd is=k m shnyt tryt r ir{r}.t=sy* ‘Do not build your tomb by tearing apart what has been done for what will be made.’

The probably related shorter form  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)$  is also occasionally found with a passive reading, less exceptionally than the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$ :<sup>192</sup>

(ii) *Pyr.* 1040c<sup>PN</sup> (PT 486)

(...) *n hprt smn.ti* (...)

‘(...) when what was to be established had not yet come into being (...)’

CT I 286a-d T2C *hw n=k bty 3sh {n} n=k bty trw.ti n rnpwt=k im trw.ti n 3bdw=k im trw.ti n smdwt=k im* ‘Emmer has been threshed for you, emmer has been reaped for you, to be made for your year-festivals there, to be made for your monthly festivals there, to be made for your half-month festivals there’,<sup>193</sup> *Neferti* 3h *mk wn dd.ti r=f m stryt* ‘Look, what should be spoken against will be a matter

189 Edel (1955-1964: §682); Westendorf (1953: 137-9); also Zonhoven (1998c: 20-1, n.96); Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §363); Edel (1955-1964: §682).

190 In *Urk.* I 213, 7 (Pepi’s protective decree for Snofru’s Pyramid), also mentioned by Edel (1955-1964: §682) as an instance of the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$ , a reading with the perfective participle is just as likely: *wpw-r ht wdt=s m šs3t im* ‘(...) except for something that is decreed and is known in advance.’

191 Noted by Zonhoven (1998c: 21, n.96).

192 Gundacker (2012: 77-9); Zonhoven (1998c); Polotsky (1976: §2.2.9); Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 26-34).

193 Similarly Polotsky (1976: §2.2.9); differently Reintges (1997: 271), who reads with T-passives. The similar passage in *Pyr.* 657a-d<sup>TMN</sup> (PT 373) has unmarked passive participles *ir* where the CT version has  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)$ ’s.



of respect'; *Urk.* IV 162, 8 *mr.ti k3=f pw ir.ti* 'What will be done is what his *ka* will desire.'

The written morphology of the *sdm.t(i)=f(i)* is exactly the same in forms with active and passive reading. For example in the following passage, where forms of the *III.inf*, one active and one passive, both have *-w* before *.t=f*:<sup>194</sup>

(iii) *Urk.* I 36, 13-14 (instructions for the funerary priests of Sennuankh)

*ir hm-k3 nb im*

***bnw.t=f***

***itw.t=f n kt wnw*** (...)

'As regards every funerary priest there  
who will disappear  
or be taken to another duty (...)'

While the active reading is by far the most common in text, the *sdm.t(i)=f(i)* thereby appears to have been unmarked for voice.<sup>195</sup> A similar comment extends to the *sdm.t(i)*.

B. In being unmarked for voice, the *sdm.t(i)=f(i)*, functionally an attributive form, contrasts with participles. In accounting for this difference, a discussion of the possible origin of the *sdm.t(i)=f(i)* is of relevance. Four main proposals have been submitted:

- (a) The *sdm.t(i)=f(i)* is set in relation to the *sdm.t(i)*, itself set in relation to the derivational suffix *-ti* also found in nomina actoris such as *k3w-ti* 'worker' or *spr-ti* 'petitioner',<sup>196</sup>
- (b) The *sdm.t(i)=f(i)* is set in relation to the *sdm.t(i)*; both forms are viewed as including an inflectional morpheme *-t* expressing future tense,<sup>197</sup>
- (c) The origin of the *sdm.t(i)=f(i)* is seen in a nisba derivation from the *sdm.t=f*,<sup>198</sup>
- (d) The *sdm.t(i)=f(i)* is set in relation to the prospective.<sup>199</sup>

The second and third of these proposals conflict with the observation that provides the basis for the fourth proposal, namely that the stem of the *sdm.t(i)=f(i)* displays the same written morphology as the prospective, with *-w* being found not only in *ult.inf* but also in *caus*.<sup>200</sup> In written morphology, the stem of the *sdm.t=f* is altogether

194 Also e.g. *irw.t=f* in *Urk.* I 13, 9, to be compared with passive *irw.t* in CT I 286a-d T2C (ii).

195 Similarly e.g. Loprieno (1995: 88); Allen (1984: §605); Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §363).

196 Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 40-4); Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §364).

197 Zonhoven (1998c: 20).

198 Based on partly different considerations, Allen (2013a: 108, 126); Malaise & Winand (1999: §580); Loprieno (1986: 100-2); not taken up, and thereby implicitly rejected, by Loprieno (1995: 88).

199 Schenkel (2000b: 102-10); Loprieno (1995: 88).

200 In details, Schenkel (2000b: 102-110); previously already Edel (1955-1964: §681.3-5); also Allen (1984: §604-605).

different from the stem of the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$ , both in the Old Kingdom and in later texts, directly speaking against proposal (c). In being identical to the stem of the prospective, the stem of the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$  already marks future tense; this directly speaks against interpreting  $-t$  as a future marker (proposal (b)), as the form would then be redundantly marked. A direct derivation from nomina actoris such as  $k3w-ti$  (proposal (a)) is problematic for the same reason, as it does not account for the prospective stem in the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$ .

Based on written morphology, the cornerstone for interpretation must be that  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$  is based on a prospective stem.<sup>201</sup> The element  $.t(i)$  appended to this prospective stem<sup>202</sup> is probably the same as the similarly looking one in the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)$ . An historical derivation of the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$  from the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)$ , rather than the other way around,<sup>203</sup> is supported by the fact that the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$ , functionally an attributive form, has an expression of the subject.<sup>204</sup> While participles express the gender and number of the participant they are oriented on, the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)$  is invariable in this respect;<sup>205</sup> appending a subject expression to the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)$  thus permits to make explicit the gender and number of the participant on which the form is oriented.<sup>206</sup> An examination of the orthographic behavior of the element  $.t(i)$  in the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$  reveals that it behaves exactly like a nisba;<sup>207</sup> this lends support to the old hypothesis that  $.t(i)$  may in fact include a nisba; if so, the invariable morpheme  $.t(i)$  could have arisen through a morphological reanalysis of feminine nisbas.<sup>208</sup> That a derivational suffix should be appended to a prospective stem is not necessarily a problem: the prospective stem is an inflectional category but things may have been different in earlier times when the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$  initially grammaticalized.

In a synchronic analysis, the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$  is a finite inflectional category of the verb. In the above interpretation, it includes an originally derivational element,  $-t(i)$ . This origin in a derivational category, still visible in the rarer  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)$ , accords with the fact that the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$ , and the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)$  alike, are not inflected for voice.

201 Schenkel (2002b: 102-10).

202 Schenkel (2002b: 108-9) discusses a possible derivation of the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$  from a subjectless prospective *form*. However, the invoked analogy of the negatival complement is problematic: the negative complement has the same stem as prospectives (Schenkel 2000a), and historically derives from the prospective itself, e.g. Pyr. 16c (PT 23-24) N m *sfh<sub>h</sub>w=k im=f* / Nt m *sfh<sub>h</sub>w im=[f]* ‘Do not let loose of him’ (Allen 2013a: 105; also Schenkel 2000a: 3-7). The rise of the negative complement as a non-finite variant of the prospective is thereby a change strictly bound to a certain constructional environment, reflecting the increasing internal dependencies between the component parts of that construction. Deriving the  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)=f(i)$  from a prospective *stem* rather than from a prospective *form* does not come with the above problems. It also solves the problem raised in Gundacker (2012: 77 and n.134).

203 E.g. Borghouts (2010: I, §73.c.(ii)).

204 Gundacker (2012: 77); Zonhoven (1998c: 20); Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 40-4); Westendorf (1953: 133-9); Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §364).

205 On the invariable  $\underline{s}dm.t(i)$ , Zonhoven (1998c); further, Gundacker (2012: 77-9).

206 Similarly e.g. Gundacker (2012: 77).

207 Schenkel (2000b: 110).

208 Along the lines of e.g.  $k3wt-[i] \rightarrow k3w-[ti] \rightarrow spr-[ti]$ . This would solve the objection raised by Zonhoven (1998c: 20) against Gunn’s (2012<sup>2</sup>: 40-4) proposal.

### 1.4.3 Passive/passively interpreted *sdmt=f*

The *sdmt=f*<sup>209</sup> occasionally has a passive reading.<sup>210</sup> Actively and passively interpreted occurrences of the *sdmt=f* stand to one another in a roughly similar proportion to the one observed with active and passive events in general. Unlike the attributive forms discussed in the preceding section (§1.4.2), passively interpreted *sdmt=f*s are therefore regular in Earlier Egyptian grammar.

In the context of the present chapter on morphology, these passively interpreted occurrences of the *sdmt=f* raise two questions. The first is whether what has so far been described in non-committal terms as ‘passively interpreted’ corresponds to a dedicated passive form morphologically distinct from the active (§1.4.3.1). The second springs from the observation that if the first question is answered negatively, the *sdmt=f* affords a case of a synchronically finite category that does not mark voice; if the first question is answered positively, the *sdmt=f* affords a case of a finite category in which voice is marked in a way altogether different from either T- or V-passives (§1.4.3.2).<sup>211</sup>

#### 1.4.3.1 A morphologically distinct passive form of the *sdmt=f*

The occasional passive reading of the *sdmt=f* is exemplified in (i). A morphologically distinct passive form of the *sdmt=f* is generally recognized based on written endings of the *III.inf.* forms that have a passive reading are often in *-yt*, contrasting with actively interpreted forms always in *-t* (ii).

209 The transcription is here without a dot (not as ‘*sdm.t=f*’ therefore) for practical reasons only, to distinguish the form from the T-passive (here as *sdm.t=f*). Synchronically, the *-t* in the *sdmt=f* can of course be analyzed as an inflectional ending, whatever the origin of the form (below in the main text).

210 Dedicated study of the passive *sdmt=f* by Zonhoven (1998a; references to previous discussions: 78, n.2); among previous studies, e.g. Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 174-85); Loprieno (1980: 24-5); Edel (1955-1964: §730, §736, §738).

211 The proposal has been made that the passive *sdmt=f* would be in fact a T-passive (Zonhoven 1998a). There is no evidence for this, as no written forms in *.tw* are found. In *Sinuhe* R 93 [*dr ms.tw=f* ‘(...) since he was born’ (adduced by Malaise & Winand 1999: §682 in support of the hypothesis), the T-passive is after a preposition and could therefore be a *sdm=f* (B 69 reads (...) *dr mst=f*, which could be a *sdmt=f*, reinterpreted as a subjunctive in R, or the subjunctive (*dr ms.t=f*)). That no written forms in *.tw* are ever found is significant particularly as the passive(ly) interpreted *sdmt=f* is found in sufficient numbers also in corpora that more often than not have the fuller writing of the marker of the T-passive (case study for *Cheops’ Court* specifically, Westendorf 1953: 113). In addition, there is good reason that the *sdmt=f* should not form a T-passive, in relation to the non-finite origin of the form (§1.4.3.2). T-passive morphology can not be accommodated onto participles (which mark voice differently) or onto infinitives (which do not mark voice: §2.3.3); more generally, T-passive morphology appears to be specific to finite categories.

## (i) CT IV 1811-m G1T

(...) *hrw pw n hnn n t̄st wsrwt* (...)

‘(...) on this day of tumult when the necks had not yet been tied together (...)’

Sim. e.g. *Berlin Leather Roll* I.10 (...) *n fht n=i m̄t̄3<m̄2>* ‘(...) when the swaddling clothes/foreskin(?) had not yet been loosened for me.’<sup>212</sup>

## (ii) CT II 34b-d B1C, B2L, B1P

(...) *n t̄rt=i nwt* (...)

*n msyt ht tpt* (...)

‘(...) when I had not yet made Nut (...)’

when the first generation had not yet been born (...)’

Sim. e.g. P. Berlin 10025, ro 5-6<sup>213</sup> *pty* [...] *ntt sw r irt r b̄3k im n rd̄yt sdm b̄3k im irt.n=f* ‘What is [...] that he is to do against this servant when this servant has not yet been caused to hear what he has done?’

A. The evidence for a morphologically distinct passive of the *sdmt=f* is less conclusive than may seem at first. In Pyramid Texts—a group of texts that make more distinctions in written forms than any other—the *sdmt=f* of *III.inf* comes with the ending *-t* in all cases, including in forms that are passively interpreted (iii):<sup>214</sup>

(iii) Pyr. 1466c<sup>Pa</sup> (PT 571)

(...) *n mst ntrw* (...)

‘(...) when the gods had not yet been born (...)’

Sim. Pyr. 779b<sup>PMNNt</sup> (PT 429) (...) *n mst=t̄* ‘(...) when you had not yet been born.’

This must of course be valued against the background that the written ending *-y* specifically is generally less common in Pyramid Texts than in later groups of texts. How heavily or not the two above occurrences weigh is therefore unclear.

In other parts of the Earlier Egyptian record, the correlation between forms in *-yt* for passively interpreted occurrences of the *sdmt=f* and forms in *-t* for actively interpreted ones holds to a considerable extent, yet is by no means absolute. Occurrences of the *sdmt=f* with a passive reading occasionally have the short written ending *-t* (iv); these could be interpreted as ‘defective spellings’. More problematic are perhaps the occasionally encountered *sdmt=f*s with an active reading and the ending *-yt* (v),<sup>215</sup> although a phonological explanation for these has been submitted:

212 On this example and on the phraseologically closely related one in *Urk.* VII 34, 1, Zonhoven (1998c: 84-5).

213 Brose (2014: 260, ex.233).

214 Allen (1984: §535.A), who concludes that the *sdmt=f* (active and passive) was a ‘single inflected form’.

215 Zonhoven (1998b: 602 and n.11; 1996: §9); Borghouts (2010: I, §53.c.3); Allen (2014<sup>3</sup>: §19.13).

## (iv) CT IV 1811-n G1T

(...) *hrw pw n hnn n tst wsrwt n snt tpw ntrw* (...)

‘(...) on this day of tumult when the necks had not yet been tied together, when the heads of the gods had not yet been severed (...)’

Sim. *Cheops’ Court* 5.11 (...) *nty n wpt=sn m mst* ‘(...) who have not yet been opened at childbirth’; possibly also *Sinuhe* B 69 (...) *dr mst=f* ‘(...) since he was born’, unless this is a T-passive (*dr ms.t=f*), as is the case in R 93 [*dr*] *ms.tw=f*. In textual alternation with the fuller spelling, CT II 400a M22C, T3C (...) *n mst rmt* ‘(...) when men had not been born’; all other versions have (...) *n msyt rmt*.

## (v) CT V 207c M1C

(...) *dr h3yt=tn r=f*

‘(...) before you descend to it.’

Sim. CT V 2031 M1C (...) *dr h3yt=k r=s*; *Merikare* E 97 (...) *r bwyf 3mw r kmt* ‘(...) until the Asiatics loathed Egypt.’<sup>216</sup> The interpretation of the written forms of *iwi* is complex; the common spelling is as *iit=f* (*passim*), less common is the long spelling as in CT II 58c S1C, B1Bo, B2Bo, B4C (...) *n tyt hrw=i* ‘(...) when my days had not yet come’ (G2T, T1L have a very short spelling, *n it*; S2C has *n iw*).

It has been proposed<sup>217</sup> that the second root consonant of the above verb is a relevant factor: *h3i* is a *III.inf-II.aleph* and *iwi* is a *III.inf-II.w*, as *bwi* also seems to be. The nature of the hypothesized phonological process is not specified; whether this could apply to texts as early as Coffin Texts is insecure.

B. Making things yet more confusing, other factors than voice may be at play in the alternation between written forms in *-yt* and such in *-t*. With *III.inf*, most occurrences of the passively interpreted *sdmt=f* are from two verbs, *msi* and *iri*, both typically with full noun subjects. Actively interpreted occurrences of the *sdmt=f* in the same inflectional class are with various verbs, mostly with pronominal subjects, anaphoric or interlocutive. Example (ii) quoted above—first with an actively interpreted *sdmt=f* with a pronominal subject, then with a passively interpreted one with a full noun subject: *n irt=i nwt* (...) *n msyt ht tpt* (...)—is fairly typical of the distribution generally found in the record. Similarly:

(vi) The *sdmt=f* in relation to the nature of the subject:

- Passive, e.g. CT II 400a (many mss.) (...) *n msyt rmt* ‘(...) when men had not yet been born’; CT II 401b (many mss.) (...) *n tryt s3r* (...) ‘(...) when the need (...) was not yet been created’; *Deir el Bahari* IV, pl. 116<sup>218</sup> (...) *n tryt sdb* ‘(...) when the *sedeb* had not yet been made’; *passim*;

216 For the active reading, Borghouts (2010: I, §53.g, (i), ex.19); Vernus (2010<sup>2</sup>: 191). Zonhoven’s (1998a: 88-9) passive reading ‘(...) until the Asiatics had been made adverse to Egypt’ is unlikely as it requires a causativization of the event.

217 Zonhoven (1998b: 602).

218 Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 50, ex.18).

- Active, e.g. CT I 167e-g B13Cb, B16C (...) *n šdt=i t3w=i* (...) *n int=i hnt=i* (...) ‘(...) when I had not yet brought up my fledgelings, (...) when I had not yet attained my lifetime (...)’;<sup>219</sup> CT VI 251d Sq3C (...) *n h3t=s* ‘(...) when she had not yet descended’;<sup>220</sup> CT VI 301j B1Bo (...) *n prt=f hr t3* ‘(...) when he has not yet gone forth upon earth’; *Urk.* IV 2, 15 (...) *n irt=i hmt* ‘(...) when I had not yet married’; *passim*.

This suggests that the written contrast between forms in *-t* and *-yt* could in part reflect prosodic conditions, rather than voice.

Here as well, however, no full correlation can be established. In the following example, both forms have full noun subjects. The first, passively interpreted, is in *-yt* while the second, actively interpreted, is in *-t*:

(vii) P. Ramesseum 10, I.4-6<sup>221</sup>

(...) [*n*] *msyt rmt*

(...) *n h3t ts n mst*

‘(...) when men had not yet been born,

(...) when the spell of birth had not yet descended.’

An example such as the last would seem to contradict an account based on prosodies—yet examples quoted under (v) would seem to contradict an account based on voice.

The present author therefore remains agnostic as to whether there was a passive form of the *s\_dmt=f* morphologically distinct from the active. A certain correlation between written forms and voice is observed, suggesting that there may in fact have been a distinction, but the evidence is too ambiguous to conclusively establish the existence of these two forms, or to deny it.

#### 1.4.3.2 The *s\_dmt=f*: A synchronically finite category not patterning morphologically with other finite passives

If there was only one form of the *s\_dmt=f*, this was unmarked for voice. If there were two forms, the morphological contrast associated with voice would have been of a type altogether different from both T- and V-passive morphology. Either way, some comments on whether the *s\_dmt=f* was originally a finite category or only secondarily became one are in order.

Hypotheses that view the *s\_dmt=f* as a primary finite category argue that a coherent semantic profile can be defined for the form across its various environments of use, as a ‘relative future’<sup>222</sup> or as ‘perfective’.<sup>223</sup> Circumstantial evidence for an analysis of

219 The full noun subjects in B12Cb and B12Cc are adapted from an original first person singular.

220 The full noun subjects in Sq6C and Sq4C are adapted from an original first person singular.

221 Full quotation by Zonhoven (1998c: 82). Significant are also the instances of *h3yt* with pronominal subject, mentioned above (iv).

222 Zonhoven (1998b; 1997), with cross-references to other studies by the same author; taken up e.g. by Allen (2014<sup>3</sup>: §19.16; 2013a: 125-6), Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.3.1.1.8), and Borghouts (2010: I, §53.a).

223 E.g. Loprieno (1986: 34-5, 43-9; 1995: 78); Malaise & Winand (1999: §579, §582); Allen (1984: §473-474); further, the references gathered by Zonhoven (1998b: 614, n.89).

the *sdmt=f* as a primary finite category is also seen in a possible connection with the Akkadian ‘perfect’ *iptaras*, a form with a complex semantic profile in part to do with perfective aspect.<sup>224</sup> That the *sdmt=f* is restricted to very few constructional environments in Earlier Egyptian is then accounted for under an interpretation of the form as a ‘linguistic remnant’ or ‘Reliktform’.<sup>225</sup> Evidence for the *sdmt=f* having once been more productive is seen in the forms *iwt=f* and *int=f*, interpreted as forms of the *sdmt=f* integrated in the paradigm of the subjunctive and thereby found in a broader range of uses than the ones historically documented for the *sdmt=f* itself.<sup>226</sup>

Various reasons speak against this interpretation. That the forms *iwt=f* and *int=f* should be related to the *sdmt=f* is unlikely: written forms of the *sdmt=f* of *iwi* are mostly as *iit=f*, less commonly as *iyt=f*, once as *it=f*, and only rarely as *iwt=f*;<sup>227</sup> they thereby differ markedly from the subjunctive *iwt=f*. Among alternative scenarios, the fact that *iwi* and *ini* both lack any obstruent could have been a parameter: the subjunctive forms *iwt=f* and *int=f* may have originally been verbal nouns of some sort used in suppletive function, first in object clauses and secondarily extended to non-subordinate uses in the process of a fuller alignment on the subjunctive paradigm. Alternatively, the forms *iwt=f* and *int=f* could reflect morpho-phonological issues: as already noted, both *iwi* and *ini* lack any obstruent; in the final-stressed inflectional pattern of the subjunctive (C<sup>~</sup>CCá-), the insertion of a final *t* in *iwt=f* and *int=f* could have served to provide a stronger onset for the stressed final syllable (*j<sup>n</sup>Štá-/*). Similar issues are perhaps at work in the stem *m3n-* of the subjunctive of *m33*, possibly the result of a dissimilation of liquids in similar prosodic position (thus, with ‘L’ for a liquid here not further specified, *\*/m<sup>~</sup>LLá-/* → *\*/m<sup>~</sup>Lná-/* (?)). Of these three possibilities for interpreting the subjunctive forms *iwt=f* and *int=f*—as a *sdmt=f*, as originally a verbal noun of some sort, or as the result of a morpho-phonological process—the first is by far the least likely.

As regards the hypothesized connection between Egyptian *sdmt=f* and Akkadian *iptaras*, this was proposed at a time when the connection between the latter and the Akkadian Gt stem was itself still very much unclear. Recent research has established that the Akkadian ‘perfect’ *iptaras* is an inner-Akkadian development, secondary to the detransitive functions of the Gt stem.<sup>228</sup> Accordingly, the Akkadian ‘perfect’ does not project back into pre-Akkadian times and *iptaras* and *sdmt=f* can not be cognates.

Since the subjunctive forms *iwt=f* and *int=f* are not related to the *sdmt=f* and since the *sdmt=f* is not related to Akkadian *iptaras*, there is no evidence, direct or indirect, that the *sdmt=f* ever had a broader distribution than the one effectively documented in Earlier Egyptian text. As regards the semantic profile of the form, the analysis of *sdmt=f* as ‘perfective’ can not be supported by the Akkadian *iptaras*, which is

224 Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.3.1.1.8.b, p.215); Malaise & Winand (1999: §578, ‘peut-être’); Zonhoven (1998a: 23-4); Loprieno (1986: 124-34); Satzinger (1971: 68, n.4).

225 E.g. Loprieno (1995: 78) and Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.3.1.1.8.b), respectively; in a similar vein, Malaise & Winand (1999: §581).

226 E.g. Borghouts (2010: I, §53d-f); Malaise & Winand (1999: §580, ‘pourrait’); Zonhoven (1998b: 629); Loprieno (1986: 34).

227 E.g. *Cheops’ Court* 11.15-16 (actively read); Heqanakht III, ro 5 (passively read); both quoted in §4.4.2.2.2, (ii)-(iii).

228 Kouwenberg (2010a: 155-60; 2010b: 633).

unrelated. The analysis as a ‘relative future’ can not be supported by the subjunctive forms *iwt=f* and *int=f*, which are unrelated as well. Nor can it be supported by the *s<sub>dm</sub>.t(i)=f(i)* and the *s<sub>dm</sub>.t(i)* forms: as discussed, these are not related to the *s<sub>dm</sub>t=f*, neither directly as a nisba, nor otherwise through an alleged common element *-t* (§1.4.2.B). Among environments in which the *s<sub>dm</sub>t=f* is effectively documented, rare uses in object clauses in Pyramid Texts directly speak against a semantic profile as a ‘relative future’.<sup>229</sup>

Rather than solely at the level of the verbal form, *n s<sub>dm</sub>t=f*, *r s<sub>dm</sub>t=f*, *dr s<sub>dm</sub>t=f*, and the more marginal uses in object clauses are probably better interpreted directly in terms of the overall *constructional* semantics involved, yielding effects such as ‘relative future’ or ‘perfective’ as described in previous studies at a constructional level. In view of the distribution of the *s<sub>dm</sub>t=f* in documented Earlier Egyptian, an old hypothesis according to which the form originated in a verbal noun of some sort, possibly the ‘complementary infinitive’, is likely to be correct after all.<sup>230</sup> Why a verbal noun in *-t*, rather than other ones such as the infinitive, was selected for these environments and to ultimately yield these semantics remains beyond the reach of an empirical description but does not constitute an obstacle to the scenario proposed. One possibility could be for example that different types of verbal nouns partly differed semantically from one another in ways such that the *-t* marked verbal noun would have been more naturally prone to be used in the particular environments that would grammaticalize into the *n s<sub>dm</sub>t=f*, *r s<sub>dm</sub>t=f*, and *dr s<sub>dm</sub>t=f* constructions.

An interpretation of the synchronically finite yet distributionally restricted *s<sub>dm</sub>t=f* as having its origin in a verbal noun accords with, and thereby finds additional support in, how the form patterns with respect to voice. If the *s<sub>dm</sub>t=f* was unmarked for voice—as was proposed to be a serious possibility (§1.4.3.1)—this would similarly reflect the origin of the form in a verbal noun, i.e. in a category that was itself unmarked for voice. If distinct active and passive forms of the *s<sub>dm</sub>t=f* existed—as is often assumed and can not be ruled out—these may reflect two different verbal nouns,<sup>231</sup> or a secondary differentiation from a single verbal noun. Either way, the fact that neither V-passive nor T-passive morphology is involved reflects the non-finite origin of the form(s).

229 Allen (1984: §467-70, particularly §469).

230 Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 174-9); Edel (1955-1964: §732.Anm); Allen (2013a: 111).

231 Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 174-9); Edel (1955-1964: §730, §738).



## 2 The Earlier Egyptian passive construction

### 2.1 The semantic condition for passivization in Earlier Egyptian

To be acceptable in a passive construction with an inflectional passive, an event must meet one, and only one, condition in Earlier Egyptian:

An event can be passivized if, and only if, it includes an agentive argument in its semantic representation.<sup>1</sup> (Agentivity is here understood in a broad sense, to include all participants that have at least some control over the event, for example Experiencers in events of perception.)

No condition bears on the nature of the O (what would be the direct object in the active) or on its relationship to the event (§2.1.1). Going further, passives from intransitives—i.e. passives from verbs that do not even have an O—are fully regular in Earlier Egyptian, provided the event includes an agentive argument in its semantic representation (§2.1.2). Unlike in many languages, no constraint to do with syntactic transitivity therefore bears on passivization: the condition is fully semantic. I conclude by discussing how agentivity is a parameter in text, and how, therefore, the same lexical verb can be open to passivization, or not, depending on its meaning in an actual textual instantiation (§2.1.3).

#### 2.1.1 Lack of semantic constraints on O

Inflectional passives do not require the O they are oriented on to be affected by the event. Put differently, they do not require it to be semantically a Patient, registering a change-of-state as a result of the event. A selective illustration of V- and T-passives with events in which the O is not a Patient is the following:

---

1 A broadly similar condition for passivization is expressed in Reintges' (1997: 222-30) observation that among intransitives only unergatives, not unaccusatives, can be passivized. While I concur with the author's observation—the first in Egyptology to address the issue—I renounce making reference to the unergative-unaccusative distinction because this has relevance only to passivization in Earlier Egyptian and does not therefore correlate intralinguistically with other phenomena in this language. The distinction is then dependent on a broader framework not espoused in the present study (e.g. Perlmutter 1978; Perlmutter & Postal 1983; for a more semantically oriented reformulation, within a different framework, e.g. van Valin 1990). Moreover, the unergative-unaccusative distinction does not make a clear difference between grammatical roles (S, A, O) and semantic roles (Agent, Patient). Applied to the issue at hand, it describes in terms of the former (and thereby ultimately of syntax), a phenomenon that pertains to semantics.

*Events of perception, e.g. m33 'see', sdm 'hear'*

(i.a) Ameniseneb (Louvre C12), 6 ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n **m3** n3 n k3wt (...) 'These works were seen (...)'<sup>2</sup>

(i.b) Khentika Ikhekhi V B 15-16 **ir m33.t(=t)** iw(=i) ḥr w3t in rmt nb (...) 'If I am seen by anyone while on the road (...)'<sup>3</sup>

NB. The above also illustrates how the A's of events of perception—semantically Experiencers, not Agents in a strict sense—are nonetheless construed as agentive enough in Earlier Egyptian for these events to be passivized without restriction.

*Events of ingestion, e.g. wnm 'eat', swr 'drink'*

(ii.a) P. Berlin Medical III.8 **wnmw** ø in s 'It (*scil.* the remedy) shall be drunk by the man.'

(ii.b) *Sinuhe* B 233-234 **mw m itrw swr.t=f** mr=k t3w m pt **hnm.t=f** dd=k 'The water in the river—it is drunk as you wish. The air in the sky—it is breathed as you say.'

*Varia, e.g. wšd 'question'*

(iii.a) P. UC 32055, ro 5 ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n **wšd** p3y=i it in imi-r3 3ḥwt mrsu 'My father was questioned by the overseer of fields, Mersu.'<sup>4</sup>

(iii.b) P. Brooklyn 35.1446, pl.V, B, 11-12 (...) **m rdt in.tw=f** r hnw **wšd.tw=f** ḥr p3 tkk **ir.n=f** (...) in having him brought to the Residence so that he may be questioned about the attack he has committed.'<sup>5</sup>

Going further, the O need not be fully individuated from the event. In the following examples, the O is semantically an integral part of the event itself (*iri nmt*, *iri k3t*): cognitively, it has little or no existence independently from that event. In (iv.b), the expression that registers a change-of-state is significantly not the O but one obliquely introduced (*im=sn*: §2.6.1.2, (iii)):

(iv.a) *Urk.* I 189, 18 (false door of Ptahhotep II) **ir n=f nmt š** i.s3ḥ in wt 'The crossing of the pool will be carried out for him after he has been *akh*-ified by the embalmer priest.'<sup>6</sup>

(iv.b) *Urk.* I 38, 16 (Niankhsekhmet) **ir.t k3t im=sn** r-gs nsw ds=f 'Work was done on them (*scil.* the two false doors) in the presence of the king himself.'

- 
- 2 Sim. e.g. P. Brooklyn 35.1446, pl.VI, C, 7 **mk sdm irt** 'Look, what has been done has been taken note of.'
- 3 Sim. e.g. *Sinuhe* B 227-228 (...) **n sdm.tw rn=i** m r3 **whmw** (...) '(...) my name was not heard in the mouth of the herald (...)'.  
 4 Sim. e.g. Semna Despatch IV, x+9 **wšd ḥr sh[r h3]st ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n dd.n=sn** (...) 'Questioned about the condition of the desert, they said: (...)'.  
 5 Sim. e.g. *A Man to His Son* 10.7 **wšd.tw kbw r mdt**<sup>2</sup> 'The moderate (lit. the cool one) is invited to talk(?)'.  
 6 Sim. e.g. *Urk.* I 39, 10 (Niankhsekhmet) **rd i3w n nsw 3** 'The king was greatly praised'; Antef son of Myt (Berlin 13272), 9 in **h3w ḥr sntwt=s** 'An extension was added to its foundation.'

More generally, no constraint bears on the referential nature of the O a passive is oriented on. For example, this need not be an entity, thus, when a passive governs a complement clause:

(v.a) *Urk.* I 108, 3 (Weni) (...) **rdy** *n<sup>c</sup>=f m h<sub>d</sub> m (w)sh<sub>t</sub> t[n]* ‘(...) which had been made to travel downstream in this barge.’<sup>7</sup>

(v.b) *Urk.* I 104, 12-13 (Weni) **dd.t** *wnt btkw nht m h<sub>3</sub>stiw pn* (...) ‘It was said that there were strong enemies among these foreigners (...)’<sup>8</sup>

### 2.1.2 Passives from intransitives

A. In addition, passives from intransitives, that is from events that do not even have an O, are fully regular in Earlier Egyptian—unlike in many languages where they are only marginally acceptable or not at all. I illustrate this with the case which is strongest for the present argument, namely passives from primary intransitives (for passives from secondary intransitives, §2.6.1.1). Whenever these can be documented in the record, examples of both V- and T-passives are adduced. In all cases, the event implies an Agent in its semantic representation:

(A) *Events of directed motion, e.g.*

- *spr* *r* ‘reach’:

(i.a) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.ε.3 (Inscription #6)<sup>9</sup> **spr** *r(=i) r=s* ‘It was about this that one had reached out to me.’

(i.b) P. UC 32209, ro II.5-6 *imi spr.tw r=f m t<sub>3</sub> t<sub>3</sub> hr dd* (...) ‘May one get to him at once saying: (...)’

- *pri* ‘go out’:

(ii.a) *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 13<sup>10</sup> (...) **pr** *r hnmwt=s<sub>n</sub>* (...) ‘(...) their wells have been gone to (...)’

(ii.b) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.η.2 (Inscription #7)<sup>11</sup> *n pr.n.t n snd=f* ‘There was no going out for fear of them (*scil.* the troops).’

- *iwi* ‘come’:

(iii.a) *Sinuhe* B 248 (...) *iw tw i<sub>3</sub>s n=i* (...) ‘(...) they came and summoned me (...)’

7 Sim. e.g. Ameniseneb (Louvre C12), 6 *mk wd sw<sup>c</sup>b=k p<sub>3</sub> r-pr n 3bdw* ‘See, you have been ordered to cleanse the temple of Abydos’; Ameniseneb (Louvre C11), 3-4 *h<sup>c</sup>.n wd rd.t n=i phwy n rny* ‘It was ordered that I be given the hindquarters of a young bull’; P. Berlin 10470, II.8 *mk rd r<sub>k</sub>=sn hr=s* ‘They were made to swear about it.’

8 Sim. e.g. *Urk.* I 127, 13; 128, 7; 136, 10; etc.

9 With fuller context, §4.2.1, (xvii).

10 With fuller context, §2.5.2.3.2, (i).

11 With fuller context, §1.1.1, (l).

(iii.b) *Merikare* E 32-33 *n iḏ.n.tw ḥ3 ḥmw-ib* ‘There is no coming around a man with skillful understanding.’

Also, with a *sḏmt=f* passively interpreted, *Heqanakht* III, ro 5 *ir grt r-s3 šdt st ḏd.t ǝ m pr sš=k ʕ.w.s. r iwt r=s* ‘Now, after collecting it, it should be put in the house of Your Excellency L.P.H. until it has been come for.’

- *ḥnti/hdi* ‘sail upstream/downstream’:

(iv.a) *Semna* Despatch I, x+13 *iw ḥnt r bw iḏ.n=sn im m hrw pn* ‘They travelled south to the place where they had come from on this (same) day.’

(iv.b) *Ipuwer* 3.6-7 *n ms ḥd.tw r kpn min* ‘There has been no travelling to Byblos today.’

- Similarly with *w3i r*, lit. ‘distance oneself from’, used as a euphemistic expression:<sup>12</sup>

(v) *Ipuwer* 7.1-4

*mṯn is ir ḥt n p3 ḥpr w3 <r> šdt nsw in ḥwrw (...)*

*mṯn is w3 r sšw3 t3 m snwyṯ in nh n rmt ḥm šhrw*

*mṯn is w3 r sbi{t} ḥr iʕrt nḥt<t> nt rʕ shrt t3wy (...)*

‘For look, things have been done that had not happened before: it has come to removing the king by wretches (...)

For look, it has come to impoverishing the land of kingship by a few people ignorant of counsels.

For look, it has come to rebellion against Re’s powerful uraeus who pacifies the Two Lands (...),<sup>13</sup>

(B) *Events of ‘calling’, etc., e.g.*

- *nīs* ‘call, summon’:

(vi.a) *Cheops’ Court* 8.12 *nīs r=i mk wi iy.kw* ‘There has been calling to me—see, I have come.’

(vi.b) *Pyr.* 346a<sup>TP</sup> (PT 264) (...) *nīs.t ir N in rʕ* ‘(...) summons will be made to N by Re.’<sup>14</sup>

- *i3š* ‘call, summon’:

(vii.a) *Sinuhe* B 248 (...) *iw iw i3š n=i* (...) ‘(...) they came and summoned me (...)’

(vii.b) *Ipuwer* 12.6 (...) *n i3š.n.tw n={i}<k>* (...) ‘(...) you cannot be called (...)’

<sup>12</sup> Quack (1993b).

<sup>13</sup> Sim. *Ipuwer* 3.13 *ptr irṯ=n r=s w3 r 3k* ‘What are we to do about it since it has come to perishing?’

<sup>14</sup> Sim. *Sinuhe* R 23-24 (...) *nīs.n.tw n wʕ im* ‘(...) and only one of them was summoned.’

- Similarly with *nḥm*, as an expression, vocal and/or physical, of joy:

(viii.a) Mentuwoser (MMA 12.184), 7-8 *iw ip m-ḥ=i m pr-nsw nḥm n=i dw3 ntr n=i* ‘There was counting by me in the palace, there was joyful shouting for me, there was praising the god for me.’

(viii.b) Mentuhotepi’s *Karnak Stela* 3 (...) *ḥḥ.tw ḥr nḥm r-ḥ3t=f* (...) ‘(...) before whom one rejoices shouting loudly (...)’

(C) *Intransitives of various sorts with an oblique argument in their argument structure, e.g.*

- *š3ḥ m* (...) ‘begin to (...)’:

(ix.a) Heqanakht II, ro 27-28 *mtn š3ḥw m wnm rmt 3* ‘Look, one has begun to eat people here!’

(ix.b) Heqanakht II, ro 31-32 *mtn š3ḥ.tw grt m rdt p3 ḥw* (...) ‘Look, one should now begin to give out these food provisions (...)!’

- In Ankhtifi’s inscriptions:

(x.a) Mo’alla #7: II.η.3 - II.θ.1 (Inscription #7) *gw3 r inbw=f isn.n=f isnyt n ḥr=f n snd* ‘Its (*scil.* Sega’s) walls were besieged after it had shut its bolts to their (*scil.* the troops’) face for fear.’

(x.b) Mo’alla II.β.2 (Inscription #5) *ir grt ḥnd.t ḥr sdwt=i mi msh* (...) ‘If, however, one treads on my tail like on a crocodile’s (...)’

(D) *Varia, e.g.*

- *3d* ‘act aggressively’, *ḥni* ‘demonstrate bravery’:

(xi) Semna Stela, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 12 *3d.t r=f dd=f s3=f ḥm-ḥt(.t) w3=f r 3d* ‘Whenever one acts aggressively against him, he shows his back; whenever one retreats, he falls into aggression.’

(xii) Hammamat 43, 6-7 *n ḥn(.n).t m ib n ḥm=f sh nḥs wn t3 nḥs* ‘One could not demonstrate bravery in the heart of His Majesty when the Nubian had been stricken and the land of the Asiatic had been opened.’

The above selective illustration documents that passives from primary intransitives are fully regular in Earlier Egyptian provided the event includes an agentive participant in its semantic representation. It further demonstrates that V- and T-passives pattern alike in this respect. This therefore appears as a general condition for passivization in Earlier Egyptian, regardless of the inflectional type of any particular passive form.

NB. Passives from intransitives are not documented in the *sdmm=f*.<sup>15</sup> This gap is an artifact of the nature of the extant record. The *sdmm=f* is limited to early funerary

<sup>15</sup> Reintges (1997: 253); Allen (1984: §486.B; §516).

corpuses, Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts; reflecting the contents expressed in these, the form happens to be used only with transitives. The V-passive and the T-passive—both considerably more frequent than the *sdmm=f* in general—are themselves documented only sparsely in subjectless constructions in Pyramid Texts.<sup>16</sup> The *sdmm=f* is formed only in certain inflectional classes, is restricted to the expression of future tense, is found only in early funerary corpuses, and is used in these often with events that stand in substantial discourse continuity to preceding ones, thus typically with events that imply two participants. That the form is not documented with syntactic intransitives, either primary or secondary, only reflects the strongly skewed nature of the record.

B. Conversely, in earlier times, passives are never formed with intransitive events that lack an Agent in their semantic representation (such as *w<sup>c</sup>b* ‘be pure’, *sd<sup>r</sup>* ‘lie’, *mwt* ‘die’, etc.).<sup>17</sup> V-passives are never found with these types of events at any time. T-marked forms with the same events only appear by the mid-/late Twelfth Dynasty: these are part of an innovative development by which the morpheme {t} is extended to various environments in which it does not function as an inflectional marker of the passive anymore (§5.1.1.1-2). With intransitive events that lack an Agent in their semantic representation, various other constructions are consistently used in earlier times whenever the direct animate participant is to be left unspecified. These include the following, of which the third is the most regular (§2.7.3.3):

*Event nominalization*

(xiii) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla IV.17-18 (Inscription #10)

*n-sp d(=i) hpr m(w)t n hkr m sp3t tn*

‘Never did I allow that there be starving in this district.’

*An active construction with s ‘a man’ interpreted non-referentially*

(xiv) Mentuwerer (MMA 12.184), 11-12

*n sdr s hkrw r dmi=i*

‘One did not spend the night hungry in my town.’

16 With passives from primary intransitives, Pyr. 1905c<sup>PNt</sup> (PT 665A: §2.5.3.2, (iv)) for the former; Pyr. 346a<sup>TP</sup> (PT 264: (vi.b)), possibly also Pyr. 1355b<sup>PN</sup> (PT 553: §2.5.3.2, (iv)), for the latter. With passives from secondary intransitives (illustration: §2.6.1), Pyr. 1473a<sup>M</sup> (PT 572) for the former; Pyr. 179a<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 219), Pyr. 204b<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 222), and Pyr. 617b<sup>TAnMNJp</sup> (PT 364) for the latter.

17 In one passage from the Old Kingdom, it has been proposed to read T-marked forms of *hru* and *b3k* (*hr.t* ‘that one be content’ and *b3k.t* ‘that one be clear’; Klothe 2002: 111). However, the text is about wishes of the speaker for himself, not for others, and therefore reads with the full nouns, *hrt* ‘peace’ and *b3kt* ‘clear character’ (for the latter, Faulkner 1973-1977, II: 57, n.28; *AL* 78.1252): *Urk.* I 204, 9-10 (Idu) *n-zp dd(=i) ht nb dw iw s3b r rmt nbw n mrr(=i) hrt b3kt wnn(=i) im3h hr ntr hr rmt dt* ‘Never did I say anything wrong, evil, or crooked against anybody for I wished peace, a clear character, and being an *imakhu* with the god and with the people eternally.’

*An active zero-subject active construction*

(xv) Antef (BM EA 1628), 8

*n rd=i m(w)t ø*

‘I did not let die.’

## 2.1.3 Agentivity as a feature in text

With a great many intransitive verbs, agentivity is not a lexically specified feature in Earlier Egyptian. Accordingly, the possibility for an intransitive verb to be used in the passive construction depends on how the event is construed in a particular instantiation in which it occurs.

A. In the above, examples were given of events of motion with an animate direct participant construed as agentive: with these events, the passive construction is regular, with V- and T-passives alike (§2.1.2, (i)-(v)). The same lexical verbs can also have an inanimate direct participant. By definition, an inanimate participant can not be agentive: the passive construction is then ruled out. Whenever the direct inanimate participant is to be left unspecified, a zero-subject active construction is used instead: thus e.g. *h̄d.n ø* (Urk. I 107, 7) when the participant moving is architectural pieces, but *iw h̄nt* (a V-passive: Semna Despatch I, x+13) when the participant moving is Nubian people, thus animate and agentive (in details, §2.7.3.1.C).

B. Conversely, intransitive verbs whose direct participant is in general non-agentive can also have meanings in which this participant is agentive. They are then regularly acceptable with inflectional passives:

(i) Urk. I 171, 3-4 (a decree of Neferirkare from Abydos)

*n rd.n(=i) sh̄m z nb m f̄3t db̄h[w] n k̄3t nb**r 3̄h̄t-n̄tr nb w̄b̄t hr=s in h̄mw-n̄tr nb*

‘I do not allow any man to empower himself of the corvée for any work on any god’s field on which priestly duty is performed by any priests.’

In a non-finite construction: while this, unlike finite constructions, does not require the direct participant to be agentive (§2.4.2.2), the construction is significant nonetheless because of the *in N* phrase, which does require that *N* be an Agent (§2.2). The verb *w̄b̄*, commonly ‘be/become pure’, here has an altogether different meaning, ‘perform priestly duties’.<sup>18</sup>

(ii) P. UC 32166, ro II.3

*hr hr=s r̄k̄ hr=s*

‘There was agreement about it. There was swearing about it.’

18 In the active, e.g. Wepwawetaa (Leiden V.4), 4-5 *ir.n=i i3t iw=i m n̄ht w̄b̄.n=i r tr=i n s33 ts.n=i nmtwt h̄rt wd̄ nsw* (...) ‘I assumed office while I was still in the youth, I became a *wab*-priest (i.e. I begun performing priestly duties) at my age of wisdom, I undertook journeys under the order of the king (...)’.

Sim. *Stèle Juridique* 21 **hr** *hr=s m-mitt* ‘There was agreement about it likewise.’ In its common meaning of ‘be pleased, content, quiet, at peace’, *hru* has a non-agentive subject and can not be used in the passive. In the meaning of ‘expressing agreement’, as here in administrative language,<sup>19</sup> the same lexical verb has an agentive subject like other verbs of vocal expression (§2.1.2, (vi)-(viii)); it can then be used in the passive.

(iii) *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 8

*phw ph.t=f*  
*grw gr.t*

‘Who attacks when attacked,  
who remains silent when one remains silent.’

According with the rhetorical intent of *Semna Stela*, *gr* is here agentive as it expresses self-control (‘control’ is in fact the most central defining property of agentivity itself). Just below, *gr*-ing is explicitly equated with a *s*-causative: 9-10 (...) *dr-ntt ir gr m-ht ph sshm ib pw n hrwy* ‘(...) for as to remaining silent after an attack, this is strengthening the heart of the enemy.’<sup>20</sup>

(iv) *Sinuhe* B 55-59<sup>21</sup>

*i<sup>c</sup>-hr pw tš3 wpwt*  
*n <sup>c</sup>h<sup>c</sup>.n.tw m h3w=f(...)*  
*wmt-ib pw m33=f<sup>c</sup>š3t*  
*n rd.n=f hms ø h3 ib=f*

‘He is a vengeful one, one who smashes foreheads,  
one can not maintain one’s position in his presence. (...)  
He is a stout-hearted one when he sees the multitude;  
he does not allow that one rests around his heart.’

In *Sinuhe*’s encomium of Senwosret, *h<sup>c</sup>* does not read as ‘stand’, but along the lines of ‘maintain one’s position’, as expressing an event that implies a considerable import of energy given the overwhelming presence of the king (*m h3w=f*). In a similar structural position, the event of ‘resting’ (*hmsi*), which is non-dynamic and does not imply an Agent, is in a zero-subject active construction, not in an inflectional passive (§2.7.3.3).

(v) *Sinuhe* B 236

*<sup>c</sup>nh.tw m t3w n dd=k*

‘One lives on the breath you give.’

<sup>19</sup> Lacau (1949: 37).

<sup>20</sup> Agentive readings of *gr* in other contexts are given for example in occurrences of the verb in the imperative (e.g. Heqanakht II, ro 37; *Eloquent Peasant* B1 111; *Ptahhotep* 375): in the imperative, an agentive reading is implied by the speech situation (§1.1.3.A).

<sup>21</sup> Sim. *Ipuwer* 10.11 *nn <sup>c</sup>h<sup>c</sup>.n.tw [...]*. The context is too damaged to support a semantic analysis.



Sim. *Loyaliste* 9.8 *nh.tw m imy wy=sn* ‘One lives on what is in their arms.’ While the direct participant of *nh* ‘live’ is generally non-agentive, it can be agentive when the argument structure is *nh m* (...) for a meaning ‘live on (i.e. feed on) (...)’—as against *nh m* (...) ‘live in (a place)’. The difference is that in *nh m* ‘live one’ the *m*-introduced phrase is part of the argument structure of the verb, while it is merely an adjunct in *nh m* ‘live in’; the former is acceptable in the passive construction, the latter not.

## 2.2 The Agent-expressing phrase

Unlike many languages, the Earlier Egyptian passive construction licenses the regular expression of the Agent in syntactic periphery. I first present the two Agent-expressing phrases in the passive construction proper, the major one introduced by *in* and the minor one introduced by *m-ʿ* (§2.2.1). Complementarily, I describe how agentivity and related notions are expressed with events that, like passives, are dynamic and oriented on a non-agentive participant, yet are not passives (§2.2.2). The nature of *m-ʿ* and *in* is addressed in turn (§2.2.3-4).

### 2.2.1 *In N* and *m-ʿ P* in the passive construction

Among its many functions, *in* serves to introduce the Agent after a verbal event. This is regularly possible in the following constructions, and only in these:

- In the passive construction after inflectional passives, both finite and non-finite (this section<sup>22</sup>);
- In the passive construction with semantically oriented constructions: the pseudoparticiple expressing a dynamic event oriented on a pronominal O (*P<sub>O</sub> PsP*: §2.3.1; §4.1) and the construction *NP r sdm* oriented on an O (*NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm*: §2.3.2; §3.3.B-C);
- After infinitives when these are oriented in a way that implies a passive-like reading (§2.3.3).

#### 2.2.1.1 Animacy

In the above constructions, the participant introduced by *in* is always human (or divine):<sup>23</sup>

22 And further: §2.4.2, (c)-(d); §2.5.2.4-5, §2.5.3.3; §2.6.1.1.E; §2.6.1.2, (ix).

23 Reflecting the high-cultural determinations of much of written performance in Earlier Egyptian, occurrences of the *in N* Agent phrase with *N* an animal are very rare in text. As the following passage, with a ‘narrative’ construction of the infinitive, illustrates, animals are linguistically categorized as animates in Earlier Egyptian: Hammamat 110, 2-3 *h3t n=f in ʿwt h3st iwt in ghst bk3t hr šmt hr=s r rmt hft-hr=s* ‘Coming down to him by the game of the desert. Coming by a pregnant gazelle walking with her face turned toward the people in front of her.’

## (i) Khusobek C.4

ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n rd.n=i **ṯt.tw** ḥ<sup>c</sup>w=f **ṯn** ḥ<sup>c</sup>nh 2 n mš<sup>c</sup>

‘I had his weapons taken by two soldiers of the army.’

With a divine being, e.g. Pyr. 262b<sup>W</sup> (PT 248) **ṯwr N ṯn** šhmt ‘N was conceived by Sakhmet.’

A similar comment extends to the participant introduced by *m*-<sup>c</sup> after a passive construction (§2.2.1.2).

Apparent ‘exceptions’ include collective expressions, semantically referring to humans (ii), metonymic extensions of an animate (and mostly divine) being (iii), and cases of personification (iv):

## (ii) Seneni (CG 20500), 6

**ḥs.kw** ḥr=s **ṯn** niwt mi-ḳd=s

‘I was praised about it by the entire town.’

Sim. e.g. *Stèle Juridique* 11-12 **ṯr ṯn** ḥ3 n wḥm w<sup>c</sup>rt mḥtt ‘Done (lit. it was done) by the bureau of the herald of the northern district.’

(iii) Pyr. 1506b<sup>P</sup> (PT 576)

n **šnw=f ṯn** dnd=ṯn ntrw

‘He will not be encircled by your wrath, O gods!’

Sim. e.g. CT VII 412a B2Bo (sim. B6C) n **ṯt=f ṯn** ḥh n 3t=k ‘He will not be taken by the flame of your striking power’ (the other versions phrase actively); *Sinuhe* B 205-206 nfr wrt **rh.t** w<sup>c</sup>rt ṯn irt.n b3k im m ḥm=f **ṯn** k3=k ‘It is very good that this flight this humble servant has done in his ignorance be known by Your ka.’

(iv) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 39-41

ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n=i **rd.kw** r iw pn **ṯn** w3w n w3d-wr

‘I was given to this island by a wave of the sea.’

In a literary text imbued with *merveilleux*. In funerary texts dealing with the royal afterlife, with the ‘sky’ and the ‘earth’ as Agents: Pyr. 1443b<sup>PaM</sup> (PT 570) **ms ntr ṯn pt** ḥr ḥw šw ḥn<sup>c</sup> tfnwt ḥr ḥw(=i) ‘The god was born by the sky upon the arms of Shu and Tefnut, upon my arms’ (N *ms(=i) in pt* [...]); Pyr. 1527b-c<sup>P</sup> (PT 577) **ṯwr N pn** ḥn<sup>c</sup>=f **[ṯ]n pt mštw N pn** ḥn<sup>c</sup>=f **ṯn** dw3t ‘This N will be conceived with him by the sky and this N will be given birth with him by the Duat’; Pyr. 2110a-b<sup>PNNta</sup> (PT 690) n **šntw N pn ṯn t3 n šntw** ḥt-wtt **ṯn t3** ‘This N will not be encircled by the earth, Khetwetet will not be encircled by the earth’; with a ‘throne’ as an Agent: Pyr. 602a<sup>TN</sup> (PT 359) **ṯp N ṯn** nst=f ‘Teti has been taken account of by his throne.’

That the expressed A or S is always animate affords an independent confirmation that agentivity is a necessary condition for passivization in Earlier Egyptian.<sup>24</sup> (To establish that this is also a sufficient condition, passives from intransitives had to be considered, as was done above, §2.1.2-3.)

### 2.2.1.2 Pronominal Agents: The complementary distribution *in N* ~ *m-<sup>c</sup> P*

The following distributional correlations regarding the expression of the Agent are noted in Earlier Egyptian:

- In the passive construction, *in* never introduces a pronoun (<sup>†</sup>*PASS in P* is undocumented).<sup>25</sup> More generally, <sup>†</sup>*in P* is undocumented in any construction;
- In the *in*-cleft construction, *in N* stands in complementary distribution to independent pronouns (*in N participle/sdm=f* ~ *ink participle/sdm=f*). Yet, independent pronouns are similarly undocumented in passive constructions (<sup>†</sup>*PASS ink*). Introducing an Agent, independent pronouns are only found—rarely—after infinitives of intransitives, that is, outside the passive construction;
- Whenever the Agent in a passive construction is pronominal, another expression, *m-<sup>c</sup>*, is used;
- *M-<sup>c</sup>* regularly introduces full nouns in various constructions that resemble the passive inasmuch as they are dynamic and oriented on a non-agentive participant (§2.2.2.1-2; also §2.2.2.3). Yet, *m-<sup>c</sup> N* expressing the Agent is found only once in the passive construction, in administrative language, and standing against many hundreds of occurrences of *in N* in the same construction.

The singular occurrence of *m-<sup>c</sup> N* in the passive construction is:

(i) P. Berlin 10018, ro 8a

*mk ip.t p3 k3 n hnp-š<sup>c</sup>w m-<sup>c</sup> hr-nht*

‘Look, the bull for the *Khenep-shau* festival is counted on(?) by Hornakht.’

This exceptional use of *m-<sup>c</sup>* is a token of administrative language.<sup>26</sup> Compare, in another formulation, P. Berlin 10063, ro 3 (...) *t3 š<sup>c</sup>t inyt n=i m-<sup>c</sup> t3w n s3tw N* ‘(...) the letter which was brought to me by the site foreman(?) N.’ In the latter, *m-<sup>c</sup>* comes very close to expressing a passive Agent but the use is in fact directly

24 While animacy is an inherent property of a noun phrase, agentivity is a relational quality, involving both a noun phrase and a verb in a particular context. However, animacy is a precondition for a noun phrase to be agentive.

25 Edel (1955-1964: §658; §756) mentions one instance of (*i*)*n* expressing the Agent after a passive; this, however, is the preposition *n* expressing either the Beneficiary (thus Faulkner 1969: 201) or a cause (Allen 2005: 166): Pyr. 1270c<sup>3</sup> (PT 534) *iz r=k ir ddnw gmw=k n=sn m nwr* ‘Go to Dednu and you will be found trembling for (/because of?) them.’

26 In administrative texts themselves, *in N* is regular, e.g. Siut I, 294-295 *ir ip.t n3 n d<sup>c</sup>bwt m-<sup>c</sup>=tn in h3ti-š imi-h3w=f* (...) ‘If these clubs with you are counted by the mayor in office (...)’

modelled on the sender formula of letters (e.g. P. UC 32198 *m-<sup>c</sup> ii-m-i<sup>c</sup>t-ib* ‘From Iyemiatib’).

The expression of the Agent in the passive is therefore subject to a strict complementary distribution: *in N ~ m-<sup>c</sup> P*. This is illustrated in an interlocutive (with a pronoun referring to one of the speech act participants) and in a delocutive one (with an anaphoric pronoun). The latter is in a letter in which the complementary distribution *in N ~ m-<sup>c</sup> P* can be illustrated directly:

(ii) *Urk.* I 220, 7 (Nekhebu)

*i.n(=i) <sup>c</sup>r<sub>k</sub> ø m-<sup>c</sup>(=i)*

‘I only came back once it had been accomplished by me.’

Sim. Mentuwer (MMA 12.184), 7-8 *iw ip m-<sup>c</sup>=i m pr-nsu (...)* ‘There was counting by me in the palace (...)’.

(iii.a) P. UC 32200, 10-12

*n grt sdm.n imi-r3 šnt it3*

*n-is ndr.tw ø m-<sup>c</sup>=f*

‘A chief of police can not interrogate a thief unless by him (*scil.* by the chief of police) arrested (*scil.* the thief).’

(iii.b) P. UC 32200, 7-9

*n-iw wd sdm it3 in rmt nbt*

‘Has it been ordered that a thief be interrogated by (just) any man?’

With *sdm* an infinitive passively read.

Occurrences of the passive construction with pronominal Agents are exceedingly rare in Earlier Egyptian text. This has reasons in discourse, to be discussed later (§2.5.2.5; §2.6.1.1.E).

### 2.2.1.3 Secondary explication of the implied Agent

The two constructions described above are the only ones that can serve to introduce the full noun or pronominal Agent in a passive construction. Of an altogether different sort are indirect strategies that are sporadically encountered: the implied Agent is left unexpressed, then secondarily specified by other means. In (i), the ‘priests’ are the Agents, but are not expressed directly as such; rather, they are presented as the group of people among which the speaker is waited for. In (ii), at a salient juncture in the narrative, the two subjectless passives have a thetic, and thereby discourse-discontinuative, effect (§2.5.3.2, (ix)); the implied Agent is unexpressed, then secondarily introduced in an additional clause:

## (i) Wadi Hilâl O 74, 14-15 (Sixth Dynasty)

*ink gr z3w iwt=f mm hmw-ntr hzy n hmw-ntr*

‘Moreover, I was one whose coming was awaited among the priests, one praised by the priests.’

(ii) *Sinuhe* B 248-249

*hḏ.n rf t3 dw3 sp 2*

*iw iw i3ṣ n=i*

*s 10 m iwt s 10 m šmt hr st3=i r ‘h*

‘When it had dawned very early in the morning,  
they came and summoned me—  
ten men coming, ten men going, introducing me to the palace.’

## 2.2.2 Expressions of agency and relation notions with other dynamic events oriented on a non-agentive participant: *M-<sup>c</sup>* and *hr*

In many languages, the formal expression of the Agent in the passive construction is provided by an oblique case, such as a dative, an instrumental, or an ablative (be this realized as a morphological case or as a prepositional phrase). This oblique expression then combines multiple functions, of which the expression of the Agent in the passive construction is only one.<sup>27</sup> For example English *by*, expressing notably the Instrumental, is recruited to introduce the Agent in the passive construction (i), but is also found in stative constructions (ii), with intransitive events with a non-dynamic subject (iii), or with passives themselves to express the Instrument (iv). In Earlier Egyptian, by contrast, *in N* is restricted to (i); in the other constructions mentioned, various other expressions, all clearly prepositional, are used:

(i) Pyr. 225a<sup>W</sup> (PT 226)

*šn n<sup>c</sup>w in n<sup>c</sup>w (...)*

‘Plait is (/has been) entwined *by* Plait (...)’

Also with passives of *šni* and the *in N* phrase, Pyr. 1506b<sup>P</sup> (PT 576; §2.2.1.1, (iii)); Pyr. 2110a-b<sup>PNNta</sup> (PT 690; §2.2.1.1., (iv)).

(ii) *Debate* 74-75

*(...) tp š šn m grh hr mryt (...)*

‘(...) on a pool surrounded at night *by* riverbankers (...)’

(iii) *Merikare* E 107-108

*nn šr rn n s m irt.n=f*

‘The name of a man will not become small *by* what he has done.’

<sup>27</sup> E.g. Keenan & Dryer (2006: 342-5).

(iv) *Urk. I 263, 14* (Pershenai)

*iw(=i) rh.k hk3 nb 3h n=f m hrt-nt*

‘I know every magical spell *by* which one becomes an *akh* in the necropolis.’

To embed the discussion of *in* and *m-<sup>c</sup>* into a broader context, and thereby to better apprehend the restrictions to which *in* is subject, I here present various constructions other than the passive in which *m-<sup>c</sup>* comes to order. I thereby discuss various types of events to which a peripheral expression is added to express how the event came about.

#### 2.2.2.1 Dynamic events with a non-agentive subject: With an animate participant added in syntactic periphery

Passives are dynamic events oriented on a non-agentive participant (or not oriented on any participant at all in the case of passives from intransitives: §2.5.3; §2.6.1). Not all dynamic events oriented on a non-agentive participant are passives, however. While passives imply an Agent in their semantic representation, active intransitives with a non-agentive subject do not. In the former, the Agent can be given a formal expression in syntactic periphery, in Earlier Egyptian by *in N* (~ *m-<sup>c</sup> P*; §2.2.1). In the latter, a peripheral expression can be added to express how the event came about; in Earlier Egyptian, this implies various prepositional expressions, chief among which is *m-<sup>c</sup>*.

NB. As a historical aside, it may be worth recalling how Dyonisios Thrax in his *Tekhne grammatike*<sup>28</sup> had a semantic definition of voice, the primary contrast being between *enérgeia* ‘action’ and *páthos* ‘affectedness’. The latter included the passive, middle events of various sorts, and more broadly intransitive events with a non-agentive subject (partly those to which the present section is devoted). By contrast, the Latin *passivus*, although formally a mere translation of *páthos*, has a different extension and is defined primarily in syntactic terms. It includes the passive but excludes the types of events to be discussed in the present section. Dyonisios’ definition was of course motivated by the formal syncretism between middle and passive voice that largely obtains in his target language of study, Ancient Greek.<sup>29</sup> The terminological overlap, and the contrast, between *páthos* and *passivus* are illustrative of how the passive (*passivus*) is part of a broader domain in which the event is oriented on a non-agentive participant (*páthos*). In Ancient Greek, the same prepositional phrase, *hupo*, could thus introduce both the Agent of the passive and the entity that brought about an intransitive event oriented on a non-agentive participant (both are in fact fairly uncommon in text).

A. A peripheral expression can be added to express how a dynamic event with a non-agentive subject came about. When the referent of the added expression is animate, the phrase is regularly introduced by *m-<sup>c</sup>*, thus with *hpr* (i), with verbs of motion with non-agentive subjects (ii), and with other intransitives (iii)-(iv). In several cases ((i.b),

<sup>28</sup> Anderson (1991: §2.7; 1994: §4).

<sup>29</sup> E.g. Bakker (1994).

(ii.b); (iv)), the subject is left unexpressed, according with its low individuation (further, §2.7.3.1):

(i.a) Wadi Hilâl N 6, 4-5

*iw hpr wnw t hm-ntr m-<sup>c</sup> b3k im (...)*

‘The hourly service of the priest happens through this humble servant (...)’

Sim. N 9, 7-8; *Ptahhotep* 520-521 *ir hpr sp nfr m-<sup>c</sup> wnn m hr-tp* ‘If a good action occurs through someone who is a chief (...)’; with a pseudoparticiples expressing a dynamic event (§4.3.3.1), *Urk.* IV 1234, 14 (Thutmose III’s *Gebel Barkal Stela*) *sp m<sup>c</sup>r hpr m-<sup>c</sup>=i im=sn* ‘Success has occurred on them through my agency.’

(i.b) *Urk.* I 108, 10 (Weni)

*hpr.n ø m-<sup>c</sup>(=i) mr-kd hft wd n hm n nb(=i)*

‘It (*scil.* the organization of quarrying and transportation just described) happened through my agency completely and according with the order of the Majesty of my lord.’

(ii.a) Hatnub 6, 8

*h3.n inrw 300 m-<sup>c</sup> tzt(=i) tn n zp w<sup>c</sup>*

‘Three hundred stones came down through the agency of this crew of mine in a single time.’

Sim. *Urk.* I 99, 15 (Weni) *i.n=f m-<sup>c</sup>=f m s3t 3 n hnw (...)* ‘It (*scil.* the sarcophagus provided to Weni by the king) came through his agency (*scil.* the god’s sealer’s) in a great barge of the Residence (...)’.

(ii.b) *Urk.* I 107, 7 (Weni)

*hd.n ø m-<sup>c</sup>(=i) r h<sup>c</sup>-nfr-mr-n-r<sup>c</sup> (...)*

‘They (*scil.* the architectural parts for Merenre’s pyramid complex) came downstream through my agency to Khanefer-Merenre (...)’

(iii) *Urk.* I 224, 10 (Pepyankh-Heryib)

*mnh.n gr ht nb m-<sup>c</sup>(=i) (...)*

‘All things became excellent through my agency (...)’

Sim. *Ptahhotep* 296-297 *ir whh m skn hr=s n m<sup>c</sup>r.n shr nb m-<sup>c</sup>=f* ‘As to someone who fails to lust for it, no plan can succeed through his agency.’

(iv) *Stèle Juridique* 18

*iw ø 3k m-<sup>c</sup>=i*

‘It has perished at my hands.’

B. In all the above types of events, the noun phrase introduced by *m-<sup>c</sup>* has an animate referent, just like the *in N* phrase in the passive construction. Yet, *m-<sup>c</sup>* is regularly used with such dynamic events with non-agentive subjects (examples could be

multiplied)—not *in*. In only two instances, both in highly specific contexts, *in* is found; one is in a *pw*-markedthetic construction in an etiology, thus from technical language, the other in Pyramid Texts:

(v) CT II 344a B1c

*hpr bwt šši pw n hr in ntrw imiw-ht=sn isk*

‘This is how the abomination of the pig came about for Horus, by the gods and the ones in their following likewise.’

Twelve witnesses; only S2P reads (...) *n hr <in ntrw> imiw-ht=sn sk*, clearly a mistake given the plural anaphoric pronoun =*sn*. The construction is to be distinguished from the formally similar *hpr infinitive in N* where *in N* has scope over the infinitive (§2.3.3, (xiii)).

(vi) Pyr. 1405a<sup>Pa</sup> (PT 562)

*dd-mdw tš kš hr nwt in ʕwy=t tfnt (...)*

‘Recitation: The earth has become high under Nut through your arms, Tefnut (...)’

#### 2.2.2.2 Dynamic events with a non-agentive subject: With an inanimate participant added in syntactic periphery

A. The expression added in periphery can also have an inanimate referent: this often comes close to expressing a cause. When the added expression is not an anaphoric pronoun, *m-ʕ* is used with events of motion with non-agentive subjects (i) while *m* is used with *hpr* (ii). The latter contrasts with *hpr m-ʕ*, used when the added expression is animate (§2.2.2.1, (i)):

(i) *Ptahhotep* 509-511

*ir sp n mʕt iry šps=sn pw*

*rwt šhʕ=sn m rʕ n rmt m-ʕ nfr n tsw=sn*

‘As to the occasion of *Maat* they (*scil.* my words) afford, this is their value: their memory moves in the mouth of men because of the perfection of their formulation.’

With the added expression referring to a situation. Referring to an entity, e.g. P. Ebers 101, 17 *n h3.n=f r hrw m-ʕ ht* ‘It (*scil.* the heart) can not go down because of the thing.’

(ii) *Merikare* E 120

*hpr.n ø is m irt.n=i (...)*

‘It happened (*scil.* the destructions evoked) because of what I had done (...)’

B. When the inanimate expression added to a dynamic event with a non-agentive subject is an anaphoric pronoun, another preposition, *hr*, is regularly used. The construction with *hr* is uncommonly found with *hpr* (iii), contrasting with both



*hpr m-ε* (with animate expressions added: §2.2.1.1) and *hpr m* (with non-anaphoric inanimate ones added: above, A):

(iii) *Ptahhotep* 543-544

*nfr.wy šsp s3 dd it=f*

*hpr n=f i3wt hr=s*

‘How good it is that a son takes what his father says!

Old age will happen to him through it.’

The same construction is common with verbs denoting the acquisition of a quality. The inanimate expressions added in periphery can refer to both an entity (iv) and to a situation (v):

(iv) Pyr. 22b<sup>WaWbWcWdTbTcPaNc</sup> (PT 32)

*iw.n(=i) in.n(=i) n=k irt hr*

*kb ib=k hr=s*

‘I have come having gotten you Horus’ eye

so that your heart may be cool through it.’

Sim. Pyr. 23a<sup>WaWbWcWdPaPbPcNcNdNiaNtbNtcNtd</sup> (PT 32) *m-n=k rdw pr im=k n wrd ib=k*

*hr=s* ‘Take the efflux which has gone out of you: your heart will not be weary through it’; in the formula of the ‘breath of life’<sup>30</sup> (e.g. Firenze 2590/no.24, b.5-6)

*t3w n r3 3h n s’h nn nw m wrdt hr=s* ‘The breath of the mouth is beneficial to the official: this is not something through which one becomes weary.’

(v) P. Ebers 101, 7

(...) *wrd.hr ib=f hr=s*

‘(...) and so his heart is weary through it.’

Sim. Urk. IV 1075, 7-8 (Rekhmire) *štp.n=i sw m hrt-ib=f m šhpr hrt=f hr=s* ‘I satisfied him with his desire, by making happen that by which he becomes content.’

Under the same conditions—when the added expression is inanimate and anaphoric—the construction extends to events that are only weakly dynamic, *nh* and *mwt* (vi), and further even in the *nfr sw* construction (vii):

(vi) Neferhotep’s *Great Abydos Stela* 10

*dd=i wrt d=i sdm=tn st*

*wp=tn ib r nh=f hr=s*

‘I will say something great, I will let you hear it

so that you may open the heart and that it lives through it.’

Sim. *Ptahhotep* 581 *nh=f m m(w)tt hr=s* ‘He lives on that by what one dies.’

30 Studied by Vernus (1976); Spiegelberg (1908).

(vii) *Ptahhotep* 403 L1

*nfr tw hr=s*

‘You will be well through it.’

Sim. *Ptahhotep* 410 P *nh sw hr=s* ‘He is alive through it.’

The distribution of *hr=s* and *in N* is directly illustrated in the case of the construction *NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm*, that is, *subject r sdm* oriented on an O (§2.3.2). In this, *in N* introduces the Agent when the construction is passive. When the added expression is animate and anaphoric, *hr=s* is used:

(viii) *Urk.* I 122, 18 (Harkhuf)

*iw=f r wd hr=s in ntr 3*

‘He is to be judged about it by the Great God.’

(ix) *Merikare* E 49

*iw t3 pn r grg hr=s*

‘This land will be founded through it (*scil.* the application of the above precepts).’

Sim., oriented on a S (and thereby not a passive construction), *Cheops’ Court* 5.6-7 *iw ib=k r kbb hr=s* ‘For your heart will be cool through it (*scil.* the above most pleasurable sights)’; with a S/O-ambitransitive (§2.6.2), *Ptahhotep* 407 *iw s3=k r hbs hr=s* ‘Your back will be clothed through it (*scil.* the precepts just mentioned and the situation resulting from it).’

C. In one case only, an anaphoric inanimate participant is not introduced by *hr* but by *m-<sup>c</sup>*. This is in *Shipwrecked Sailor*, the same literary composition in which a ‘wave’ (*w3w*), also notionally an inanimate, is introduced by *in* in a passive construction. Just like *w3w*, the ‘star’ (*sb3*, here anaphorically as =*f*), is treated morphosyntactically as if it were animate; the construction with *m-<sup>c</sup>*, the one regular with added animate participants (§2.2.2.1), is used:

(x) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 129-130

*h<sup>c</sup>.n sb3 h3w*

*pr.n n3 m ht m-<sup>c</sup>=f*

‘A star came down

and these (*scil.* the serpent’s children) went up in fire through its action.’

In the passive construction, 39-41 *h<sup>c</sup>.n=i rd.kw r iw pn in w3w n w3d-wr* ‘I was given to this island by a wave of the sea.’

In their complementarity, *Shipwrecked Sailor* 39-41 and 129-130 thus illustrate the regular distribution with expressions with animate referents:

*With animate participants**(in Shipwrecked Sailor, with inanimates linguistically categorized as animates)*Passive construction:  $in\ N\ (\sim\ m^{-c}\ P)$  (§2.2.1)Intransitives with a non-agentive subject:  $m^{-c}\ P/N$  (§2.2.2.1)

## 2.2.2.3 Existential constructions implying an event

In existential constructions implying an event,  $m^{-c}$  can serve to introduce the animate participant to whom this event is attributed:

(i) Cairo Bowl, inside, 5-7

*ḥ3 tw ḥr=s min mi m3t grg pr=s st.t n=k mw**ir nfr.n Ø m<sup>-c</sup>=k k3 pr=k ḥb3*

‘Take care of it today anew so that her household gets founded and that water be libated for you.

If there is nothing as an action of yours (lit. with you), then your house will be hacked up.’

The same construction recurs in a common formula in the late Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period.<sup>31</sup> This comes in two main variants: one states that something has been found ‘as the action of’ (lit. ‘with’) someone (*gmi m<sup>-c</sup> N*; (ii)); the second provides an overt verbal expression of the action that is only implicit in the first formulation (*gmi ir in N*; (iii)). In the second type, *in N* is used, as is regular in the passive construction (here with *ir* a pseudoparticiple expressing a dynamic event: ‘done by N’). The first type, by contrast, is an existential construction implying an event (lit. ‘find (that there is) something as the action of’,<sup>32</sup> lit. ‘with’); like in (i),  $m^{-c}$  is used:

(ii) *Urk.* I 254, 10 (Qar of Edfu)*n gmt.n(=i) is pw m<sup>-c</sup> ḥr-tp wn m sp3t tn tp<sup>-c</sup>w*

‘This is not something that I have found as an action of a chief who was in this district before.’

Sim. Weha (OIM 16956), 6-7.

(iii) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.δ.2-3 (Inscription #5)*n gmt(=i) ir is pw n<sup>sic</sup> kiw ḥriw-tp wn m sp3t tn*

‘This is not something that I have found had been done by other chiefs who had been in this district.’

Sim. Mo<sup>c</sup>alla IV.25-26 (Inscription #10); *Urk.* I 125, 10-11 (Harkhuf); Hatnub 8, 3-4; Wahankh Antef II’s *Dog Stela* (CG 20512), 1.

31 On the formula, Moreno García (1997: 65-6); Vernus (1995: 67-9); Vandier (1950: 196-7).

32 In French, ‘à l’actif de’ (Vandier 1950: 198).

Deviations from the above distribution *gmi m-<sup>c</sup> N – gmi ir in N* are encountered. In (iv), *gmi in N*—at the line break and standing against *gmi ir in N* twice in Mo<sup>c</sup>alla (iii)—is probably just for *gmi <ir> in N*.<sup>33</sup> In (v), the construction is with a verb in a passive construction, yet *m-<sup>c</sup> N*, not *in N*, is used; also differing from (iii), the verb is not *iri*, but *ip*. In view of (i)–(iii) and in light of the general distribution of *in* and *m-<sup>c</sup>*, the construction here reflects that *m-<sup>c</sup> N* has scope over the event of finding (*gmi*), not over the passive verb (*ip*):

(iv) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla IV.19-20 (Inscription #10)

*n gmt(=i) | is pw in hk3w tpiw-<sup>c</sup>wy*

‘This is not something that I have found <had been done> by previous rulers.’

(v) Siut V, 10

*iw d.n=i b3kw [nw s] nb r t3 gm.n(=i) ip m-<sup>c</sup> itw=i*

‘I forgave the taxes of every man which I found counted as the action of my fathers.’

#### 2.2.2.4 Expressing the cause after all types of events

Finally, *m-<sup>c</sup>* introducing an inanimate participle, be this an entity or a situation, can express the cause after all types of events alike: dynamic ones (i), non-dynamic ones (ii), and among the former, passives (iii). The conjunction *m-<sup>c</sup>-ntt* is directly related to this use.<sup>34</sup>

(i) *Ipuwer* 2.4

*n kd.n hnmw m-<sup>c</sup> shrw t3*

‘Khnum does not fashion anymore because of the condition of the land.’

Sim. *Ptahhotep* 641-644 *it.n=i rnpt 110 m nḥ n dd n=i nsw ḥswt hnt tpiw-<sup>c</sup> m-<sup>c</sup> irt m3t n nsw r st im3ḥw* ‘I got 110 years of life that the king gives to me, praises of me being beyond the predecessors’ because of performing the *Maat* for the king until the state of *imakhu*-ness’; with an intransitive, Semna Despatch IV, x+10 *iw t3 h3st hr m(w)t m-<sup>c</sup> hkr* ‘The (population of the) desert is dying of hunger’; *passim*, common.

(ii) *Merikare* E 81

(...) *ib=f hḏ m-<sup>c</sup> t3-mḥw*

‘(...) whose heart was troubled because of the Delta.’

<sup>33</sup> Similarly Vandier (1950: 196, #2; 221).

<sup>34</sup> Less common than *hr-ntt* with roughly similar meaning, e.g. Siut I, 289 *m-<sup>c</sup>-ntt ntsn ir=sn n=i p3 t3 hntkt* ‘because they are the ones who will make the bread and beer for me’; P. UC 32197, ro II.9 *m-<sup>c</sup>-ntt t3 hmt ng3.ti* ‘because the green frit is missing’; further Meir I, pl.5; P. Smith 5, 22; for an Old Kingdom instance, Stauder-Porchet (2009: 44, n.68). Combining *m-<sup>c</sup>* and *m-<sup>c</sup>-ntt*, P. Ebers 100, 21 *ndḥdh rf h3ty m-<sup>c</sup>=sn m-<sup>c</sup>-ntt prr=f ps* ‘Then the heart ...(?)’-s by them, because it ends up cooked.’

Sim. *Merikare* E 92 (...) *w3wt iry ksn m-<sup>c</sup> dww* ‘(...) whose roads are painful because of the mountains’; *Ipuwer* 3.4 *h<sup>c</sup>w=sn snm m-<sup>c</sup> isywt* ‘Their limbs are saddened because of old clothes’; *passim*, common.

(iii) *Ptahhotep* 586-587

*sw3.t hr spw=f m-<sup>c</sup> <sup>c</sup>3w n iyt hr=f r<sup>c</sup>-nb*

‘His (good) deeds will be passed over because of the multitude of misdeeds bearing on him every day.’

### 2.2.3 *M-<sup>c</sup>*

Two expressions—*m-<sup>c</sup>* and *hr*—were just discussed as introducing the participant, an entity or a situation, through whom or by which an event came about. Unlike *in*, *m-<sup>c</sup>* and *hr* are prepositions. That an expression such as *hr* ‘under’ can be recruited for expressing how an event came about (§2.2.2.2.B) finds parallels (e.g. Ancient Greek *hupo*) and reflects a cognitive basis: in the human experience of the physical world, things generally go down, not up, and subsequent state-of-affairs can therefore be construed as lying ‘under’ prior ones, thus under causes. In the case of *m-<sup>c</sup>* similarly, parallels in other languages can be cited, notably in passive constructions that do not allow the regular expression of the Agent and in constructions other than the passive. In Classical Arabic, a language in which the passive construction only marginally licenses the expression of the Agent, this is occasionally introduced by *bi-iadi*, *<sup>c</sup>ala-iadi*, the former almost a calque of Egyptian *m-<sup>c</sup>*. In English, *at hands of* can be used to specify the Agent after a verbal noun (but not in the passive construction). Much later in the linguistic history of Egyptian itself, in the third person plural construction functioning as an Ersatz to the passive (not itself a passive), the (uncommonly) expressed Agent is introduced by (εΚΟΛ) 21TÑ-/21TOOT= (< *hr-drt*). In addition, Earlier Egyptian *m-<sup>c</sup>* also warrants a strictly language-internal discussion.<sup>35</sup>

A. *M-<sup>c</sup>* includes <sup>c</sup> ‘arm’. In various expressions, the arm is a distinguished metonymy for a man’s acting and agency: with another word for ‘arm’, in the autobiographical topos *ir m hps=f* ‘who acts with his (own) strong arm’;<sup>36</sup> with <sup>c</sup> itself, Heqaib (BM EA 1671), 11 *pr.n(=i) m pr(=i) h3.n(=i) m is(=i) pr(=i) grg iw<sup>c</sup>w(=i) <sup>c</sup>=f nht* ‘I came from my house and went down into my tomb only when my domain was founded and my heir’s arm was strong’ (implying: when my heir could act on his own); *Sinuhe* B 192 *wt3w m <sup>c</sup>wy t3yt* ‘wrappings from the hands of Tayet’. That the arm, inalienably possessed by the Agent, is the Instrument by which he acts is also reflected in the writing system, in the numbers of signs of the hand or the arm in category D (‘body parts’) and in how signs in category A (‘human figures’) are often differentiated from each other by the positions of, and objects held, by arms and hands. The metonymic association between <sup>c</sup> ‘arm’ and agentivity is further manifest in idioms such as *pri <sup>c</sup>*

35 On the related *m-di* and *m-drt* in Later Egyptian, now Grossman & Polis (2012: 203-9) with references to previous discussions.

36 References in Stauder (2013a: 401-2).

‘be active’;<sup>37</sup> *ini* ‘stretch out (to act)’;<sup>38</sup> or *wdi* ‘stretch out the arm’, thus ‘begin (an activity)’.<sup>39</sup>

The noun *ʿ* can itself mean ‘act, action’.<sup>40</sup> Similar meanings are more common in compounds, thus in *st-ʿ* ‘activity’, e.g. Tjetji (BM EA 614), 6 *ḥ<sup>ʿ</sup>.n rd.n=f n=i nn rḥ.n=f ikr st-ʿ(=i)* ‘Then he gave me this for he knew the excellence of my activity’.<sup>41</sup> Other such compounds include *r3-ʿwy* ‘actions’;<sup>42</sup> *r3-ʿ* ‘activity’ (below), ‘art’<sup>43</sup> or ‘manner’;<sup>44</sup> or, with *r3-ʿ* itself a component of a higher-order compound, in e.g. *r3-ʿ-ḥt* ‘combat’.<sup>45</sup> In one place, *r3-ʿ* serves to introduce the participant to whom a detransitive event is attributed. *Mwt*, an event that does not imply an Agent, can not be passivized and the *in N* phrase is accordingly excluded; the Agent-expressing phrase is also excluded by the construction itself, with *tw* in preverbal position (§5.1.2.2). The participant responsible for the event, not an Agent, is introduced in an indirect manner:

(i) Eighteenth Dynasty Menology, 8

*iw.tw r m(w)t n r3-ʿ w<sup>ʿ</sup>b*

‘One will die because of the activity of the *wab*-priest.’

Sim., after a noun, P. Ebers 102, 4-5 *ir 3k-ib mht-ib in t3w n r3-ʿ hry-ḥb irr st* ‘As to forgetfulness and negligence, it is the breath of the activity of the lector priest that makes them’; sim. 100, 19.<sup>46</sup>

B. The preposition *m* most fundamentally expresses a position; in the case of verbs, it can also express a motion away from a place when the prepositional phrase introduced by *m* is part of the argument frame of the verb, that is, it is a complement, not an adjunct; in most cases, *m* thereby introduces inanimate participants.<sup>47</sup> As the arm can stand metonymically for the person, the compound preposition *m-ʿ*<sup>48</sup> is often used with animate participants. When no motion is implied, one basic meaning is ‘with’, e.g. Hatnub 17, 12 *sm niwt=f iw nn wn m-ʿ=s* ‘who nourishes his town when it has nothing’ (*niwt* ‘town’ standing for the people in it, and thereby semantically animate; on this, compare the acceptability of *niwt* in the *in N* phrase: §2.2.1.1, (ii)). With a verb that implies a motion, one common value of *m-ʿ* is ‘(away) from’, e.g. *iti m-ʿ* ‘take away from’, *šdi m-ʿ* ‘save from’, *dbḥ m-ʿ* ‘ask from’, etc.

37 E.g. Parkinson (2012a: 125).

38 E.g. Parkinson (2012a: 203).

39 E.g. Parkinson (2012a: 203).

40 AL 77.0544.

41 In the same topos, e.g. Rediukhnum (CG 20543), 11; in other contexts, e.g. Tjetji 11; Mo<sup>ʿ</sup>alla I.α.3 (Inscription #2). For *st-ʿ* in medical texts, Vernus (1990: 37, ex.77-78).

42 E.g. FCD 146; HannLex. 5, 1451a.

43 E.g. CT VI 381h, after Vernus (1981b: 97, n.y).

44 E.g. Merikare E 103, after Vernus (1981b: 97, n.y).

45 E.g. FCD 146.

46 After Vernus (1981b: 97, n.y).

47 Stauder-Porchet (2009).

48 To be distinguished from the prepositional phrase *m ʿ* ‘in the hand’, e.g. Urk. I 232, 8 (Werra) *ḥsf 3ms wn m ʿ ḥm=f r w<sup>ʿ</sup>rt n sm wr-r<sup>ʿ</sup>* ‘The *ames*-scepter that was in the hand of His Majesty came against (lit. opposed) the leg of the *sem*-priest Werra.’

As noted, the arm is also, more specifically, a metonymy for a man's acting and agency. In existential constructions, the *m-<sup>c</sup>* phrase can thus express possession (derived from a more literal sense of proximity, 'with') when the unexpressed subject refers to an entity, thereby not implying an event; in (ii.a), the origin of this meaning is still transparent. In the formally identical construction, the *m-<sup>c</sup>* phrase can also express agency when the unexpressed subject refers to a situation, thereby implying an event (ii.b):

(ii.a) Antef (CG 20003), 2-4

*iw=tn r drp n=i m ntt m {hnk}<=>=tn*  
*ir nfr.n wnn ø m(-)<sup>c</sup>=tn iw=tn r dd m r3=tn (...)*

'You will present offerings to me from what is in your hand.

If there is nothing in your hand (/with you), you will say with your mouth (...)'

(ii.b) Cairo Bowl, inside, 5-7

*h3 tw hr=s min mi m3t grg pr=s st.t n=k mw*  
*ir nfr.n ø m-<sup>c</sup>=k k3 pr=k hb3*

'Take care of it today anew so that her household gets founded and that water be libated for you.

If there is nothing as an action of yours, then your house will be hacked up.'

With *gmi m-<sup>c</sup>* similarly, the *m-<sup>c</sup>* phrase expresses possession when the object 'found' refers to an entity, not implying an event (iii.a), but expresses agentivity when the object 'found' refers to a situation, thereby implying an event (iii.b):

(iii.a) Heqanakht I, ro 8-9

*ir tm=tn gm ø m-<sup>c</sup>=f hr=tn sm=tn tp-m hrw-nfr*

'If you do not find any from him, you will have to go before Herunefer.'

Sim., after a passive, *Ptahhotep 59 iw gm.t=s m-<sup>c</sup> hmwt hr bnwt* 'It (*scil.* fine speech) is found with maidservants on the millstones.'

(iii.b) *Urk.* I 254, 10 (Qar of Edfu)

*n gmt.n(=i) is pw m-<sup>c</sup> hr-tp wn m sp3t tn tp-<sup>c</sup>w*

'This is not something that I have found as an action of a chief who was in this district before.'

Alternating with *in N* used when the event is overtly expressed (*gmi ir in N*):  
 §2.2.2.3, (ii)-(v).

Related to agency more broadly, *m-<sup>c</sup>* also develops meanings along the lines of 'under X's authority', e.g. *Tjetji (BM EA 614) 13-14 d.n=f n(=i) smt nb wnt m-<sup>c</sup>(=i) m rk it=f hr sd3t=s hr hm=f* 'He assigned to me every duty that had been under my authority in the time of his father to continue it under His Majesty.' Going further, *m-<sup>c</sup>* can introduce an expression co-indexed with the subject participant, thereby underscoring his agentivity (iv). How the construction of *m-<sup>c</sup>* introducing an animate

participant after dynamic events with a non-agentive subject (§2.2.2.1) relates to these meanings of the preposition is then illustrated by the sequence *hr-<sup>c=f</sup>* ‘under his authority’ (after a noun phrase) – *m-<sup>c=f</sup>* ‘by his agency’ (after a verb) in (v):

(iv) Hatnub 4, 4

*iw(=i) h3.k s<sup>c</sup>rk.n(=i) wi3 m-<sup>c</sup>(=i)*

‘I went down after I had completed the boat all by myself.’

A German rendering as *eigen-händig* has been proposed.<sup>49</sup>

(v) *Urk.* I 99, 12-15 (Weni)

*rd hm=f d3 hmti-ntr hn<sup>c</sup> tzt n[t] ‘pr h<sup>c</sup>w hr-<sup>c=f</sup> r int n(=i) krs pn m r3-3w  
i.n=f m-<sup>c</sup>=f m s3t<sup>c</sup> 3 n hnw*

‘His Majesty had a god’s-sealer with a boat-crew *under his authority* cross the river to bring me this sarcophagus from Tura.

It came *through his agency* in a great barge of the Residence (...)’

The association between the ‘arm’ and agentivity finds a further manifestation in cases when *m(-)<sup>c</sup>(wy)* expresses the Instrument, that is, the efficient extension of an Agent, in the active and in the passive (vi)-(vii). Even though the form is a dual, the meaning of *m-<sup>c</sup>wy* in (vi) is already bleached (lit. ‘through the two hands of their power(!)’), as it is in *m-<sup>c</sup>* introducing the Agent. In (vii), the Agent of the passive is additionally expressed through the *in N* phrase, to which the Instrument *m<sup>c=f</sup>* is co-indexed. In (viii), it is introduced as the possessor of the hand (here *drt*); the construction then comes very close to *m-<sup>c</sup>* regularly introducing the pronominal Agent after a passive:

(vi) CT VI 331f B9C

*in rhwy srwd.ti sw m-<sup>c</sup>wy shmw=sn*

‘It is the Two Companions who will plant it through their power.’

(vii) CT V 27a (var. mss.)

*ts h3t=i in šw m<sup>c=f</sup> i3b tw3=f nwt im=f*

‘My forehead will be raised by Shu with his left hand by which he supports Nut.’

(viii) CT VI 164a BH3Ox

*iw tht[h] psdt m dr<rt>=f*

‘The Ennead has been troubled by his hand.’

B1Bo *iw t<h>th psdt m drt nt N* ‘The Ennead has been troubled by N’s hand.’

To conclude, the distinguished association between ‘arm’ and agentivity finds an explicit formulation in a statement by a king (encyclopedically a quintessentially

<sup>49</sup> Hafemann (TLA).



agentive being), in a text in which agency, or the lack thereof, is more generally concerned (§2.1.2, (xi); §2.1.3, (iii)):

(ix) *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 5-6

*k33t ib=i pw hprt m ʕ=i*

‘What happens through my arm is what my heart ponders.’

An event can ‘happen on/with’ (*hpr m-ʕ*), i.e. ‘happen to’, an animate participant (e.g. *Debate* 9-10; *Shipwrecked Sailor* 22-23). It can also ‘happen through the arm of’ (*hpr m ʕ*; (ix), not the compound preposition)—and further, ‘happen through (the acting, or agency, of)’ an animate participant (*hpr m-ʕ*, with the compound preposition: §2.2.2.1, (i)).

## 2.2.4 *In*

In accounting for the nature of the particle introducing the full noun Agent in the passive construction, *in*, various proposals have been made.

### 2.2.4.1 A prepositional origin?

Although it readily translates as a preposition in languages such as English, French, or German (§2.2.2, (i)-(iv)), Earlier Egyptian *in* is synchronically not a preposition: the particle has no functions in expressing an oblique case of any sort and it is restricted to introducing full nouns. On the other hand, it has been proposed that *in* is historically related to the preposition *n*, also found reanalyzed as an inflectional morpheme in the *sdm.n=f*.<sup>50</sup> That a dative expression may be recruited to introduce the Agent in a passive construction would be paralleled in other languages (e.g., among many others, Sanskrit). Moreover, short forms of the Agent-expressing *in*, as *n*, are documented, as are long ones of the preposition *n*, as *in* (§2.2.4.1.1). The hypothesis may also seem to find support in the *sdm.n=f*, which can be shown to have its origin in a detransitive construction with the Agent introduced by *n* (§2.2.4.1.2). However, various other considerations speak against interpreting *in* as related to *n*, more broadly, against *in* as being prepositional in origin (§2.2.4.1.3).

#### 2.2.4.1.1 Written alternations *in* ~ *n*

A. The preposition *n* is occasionally written in a fuller form, as *in*, when it stands initially in the sentence (a) or is preceded only by *mk* (b). Conjunctions that incorporate *n* can also be written more fully when they are fronted (c)-(d). In all cases, therefore, prosodics are a conditioning factor associated with fuller spellings:

(a) E.g. *Giza* III, p.156 *in k3 mry* ‘For the ka of the Beloved One!’<sup>51</sup>

(b) P. UC 32201, vso 8-10 *mk in g3w n ipwty ʕ3 hnʕ=i iw 3 rd.n=i iwt=f* (...) ‘See, for the lack of a messenger here with me, I could hardly have had him go (...)’

<sup>50</sup> Oréal (2007); Grandet & Mathieu (1993).

<sup>51</sup> Further examples: Fischer (1989); Barta (1988); Edel (1955-1964: §757).

(c) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 110-111 **in-mrwt** *wn=f hr dd gr* ‘In order that he keeps speaking, be silent!’

(d) P. UC 32205, ro 12-13 **in-ntt** *itw t3 m[?]t in N m hnt* ‘For the *mat*-boat was taken by N going to the south’ (sim. P. UC 32203, ro 6).

B. Conversely, the Agent-expressing *in* can appear in a short form, as *n*.<sup>52</sup> The *in N* phrase commonly stands at the end of the clause, or even the sentence, often at some distance from the verb. Rarely, the short spelling *n* occurs in such cases (i). In most cases, however, occurrences of the short spelling *n* are when the Agent-expressing phrase is close to, or even directly follows, the passive verb (ii)-(v). The latter includes cases of a zero-subject passive construction (ii.b) and constructions with the pseudoparticiple ((iii.b), (iv.b)) with no further expression intervening between the verb and the Agent-expressing phrase. Prosodics, and possibly *samdhi*, thus often appear to have been a factor associated with short spellings of *in*:

(i) Pyr. 1343d<sup>P</sup> (PT 548)<sup>53</sup> **wn n=f** *ʕ3 i3bti n pt n imn-k3w* ‘The eastern door of the sky has been opened for him by Hidden-of-Ka’s.’

The parallel formulation in Pyr. 2170c<sup>PN</sup> (PT 697), has the full spelling *in*.

(ii.a) *Urk.* I 106, 3 (Weni) *n-zp ir.t i3wt tn n b3k nb dr-b3h* ‘Never had this office been done by any servant before.’

(ii.b) *Urk.* I 103, 5 *n-zp wb3.t ø n b3k nb* ‘Never had they been instructed by any servant.’

In the same inscription, also regularly *pn* for *ipn*<sup>54</sup> and *ptn* for *iptn*.<sup>55</sup>

(iii.a) *Urk.* I 121, 6 (Harkhuf) (...) **s3h.t=f** *is n hr-hb* (...) ‘(...) that he be *akh*-ified by the lector priest (...)’

(iii.b) *Urk.* I 125, 10-11 *n-zp gmy(=i) ø ir n smr imi-r3 ʕw nb* ‘Never did I find that it had been done by any companion and director of interpreters.’

(iv.a) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.8.2-3 (Inscription #5) *n gmt(=i) ir is pw n kiw hriw-tp wn m sp3t tn* ‘This is not something that I have found had been done by other chiefs who had been in this district.’

(iv.b) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla I.α.2-3 (Inscription #2) *gm.n(=i) pr hww ttf mi grgt mkh3 n iry=f m st-ʕ* (...) ‘I found the domain of Khuu inundated like a *gereget*, neglected by the one responsible for it and in charge (...)’

52 Beyond the instances quoted, also *Giza* II, p.146 (Edel 1955-1964: §756).

53 Edel (1955-1964: §756); Faulkner (1969: 211, 212, n.3); Topmann (*TLA*).

54 *Urk.* I 104, 10 (*h3stiw pn*); 109, 7 (*hntiw 5 pn*).

55 *Urk.* I 102, 8 (*h3swt ptn*); 103, 4 (*tzwt(=i) ptn*); sim. 104, 8; 104, 15.

(v) P. Berlin 10026, ro 15-16<sup>56</sup>

(...) *tm gmy sīp nn n šms n ḥ3ti-<sup>c</sup> ḥdny*

‘(...) as it has not been found that these (*scil.* the three bags of Upper Egyptian barley) had been controlled by the follower of the mayor Hedjeny.’

Interrogative *in*—the same particle as the Agent-expressing *in*, if in a different function—is also occasionally spelt *n*.<sup>57</sup> On an altogether different level, the alternation *in* ~ *n* is regularized in the morphological paradigm of the independent pronoun:<sup>58</sup> *in-k* in the first person, but *n-t-k*, *n-t-f*, etc. in the second and third. In one sequence, a fuller form of the third person plural pronoun is found, *intisn* (Pyr. 1650b-c, 1651a-e<sup>N</sup> (PT 599); P *ntisn*); probably significantly, the context is focal.

#### 2.2.4.1.2 Digression: -*n*- in the *sdm.n=f*

A. It has long been proposed that the *sdm.n=f* has its origin in a detransitive construction—a resultative or a passive one—in which the Agent was introduced by the preposition *n* or by *in*, the two being originally related or not.<sup>59</sup> This historical development is amply documented cross-linguistically:<sup>60</sup> illustrations include for example the European *haben*-perfects,<sup>61</sup> or, in languages that do not have a verb ‘to have’ such as several Semitic ones, developments from constructions in which the Agent is introduced by a preposition.<sup>62</sup> That the Earlier Egyptian *sdm.n=f* also originated in such a construction, and that the tense-aspect morpheme -*n*- goes back historically to the preposition *n* specifically is supported by the following considerations regarding the use of the *sdm.n=f* in zero-subject constructions.

(a) In Middle Egyptian, the *sdm.n=f* without overt subject expression occasionally has written forms as *sdm.ny* or *sdm.n<sup>PLUR</sup>*; no other form of the suffix conjugation ever does. The element written *.ny* (or *.n<sup>PLUR</sup>*) is analyzed as a ‘prepositional adverb’:<sup>63</sup> the construction *sdm.n(y)* or *sdm.n<sup>PLUR</sup>* thereby implies that the tense-aspect morpheme -*n*- historically derives from the preposition *n*.

56 Brose (2014: 168, ex.136).

57 E.g. *Urk.* I 129, 11 (Harkhuf); *passim* in Middle Kingdom documentary texts (Brose 2014: 350-2); *Sinuhe* B 114 (R *in*); *Eloquent Peasant* B1 33 (R *in*).

58 Kammerzell (1991b); Loprieno (1995: 64-5); also Uljas (2005).

59 First Sethe (1918: 99); in various declinations, subsequently e.g. Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §411.2); Westendorf (1953: 6-13); Edel (1955-1964: §667, §756); Grandet & Mathieu (1993); Satzinger (2003: 396-7); Depuydt (2003); Oréal (2007); Werning (2008: 284-5); Brose (2014: 207). In early formulations of the hypothesis, various forms, or even all forms, of the suffix conjugation would have originated in constructions with passive participles (e.g. Westendorf 1953: 6-13; overview of the history of research: Schenkel 1975). While this generalized ‘Passivtheorie’, as it has been called, can not be upheld, the argument regarding the *sdm.n=f* specifically remains valid and can be strengthened much further by the additional considerations presented below.

60 E.g. Bybee et al. (1994: 51-105); Maslov (1988: 73-4); Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988: 41-4).

61 E.g. Drinka (2001).

62 E.g. Coghill & Deutscher (2002) for the case of Neo-Aramaic already evoked by Sethe, in which the Agent is introduced by a preposition *l* expressing the dative like Egyptian *n*, to which, incidentally, it is also cognate.

63 The basic study is Edel (1959); first observed perhaps by Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup> [1924]: 137-9); subsequently e.g. Kroeber (1970: 35-40); Kammerzell (1988: 48-50); Junge (2003: 254); Stauder

(b) While all forms of the suffix conjugation can be used in zero-subject constructions, they are subject to strong restrictions regarding the nature of the unexpressed participant, which must score low on the scales of animacy and of individuation (§2.7.3 for active constructions, §2.5.2.2 for passive ones). However, in the construction  $\underline{s}dm.n \ \emptyset_i$  (the  $\underline{s}dm.n=f$  with an unexpressed anaphoric subject), the  $\underline{s}dm.n=f$  can be used with a much broader range of verbal events (including such that score higher on semantic transitivity) and with a broader range of unexpressed participants (including such that score high in individuation and agentivity) (§2.7.3.2). As an illustration of the above, often combined, dimensions,  $N_i \underline{s}dm.n \ \emptyset_i$  is contrasted with  $N_i \underline{s}dm \ \emptyset_i$ :

$N_i \underline{s}dm.n \ \emptyset_i$

The subject must be plural, but can be highly individuated and fully agentive. E.g. Abkau (Louvre C15), x+3 *inbw=s ph.n \ \emptyset \ k3 pt* ‘Its walls, they reached the height of the sky’; *Debate* 104 *hnmsw nw min n mr.ny \ \emptyset* ‘Friends of today, they do not love’; *Urk.* IV 138, 14 (Thutmose II’s *Aswan Inscription*) *wnw m ndt nt nb t3wy hmt.n \ \emptyset \ k3t* ‘The ones who used to be subjects of the lord of the Two Lands, they have conceived plots’; *Chapelle Rouge*, p.98: I.2-3 (HHBT II 7, 11-3) (...) *t3 r-dr=f šsp.n \ \emptyset \ sgri* (...) *wrw ‘h w3h.n \ \emptyset \ hr* ‘(...) the whole land, it became silent (...) the great ones of the palace, they bent their heads’; p.120: V.7-8 (HHBT II 19, 2) *wn.in nn smrw ibw=sn šsp.n \ \emptyset \ mht* ‘These companions’ hearts, they begun to forget’; *Urk.* IV 1073, 4 (Rekhmire) *smrw h3m.n \ \emptyset \ s3=sn* ‘The companions, they bent their backs.’

$N_i \underline{s}dm \ \emptyset_i$ <sup>64</sup>

Except in one isolated instance (§2.7.3.2, (ii)), the unexpressed subject is always inanimate and non-agentive. It also scores low in individuation, being plural, (*Loyaliste* 10.3 *iw hrw=sn smn \ \emptyset \ inbw* ‘Their voices make walls stable’; P. Ebers 100, 11-12 *iw mtw 4 wb3 \ \emptyset \ n phwyt* ‘The four vessels open to the anus’); standing for an abstract entity (*Kagemni* I.6 *iw nfrt idn \ \emptyset \ bw-nfr iw nh n kitt idn \ \emptyset \ wr* ‘A good thing deputizes for goodness; A little thing deputizes for much’; *Merikare* E 106 *iw s3wtj snhh \ \emptyset \ rnpwt* ‘Watchfulness makes the years younger’); or pointing to a situation (*Ptahhotep* 303 *iw=s sibt \ \emptyset \ itw mwwt* ‘It makes fathers and mothers bad(?)’). The contexts are typically generic.

This different behavior of the  $\underline{s}dm.n=f$  vis-à-vis other forms of the suffix conjugation can not be accounted for on semantic grounds. The reason must therefore be morphological:  $N_i \underline{s}dm.n \ \emptyset_i$  includes the prepositional adverb  $n(y)$ . This confirms that the  $\underline{s}dm.n=f$  historically derives from a construction that included the preposition  $n$ .

(2013a: 25-6, 107, 108-9; in press c: §10); Vernus (in press: §5.2.1); in the present study, §2.7.3.2; §5.3.5.2.NB.

64 Occurrences gathered by Vernus (in press: §4.2.1.2, ex.40-45a).

NB. With a view on vocalized forms, doubt has been expressed that the *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f* (\**/CaCiC-na-/*, based on Cuneiform *šá-te-ep-na-re-a* for *stp.n-r<sup>c</sup>*) could have originated in a construction with the preposition *n* (\**/ni-/ > nλ=*).<sup>65</sup> However, the vowel in question varies in other transcribed forms, *mar-ni-ip-ta-aḫ* (*mr.n-pth*) and *zi-in-nu-uk* (*dd.n=k*);<sup>66</sup> all three are probably relative forms. Moreover, the vowel after *-n-* is post-tonic and not morphemic: basing any argument on this is therefore highly risky. Finally, the *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f* is fully grammaticalized in synchrony, aligning with other synthetic forms of the suffix conjugation. The post-tonic vowel at the end of the inflected stem, essentially one that is required for prosodic reasons, would therefore have been subject to the same non-morphemic alternations as was possibly the case in several other forms of the suffix conjugation.

B. This establishes that the *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f* has its origin in a detransitive construction of some sort—a resultative or a passive one—with the tense-aspect marker *-n-* going back to the preposition *n*. In fleshing out the scenario, the first question lies with the more precise nature of the historically underlying detransitive construction.

In the ‘Passivtheorie’, the *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f* was said to have its origin in a construction with a passive participle the predicate of *nfr sw*.<sup>67</sup> However, the construction *smn sw<sub>O</sub>*—that is, the passive participle in the *nfr sw* construction—inherits the qualifying semantics of the higher-order construction of which it is a particular instantiation, *nfr sw* (§2.8). Contrasting with constructions with the pseudoparticiple, in which the event, although often non-dynamic, is presented as bound to linguistic time, *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* expresses that a state-of-affairs is not related to linguistic time. Significantly, *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* is not found with *n* expressing the Beneficiary.

Among alternative scenarios, a connection of the *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f* with the V-passive<sup>68</sup> is ruled out by morphological considerations. The *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f* is based on a stem (Ca)CiC*n*~ (\**/CaCiC-n~-/* in 3*rad*, \**/CiC-n~-/* in 2*rad*), in which the vowel *-i-* is tonic and morphemic. While the reconstruction of the stem of the perfective V-passive remains unclear, the occasionally encountered written ending *-w* suggests different options, possibly along the lines of <sup>3</sup>C<sup>+</sup>Cu(:)C- or the like (§1.2.5.C); whether this is correct or not, a reconstruction with a vowel *-i-* seems excluded.

Constructions with the pseudoparticiple as a source for the *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f*<sup>69</sup> are problematic as well. As the interlocutive (first and second) persons have personal endings, the *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f* could not have begun developing in these persons (*PsP-ending<sub>1/2-O</sub> n NP → s<sub>dm</sub>.n NP wi<sub>O</sub> !?*). The development must then have begun in the third person, with similar constructions extending secondarily to interlocutive persons. However, a full noun subject precedes the pseudoparticiple; so does a pronominal third person subject except when the clause is syntactically embedded, yet the *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f* could not have developed in a dependent construction. Moreover, the

65 Edel (1955-1964: §667); rather than to the preposition *n*, Edel entertains the hypothesis that the tense-aspect *-n-* may go back to the Agent marker *in* (§658, §659, §756).

66 E.g. Starke (1981); Osing (1987: 356-7); Zeidler (1992: 214-5); Gundacker (2011: 59, n.185).

67 E.g. Sethe (1918: 99); Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §411.2); Westendorf (1953: 6-13); Edel (1955-1964: §667, §756).

68 Proposed by Oréal (2007).

69 Proposed by Werning (2008: 284-5).

preverbal position of the third person subject in a construction with the pseudoparticiple is historically original, not a secondary development. This follows from the morphological nature of the third person endings of the pseudoparticiple: these are nominal, expressing agreement, not person.<sup>70</sup> Like the constructions in interlocutive persons, if for different reasons, the third person construction of the pseudoparticiple is therefore not a possible source construction for the *sdm.n=f* either ( $NP_O PsP n NP \rightarrow sdm.n NP NP_O !?$ ).

C. In short, none of the forms or constructions attested in historically documented Earlier Egyptian can be the source construction from which the *sdm.n=f* grammaticalized. Rather than in terms of actual forms or constructions, a scenario for the origin of the *sdm.n=f* must then be phrased in terms of a resultative stem. The *sdm.n=f* is documented as fully grammaticalized as early as the late Second Dynasty;<sup>71</sup> the moment in time when it grammaticalized is unknown but earlier than the earliest layer of Egyptian that can be empirically accessed. By definition, a stem would have been part of an actual form, itself used in actual constructions: however, what forms and what constructions existed in the early periods that would be here relevant remains beyond reach. For methodological reasons, therefore, reference will be made to a resultative stem only; based on how the *sdm.n=f* sounded in the later second millennium, this stem is here symbolically represented as ‘CaCiC-’, explicitly as a convention.

The process of reanalysis of a resultative construction into what was to become the *sdm.n=f* involved a reanalysis of the preposition *n*, notably expressing the Dative and the Beneficiary. Semantically, this was reinterpreted as the Agent by a cross-linguistically well documented process.<sup>72</sup> Datives and Beneficiaries are typically animate, as Agents must be. They also tend to score high in topicality, as Agents also do. Put in more synthetic terms, if semantic roles are mapped onto the Nominal Hierarchy (a composite scale combining the parameters of animacy, topicality, and individuation), Datives and Beneficiaries score second only to Agents.<sup>73</sup>

The process of reanalysis was probably begun with pronominal participants. This is likely on formal grounds: when pronominal, a Dative/Beneficiary expression displays clitic behavior in Earlier Egyptian and may therefore well have in earlier times already. In cliticizing to the verbal stem, a pronominal Dative/Beneficiary is in a position in which it could subsequently be reanalyzed as the syntactic subject.

70 The topic has been discussed most intensively for the Akkadian cognate form (Kouwenberg 2000; Huehnergard 1987; Kraus 1984; Buccellati 1968; Rowton 1962). The result of this debate is that the form is fully verbal in synchrony but has its origin in a non-verbal construction at least in the third person; in particular, third person endings are not indices of person.

71 The form is documented as fully grammaticalized no later than the first verbal clauses themselves, in the late Second Dynasty (*LÄF* 368, d; Peribsen) and in the early Third (Kahl et al. 1995: NE/HE/4).

72 References above, n.60-2. The semantic connection between Dative/Beneficiary and Agent, both metaphorically ‘possessors’ of an event, finds a neat illustration in e.g. *Debate 77-78 nm n=s prt m imnt* ‘(...) though she has no emerging from the West (...)’.

73 E.g. Givón (2001<sup>2</sup>: II, 94-5).

CaCíC- [*n*-P]<sub>Dative/Ben.</sub> *NP*<sub>O(subject)</sub>

→ [CaCíC-*n*<sub>inflectional\_marker</sub>] *P*<sub>subject</sub> *NP*<sub>O(direct\_object)</sub>

(With full noun Dative/Beneficiary: CaCíC- *NP*<sub>O(direct\_object)</sub> [*n* *N*]<sub>Dative/Ben.</sub>)

That the reanalysis begun with pronominal participants is also likely on semantic grounds. By virtue of the prototypical correlation between the grammatical relation of subject, the semantic role of Agent, and discourse topicality, active subjects, and particularly agentive ones, generally score high in topicality.<sup>74</sup> As noted, Datives and Beneficiaries also tend to score high in topicality; when pronominal, they score even higher, either pointing to a speech act participant or being linked anaphorically to a referent in preceding discourse. Semantically, a pronominal Dative/Beneficiary is therefore the participant most prone to undergo reanalysis into the Agent of an active construction.

Once a construction [CaCíC-*n*<sub>inflectional\_marker</sub>] *P*<sub>subject</sub> *NP*<sub>O(direct\_object)</sub> had begun emerging with pronominal Agents, it would have been extended to full noun Agents. As the resultative source construction implies the presence of an O, the *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f* would have initially developed with syntactically transitive verbs; once it had, it would have extended to syntactically intransitive ones as well.

#### 2.2.4.1.3 Against a prepositional origin of the Agent marker *in*

*In* introducing the Agent after a passive construction occasionally surfaces in written form as *n* and the preposition *n* itself occasionally surfaces as *in*. However, these alternations correlate with prosodical conditions and possibly with *sam<sub>dhi</sub>* phenomena (§2.2.4.1.1); they do therefore not afford evidence that the preposition *n* and the Agent-introducing *in* should have been historically related to one another. The preposition *n* is present in the source construction from which the *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f* developed; diachronically, therefore, the preposition *n* is associated with agency. However, this need not imply that *in* introducing the Agent in the passive construction must be related to *n*: there may just as well have been different ways of introducing the Agent, in synchrony and/or in different periods of Egyptian prior to its first documentation.

Other considerations speak decisively against an analysis of the Agent marker *in* as being historically related to the preposition *n*:

- (a) *In* is used not only to introduce the Agent in passive constructions and after the infinitive, but also as a focus marker in cleft-sentences, as a quotative index, and in various functions with scope over a whole clause (§2.2.3.3). These uses can not be accounted for if *in* is set in relation to the preposition *n*;
- (b) *In* introduces the Agent in passive constructions but does not introduce animate and inanimate participants after dynamic events with a non-agentive subject nor in existential constructions implying an event (§2.2.1-3). Prepositional expressions, on the other hand, are typically capable of doing so. This is illustrated in Earlier Egyptian itself by *m-<sup>c</sup>* and, under specific conditions, *hr*;

74 E.g. Woods (2008: 51-2).

(c) In the passive construction, *in* stands in complementary distribution to *m-*<sup>75</sup> depending on the nature of the Agent, a full noun or a pronoun, respectively (§2.2.1.2). If *in* had a prepositional origin, the restriction to full nouns remains unaccounted for;

(d) The Earlier Egyptian preposition *n* has a cognate in West-Semitic *l<sup>e</sup>*.<sup>75</sup> *In*, for its part, is present incorporated in the independent pronouns (*in-k*, etc.); these correspond to Semitic *ano:ki*, *ana:ku*, etc. On morphological grounds as well, Earlier Egyptian *n* and *in* can not be related.

#### 2.2.4.2 *In* originally an ergative morpheme?

A. It has been proposed that *in* points to an earlier stage in which Egyptian would have displayed a (split-)ergative alignment<sup>76</sup> and that *in* itself would have originally been an ergative marker.<sup>77</sup> In this hypothesis, ‘passive voice emerged in Egyptian as a specialized function within the semantic category of “perfectivity” and as a consequence of the marginalization of ergative features.’<sup>78</sup> The hypothesis involves the following additional dimensions and observations:

(a) *In* introduces not only the Agent in the passive construction, but also the subject in the *in*-cleft construction. The latter is used only in the active and therefore often agentive;<sup>79</sup>

<sup>75</sup> Stauder-Porchet (2009: 24); Loprieno (1995: 100).

<sup>76</sup> Ergativity (e.g. Dixon 1994; Lazard 1997; 1994) is a phenomenon to do with alignment, that is, with how the grammatical roles A, S, and O are realized morphosyntactically in terms of case marking, intraverbal agreement and/or word order, depending on which of these (possibly combined) dimensions are relevant in any given language. Languages in which A, S, and O are all treated differently are very uncommon, probably because of the uneconomical nature of a threefold differential marking; languages in which A, S, and O are all treated alike are similarly uncommon, probably because of the resulting problems in identifying the roles of the participants in the clause. As A and O typically co-occur in a transitive clause, the issue is whether S, the single direct participant in an intransitive clause, is treated as an A or as an O. In accusative alignment (as in e.g. English), S aligns with A (the ‘nominative’, generally less marked) against O (the ‘accusative’, generally more marked). In ergative alignment, S groups with O (the ‘absolutive’, generally less marked) against A (the ‘ergative’, generally more marked). ‘Split-ergativity’ refers to the fact that in most languages that display ergative alignment, this concerns only part of the grammar of this language. For example, the perfective domain may display ergative alignment while the imperfective displays accusative alignment. Or, expressions on the lower end of the Nominal Hierarchy (such as for example inanimates, or third persons more broadly) may display ergative alignment while expressions on the top of the Nominal Hierarchy (such as for example animates, or first and second persons more narrowly) display accusative alignment. In addition to the above type of ‘morphological ergativity’, some languages also display deeper phenomena of ergativity, referred to under the umbrella of ‘syntactic ergativity’. These include for example obligatory pivots for relativization and/or clause-combining grouping O with S against A.

<sup>77</sup> Loprieno (2003: 79-84; 1995: 64-5, 83-4); also Jenni (2005: 116; below, NB); Roccati (1997); Grandet & Mathieu (1993, with a view on the *sdm.n=f* only, and relating *in* to *n*; on these not being related, §2.2.4.1); Zeidler (1992: 210-2). Critically, Reintges (1998a: 210-1; 1998b: 458-61); critically on *in* but contemplating ergativity in prehistorical times on other levels, Satzinger (2001; below, n.87).

<sup>78</sup> Loprieno (2003: 81).

<sup>79</sup> One apparent counter-example to this generalization is regularly cited, *Shipwrecked Sailor* 184-186, read as *in-m rd.t mw [n] 3pd ḥd B n sft=f dw3*, interpreted as: ‘By whom can water be given to



- (b) The Agent in the passive construction can be introduced by *m-<sup>c</sup>* as well, in complementary distribution to *in* (*in* *N* ~ *m-<sup>c</sup>* *P*). One parameter of a split-ergative alignment is the Nominal Hierarchy: participants scoring low on that hierarchy, such as full nouns, display ergative alignment while participants high on that hierarchy, such as pronouns, display accusative alignment;
- (c) In the qualifying construction *nfr sw*, the subject is realized as a dependent pronoun, not as a suffix pronoun. Moreover, various semantic effects are observed;
- (d) With infinitives, the ‘subject’ of an intransitive is realized as a suffix pronoun, as is often also the case of the ‘direct object’ of a transitive;
- (e) Earlier Egyptian has a construction in which the O argument is introduced indirectly, by the preposition *m* (§2.6.1.2). In several respects, this can be described as functionally similar to antipassive constructions, which are found in certain languages with ergative alignment.

B. In Earlier Egyptian as documented from the earliest times on, the Agent-expressing *in*-phrase is found after passives from both transitives and intransitives. It therefore groups the grammatical roles A and S. In *in*-cleft constructions similarly, *in* groups the grammatical roles A and S. Ergative alignment would consist in grouping O with S; by definition, a grouping of A with S is accusative alignment. If *in* were to be an ergative morpheme, this must have been in prehistory.

As regards the diachronic relationship between the passive and ergativity, the associated alignment is split-ergative along aspectual lines: the perfective is then ergative while the imperfective is accusative.<sup>80</sup> In Earlier Egyptian, however, *in*—in the passive construction and *in* in the *in*-cleft construction alike—is used in both the accomplished and the unaccomplished, in direct contradiction to cross-linguistically observed patterns.

Furthermore, the change is recurrently in one direction, from passive to ergative, never the opposite as would be the case in Egyptian under the ergative hypothesis.<sup>81</sup> While an individual, historically documented language may always exhibit phenomena not yet documented in other languages, positing counter-directional developments should be avoided in reconstruction. In addition, there is a clear rationale to the cross-linguistically observed directionality of the change: when the passive construction—a marked voice construction—is used increasingly often, it can gradually lose its markedness and eventually undergo a reinterpretation as an unmarked construction, thus possibly yielding an ergative construction.<sup>82</sup> The

---

a bird at the daybreak of its slaughter in the morning?’ This must be read differently, as a rare cleft-construction with the *sdm.t(i)*, itself a variant of the similarly rare cleft-construction with the *sdm.t(i)=f(i)*, thus ‘Who is to give water (...)?’ (in details, Gundacker 2012: 75-9; already contemplated by Loprieno 2003: 89, n.41).

80 E.g. Dixon (1994: 97-101); Abraham (1996); Coghill & Deutscher (2002).

81 E.g. Dixon (1994: 187-93).

82 An ergative alignment is not any more marked than an accusative one; in languages that have both, these stand in complementary distribution, not in opposition.

development posited for prehistoric Egyptian would be very odd in terms of the discourse bases of both passive voice and ergativity.

C. Regarding other elements that have been evoked in the discussion, *m-ʿ* comes to order when *in* can not: this suppletive relationship concerns not only the Agent-expressing phrase in the passive construction, but other constructions as well (§2.2.2). Both *m-ʿ* and *in* can introduce A's and S's: both strategies are similarly accusative; they do not point to a split in alignment.

In the qualifying construction *nfr sw* with a participle as predicate, the subject can be a S (both a non-agentive and an agentive one),<sup>83</sup> an A, or an O. The acceptability of any verb in the *nfr sw* construction is determined by semantic parameters, as are the observed semantic effects (§2.8). The issue is not one of alignment.

With infinitives, a single expressed argument is coded by a suffix pronoun regardless of whether this is a S or an O, but if two are expressed, various possibilities exist: the first, the A, can be introduced by *in* or it can be realized as a suffix pronoun. In the second case, the syntax of the infinitive mirrors finite constructions; in the first case, the syntax of the infinitive is nominal. In the first case, the alignment is accusative by analogy; in the second, the issue is not one of alignment.

As to the Earlier Egyptian Mediate Construction of O, this is an antipassive only in a broad sense. The construction does not involve associated verbal morphology and it does not serve to feed a syntactic pivot. It does not point to an erstwhile ergative syntax of Egyptian (§2.6.1.2.A, NB).

NB. Independently from the above, it has been proposed that the syntax of pronominal expressions after the imperative could provide evidence for an originally split-ergative alignment of Egyptian.<sup>84</sup> With imperatives from intransitive verbs, a pronominal expression co-indexed to the Agent of the imperative is realized as a dependent pronoun (*tw*), while with transitive verbs it is realized as dative expression (*n=k*). The observation is descriptively correct but can not be interpreted as pointing to split-ergativity. The dative expression (*n=k*) can not be related to *in*, because *in* does not introduce pronominal expressions in any construction. Even if it could, *in* displays no trace of an erstwhile association with ergativity (above, B-C). The proposed interpretation would also imply that the imperative would be ergative with transitives but not with intransitives; as, however, there is no passive imperative, S's are not grouped with O's. Moreover, split-ergative alignment would concern pronominal expressions: this is in contradiction to the Nominal Hierarchy, whereby ergative alignment concerns the lower end of the hierarchy while the higher end, notably pronominal expressions, display accusative alignment.<sup>85</sup> Finally, even in languages that are otherwise thoroughly ergative, the imperative is the one construction that has accusative alignment.<sup>86</sup> The discourse basis for this correlation is that the imperative foregrounds the role of the Agent; as A's and S's are the two grammatical

83 To use Loprieno's (2003) terminology, the subject in the *nfr sw* construction can be of both the S<sub>A</sub> and S<sub>O</sub> type or, equivalently, be of both the unergative and the unaccusative type.

84 Jenni (2005: 116).

85 E.g. Silverstein (1976); Dixon (1994: 85-97); Woods (2005).

86 Dixon (1994: 131-3).

roles associated with the semantic role of Agent, the imperative groups these together.<sup>87</sup>

### 2.2.4.3 A focal particle, originally a presentative/quotative index

In discussing the nature and origin of *in*, the whole set of functions for which the particle is used must be considered. These include:

- Introducing the Agent in a passive construction (§2.2.1) or after a passively interpreted infinitive (illustration: §2.3.3);
- Introducing the focused-upon participant in *in*-cleft constructions;
- As a quotative index, standing alone or following another quotative expression to which the noun phrase introduced by *in* is then co-indexed;<sup>88</sup>
- With scope over a whole sentence, as an interrogative particle in yes/no-questions;
- With scope over a whole sentence, with assertive force.<sup>89</sup>

Based on this distribution, it has been convincingly argued that *in* is a focal particle which can have scope over a constituent (in *in*-cleft constructions) or over a sentence (in which case various effects to do with illocutionary force result).<sup>90</sup> The passive construction with the *in N* phrase is for its part analyzed as the simplification of an originally bipartite sequence consisting in a passive without expression of the Agent

87 On an altogether different level, not concerning *in*, another proposal has been to recognize traces of ergativity in the contrast between the suffix conjugation and the pseudoparticiple (Satzinger 2001: 178-81, with evolutionary overtones). The latter is often used with intransitives, thus with a S as its subject, but can also be used with transitives, overwhelmingly with the O, not the A, as its subject; the pseudoparticiple would thereby seem to group O with S. However, not all intransitives can be used in the pseudoparticiple: for example *šhs* 'run' can not. Nor can all transitives be used in the pseudoparticiple: for transitives and intransitives alike, strong semantic constraints bear on the acceptability of the form (§4.3.3, particularly §4.3.3.2-3). Moreover, the same form used with transitives can have the A, not the O, as its subject: regularly so with *rh* and *hm*, under specific semantic and/or textual conditions with other verbs. The pseudoparticiple, therefore, does not display ergative alignment, nor do the cognate Afroasiatic forms, such as the Akkadian stative. More generally, the orientation of the pseudoparticiple is neither ergative nor accusative: both alignment types are defined in terms of groupings of grammatical roles (O with S against A, and A with S against O, respectively); grammatical roles are themselves defined in strictly syntactic terms. The pseudoparticiple, for its part, is oriented semantically, that is, the grammatical role of its subject and the acceptability of the form with any particular event are determined by parameters to do with the semantics of the event (§2.3.1; §4.3.3). With syntactically transitive events, semantic transitivity—high for an orientation on O, low for an orientation on A—is a central parameter, for example (§2.3.1.3). In being oriented semantically, the pseudoparticiple stands outside the (syntactically defined) contrast between ergative and accusative alignment. The semantic orientation of the pseudoparticiple accords with the resultative semantics of the form. It is therefore original, not the result of an adjustment from an originally absolutive case.

88 Faulkner (1935); Allen (1984: §204-10); Güldemann (in press).

89 E.g. *Urk. I 129, 5-7* (Harknuf) *in tr rh tw irt mrrt hzzt nb=k in wrš=k sdr=k hr mh m irt mrrt hzzt wdt nb=k* 'Indeed you know to do what your lord loves and praises! Indeed you spend day and night thinking about doing what your lord loves, praises, and orders!' Further Reintges (1997: 163-8).

90 Reintges (1998; 1997: 162-72).

followed by *in N* in apposition (‘—It is N’), e.g. (i).<sup>91</sup> The originally bi-clausal structure is of course fully reanalyzed in the passive construction as documented in historical times, as is demonstrated for example by cases in which the *in N* phrase has moved before an adjunct that has scope over the passive event, e.g. (ii):

(i) Pyr. 1704b<sup>M</sup> (PT 609)

*wb3 š mn<sup>c</sup> in N pn*

\*‘The Pool of the Nurse has been opened—It was this N (who did).’

→‘The Pool of the Nurse has been opened by this N.’

(ii) Pyr. 472a<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 305)

*ī(3)z m3kt in r<sup>c</sup> hft wsir*

‘A ladder was tied together by Re before Osiris.’

Complementing this analysis, a further study strongly suggests that among all documented functions of *in*, the ones in which the particle is a quotative index are primary.<sup>92</sup> Related to these, *in* would have had functions as a presentative index (~ ‘there is N/it is N’). This would have formed the basis from which other functions subsequently developed, as in *in*-cleft constructions (~ ‘It is N (no other) who does (...)’) and in the passive construction itself (\*‘The Pool of the Nurse has been opened—It was this N (who did)’).

B. This analysis finds further support in exceptional uses of *in* that do not fall under any of the regular ones listed above. In (iii), *in N* constitutes a full clause; this is followed by another clause in which *in* introduces the subject of a situational predicate construction. The construction reflects the presentative-focal connection just evoked. In (iv) and (v), the latter in a non-standard register, *in* introduces a noun co-indexed to an active subject, making the reference of this subject explicit. These constructions are best accounted for as related to the presentative functions of *in* that have been argued to historically underlie the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase in the passive construction:

(iii) *Heqaib*, Stela #10, x+19-20<sup>93</sup>

*rd.n n(=i) hm=f krstt m š n hnt-š hr nfrw wsht m nbw hbsw mrhwt*

*in h<sup>c</sup>w 2 n hrt-ib*

*in imi-r3 š-hnwti n hm=f m-s3 ir*

‘His Majesty gave me a coffin of Lebanese cedar wood as well as mummy-wrappings, a golden necklace, clothings and oils.

These were two boats of value (lit. of desire).

It was His Majesty’s chamberlain who was in charge of them.’

91 Reintges (1997: 172-8).

92 Güldemann (in press). As the author also makes very likely, the verb *i* ‘say’ (Faulkner 1935; Allen 1984: §204-10) is a secondary development, reanalyzed from *in*.

93 Vernus (1991: 337).

## (iv) CT V 27d-e Sq6C (sim. B1C)

*smn tbwt nt N pn hr 3kr in 3st*  
*smn=s<sub>i</sub> N pn in 3st<sub>i</sub> hr 3kr m ntr ʕnh*

‘The sandals of this N will be established on earth by Isis;  
 she will establish this N—Isis will—on earth as a living god.’

B2P reads passively throughout: *smn tbwt=i hr 3kr in 3st i.smn=i in 3st hr 3kr (...)* ‘My sandals will be established on earth by Isis; I will be established by Isis on earth (...)’; note the different sequences in 27d and 27e, *hr 3kr in 3st* then *in 3st hr 3kr*, both equally grammatical, but possibly indicative that 27e B2P is a secondary reading. B2L reads the second clause without *in 3st*: (...) *smn=s wi hr 3kr (...)* ‘(...) she will establish me on earth (...)’.

## (v) P. UC 32201, ro 13-14

(...) *rd.n ø p3 imw h3 in b3kt<sub>i</sub> sw 3tp*

‘(...) one had the ship sent off—Baquet had—once fully loaded.’

The linguistic register is non-standard.<sup>94</sup> (a) In *rd.n ø*, an animate and agentive participant is left unexpressed, at odds with the general semantic constraints of low animacy and non-agentivity that bear on zero-subject constructions in Middle Egyptian (§2.7.3.1 for active constructions; §2.5.2.2 for passive ones; for this passage in particular as differing from all other even remotely comparable constructions, §2.7.3.2.C). (b) The construction *rd NP PsP* (here *rd.n ø p3 imw h3*) is rare in pre-New Kingdom times and possibly confined to non-standard varieties.<sup>95</sup> (c) *Sw 3tp* is a subject-first construction with a pronominal subject asyndetically linked to the preceding segment; in this form, this remains unparalleled. Unlike in (iv), the participant is not expressed at all in its regular subject position: while in (iv), *in N* is a strategy for emphasis, it serves to introduce a participant as an afterthought in (v). In relation to the other elements of a non-standard register, this exceptional afterthought construction suggests that (v) is a rare token of a more ‘spontaneous’ linguistic performance.

The unique instances of *Ns PsP in N* and *hpr in N* (§2.2.2.1, (v)-(vi)) are best analyzed along similar lines, as rare reflections of the original capacity of *in* to introduce an added element of information, outside the clause itself. In glossing translations, this analysis could be reflected as: Pyr. 1405a<sup>Pa</sup> (PT 562) *t3 k3 hr nwt in ʕwy=t tfnt* ‘The earth has become high under Nut—it was your arms, Tefnut, (that did)’; CT II 344a B1c *hpr bwt š3i pw n hr in ntrw imiw-ht=sn isk* ‘This is how the abomination of the pig came about for Horus—it was the gods and the ones in their following likewise (who did).’

94 Brose (2014: 168, ex.138) emends into a construction with a V-passive: *rd {n} p3 imw h3 in b3kt (...)*; this interpretation is problematic as it does not account for the other elements of a non-standard register found in the same clause ((b) and (c) in the main text). A different interpretation (Brose 2014: 302, ex.426) *rd n p3 imw (...)* ‘Dem Schiff wurde geboten (...)’ is problematic in view of the inanimate Dative expression introduced by *n*.

95 Schenkel (2007b) and Peust (2006a); minor complement in Stauder (2013a: 220, n.78).

C. The analysis finds further support in the distribution of *in* and *m-ʕ* as described above. This can be summarized in the following table:

*Introducing the Agent in the passive construction*

*in N* ~ *m-ʕ P* (§2.2.1.2)

*After other dynamic events with a non-agentive subject*

Introducing an animate participant *m-ʕ P/N* (§2.2.2.1)

Introducing an inanimate participant *m-ʕ N, m N – hr P* (§2.2.2.2)

*After existential constructions implying an event*

*m-ʕ P/N* (§2.2.2.3)

If *in* had been prepositional in origin, expressing a dative or an oblique case of some sort, the restriction of *in N* to the passive construction would remain unexplained. If, on the other hand, the Agent-expressing *in N* passive construction has its origin in the simplification of a bipartite structure with *in N* originally an extra-clausal presentative and/or focal phrase, a natural account is given for why *in N* is found only in the passive construction. An original association of *in* with presentative functions also accounts for why *in* introduces only full noun Agents in the passive construction, never pronominal ones: personal pronouns, which score high in topicality, would not have been used in the presentative construction that formed the second part of the bipartite structure in which the Agent-expressing passive construction originated.

In all environments in which *in N* was not used—with pronominal Agents, with events oriented on a non-agentive subject but not passive, and in existential constructions only implying an event and thereby an Agent—expressions of prepositional origin were used to supplement *in N*. By far the most common of these was *m-ʕ*, which includes ʕ ‘arm’ and displays distinguished associations with agency more generally (§2.2.3).

## 2.3 Semantically oriented constructions: *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* and *NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm*

The orientation of inflectional passives—T-passives, V-passives, the *sdmm=f*, and passive participles—can be described in terms of grammatical roles in necessary and sufficient conditions:

- An inflectional passive from a syntactically transitive verb has the second direct argument, the O, as its subject (the first direct argument, the A, is either left unexpressed or is expressed by the *in N* phrase in syntactic periphery);
- An inflectional passive from a syntactically intransitive verb—whether primarily or secondarily intransitive (§2.5.3 and §2.6.1, respectively)—is subjectless (the direct argument, the S, is either left unexpressed or is expressed by the *in N* phrase in syntactic periphery).

At no point in the above are semantics a factor. Grammatical roles, in terms of which the orientation of inflectional passives is fully defined, are themselves strictly syntactic categories. Accordingly, the orientation of inflectional passives is here termed a ‘syntactic’ one. By the same token, active forms of the suffix conjugation are also syntactically oriented: their subject is an A or a S, depending on whether the verb is transitive or intransitive.

The present section is devoted to two constructions not addressed so far: *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* (that is, a pseudoparticiple with a pronominal O as its subject) and *NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm* (that is, *NP r sdm* with an O as its subject). Morphologically, the forms involved are not inflectional passives, yet the constructions in which they occur can regularly function as passive constructions and are therefore an integral part of the overall passive paradigm of Earlier Egyptian. Unlike inflectional passives, the orientation of *NP PsP* and *NP r sdm* can not be described in syntactic terms. Both can be oriented on an O, a S, and an A—that is, on all three grammatical roles alike. Conversely, they can not be oriented on all O’s, all S’s, or all A’s. In short, grammatical roles provide neither necessary nor sufficient conditions for describing the orientation of *NP PsP* and *NP r sdm*. Rather, it is the semantic relationship between the verbal event and the subject in the constructions to be discussed that determines their orientation—including when they are oriented on an O, then functioning as a passive construction.

### 2.3.1 The pseudoparticiple

When oriented on a pronominal O, the pseudoparticiple can express a dynamic event and in this case be an integral part of the overall paradigm of the accomplished passive (§2.3.1.1; in more substantial details, §4.1). The form itself is not an inflectional passive, however; to describe its orientation, some background on the semantics of the pseudoparticiple as a resultative form is first recalled (§2.3.1.2; in more details, §4.3). The conditions under which the form can be oriented on an A are the most restrictive and therefore merit a distinct discussion (§2.3.1.3). The more general conditions under which the form can be oriented on a S or an O are addressed in turn (§2.3.1.4).

#### 2.3.1.1 The pseudoparticiple in the passive construction: *P<sub>O</sub> PsP*

Although not an inflectional passive, the pseudoparticiple<sup>96</sup> can be used in the passive construction. While *N<sub>O</sub> PsP*—that is, the pseudoparticiple with a full noun O as its subject—always expresses non-dynamic events (§4.1.2), *P<sub>O</sub> PsP*—that is, the pseudoparticiple with a pronominal O as its subject—can express both non-dynamic and dynamic events (§4.1.1). In the latter case, *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* expresses a (perfective) passive. This is demonstrated among other things by the regular occurrence of the

96 In line with e.g. Borghouts (2001), Reintges (2006), and Vernus (1997: 17–8), I consider the pseudoparticiple a morphological unity. For proposals to split it into two forms, Kammerzell (1990; 1991a) and Schenkel (1994), along different lines; on this debate, further Jansen-Winkel (1991); Depuydt (1995); Satzinger (1998). An in the present author’s opinion decisive argument in favor of the morphological unity of the form resides in the unitary semantic analysis presented below (this section and §4.3).

Agent-expressing *in N* phrase ((i); in details, §4.1.1.B); as discussed, the *in N* phrase is found only in the passive construction and after passively read infinitives (§2.2). More generally, *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* expressing a dynamic event stands in complementary distribution to the perfective V-passive used with non-pronominal O's (full nouns, complement clauses, in zero-subject construction, and in subjectless constructions) ((ii); in details, §4.1.3):

(i) Hatnub 6, 4

*iw(=i) h3b.k r hwt-nbw in h3t[i-<sup>c</sup> ...]*

‘I was sent to Hatnub by the prince [...]

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B2 135

*h<sup>c</sup>.n=f in*

*ir wpwt m h[nw=f nb<sup>?</sup>]*

‘Then he was brought

and an inventory was made of all his goods.’

Moreover, *V-pass P*, a common construction in earlier times, has specialized functions in these: with negative events (§4.3.5.1.3; §4.3.5.2.1) and in the ‘emphatic’ construction notably (§4.2.1). The construction *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* is, in other words, the regular expression of the accomplished passive with non-negative and fully asserted events with a pronominal O as their subject. As such, the construction is an integral part of the paradigm of the accomplished passive:

*Accomplished passive: non-negative and fully asserted events*

Non-dynamic (resultative): *P/N<sub>O</sub> PsP*

Dynamic (passive): *P<sub>O</sub> PsP ~ V-pass non-P* (*in N*)

### 2.3.1.2 The pseudoparticiple: General background

A. The orientation of the pseudoparticiple can only be described if the semantics of the form are considered. Whatever its subject, the pseudoparticiple is regularly used with non-dynamic events, expressing that an entity is in a state; the state can be primary or secondary, that is, resulting from some previous event thereby implied. Under more restrictive conditions but still regularly, the same form also expresses a dynamic event, implying a resulting state affecting the subject (§4.3.3.1). The semantic connections between these uses are clear, from a state, to a state implying some previous event, to a dynamic event implying a resulting state affecting the subject. Typologically, the pseudoparticiple can be described as a resultative category.<sup>97</sup>

B. Of the non-dynamic and dynamic uses of the pseudoparticiple, the first are primary, both typologically and historically.<sup>98</sup> Typologically, resultative categories can develop further to express dynamic events, but often do not. In the history of

<sup>97</sup> For an introduction to resultative forms and constructions, Nedjalkov (1988).

<sup>98</sup> Different views in Oréal (2010; 2009).



Egyptian itself, the pseudoparticiple would lose its dynamic uses during later Late Egyptian, retracting to its basic non-dynamic uses in Demotic and Coptic.

Historically, the Akkadian form cognate to Earlier Egyptian pseudoparticiple<sup>99</sup> has developed dynamic uses only marginally;<sup>100</sup> dynamic uses in Earlier Egyptian thereby appear as an inner-linguistic innovation. That this is indeed the case can also be demonstrated directly (further, §4.1.5.B). In historical times, the pseudoparticiple is a regular part of the accomplished paradigm with certain types of events, thus subject-affecting intransitives (such as *iwi* ‘come’). When oriented on an O, however, the same form can be dynamic only when the O is pronominal (§4.1.1-3); moreover, even with pronominal O’s, the development was not yet fully completed in early historical times, as is demonstrated by rare occurrences of *V-pass P* in environments in which *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* is regular and would become exclusive in later texts (§4.1.4).

NB. The label ‘Old Perfective’ and the associated interpretation<sup>101</sup> reflect a time in Wissenschaftsgeschichte when the relationship between the East Semitic (i.e. mostly Akkadian) stative and the cognate West Semitic perfect (*qatala*, etc.) was insufficiently understood. The latter was then considered to project back to a ‘common Semitic’ level and, beyond, to a possibly ‘common Afroasiatic’ one. However, subsequent research has demonstrated that the West Semitic perfect is an inner-West Semitic innovation, secondary to the non-dynamic uses of the cognate category as documented in East Semitic.<sup>102</sup> While all these forms—the Egyptian pseudoparticiple, the East Semitic stative, and the West Semitic perfect—are cognate, the first can be set in direct relation only to the second, not to the third. Accordingly, the dynamic uses in Earlier Egyptian are an inner-linguistic development like the ones in West Semitic; these developments are independent from one another.

That these two inner-linguistic developments are independent from one another is also demonstrated by their different nature: while the inner-West Semitic development consists in an evolution into a perfect, the inner-Egyptian development consists in an extension of the pseudoparticiple to express dynamic events under certain conditions. Meanwhile, the form remains a resultative in Earlier Egyptian, keeping to its semantic orientation (below). In West-Semitic, by contrast, the evolution into a perfect leads to a change in orientation: except for some remnants for example in Biblical Hebrew, this has become syntactic.<sup>103</sup>

99 On the Afroasiatic background of the pseudoparticiple, Kouwenberg (2010a: 189-93).

100 E.g. Kouwenberg (2010a: 163-76); Rowton (1962).

101 E.g. Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §3, §309); Oréal (2010).

102 Tropper (1995); Kouwenberg (2010a: 181-9).

103 As regards the label ‘Parfait ancien’ (Winand 2006), this is indexed on the Indo-European category labeled ‘perfect’ (the relevance of a typological parallel between the pseudoparticiple and the Indo-European ‘perfect’ was already pointed out by Schenkel 1971). Like the Semitic stative, the Indo-European ‘perfect’ originally expresses non-dynamic events and only subsequently develops into a perfect (e.g., among many others, Neu 1985; 1989). Beyond the labels, Winand’s (2006: 198) analysis of the non-dynamic uses of the pseudoparticiple as primary accords with the one presented here.

### 2.3.1.3 The pseudoparticiple oriented on A

The Earlier Egyptian pseudoparticiple can be oriented on a S, an O, or an A. I begin with the last, the so-called ‘active-transitive’ construction of the pseudoparticiple. Constructions of the pseudoparticiple oriented on an A fall into two broad types:

- (a) With *rh* ‘know’ and *hm* ‘not know’, the pseudoparticiple oriented on an A is fully regular, found in all types of texts in the record, and with all grammatical persons. With *rh* and *hm*, the pseudoparticiple is never oriented on an O;
- (b) With other verbs, the pseudoparticiple oriented on an A is rare, mostly found in a subset of stylistically highly elaborated so-called event biographies of the Sixth Dynasty, and by and large limited to the first person singular. With the same verbs, the pseudoparticiple is more often oriented on an O.

#### 2.3.1.3.1 *Rh* and *hm*

Given their lexical semantics, *rh* and *hm* readily express a non-dynamic event.<sup>104</sup> As such, their use in the pseudoparticiple accords with the stative value of the form. Going further, *rh* and *hm* are distinguished among transitive verbs in the Earlier Egyptian lexicon by their very low semantic transitivity:<sup>105</sup> in an event of ‘(not) knowing’, the O does not register a change-of-state and is therefore not a Patient; nor is the A an Agent (it does not control, initiate, or otherwise effect the event); in addition, the event is atelic and non-dynamic. While syntactically transitive, *rh* and *hm* thereby score very low in semantic transitivity: this makes them regularly acceptable in the construction of the pseudoparticiple oriented on an A.<sup>106</sup> The very same reason accounts for why the pseudoparticiple of *rh* and *hm* is not ever oriented on an O: for the pseudoparticiple of a syntactically transitive event to be oriented on an O, this O must be conceived as one that can be affected by the event and the event must be telic (§4.3.3.2-3); in short, the event must score high in semantic transitivity.

These same correlations are further reflected in the use of *rh* in the *nfr sw* construction (*rh sw<sub>A</sub>*: §2.8.2, (i)). In this, *rh* is one of very few syntactically transitive verbs to be found in the active participle (§2.8.2.B); among these, it is also the one most common in text. On the other hand, the same verb is not found in the *nfr sw* construction oriented on an O, a construction that in itself is not uncommon (*smn sw<sub>O</sub>*: §2.8.3). As discussed later (§2.8.2-3), the relevant parameter is in both cases the very low semantic transitivity of *rh*, like in the pseudoparticiple.

<sup>104</sup> This does of course not mean that the same verbs can not also express dynamic events, with forms of the suffix conjugation (e.g. Winand 2006: 243-4).

<sup>105</sup> ‘Semantic transitivity’ is here introduced informally, with respect to event semantics only (semantic roles and Aktionsart). For a broader discussion, §4.3.4.1.

<sup>106</sup> The Egyptian configuration is by no means rare: in two languages already evoked, e.g. the Akkadian stative *lamda:ku* and the Ancient Greek ‘perfect’ (originally a stative/resultative) *woida*, both ‘I know’.

## 2.3.1.3.2 In Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts: Low semantic transitivity

With verbs other than *rh* and *hm*, the pseudoparticiple oriented on an A is uncommon. Most occurrences are from a small subset of event biographies of the Sixth Dynasty: these warrant a distinct treatment (§2.3.1.3.3). Among occurrences that have been quoted from other texts, several are to be read differently and do not involve a pseudoparticiple.<sup>107</sup> Among the three remaining instances, two are distinguished by a very low semantic transitivity; like *rh* and *hm*, the events are transitive only in syntax:

(i) Pyr. 1300b-c<sup>PaPbN</sup> (PT 537)

*šzp gbb ʕ=k                      ʕnh.t m htp hr itw=k*  
*shm=k m dt=k                wnh.t dt=k*

‘Geb will seize your arm—be alive in peace with your fathers!

You will have power over your body—be dressed in your body!’

The O, *dt=k*, is not a Patient. What is more, it refers to a body part, co-indexed to the subject: *wnh.t dt=k*, which is non-dynamic, has typically middle semantics associated with events of grooming. The event, in parallel to *ʕnh.t*, denotes a state in which the participant addressed is to find himself; like *rh* and *hm*, it scores very low in semantic transitivity. Put differently, *wnh.t dt=k* is transitive only in syntax.

(ii) CT VI 220j L2Li<sup>108</sup>

*i.mr.k i.nd=k irt=k m-ʕ ir[...] n=k*

‘I desire that you rescue your eye from the one who acts for you.’

Although not as low as *rh* and *hm*, *mri* does not score high in semantic transitivity either: the O is not a Patient and the A is only weakly agentive. In the present case, the event is not dynamic and the A is not agentive at all. Significantly, *mri* is one among the very few verbs other than *rh* that can be used in the *rh sw<sub>A</sub>*

107 (a) Pyr. 786a<sup>PN</sup> (PT 435) has been read as (...) *nls.k rn n wsir N* ‘Ich habe den Namen des Osiris N gerufen’ (Edel 1955-1964: §588). This is to be segmented differently, as *dd-mdw ink nwt msntn i.sk(=i) r3 n wsir N* ‘Recitation: I am Nut ...(?) I will wipe the mouth of Osiris N’ (Allen 1984: §590, noting the parallel formulation in Pyr. 179a-b<sup>WNNI</sup> (PT 219)). The reading is confirmed by the Z1 stroke in N, implying that *r3 n*, not *rn*, is to be read and therefore that the verb is *sk*, not *nls*; the N version further has a classifier with the verb, also implying that the verb is *sk*, not *nls*. (b) In Pyr. 1272b<sup>P</sup> (PT 534) *dd.t* (...) has been read as ‘Sage (...)!’ (Edel 1955-1964: §594). This, however, is a T-passive of the subjunctive (‘may there be said (...)’) (similarly Topmann, *TLA*). (c) In an Old Kingdom ‘Rede und Ruf’, *i.dd tw in tw=k wn.ti mdw pw n š* has been read as ‘Rede doch! Gehst du (etwa) an diesem schönen “Stock des Sees” vorbei?’ (Edel 1955-1964: §590). This is to be segmented differently, with *wni* read intransitively and *mdw pw n š* as an *A pw* clause: ‘Rede! Willst du nicht schnell machen? Es ist ein schöner Stock vom See’ (Erman 1919: 50). The use of *wni*, a verb of manner of motion, is possible in the pseudoparticiple when the motion is construed as a state (§4.3.3.2.A). (d) CT IV 51e-g B3L, B1L has been read as *iwr.kw šd ms.kw pd nnk tm* (...) ‘I have conceived the lower sky, I have born the upper sky. The universe is mine (...)’ (Reintges 1997: 361, ex.11, with discussion in n.9). With Faulkner (1973-1977: II, 221), I read with subjunctives *iwr=k w šd ms=k w pd* (...) ‘May you conceive me, O Pool; may you fashion me, O Earthly Expanse, (for everything is mine, and I am the Lord of the First of the Year, (even) Nepri).’

108 Reintges (1997: 362, ex.12a).

construction (the *nfr sw* construction with an active participle of a syntactically transitive verb as its predicate: §2.8.2, (ii)).

The third instance is different and best interpreted as an exceptional, context-induced extension of use of the pseudoparticiples, here to express the lasting nature of the event wished for, accordingly presented as a state:

(iii) Pyr. 2108a-2110d<sup>PN</sup> (PT 690)

*h3 N db3.t m ntr hr=k m z(3)b wsr is (...)*

*b3=k m hrw sd3=k m grh ntr is nb šꜥt*

**wḏ.ti** *mdw ntrw šhm is hnt šhmw*

‘O N! Be arrayed as a god, your face being a jackal’s like Osiris’ (...)

Your power is in the day, the trembling you cause is in the night, like a god, lord of terror.

Be the commander of the gods like a power at the fore of the powers!’

In context, *wḏ mdw*, in itself a dynamic event, reads in parallel to, and as a closing heightening of, the previous *db3.t*. For the general principle of a recategorialization of an otherwise dynamic event into a non-dynamic one, compare the *hꜥ sws* construction (§2.8.2.A, (c); this goes even further, since the event is presented as not even related to the temporal flow). For a different, but similarly unique, context-induced constructional extension in Pyramid Texts, also with the pseudoparticiples, Pyr. 1405a<sup>Pa</sup> (PT 562) (§2.2.2.1, (v); 2.2.4.3.B, *fine*).

### 2.3.1.3.3 In Sixth Dynasty event biographies

Constructions of the pseudoparticiples oriented on an A in Old Kingdom autobiographies are relatively less exceptional than the above; they are also of an entirely different semantic nature. While the constructions with *rh* and *hm* and the rare ones just discussed are determined by the very low semantic transitivity of the event, no such constraint, or even correlation, is observed in Old Kingdom autobiographies. In (i), for example, the A is highly agentive, acting for the king (*n=f*); the event is dynamic; and the O registers a change-of-state as a result of the event (a change in position for the offering table, a coming into existence for the barges):

(i) *Urk.* I 108, 1-4 (Weni)

**sh3.k** *n=f htp pn n hrw 17 (...)*

**šꜥ.k** *n=f wšht m šnd (...)*

‘I had this offering table go down for him in seventeen days (...)

I cut for him a barge of acacia wood (...)’

In analyzing these constructions of the pseudoparticiples oriented on an A in Old Kingdom autobiographies, their distribution in text, which is highly specific, provides the crucial point of entry:

- The construction is strictly limited to the first person singular. This is significant as the very same texts in which the construction occurs also have third person participants, including pronominal ones;

- The construction is strictly limited to so-called event biographies of the Sixth Dynasty. It never occurs in letters or decrees, even though these include accomplished active events in the first person singular, both in reference to officials and to the king. Nor does it ever occur in Fifth Dynasty (auto)biographies. Nor does it ever occur in contemporaneous Sixth Dynasty so-called ideal biographies, even though these are replete with accomplished events in the first person singular;

- Even in Sixth Dynasty event biographies, the construction is very restricted. Of an overall total of eighteen occurrences, nine (50%) are from only one text, while fourteen (>75%) are from only two texts combined:

- Weni: *Urk.* I 99, 10 (*dbh.k*); 100, 9 (*ir.k*); 100, 11 (*ir.k*); 102, 17 (*m<sup>3</sup>.k*); 104, 10 (*d<sup>3</sup>.k*); 106, 4 (*ir.k*); 106, 11 (*ir.k*); 108, 1 (*sh<sup>3</sup>.k*); 108, 4 (*s<sup>c</sup>.k*)—9 occurrences;

- Sabni son of Mekhu: col.3-4 (*shtp.k*); col.4 (*rd.k*); col.6 ([*sb*]<sup>7</sup>.*k*); col.13 (*w<sup>3</sup>h.k*); col.19 (*krs.k*)—5 occurrences;

- Other texts: *Urk.* I 86, 4 (*ir.k*); 141, 2 (*in.k*); Hatnub 4.4 (*in.k*); 4.5 (*s<sup>c</sup>nh.k*)—4 occurrences.

In most Sixth Dynasty event biographies—including very major ones such as Harkhuf, Pepynakht-Heqaib, Nekhebu, Ini, and others—the construction never occurs. In these texts, the regular expression of the accomplished active also found in letters and decrees, *iw sdm.n(=i)*, is used for the same types of events, often in formulations that are directly comparable phraseologically, e.g.:

(ii.a) *Urk.* I 104, 9 (Weni) ***ir.k*** *r hzt w hm[=f ...]* ‘I acted in a way that His Majesty praised me (...)’

(ii.b) *Urk.* I 133, 11 (Pepynakht-Heqaib) *iw* ***ir.n(=i)*** *r hzt (w) nb(=i) (...)* ‘I acted in a way that my lord praised me (...)’

(iii.a) *Urk.* I 99, 10-11 (Weni) [***d***]***bh.k(i)*** *m-<sup>c</sup> hm n nb(=i) in(.)t n(=i) krs inr h<sup>d</sup> m r<sup>3</sup>-3w* ‘I asked from the Majesty of my lord that a coffin in white stone of Tura be brought to me.’

(iii.b) *Urk.* I 147, 13-14 (Djau of Deir el-Gebrâwi) *iw* ***dbh.n(=i)*** [*m-<sup>c</sup> hm=f*] *nd i<sup>3</sup>t nt h<sup>3</sup>ti-<sup>c</sup> n d<sup>c</sup>w pn* ‘I asked from His Majesty that the dignity of hereditary prince be bestowed on this Djau’; sim. 146, 6.

Based on the above, the construction is interpreted as a stylistically marked, extended use of the regular construction of the pseudoparticiple.<sup>109</sup> In the highly specific context of a self-presentation in his own tomb,<sup>110</sup> the speaker presents an action he has performed for the king by a resultative form so as to express that the event has affected him and has lasting relevance in how he can present himself to posterity.

While here bound to very specific high-cultural determinations, the semantic process of extension itself is not unsimilar to what has been called the ‘possessive’ semantics of the pseudoparticiple.<sup>111</sup> In an entirely different cultural context, these are illustrated e.g. by the Akkadian construction *eqlam sabit* ‘he holds the field (lit. he has seized the field)’, an extended use of the stative not uncommon in legal contexts, that is, in contexts where the lasting consequences of situations matter.

A more detailed analysis requires an examination of further aspects of the texts in which the extended construction of the pseudoparticiple occurs: their composition and rhetoric strategies; the interplay of the two main participants (the speaker and the king) and strategies for foregrounding these; the correlation of the extended construction of the pseudoparticiple with the past tense *sdm=f*; and the indexical values associated with both these constructions in Sixth Dynasty event biographies.<sup>112</sup>

#### 2.3.1.3.4 In the Twelfth Dynasty: Textual revivals and indexical values

After the Sixth Dynasty, the extended construction of the pseudoparticiple recurs in the Twelfth Dynasty:<sup>113</sup>

109 Also interpreting as an extended use, Reintges (2011: 30). The analysis presented here is at odds with the common one, widely accepted ever since Doret’s (1986: 61-6) study: this views the ‘active-transitive’ construction of the pseudoparticiple with pronominal subjects as regular and therefore as part of the accomplished paradigm in Old Egyptian. In this tradition, the rarity of the construction in all post-Old Kingdom times is interpreted as a loss whereby this linguistic change would be one distinctive diagloss of Old vs. Middle Egyptian. In the present analysis, the presence of the extended construction of the pseudoparticiple in some Sixth Dynasty event biographies is made possible by generic determinations of these texts. The lack of the extended construction of the pseudoparticiple in the First Intermediate Period and in most Middle Kingdom autobiographies reflects thorough-going changes in the autobiographical discourse after the Old Kingdom, not linguistic change. From a wissenschaftsgeschichtliche perspective, it may be worth pointing out that the classical analysis as in Doret (1986) and much subsequent literature harkens back to Osing (1977), a study devoted to Weni’s inscription, the one text that includes half of all occurrences of the construction in the Old Kingdom.

110 Although not from a funerary context, the two occurrences in Hatnub 4 are phraseologically and generically linked to the ones in event biographies. Like autobiographies, expedition inscriptions, also have to do with self-presentation, and these two types of discourse entertain tight relationships with one another.

111 Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988: 9-10, 22-6).

112 Stauder (in prep).

113 Jenni (2007) interprets the Middle Kingdom constructions of the pseudoparticiple oriented on an A as reflecting a change in modality of a form that is analyzed as semantically a middle. However, the pseudoparticiple is regularly used with events that are not middle (e.g. *iwi* ‘go’), while events that are typically middle are not used in the pseudoparticiple (e.g. verbs of body grooming or of emotive speech). A middle analysis of the pseudoparticiple is also contradicted by the fact that the form is invariably perfective when expressing a dynamic event; middle categories do not display a similar aspectual bias. The two domains of the stative/resultative and of middle voice overlap only inasmuch as the event is in both cases viewed as affecting the participant on which it is oriented (for middle voice, e.g. Kemmer 1993; Klaiman 1991); such overlap is also reflected in the productive historical connections between the two (thus, classically, in Indo-European where the

- In autobiographies: Semti (BM EA 574), 14; Iykhernefret (Berlin 1204), 10; *Urk.* VII 47, 14 (Djehutihotep);
- In mining inscriptions: Wadi el-Hudi 14, 10; 143, 14 (§2.5.2.2, (vi));
- In one literary text: *Sinuhe* B 45; 114.<sup>114</sup>

Except in Semti and in the literary text,<sup>115</sup> these occurrences of the construction in autobiographies and expedition inscriptions are in direct phraseological continuation to Sixth Dynasty models,<sup>116</sup> thus:

- (i) *Urk.* I 141, 2 **in.k im** (...) ‘I brought it from there.’  
→ Wadi el-Hudi 14, 10; 143, 14 **in.k im** (...)
- (ii) *Urk.* I 100, 11 (Weni) **tr.k mr-ḳd r ḥzt w ḥm=f ḥr=s r ḥt nb** ‘I have acted entirely so that His Majesty praised me about it more than anything.’  
→ Iykhernefret (Berlin 1204), 10 **tr.k mi wḏt.n nbt ḥm=f** (...) ‘I have acted like everything His Majesty has ordered (...)’
- (iii) Sabni son of Mekhu 4 **rd.k f[3].t=f** (...) ‘I had him carried (...)’  
→ *Urk.* VII 47, 14 (Djehutihotep) **rd.k iwt d3mw** (...) ‘I had troops come (...)’

The extended construction of the pseudoparticiple is here the object of a purely textual revival—as are other constructions at the same time, often in the same texts and similarly in phraseologically determined inheritance from older models (for example the past tense *sdm=f*, §4.3.5.1.1.B; *V-pass P*, §4.2.1, (xx)-(xxi)). By virtue of its out-of-the-ordinary quality, compounded with its formal salience, the extended construction of the pseudoparticiple is further exploited as a device for underscoring the often most major textual articulation in those compositions in which it occurs.<sup>117</sup>

Given its distinguished association with autobiographies and the allied genre of expedition inscriptions, the construction has also become a linguistic index of these genres. In *Sinuhe*, the construction is recruited as part of a much broader set of strategies by which various genres are palimpsestically evoked, linguistically and non-linguistically. Like in contemporaneous autobiographies, the construction is placed at salient junctures in the literary text. As can be further analyzed, the construction is deliberately used in *Sinuhe* in places that make the associated indexical

---

middle voice emerges through a contamination between the ‘perfect’ (originally a stative/resultative category) and the dynamic conjugation; e.g. Neu 1985; 1989). Despite such overlap, the resultative and middle voice are two distinct categories; as regards the Earlier Egyptian pseudoparticiple, this is resultative, not middle.

114 In *Amenemhat* 6f (...) *ir.kw mi s3-B n smt*, the construction has been read as both active and passive; only the latter is grammatically possible, thus ‘(... on me) who was made like a worm in the desert.’ Discussion: Stauder (2013a: 444-8).

115 On other significant elements of shared linguistic repertoires in Semti and *Sinuhe*, Stauder (2013a: 245-6).

116 In more details, Stauder (2014a: §3.2).

117 Stauder (2014a: §3.1).

overtones dissonate—a token of the semantic tensions expressed in *Sinuhe* and a sign of fictionality, here realized on a linguistic level.<sup>118</sup>

After the Twelfth Dynasty, the construction recurs only once, in *Mutter und Kind* V.10-VI.1.<sup>119</sup> Having lost any specific indexical association, it has become a mere token of elevated language, with the one verb with which it was found most often in earlier times, *iri*.

#### 2.3.1.4 The semantic orientation of the pseudoparticiple

As the previous discussion demonstrates, the construction of the pseudoparticiple oriented on an A is regular only with *rh* and *hm*: with all other verbs, the construction is rare and subject to specific conditions, semantic or textual/generic. The pseudoparticiple is, on the other hand, very common with events oriented on a S or an O, provided certain principled semantic conditions are met. The marginal status of uses of the pseudoparticiple with an A as its subject reflects a general implication whereby languages with the possibility for such construction will also have the construction with an O and a S as subjects, while the reverse does not hold true.<sup>120</sup> As regards the semantic conditions to be met, these directly relate to the resultative semantics of the form (in more substantial details, with illustration, and including a discussion of the rare but equally significant exceptions to the generalizations made, §4.3.3.2-4):

- When oriented on a S, the pseudoparticiple can express a primary state (that is, a state not implying a previous event from which it would have resulted, e.g. *t3* ‘be hot’). When expressing a secondary state (that is, a state implying some previous event) or a dynamic event implying a resulting state, the event must be of a sort that the S is affected by it. In particular, the event must be telic (that is, imply an Endpoint in its semantic representation);
- When oriented on an O, the pseudoparticiple can only express a secondary state or a dynamic event (this derives almost tautologically from the fact that a syntactically transitive event oriented on its second direct participant can not be conceived of as a primary state). In all cases when the pseudoparticiple is oriented on an O, therefore, the O must be affected by the event and the event must be telic;
- When oriented on an A, the pseudoparticiple is regular only with *rh* and *hm*, which denote events scoring very low in semantic transitivity. With other events, the construction is marginally possible under similar conditions of very low transitivity (e.g. *mri* ‘like (that ...)’, *wnh dt=f* ‘clothe one’s body/oneself’). Uses of the pseudoparticiple oriented on an A with events that do not score low in semantic transitivity are confined to one textual genre (including subsequent revivals): these are extended uses reflecting the generic and thereby ultimately high-cultural over-determinations of these texts.

---

118 Stauder (2014a: §3.2).

119 Stauder (2013a: 393).

120 Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988: 36).



No syntactic condition bears on the orientation of the pseudoparticiple: the form can be oriented on all grammatical roles alike, S's, O's, and A's. On the other hand, with all grammatical roles alike, semantic conditions determine whether the pseudoparticiple can be used. Accordingly, the orientation of the pseudoparticiple is semantic.

The pseudoparticiple oriented on an O differs from inflectional passives in that only the former is subject to the above semantic conditions; inflectional passives can be used regardless of whether the O is affected or not and of whether the event is telic or not (§2.1.1). What is more, inflectional passives can be formed with syntactically intransitive events (provided their S is an Agent: §2.1.2; §2.5.3), that is, with events that have only one direct participant. This, a S, is either left unexpressed or expressed in syntactic periphery: in all cases it is demoted from the subject position. With the same syntactically intransitive events, the pseudoparticiple is, by contrast, necessarily oriented on the S. While the pseudoparticiple is semantically oriented, inflectional passives are syntactically.

The semantic nature of the orientation of the pseudoparticiple is perhaps most directly manifest in the case of syntactically transitive events, which can be oriented either on an O or on an A. When oriented on an O, the pseudoparticiple requires that the event be telic and subject-affecting, implying that the event must score high on semantic transitivity (further discussion, §4.3.4.1.2); when the pseudoparticiple is oriented on an A (and leaving aside the extended uses in Sixth Dynasty event biographies), the reverse is observed: the event must score very low on semantic transitivity.

### 2.3.2 *NP r sdm*

A. Another semantically oriented construction is *NP r sdm*. Illustrating the phenomenon in the apodoses of threat formulae,<sup>121</sup> the formally identical construction can be oriented on an A (i), a S (ii), and an O (iii)-(iv).<sup>122</sup> In (iii)-(iv), the construction is passive, as is demonstrated by the presence of the Agent-expressing phrase in (iii):

(i) *Urk.* I 119, 7 (Djau of Abydos)

*iw=tn r šdt n(=i) prt-hrw (...)*

‘You are to recite an invocation-offering for me (...)’

(ii) Isi (Saqqara)<sup>123</sup>

*iw(=i) r zbt hr=sn (...)*

‘I am to stand up for them (...)’

121 In the Old Kingdom, Edel (1944: §12-14, §16, §18); more generally, Merschauer (1991).

122 Previous discussions: Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 66-8); Westendorf (1953: 140-2).

123 Quoted after Edel (1955-1964: §937).

(iii) *Urk. I 219, 4-5 (Nekhebu)*

*ir z nb sšn.t=f h̄t nb m iz(=i) pn*  
*iw(=t) r wḏꜥ hnꜥ=f tn ntr ʕ3*

‘As to anyone who will dismantle anything in this tomb of mine,  
 I am to be judged with him by the Great God.’

Sim. *Urk. I 218, 13; 117, 6 (Seneni); 150, 10 (CG 1650); 263, 10 (Pershenay;*  
 with the *r* omitted in writing). In the third person, *Urk. I 122, 18 (Harkhuf)*.<sup>124</sup>

(iv) *Siut IV, 79-80*

*ir swt sbi nb (...)*  
*iw=f r p[s]t (...)*

‘As, however, to any rebel (...),  
 he is to be cooked (...)’

Sim. *Siut III, 64 (...)* [*hꜥ*]<sub>w</sub>=[*s*]<sub>n</sub> *r tk[ʕ]* ‘(...) their bodies are to be burnt.’

Outside threat formulae, the construction *NP r sdm* displays similar alternations in orientation in Middle Egyptian literary texts: on a S (v), on an O (thus a passive construction) (vi), and on a S/O-ambitransitive (§2.6.2) (vii). In all three cases similarly, *hr* introduces a pronominal expression referring to a state-of-affairs previously evoked, in relation to which the event is said to come about (§2.2.2.2.B):

(v) *Cheops’ Court 5.3-7*

*ib n hm=k r kbb n m33 hnn=s n hnt m-ḥd m-hnt (...)*  
*iw ib=k r kbb hr=s*

‘Your Majesty’s heart will be cool at seeing how they row a rowing trip up  
 and down! (...)’

For your heart will be cool through it.’

(vi) *Merikare E 49*

*iw t3 pn r grg hr=s*

‘This land will be founded through it.’

(vii) *Ptahhotep 407*

*iw s3=k r hbs hr=s*

‘Your back will be clothed through it.’

The construction is not uncommon in relative clauses, notably in administrative (ix)-(x) and in technical texts (xi).<sup>125</sup> As (ix) illustrates, *r sdm* can be set twice with the same subject:

<sup>124</sup> For variants of the same formulation, with constructions other than *NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm*, Edel (1943: §12).

<sup>125</sup> Further occurrences: Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 67, ex.7 and 12).

- (viii) Siut III, 1 (...) *msw ntiw r mst* ‘(...) children who are to be born.’
- (ix) P. Berlin 10033, ro 2 (...) *ntt r irt r s[i]p* ‘(...) what is to be done and controlled.’
- (x) P. Berlin 10025, ro 4 (...) *ntt r irt r b3k im* ‘(...) what is to be done against this servant.’
- (xi) P. Rhind Mathematical 82 (...) *d3tt ntt r rdt* ‘(...) the remainder which is to be given’; (...) *ntt r hbt* ‘(...) what is to be deduced.’

B. The possibility for *NP r sdm* to be oriented on an O can not be brought in relation to the fact that the construction includes an infinitive, a category that itself displays a remarkable versatility in its orientation (illustration, §2.3.3). This is for three reasons:

- (a) The orientation of the infinitive is determined by the fact that this form is a verbal noun. Nominal orientation does not extend to a verbal category such as *NP r sdm*, a grammaticalized construction in which the infinitive is part of the predicate;
- (b) Unlike the Earlier Egyptian *NP r sdm*, its direct morphological heir, the Late Egyptian ‘Future III’ can not be oriented on an O, even though it similarly includes an infinitive in a still morphologically transparent fashion;
- (c) Morphologically, the construction *NP hr sdm* is similar to *NP r sdm*. Yet, only the latter can be oriented on O:

<i>NP<sub>A</sub> hr sdm</i>	<i>NP<sub>S</sub> hr sdm</i>	[ <sup>†</sup> <i>NP<sub>O</sub> hr sdm</i> ]
<i>NP<sub>A</sub> r sdm</i>	<i>NP<sub>S</sub> r sdm</i>	<i>NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm</i>

The possibility for *NP r sdm* to be oriented on an O is therefore not a feature of the infinitive, but one of the construction as a whole, and of this particular construction as it differs from the otherwise morphologically similar *NP hr sdm*. Put differently, the reason is not morphological, but semantic.

When initially developing, *NP r sdm* expresses that the subject is bound to the fulfillment of the event.<sup>126</sup> Like in the construction *NP PsP*, the orientation is semantic in *NP r sdm*.<sup>127</sup> In the latter, the subject finds itself in a situation implying an event to come; in the former, the subject finds itself in a state resulting from a completed event: in either case, an event is related to as situation or state the subject finds itself in. Among the above examples, (iii)-(iv)—and (i)-(ii) alike—are from threat formulae, asserting events that are bound to happen, should the condition expressed in the *ir*-headed protases be met. Ex.(vi)—and (v) and (vii) alike—are followed by *hr=s*, expressing that an event to come stands in direct relation to a state-of-affairs previously evoked. For *NP r sdm* in relative clauses (viii)-(xi), the

<sup>126</sup> Vernus (1998b; 1990: 5-7). These semantics of the construction reflect the semantics of *r* as a preposition, which most basically expresses a relation between A and B where B is inanimate (Stauder-Porchet 2009). On *NP r N* by the times *NP r sdm* begins developing, Vernus (1990: 5-6); in later times, Brose (2014: 426); Stauder-Porchet (2009: 64-7). Different views in Polis & Grossman (in press).

<sup>127</sup> For similar constructions in other languages, Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 66).

concentration of occurrences in administrative and technical texts is similarly significant.

In the Middle Kingdom, *NP r sdm* develops semantically weakened uses as a future.<sup>128</sup> When used as a future, the construction is not be oriented on an O anymore. By the same token, its use extends to all A's and S's regardless of semantics: when used as a future, Middle Egyptian *NP r sdm* is syntactically oriented. It then synchronically contrasts with the same formal category still used with its original strong semantics and semantically oriented:

	<i>Events bound to occur</i> (semantic orientation)	<i>Future</i> (syntactic orientation)
OEg. and FIP	<i>NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm</i> (iii)-(iv)	/
MK-...	<i>NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm</i> (vi)	<sup>†</sup> <i>NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm</i> (for events oriented on an O: <i>sdm.t NP<sub>O</sub> / (X.)tw r sdm NP<sub>O</sub></i> )

The passive counterpart to Middle Egyptian *NP r sdm* used as a future is first the T-passive of the prospective, from the late Twelfth Dynasty on also *(X.)tw r sdm*, that is, *NP r sdm* itself with {t} an impersonal pronoun inserted into the subject slot (§3.3.B; §5.1.2.2). In either case, voice is marked: it must be, because the orientation of *NP r sdm* weakened into a future tense has become syntactic.

### 2.3.3 Appendix: Nominal orientation, infinitives alternating with passives

Syntactically a noun, an infinitive can be oriented on any direct participant, an A, a S, or an O. This is to be distinguished from the phenomenon of semantic orientation discussed above for the pseudoparticiple and *NP r sdm* expressing events bound to occur: like syntactic orientation, semantic orientation concerns finite constructions. By contrast, the orientation of the infinitive is defined by the nominal nature of the form—a type of orientation that is more generally found with verbal nouns (e.g. *Ptahhotep* 412 *mrwt=k* ‘love of you’; 510 *sh3=sn* ‘their memory (*scil.* of my words)’; *Sinuhe* B 150 *mtr=i* ‘my reputation (lit. witnessing of me)’; 156 *sh3wy=i* ‘memory of me’; *Eloquent Peasant* B1 329 *snd=k* ‘fear of you’).

Occurrences of infinitives oriented on an O are presented below in various environments; for the sake of illustration, instances with an overt expression of the Agent by means of the *in N* phrase are intentionally over-represented. For the same purpose, the exemplification includes finite passive constructions in similar environments and/or in textual alternation with infinitives. One question raised by these alternations concerns the functional correlates of the formal contrast between infinitival constructions and finite ones. This issue, which also has a diachronic component, transcends the scope of the present study.

---

128 Vernus (1990: 9-15).

A. The use of infinitives in lieu of finite complement clauses governed by verbs of order and wish is probably the least remarkable. Pending a study yet to be done, it seems likely that the non-finite syntax correlates with a higher degree of integration between the two events:

(i) Senedjemib-Inti, Inscription C, 23

*iw rd.n hm=f htm wdw r=s m sd3t nt °*

‘His Majesty had the decrees concerning it sealed with the documentary seal.’

Sim. e.g. CT III 169h B2Bo (xiv); *Duties of the Vizier* R 2-3 (...) *nn rdt sdm hr-ph r-h3t hry* ‘(...) without letting the lower ranking one (*scil.* official) be heard before the higher ranking one.’ With *wd*, e.g. *Urk.* I 292, 7 (Neferkare’s *Third Coptos Decree*) *iw wd.n hm(=i) s°h° snt* (...) ‘My Majesty ordered that a pole be erected (...)’; P. UC 32200, 7-9 *n-iw wd sdm it3 in rmt nbt* ‘Has it been ordered that a thief be interrogated by (just) any man?’ With *dbh m-°*, e.g. *Urk.* I 147, 13-14 (Djau of Deir el-Gebrâwi) *iw dbh.n(=i) [m-° hm=f] nd i3t nt h3ti-° n d°w pn* ‘I asked from His Majesty that the dignity of hereditary prince be bestowed on this Djau.’<sup>129</sup> With *mri*, e.g. *Urk.* I 71, 3 (Inti) *ir hm rmt nb mrw.t=f krs=f m išt=f* (...) ‘As to every man who will wish to be buried in his (own) tomb (...)’.

For the finite construction, with a prospective V-passive in earlier times, e.g. CT I 199f B12C *iw wd.n n=i r° rd n=k tp=k* ‘Re has ordered me that your head be given to you.’ In B10Cb, B1Y, and B16C, the construction could be finite, with a T-passive of the prospective, or infinitival: *iw wd.n n=i r° rd(.)t n=k tp=k*. In view of the date, the latter is more likely in Ameniseneb (Louvre C11), 3-4 *h°n wd rdt n=i phwy n rny* ‘It was ordered that I be given the hindquarters of a young bull.’

With verbs of perception-cognition-utterance, the same construction is very rare. The following occurrence is from a temporal and cultural horizon that might suggest a somewhat artificial quality:

(ii) *Urk.* IV 521, 10-12 (Puiemre)

*iw m3.n=i s°h° pr-wr m hbny b3k m d°m in nsw-bity m3°t-k3-r° n mwt=s mwt nbt i3rw*

‘I saw the erecting of a *per-wer* in ebony and worked with electrum by the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Maatkare for her mother Mut, lady of Asheru.’

B. The use of the infinitive after a preposition is common in the Old Kingdom in particular and remains well documented in later times. Most occurrences are with adjuncts (iii), but cases when the prepositional phrase is part of the argument frame of the verb are occasionally found as well (iv):

<sup>129</sup> Further examples: Edel (1955-1964: §711).

(iii) *Urk.* I 189, 10 (false door of Ptahhotep II)

(...) *m-ḥt s3ḥt=f tn ḥrw-ḥbt*

‘(...) after his *akh*-ifying by the lector priest.’

With other prepositions, e.g. *Urk.* I 223, 9 (Pepyankh-Heryib of Meir) *n-zp sdr(=i) dbꜣt ḥr.t r(=i) dr rdt(=i) m smr* ‘Never did I sleep with the seal far away from me since I was made a companion.’ With *ḥr* expressing a cause, *Ipuwer* 6.6-7 *smw šnw snḥ3w ḥr šḥ3 st tn rmtw* ‘Omens(?) and predictions(?) are made dangerous because of their being recalled by people’;<sup>130</sup> *Khakheperreseneb* vso 3 (xv). With *n-mrwt*, *Merikare* E 118 (...) *m-mryt smnh* {*ir.n=i*} <*irt.n=f*> *tn ky iy ḥr-s3=f* ‘(...) for the restoration of what he has done by another coming after him.’ With *ḥft*, in a possibly slightly artificial construction, *Urk.* IV 358, 5-6 (Hatshepsut’s Northern Obelisk in Karnak) (...) *ḥft rdt i3w n nsw-bity nb t3wy ʕ3-ḥpr-k3-rꜥ tn ḥm n ntr pn šps ḥft sꜥḥꜥ tḥnwꜣ wrwy tn ḥmt=s m sp tpy* ‘(...) according with the giving praise to the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, the lord of the Two Lands, Aakheperkare by the Majesty of this august god, according with the erecting of the two great obelisks by Her Majesty as the First Time.’

Without *m-ḥt*, a finite construction in *Urk.* I 189, 18 *ir n=f nmt š t.s3ḥ tn wt* ‘The crossing of the pool will be carried out for him after he has been *akh*-ified by the embalmer priest’; for *m-ḥt P/N PsP* in slightly later times, §4.4.2.2.1, (v)-(vi); for *m-ḥt V-pass P/N*, possibly an innovation in the written language of the early Eighteenth Dynasty, §4.4.2.2.1 (iii)-(iv); for an uncertain earlier example, §4.4.2.2.1, (ii).

(iv) *Ipuwer* 7.1-4

*mtn is ir ḥt n p3 ḥpr w3 <r> šdt nsw tn ḥwrrw* (...)

*mtn is w3 r sšw3 t3 m snwyꜣ tn nh n rmt ḥm šhrw*

*mtn is w3 r sbi{t} ḥr iꜣrt nḥt <t> nt rꜥ shrt t3wy* (...)

‘For look, things have been done that had not happened before: it has come to removing the king by wretches (...)

For look, it has come to impoverishing the land of kingship by a few people ignorant of counsels.

For look, it has come to rebellion against Re’s powerful uraeus who pacifies the Two Lands (...)

As the above illustrates, the entity on which an infinitive with a passive-like reading is oriented can be coreferential with an entity in the main clause, or not. These two situations are further illustrated with the preposition *r* (v)-(vi). In (vi), the construction, which is more complex to process, was turned into an inflectional passive in the New Kingdom versions of the same text:

130 Transl. Enmarch, *TLA*.

(v) *Urk.* I 254, 1 (Qar of Edfu)

*in.t(=i) n ppy r tzt mm msw hriw-tp*

‘I was brought to Pepi to be educated among the children of the chiefs.’

(vi.a) *Loyaliste* 3.6, Sehetepibre

*htp=f r tpr t3w*

‘He calms down for air to be breathed.’

(vi.b) *Loyaliste* 3.6, Kairsu

*htp=f tpi.tw t3w=f*

‘He calms down so that one can breathe his air.’

The alteration renders the construction easier to process in making it explicit that the Agent implied in *tpr* is not co-indexed with the subject (thus, not \*‘he calms down to breathe air’).<sup>131</sup>

C. The infinitive nominally oriented on an O is found in the construction *N n V*, with the head noun being a generic expression of time (vii), of ‘occasion’ (viii), or of (a type of) man (ix):

(vii) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 185-186<sup>132</sup>

(...) *hd t3 n sft=f dw3* ‘(...)

(...) at the daybreak of its (*scil.* the bird’s) slaughter in the morning.’

Sim. with the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase, *Heavenly Cow* 77-78<sup>133</sup> *ist hd t3 n sm3 rmtw in ntrt m sww=sn nw hntyt* ‘Meanwhile, it dawned for the killing of men by the goddess on their days of sailing upstream’; Heqanakht I, 14 (§2.7.2.2, (v)).

A finite construction in e.g. *Urk.* I 232, 5 (Werra) *nsw-bity nfr-ir-k3-r h m bity hrw n szp.t h3tt dpt-ntr* ‘The King of Upper and Lower Egypt Neferirkare appeared as the king of Lower Egypt on the day in which the prow-rope of the god’s barque is seized.’

(viii) *Urk.* IV 1072, 16 (Rekhmire)

*sp tpy pw n t33 n=i*

‘It was the first occasion of calling to me.’

A finite construction in e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 77-79 *sp pw n hsf.tw n nmty-nht pn hr nh n hsmn hn nh n hm3t* ‘Is it an occasion that this Nemtynakht be punished for a little natron and a little salt?’

<sup>131</sup> Further discussion: Stauder (2013a: 451-2).

<sup>132</sup> For a review of the various interpretations this clause has merited, Gundacker (2012).

<sup>133</sup> Further, Stauder (2013a: 305).

(ix) *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 13

*n rmtw is nt šft st*

‘They are not men to be respected.’<sup>134</sup>

Sim. e.g. Wepwawetaa (Leiden V.4), 12 *ink wnt s n 3wt n=f* ‘I am assuredly a man to whom a hand is extended’; *Urk.* IV 415, 13 (Senenmut) *ink sḥ n sdm n=f* ‘I am an official who is listened to.’

D. The infinitive nominally oriented on an O is further found in the subject slot of various constructions: the qualifying construction *nfr sw* (x), in a situational predicate construction given appropriate context (xi), in the construction of non-existence *nn N* (xii), and as the subject of *hpr* in etiologies (xii):

(x) *Ptahhotep* 72

*wr wḃ in sdmw*

‘Great will be the disapproval by the judges.’

L2 makes the passive reading morphosyntactically explicit: *tw r wḃ=f in sdmw* ‘He will be disapproved of by the hearers.’ The result of the textual process is a syntactic hybrid between an active impersonal construction with {t} in preverbal position and the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase in syntactic periphery, otherwise reserved to syntactically passive constructions.<sup>135</sup>

(xi) *Sinuhe* B 48-50

*nb s3t pw ikr šrw mnḥ wdt-mdw*

*pṛt h3t hft wḏ=f*

‘He is a lord of wisdom, of excellent plans, of effective orders;  
Coming and going are according to his decree.’

In a eulogy. Sim., in a dependent clause, *Sinuhe* B 247 (...) *šbb ṯḥ tp-m3=i r pḥt=i dmi n itw* ‘(...) with kneading and brewing accompanying me until I reached the harbor of Itju.’

(xii) *Urk.* IV 65, 9 (Ineni)

*nn šn=i in iryw-3 hr sb3w nw imnt*

‘There will be no repelling me by the door-keepers on the gates of the West.’

In the same formula, without an expressed Agent, e.g. *Urk.* IV 116, 6 (Paheri); 498, 9 (Senemiah). In earlier times, not in this formula, *Sinuhe* B 259 *nn bs=k in pḏtiw* ‘You will not be interred by Asiatics.’

For the finite constructions, with a *sdmm=f* in earlier times and a *sdm.n.t=f* in later ones, e.g. CT VII 389b (mult. mss.) *n šn N in ir m ʿwy=f* ‘N will not be repelled by He-who-acts-with-his-arms’; Book of the Dead 151, II.16 (Nu) *n šn.n.tw=f hr sb3 nb n imnt* ‘He can not be repelled on any gate of the West.’

<sup>134</sup> On the syntax of the resumptive expression *st*, Uljas (2013: 81, n.19).

<sup>135</sup> Further, Stauder (2013a: 94-6, 361-2).



(xiii) *Heavenly Cow* 99-100

*hpr trt sdrwt pw m ipt hmwt hb n hwt-hr in rmt nb dr hrw tpy*

‘Thus came about the making of sleeping-drinks by all men as a mission of the servants on the celebration of Hathor since the first day.’

Sim. e.g. 165 *hpr rdt s3 pw in it=f hr d3d3=f* ‘Thus came about the (*scil.* custom of) placing a son on his head by his father’; *Urk.* IV 498, 4 (Senemiah) *3w n=k dhwtw wy=f hpr nis=k in si3* ‘May Thot stretch his arms to you so that your calling by Sia may occur.’ (The construction is to be distinguished from the formally identical and very rare construction in which *in* has scope not over the infinitive but over *hpr* itself (or perhaps better, over the group formed by *hpr* and the infinitive) (§2.2.2.1, (iv).)

E. The illustration was so far with syntactically transitive verbs only. The same constructions are possible with derived intransitives (that is, O-detransitivized transitives: §2.6.1.1) (xiv), with primary intransitives having an oblique argument in their argument frame (xv), and with intransitives lacking any further argument (xvi). In these cases, the infinitive, rather than being positively oriented on an argument, is oriented away from what would have been its active subject; the reading is similarly ‘passive-like’:

## (xiv) CT III 169h B2Bo

*iw rd.n=f sdm n=i m-b3h m-33*

‘He caused that there be listening to me in presence of the Great Devourer.’

(xv) *Khakheperreseneb* vso 3

*hrt sf mi p3 hrw hr sni r=s <3>n 33 (...)*

‘Yesterday’s share is like this day’s because it is emulated by many (...)’

Sim. e.g. *Urk.* IV 415, 13 (Senenmut); 1072, 16 (Rekhmire) (viii).

(xvi) *Debate* 6

*iw grt wrt r 3b*

‘This is also too much to exaggerate.’

## 2.4 Interim summary

To serve as a background to the subsequent discussion of the functions of the passive, a synthesizing presentation of the Earlier Egyptian passive construction as discussed so far is provided.

### 2.4.1 The finite passive construction

Earlier Egyptian finite passive constructions fall into two types: syntactically oriented ones (the major type) and semantically oriented ones.

#### 2.4.1.1 The syntactically oriented passive construction

The finite, syntactically oriented passive construction involves the following dimensions in Earlier Egyptian:

##### *Acceptability in the passive*

The Earlier Egyptian passive construction is open to any event that implies an Agent in its semantic representation (§2.1). In particular, passives from intransitives are fully regular, provided they meet the semantic condition for passivization; this includes primary intransitives (e.g. *pri* ‘go out’) and secondary intransitives (e.g. *iri* ‘act’). Agentivity—a relational quality between the verb and a participant—is not lexically specified; the same lexical verb is acceptable in the passive or not depending on the event it expresses (§2.1.3).

##### *Mapping of grammatical roles and grammatical relations*

The passive maps grammatical roles and grammatical relations differently than the active does. With transitives, the A—the subject in the active—is generally left unexpressed, while the O—the direct object in the active—is in subject position. With intransitives, the S—the subject in the active—is generally left unexpressed; as there is no other direct participant, the construction is subjectless. Passives from secondary intransitives (/O-detransitivized verbs, such as *iri* ‘act’) are similarly subjectless.

##### *Expression of the Agent in syntactic periphery*

Less commonly, the A (with transitives) or the S (with intransitives) is given an expression in syntactic periphery. In Earlier Egyptian, a full noun Agent is introduced by *in*—a poly-functional particle, not a preposition (§2.2.4). *In* is supplemented by *m-ꜥ*—a preposition (§2.2.3)—with pronominal Agents (§2.2.1). After verbal events, *in* only serves to introduce the Agent of the passive (or of an infinitive with a passive-like reading); with dynamic events with a non-agentive subject (e.g. *hḏ.n* *ø* ‘it came down’), agentivity is expressed by *m-ꜥ* (mainly) and *hr* (under specific conditions) (§2.2.2).

##### *Morphological marking on the verb*

The finite passive construction is marked by inflection on the verb (except, perhaps, in the case of the *sḏmt=f*, a form of non-finite origin: §1.4.3). Earlier Egyptian has two main morphological types of passive inflection, T-passives (§1.1) and V-passives (§1.2) (passives associated with partial reduplication are arguably a secondary type: §1.3). While T- and V-passives differ in their morphological type and their tense-aspect correlates (§3-4), they do not with

respect to the passive construction. For example, both are regularly used under the exact same semantic conditions with intransitives (§2.1.2-3).

#### 2.4.1.2 The semantically oriented passive construction

In Earlier Egyptian, passive events can also be expressed by the pseudoparticiple with a dynamic reading and a pronominal O as its subject ( $P_O PsP$ : §2.3.1; §4.1) and with  $NP r sdm$  with an O as its subject ( $NP_O r sdm$ : §2.3.2). The constructions  $NP PsP$  and  $NP r sdm$  can be oriented on all three grammatical roles, A's, S's, and O's, alike. On the other hand, their orientation—be it on an A, a S, or an O—is in all cases subject to semantic conditions. Their orientation is therefore not syntactically defined, but semantically.

The constructions  $P_O PsP$  and  $NP_O r sdm$  have the following elements in common with the syntactically oriented passive construction just summarized:

##### *Mapping of grammatical roles and grammatical relations*

By definition, the constructions  $P_O PsP$  (with dynamic events) and  $NP_O r sdm$  are oriented on an O.

##### *Expression of the Agent in syntactic periphery*

The A can be expressed in syntactic periphery by means of *in* (§2.3.2; §4.1.1.B).

By virtue of their different type of orientation, semantically oriented passive constructions also differ from syntactically oriented ones:

##### *Acceptability in the passive*

To be oriented on an O, an event in the pseudoparticiple must be telic and subject-affecting; exceptions are rare and associated with specific semantic effects (§4.3.3). More generally, the semantic conditions for an orientation on an O imply that the event must score high in semantic transitivity (§2.3.1.4; further, §4.3.4); with events scoring low in semantic transitivity, the same construction is oriented on an A (mostly with *rh* and *hm*: §2.3.1.3). Conditions for  $NP r sdm$  to be oriented on an O are similarly to do with event semantics (§2.3.2.B). With syntactically intransitive verbs, both  $P PsP$  and  $NP r sdm$  necessarily read actively: unlike inflectional passives in the syntactically oriented passive construction, neither construction can be used for subjectless passive.

##### *Verbal morphology*

$P_O PsP$  and  $NP_O r sdm$  are formally identical to the same constructions oriented on other grammatical roles, A or S. Unlike syntactically oriented passive constructions, semantically oriented ones do not involve specific marking of passive voice on the verb.

### 2.4.2 The non-finite passive construction

Non-finite passive forms—passive participles—also mark voice inflectionally (§1.4.1). Exceptions are only the *s<sub>dm</sub>.t(i)=f(i)* and *s<sub>dm</sub>.t(i)*, two forms that have a more marginal status and are arguably derivational in origin (§1.4.2). Like finite inflectional passives, passive participles are syntactically oriented. However, their syntax is made complex by the extraordinary productivity of passive participles in the domain of relativization. The participant on which passive participles are oriented need not be coreferential with the antecedent: it can also be coreferential to any expression only obliquely related to the passive participle, resulting in a complex construction with indirect coreference.<sup>136</sup>

Given the possibility of such indirect constructions, passive participles can be formed from intransitives, both primary (a) and secondary ones (b). Furthermore, passive participles can accommodate an expression of the Agent in syntactic periphery, both with transitives (c) and with intransitives (d):

(a) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 178 *ir ḥsft r ḥsfw n=f* ‘Make a punishment against the one who is to be punished’; *Installation of the Vizier* 15 *3d=k ḥr 3dt ḥr=s* ‘You should display anger only about what there is to be angry about.’

(b) *Loyaliste* 2.9 *r<sup>c</sup> pw m33w m stwt=f* ‘He is Re by whose rays one sees’; *Urk.* I 184, 1 (Kaiemtjenenet) (...) *r bw dd im [r t3]* ‘(...) to the place where land is touched.’

(c) *Pyr.* 1699a<sup>M</sup> (PT 606) *i n=n iry mrt r=f in sn=f stš* ‘He to whom ill was done by his brother Seth comes to us.’

(d) *Urk.* I 171, 4 (a decree of Neferirkare from Abydos) (...) *r 3ht-ntr nb w<sup>c</sup>bt ḥr=s in ḥmw-ntr nb* ‘(...) on any god’s field on which priestly duty is performed by any priests.’

Against these well-described phenomena, two points of specific interest merit discussion. In both of these, the non-finite passive construction differs from the finite one. Both demonstrate that the syntax of relativization is primary in the case of passive participles.

#### 2.4.2.1 Pronominal O’s

When the O on which the passive participle is oriented is not coreferential with the antecedent, this finds an expression after the participle. When the O is pronominal and singular, a dependent pronoun, not a suffix pronoun, is used:

(i) *Beb* (Leiden V.88), 10-11

*i.k m ḥtp r šm<sup>c</sup> ir.n(=i) ḥ3bt wi r=s*

‘When I came to Upper Egypt in peace, I did what I had been sent for.’

<sup>136</sup> E.g. Schenkel (2006b); Reintges (2005); Depuydt (1996; 1997); Satzinger (1984).

Sim. e.g. Heqanakht III, ro 6 (...) *t3 ipt h3t st im=s* ‘(...) the *oipe* with which it is to be measured’; *Ptahhotep* 623 *hs grt msy n=f sw* ‘Favored is the one to whom he was born’; *Cheops’ Court* 12.3 (...) *n gm.n=s bw irrw st im* ‘(...) but she could not find the place where it was done’; *Duties of the Vizier* R 34 *ntf š3 ‘h‘w r š3w nb n=f sw* ‘He is the one who assigns boats to everyone to whom boats are to be assigned.’ With the Agent expressed, *Urk.* I 119, 1 (Djau of Abydos); *Duties of the Vizier* R 12-13 (§2.5.2.4, (x)-(xi)).

Constructions have been quoted with a suffix pronoun.<sup>137</sup> These are to be analyzed differently:

(ii) Pyr. 1273c<sup>P</sup> (PT 534)

*i.z r=t ir hwwt srkt r bw pw h(w)y=t im* (...)

‘Go, you, to the Houses of Selqis, to this place where you have been beaten (...)’

*Bw* is fully determined by the demonstrative *pw* and what follows can therefore not be a restrictive relative clause. Rather, the construction is finite and the form is a perfective V-passive in asyndetic dependency (a ‘virtual relative clause’ in Gardinerian terminology).

(iii) Pyr. 27d<sup>PNNt</sup> (PT 35)

(...) *hrw ms=f im*

‘(...) the day he was born.’

*Ms=f* is a perfective V-passive, in dependency to the noun *hrw* (§4.4.2.1, (v)-(vi)).<sup>138</sup>

(iv) CT I 248e B4C (sim. in the other witnesses)

*it=t pw msy=t n=f*

‘This is your father: you were born to him.’

As the context strongly suggests, this is probably an instance of the perfective V-passive with a pronominal subject in the ‘emphatic’ construction (‘you were born to him’; §4.2.1, (ix)).<sup>139</sup> Less likely is an interpretation similar to (ii), with *msy=t* a V-passive elaborating on a noun phrase already fully determined by the possessive expression (*it=t*) (‘This is your father to whom you have been born’).

The use of the dependent pronoun is therefore regular.<sup>140</sup> Descriptively, the syntax of the O is different in non-finite and in finite passive constructions. One effect of—although not the reason for—this particular syntax of the O in non-finite constructions is that it avoids a possible confusion with relative forms in some cases. Even though

<sup>137</sup> The first two by Edel (1955–1964: §661), the third by Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §377.2); subsequently e.g. Depuydt (1996; 1997).

<sup>138</sup> Similarly, Schenkel (2006b: 77–9).

<sup>139</sup> Similarly, Schenkel (2006b: 76).

<sup>140</sup> Similarly, Schenkel (2006b).

the O is morphologically a dependent pronoun, not a suffix pronoun, this syntax of the non-finite passive construction can not be analyzed as non-promotional (that is, the O can not be analyzed as a direct object<sup>141</sup>). Other than in *in*-cleft constructions and in the qualifying construction *nfr sw*, participles are not predicative; accordingly, no subject or object positions are defined in constructions of passive participles.

While pronominal subjects are realized as suffix pronouns with finite forms of the verb, active and passive ones alike, other pronominal expressions added after a verb follow a hierarchy, which is manifest most clearly in the imperative:<sup>142</sup> when the imperative is intransitive, the pronoun highest in the hierarchy, the dependent pronoun is added; when the event is transitive, i.e. has a direct object, a dative-like expression is added. With passive participles, the added pronominal expression is the highest in the hierarchy, a dependent pronoun.

#### 2.4.2.2 Passive participles from events that do not include an Agent in their semantic representation

In the finite passive construction, only intransitives that imply an Agent in their semantic representation are acceptable (§2.1.2-3). Intransitives that do not imply an Agent are never found in the finite passive construction; what is more, another construction is regularly used with these, the non-anaphoric zero-subject construction (§2.7.3.3). By contrast, the non-finite passive construction regularly accommodates intransitives that do not imply an Agent:

##### (i) *Urk.* I 218, 6 (Nekhebu)

*iw(=i) rh.k 3ht nb n m hrt-ntr*

‘I know everything by which one becomes an *akh* in the necropolis.’

Sim. e.g. *Urk.* I 263, 14 (Pershenai) *iw(=i) rh.k hk3 nb 3h n=f m hrt-ntr* ‘I know every magical spell by which one becomes an *akh* in the necropolis’; *passim*.<sup>143</sup>

##### (ii) Mentuhotepi’s *Karnak Stela* 8

(...) *snḏw n hh=f(...)*

‘(...) whose flame one fears (...)’

Sim. e.g. *Urk.* IV 1091, 6 (*Installation of the Vizier*) *sr pw sr snḏw [n]=f* ‘The official one fears is a (real) official.’

##### (iii) Mentuhotepi’s *Karnak Stela* 4

(...) *ḥnw m shrw=f(...)*

‘(...) on whose decisions one lives (...)’

Sim. e.g. *Loyaliste* 2.7 (Kairsu; this verse not in the *Sehetepibre* version) *rḥ pw ḥnw hr ssmw=f* ‘He is Re under whose conduct one lives.’

141 Proposed by Satzinger (1984: 43).

142 Jenni (2005), with a different interpretation.

143 Occurrences of this formula: Hays (2012: I, 261-2).

(iv) *Ptahhotep* 581

ṛnh=f m m(w)tt hr=s

‘He lives on that by what one dies.’

A similar construction, also with *hr* (§2.2.2.2.B) in the formula *t3w n r3 3h n sʕh nm nw m wrdt hr=s* ‘The breath of the mouth is beneficial to the official: this is not something through which one becomes weary.’

While intransitives not implying an Agent differ semantically from those implying one, both are similarly syntactically intransitive. The syntax of relativization—which concerns issues of coreference between an antecedent and participants relating to the participle<sup>144</sup>—is therefore the primary determinant in the non-finite passive construction.

## 2.5 Functions of the passive

### 2.5.1 Introduction

A. The passive is a marked construction. Even in a language like Earlier Egyptian in which the condition for passivization is solely semantic, not syntactic, and in which the passive construction therefore extends to a large subset of intransitives (§2.1), the passive is significantly less common in text than the active. In the case of syntactically oriented passive constructions, the passive involves an additional morphological marking of voice on the verb (§2.4.1.1; §1); semantically oriented constructions are also associated with specific morphology and they are subject to additional semantic conditions (§2.4.1.2; §2.3.1-2). The correlation between a lesser text frequency and a higher degree of morphological marking conforms to a very general, and ultimately economical, tendency whereby relatively more common constructions (here the active) receive a relatively lighter morphological marking or none at all.<sup>145</sup>

The markedness of the passive construction has a cognitive basis, which can be sketched as follows. An event is prototypically viewed from the perspective of its Initiator, the salient participant that is the effective cause of the event. In the case of a transitive event, the event is viewed as going from the Initiator to an entity that constitutes the Endpoint of the event. In the active, the former is the syntactic subject and the latter is the syntactic object. In the passive, by contrast, the Agent is backgrounded: the event is viewed from the perspective of its Endpoint, counter to the logical sequence, reverse-wise as it were.<sup>146</sup>

144 Thus, with two of the above examples, the first implying an Agent the second not, *Eloquent Peasant* B1 178 *hsfw n=f* ‘the one who is to be punished’; *Urk.* IV 1091, 6 *sr sndw [n]=f* ‘the official one fears’.

145 While the tendency has manifold manifestations, one direct case in point in Earlier Egyptian is for example pronominal morphology, with plural forms being generally heavier than singular ones.

146 E.g. Woods (2008: 75), with references.

NB. Relating to its higher morphological marking and cognitive complexity, the passive is also a construction more difficult to process than the active. This is seen for example in the often higher frequency of active impersonal constructions in less formal, or spoken, varieties of languages that also have a passive construction.<sup>147</sup> In Earlier Egyptian, where active impersonal constructions are very rare in the highly formal written record (§2.7), phenomena reflecting processing are difficult to track. One diachronic development may be significant in this context, however. In verbal relativization, analytic strategies develop first with negative events and, among these, particularly with passive ones, that is, with events that on one or both accounts deviate from the prototypical positive, active event.<sup>148</sup> Thus, in the Middle Kingdom already, e.g.:

(i) Hatnub 22, 18

*iw grt ir.n=i ntt n ir.t ø in kw rmt*

‘I did what had not been done by other men.’

Sim. e.g. Wepwawetaa (Leiden V.4), 9 *sm.n=i nty n sm.t=f* ‘I succored the one who had not been succored’; *Shipwrecked Sailor* 73 (...) *nty n m3.t=f* ‘(...) one who has not been seen.’

Although this can not be definitely established, processing may also have been a factor in some cases of textual alteration of passive constructions into active ones. With passives from intransitives, a likely case in point is the extraordinarily complex textual variation observed in CT I 73c-74f.<sup>149</sup>

B. When an Agent is expressed in the syntactic periphery of a passive construction, the passive has the same number of expressed core arguments as the active. In certain formulations in Pyramid Texts, active and passive constructions can thus serve to provide two complementary perspectives on events closely related to one another:

147 On an altogether different level, passive constructions are often acquired relatively late. However, in languages in which the passive construction is simpler than the active, and/or in which the passive is used often in child-directed language, the construction can also be acquired fairly early (Tomasello 2003: 156-8).

148 That the early developments of analytic strategies for verbal relativization are in some cases to provide more easily processed structures is also illustrated e.g. by Siut I, 295 (...) *p3 t3 hnkt irrw* (or *irw*) *n=i t3 knbt nt hwt-ntr nty rd.n=i n=in sw* ‘(...) this bread and beer which this council of the temple made (/makes) for me and which I have given to you.’ This altogether exceptional construction probably relates to the distance of the *nty*-headed relative clause to its antecedent (*p3 t3 hnkt*), from which it is separated by the intervening *ir(r)w n=i t3 knbt nt hwt-ntr*: the selection of a *nty*-headed clause is probably a strategy to ease processing. (Alternative accounts have been proposed in semantic terms: to provide a specific expression of perfect aspect, with current relevance (Allen 2013: 197, ex.12.176) or to underscore a pivotal element (here the Dative, *n=in*; Borghouts 2010: I, §109.d.))

149 Discussion: Stauder (in press a: §1.9).



(ii) Pyr. 602a<sup>TN</sup> (PT 359)

*tp N tn nst=f*

*i.sh3.n sw m'wh=f*

‘Teti has been taken account of by his throne;  
His oar has remembered him.’

P phrases both clauses actively (*ip.n sw st=f*(...)).

Sim. e.g. Pyr. 262b<sup>W</sup> (PT 248) *twr N tn shmt in šzmtt mst N* ‘N was conceived by Sakhmet, it is Shesmetet who gave birth to N.’

Such formulations, here to do with specific aspects of the patterning and texture of Pyramid Texts, remain exceptional. In general, passive constructions with expressed Agents differ markedly from active constructions in terms of their discourse functions. Moreover, passive constructions with expressed Agents are substantially less common in text than ones without an expressed Agent. The passive most fundamentally serves to present the event under a perspective in which it is oriented on its Endpoint. This has manifold implications, notably in the relations of voice and aspect, which are particularly complex in Earlier Egyptian: as to be discussed in part II of this study, active and passive forms are not pendants of one another.

The present section concentrates on the discourse functions of the passive. The passive maps grammatical roles and grammatical relations differently than the active does. The Agent—the A with a transitive verb, the S with an intransitive one—is removed, or ‘demoted’, from the subject position it occupies in the active. Correlatively, the O is ‘promoted’ to the subject position in passives from transitives. In passives from intransitives, the demotion of the Agent is not accompanied by a correlative promotion: passives from intransitives are subjectless constructions. These syntactic processes have direct correlates in the discourse functions of the passive because the grammatical subject tends to concentrate much discourse topicality in the clause. In the broadest possible terms, discourse topicality refers to how a participant is present, and how its referent is accessible, in discourse. Accordingly, the functions of the passive—the reason why a passive construction is used rather than an active one—themselves have to do with discourse. While the passive as a morphosyntactic construction is fully described at the clausal level, its functions typically reside at a level that transcends the boundary of the clause.

### 2.5.2 Passives from transitives

The functions of passives from transitives revolve around the often complementary dimensions of Agent backgrounding and discourse continuity on a participant other than the Agent. The passive is typically used under one or several of the following conditions.<sup>150</sup>

<sup>150</sup> Woods (2008: 75), after Jespersen (1924: 167-8) and Shibatani (1985: 830-1). On the discourse functions of passives, further Foley (2006: 429-37); Keenan & Dryer (2006: 325-8); Givón (2001<sup>2</sup>: II, 122-54).

- ‘a. The Agent is omitted for contextual reasons: it is either 1) unknown or unimportant; 2) non-specific and so cannot easily be stated; 3) generic or self-evident from the context; or 4) for particular reasons of sensitivity, deliberately withheld.
- b. Contrary to the typical case, in the particular clause in question the Object (*scil.* the O) happens to be more topical or salient than the Agent.
- c. The passive is required in order to facilitate the joining of clauses, i.e., to create a syntactic pivot.’

I first discuss passives without an expressed Agent (§2.5.2.1-4), then turn to passives with an expressed Agent (§2.5.2.5-6).

#### 2.5.2.1 Agent backgrounding and discourse continuity

The passive presents the event under a perspective in which the Agent is backgrounded: while it remains present in the semantic representation of the event, the Agent is out of focus and most commonly unexpressed.<sup>151</sup> With passives from transitives, discourse continuity then bears on some other participant, most commonly the O.

A. The Agent can be left unexpressed because it is unknown,<sup>152</sup> irrelevant, extremely general or diffuse, or otherwise not to be named. Extremely general or diffuse Agents are common in statements about general state-of-affairs, for example in literary texts. In such contexts, the O’s are themselves typically non-specific in their reference and the aspectual interpretation is often imperfective:

##### (i) *Ptahhotep* 284

*iw ngb.tw s h3 r 3ht n=f*

‘A thousand men are diverted from what is beneficial for them.’

##### (ii) *Amenemhat* 9b-d

*in iw šd.tw hnnw m-hnw pr*

*in iw wb3.tw mw ʿdd gbbw*

*swh3.tw ndsw hr irt=sn*

‘Are tumultuous people ever brought up in the House?

Is water that hacks up the earth ever given an open way?

Are commoners ever made into fools because of their actions?’

The passive also comes to order when the Agent, typically an open plurality of people, is textually irrelevant. In (iii), thanks will be given ‘in the town’ but who more

<sup>151</sup> Using the term ‘focus’ in relation to the notion of perspective, not as the term complementary to ‘topic’ as in studies on information structure. In terms of perspective, the Agent is in focus as the subject in the active, while in terms of information structure it is a clausal topic (unless focal-ized, as in a cleft-construction).

<sup>152</sup> In Arabic grammar, the passive is thus referred to as *al-fʿl al-majhuul faaʿilhi* ‘the verb whose Agent is unknown’.

precisely might do so is of no significance to what is being said. In (iv), the passive construction provides the introductory background to an episode that highlights how Weni conducted the subsequent steps of the inquiry, ‘alone’ (*wʕ*): whoever else may have also been involved in the process is textually left out, as befits a type of discourse, so-called event biographies, that in the Sixth Dynasty entirely revolves around the relationship between the king and the official. In (v), the Beneficiary (*n dʕmw*) attracts much discourse salience; there is no place left for an Agent:

(iii) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 132-133

*sdd=i rf hprt hr=i m m3t.n=i m b3w=k*

*dww3.tw n=k ntr m niwt hft hr knbt t3 r-dr=f*

‘I will relate what has happened to me, of what I have seen of your awe,  
and the god will be praised for you in the town in front of the council of the  
whole land.’

(iv) *Urk. I* 100, 13 (Weni)

*ʃn.t ht m ipt-nsw r hmt-nsw wrt-hts m s3t3*

‘An inquiry was secretly conducted in the royal harem against the king’s wife,  
the great-of-affection.’

(v) *Pyr.* 693c-d<sup>T</sup> (PT 398)

*twr N n dʕmw ms N n dʕmw*

*in dʕmw z n mwt=f im=f*

‘N was conceived *for Djaamu*, N was born *for Djaamu*,  
*it is Djaamu* who has gone to his mother with him.’

In an otherwise similar formulation, also in an ‘emphatic’ construction, discourse salience is attracted by the Agent in *Pyr.* 2206c<sup>Nt</sup> (PT 704) *twr=s in ʃhmt ms NN tn [i]n ʃzmtt* ‘She was conceived by Sakhmet, N was born by Shesmetet.’

A passive can also be used because the Agent, although fully specific and well known, is not to be named. In Egyptian, this use of the passive is found in reference to the king, both with the king speaking (vi) and with the king being addressed (vii). The Agent can also be given a formal expression in syntactic periphery (vii). In both cases, the passive provides an indirect formulation and thus relates to the pragmatics of politeness (for a more complex example, with a syntactically intransitive verb, §2.5.3.1, (v)).<sup>153</sup> Such cases of ‘royal detransitivity’, as the Egyptian phenomenon may be called, are not uncommon in New Kingdom texts (viii):<sup>154</sup>

153 In other languages, such honorific functions of the passive (Shibatani 1985: 837-8) can be more developed, for example in Sanskrit passive imperatives (e.g. *gamyataam* ‘Be there going!’, morphologically a passive imperative of *gam-* ‘go’), used to euphemize an order by not addressing the manipulee directly.

154 Morphosyntactically, the construction is then most commonly the active impersonal one (§5.1.2), yet the pragmatic motivations for making recourse to a detransitive construction rather than to an active one remain similar.

(vi) *Urk.* I 128, 5-9 (Harkhuf, the king's letter)

*iw st3 mdt nt mḏ3t=k tn irt.n=k hr nsw r izt*  
*r rdt rh.t wnt=k h3.t m ḥtp m i3m hn<sup>c</sup> mš<sup>c</sup> nt hn<sup>c</sup>=k*

‘The matter of this letter of yours has been acknowledged, which you made to the king in the palace  
 to let One know that you had descended in peace from Iam with the expedition that was with you.’

(vii) *Sinuhe* B 205-206

*nfr wrt rh.t w<sup>c</sup>rt tn irt.n b3k im m hm=f in k3=k*

‘It is very good that this flight this humble servant has done in his ignorance be known by Your ka.’

(viii) Akhenaten's *Second Proclamation*, Stela A, 1 (sim. B, Q, R, S, U)

*hrw pn iw.tw m 3ht-itn (...)*

‘On this day, when One was in Akhetaten (...)’

Further occurrences in a similar formulation, §5.1.1.3, (iv). In a different construction, with sequential *iw.tw hr sdm*, *Urk.* IV 1304, 2 (Amenhotep II's *Syrian Campaigns*) (§5.1.2.3.1, (iv)). With an expression of the Agent by the *in N* phrase resulting in a syntactically hybrid construction, *Urk.* IV 1281, 14-15 (Amenhotep II's *Sphinx Stela*; §5.1.3.4, (ii)). In the construction *ib.tw r sdm*, §5.1.4.4, (iii). *Passim* in Ramesside inscriptions and *Late Egyptian Stories*.

B. In leaving the Agent unexpressed, the passive often reflects that discourse continuity bears on some other participant in the clause, most commonly the O, the subject in the passive. In (ix), the O is the same in both the active and the passive clauses, first as a direct object in the active ones, then as a subject in the passive one. In the active clauses, the Agent, the addressee, is more topical than the O ( $A > O$ ); in the passive clause, the Agent is entirely out of focus ( $O \gg [A]$ ): in all cases, the relatively more topical argument is the clausal subject. In (x), the assertion is all about the speaker, first hearing, then being heard. In both clauses, this is the subject (in the second, hooked on the inalienably possessed *rn* ‘name’):

(ix) *Pyr.* 1965a-c<sup>N</sup> (PT 669)

*ms.n.t sw dn.n=t sw nh.n=t sw nhwt n rdwy=f n wy=f* ( $A > O_i$ )  
*t(3)z=f ir=f m išt* ( $O_i \gg [A]$ )

‘You have given birth to him, you have shaped him, you have spat him out in a spitting, yet he has no legs, he has no arms.  
 With what will he be tied together?’

(x) *Sinuhe* B 227-228

*n sdm=i ts hwrw*

( $A_i > O$ )

*n sdm.tw rn=i m r3 whmw*

( $O_i >> [A]$ )

‘I did not hear reproaches,  
my name was not heard in the mouth of the herald.’

When the O is low in topicality, discourse continuity can also bear on another participant, typically the Beneficiary (that is, the participant *for whom* an event is carried out). By definition, a Beneficiary is optional in any clause; when it is present, it typically represents a topical participant, often scoring higher in this respect than the O. In (xii), the Agent is unexpressed because it is diffuse and textually irrelevant. The O is non-referential (that is, it does not refer to any ‘night-vigil’, ‘funeral procession’, etc. in particular, and thereby has no specific referent in the world of discourse). Discourse continuity bears on the Beneficiary, here the addressee:

(xi) *Sinuhe* B 189-196

*iw min is š3ṣ.n=k tni fh.n=k b33t šh3 n=k hrw n krs sbt r im3h*

*wḏṣ.tw n=k h3wy m sft wt3w m ʿwy t3yt*

*ir.tw n=k šms-wḏ3 hrw sm3-t3 (...)*

*ir.tw hbb nnyw r r3 is=k*

*nls.tw n=k dbht-htpw*

*sft.tw r r3 ʿbw=k (...)*

‘For today you have begun to be old, you have lost virility. Have in mind the day of burial, the passing to blessedness!

A night-vigil will be assigned to you with holy oils and wrappings from the hands of Tayet;

A funeral procession will be made for you on the day of joining the earth (...)

The dance of the Oblivious Ones will be performed at the entrance of your tomb;

The invocation-offerings will be recited for you;

Sacrifices will be made at the entrance of your offering-chapel (...)

C. In the above examples, the Agent in the passive clause is diffuse and textually irrelevant. A passive can also be used when the Agent is specific and well established in discourse. In both (xii) and (xiii), the Agent of the passive is the king, directly evoked in the preceding clauses (*hm=f*; *wpt n nsw*). The passive construction then effects a change of perspective, the event being viewed from the vantage point of the O, in both cases the speaker and a core participant in the preceding active clause:

(xii) *Semti* (BM EA 574), 2-3

*iw d.n wi hm=f r rdwy=f m nhnt*

( $A_j > O_i$ )

*dm rn=i hnt mitw=i*

( $O_i > [A_j, \text{the king}]$ )

‘His Majesty placed me to his feet in my childhood  
and my name was pronounced before the one of my peers.’

(xiii) Senwosret (Louvre C 174), 5-7

*ir.n=i wpt n nsw*

( $A_i > O_{(j)}$ )

*fk3.kw m ʿ-hnwti*

( $O_i > [A_j, \text{the king}]$ )

‘I carried out the king’s missions

and I was rewarded in the audience chamber.’

In (xiv), similar relations span a longer segment of text. The unexpressed participant of the detransitive constructions in the two closing clauses of the text<sup>155</sup>—the king, possibly also the official—is well established in preceding discourse. In leaving this participant unexpressed, the two final clauses set the perspective on the restoration work carried out by the speaker, which represents the main focus in his autobiography. In thus recentering the perspective, and through their ‘descending profile’ (active > passive > non-dynamic),<sup>156</sup> these final formulations achieve a closing effect:

(xiv) Ameniseneb (Louvre C12), 7-17

*ʿhʿ.n sw3b.n=i sw m pr hry pr hr m inbw=f hr s3 m hn*

*sš kdw t hr mh m drwy m tit m imw m sm3wy irt.n nsw-bity hpr-k3-rʿ m3ʿ-hrw*

(work carried out<sub>i</sub>)

*ʿhʿ.n hw-b3k wd3 r htp st=f m r3-pr pn (...)*

( $S_j$ )

*ʿhʿ.n sr n k3pʿ wd3 m-hd*

( $S_k$ )

*ʿhʿ.n m3 n3 n k3wt*

( $O_i > [A_{j(k?)}]$ )

*ʿhʿ.n.tw hʿw im wr r ht nbt*

( $OBL_i > [A_{j(k?)}]$ )

‘I cleansed it (*scil.* the temple of Abydos), the lower and upper house, its walls outside and inside,

the painters filling it with pigments, with figures, and with clay in renewing what the King of Upper Egypt, Kheperkare, the justified, had made.

Then the Protector-of-the-Moringa-Tree (*scil.* the king) proceeded to take seat in this temple (...)

An official of the *kap* proceeded northward.

These works were inspected,

and One was rejoiced over them more than anything.’

### 2.5.2.2 Passive zero-subject constructions

Directly related to these functions in discourse continuity is the zero-subject construction of the passive. In this, a subject lacking an overt expression is anaphorically linked to some expression in the preceding clause, or its referent is contextually retrievable, having been evoked directly, indirectly, or by association in preceding discourse. The zero-subject passive construction is thereby a strategy of inter-clausal integration. Zero-subject constructions of the passive are distinct from subjectless constructions of the passive to be discussed later (§2.5.3; §2.6.1): in the former, the

155 While *ʿhʿ.n m3 (...)* is passive, *ʿhʿ.n.tw hʿw (...)*, with a non-dynamic event, is not; for the latter construction, which is innovative in Middle Egyptian, §5.1.1.3, (i).

156 On the sequence active > passive, §2.5.2.3.2.C; on the sequence passive > non-dynamic, §4.1.2.C.

event is transitive and the passive subject merely lacks a formal expression; in the latter, the event is intransitive and the passive construction is genuinely subjectless.

The acceptability of the passive zero-subject construction is subject to semantic conditions. As the following illustration demonstrates, only passive subjects that score low on the related scales of individuation and animacy and/or are non-referential can be left without an overt expression. Similar semantic constraints apply to active zero-subject constructions to be evoked later (§2.7.3.1).

A. The unexpressed subject can be directly anaphoric to an entity in the preceding clause. Its referent is inanimate and typically of the mass type (i)-(iv).<sup>157</sup> More rarely, it can be of the count type but it can not be singular (v):

(i) Khufudjedef

*hṭp-d-nsw hṭfw-dḏ=f<sub>i</sub>*

*ir.t* *ṭ<sub>i</sub>* *n=f m ḥ3b nb*

‘An offering that the king gives to Khufudjedef  
that it (*scil.* the offering, consisting in many things) may be made for him at  
every festival.’

(ii) CT III 200f B2L<sup>158</sup>

*rd.n.t n=i* *t3 ḥnkt<sub>i</sub>* *m bw nb dḏ.tw* *ṭ<sub>i</sub>* *n=i im*

‘Bread and bear have been given to me in every place where they are given to  
me.’

(iii) Heqanakht III, ro 5

*ir grt r-s3 šdt st<sub>i</sub>*

*dḏ.t* *ṭ<sub>i</sub>* *m pr sš=k* *ṛ.w.s. r iwt r=s*

‘Now, after collecting it (*scil.* full barley and emmer),  
it should be put in the house of Your Excellency L.P.H. until it has been come  
for.’

(iv) *Sinuhe* B 87-91

*ir n=i* *ṛkw m mint irp m ḥrt-hrw twf ps 3pd m 3šr ḥrw-r* *ṛwt ḥ3st<sub>i</sub>*

*iw grg.t* *ṭ<sub>i</sub>* *n=i*

*iw w3ḥ.t* *ṭ<sub>i</sub>* *n=i ḥrw-r inw n tsmw=i*

‘Provisions were made for me with strong drinks, wine as a daily supply,  
cooked meat, fowl from the grill and in addition the game of the desert.  
It was snared for me  
and it was laid down for me, in addition to the catch of my dogs.’

<sup>157</sup> The count-mass continuum constitutes one dimension of individuation: for example, with both inanimate entities, a ‘house’ can be counted but ‘water’ can not. The latter scores lower in individuation than the former.

<sup>158</sup> The two other versions have passive participles, unmarked (B3L *rdw*) or marked/imperfective (B1L *dḏw*).

(v) CT VII 506a-b B5C

*iw 3ht st3ty=t<sub>i</sub> m htp*

*n t<sub>i</sub>w Ø<sub>i</sub> m-<sup>c</sup>=i*

‘My two aruras of field are offerings,  
they can not be taken away from me.’

The chain of zero-anaphoric reference can be long: in (vi), it runs uninterrupted through two active clauses, then two passive ones, in all cases bearing on the O’s. Rarely, zero-anaphoric reference is discontinuous across sentence boundaries, possibly only in the case of parallel formulations (vii):

(vi) Wadi el-Hudi 143, 13-14<sup>159</sup>

(...) *r irt mrrt k3=f m hsmn pn n t3-sti<sub>i</sub>*

*in.k Ø<sub>i</sub> im r-<sup>c</sup>3t-wrt*

*shn.n=i Ø<sub>i</sub> mi r r3 šnwty*

*it<sub>i</sub>h Ø<sub>i</sub> hr wnš*

*3tp Ø<sub>i</sub> hr st3t*

‘(...) to do what his *ka* desires with this Nubian amethyst.

I brought it from there in very great quantity:

I extracted it like at the door of a double granary,

it was drawn on a sledge

and was loaded onto a pallet.’

(vii) Berlin Bowl, ro 1-2

*ir wnn irr.t nn skrw<sub>i</sub> m-<sup>c</sup> rh=t*

*mt pr m-<sup>c</sup> hrdw=t wgg m3*

*ir wnn irr.t Ø<sub>i</sub> m msdd=t*

*3 it=t <m> hr-ntr*

‘If it is the case that these injuries are inflicted with your knowledge,  
see, the house is with your children yet misery is renewed.

If it is the case that they are inflicted against your will,  
your father will be great in the necropolis.’

In a few cases, an unexpressed passive subject is anaphoric to an animate participant. In (viii), this is collective; the context is a funerary self-presentation in which ‘troops’ have no textual existence other than as an extension of the speaker’s agency. In (ix), the unexpressed subject is ‘Nubians’: the use of the construction implies that these are here linguistically categorized as if they were of the mass type:

159 Different interpretation by Vernus (in press: 10.2, ex.118).



(viii) *Urk.* I 103, 4-5 (Weni)

*wb3.n(=i) tnw tẓwt ptni*

*n-zp wb3.t 0; n b3k nb*

‘I instructed the complete number of these troops  
—never had they been instructed by any servant.’

(ix) *Semna Despatch* IV, x+9-11

(...) *ḥḥ.n dd.n=sni n sdm=n ht nbt iw t3 ḥ3st ḥr m(w)t m-ḥ ḥkr ḥrw=fy s[t]i*

*ḥḥ.n rd.n b3k im ḥd.t 0; r ḥ3st=sni m ḥrw pn*

‘(...) they said: “We have not heard anything, but the desert is starving”—thus they said.

This humble servant had them (i.e., this pack of people, ‘it’) dismissed to their desert on this (same) day.’

B. In the above, the unexpressed passive subject was anaphoric to a specific entity established in previous discourse. The passive zero-subject construction is also commonly used when the anaphora is to a non-referential entity, that is, to an entity that has no specific referent in the world of discourse. This entity is commonly a generic expression such as *ht nb* ‘a thing’, ‘any thing’, ‘things’, ‘all’ ((x), (xii)) or *rmṯ* ‘men’ ((xi), (xiii)). In (x)-(xi), a non-referential interpretation of the unexpressed subject is imposed by the *ir*-conditionals. Elsewhere, it results from the fact that the statement has general validity (xiii), or even absolute validity in the case of an epithet of the queen (xii):

(x) *Urk.* I 36, 17 - 37, 2 (instructions for the priests of Sennuankh)

*ir ḥm-k3 nb im=sni sn.t=f ht r sn-nw=f*

*nḥm ḥt nb dt.n(=i) n=f*

*igr dd.t 0; n ḥm-k3 sn=f ht r=f*

‘As to any funerary priest among them who will have a legal dispute against his colleague,  
any things I have given him shall be taken away;  
moreover, it will be given precisely to the funerary priest against whom he has a legal dispute.’

(xi) *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep 7-9

*ir sw(t) ḥ3w nb n t3 st dsrt bw irrw n=sni rmṯi ḥ3wt im*

*ḥrs.tw 0; im (...)*

‘As regards, however, any tomb in the Sacred Place, where people make tombs for themselves  
and where they are buried (...)’

(xii) *IAF* III 326, c (seal of Nimaathapi)

*dd(t) ḥt nb<sub>i</sub>*

*ir ø<sub>i</sub> n=s*

‘Who says a thing  
and it is done for her.’

An epithet of the queen; sim. 325, c.<sup>160</sup>

(xiii) *Ipuwer* 12.4

*pr<sub>r</sub> styt m ḥmwt rmt<sub>i</sub>*

*n gm.n.tw ø<sub>i</sub> ḥr w3t ḥw-n-r3-ḥr pr*

‘From the wives of men seeds come forth,  
yet no one can be found on the road as fighting has broken out.’

An unexpressed subject in the passive can also refer back to a non-generic human participant, provided this is non-referential. In (xiv), a statement with general validity is made: *it3* does not refer to some thief in particular, but to any thief who would find himself in the condition described. In (xv), the ultimate target is the addressee, and thereby highly specific, yet the rhetoric strategy consists in first making a statement of absolutely general validity. The zero-subject expression is not anaphoric to some group of ‘officials’ in particular; rather, the statement holds for any official whosoever, of which the addressee is urged to be an instantiation:

(xiv) P. UC 32200, 10-12

*n grt sdm.n imi-r3 šnt it3<sub>i</sub>*

*n-is ndr.tw ø<sub>i</sub> m-<sup>c</sup>=f*

‘A chief of police can not interrogate a thief  
unless by him (*scil.* the chief of police) arrested (*scil.* the thief).’

(xv) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 327-329

*srw<sub>i</sub> ir.n.tw ø<sub>i</sub> r ḥsf<sub>r</sub> r iyt*

*ibw pw n 3dw*

*srw<sub>i</sub> ir.n.tw ø<sub>i</sub> r ḥsf<sub>r</sub> r grg*

*n rd.n snd=k spr(=i) n=k*

*n si3.n=k ib=i*

‘Officials—they were appointed to outlaw evil:  
they are a shelter against the aggressor!  
Officials—they were appointed to outlaw falsehood:  
Yet fear of you does not make me appeal to you,  
you do not perceive my heart!’

NB: In *Ipuwer*, and only in this text, a construction *N<sub>i</sub> sdm.t ø<sub>i</sub>* is fairly common with certain types of events,<sup>161</sup> e.g. *Ipuwer* 5.6 *iw ms msw srw<sub>i</sub> ḥw.tw ø<sub>i</sub> r s3wt*

<sup>160</sup> Vernus (in press: §9.2, ex.80), with references across Egyptian history.

*hrdw nw nht<sub>i</sub> d.tw ø<sub>i</sub> hr k3nr* ‘But now, the children of officials are beaten against the wall, children of prayer are placed on the high ground.’ While the textual status of the construction—whether integral to the original text or not—is open to discussion, the construction made sense to the scribes who copied the text (§3.1.2.NB). In the context of the lament, the zero-subject expressions are not anaphoric to any particular group of ‘children of officials’, etc.: like in (xv), they do not have a specific referent.

C. Rather than to an entity, referential or non-referential, an unexpressed subject can also refer back to a situation:

(xvi) *Merikare* E 119-121

*mk sp hs<sub>i</sub> hpr m h3w=i d.tw d3t<sup>?</sup> nt tnw<sub>i</sub>*

*hpr.n ø<sub>i</sub> is m irt.n=i*

*rh.n=i st<sub>i</sub> r-s3 tr.tw ø<sub>i</sub>*

‘Look, a bad deed happened in my time, when the district(?) of This was hacked up.

While it happened through what I had done,

I heard it only after it had been done.’

(xvii) *Sinuhe* B 36-38

*nsw-bity shtp-ib-r<sup>c</sup> wd3w r 3ht*

*n rh.n.tw hp<sub>r</sub>t hr=s<sub>i</sub>*

*dd.n=i swt m iw-ms*

*ii.n=i m mš<sup>c</sup> n tmhw whm.tw ø<sub>i</sub> n=i (...)*

The king of Upper and Lower Egypt Sehetepibre has proceeded to the horizon,  
one does not know what happened about it

—but I spoke in disguise—

When I came back in the Libyan expedition, it was reported to me (...)

More often than not, a situation to which a passive unexpressed subject refers back does not receive a phrasal expression in the preceding context; the contents of the unexpressed subject are then to be retrieved from the relevant preceding segment of discourse:

(xviii) *Urk.* I 219, 16 - 220, 7 (Nekhebu)<sup>162</sup>

*iw h3b.n w hm=f r hrp k3t m hwwt-k3 nt hm=f m t3-mhw gs-pr nt hwt*

*mht<sup>c</sup>(=i) m niwt šw m 3h-bit nt hr rs<sup>c</sup>(=i) m mn-nfr-ppi*

*i.n(=i) im r<sup>c</sup>k ø*

*iw (...) hw[t-k3] im kd hwz dy htw ir ndr<sub>j</sub> m t3-mhw*

*i.n(=i) r<sup>c</sup>k ø m-<sup>c</sup>(=i)*

161 Stauder (2013a: 87-90).

162 Reading after Doret (1986: 66, 72-3).

‘His Majesty sent me to direct work on the *ka*-chapels of His Majesty in Lower Egypt and the administration of the domain;  
the northern end of my administration was the Town of Pools and Akhbit of Horus, the southern end of my administration was in Mennefer-Pepi.  
I only came back once it (*scil.* the actions just evoked) had been accomplished.  
I (...) a *ka*-chapel there, built and constructed, the woodwork thereof placed (in position), having been cut in Lower Egypt.  
I only came back once it (*scil.* the actions just evoked) had been accomplished by me.’

(xix) *Urk.* I 251, 1-2

*nd.t n(=i) smr w<sup>c</sup>t s<sup>c</sup>k.t(=i) r pr-nsw [...]*

***n ir ø m s3r n rmt nb***

‘I was named sole companion and I was introduced to the palace [...]  
It had not been done as a favor to any man.’

(xx) *Sasobek* B1 19 (probably: the text is damaged)

*iw ts h<sup>c</sup> ir=f dkrw*

*wn n=f mrwt [...]* (half a column missing)

***n psš ø hn<sup>c</sup> nb-kd m st nbt***

‘A well-standing utterance creates essence(?)

Love rushes to it [...]

It has not been divided with a man of character in any place.’

(xxi) *Duties of the Vizier* R 3-4

*pr prrt nbt m pr-nsw*

***smi ø n=f***

*h<sup>c</sup> kt nbt r pr-nsw*

***smi ø n=f***

‘Should whatever leaves the palace leave,  
it shall be reported to him;

Should whatever enters the palace enter,  
it shall be reported to him.’

D. Summarizing the above, the passive zero-subject construction can be used under the following conditions:

- The unexpressed subject refers back to a situation evoked in the preceding discourse (C), be this given a phrasal expression (typically a feminine pronoun: (xvi)-(xvii)) or not (xviii)-(xxi);
- The unexpressed subject is anaphoric to an inanimate entity (A)-(B). The entity is generic and non-referential ((x), (xii)) or of the mass type ((i)-(iv), (vi)); rarely it is not of the mass type but non-singular (v);

- The unexpressed subject is anaphoric to an animate entity. The entity is non-referential; it is expressed by a generic noun ((xi), (xiii)) or not ((xiv)-(xv)). (When animate entities with a specific referent are unexpressed, they are linguistically assimilated to the mass type: (viii)-(ix).)

Some of the parameters at play can be captured in the following contrastive illustration with examples already presented:

*Individuation* (in an otherwise similar construction)

- Reference to a situation—zero-subject construction:

(xxii.a) Hatnub 22, 18 *iw grt ir.n=i ntt<sub>i</sub>n ir.t ø<sub>i</sub> in kw rmt* ‘I did what had not been done by other men.’

- Reference to an animate and singular participant—pronominal anaphora:

(xxii.b) Wepwawetaa (Leiden V.4), 9 *sm.n=i nty n sm.t=f<sub>i</sub>* ‘I succored the one who had not been succored.’

*Referential status* (in both cases with animate and singular participants)

- Non-referential (no specific referent in the universe of discourse)—zero-subject construction:

(xxiii.a) P. UC 32200, 10-12 *n grt sdm.n imi-r3 šnt it<sub>3</sub>i n-is ndr.tw ø<sub>i</sub> m-<sup>c</sup>=f* ‘A chief of police can not interrogate a thief unless by him (*scil.* the chief of police) arrested (*scil.* the thief).’

Referential—pronominal anaphora:

(xxiii.b) Pyr. 1965a-c<sup>N</sup> (PT 669) *ms.n.t sw<sub>i</sub> dn.n=t sw<sub>i</sub> nh.n=t sw<sub>i</sub> nhwt n rdwy=f<sub>i</sub> n <sup>c</sup>wy=f<sub>i</sub> t(3)z=f<sub>i</sub> ir=f m išt* ‘You have given birth to him, you have shaped him, you have spat him out in a spitting, yet he has no legs, he has no arms. With what will he be tied together?’

As the examples presented in this section further illustrate, the passive zero-subject construction is a strategy of inter-clausal cohesion, particularly when the unexpressed subject is anaphoric to an entity. The construction thereby represents another aspect of the broader functions of the passive of transitives in discourse continuity discussed in the preceding section.

Semantic parameters similar to the ones just discussed for passive constructions condition active zero-subject constructions (§2.7.3.1). With an unexpressed subject anaphoric to an entity in a preceding clause<sup>163</sup> or referring back to a situation evoked in previous discourse, active zero-subject constructions are found notably with events of non-agentive motion (e.g. *pri* ‘come forth’, with a non-agentive subject), with events such as *hpr* ‘occur’ or *nfr/3h* ‘be good/beneficial’, and in existential constructions.<sup>164</sup> Active zero-subject constructions in which the anaphoric relation is inter-

163 For constructions in which the zero-subject is anaphoric to a left-dislocated noun phrase (*N<sub>i</sub> sdm.n ø<sub>i</sub>* and *N<sub>i</sub> sdm ø<sub>i</sub>*, once *N<sub>i</sub> n sdm ø<sub>i</sub>*), §2.2.4.1.2, (b); §2.7.3.2.A, (ii)-(iii).

164 In the present study, §2.7.3.1 (not discussing *nfr/3h* and discussing existential constructions only marginally); discussing all these event types, Vernus (in press).

clausal are thereby limited to those events, all intransitive, that meet the general semantic condition for leaving the subject unexpressed. An active subject of a transitive event is typically animate and agentive and scores high in individuation: it thereby fails to meet these semantic conditions. A passive subject, by contrast, is not an Agent and can score low in animacy and individuation. With transitive events, the zero-subject construction here discussed is therefore specific to the passive.

### 2.5.2.3 Active-passive alternations as a means of narrative texturing

In leaving the Agent unexpressed, the passive can reflect that discourse continuity bears on some other participant in the clause, most commonly the O, the passive subject (§2.5.2.1.B). As a specific case of this, the subject of a passive construction can be left unexpressed under certain semantic conditions (§2.5.2.2). The passive can also be used in contexts in which the Agent is well established, to present the event under a different perspective (§2.5.2.1.C). Related to these are uses of the passive in alternation to the active as a strategy for texturing in narrative. In backgrounding the Agent, the passive has a less salient profile in text than the active, a construction in which the Agent, the participant initiating and controlling the event, is expressed in subject position. Two cases are to be distinguished, depending on whether the passive precedes or follows the active.

#### 2.5.2.3.1 The passive first

A passive can provide a setting to a following active in the main chain of events. In itself, such function is not specific to the passive. In (i), active and passive events are thus in similar structural position; the active event is here with a non-agentive subject, but the same construction otherwise occurs with agentive subjects as well:

(i) *Sinuhe* B 199-200

*spr.n wd pn r=i ḥḥ.kw m hr-ib whwt=i*

*šd.n.t=f n=i d.n(=i) wi hr ht=i (...)*

‘When this decree reached me, I was standing in the midst of my tribe.

When it was read out to me, I put myself on my belly (...)

More significant are the two following examples. In (ii), at the beginning of the narrative proper, a passive event provides a setting for the first clause in the main chain of events. In both clauses, the O is low in topicality; rather than on this level, the two clauses further relate to one another in sharing the same Agent, Egyptian troops in both cases.<sup>165</sup> In (iii), the passive clause (*wšd (...)*) similarly provides a setting to a following clause in the main chain of events (*ḥḥ.n dd.n=sn*); discourse continuity here bears on the shared subject, the O of the passive, the A of the active. Of particular interest is the apparently not otherwise paralleled construction of a pseudoparticiple oriented on an O before the main clause it relates to:

<sup>165</sup> In the real world, these could of course not have been the same individuals, building an enclosure and killing Nubians in two different places simultaneously. As is the case in general, real-world facts are of little relevance to the linguistic construal of events.

(ii) Antefiker's *Girgawi Inscription* 6-7

*wn.t hr kd hnr t pn* (O > [A<sub>i</sub>])

*h<sup>c</sup>.n sm3 nhs w spt nbt m w3w3t (...)* (O > [A<sub>i</sub>])

'While this enclosure was being built,  
the Nubians, the whole remainder of Wawat, were killed (...)'

On the construction with *t* in preverbal position, §5.1.1.1.

## (iii) Semna Despatch IV, x+7-10

*(...) r-ntt m[d3]y 2 md3yt 3 [hr] ..? h3w hr h3st m hsb t 3 3bd 3 prt [sw 2]7*

*dd.n=sn i.n=n r b3k n pr-<sup>c</sup>3 <sup>c</sup>.w.s.*

*wšd hr sh[r h3]st* (O<sub>i</sub> >> [A])

*h<sup>c</sup>.n dd.n=sn n sdm=n ht nbt iw t3 h3st hr mt m-<sup>c</sup> hkr hrw=fy s[t]* (A<sub>i</sub> > O)

'(...) that 2 Medjays and 3 Medjay women [...]..? have come down through the desert in year 3, the third month of Inundation, day 27, and said: "We have come to work for Pharaoh, L.P.H."'

Questioned about the condition of the desert,  
they said: "We have not heard anything, but the desert is starving"—thus they said.'

*Wšd* can not be a V-passive in a zero-subject construction because the unexpressed subject would then be cataphoric. Cataphoric zero-subject constructions are regular in Earlier Egyptian,<sup>166</sup> but not in an inter-clausal relationship. In particular, inflectional passives are never found in cataphoric zero-subject constructions. The construction is therefore one with a pseudoparticle,<sup>167</sup> as in e.g. Hatnub 14, 6 *hnt.kw ph.n=i 3bw hd.kw ph.n=i mhit<sup>sic</sup>* 'Having sailed upstream, I reached Elephantine; having sailed downstream, I reached the Delta.' A rare instance other than in the first person singular is Mo'alla IV.14-15 (Inscription #10) *hnt ph.n=f w3w3t hd ph.n=f t3-wr* 'Having sailed upstream, he reached Wawat; having sailed downstream, he reached the Thinite nome.' The present occurrence is the only one I am aware of with the pseudoparticle oriented, not on a S, but on an O.

2.5.2.3.2 The passive second: *Sdm.n=f* – *V-passive*

More common are sequences in which a (series of) V-passive(s) follow(s) a (series of) *sdm.n=f*(s), e.g.:

(i) *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 13-15

*iw m3.n st hm=i nn iw-ms*

*h3k.n=i hmwt=sn in.n=i hrw=sn*

*pr r hnmwt=sn hw k3w=sn*

*wh3 it=sn rd ht im*

<sup>166</sup> Vernus (in press: §2.2.3.3-4; §8).

<sup>167</sup> On the pseudoparticle used before a main clause it relates to, Stauder (2013a: 21-3); Díaz Hernández (2013: 113-8); Vergote (1955: 352-3; with various examples not belonging here).

‘My Majesty has seen it—no untruth—  
 I have captured their wives, I have brought their dependents;  
 Their wells have been gone to, their cattle has been stricken,  
 their wheat has been pulled out, it has been set on fire.’

A. Such sequences have been analyzed differently, as involving ‘incomplete (or noncommittal) morphology’. Under this analysis, the forms boldfaced in (i) would not be passives at all; rather, for example *wh3* would stand for *wh3(.n=i)*, as is indeed the case in the parallel version of the same text, Stela Khartum 3, 12.<sup>168</sup> The last observation can not be an argument, however, as nothing requires the two versions to have been phrased similarly in all details. The proposed analysis is also problematic in view of the first of the four boldfaced forms in (i), which can not have been shortened from a *sdm.n=f* since a form *pr(.n=i)* would entail an ‘emphatic’ construction. Furthermore, the very same sequence, with a similar functional profile, is found with both the *sdm.n=f* and the following form preceded by *iw* (ii). It is also, if rarely,<sup>169</sup> found with negative accomplished events, for which the morphological analysis—with a past tense *sdm=f* in the active (*n sdm=f*), then with a V-passive in the passive (*n sdm NP*: §4.3.5.1.3)—is clear (iii). This establishes that the second form in the sequence is morphologically passive. This analysis is confirmed by cases in which the O of the second form in the sequence is pronominal: the form is then a pseudo-participle ((iv); *dr.t* in parallel to *nḥm* in (v), in a formulation that is intertextually tightly allied with (i)):

(ii) *Urk.* I 109, 3-6 (Weni)

*iw ir.n(=i) mr-ḳd n rnpt wḥt (...)*

***tw gr tr snds n ḥ (...)***

‘I did it completely in a single year, (...)’

Moreover, a reduction(?) of the palace was done (...)’

(iii) Hatnub 22, 7-8

*n ḥw3=i ky ḥr išt=f*

***n m3r nds m šdw=f***

‘I did not rob another of his property,

no citizen was driven from his plot.’

(iv) Hammamat 113, 9-10

*iw h3b.n w nb(=i) (...)*

*stp.n=f w hnt niwt=f*

***ssbk.kw hnt šnwt=f***

‘My lord (...) sent me (...)’

<sup>168</sup> Borghouts (2010, I: §67.d).

<sup>169</sup> As is illustrated below (B), the sequence under discussion is typical of narrative and narrative discourse; it is accordingly rare with non-positive events.



after he had chosen me in front of his city,  
after I had been honored in front of his court.’

(v) *Sinuhe* B 101-104

*h3st nbt rwt.n=i r=s iw ir.n=i hd=i im=s*

*{dd}<dr>.t hr smw hnmwt=s*

*h3k.n=i mnmnt=s in<.n>=i hrw=s*

*nhm wnmnt=sn*

‘Every foreign country I marched against, I made my attack on it  
and it was repelled from its grasslands and wells;  
I plundered its cattle, I brought back its dependents  
and its provisions were taken.’

B. The sequence *sdm.n=f* – *V-passive* is recurrent in narrative and narrative discourse, in autobiographies and in literature. The Agent in the first, active event is often the same as the one implied in the second, passive event, e.g.:

(vi) *Urk.* I 121, 11-16 (Harkhuf)

*ii.n(=i) mrn m niwt(=i) h3.n(=i) m sp3t(=i)*

*kd.n(=i) pr s3h3 3w* (A<sub>i</sub> — [A<sub>i</sub>])

*s3d.n(=i) s srd nhwt* (A<sub>i</sub> — [A<sub>i</sub>])

‘I came today from my town, I descended from my district,  
having built a domain, wooden doors having been erected,  
having dug a pool, sycamores having been grown.’

Sim. *Urk.* I 199, 3 (Neferseshemre-Sheshi) *rd.n(=i) t3 n hkr hbs <n h3y> sm3 t3 m*  
*iw* ‘I have given bread to the hungry, clothing to the naked, the boat-less was  
made to reach land.’

(vii) *Eloquent Peasant* R 11.3-4

*h3.n 3g.n[=f] hr [3]t=f nbt im=s* (A<sub>i</sub>)

*nhm 3w=f* (— [A<sub>i</sub>])

*s3k r niwt=f* (— [A<sub>i</sub>])

‘Then he (*scil.* Nemtynakht) thrashed his every limb with it  
and his donkeys (*scil.* the peasant’s) were taken  
and entered into his estate.’

Sim., evoking elements of the ideal biography, *Sinuhe* B 26-27 *h3.n rd.n=f n=i mw*  
*ps n=i irtt* ‘Then he gave me water and milk was boiled for me.’

In other instances of the sequence, the Agent of the passive form is somewhat more diffuse. However, the passive event is still related to the initial active one; agency in the passive event is thereby profiled as an extension of the highly specific agency of the active event. Such occurrences of the sequences are notably in recounts of building activities (viii), of military activities (ix), and in autobiographical narratives of how the speaker took care of his region (x)—in all cases, highly agentive activities:

(viii) Wahankh Antef II's *Dog Stela* (CG 20512), 2-4

*iw grt kd.n(=i) hwwt-ntr=sn* (A<sub>i</sub>)  
*sk3hw rwdw=sn* (— [A<sub>i</sub>])  
*srwd rrt=sn* (— [A<sub>i</sub>])  
*smn htpw-ntr=sn (...)* (— [A<sub>i</sub>])

‘I also built their temples,  
 and their staircases were plastered,  
 their gates restored,  
 their divine offerings established (...)’

Sim. Rediukhnun (CG 20543), 13 *iw grg.n(=i) s snfr ssm=s m nfrt r tpt-<sup>c</sup>wy* ‘I organized it and its management was made better than before’; Khusobek D.3-4 *ir.n=i n=i mih<sup>c</sup>t tw s3h.tt smnh st=s r rwd ntr 3* ‘I made for myself this tomb, it was consecrated and its place was embellished at the staircase of the Great God’;<sup>170</sup> *Urk.* I 109, 3-6 (ii).

(ix) *Urk.* I 105, 2-4 (Weni)

*i.n(=i)*  
*ndr.n(=i) sn mr-kd=sn* (A<sub>i</sub>)  
*sm3 btk nb im=sn* (— [A<sub>i</sub>])

‘I returned  
 when I had grasped them in their entirety,  
 when every rebel among them had been slaughtered.’

Sim. *Sinuhe* B 101-104 (v); *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 13-15 (i).

(x) *Urk.* VII 16, 9-10 (Ameny)

*h<sup>c</sup>.n sk3.n=i 3hwt nbt nt m3-hd r t3š=f rst mht* (A<sub>i</sub>)  
*s<sup>c</sup>nh hrw=f* (— [A<sub>i</sub>])  
*ir sbw=f* (— [A<sub>i</sub>])

‘Then I plowed all the fields of Oryx-Name till its southern and northern  
 boundary  
 and its people were nourished  
 and its food was made.’

C. In the sequence *sdm.n=f* – *V-passive*, the Agent of the accomplished active event does double duty, extending over the accomplished passive event, directly (A) or in a more diffuse way (B). The result is what might be described as a ‘descending profile’ of the sequence: the first accomplished event is salient because the Agent, the participant that puts energy into the event, is expressed; the passive event that follows is less salient because the Agent is left unexpressed. The less salient passive event leans on the more salient active one; the sequence thus profiles a series of events in a way that they are tightly bound together. In relation to its Agent-backgrounding functions, the passive here serves functions in narrative texturing.

170 Sim. e.g. *Sehetepibre* (CG 20538), 2 and *passim*; on the *m<sup>c</sup>h<sup>c</sup>t*-formula, Simpson (1974: 10-3).

The sequence is recurrent in autobiographies and in narrative literature, two types of texts that are generically allied, the latter drawing in part on the former. The *Semna Stela*, from which the first quotation derives, is itself intertextually allied with both these genres.<sup>171</sup> As a stylistic device, the sequence *sdm.n=f – V-passive* is yet another token of the specific, tightly-knit texture<sup>172</sup> of written language in these types of texts.

#### 2.5.2.4 With an expressed full noun Agent

A. The prototypical passive construction is without an expressed Agent.<sup>173</sup> Prototypicality is here understood as reflecting the following interrelated dimensions:

- Typology: in many passive constructions in many languages, the Agent can not, or can only marginally, be expressed (for example in several Semitic languages);
- History: reflecting the source constructions from which they typically derive—reflexive constructions, resultative constructions, impersonal subject constructions, etc.—passives do not license the expression of the Agent when they first develop. Strategies for expressing the Agent in a passive construction emerge only secondarily, if they do at all<sup>174</sup> (for Earlier Egyptian: §2.9.2.2.C; §2.2.4);
- Text frequency: in passive constructions in which the expression of the Agent is licensed, occurrences of the construction with an expressed Agent are considerably less common in text than occurrences without an expressed Agent<sup>175</sup> (thus in Earlier Egyptian itself);
- Functions of the passive: the main functions of the passive revolve around Agent backgrounding and discourse continuity on other participants; the Agent is most strongly backgrounded when left unexpressed.

B. Like passives without an expressed Agent, passives with an expressed Agent have their functions in discourse. More specifically, the relative discourse topicality of the two core participants, the A and the O, is often the major determining factor for whether an active or a passive construction is selected when both participants are expressed. The active, the unmarked construction, is used in the situation that is most common in discourse, when the A is relatively more topical than the O. The passive, the marked construction, is used when the relative topicality of A and O is reversed, a situation less commonly encountered in discourse. The passive thus serves to place the relatively more topical participant in subject position.<sup>176</sup> In Egyptian as in many

---

<sup>171</sup> Eyre (1990).

<sup>172</sup> More generally on texture in higher written registers of Middle Egyptian, Collier (1996); Uljas (2007b).

<sup>173</sup> E.g. Keenan & Dryer (2006: 342).

<sup>174</sup> E.g. Lichtenberk (1985: 38).

<sup>175</sup> E.g. Shibatani (1985: 830–1, 837); Jespersen (1924: 168).

<sup>176</sup> With a textbook example, *‘a car run him over* is rather less natural in discourse than *he was run over by a car*. Or, with both the A and the O morphosyntactically determined expressions, but the A only encyclopedically given and the O actually established in discourse, *‘la police a arrêté ce*

languages, the relatively more topical is expressed first both in the active and in the passive. In this sense, the recourse to a passive construction can also be viewed as serving to preserve the natural flow of discourse, from the more topical to the less topical participant:

*Active*

A > O (unmarked) (sequence A<sub>subject</sub> – O<sub>object</sub>)

*Passive with an expressed Agent*

O > A (marked, less common) (sequence O<sub>subject</sub> – A<sub>periphery</sub>)

(Passives without an expressed Agent:

O >> [A] (the more common situation: Agent diffuse, unknown, irrelevant, etc.)

O > [A] (§2.5.2.1.C; §2.5.2.3.1, (ii); §2.5.2.3.2.)

In all examples quoted below except the last, the O, be this the speaker or an expression established in previous discourse, is relatively more topical than the O. In addition, the expressed passive Agent attracts discourse salience. the Agent is expressed in a construction in which it could have been, and most commonly is, left unexpressed. Moreover, it is expressed, not in the regular subject position as in the active, but in a more exposed position, in syntactic periphery, and thereby in the rhematic tail of the clause:

(i) P. UC 32055, ro 5

ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n wšd p3y=i it in imi-r3 3ḥwt mrsw

‘My father was questioned by the overseer of fields, Mersu.’

The expressed Agent is named and titled.

(ii) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 39-41

ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n=i rd.kw r iw pn in w3w n w3d-wr

‘I was given to this island by a wave of the sea.’

The Agent phrase is hardly informative in a narrow sense: had it been left unexpressed, it would not have been any less clear that the speaker, just having suffered shipwreck, was washed to the shore ‘by a wave of the sea’. As a notionally inanimate entity, but linguistically categorized as an animate one (§2.2.1.1, (iv)), w3w n w3d-wr would be later echoed by sb3 ‘star’, subject to a similar linguistic recategorialization (§2.2.2.2.C). In being expressed, both are highlighted in the overall narrative.

---

*voleur* is less natural in most contexts than *ce voleur a été arrêté par la police* (Lazard 1994: 209). Relative topicality is emphasized e.g. by Givón (2001<sup>2</sup>: II, 122-54).

(iii) Sabni son of Mekhu 4 (*Urk.* I 136, 16-17)

(...) *smr w<sup>c</sup>t pn hr ʕ*

*rd.k f[ʒ].t=f tn tẓwt nt pr-dt(=i)*

‘(...) this sole companion on a donkey.

I had him carried by the troops of my (own) funerary estate.’

Sabni expresses that he had the order carried out with his own resources—no self-evident matter in the highly over-determined textual space of Sixth Dynasty event biographies in which the king had long been the sole initiating and fully controlling participant.

(iv) Khusobek C.4

*h<sup>c</sup>.n rd.n=i t.tw h<sup>c</sup>w=f tn ʕnh 2 n mš<sup>c</sup>*

‘I had his weapons taken by two soldiers of the army.’

Also in an autobiography, if a Twelfth Dynasty one that abides by substantially different generic conventions, the expressed passive Agent is the army led by the speaker and therefore refers back to him.

The discourse salience of an expressed passive Agent is reinforced when this is subject to quantification (v)-(vi) or otherwise further elaborated (vii). When the Agent phrase is long, the use of a passive also serves to avoid placing it in subject position; rather, this long, and accordingly informatively loaded, constituent finds its place in the rhematic tail of the clause (vii):

(v) Khentika Ikhekhi V B 15-16

*ir m33.t(=i) iw(=i) hr w3t tn rmt nb (...)*

‘If I am seen by anyone while on the road (...)’

(vi) Seneni (CG 20500), 6

*hs.kw hr=s tn niwt mi-ḳd=s*

‘I was praised about it by the entire town.’

(vii) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.8.2-3 (Inscription #5)

*n gmt(=i) tr is pw n<sup>sic</sup> kiw hrw-tp wn m sp3t tn*

‘This is not something that I have found had been done by other chiefs who had been in this district.’

C. In non-finite constructions, the recourse to a passive with an expressed Agent—rather than to an active relative form—also serves to give the Agent salience (viii). In (ix), the Agent phrase is not merely *\*in stš*, but *in sn=f stš*; in placing the Agent out of the unmarked subject position, the passive highlights the counter-normative nature of the event. In (x), in an inscription that is fully focused on the privileged ties of Djau’s family with the royal family of the early Sixth Dynasty, the passive highlights the queen as the speaker’s mother; the longest constituent, the Beneficiary in the passive construction, comes last so that the linguistic sequence goes from Nebet to Khui. In

(xi), in a text that is all about expressing the central position of the vizier, the passive construction serves to highlight the ‘vizier in his office’, a phrase also referring to the pictorial scene next to which the text of the *Duties* is inscribed; here as well, the longest constituent, in this case with scope over the main clause, comes last:

(viii) Pyr. 657d<sup>TMN</sup> (PT 373)

(...) *m wḏḏt irt n=k in it=k gb*

‘(...) as what was ordered to do for you by your father Geb.’

Sim. e.g. *Urk.* IV 972, 14 (Great Royal Herald Antef) (...) *nḥḥw n=f snb ḥnh in rmt nbt* ‘(...) one to whom health and life were asked for by all men.’

(ix) Pyr. 1699a<sup>M</sup> (PT 606)

*i n=n try mrt r=f in sn=f stš*

‘He to whom ill was done by his brother Seth comes to us.’

(x) *Urk.* I 118, 14 - 119, 2 (Djau of Abydos)

*ir.n(=i) nw m t3-wr 3bdw (...)*

*n mrwt sp3t mst w im=s*

*in hkrt-nsw nbt*

*n it(=i) rpḥ h3ti-ḥ mry-ntr im3ḥw ḥr ntr 3 ḥwi*

‘I did this (*scil.* tomb) at Abydos in the Thinite nome (...)

for love of the district in which I was born

by the royal ornament Nebet

to my father the prince and count, the one beloved of the god, the *imakhu*  
with the Great God, Khui.’

(xi) *Duties of the Vizier* R 12-13

*[in t3ty ḥsf p3 sr r-]d3t n3 šny st ḥr=s*

*in t3ty m h3=f*

*m idryt nb m h3w-ḥr ḥsf m sw3 ḥt*

‘It is the vizier who punishes the official in accordance with what they have been interrogated about

by the vizier in his office,

with any type of repression(?) in addition to punishment by cutting off a limb.’

D. In the cases presented so far, the passive construction with an expressed Agent was used in situations in which the O is relatively more topical than the A and in which the A attracts discourse salience: in these, the passive serves to place the O in the subject position and the A in the rhematic tail of the clause, thereby also preserving the natural flow of discourse. Less commonly, a passive construction with an expressed Agent is used when the O scores low in discourse topicality, like in the active.

While in the active, the relative topicality of the participants is mirrored in the linguistic sequence ( $A_{\text{subject}} > O_{\text{object}}$ ), it is not in the passive ( $O_{\text{subject}} < A_{\text{periphery}}$ ). The

effect is then that the passive construction is not a statement about what happened to a participant (the O, which is not topical—unlike in the more common case in the passive when  $O > A$ ). Nor is this a statement about who made the event happen (the A, which is expressed only in syntactic periphery—unlike in the active). Rather, the statement is about the fact that something did happen. Put differently, the passive is oriented not so much on a participant, but rather on the event itself. In contrast with the general case, the passive is here discourse-discontinuative. These correlations are illustrated by (xii): the segment quoted opens the spell and does not, therefore, relate to preceding discourse. The A's are introduced in syntactic periphery (*r<sup>c</sup>*, *hr*) as new participants around which the subsequent clauses would revolve:

(xii) Pyr. 472a-d<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 305)

*ṯ(3)z m3kt in r<sup>c</sup> hft wsir*

*ṯ(3)z m3kt in hr hft it=f wsir m sm=f n 3h=f*

*w<sup>c</sup>=sn m pn gs w<sup>c</sup>=sn m pf gs*

*iw N imiwt=sn (...)*

‘A ladder was tied together by Re before Osiris,

A ladder was tied together by Horus before his father Osiris in his going to his

*akh*:

One of them is on this side, one of them is on that side;

N is now between them (...)

#### 2.5.2.5 With an expressed pronominal Agent

Only three occurrences of pronominal passive Agents have been noted in Earlier Egyptian ((i)-(ii); §2.6.1.1, (xiv)). While one or two other ones may have escaped attention, the construction is by all means extremely rare: among Earlier Egyptian passive constructions with an expressed Agent, occurrences with a pronominal Agent number significantly below one percent.

This rarity of the passive construction with a pronominal Agent, not only in Earlier Egyptian, has its basis in discourse. Personal pronouns either point to a speech act participant (in interlocutive (/first and second) persons) or are anaphoric (in the delocutive (/third) person): in all cases, they stand for highly topical participants. Passive constructions with an expressed Agent in most cases reflect a situation in which the O is more topical than the A ( $O > A$ ); when the A is highly topical, either as a speech act participant or as an anaphoric expression, the active is almost invariably used. Put differently, a relatively more topical expression tends to precede a relatively less topical one in a clause; one major function of the passive is precisely to preserve this sequence. A passive construction in which the expressed Agent is a pronominal expression runs counter to the natural flow of discourse.

The rare cases when a passive construction with a pronominal Agent is made recourse to then reflect very particular conditions. In (i), with a first person Agent, two similar zero-subject constructions echo one another in a short distance. In the first, the unexpressed subject refers back to actions accomplished by the speaker in response to the king sending him out to do them; in the second, the unexpressed

subject refers back to actions the speaker has as it seems accomplished by and for himself. This is underscored by *m-<sup>c</sup>(=i)*:

(i) *Urk.* I 219, 16 - 220, 7 (Nekhebu)

*iw h3b.n w hm=f r hrp k3t m hwwt-k3 nt hm=f (...)*

*i.n(=i) im r̥k̥ ø*

*iw (...) hw[t-k3] im kd hwz dy htw ir ndrj m t3-mhw*

*i.n(=i) r̥k̥ ø m-<sup>c</sup>(=i)*

‘His Majesty sent me to direct the work on the *ka*-chapels of His Majesty (...)

I only came back once it (*scil.* the actions just evoked) had been accomplished.

I (...) a *ka*-chapel there, built and constructed, the woodwork thereof placed (in position), having been cut in Lower Egypt.

I only came back once it (*scil.* the actions just evoked) had been accomplished by me.’

On *m-<sup>c</sup>* underscoring a speaker’s agentivity in a closely allied genre (expedition accounts) and in a directly comparable formulation, but with an active event, Hatnub 4, 4 *iw(=i) h3.k s̥r̥k̥.n(=i) wi3 m-<sup>c</sup>(=i)* ‘I went down after I had completed the boat all by myself.’

In (ii), with a third person pronominal Agent, the exceptional construction is motivated by the double anaphoric chain running through the two clauses here combined:

(ii) *P. UC* 32200, 10-12

*n grt sdm.n imi-r3 šntj it3j*

*n-is ndr.tw øj m-<sup>c</sup>=fj*

‘A chief of police can not interrogate a thief

unless by him (*scil.* the chief of police) arrested (*scil.* the thief).’

### 2.5.3 Passives from intransitives

Unlike many languages, Earlier Egyptian licenses passives from intransitives on a regular basis, provided these include an Agent in their semantic representation (§2.1.2-3). In lacking an O, passives from intransitives are subjectless constructions. This has various effects on the discourse functions of passives from intransitives, which both resemble and differ from the ones of passives from transitives. (The present section concentrates on passives from primary intransitives, such as *iwi* ‘go’; passives from secondary intransitives, such as *iri* ‘act’, are discussed in a distinct section, §2.6.1.)



## 2.5.3.1 Agent backgrounding and discourse continuity

A. As intransitives lack an O that could be promoted into the subject position in the passive, the Agent-backgrounding component is very prominent among the functions of passives from intransitives:<sup>177</sup>

(i) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.β.2 (Inscription #5)

*ir grt hnd.t hr sdwt=i mi msh (...)*

‘If, however, one treads on my tail like on a crocodile’s (...)’

(ii) Heqanakht II, ro 27-28

*mtn ššw m wnm rmt š*

‘Look, one has begun to eat people here!’

(iii) P. Berlin 10024B, ro 4

*ir wnn wn inyt=s hr=s*

*kš.tw r sdm m-ht [...]*

‘If it is the case that it is what she brought about it,  
one may consider to listen after [...].’

Sim. P. Berlin 10018, ro 3a *im tw.t n=k r [...]* ‘Cause that one comes to you to [...].’; P. UC 32190A, ro III.6-7 (...) *hr tm rd tw.t r hnw* ‘(...) about the not causing one to come to the Residence.’

(iv) *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 12

*šd.t r=f dd=f sš=f*

*hm-ht(.t) wš=f r šd*

‘Whenever one acts aggressively against him, he shows his back;  
Whenever one retreats, he falls into aggression.’

In a highly rhetorical salutation to the king, the speaker refers to himself in the passive, first obliquely (*nisw*, a nominalization of the event) then directly (*nis r=i*, with a first person expressed). All the while, the Agent, the king, is left unexpressed, other than extra-clausally, in the vocative. In a here highly complex way, the formulation is another illustration of how the passive can relate to the pragmatics of politeness (‘royal detransitivity’; §2.5.2.1, (vi)-(viii) for transitives):

(v) *Cheops’ Court* 8.11-12

*nisw pw iy i (i)ty ʿ.w.s.*

*nīs r=i mk wī iy.kw*

‘The one called is one come, O sovereign L.P.H.!  
There has been calling to me—see, I have come.’

B. By definition, a passive from an intransitive is subjectless; the construction can not, therefore, serve to feed topic continuity on the subject like passives from

<sup>177</sup> E.g. Comrie (1977); Frajzyngier (1982); Shibatani (1985).

transitives often do. However, like these, passives from intransitives often have functions in discourse continuity in Earlier Egyptian, with topic continuity running on another grammatical relation than the subject. In (vi), the sequence, which is all about the speaker, consists in two pairs of two clauses, each pair with an active then a passive. In the second pair, the passive is from a transitive (*sdm.tw*) and the first person is attached to the O, an entity inalienably possessed by the speaker (*rn=i*). In the first pair, the passive is from an intransitive (*shs.t*) and the first person is in a peripheral case (*m-s3=i*; ‘OBL(ique)’). In both passive constructions alike, the Agent is diffuse and irrelevant, and discourse continuity concerns the speaker:

(vi) *Sinuhe* B 226-228

*n snd=i*                      *n shs.t m-s3=i*                      (*S<sub>i</sub>*        – OBL<sub>i</sub> >> [*S*])  
*n sdm=i ts hwrw*   *n sdm.tw rn=i m r3 whmw*                      (*A<sub>i</sub>* > O – O<sub>i</sub> >> [*A*])

‘I did not fear, I was not run after,

I did not hear reproaches, my name was not heard in the mouth of the herald.’

Sim. e.g. B 40-41 *n w3t.t=i n psg.t[w r hr]=i* ‘I had not been talked of and my face had not been spat upon’ (restoration with support of AOS and indirectly through the garbled version of R); *Ipuwer* 12.6 *ir snm.n.tw=n n gm.n=i tw n 33.n.tw n={i}<k> m sw* ‘If we had been saddened, I cannot find you, you cannot be called in vain.’

As already observed in the case of passives from transitives (§2.5.2.1.C; §2.5.2.3.1, (ii); §2.5.2.3.2), discourse continuity can also be on the unexpressed Agent. In (vii), the ‘six other Nubians’ are established in discourse in the initial active clause. In the two following passives—the first from a transitive (*swnt*), the second from an intransitive (*hnt*)—the Nubians remain unexpressed, even though they are present all along as anaphoric expressions (=sn). Such sequence of passives directly following upon one another, including passives from intransitives (here *iw hnt* (...)), is a general feature of administrative language (§2.5.3.2, (vii)–(viii); §2.6.1.1.B). Particularly in the case of *iw hnt* (...), one also wonders whether the recourse to a passive—rather than to an active, \**iw=sn hnt* (...)—expresses certain encyclopedic conceptions about Nubians. In another passage of the Semna Despatches, Nubians were observed to be subject to zero-anaphora and thereby linguistically categorized as a mass noun (§2.5.2.2, (ix)):

(vii) Semna Despatch I, x+12-13

*iw ky nh3syw 6 spr r mnnw shm-h3w-r3 m33-hrw r irt swnt mi [...]* *pn3 m 3bd 4 prt sw 8*

*iw swnt int.n=sn*

*iw hnt r bw ii.n=sn im m hrw pn*

‘Six other Nubians reached the fortress Khakaure-(the-justified)-is-powerful to do trade like [...] this(?) in month 4 of the Winter, day 8.

What they had brought was traded.

It was travelled south (*scil.* they travelled south) to the place where they had come from on this (same) day.’

Finally, discourse continuity can concern both an oblique expression and the Agent. In a sequence already discussed and here repeated (viii), the Agent of the series of accomplished actives—the king speaking—extends, if in a possibly somewhat diffuse manner, to the series of accomplished passives that follow (*sdm.n=f* – *V-passive*: §2.5.2.3.2). In parallel to continuity on the Agent, first expressed then unexpressed, topic continuity runs on the third plural participant—the Nubian enemies—throughout the sequence. The subjectless passive *pr r* thereby has discourse functions exactly similar to the ones of the three following passives from transitives, *hw*, *wh3*, and *rd*. While not as classically patterned, a similar analysis applies to (ix), from slightly earlier times:

(viii) *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 13-15

<i>iw m3.n stj hm=i<sub>i</sub> nn iw-ms</i>	(A <sub>i</sub> > O <sub>j</sub> )
<i>h3k.n=i<sub>i</sub> hmw<sub>t</sub>=sn<sub>j</sub> in.n=i<sub>i</sub> hrw=sn<sub>j</sub></i>	
<i>pr r hnmw<sub>t</sub>=sn<sub>j</sub> hw k3w=sn<sub>j</sub></i>	(OBL <sub>j</sub> , [A <sub>i</sub> ] – O <sub>j</sub> , [A <sub>i</sub> ])
<i>wh3 it=sn<sub>j</sub> rd ht im<sub>j</sub></i>	(O <sub>j</sub> , [A <sub>i</sub> ] – OBL <sub>j</sub> , [A <sub>i</sub> ])

‘My Majesty has seen it—no untruth—  
I have captured their wives, I have brought their dependents;  
Their wells have been gone to, their cattle has been stricken,  
their wheat has been pulled out, it has been set on fire.’

(ix) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.η.2 - II.θ.1 (Inscription #7)

<i>iw(=i) hd.k mni.n(=i) m i3btt nt w3st</i>	(S <sub>i</sub>
<i>phwy h<sup>c</sup>w m is imbi hnt h<sup>c</sup>w m š3y sg3<sub>j</sub></i>	... X <sub>j</sub> )
<i>gw3 r inbw=f<sub>j</sub> isn.n=f isnyt n hr=f n snd</i>	(OBL <sub>j</sub> , [S <sub>(i)</sub> ])

‘I sailed downstream and I moored to the east of the Theban district  
—the vanguard of the fleet being by the Tomb of Imbi, the rearguard of the  
fleet by the Field of Segā—  
Its (*scil.* Segā’s) walls were besieged after it had shut its bolts to their (*scil.* the  
troops’) face for fear.’

### 2.5.3.2 The orientation on the event itself

A. Being subjectless constructions, passives from intransitives, by definition, are not oriented on a participant in subject position. In lacking an O, passives from intransitives are more generally less Endpoint-oriented than passives from transitives.<sup>178</sup> Not uncommonly, therefore, the orientation of a subjectless passive is on the event itself.<sup>179</sup> The information structure of subjectless passives can then be of the ‘thetic’ type. (That is, the situation is presented en bloc, differing from ‘categorical’

178 This does of course not mean that passives from intransitives necessarily lack an Endpoint in all cases: for example, the Goal of an event of motion, morphosyntactically realized as an oblique case, can provide such an Endpoint (e.g. *pri r* in §2.5.3.1, (viii)).

179 Similarly Reintges (1997: 238-40).

statements in which the primary articulation of information structure is bipartite, between a participant and the event).<sup>180</sup>

The common orientation of Earlier Egyptian subjectless passives on the event itself, rather than on a participant involved in it, reflects a more general phenomenon. As Priscian already noted, ‘when I say *curritur*, I mean *cursus*’;<sup>181</sup> or, in the words of a more recent student of the same language, ‘a clause with an impersonal passive is a statement about what happened rather than about who did it.’<sup>182</sup> Staying in Latin, the particular articulation of information structure in subjectless passives is aptly illustrated in e.g. *bibitur estur quasi in propina* ‘There is drinking and eating like in a tavern’ (Plautus, *Poenulus* 635). The clause consists in two elements—the verbs and the shared adverbial phrase—reflecting a possibly very general condition on communication whereby predication is in most cases about relating two elements to one another. However, neither of these two elements refers to a participant that could be the clausal topic: the statement is not about relating a verbal event to a participant and the articulation of information structure is not bipartite as in a categorial statement (topic – comment). Rather, the construction is oriented on the events themselves and the information structure of the clause is *thetic*. This *thetic* effect is reinforced by the adverbial elaboration (*quasi in propina*), which has scope over these events.

In Earlier Egyptian, passives from intransitives can be used in contexts of discourse continuity, when this bears either on an oblique expression and/or on the implied Agent (§2.5.3.1). In other cases, the orientation on the event itself is more pronounced: rather than relating to a preceding segment of discourse, passives from intransitives are typically found in segment-initial position and can even serve functions in underscoring discourse discontinuity, particularly in narrative (this section). In languages that license passives from intransitives, the latter functions are often central.<sup>183</sup> That Earlier Egyptian passives from intransitives can be used for both types of functions—topic continuity and orientation on the event itself—is therefore noteworthy.

NB. Similar effects are occasionally observed with passives from transitives, when the O is non-topical, indefinite, and/or low in individuation. Like subjectless passives, passives with a non-topical O do not relate to preceding discourse, are often found in segment-initial positions, and can even have discourse-discontinuative functions. The orientation on the event itself can also be more or less pronounced. In (i), *ht*, literally ‘a thing’, is part of the combination *šni ht*; the O has no referential status and its individuation from the verbal event is accordingly minimal: semantically, *ht* comes close to being an internal object. The clause opens a new sequence in Weni’s autobiography; it does not relate to preceding discourse. In (ii), also with a non-topical O, the orientation on the event itself is pronounced (analysis: §2.5.2.4.D). The construction occurs in spell-initial position:

180 For an introduction to the general *thetic*-categorial distinction, not discussing subjectless passives specifically, Lambrecht (1994: 137–46).

181 Quoted by Lambert (1998: 303).

182 Pinkster (1992: 168); similarly Fugier (2002: 137); beyond Latin, e.g. Croft (1991: 260).

183 E.g. Pinkster (1992).

(i) *Urk.* I 100, 13 (Weni) **šn.t** *ht m ipt-nsw r hmt-nsw wrt-hts m sšt3* (...) ‘An inquiry was secretly conducted in the royal harem against the king’s wife, the great-of-affection (...)’

(ii) *Pyr.* 472a-d<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 305) (§2.5.2.4, (xii)) **t(3)z m3kt in r<sup>c</sup> hft wsir t(3)z m3kt in hr hft it=f wsir m šm=f n 3h=f w<sup>c</sup>=sn m pn gs w<sup>c</sup>=sn m pf gs iw N imiwt=sn** (...) ‘A ladder was tied together by Re before Osiris, a ladder was tied together by Horus before his father Osiris in his going to his *akh*: one of them is on this side, one of them is on that side, N is now between them (...)’

With the same verb, the passive is used for discourse continuity on the O in *Pyr.* 1965a-c<sup>N</sup> (PT 669; §2.5.2.1, (ix)) **ms.n.t sw<sub>i</sub> dn.n=t sw<sub>i</sub> nh.n=t sw<sub>i</sub> nhwt n rdwy=f<sub>i</sub> n <sup>c</sup>wy=f<sub>i</sub> t(3)z=f<sub>i</sub> ir=f m išst** ‘You have given birth to him, you have shaped him, you have spat him out in a spitting, yet he has no legs, he has no arms. With what will he be tied together?’

B. The orientation of a subjectless passive on the event itself is more or less pronounced in individual cases. In (iii), the prepositional phrase includes an anaphoric expression, implying continuity with the preceding segment of discourse. However, this prepositional phrase is not part of the argument frame of the verb: it elaborates the verbal event like adjuncts do. The orientation on the event itself is accordingly prominent:

(iii) *Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.η.2* (Inscription #7)

**n pr.n.t n snd=f**

‘There was no going out for fear of them (*scil.* the troops).’

With the same verb, *r hnmwt=sn* is part of the argument frame in *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 13 (...) **pr r hnmwt=sn<sub>i</sub>** (...) ‘(...) their wells have been gone to (...)’ In this, the subjectless passive is used alongside a series of passives from transitives in a context of strong discourse continuity concerning both the anaphoric expressions (the O in the passives from transitives, an oblique case in *pr r* (...)) and the Agent (§2.5.3.1, (viii)).

In (iv), all three clauses are on thethetic side of thethetic-categorial continuum, despite a common Beneficiary ( $n=k$ ) linking them together. The first clause is with an active intransitive, the second with a passive from a transitive, and the third with a passive from an intransitive: none is with an active transitive. More specifically, the inanimate subject in the first clause (*t3*) does not represent an entity semantically autonomous from the verb (*sd3*); it does not stand, therefore, for an entity that could serve as a clausal topic; rather, *t3* is integral to the event of *sd3 t3*. The subject of the second clause, an O, is non-referential (*wdnt* does not refer to any specific ‘offering’) and thereby similarly unfit to serve as a clausal topic. The third clause is with a passive from an intransitive; the complementary infinitive underscores the orientation on the event itself further:

(iv) Pyr. 1905c<sup>Nt</sup> (PT 665A)<sup>184</sup>

*sd3 n=k t3*

*sk n=k wdnt*

*rw w n=k rwwt*

‘The earth will tremble for you,  
an offering will be laid down for you,  
there will be danced a dance for you.’

*Rwwt* is adverbial in this construction;<sup>185</sup> the passive is accordingly subjectless.<sup>186</sup>

Another possible occurrence with an intransitive verb is possibly Pyr. 1355a-b<sup>PN</sup> (PT 553)<sup>187</sup> *šmt=k 4 iptw tpt-šwy h3t hr šm.t šmt im n ntr dr h3t rʿ* (...) ‘These four walkways of yours that are in front of Horus’ tomb, may a going be gone on them to the god since the sun has come down (...)’. In later times, e.g. *Neferti 9b sbt.tw m sbt n mr nn rmw.tw n m(w)t* ‘There will be laughing loudly at a sick man, there will be no crying for death.’

The orientation on the event itself is strong when the participant in the oblique phrase is not topical (v). It is even stronger when a clause does not include any oblique phrase at all: the clause then consists, quite literally, in the event itself (vi). Both (v) and (vi) are from laments; the subjectless passive constructions express a perspective on the events under which these are lamented in their bare form:

(v) *Ipuwer 12.8*

*ʿkr hwt ntr [...]*

‘There has been entering the temple [...].’

184 Allen (1984: §504); Reintges (1997: 225). For *sk*, a rare use of a perfective V-passive with an event yet to come, §1.2.3.2, (ii).

185 Vernus (2001); Allen (1984: §694-5); Polotsky (1976: 47). For occurrences in Pyramid Texts, Allen (1984: §690) and Mathieu (2013: 452-3), with partly diverging lists, both not including (iv).

186 Further passive occurrences of the construction in the Old Kingdom, with transitive verbs, are: (a) The complementary infinitive precedes the subject (the earlier construction; Vernus 2001: 198): Pyr. 341a-b<sup>W</sup> (PT 263) *d3.t d3t N pn ir gs i3bti n 3ht d3.t d3t N pn ir gs i3bti n pt* ‘May this N be ferried across in a ferrying to the eastern side of the horizon, may this N be ferried across in a ferrying to the eastern side of the sky.’ Pyr. 344a<sup>T</sup> (PT 263) *d3.t d3wt N im ir gs pf i3bti n pt* (...) ‘May this N be ferried across in a ferrying to this eastern side of the sky (...)’, P *sd3.t sd3yt it=i im r 3ht nt pt* (...) ‘May my father there be ferried across in a ferrying to the horizon of the sky (...)’ *Urk. I 73, 2* (Djenwen) *mk.t mkt ht zbt n k3=s* ‘May the property of the one who has gone to her *ka* be well protected!’ Pronominal O’s are directly suffixed (the phenomenon is prosodic; it does not imply that the complementary infinitive is a syntactic subject): Pyr. 689b<sup>I</sup> (PT 393) (...) *pšr pšr=k k3 wr* (...) ‘Your have been encircled in an encircling, Great Bull!’ (possibly different is Pyr. 1981a<sup>N(P)</sup> (PT 670) *zṯ zṯ=k in 3s[t]* ‘Your libation has been libated by Isis.’) (b) The complementary infinitive follows the subject (the later construction; Vernus 2001: 199): Pyr. 360a<sup>P</sup> (PT 266) *d3.t N pn im d3wt ir 3ht hr hr 3hti* ‘May this N there be ferried across in a ferrying to the horizon to Horus-of-the-horizon’; sim. in Coffin Texts, CT II 3g (§4.2.1, (viii); §4.2.2, (v)). The construction is also found once with a pseudoparticiple oriented on an O and expressing a secondary state: Pyr. 278c<sup>WT</sup> (PT 254) (...) *B dni dnit* (...) ‘the earth being dammed up in a damming.’

187 Mathieu (2013: 453); Allen (2005: 186) and Topmann (*TLA*) read with *šm.t* a pseudoparticiple (‘you have gone a going’).

Other subjectless passives in *Ipuwer*, similarly presenting the event in its bare form: 2.4 (§2.6.1.1, (xiii)); 6.3 (§2.6.1.1, (ix)).

(vi) *Debate* 111-113

*dd=i n m min*

*iw h<sup>c</sup>g3.tw*

*s nb<sub>i</sub> hr itt snw=f<sub>i</sub>*

‘To whom can I speak today?

There is plundering,

everyone is robbing their brothers.’

Other subjectless passives without an adverbial phrase: CT II 167b (*iw*) *smn/try*

‘There has been creating, there has been establishing’ (§2.6.1.1, (viii));

P. Brooklyn 35.1446 pl.IV, ro 31.f *iw kn(.n)tw* ‘There has been completion’

(§2.6.1.1, (v)); *Ipuwer* 2.4 *n tw[r].n.tw* ‘There is no conceiving’ (§2.6.1.1, (xiii))

(all from secondary intransitives).

In administrative texts (and similarly in technical language such as in medical treatises), subjectless passives—both from primary intransitives and from secondary ones (that is, from O-detransitivized events: §2.6.1)—abound, often following one another in direct sequence. The individual events are thereby presented en bloc, one after the other, the sequence of suchthetic statements giving the text a list-like flavor:<sup>188</sup>

(vii) P. UC 32166, ro II.3

*hr hr=s*

*rk hr=s*

‘There was agreement about it.

There was swearing about it.’

(viii) *Stèle Juridique* 18-19

*h<sup>c</sup>.n mdw r=s m h3 n whm n w<sup>c</sup>rt mhtt (...)*

*k r=s m mitt hn<sup>c</sup> dd (...)*

*wšd r-dd (...)*

‘There was discussion about it in the office of the herald of the northern district (...).

There was acquiescing to it likewise, and saying: (...)

There was questioning in these terms: (...)’

In narrative, the orientation on the event itself can induce a strong effect of discontinuity. As the statement is not about relating an event to a participant, the event also fails to be related to preceding discourse. In (ix), the two subjectless passives—sharing the same argument and thereby in a quasi-serial construction—open the episode in which Sinuhe is reintroduced to the royal sphere. In the overall arc form of

<sup>188</sup> Similarly Vernus (in press: §12.6).

the composition, the juncture is salient as it opens the final reintegrative and epiphanic section, reversing all misplacements that had previously occurred as the result of the initial centrifugal move of the protagonist:

(ix) *Sinuhe* B 246-249

*šsp.n=i fβ.n=i tβw*

*šbb ᵀᵀ tp-m³ᵀ=i r pḥt=i dmi n itw*

*ḥd.n rf tβ dw³ sp 2*

*iw tw iββ n=i*

*s 10 m iwt s 10 m šmt ḥr stβ=i r ᵀᵀ*

*iw dhn.n=i tβ (...)*

‘I took to set sail,  
with kneading and brewing accompanying me until I reached the harbor of Itju.  
When it had dawned very early in the morning,  
one came and summoned me—  
ten men coming, ten men going, introducing me to the palace.  
I touched the ground (...)’

### 2.5.3.3 Subjectless passives with an expressed Agent

With transitives, the functions of passives with an expressed Agent typically revolve around the relative topicality of O and A (O > A: §2.5.2.4). A similar principle, concerning an oblique expression, occasionally extends to passives from intransitives (OBL > A). More generally, however, the Agent-backgrounding functions are primary in passives from intransitives.<sup>189</sup> Subjectless passives with an expressed Agent are accordingly uncommon, even in languages that license them.<sup>190</sup> In Earlier Egyptian, occurrences are found, mostly in funerary texts (for occurrences outside these, with O-detransitivized events, §2.6.1.1.E). Although the clause includes a participant, the expressed Agent, this is introduced only in syntactic periphery, secondarily therefore. Passives from intransitives with an expressed Agent thereby express a perspective strongly oriented on the event itself. It has been suggested that this particular perspective on the event could reflect the performative nature of the funerary texts in which the construction is most often found.<sup>191</sup>

In (i), the subjectless passive construction is the first event after a series of temporal expressions opening the spell. The first passive is subjectless and the second is with a non-referential O. In (ii), the introduction of the Agent in the rhematic tail of the clause—rather than in subject position, as in the active—reflects its considerable length and semantic elaboration. While the passive construction is not spell-initial, the associated thetic force is no less strong. Subjectless passives alternate with passives from transitives in (iii), but the latter are with non-topical O’s. The thetic force associated with all events in this sequence, again in spell-initial position, is also

189 E.g. Comrie (1977); Frajzyngier (1982); Shibatani (1985).

190 E.g. Pinkster (1992: 166); Hock (1991<sup>2</sup>: 322).

191 Vernus (in press: §12.6.7).



manifest in that the full explicitation of the Agents is postponed until the sixth clause in the sequence (3st pw (...)):

(i) Pyr. 345a-346b<sup>TP</sup> (PT 264)

*iw nw pn bk3 (...)*

**nīs.t** ir N **in** r<sup>c</sup>

**d.t** n=f i<sup>h</sup>t in n<sup>h</sup>b-k3w hr is 3<sup>h</sup>ti is

‘When the time comes tomorrow, (...)’

There will be summons to N by Re,

He will be given a meal by Nehebkau like Horus, like the One-of-the-horizon.’

(ii) CT I 215a-216a (various witnesses)

*hr sd3 m 3<sup>h</sup>t i3btt hr hrw i3kb m wryt*

*iw 3st hr imw 3 nbt-<sup>h</sup>wt hr rmyt hr ntr pn nb ntrw*

**w3** m m3.n=f m wryt **in** ir <sup>h</sup>wt r=f ir.n=f <sup>h</sup>prw m py nf3f3=f hr drwy=f

‘Falling and trembling in the eastern horizon because of a sound of mourning in the Great Place!’

Isis is moaning greatly and Nephtys is crying because of this god, lord of the gods,

For there has been a conspiracy against the one he has seen in the Great Place by the one who did things against him after he transformed himself into a louse and crept under his house.’

(iii) CT I 73d-74f B1P<sup>192</sup>

*iw <sup>h</sup>3 n=k in bik*

*iw **ng** n=k in smn*

*iw **d3** n=k 3 in d<sup>h</sup>wti*

*iw **sh** n=k <sup>h</sup>pš n <sup>h</sup>ftiw=k*

*iw <sup>h</sup>3 n=k in drty 3st pw <sup>h</sup>n<sup>c</sup> nbt-<sup>h</sup>wt (...)*

‘There has been screaming for you by the falcon, there has been cackling for you by the *semen*-goose;

An arm has been extended to you by Thoth, a strong arm has been struck for your enemies;

There has been screaming for you by the two kites—they are Isis and Nephtys (...)

## 2.6 The passive in interaction with transitivity alternations

The Earlier Egyptian verb displays considerable flexibility in transitivity. Such transitivity alternations concern the O, which can be suppressed or introduced indirectly (§2.6.1); they further concern intransitive verbs that can be used transitively

<sup>192</sup> On the complex textual variation in this sequence, including alternations with active forms, Stauder (in press a: §1.9).

(§2.6.2). In all these cases, alternations in transitivity are morphologically unmarked. The present section focuses on how these alternations interact with the passive.

### 2.6.1 The passive in interaction with transitivity alternations on the O

A transitive verb can be made intransitive by suppression of the O (§2.6.1.1). In another construction, the O remains expressed, but is introduced indirectly; the event is similarly intransitive syntactically (§2.6.1.2). Both processes are compatible with passivization.<sup>193</sup>

#### 2.6.1.1 Passives from O-detransitivized transitives (/secondary intransitives)

A. The O of a transitive verb can be suppressed, affecting the semantic representation of the event. In lacking an O, the event is viewed in its bare form (e.g. *iri* O ‘make something’ ~ *iri* ‘act’; *h3b* O ‘send someone’ ~ *h3b* ‘send’). In some cases, the lack of an O, that is, of an Endpoint to the event, results in making the event more general; O-detransitivized events thereby not uncommonly correlate with imperfective aspect.<sup>194</sup>

The suppression of the O is to be distinguished from the omission of the O.<sup>195</sup> The latter process concerns O’s that are high in discourse topicality; the omission of the O is for inter-clausal integration and the event remains syntactically transitive. The former process, by contrast, affects the semantics of the event; an O-detransitivized verb is intransitive, if secondarily so. Put differently, the omission of the O has functions at the level of inter-clausal relationships; the suppression of the O bears on the event itself and has functions primarily at an intra-clausal level.

In the passive, the omission of the O results in a zero-subject construction (§2.5.2.2); the suppression of the O, by contrast, yields subjectless passive constructions. Passives with an omitted O and passives with a suppressed O have different, and in some ways even opposite, discourse functions. The former are used in contexts of discourse continuity and are adequately described alongside passives from transitives with an expressed O (§2.5.2). Passives with a suppressed O, by contrast, are in many ways similar to passives from primary intransitives (§2.5.3): they often express an orientation on the event itself, invite athetic reading, and tend to be used in segment-initial, or even discourse-discontinuative, contexts. Passives from O-detransitivized events only differ from passives from primary intransitives in that they can additionally display the aspectual correlates associated with O-detransitivization more generally, in the active and in the passive alike.

B. By definition, passives from O-detransitivized events lack an O on which they could be oriented. Like in passives from primary intransitives, the orientation is often

<sup>193</sup> Previous discussion: Reintges (1997: 230-8).

<sup>194</sup> Winand (2006: 125-30, 277, 302-3; 2004). E.g. *Ptahhotep* 140 *wr d=f n ph.n s* ‘The great one gives away, a man can not obtain’; in both events, the O is suppressed; in the first, the dative is also suppressed, making the event yet more general (Winand 2006: 277).

<sup>195</sup> For the similar distinction in the active, Winand (2006: 125-6; 2004).

on the event itself, inviting a thetic reading. The construction is accordingly common in administrative and other technical texts:<sup>196</sup>

(i) *Urk.* I 4, 15-16 (Metjen)

*iw* **zh** *im r* <sup>c</sup>-*nsw rn=sn r=s r* <sup>c</sup>-*nsw*

‘There was production of a piece of writing according to a royal document, their names (*scil.* of the “foundations of Metjen”) being in the royal document.’

(ii) Sabni son of Mekhu 11

**dd** *r wd pn (...)*

‘There was said in this decree: (...)’

(iii) P. Bulaq 18, XIX.2.2-3

*imi* **β.tw** *n nʒ n rmt pr [mn<sup>c</sup>t]*

*nty nfr pw* **β.tw** *n=sn m sf*

‘Cause that things be brought to these people of the House of the nurse to whom there was no bringing yesterday.’

In (iv), an O-detransitivized passive of *iri* is found in an extended use of the perfective V-passive (§1.2.3.1). Relating to the thetic force of the statement, a strongly assertive modality is expressed by *iw*. In (v), in a similar register, the passive of an O-detransitivized event is also introduced by *iw*; the form of the verb is a *sdm.n.t=f*, in an altogether exceptional collocation with *iw*. Like in (iv), a strong assertive modality is expressed by *iw*. The thetic force of the statement is particularly pronounced, since the clause not only lacks a subject, but also an adverbial phrase: the event is presented in its barest possible form. As to be discussed later in relation to the functional profile of the *sdm.n.t=f*, it is this thetic force that motivates the use of a T-passive of the *sdm.n=f*, and thereby provides the particular semantic conditions that here license the exceptional combination of a *sdm.n.t=f* with *iw* (§4.4.1.1.1.B):

(iv) *Urk.* I 224, 6 (Pepyankh-Heryib)

*iw* **tr** *hft mrrt=sn*

‘There shall be acted (*lit.* it has been acted) according to what they wish.’

(v) P. Brooklyn 35.1446 pl.IV, ro 31.f<sup>197</sup>

*iw* **k(n).tw**

‘There has been completion.’

Sim. ro 37.f, 44-45.f, 57.f, 63.7; with a V-passive, *iw* *k(n)*, ro 53.f, 70-71.f. For the identification of the form as *iw* *k(n).tw*, §4.4.1.1.1, (ii). Other subjectless

196 Similarly Vernus (in press: §12.6.3-5), with other examples, including from medical texts, and an analysis in terms of a ‘style procédural’. Brose (2014: 266-7) evokes the possibility that in some cases the construction may be with a passive participle rather than finite.

197 Vernus (in press: §12.6.4, ex.158).

passive construction without an adverbial phrase: CT II 167b (§2.6.1.1, (viii));  
*Debate* 112 (§2.5.3.2, (vi)); *Ipuwer* 2.4 (§2.6.1.1, (xiii)).

C. Passives from O-detransitivized events reading as oriented on the event itself are not limited to technical texts. The effect is noticeable particularly with events that are not regularly O-detransitivized. In (vi), a short segment of direct speech, no discourse continuity is involved. In context, the orientation on the event itself is similarly manifest in (vii). In (viii), the subjectless construction is without any adverbial phrase:

(vi) Pyr. 179a<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 219)

*nwt s3=t pw pw-nn dd.n=t ir=f*

**ms.n.t** *n(=i)*

*i.t tn*

‘Nut, this one here is your son of whom you have said:

“There was birth for me”

—so you said.’

(vii) Pyr. 204a-b<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 222)

*htm{ti}.n=k tw m wr-hk3w stš imi nwbt nb t3 šm<sup>c</sup>*

*n fh.ti n=k*

*n i3b.t n=k*

‘You have provided yourself as the Great-of-Magic, Seth who is in Ombos,  
 lord of Upper Egypt;

There has been no loss for you,

There has been no cessation for you.’

Thus W; N *n fh.ti n=k n i3b.ti n=k*; Nt *n fh.t n=k n i3b.d<sup>sic</sup> n=k*. Sim. Pyr. 206a-b<sup>WNNt</sup>.

(viii) CT II 166k-167b

*iw ntrw mdw=sn im<sup>sic</sup> itin irt hr 3t*

B2L **smn/try** *iw htp ø hr=s*

B2P **try mn<sup>sic</sup>** *iw htp ø hr=s*

Sq4C *iw smn/try iw htp ø hr=s*

‘The gods speak of this(?) great eye of Horus:

There has been creating, there has been establishing—

One is content about it.’

Sim. CT II 175b, 175f Sq3Sq *iw trw smn htp ø hr=s*. For the analysis of *htp ø*, §2.7.3.3, (vi). Other subjectless passives without an adverbial phrase: *Debate* 112 (§2.5.3.2, (vi)); P. Brooklyn 35.1446 pl.IV, ro 31.f (§2.6.1.1, (v)); *Ipuwer* 2.4 (§2.6.1.1, (xiii)).

Similar effects are observed in Middle Egyptian literary texts. In (ix), the subjectless passive construction heightens the urgency of the events that are lamented upon by presenting these in their barest possible form. In narrative (x)-(xi), the thetic force of

the construction is reflected in its use in segment-initial, and thereby discourse-discontinuative, contexts, here further underscored by *ist* (*rf*):

(ix) *Ipuwer* 6.3

*iw ms it 3kw hr w3t nb*  
*sh3w m hbsw*  
*hs3 m mrht*

‘But now, barley has perished on every road.  
 There has been stripping people of their clothes,  
 There has been making them unanointed with oil.’

Both *sh3i* and *hs3* are O-detransitivized; the latter is a S/O-ambitransitive (§2.6.2).

(x) *Sinuhe* R 22-24

(...) *n sp sinn=f rs-sy*  
*ist h3b r msw-nsw<sub>i</sub> wnw m-ht=f m mš<sup>c</sup> pn*  
*nls.n.tw n w<sup>c</sup> im<sub>i</sub>*

‘(...) He did not delay at all.

Now, there had been sending to the royal children who where after him in this expedition,  
 and only one of them was summoned.’

The subjectless passive *h3b*, in the clause that opens a new segment, has thetic force. The subjectless passive in the following clause, *nls*, by contrast, includes an expression in its argument frame that is anaphorically linked to an expression in the preceding clause (§2.5.3.1). While the first subjectless passive is discourse-discontinuative, the second is not.

(xi) *Sinuhe* B 172-175

(...) *sb=s nh<sub>i</sub> hr=i*  
*ist rf dd n hm n nsw-bity hpr-k3{w}-r<sup>c</sup> m3<sup>c</sup>-hrw hr sšm pn nty wy hr=f*  
*wn.in hm=f h3b=f n=i (...)*

‘“(...) may she spend eternity above me!”

Now, there was telling the Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Kheperkare, the justified, about this condition I was in.  
 Then His Majesty sent to me (...)’

D. Like in the active, the suppression of the O, the Endpoint of the event, not uncommonly correlates with imperfective aspect. Specific to the passive is the more or less strongly pronounced orientation on the event itself.

In both (xii) and (xiii), O-detransitivization correlates with imperfectivity, as is manifest in the constructions (a *mrr=f*, a *n sdm.n=f*) and further, in the case of (xii), in the adjunct clauses introduced by *r-tnw* ‘every time (...)’. The discourse functions of the two constructions are different, however. With anaphoric datives, (xii) is in continuity to the preceding segment of discourse. In (xiii), the clause does not include

an expression linked to the preceding discourse, nor any adverbial phrase at all: the orientation on the event itself is maximally strong. What is more, the Agent of the passive *n iwr.n.tw* is present in the immediately preceding clause (the ‘barren’ ‘wives’). In contrast to a possible active construction anaphorically linked to the preceding clause (\**n iwr.n=sn*), the recourse to a passive construction serves to present the event in its bare form and en bloc, as befits a lament:

(xii) CT V 11b-d T1L

(...) *rh=sn ntr<sub>i</sub> 3h<sup>c</sup> pr ikr*

**inn.t** *n=f<sub>i</sub> r-tnw dbh=f*

**s<sup>c</sup>r.t** *n=f<sub>i</sub> r-tnw ibb=f*

‘(...) They know the god, the equipped and efficient *akh*.

One brings to him every time he asks;

One presents to him every time he is thirsty.’

(xiii) *Ipuwer* 2.4

*iw ms hmwt wsr<.ti>*

*n iw[r].n.tw*

‘But now, wives are barren:

There is no conceiving.’

Other subjectless passives without an adverbial phrase: CT II 167b (§2.6.1.1, (viii)); *Debate* 112 (§2.5.3.2, (vi)); P. Brooklyn 35.1446 pl.IV, ro 31.f (§2.6.1.1, (v)).

E. Like in similar constructions with primary intransitives (§2.5.3.3), two often combined effects are observed in passive constructions of O-detransitivized verbs with an expressed Agent: expressing the Agent in a more exposed position than the subject and setting the perspective on the event itself. In (xiv), the secondary expression of the Agent in syntactic periphery is remarkable for two reasons, because it refers to the speaker—the quintessentially topical participant—and because it occurs in the context of an autobiography, a genre in which the speaker acts in the active. In deviating from the ordinary, the construction emphasizes the role of the speaker. In expressing him in an oblique case, like the referentially identical Beneficiaries in the two passive clauses that follow, it also underscores the parallelism between the three events.<sup>198</sup>

(xiv) Mentuwer (MMA 12.184), 7-8

*iw ip m-<sup>c</sup>=i m pr-nsw*

*nhm n=i*

*dw3 ntr n=i*

‘There was counting by me in the palace,

there was joyful shouting for me,

there was praising the god for me.’

<sup>198</sup> Vernus (in press: §12.6.6, ex.173).

In (xv), the secondarily expressed Agent comes long after the verb and is subject to further elaboration (*ḳrs.n(=i) sw*). In setting the perspective on the event itself and in introducing the Agent only in the rhematic tail of the sentence, the passive construction contributes to underscoring the paradox of the situation that is complained about:

(xv) Qaw Bowl, inside, 4

*in irr.t r=i r-gs=k*

*n irt.n ddt.n s3=k im*

*in sn(=i) ḳrs.n(=i) sw*

‘Is there acting against me next to you

—even though there is nothing that your son did or said—

by my brother, whom I buried?’

In (xvi)-(xvii), the orientation on the event itself is a determining factor in the use of the construction. The first (xvi) has the characteristically thetic information structure commonly encountered in administrative texts. In (xvii), the passive is with a semantically generic verb and in segment-initial position. The event is presented merely as an ‘acting’ and the Agent is only secondarily expressed in syntactic periphery; more specific elaborations follow, in the active. The subjectless passive construction introduces the Agent as a new participant with subsequent relevance and opens the sequence qua its thetic force:

(xvi) *Stèle Juridique* 11-12

*ir in ḥ3 n whm wʿrt mḥtt*

‘Done (lit. it was done) by the bureau of the herald of the northern district.’

(xvii) Pyr. 1473a-1474b<sup>M</sup> (PT 572)

*irw n=f in tm mr irt n=f*

*in.n=f n=k ntrw irw pt ink.n=f n=k ntrw irw t3*

*d=sn ʿwy=sn ḥr=k ir=sn n=k m3ḳt i3ḳ=k ir pt*

‘There will be acted for him by Atum like what has been done for him:

He has fetched for you the gods who belong to the sky, he has embraced for you the gods who belong to the earth

So that they can place their arms under you and that they can make for you a ladder, and that you can climb to the sky.’

Sim. CT VII 32g (var. mss.).

### 2.6.1.2 The passive and the Mediate Construction of the O

A. By definition, the second core argument of a transitive verb is ordinarily introduced directly—as the direct object in the active or the subject in the passive—

but it can also be introduced indirectly, in a prepositional phrase with *m*.<sup>199</sup> This construction—here termed the ‘Mediate Construction of the O’ (MCO)—has two major, often combined, effects. In introducing the O not as a core argument but obliquely, the MCO can express a lesser affectedness of the O; the construction then often correlates with imperfective aspect. By the same token, the MCO also has effects at the level of the information structure of the clause: when occurring in the ‘emphatic’ construction, it can serve to highlight the O.

Both effects are strongest when the verb is in the *mrr=f*, a form that combines functions in the ‘emphatic’ construction with an imperfective aspectual profile. Moreover, as to be argued later, both these determinations of the *mrr=f* are ultimately related to one another because the imperfective profile of the *mrr=f* provides the aspectual basis in which the unaccomplished ‘emphatic’ construction has its roots (§4.4.1.2). Both effects of the MCO are also iconic to some extent. The lesser affectedness of the O (and related to this, the common imperfective correlates of the MCO) is iconically reflected in a higher distance between the verb and its O. The highlighting of the O is iconically reflected in the extraction of the O out of the verbal phrase.<sup>200</sup>

NB.1 Both in its form and its functions, the MCO can be described as an antipassive,<sup>201</sup> if this is understood in a broad sense. The Earlier Egyptian construction does not involve a morphological marking on the verb and it does not serve to feed an O/S syntactic pivot. The MCO is not, therefore, an antipassive in the more specific sense, as is found in some syntactically ergative languages.<sup>202</sup>

NB.2 In the later history of Egyptian, the MCO would undergo major functional and formal changes. In Late Egyptian—when a specific expression of progressive aspect in verbal morphology had been lost due to the semantic generalization of *NP hr sdm*—the MCO would occasionally be recruited to serve as an optional marker of progressive aspect.<sup>203</sup> After Late Egyptian, the formal heir of the construction would evolve into what has become known as ‘durative object marking’ in relation to the ‘Stern-Jernstedt rule’.<sup>204</sup> The phenomenon in Demotic and Coptic is complex, has verbal aspect interacting with the definiteness, topicality, and referential status of nominal expressions, and is further determined by other intralinguistic factors such as the paradigmatic organization and morphological makeup of verbal patterns. While the phenomenon relates to what has become known under the umbrella term of

199 Winand (in press; 2006: 136-49); Peust (2008); Loprieno (2003: 81-2); Reintges (1997: 232-8); Silverman (1980).

200 The notion of ‘distance objectale’ is here relevant: Lazard (1995: 382 in particular).

201 Loprieno (2003: 81-2); Reintges (1997: 232-4). For an introduction to the antipassive, e.g. Woods (2008: 77-80); Foley (2006: 429-37); Givón (2001<sup>2</sup>: II, 168-72); Dixon (1994: 146-52); Cooreman (1994); Lazard (1994: 253-60).

202 Contra Loprieno (2003), who interprets the Earlier Egyptian MCO as a trace of an erstwhile split-ergative alignment of Egyptian.

203 Winand (in press; 2006: 145-8).

204 For Demotic, Simpson (1996: 151-6), with a review of previous discussions; for Coptic, Shisha-Halevy (1986: ch.3); Engsheden (2006).



‘Differential Object Marking’ in typological literature,<sup>205</sup> it is also in many ways language-specific. The diachronic process by which the Earlier Egyptian MCO evolved into the substantially different constructions in Demotic and Coptic remains to be studied in full detail.

B. The Mediate Construction of the O is regularly used in the passive with effects largely similar to the ones observed in the active. A first series of examples illustrates how the construction relates to other constructions discussed so far. A passive MCO can in some cases be almost indiscernible from a passive from an O-detransitivized verb with a *m*-introduced prepositional phrase expressing the metaphorical place of the event (i). In (ii), a locus classicus, the MCO correlates with imperfective aspect and serves to highlight the O, here inviting a restrictive-focus reading; alternatively, the construction could be viewed as a zero-subject construction with the unexpressed O secondarily elaborated by the *m*-introduced prepositional phrase:

(i) P. UC 32201, vso 12-13

*n in.tw m tbt nt p3 ḥsb 11*

‘Nothing was brought as payment of the 11 enrolled men.’

(ii) *Ipuwer* 12.13-14

*ir šm s 3 ḥr w3t gmm.tw m s 2*

‘If three men go on the street, only two are found.’

((...) *gmm.tw* *ø*; *m s 2* ‘(...) they are found as two men.’)

Illustrative of how the semantics of the MCO relate to other constructions is also (iii) with a passive from a syntactically transitive verb with an O that is semantically an internal object (*k3t* ‘work’ here has no referential status of its own and is accordingly only minimally individuated from the verbal event). In context, the statement highlights the presence of the king and the event is presented as ongoing. Rather than bearing on the O, which is an O only in form, the event concerns the participant introduced by *m*, semantically the actual Patient, which is affected only incompletely:

(iii) *Urk.* I 38, 16 (Niankhsekhmet)

*ir.t k3t im=sn r-gs nsw ds=f*

‘Work was done on them (*scil.* the two false doors) in the presence of the king himself.’

C. Like its active pendant, the passive MCO often expresses that the O is only incompletely or indirectly affected, or not at all. Not unexpectedly, the construction is found with events of ingestion whose O is of the mass type (here *smw* ‘plants’, *mw* ‘water’, *itrw* ‘the River’) (iv),<sup>206</sup> yet by no means limited to these (v). When the O is

205 E.g. Bossong (1998); Lazard (2001; 1994: 228-32).

206 For examples in the active, Winand (2006: 138, ex.111 and 113). The oblique introduction of the O with a verb of ingestion is a cross-linguistically common phenomenon, often with aspectual correlates. Thus in Ancient Greek with an alternation *plein húdoor* ~ *pinein húdatos* ‘drink water’:

an animate participant, a construction with *n* can be used in apparently similar function (vi):

(iv) *Ipuwer* 6.1

*iw* [*ms* ... (two quadrats empty)] *m smw s<sup>c</sup>m.tw m mw*

‘O, [yet one eats(?)] plants and one ingests water.’

Sim. 2.10 *iw ms itrw m snf swr.tw im=f* ‘But now, the River is blood and one drinks from it.’ The MCO is of course not mechanically triggered by events of ingestion; for the direct syntax of O, *Sinuhe* B 233-234 *mw m itrw swr.t=f mr=k* ‘The water in the river—it is drunk as you wish’; *Hymn* 6.7-8 *swr.tw mw irt nbt im=f rdw h3w hr nfrw=f* ‘When water is drunk, every eye is on him, who gives an excess on his good things.’

(v) *A Man to His Son* 3.3

*in-iw hb3.tw im=f r3-pw*

‘Or: is there lessening on it (/is anything subtracted from it)?’

Sim. *Hymn* 2.7 *ir hb3.tw m p3wt ntrw* (...) ‘When there is reducing on the offering loaves of the gods (...)’

(vi) *Urk.* I 232, 10-12 (Werra)

*sk dd.n hm=f*

*mry ø n h[m](=i) wd3=f wrt ny skr n=f*

*sk sw [šps] hr hm=f r z nb*

‘His Majesty said:

“It is My Majesty’s desire that he be very well without there being any striking at him.”

For he was eminent with His Majesty more than any man.’

Also like in the active, the passive MCO can be used in the (mostly unaccomplished) ‘emphatic’ construction. The two constructions combined highlight the O, which is placed under a narrow focus of various types:<sup>207</sup>

(vii) *Debate* 117-118

*snw bin inn.tw m drdrw r mtt nt ib*

‘Friends have become bad, only strangers are brought for honesty.’

Sim. 124-125 *iw šw ø m k-ib inn.tw m hmm r srht n=f* ‘There is a lack of intimates, one resorts even to an unknown man to complain to him’; as a secondary reading,<sup>208</sup> *Ptahhotep* 349 L2 *inn.tw m k wn 3hw* ‘To an intimate recourse is made when there is trouble’ (P *iw in.tw kw wn 3k* ‘Intimates are brought when there is ruin.’)

---

in the former, with an aorist infinitive (a perfective tense), the O is in the accusative; in the latter, with a present tense infinitive, the O is introduced in an indirect case, the genitive.

207 For examples in the active, Winand (2006: 138, ex.110); Silverman (1980).

208 Stauder (2013a: 77-8).

(viii) Pyr. 617b<sup>TAnMNJp</sup> (PT 364)

$$n \text{ } \underline{h}n.n.ti \text{ } im=k$$

There can be no disturbing on you.'

*ir wd<sup>c.t</sup> m N<sub>pn</sub> in gbb (...)*

If there is a judgment on this N by Geb (...)'

- In negative clauses: (i), (vi), (viii);
- In conditional constructions: (ix), (ii);
- In a sentence question: (v).

Among all the above occurrences of the passive MCO, such that are not in negative, conditional, or interrogative environments are only two ((iv) and (vii)). Both have imperfective aspect.

In a negative construction, the occurrence of the event is denied; in a conditional construction, the occurrence of the event is possible but not asserted; in a sentence question, the occurrence of the event is asked about; in a clause with imperfective aspect, the occurrence of the event is not related to any moment in time in particular. In augmenting the syntactic distance from the verb to the O, the (passive) MCO also augments the semantic distance between the two. The construction most fundamentally reflects that the transmittal from the event to the O is in question. The often noted correlation of the MCO with imperfective aspect is a special case. The use in the (unaccomplished) ‘emphatic’ construction—with a form of the verb that itself has an imperfective profile (§4.4.1.2)—is a special case of this special case.

## 2.6.2 Passives from S/O-ambitransitives

In the preceding section, I discussed intransitive constructions of verbs that are more commonly used as transitives and how these constructions interact with the passive. I now turn to transitive constructions of verbs more commonly used as intransitives, also with a view on how these interact with the passive. Unlike what this introductory formulation might suggest, the phenomena addressed in the precedent and in the present sections are of an altogether different nature. All they have in common is that both similarly bear witness to the considerable flexibility of Earlier Egyptian in matters of transitivity.

### 2.6.2.1 Ambitransitivity in Earlier Egyptian

Like agentivity with intransitives (§2.1.2), transitivity can be variable with certain verbs. Pending a fuller study yet to be made,<sup>209</sup> two major types of transitivity alternations can be distinguished: the first can be viewed as consisting in the addition of an O as a second direct argument; the second can be viewed as consisting in the addition of an A.

A. In what is here referred to as ‘S/A-ambitransitives’, the added second argument is an O; the S of the intransitive alternant corresponds to the A of the transitive alternant. E.g.:

---

209 Previous discussions: Vernus (2009: 307-12, for the specific case of verbs of the type  $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ , with S/O-ambitransitivity being the outcome of a neutralization of an original contrast between  $n-C_1C_2C_1C_2$  and  $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ , the former type losing in productivity); Winand (2006: 130-5); Breyer (2006: 102-4); Schenkel (1999, particularly for the case of Ls); Vernus (1984a, 212; 1984b: 183-4); Korostovtsev (1972, an unsorted list); Edel (1955-1964: §422); Firchow (1953a, concentrating on the case of  $w^c b$ ).

- (a)  $wni_{INTR}$  ‘hurry’ ~  $wni_{TR}$  ‘bypass, neglect’ (not uncommon),  
e.g. *Loyaliste* 8.5 TC<sup>210</sup> *m wny mdwt=i* ‘Do not neglect my words’ (sim. *A Man to His Son* 1.1).
- (b)  $mdw_{INTR}$  ‘speak, talk’ ~  $mdw_{TR}$  ‘address, talk to’ (rare), ‘speak (things)’,  
e.g. CT I 307h T2C (sim. T9C, B10C)<sup>211</sup> *wn mdw.n tw hr* ‘Horus had addressed you’; *Ptahhotep* 71 *iw=f hr mdt bint* ‘while he speaks bad things’.
- (c)  $rmi_{INTR}$  ‘weep, cry’ ~  $rmi_{TR}$  ‘beweep, cry over’ (only occasionally),  
e.g. *Neferti* 3f (...) *rmw=k t3 pn* (...) ‘(...) and beweep this land (...)’; sim. *Kemit* 8.b-c (§4.4.1.1.1, (vii)).
- (d)  $hpi_{INTR}$  ‘walk, go’ ~  $hpi_{TR}$  ‘encounter (someone)’ (only occasionally),  
e.g. *Herdsmen* x+23 *hp rf sw ntrt tn* ‘this goddess encountered him’; sim. CT II 280/81d; *Sinuhe* B 10.
- (e)  $b3k_{INTR}$  ‘work’ ~  $b3k_{TR}$  ‘work (an object), carry out (a task), enslave (someone)’ (common).

B. In what is here referred to as ‘S/O-ambitransitives’, the added second argument is an A; the S of the intransitive alternant corresponds to the O of the transitive alternant. In a first group of such S/O-ambitransitives, the transitive alternant remains rare; the event that on occasions can be expressed by a transitive alternant is much more commonly expressed by causatives marked as such by derivational morphology. E.g.:

- (f)  $w^{\epsilon}b_{INTR}$  ‘be/become/make oneself pure’ ~  $w^{\epsilon}b_{TR}$  ‘purify, cleanse’ (rare),  
e.g. CT IV 344b B3L, B1L<sup>212</sup> (...) *inp ntr hr w^{\epsilon}b=i* ‘(...) Anubis the god is cleansing me’ (or: ‘(...) Anubis is the god cleansing me’),<sup>213</sup>  
—alongside the overly common *sw^{\epsilon}b/s^{\epsilon}b*.
- (g)  $mn_{INTR}$  ‘remain, endure’ ~  $mn_{TR}$  ‘establish’ (rare),  
e.g. CT VII 237i P. Gard. II<sup>214</sup> *n i.mnt(=i) sw im* ‘while I had not yet established him there’;  
—alongside the overly common *smn*.

210 Later versions, from PL on, read with a different verb, *smi*.

211 Vernus (1984a: 212, n.79).

212 Further Winand (2006: 134).

213 Further examples: Fircchow (1953a).

214 Winand (2006: 133, ex.94; also ex.93).

(h)  $\dot{h}tm_{INTR}$  ‘perish, be destroyed’ ~  $\dot{h}tm_{TR}$  ‘destroy, annihilate’ (only occasionally),

e.g. Pyr. 293c<sup>WT</sup> (PT 254)  $iw \dot{h}tm.n=f tpw=sn-t3$  ‘He has annihilated their survivors’; CT V 203i M1C  $in b3=f \dot{h}tm=f sw$  ‘It is his *ba* that will destroy him’;

—alongside the more common  $\dot{s}h\dot{t}m$  (e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 98; 142; 273; 304).

NB. With some of the same verbs, an intermediate stage in transitivity augmentation is seen in cases when the verb is still syntactically intransitive but the S is agentive and the event is semantically reflexive (or middle). With  $w^b$ : Pyr. 750a<sup>TM</sup> (PT 420)  $\dot{d}d-mdw h3 N pw w^b sntr tw n r^c$  ‘Recitation. O this N, purify yourself, cense yourself for Re’ (in the imperative, implying an Agent); with  $mn$ : *Urk.* IV 1510, 3<sup>215</sup>  $mn.in hm=f r hnmw$  ‘Then His Majesty established himself at Hermopolis.’

With other S/O-ambitransitives, the transitive alternant is not as rare as in the above, e.g.:

(i)  $w\check{s}_{INTR}$  ‘be empty, desolate’ ~  $w\check{s}_{TR}$  ‘lay empty, strip bare’ (less common), e.g. CT VII 468b (var. mss.)  $in hwt w\check{s}=s hwt$  ‘One mansion destroys the other’;<sup>216</sup> *Loyaliste* 11.12  $w\check{s}=k sw k3=f r \check{s}m3$  ‘You make him desolate and he plans to be a vagabund’.

(j)  $ski_{INTR}$  ‘perish’ ~  $ski_{TR}$  ‘destroy’ (not uncommon), for the former, e.g. the formula  $n sk=f n \dot{h}tm=f (/n sk \emptyset n \dot{h}tm \emptyset)$  ‘It does not perish, it is not destroyed’;<sup>217</sup> for the latter, e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 148-149  $n\dot{h}-wy m3ir sky=k$  ‘How miserable is the poor man you destroy.’

C. Some verbs, finally, display both S/A- and S/O-transitivity alternations, depending on the nature of the added argument. E.g.:

(k)  $3s_{INTR}$  ‘hasten, hurry’ (common)

~  $3s_{TR}$  ‘overtake’ (with an added O, thus as a S/A-ambitr.) (rare),

e.g. *Sinuhe* B 21-22<sup>218</sup>  $hr n ibt 3s.n=f w^{sic}$  ‘An attack of thirst overtook me’; sim. B 168-169  $wgg 3s.n=f wi$  ‘Weakness, it has overtaken me’;

~  $3s_{TR}$  ‘hasten, press someone’ (with an added A, thus as a S/O-ambitr.) (rare); illustration: §2.6.2.2, (v).

(l)  $h\dot{t}p_{INTR}$  ‘be at peace, rest’ (common)

~  $h\dot{t}p_{TR}$  ‘occupy, rest in’ (with an added O, of place, thus as a S/O-ambitr.) (*passim*);<sup>219</sup>

215 Winand (2006: 133, ex.95).

216 Reintges (1997: 324, n.31).

217 Numerous references: Vernus (1990: 131-4).

218 R alters into a serial construction  $hr.n ibt 3s[.n]=s wi$  ‘Thirst struck and it overtook me.’

~ *h̥tp*<sub>TR</sub> ‘satisfy’ (with an added A, thus as a S/O-ambitr.) (rare),

e.g. Pyr. 388b<sup>WTPN</sup> (PT 271) *N pi h̥tp t3wy N pi sm3y t3wy* ‘N is the one who satisfies the Two Lands; N is the one who unites the Two Lands’,<sup>220</sup>

—alongside the overly common *sh̥tp*<sub>TR</sub>.

NB. S/O-ambitransitivity would develop further in Demotic and Coptic;<sup>221</sup> in the process, the very nature of the phenomenon would also change. In Demotic and Coptic, the group of S/O-ambitransitives includes various sorts of events that can be construed as happening by themselves (that is, without an external Agent). Moreover, the transitive and intransitive alternants of a given verb then generally seem to be similarly common in terms of orders of magnitude; there is no easy way to declare which is primary over the other. S/O-ambitransitivity in Demotic and Coptic can therefore be described as an anticausative alternation (not unlike e.g. English *I broke<sub>TR</sub> the glass* ~ *The glass broke<sub>INTR</sub>* (anticausative)).<sup>222</sup> In Earlier Egyptian, by contrast, the intransitive alternant is in most cases considerably, or even overwhelmingly, more common in text than the transitive alternant of the same verb. Differing from the Demotic-Coptic configuration, the intransitive alternant can in Earlier Egyptian be described as primary (in terms of text-frequency, thereby probably also in terms of the mental representation of the lexicon). By the same token, the transitive alternant can be described as the product of an augmentation in transitivity. S/O-ambitransitivity in Earlier Egyptian can not be described as an anticausative alternation.

219 FCD 180.

220 Sim. *Paheri* 5 (FCD 180). In *Debate* 23-24 *wdʿ wi dh̥wty h̥tp ntrw*, *h̥tp* has been read transitively (e.g. Gardiner 1957<sup>3</sup>: 274, ‘Thot who pacifies the gods’), but a reading with a finite form is preferable (Allen 2011b: 40, ‘Let Thoth judge me and the gods become content’).

221 Like in Earlier Egyptian, a detailed study of S/O-ambitransitivity alternations in Demotic and Coptic remains a desideratum. For Demotic, provisionally Simpson (1996: 109); Quecke (1979: 447); for Coptic, Layton (2011<sup>3</sup>: §174); Funk (1978: §3.6.2).

222 An ‘anticausative’ differs from a passive in that the former does not imply an Agent in its semantic representation (e.g. *the glass broke* (*scil.* by itself)) while the latter does (e.g. *the glass was broken* (*scil.* by someone)). While the anticausative and the passive can be given a similar expression in some languages, other languages make a morphosyntactic distinction between the two. In Coptic, which does not have inflectional passives but an active impersonal construction performing some of the functions of the passive (Quecke 1987), a contrast along similar lines is observed as well: *λϥΟΥΘΝ ΠΙΠΕΡΠΕ ΜΠΠΟΥΤΕ* ‘God’s temple opened’ (Rev 11:19) *ΧΙΝΕΝΕΞ ΜΠΟΥΣΩΤΜ ΧΕ ΛΥΟΥΘΝ ΕΝΒΑΛ ΠΟΥΑ ΕΛΥΧΠΟΧ ΕΦΟΝΒΛΛΕ* ‘Never has it been heard that the eyes of a person born blind have been opened’ (John 9:32). Only the latter construction is compatible with the expression of an Agent in an oblique phrase, e.g. *ΠΕΝΤΑΥΧΟΟΧ ΖΙΤΜΠΕΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ* ‘what was said by the prophet’ (Acts 13:40) (examples from Layton 2011<sup>3</sup>: §174-5). In Demotic, a similar contrast is observed between ambitransitivity alternations notably expressing the anticausative and the active impersonal construction (examples from Simpson 1996: 109): *Sacerdotal Decrees*, Q.29 *mtw=s wnh d* (...) ‘so that it may become public that (...)’ (no Agent implied); H.12 *nt-ih=w w3h=w* ‘which are added’ (an Agent is implied—that Demotic only exceptionally licenses this to be actually expressed does not affect the analysis).

## 2.6.2.2 Transitive alternants of ambitransitives in the passive

The transitive alternants of S/A- and S/O-ambitransitives have an agentive A. In line with the semantic condition on passivization in Earlier Egyptian (§2.1.2-3), they can therefore be made passive. In Earlier Egypt, the syntactic transitivity of an event generally used intransitively can thus be augmented without further morphological marking, and then made passive in the regular passive construction, with the relevant morphological marking.

A. Beginning with S/A-ambitransitives, an illustration is the following:

(i) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 11

*hnn.tw shrw ntrw*

*wn{t}.tw mhrw=sn*

‘The counsels of the gods are thrown into tumult,  
their directives are neglected.’

For *wni* as a S/A-ambitransitive, §2.6.2.1, (a).

Since their S is agentive, the intransitive alternants of S/A-ambitransitives can also be passivized, e.g., with *rmi*<sub>INTR</sub>, *Neferti* 9b (...) *nn rmw.tw n m(w)t* ‘(...) One will not cry for death’ (for occurrences of the much rarer *rmi*<sub>TR</sub>, §2.6.2.1, (c); I am not aware of an instance of a passive construction of *rmi*<sub>TR</sub>, but this is hardly more than a gap in the record given the overall rarity of *rmi*<sub>TR</sub>).

B. The case of S/O-ambitransitives is different because their intransitive alternants generally have a non-agentive S and thereby fail to meet the semantic condition for passivization (e.g. *w<sup>c</sup>b* ‘be(come) pure’, not to be passivized). In their regular use as intransitives, these verbs can only be passivized when the S is made an Agent, often with a change in meaning (e.g. *w<sup>c</sup>b* ‘perform priestly duties’, in a passive construction: §2.1.3, (i)).<sup>223</sup> When transitivized, as rarely happens, the same verbs have an Agent (the added A) and can be made passive. Two different construals of an event of *w<sup>c</sup>b*-ing are illustrated in direct collocation in (ii): first as an intransitive with no implied Agent (*w<sup>c</sup>b N pn m šht iBrw*), then as a transitive made passive, with an expressed Agent (*w<sup>c</sup>b.ti N pn in (...)*). In (iii), the Agent of the passive of the rare transitive alternant of *wš* remains unexpressed but is similarly implied to be present in the semantic representation of the event by the morphologically marked passive construction:

(ii) Pyr. 1245a-e<sup>P</sup> (PT 525)

*sd3 N pn m š knzt*

*w<sup>c</sup>b N pn m šht iBrw*

*w<sup>c</sup>b.ti N pn in šmsw hr pdt km3 inpw*

*ir=sn n N r3 n prw ir=sn n N pn <r3 n> šwiw*

<sup>223</sup> For the T-marked form of *h<sub>tm</sub>*<sub>INTR</sub> in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 253-254 *šhtm m rd h<sub>tm</sub>.tw* ‘Destroyer, let not perish!’, an innovative construction, not passive anymore, §5.1.1.1.



‘May this N proceed into the lake of Kensest,  
 May this N become clean in the Field of Reeds,  
 May this N be made clean by the Followers of Horus, Anubis’ bow and throw-stick;  
 May they make for N the spell of coming forth, may they make for this N the spell of ascending!’

M and N read actively, also with  $w^c b_{TR}$ :  $w^c b \text{ } \underline{tw} \text{ } \underline{hr}$  (...),  $w^c b \text{ } \underline{tw} \text{ } \underline{smsw} \text{ } \underline{hr}$ . For  $w^c b$  as a S/O-intransitive, §2.6.2.1, (f).

(iii) Cairo Bowl, inside, 4-5

$mrr=k \text{ } w\dot{s}.t \text{ } ryt=k \text{ } hr \text{ } ih$

‘Why do you want your household to be stripped bare?’

Sim. *Neferti* 10c-d  $\underline{hdd} \text{ } m \text{ } iryt \text{ } w\dot{s}<\text{ } \text{ } \underline{tw} \text{ } m \text{ } gmyt \text{ } iryt \text{ } m \text{ } tmmt \text{ } ir$  ‘Destruction is in what had been done, what is being lost is what had been found, what is done is what had not been done’ (a secondary reading: §5.1.4.2, (v)). For  $w\dot{s}$  as a S/O-intransitive, §2.6.2.1, (i).

The following constructions, with {t} in preverbal position, are not inflectional passives anymore (§5.1.2). Yet, like passive ones, they are detransitive in the sense that the Agent is left unspecified. These constructions are thereby similarly illustrative of the phenomenon here discussed, the interaction between morphologically unmarked syntactic and semantic transitivity of the event on the one hand, and morphologically marked detransitivization with respect to the Agent on the other:

(iv) Hammamat 19, 10-12

$\text{ } h^c.n \text{ } ir \text{ } p\dot{z} \text{ } sm\dot{z}$

$wn.in.tw \text{ } hr \text{ } sfn \text{ } n\dot{z} \text{ } n \text{ } mnw \text{ } mi \text{ } dd(t).n=f \text{ } nbt$

‘The ramp was made

and (the way for) these blocks was made smooth according to all he had said.’

With a rare occurrence of  $sfn_{TR}$ , significantly in a technical sense. In the overwhelming majority of cases,  $sfn$  is intransitive, with meanings such as ‘be lenient, gentle, soft’.

(v) *Paheri*, pl.3, 2<sup>nd</sup> register from bottom, 2<sup>nd</sup> inscription from the right, 10-11

$hr \text{ } tw.tw \text{ } hr \text{ } \dot{z}s=n \text{ } m \text{ } smt$

‘And they are hurrying us in (our) going.’

For  $\dot{z}s$  as an ambitransitive, §2.6.2.1, (k).

## 2.7 Earlier Egyptian active impersonal constructions

The passive is, among other things, an Agent-backgrounding construction (§2.5), a function that is realized through a remapping of grammatical roles (A and O for

transitives; S for intransitives) and grammatical relations (subject, direct object). The passive thereby differs syntactically from the active, a difference that is marked by specific inflection on the verb in most cases (§2.4.1). Earlier Egyptian active impersonal constructions,<sup>224</sup> for their part, serve to leave the identity of their first direct participant unspecified. Unlike passive constructions, they do not involve a specific syntax nor, associated with this, additional verbal inflection: morphosyntactically, these are regular active constructions, with a subject expression that is interpreted as lacking specific reference. Moreover, the same constructions can be used with their subjects interpreted anaphorically and/or as referring to a specific entity: describing the constructions as impersonal is therefore in reference to the fact that unlike other constructions they require such an impersonal reading under certain conditions, not that impersonality would be inherent to the construction.

While passive and active impersonal constructions display an altogether different morphosyntax, both often serve to leave the identity of the A (/the S with intransitives) unspecified (for further discussion of the functional similarities, as well as differences, between the two constructions, §5.3.3.1). Active impersonal constructions can then be used in lieu of passive ones, depending on discourse conditions and register in languages that have both construction types,<sup>225</sup> and more broadly in languages that lack passives altogether (for example in Demotic and Coptic). In Earlier Egyptian—at least in the written standards of Earlier Egyptian documented in the extant record<sup>226</sup>—active impersonal constructions are not very developed, no doubt because of the productivity of the passive construction, including passives from intransitives. Leaving aside expressions such as *rmt* ‘people’—which not uncommonly invite a non-referential interpretation (in various syntactic positions, not only as a subject)—three constructions merit a closer discussion:

- An active construction with a third person plural subject = *sn* (§2.7.1);
- An active construction with *s* ‘a man’ as its subject (§2.7.2);
- A non-anaphoric zero-subject active construction (§2.7.3).

The first, as well as a subtype of the third (§2.7.3.2.B), are used in contexts in which a passive construction could also have been used; these are therefore mere alternatives to the passive. In the written standards documented in the record, both are very rare; they may have been more common in spoken varieties. The status of the second and third is different, as these are used in contexts in which the passive construction could not be used: when the unspecified participant controls subsequent anaphoric reference

224 ‘Impersonal’, the received label, is kept here for convenience (a proposed alternative, such as ‘desubjective’ (Haspelmath 1990), is descriptively more correct but has gained little currency). On the complex terminological and conceptual issues surrounding a term that has deep roots in European, and ultimately classical, grammatical traditions (*impersonalis* < *aprósoopon*), e.g. Cuzzolin (2002).

225 E.g. Sansò (2006).

226 In languages that have both inflectional passive constructions and active impersonal ones, the latter are often more common in less formal and typically spoken varieties, possibly reflecting the lesser amount of processing involved relative to the passive construction. For example, the *on*-construction is common in colloquial French, but rare in literary or academic prose. As already noted, the distribution is also a matter of discourse conditions, beyond register.

and with events that do not meet the semantic condition for passivization. The *s*-construction, and even more so the zero-subject construction, thereby entertain a counterpart relationship with the passive.

### 2.7.1 The Earlier Egyptian third person plural construction

A construction with a third person plural subject can be interpreted as active impersonal when the pronoun lacks an antecedent in previous discourse, in other words, when the pronoun is used non-anaphorically. In Earlier Egyptian, this is illustrated by rare cases of constructions with *=sn*.

#### 2.7.1.1 The third person plural ↔ passive connection in Earlier Egyptian

A. Third person plural constructions commonly develop passive-like functions, more or less productively depending on individual languages: for example Latin *dicunt* (3pl) ~ *dicitur* (passive), English *they* (used more or less broadly depending on discourse conditions and register), or the third person plural construction developing in Demotic and Coptic, at a time when Egyptian had lost all inflectional passives. The connection between the two construction types is also diachronic: although they hardly ever develop into full-fledged passive constructions, third person plural constructions form a basis from which incipient or emergent passives can grammaticalize.<sup>227</sup>

The rationale for this cross-linguistically recurrent connection involves two complementary dimensions:

- (a) In the passive, the Agent is often referentially indeterminate: it often has a plurality of possible referents;
- (b) Of all grammatical persons, the third plural is the one referring to participants lowest in individuation: a third person is not a speech act participant, and a plural is typically less specific than a singular.

B. Beginning with the latter dimension, the possibility for third person plural pronouns to stand for referents scoring very low in individuation is illustrated by the following sequence, in which feminine participles referring to collectives (*\*kt nbt prrt nbt*) are taken up anaphorically by third person plural pronouns (*\*k=sn pr=sn*), themselves taken up anaphorically by zeroes (*\*k ø pr ø*):

##### (i) *Duties of the Vizier* R 4

*ir grt \*kt nbt prrt nbt r s3tw n hnw*

*\*k=sn pr=sn*

*in wpwty=f dd \*k ø pr ø*

‘As to everything that enters and goes out of the area of the Residence,  
when it enters and goes out,  
it is his messenger who has it enter and go out.’

<sup>227</sup> Siewierska (2008; 2010); Heine & Kuteva (2002: 235-7).

Thoroughly remarkable is the following sequence in which *sn* (in *pr=sn*) is anaphoric to *s* ‘a man’, interpreted as lacking any specific referent (note the imperfective aspect of the verb, *mi 3bb*). This is mirrored by a similar construction that happens to exist in English (*someone* → *they*). Earlier Egyptian, however, differs from English in that the same antecedent *s* ‘a man’ is then also taken up anaphorically by a singular pronoun (*ir.n=f*) resulting in what may be described as split-agreement (*s* ‘a man’ → *=sn* → *=f*). This can not be mirrored in English rendition anymore (*someone* → *they* → <sup>21</sup>*he*):

(ii) *Debate* 140-142

*iw m(w)t m hr=i min*

*mi 3bb s m33 pr=sn*

*ir.n=f rnpwt ʕ33t it m ndr*

‘Death is in my sight today,  
like when someone desires to see their houses,  
when they have spent many years taken in captivity.’

Significant is also the diachronic development that leads to the rise of the Late Egyptian third person plural pronoun (=w). This has its ultimate origin in a form *sdm.n(y)* which includes the ‘prepositional adverb’ *n(y)* ‘to it’<sup>228</sup> and can have an impersonal interpretation (§2.7.3.2.B).

C. Another reason for the commonly observed third person plural – passive connection is the often indeterminate reference of the implied passive Agent and the ensuing plurality of possible referents. This finds a direct illustration for example in occasional cases of textual alternations between passive and third person plural constructions:

(iii) *Hymn* 12.1-2

*wbn=f=k m niwt hkr*

*hr s33=sn/.tw m inw nfr n 33w*

‘When he/you rise(s) in the city of hunger,  
they are/one is sated with the good produce of the fields.’

(iv) *Ptahhotep* 33

P *ih tr.t n=k mitt* ‘Then the same will be done for you.’

L2, C *ih tr=sn n=k mitt* ‘Then they will do the same for you.’

The third person plural constructions here have antecedents in preceding discourse: *niwt* ‘town’ read as a collective (some versions have *niwtiw* ‘citizens’) in (iii), *sdmyw* ‘the hearers’ and *imiw-h3t* (...) ‘the ancestors (...)’ (30-32) in (iv). In both cases, therefore, the third person plural constructions are not active impersonal, unlike the ones to be presented below (§2.7.1.2). The textual alternations themselves are not less significant: while in (iii) the original reading can not be determined,<sup>229</sup> it can in (iv),

228 Edel (1959); Vernus (in press: §5.2.1); Stauder (in press c: §10); in the present study, §5.3.5.2.NB; further references, above, n.63.

229 On the complex textual issues surrounding these verses, Stauder (2013a: 224-6).

where *ir.t*, a passive, is altered into *ir=sn*. The alteration, to be sure, was supported by the fact that the preceding verses included nominal expressions that could be interpreted as possible antecedents; for the change to take place at all, however, a possible pluralizing interpretation of the Agent of *ir.t* in P was a necessary condition.

On an altogether different level, the plurality of possible referents of the implied passive Agent finds a direct illustration in rare cases of a written complementation of *.tw* by the plural strokes (in an innovative construction, Wadi el-Hudi 10, 2 *prt tw*<sup>PLUR</sup>; not in an innovative construction, Hammamat 19, 9 *ir.t*<sup>PLUR</sup>); these written forms, not found in standard registers, will be discussed in a later chapter (§5.1.3.2). In a different construction but similar in principle, another case of a written complementation of an unexpressed participant by the plural strokes is found in a zero-subject active construction (*Sinuhe* B 59 *hms*  $\emptyset$ <sup>A1-PLUR</sup>: §2.7.3.3, (ii)).

### 2.7.1.2 Third person plural constructions with a non-anaphoric subject

A. The existence of the construction is illustrated most directly in the following proper name. A proper name is a segment of speech that is not part of a broader sequence of discourse; the third person plural subject pronoun can therefore not have an antecedent:

(i) Wien ÄS 111, 9<sup>230</sup>

*nn-hm=sn*

‘They-will-not-ignore’

Illustrations of the construction in continuous text include the following:<sup>231</sup>

(ii) Bia, Inscription A, 6-7

[*ink*] *mry it=f hz mwt=f im3hw hr nb=f r<sup>c</sup> nb*  
*wn=sn dd=s<n> r(=i) [m]33=sn w <sup>c</sup>k(=i) m rwt*  
*mk im3hw pw m3<sup>c</sup> iw=f*  
*hr=sn r(=i)*

‘I am one beloved of his father, praised of his mother, an *imakhu* with his lord every day.

They used to say about me when they saw me entering through the door:

“See, he is a true *imakhu* when he comes.”

—so they said about me.’

In variant formulations,<sup>232</sup> the third person plural is anaphoric to an antecedent *rmt*, itself lacking a specific referent.

230 Borghouts (2010: I, §17.g, ex.27).

231 Another possible, but uncertain, occurrence is Akhenaten’s *First Proclamation*, Stela X, 3 *prt bw gm.n=w s m* (...) ‘Look, they did not find it as (...)’ (Vernus in press: §13.3.1, ex.182); Stela K, 1 has only one stroke, possibly for a first person (Murnane & Van Siclen III 1993: 54, n.hh).

232 Kloth (2002: 73-4).

(iii) *Sinuhe* B 167-171

*ih rnpy h<sup>c</sup>w=i <n>-ntt <r>f i3w h3w*

*wgg 3s.n=f wi irty=i dns <sup>c</sup>wy=i nw*

*rdwy=i fh.n=sn šms ib wrd*

*tkn wi n wd3*

**sb=sn** {n} *wi r niwwt nhh (...)*

‘So my limbs may rejuvenate for now old age has descended:

Weakness, it has overtaken me, my eyes have become heavy, my arms weak;

My legs, they have ceased to follow, the heart has become weary.

I am close to departing.

May they conduct me to the towns of eternity (...)!’

B. In one case, *sn* is used non-anaphorically in a position other than subject. What is expressed in (iv.a) could not have been expressed by the passive, since in the passive the non-expressed participant is necessarily an A or a S (iv.b).<sup>233</sup> In this highly specific case only, the construction may be viewed as a counterpart, not an alternative, to the passive:

(iv.a) *Merikare* E 128

*šm b3 r bw rh.n=f gr*

*sikr hwt=k n imnt smnh st=k nt hr(t)-ntr m <sup>c</sup>k3 m irt m3<sup>c</sup>t*

**rhnt ib=sn** *pw hr=s*

‘The soul goes to the place it already knows.

Make good your palace of the West, perfect your place of the necropolis with exactitude and with performing the *Maat*—

This is what their<sup>234</sup> heart relies upon.’

(iv.b) *Debate* 121

*nn wn ib n s rhn.tw hr=f*

‘There is no man’s heart that could be relied upon.’

C. Although similar in its most general principle, the Earlier Egyptian third person plural active impersonal construction stands in no connection to the Demotic and Coptic one. The latter developed only by the late Ramesside period when it was made possible through the combined result of two long-term processes, the spread of T-passives over V-passives during Old, Middle, and Late Egyptian, and the reinterpretation of some .*tw*-marked constructions as themselves active impersonal followed by the generalization of this reinterpretation (§5).

The Earlier Egyptian third person plural construction with an impersonal reading remains very rare in text. This is probably because it does not have functions that could not be performed by the passive itself (except for the highly specific case

233 Altogether different is the case of the construction *ib.tw r sdm*: in this, *ib* is an integral component of a specialized construction (§5.1.4.4) unlike in (iv.a).

234 A much-discussed interpretive issue is whether the non-specified participant is the gods or men; references to the debate by Dils (*TLA*).

presented in B). Unlike the two constructions to be discussed next, the Earlier Egyptian third person plural construction does not stand in a counterpart relationship to the passive. It provides a vary rare alternative to the passive, which may or may not have been more widespread in registers and varieties other than the strongly standardized ones documented in the record.

## 2.7.2 Constructions with *s* ‘a man’

Another Earlier Egyptian construction that can have an impersonal reading is the one with *s* ‘a man’ in subject position.

### 2.7.2.1 In general

The noun *s* ‘a man’ can have a non-referential interpretation, that is, be interpreted as not referring to any entity in particular in the world of discourse. As such, it can stand for a non-specified participant in subject position (a) and in all other syntactic positions similarly (b)-(d). Being a full noun, *s* ‘a man’ can also be the antecedent controlling subsequent anaphoric reference (c)-(d):

(a) *A Man to his Son* 1a *ḥ3ti-<sup>c</sup> m sb3yt irt.n s n s3=f* (...) ‘Beginning of the teaching a man made for his son (...)’

(b) *Amenemhat* 3b (...) *ḥr-ntt nn wn{n} mr n s hrw n ksnt* ‘(...) because no one has a servant on a day of difficulty.’

(c) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 17-18 *iw r3 n s; nḥm=f swi* ‘A man’s speech can save him.’

(d) *Neferti* 10d-e *tw nḥm ḥt s; r=f; rdw n nty m rwtw* ‘A man’s property is taken from him to be given to one who is outside.’

Constructions with *s* ‘a man’ thus provide one way to leave the identity or reference of a participant unspecified. In the following passage, the construction is associated with another one that can serve a similar purpose, the *sḏm sḏm* construction.<sup>235</sup> Both are styleful ways for the speaker to refer to himself only obliquely in the first part of a series of antithetical verses, then directly.<sup>236</sup>

(i) *Sinuhe* B 149-156

<i>w<sup>c</sup>r w<sup>c</sup>r n h3w=f</i>	<i>iw mtr=i m ḥnw</i>
<i>s33 s33y n ḥkr</i>	<i>iw=i d=i t3 n gsy=i</i>
<i>rww s t3=f n ḥ3yt</i>	<i>ink ḥdt p3kt</i>
<i>bh3 s n-g3w h3b=f</i>	<i>ink s3 mrt</i>
<i>nfr pr=i wsh st=i sh3wy=i m ḥ</i>	

‘A fugitive flees because of his surroundings, yet my reputation is in the Residence;

A creeper creeps for hunger, yet I give bread to my neighbor.

<sup>235</sup> Werning (2013: 265); Baumann (1998: 130-2); Allen (1984: §305); Firthow (1953b: 197-8).

<sup>236</sup> Further discussion, Stauder (2014a: §2).

Someone leaves his country for nakedness, but mine are white clothes and fine linen;

Someone runs away because of lack of who would send him, but I am rich in dependents.’

My house is good, my place is large, memory of me is in the palace.’

### 2.7.2.2 As a counterpart to the passive: Agents controlling anaphoric reference

Constructions with an expression for ‘a man’ as their subject can grammaticalize into regular ‘Passiv-Ersätze’, thus the German *man*-construction.<sup>237</sup> Unlike these, the Earlier Egyptian *s*-construction never grammaticalized: for example, *s* can control anaphoric reference (§2.7.2.1, (c)-(d)). Nor did the *s*-construction ever become an alternative to the passive. Like for other Earlier Egyptian constructions that can be interpreted as active impersonal, this is probably because of the productivity of the passive construction, including passives from intransitives.

There are, on the other hand, specific cases in which the *s*-construction stands in a counterpart relationship to the passive construction. Being a full noun, *s* ‘a man’ is not subject to the constraints to which passives are. The *s*-construction can thereby be used in certain environments in which inflectional passives can not. In at least one instance, it is used with a non-dynamic event, that is, with an event that fails to meet the semantic constraint bearing on passivization in Earlier Egyptian (§2.1.2-3):

#### (i) Mentuwoser (MMA 12.184), 11-12

*n sḏr s ḥkrw r dmi=i*

‘One did not spend the night hungry in my town.’

The construction with *tw* is a later, post-early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty development (e.g. *Neferti* 9c *nn sḏr.tw ḥkr n m(w)t* ‘The night will not be spent starving to death’; §5.1.1.2).

This use remains exceptional, no doubt because of the existence of another construction regularly performing just that function, the zero-subject active construction (§2.7.3.3; e.g. *Ptahhotep* 10 P *sḏr ʔ n=f ḥdr r nb* ‘Because of it one lies anguished every day’).

Considerably more common is the use of the *s*-construction in another function. In the passive construction, the implied Agent can control certain types of secondary predicates (§5.1.4.3) but it can not control anaphoric reference. (One possible exception is only *Ptahhotep* 343 P<sup>238</sup> *n rh.n.tw ḥprt si3=f dw3*, provided this is correctly interpreted to read:<sup>239</sup> ‘One can not know what will happen to the point of perceiving tomorrow(?)’.) Nor can the unexpressed subject in the zero-subject active

237 Grammaticalization is seen notably in the decategorialization of *man*, not a full noun anymore: unlike *Mann*, *man* lacks the article; moreover, the latter can not control anaphoric reference (*man* → <sup>17</sup>*sein X*). (Decategorialization is further reflected in orthography, in the shorter form *man* as opposed to *Mann* and the lack of capitalization). This type of development is not uncommon, e.g. Giacalone Ramat & Sansò (2007); Heine & Kuteva (2002: 208-9).

238 L1 and L2, both here preserved, phrase differently (D 345).

239 Thus Vernus (2006: 153).



construction (§2.7.3) control anaphoric reference. By contrast, *s*, a full noun, can (§2.7.2.1, (c)-(d)). Whenever the (first) direct argument is to be left unspecified, yet supports anaphoric reference, the *s*-construction comes to order. The two following similarly structured sequences demonstrate the counterpart relationship with the passive construction:

(ii.a) *Debate* 109-111

*dd=i n m min*

*sh<sup>c</sup>r s<sub>i</sub> m sp=f<sub>i</sub> bin*

*ssbt=f<sub>i</sub> bw-nb iw=f dw*

‘To whom can I speak today?

When someone causes anger by their bad deed,

they make everyone laugh even though it (*scil.* their bad deed) is evil.’

(ii.b) *Debate* 116-118

*dd=i n m min*

*snw bin*

*inn.tw m drdrw r mtt nt ib*

‘To whom can I speak today?

Friends have become bad,

only strangers are brought for honesty.’

Examples abound (iii). A less common variant is with a quantifier; in this as well, the counterpart relationship with the passive is directly illustrated in text (iv):

(iii) *Merikare* E 137-138

(...) *mi hw s<sub>i</sub> s<sub>3</sub>=f<sub>i</sub> hr sn=f<sub>i</sub>*

‘(...) like when a man strikes his son because of his brother.’

Sim. E 55; E 63-64; *Neferti* 9e *hms s<sub>i</sub> r k<sup>c</sup>h=f<sub>i</sub> s<sub>3</sub>=f<sub>i</sub>* ‘A man will sit bowing his back’; *passim* in Middle Egyptian literary texts. Sim. in Coffin Texts, e.g. CT III 204a (var. mss.) *irr s<sub>i</sub> mrrt=f<sub>i</sub> m hrt-ntr* ‘How a man does what he likes in the necropolis’; CT IV 236j T2Be *dd s<sub>i</sub> r<sub>3</sub> pn k=f<sub>i</sub> r imnt r-s<sub>3</sub> prr=f<sub>i</sub>* ‘A man should say this spell when he enters the west every time(?) after he goes out’; with the first anaphoric expression, here reflexive, cliticizing before *s*, CT III 199a B2L *ist sw<sub>i</sub> s<sub>i</sub> hr gs=f<sub>i</sub> [...]* ‘A man’s raising himself on his [...] side.’ *Passim* through the record.

(iv) *Debate* 111-113

*dd=i n m min*

*iw h<sup>c</sup>q<sub>3</sub>.tw*

*s nb<sub>i</sub> hr itt snw=f<sub>i</sub>*

‘To whom can I speak today?

There is plundering,

everyone is robbing their brothers.’

Sim. 105-106; 119-120.

Similar in principle is (v), except that *s* is here introduced by *in*. The implied Agent, here in a nominally oriented infinitive (§2.3.3), is made explicit, if by a generic *s*, so that it can support anaphoric reference:

(v) Heqanakht I, ro 14

*mk n rnpt is n3 nt b3g in si hr nb=f; hr it=f; hr sn=f;*

‘See, this is not a year for a man to be indolent about his lord, his father, and his brother!’

### 2.7.3 Non-anaphoric zero-subject constructions

The most important among Earlier Egyptian constructions that can read as active impersonal is the construction with a non-anaphoric zero-subject. To describe this, some broader background on zero-subject constructions, anaphoric and non-anaphoric ones, is preliminarily provided.

#### 2.7.3.1 A brief note on active zero-subject constructions

A. In terms of their discourse functions, zero-subject constructions are located along a continuum from anaphoric to non-anaphoric.<sup>240</sup> The lack of an overt subject expression can reflect that the unexpressed subject is anaphoric to an expression in the preceding segment of discourse, a referential entity (i) or a non-referential one (ii)-(iii). The unexpressed subject can also refer back to a situation previously evoked, salient (iv) or more diffuse (v); all the way down the continuum, the unexpressed subject can lack any antecedent in discourse (vi). As already discussed, a similar typology applies to passive zero-subject constructions (§2.5.2.2):

(i) *Urk.* IV 98, 8-10 (Thutmose I’s *Abydos Stela*)

*3bt=i im; n tšy.n=sn; n ir.n 3bw im*

‘My offerings there, they do not swerve, they do not make a pause there.’

(ii) Antef (Strasbourg 345 + Florence 7595), 4-6<sup>241</sup>

*ir hk3 nb spry(=i) r[=f];*

*h<sup>c</sup>.n 3; h<sup>c</sup>y m hsfw(=i) (...)*

‘As to any chief I would petition,  
he was rejoiced in encountering me (...)’

240 Important complementary analyses in Vernus (in press). On ‘zero’ in Egyptian, and the possible misuse of this notation, also Winand (2009); more generally in linguistics, Lemaréchal (1997).

241 Vernus (in press: §9.1, ex.78).

(iii) *Urk. I 39, 12-14* (Niankhsekhmet)

(...) *sk sw rḥ ḥn<sup>c</sup> šms r-dr=f*  
*ir is pry ḥt nb<sub>i</sub> m r3 n ḥm=f*  
*ḥpr ø<sub>i</sub> ḥr-<sup>c</sup>*

‘(...) because he (*scil.* Niankhsekhmet) knew and the whole retinue as well that if anything comes out of His Majesty’s mouth, it occurs immediately (...)’

Sim. e.g. *Ptahhotep 512-514 inn.tw mdt nb<sub>i</sub> n sk.n ø<sub>i</sub> m t3 pn dt* ‘When any word is brought, it can not perish in this land ever’; *Duties of the Vizier R 4* (§2.7.1.1, (i)).

(iv) *Eloquent Peasant B1 306-308*

*iw grt ḥt=i mḥ.t ib=i 3tp*  
*pr ø is m ḥt=i n<sup>c</sup> iry*  
*ngt pw m dnit mw=s 3sw*

‘Now, my body is full, my heart is loaded:  
 Should it (*scil.* the condition just referred to) come out of my body due to its state,  
 this is the breach in a dyke whose waters flow out.’

(v) *Cairo Bowl, inside, 5-7*

*ḥ3 tw ḥr=s min mi m3t grg pr=s st.t n=k mw*  
*ir nfr.n ø m-<sup>c</sup>=k*  
*k3 pr=k ḥb3*

‘Take care of it today anew so that her household is founded and that water be libated for you.  
 If there is nothing as an action of yours (lit. with you),  
 then your house will be hacked up.’

(vi) *Ptahhotep 482*

*ir pr ø m mḥr*  
*n ḥk.n ø*

‘When something comes out of the storeroom,  
 it does not go in again.’

B. Turning to the semantic conditions under which the zero-subject construction is licensed, these are mostly from inanimate and non-singular participants; an exception is only (ii). In most cases, unexpressed subjects stand for ‘things’ or ‘words’ ((iii), (vi)), or even situations (iv)-(v). The constructions are negative ((i), (iii) (*Ptahhotep 512-514*), (v), (vi)), and/or imperfective ((i), (iii) (*Ptahhotep 512-514*), (vi)), and/or conditional (ii)-(vi): these imply a non-referential reading (that is, one by which no specific referent in the world of discourse is evoked). In (ii), the semantically conditional construction, with a quantified nominal expression additionally elaborated (*sp<sub>ry</sub>=i*)), also imply a non-referential reading, making the zero-subject construction acceptable with an animate participant (not ‘a chief’ in particular, but ‘any chief’ ‘I

might petition', thus a potential multiplicity of 'chiefs'). Unexpressed active subjects thus typically score low on the related scales of animacy and individuation, and typically occur in contexts that imply a non-referential reading. Similar observations were made with respect to unexpressed subjects in passive constructions (§2.5.2.2).

This semantic condition is illustrated further by the contrast between two constructions in the same text. Within the overall bipartite articulation of Weni's inscription, an episode by which the king provides Weni with a sarcophagus is mirrored by and resonates with the substantially more developed episode in which Weni provides for the funerary equipment of the king. The formulations are parallel to one another, with events of directed motion oriented on inanimate subjects and agency expressed indirectly through *m-ʿ* (§2.2.2.1). In the first, the subject, referring to a singular item, is overt. In the second, the subject, referring to a whole series of elements previously described, remains unexpressed:

(vii.a) *Urk.* I 99, 15 (Weni)

***i.n=f m-ʿ=f m sʔt ʿ3 n hnw (...)***

'It (*scil.* the sarcophagus provided to Weni by the king) came through his agency (*scil.* the god's sealer's) in a great barge of the Residence (...)'

(vii.b) *Urk.* I 107, 7 (Weni)

***hḏ.n ø m-ʿ(=i) r hʿ-nfr-mr-n-rʿ (...)***

'They (*scil.* the stones and architectural parts for Merenre's pyramid complex) came downstream through my agency to Khanefer-Merenre (...)'

The same contrast was also described in passive zero-subject constructions (§2.5.2.2.D).

C. The zero-subject constructions described so far relate to the passive only inasmuch as they consist in dynamic events oriented on a non-agentive participant (for these more generally, §2.2.2.1-2). However, they are not counterparts, nor alternatives, to the passive. Passives have an Agent in their semantic representation. In a passive, the (typically) unexpressed participant is therefore animate; in the constructions presented above, the unexpressed participant is inanimate.

Put differently, events in the passive construction and the ones in the zero-subject constructions described so far are of different types, even if their expression may involve the same lexical verb (viii). This difference correlates with different expressions of agency in syntactic periphery (ix):

(viii.a) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 307-308

***pr ø is m ht=i n ʿ iry ngt pw m dnit mw=s ʔsw***

'Should it come out of my body due to its state, this is the breach in a dyke whose waters flow out.'

(viii.b) *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 13

(...) **pr** *r* **hn***mw***t**=*sn* (...)

‘(...) their wells have been gone to (...)’

Sim. Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.η.2 *n* **pr.n.t** *n* **snd**=*f* ‘There was no going out for fear of them.’

*With an expression of agency*

(ix.a) *Urk.* I 107, 7 (Weni)

**hd.n** **ø** **m**-<sup>c</sup>(=*i*) *r* **h**<sup>c</sup>-*nfr*-*mr.n*-*r*-<sup>c</sup> (...)

‘They came downstream through my agency to Khanefer-Merenre (...)’

Sim. *Urk.* I 108, 10 (Weni) **hpr.n** **ø** **m**-<sup>c</sup>(=*i*) *mr-ḳd* (...) ‘It happened through my agency completely (...)’; Cairo Bowl 5-7 (iv).

(ix.b) CT I 73d-74b B1P

*iw* **h3** *n=k* **tn** *bik*

*iw* **ng** *n=k* **tn** *smn*

‘There has been screaming for you by the falcon,  
there has been cackling for you by the *semen*-goose.’

Illustrated with a verb of expressive speech (passives of verbs of directed motion with an expression of the Agent happen not to be documented in the record). For the lexical verbs themselves, e.g. *Semna Despatch* I, x+13 *iw* **hnt** *r* *bw* *ii.n=sn im m hrw pn* ‘It was travelled south to the place where they had come from on this (same) day’; *Ipuwer* 3.6-7 *n ms* **hd.tw** *r* *kpn min* ‘There has been no travelling to Byblos today.’

To receive an impersonal reading—to be, in other words, a counterpart, or an alternative, to the passive—a construction must involve the same type of participants, that is, animate ones. In addition, the identity of the unexpressed subject must be unspecified; it can not, in other words, be anaphoric. Among constructions that meet this twofold condition, two cases are to be distinguished:

- When the unexpressed non-anaphoric animate expression is agentive, the construction provides an alternative to the passive (§2.7.3.2.B);
- When the unexpressed non-anaphoric animate expression is non-agentive, the construction provides a counterpart to the passive (§2.7.3.3).

#### 2.7.3.2 A rare alternative to the passive: Unexpressed agentive participants in the *sdm.n(y)* construction

Unexpressed agentive participants are exceedingly rare in subject position—except in one construction, *sdm.n* **ø**. In this, the unexpressed subject is anaphoric, either to a left-dislocated noun phrase (*N<sub>i</sub> sdm.n* **ø**; §2.2.4.1.2, (b)) or to a noun phrase in the preceding clause. In the anaphoric *sdm.n* **ø** construction—which incorporates the ‘prepositional’ adverb *n(y)* (§2.2.4.1.2)—the subject is always plural, with varying degrees of individuation.

Leaving this specific construction aside, unexpressed subjects tend to score low in animacy and individuation in all other constructions (§2.7.3.1); they are therefore hardly ever Agents. Whenever an agentive participant is to be left unexpressed, a passive construction—a construction that extracts the Agent from its subject position—is almost invariably resorted to. There are very few occurrences, however, of unexpressed agentive subjects. These fall into two types: while the first implies an anaphoric relation, the second does not. Only the latter can be described as an alternative to the passive.

A. In three occurrences, an anaphoric agentive participant is left unexpressed in constructions other than the anaphoric *sdm.n*  $\emptyset$ . In (i), the unexpressed subject is anaphoric to the subject of the preceding clause; the relation is inter-clausal. In (ii) and (iii), it is anaphoric to a left-dislocated noun phrase:

(i) Pyr 616a-c<sup>TM</sup> (PT 364)

*ink.n n=k nbt-hwt<sub>i</sub> ʕwt=k nbt m rn=s pw n sš3t nbt kdw*  
*sd3.n*  $\emptyset_i$  *n=k sn*

‘Nephthys has collected all your limbs for you in this her name of Seshat-lady-of-builders,  
 and has made them sound for you.’

The construction differs from *sdm.n*  $\emptyset$  expressing an inter-clausal anaphoric relation because unlike in this the subject is here singular and maximally individuated. One wonders whether the fact that the second clause includes three pronominal expressions, two anaphoric ones and one pointing to the addressee, may have played a role in triggering the omission of the subject, the participant highest in discourse topicality among the two that entertain an anaphoric relation with the preceding clause.

*Eloquent Peasant* B1 225-226 is uncertain as a parallel as the lack of a subject could well be a mere scribal omission:<sup>242</sup> *iw.in rf shty pn<sub>i</sub> r spr n=f 4-nw sp gm.n*  
*ʕ<sub>i</sub>ʔ<=>fʔ sw hr prt (...)* ‘Then this peasant came to petition him a fourth time and <he><sup>ʔ</sup> found him coming out (...)’.

(ii) Sinai 136 W 1<sup>243</sup>

*iw=sn<sub>i</sub> dd ʕ<sub>i</sub><sup>PLUR</sup> hft spr=i*

‘They used to say when I arrived.’

An isolated instance of *NP<sub>i</sub> sdm ʕ<sub>i</sub>* with an agentive subject. In other occurrences of this rare construction,<sup>244</sup> the subject is inanimate and low in individuation (§2.2.4.1.2, (b)).

242 Thus e.g. Parkinson (2012a: 188).

243 After Vernus (in press: §4.2.1.2, ex.42).

244 Vernus (in press: §4.2.1.2, ex.40-41; 43-45a).

(iii) *Ipuwer* 3.10-11<sup>245</sup>

*iw ms 3bw tnt [sp3w]t<sup>2</sup> sm<sup>c</sup>w<sub>i</sub> n b3k ø<sub>i</sub> n [h3]ʿyt*

‘But now, Elephantine, Thinis, and the nomes(?) of Upper Egypt, they have not worked because of strife.’

The construction, which is apparently unparalleled, is similar to *N<sub>i</sub> sdm.t ø<sub>i</sub>* which is common in *Ipuwer*, and specific to that text (§3.1.2.NB).

B. Equally rare are cases when the unexpressed agentive subject is not anaphoric. The reference of the Agent is thereby left unspecified and the construction functions as an alternative to the passive:

(iv) Cairo Bowl, inside, 5

*iw b3.n ø pr=k*

‘They destroyed your house.’

(v) Irtysen (Louvre C14), 12

(...) *nn rdt m3h sn ht*

*n i<sup>c</sup>.n ø n mw grt*

‘(...) without letting fire consume them,  
without people cleaning them by water either.’

(vi) *Ptahhotep* 353-354

*wḥm mdt m3*

*n sdm.n ø st*

*r B m dd rs-sy*

‘Repeat a matter that has been heard (*scil.* for which there are witnesses)!

One can not get information about it?—

Let go (lit. to the ground)! Do not speak at all!’<sup>246</sup>

In all three cases, the form is a *sdm.n=f*.<sup>247</sup> The construction is therefore similar to the one in e.g. *Debate* 104 *hnmsw nw min n mr.ny* ‘The friends of today, they do not love’, with a *sdm.n(y)*. This form includes the ‘prepositional adverb’ *n(y)* (§2.2.4.1.2.A); while the subject is left unexpressed, the lack of an expression of the subject is marked on the verb. The construction thereby differs from genuine zero-subject constructions discussed in the present section. The ‘prepositional adverb’ originally points to diffuse participants (‘to it’, secondarily ‘to them’). When the

<sup>245</sup> Restoration after Enmarch (2005: 29).

<sup>246</sup> Following the interpretation by Vernus (2010<sup>2</sup>: 131).

<sup>247</sup> In *Sinuhe* B 263-264, a *sdm.in=f* apparently lacks an expressed subject: *rd.in | st3.tw msw-nsw dd.in ḥm=f* (...). However, the lack of a subject is here at a line break. Moreover, if the construction was a zero-subject one, this would mean that someone, not the king, had the royal children brought, which is problematic both semantically and encyclopedically (‘The children were made to be ushered in (...’). Accordingly, the passage must in all likelihood be emended: ‘Then <His Majesty> had the royal children ushered in (...) Then His Majesty said (...)’.

unexpressed subject of *sdm.n(y)* is agentive, the construction relates more broadly to the general third person plural – passive connection discussed previously (§2.7.1).

C. Altogether unique is a case of a zero-subject construction in which the omitted subject, with no anaphoric antecedent, is subsequently taken up by an *in N* phrase. As already discussed, the sentence displays various other exceptional or even unparalleled constructions, strongly suggesting that this may be a token of a non-standard register, not otherwise documented in the extant record (§2.2.4.3, (v)):

(vii) P. UC 32201, ro 13-14

(...) *rd.n* *ø* *p3 imw h3 in b3kt* *sw 3tp*

‘(...) one had the ship sent off—Baqet had—once fully loaded.’

### 2.7.3.3 The counterpart of the passive with events that do not meet the semantic condition for passivization

A. Occurrences of a construction with a non-anaphoric unexpressed subject standing for an animate, but non-agentive, participant are the following:

(i) Antef (BM EA 1628), 8

*n rd=i m(w)t ø*

‘I did not let die.’

(ii) Ptahhotep 10 P<sup>248</sup>

*sd r ø n=f hdr r<sup>c</sup> nb*

‘Because of it one lies anguished every day.’

(iii) Sinuhe B 59<sup>249</sup>

*n rd.n=f hms ø<sup>A1-PLUR</sup> h3 ib=f*

‘He does not allow that one rests around his heart.’

(iv) Debate 108<sup>250</sup>

*h t p ø h r bin*

‘One is content about evil.’

(v) Debate 123-124<sup>251</sup>

*i w š w ø m k-ib*

‘One lacks intimates.’

248 A much-disputed passage. For the various options that have been contemplated and the analysis that supports the reading here presented, Stauder (2013a: 478-9). Regarding the construction *sd r N PsP r<sup>c</sup> nb*—with *r<sup>c</sup> nb* having scope not over the immediately preceding secondary predicate (the pseudoparticiple) but over *sd r*—also Pyr. 123k<sup>TMN</sup> (PT 206) *sd r N wd3 r<sup>c</sup> nb* ‘N will lie sound, every day.’

249 Stauder (2013a: 479, for the analysis; 453, for the later witnesses).

250 On the reading, Stauder (2013a: 480); Allen (2011a: 92).

251 On the reading, Stauder (2013a: 480).



The following complex sequence also belongs here. The split column in two out of three witnesses associates *smn* and *iry* with one another, while *hṭp* is on another level, separated from *smn* and *iry* by a *iw* in all witnesses. *Smn* and *iry*, two dynamic events, are V-passives of O-detransitivized events, thus subjectless passives, here with a strong thetic effect (§2.6.1.1, (viii)). *Hṭp*, a non-dynamic event, is in the zero-subject active construction here under discussion.<sup>252</sup>

(vi) CT II 166k-167b

*iw nṯrw mdw=sn im<sup>sic</sup> itin irt hr ʕt*

B2L *smn/iry* (split column)

*iw hṭp ø hr=s*

B2P *iry mn<sup>sic</sup>*

*iw hṭp ø hr=s*

Sq4C *iw smn/iry* (split column)

*iw hṭp ø hr=s*

‘The gods speak of this(?)<sup>253</sup> great eye of Horus:

There has been creating, there has been establishing—

One is content about it.’

Sim. CT II 175b, 175f Sq3Sq *iw irw smn hṭp ø hr=s*.

C. As discussed, passivization underlies the condition that the event must include an Agent in its semantic representation. Intransitives that do can thereby be passivized regularly in Earlier Egyptian; intransitives that do not can not be passivized (§2.1.2-3). The above illustrates the use of the zero-subject construction precisely with the latter type of events: *mwt*, *sdr*, *hms*, *hṭp*, or *šw*. When used non-anaphorically and for an unexpressed animate and non-agentive participant, the zero-subject construction thus provides the regular counterpart to the passive for those events that fail to meet the semantic condition for passivization.

This counterpart relationship can be illustrated further, contrasting the above zero-subject constructions for events that lack an Agent in their semantic representation with passives for intransitives that have one, in the same text (vii) or even in direct sequence to one another (viii)-(ix):

(vii) *Ptahhotep* P

293 *pr.tw hr irt=f(...)*

‘One will renounce applying it (...)’<sup>254</sup>

10 *sdr ø n=f hdr rʕ nb*

‘Because of it one lies anguished, every day.’

252 Different reading by Vernus (in press: §12.6.2, ex.155), with three V-passives on the same level.

253 Faulkner (1973-1977: I, 119, n.12).

254 Sim. e.g. 480 *n wh.n.tw m š3 sw* ‘one can not escape from who has fated it’; 586 *sw3.t hr spw=f(...)* ‘His (good) deeds will be passed over (...)’.



*B* expresses one that obtains only in time.<sup>256</sup> Reflecting these determinations, the construction *A m Pass\_part* is common notably in literary laments as an integral part of their *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation, e.g.:

(i) *Khakheperreseneb* vso 2-3

*dd hr m ddw n=f hr*

‘He who used to give orders is (now) one to whom orders are given.’

Sim. e.g. *Neferti 3i mk rf wn sr m pth {§3<sup>c</sup>.n=k im} <r> t3* ‘Look, moreover, the official is (now) one cast down to the ground’; *passim*.

Among various non-verbal constructions, the present section focuses on *nfr sw* with a passive participle as its predicate: *smn<sub>Pass\_part</sub> sw<sub>O</sub>* ‘he is established’ (dubbed after an example quoted below, §2.8.3, (xi)). In its relation to two other constructions in which the subject is also an O, *P/No PsP* and clauses with inflectional passives, the *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* construction demonstrates the flexibility of Earlier Egyptian in how state-of-affairs oriented on O can be presented regarding their relation to linguistic time.

### 2.8.1 *Nfr sw*: Constructional semantics

A. *Nfr sw* expresses qualifying semantics: the relation between the entity represented by the subject and the condition represented by the predicate is presented as inherent, in other words as not subject to the flow of time.<sup>257</sup> *Nfr sw* and *NP PsP* entertain a close relationship, as both express, or can express, non-dynamic state-of-affairs. This proximity probably for example accounts for cases of morphological renewal in the ending of the pseudoparticiple: from Middle Egyptian on, the construction of the third person feminine singular pseudoparticiple (*NP nfr.t(i)*) is thus occasionally replaced by *NP nfr s(i)*.<sup>258</sup> As to the ending of the first person plural—originally *.nw* (in line with e.g. Akkadian *-á:nu*)—this was rapidly superseded by an innovative ending *.wn*<sup>259</sup> (not paralleled in cognate forms), arguably reanalyzed from *nfr.w n* (i.e. from *nfr sw* with ‘exclamative’ *w(i)*).<sup>260</sup>

Such close semantic relationship notwithstanding, the two constructions, *nfr sw* and *NP PsP*, contrast in a principled manner. When expressing a state, the latter expresses that this state is bound in time, in particular that it did not always obtain. For its part, *nfr sw* expresses a state-of-affairs that lies outside any temporal contingency.<sup>261</sup> Significantly, *NP PsP* often combines with *iw*, whose functions notably including anchoring in time (§4.3.6.1); *nfr sw*, by contrast, never does. Illustrative of the contrast is also the avoidance of the pseudoparticiple in Old Kingdom theophoric names;<sup>262</sup> as has been established on grounds independent from

256 Winand (2006: 160-3).

257 Winand (2006: 156-7; 163-5).

258 E.g. Vernus (1995: 11, n.29; 1984a: 200); Westendorf (1962: §171, §188; 1953: 71-5); Gardiner (§1957<sup>3</sup>: §374 *fine*).

259 Documented in the Old Kingdom already (Edel 1955-1964: §574).

260 Allen (2013a: 67).

261 Winand (2006: 244-6; 250); for the versatile semantics of the form, §4.3.3.1.

262 Fischer (1996).

the above considerations, a written sequence such as  $\langle r^c - wr \rangle$  is to be read as  $wr - r^c$  (*nfr sw*) ‘Re-is-(inherently-)great’, not as  $^{\dagger}r^c - wr$ . In view of the above, the latter would have had the culturally problematic effect of expressing that Re at some point in time might not have been ‘great’ like he now is.

B. As with all matters to do with linguistic semantics, the issue lies in how a state-of-affairs is presented linguistically, not in what might obtain in the world of reference. This may be briefly illustrated in *Sinuhe*. In (i), *NP PsP* is used for a state that has a clear left bound in time: Senwosret, of whom *Sinuhe* had been telling Amunenshi, has just become the new king. This directly accords with the constructional semantics of *NP PsP*:

(i) *Sinuhe* B 75-76

*hr hm kmt nfr.t <n>-ntt s rh.t rwd=f*

‘Then, to be sure, Egypt is fine for it knows that he (*scil.* Senwosret) is firm.’

More remarkable are (ii) and (iii) with *nfr sw* used in reference to a state-of-affairs that in the world of reference would also have had an inception (*Sinuhe* was not always with Amunenshi and he was not always close to dying). Among other things, *Sinuhe* is about problematizing cultural values; different stages in *Sinuhe*’s progress, first centrifugal then centripetal, thereby have paradigmatic value. In (ii), *Sinuhe* is said to be well, a paradoxical situation as he has just left Egypt and as the statement is made by a foreign ruler. In (iii), *Sinuhe* is presented in an altogether different situation, the one in which the funerary values associated with Egyptian élite culture have inescapable relevance. In both cases, abstract situations, in part echoing and mirroring one another within the overall discourse developed in the *Tale*, are exposed; to highlight this, *nfr sw*—not *NP PsP*—is selected. As (iii) further illustrates, such thorough-going linguistic subtlety was not comprehended in AOS anymore, which regularizes to the construction with the pseudoparticiple:

(ii) *Sinuhe* B 31

*nfr tw hn<sup>c</sup>=i*

‘You are well-off with me.’

(iii) *Sinuhe* B 170-171

*tkn wi n wd3*

‘I am close to departing.’

AOS [t]k[n].kw n wd3.

## 2.8.2 *Nfr sw* not with adjectives: The active constructions $h^c sw_s$ , $rh sw_A$

According with the constructional semantics of *nfr sw* just described, the construction is found most commonly with adjectives. Yet it can also be extended to participles of verbs that do not denote qualities.

A. Intransitive verbs found in the *nfr sw* construction are such that denote events possibly conceived of as inherently related to an entity. Significantly, the events in (a)-(e) are all atelic. In general they do not imply an Agent either: while *tkn* (b), *h<sup>c</sup>i* (c), and *ršw* (d) can in other constructions be occasionally construed as implying an agent—when denoting the vocal or gestural expression of ‘rejoicing’ and ‘being happy’—they do not imply any in the *nfr sw* construction; only *nh* (e) is inherently agentive, yet this aspect is backgrounded in the *nfr sw* construction. Contexts are a eulogy (*Sinuhe* B 66-67, (c)) and statements of general validity (the others); both are presented as unbounded in time:

(a) *Ptahhotep* 410 ***nh sw hr=s*** ‘He is alive through it.’

(b) *Sinuhe* B 170-171 ***tkn wt n wd3*** ‘I am close to departing.’

(c) *Sinuhe* B 66-67 ***h<sup>c</sup> s im=f r ntr=sn*** ‘It (*scil.* his city, in reference to Senwosret) rejoices at him more than at its god’; *Ptahhotep* 270 L2 ***h<sup>c</sup> sw im r sprw nb*** ‘He rejoices at it more than any petitioner (...)’; *passim*.

(d) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 124 ***rš-wy sdd dpt.n=f sn ht mr*** ‘How happy is he who relates what he has tasted so that painful things pass!’<sup>263</sup>

(e) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 148-149 ***nh-wy m3tr sky=k*** ‘How miserable (lit. lamenting) is the poor man you destroy!’<sup>264</sup> (*sim.* B1 235-236).

B. The construction is occasionally extended to active transitives, most commonly with *rh* (i),<sup>265</sup> but also with *mri* (ii), and with yet other events (iii). In the examples quoted, the contexts are all very strongly eulogistic:

(i) *Urk.* I 129, 5 (Harkhuf, the king’s letter)<sup>266</sup>

in ***rh tw irt mrrt hzzt nb=k***

‘Assuredly you know to do what your master loves and praises.’

*Sim.* e.g. *Urk.* I 63, 4; 179, 17; *Urk.* IV 1279, 11; 13.

(ii) *Siut* IV, 19

***mr-w tw ntr[=k] nitwy it(=i)-[ib(=i)] s3 hty***

‘How your city god loves you, Khety son of Itiibi!

(iii) *Loyaliste*, short version (Sehetepibre), 2.10-3.3

***shd-w sw t3wy r itn***

***sw3d sw r h<sup>c</sup>p 3***

‘He (*scil.* the king) illuminates the Two Lands more than the sun-disk;  
He makes thrive more than a great inundation.’

263 Parkinson (1997a: 99, n.16) comments: ‘the exclamation asserts a central morale of the tale: that telling a misfortune can be cathartic (...)’.

264 Transl. Parkinson (2012a: 126).

265 For constructional alternations with *rh* discussed in a broader context, Winand (2006: 243-4).

266 On generic aspects of the king’s letter in the Old Kingdom, Eichler (1991); these are directly relevant to the eulogistic character, and thereby grammar, of statements such as the above.

Expanded in the long version (New Kingdom copies) by two additional *nfr sw* constructions, with active intransitives:<sup>267</sup>

*shd-wy sw t3wy r itn*  
*wbd hh=f r ns n sdt*  
*snw(h) sw <m> 3t=f r ht*  
*shd<sup>sic</sup>-wy sw r h'py ʕ3*

‘He (*scil.* the king) illuminates the Two Lands more than the sun-disk;  
 His heat burns more than the tongue of the flame;  
 He consumes in his moment more than fire;  
 He illuminates more than a great inundation.’

As is already illustrated in the second clause of (iii) (*sw3d sw r h'p ʕ3*), the construction extends to O-detransitivized transitives. Similarly, with *mri* as in (ii):

(iv) *Neferti* 10a

*r3 nb mh m mrw wi*

‘Every mouth is full of “I am in want” (...)’<sup>268</sup>

In the events denoted by the above syntactically transitive verbs—*rḥ* ‘know’, *mri* ‘love’, *shd* ‘illuminate’ and *sw3d* ‘make thrive’ (the last two with the king likened to the sun as its subject)—the A argument does not have the semantic role of an agent. Nor does the O of these same events—including, in the case of the O-detransitivized events *sw3d* (ii) and *mr* (iv), the implied O—have the semantic role of a patient. Directly related to this, all these events are presented as non-dynamic. On these three accounts, the events thereby score very low on the scale of semantic transitivity<sup>269</sup>—their syntactic transitivity notwithstanding. Significantly, the one syntactically transitive verb most commonly found in the *nfr sw* construction, *rḥ* (i), is also the only syntactically transitive verb regularly conjugated in the pseudoparticiple with an active reading; as discussed, it is precisely this very low semantic transitivity of *rḥ* that permits the pseudoparticiple of this verb to be oriented on the A, not on the O as it is otherwise regular with syntactically transitive verbs (§2.3.1). Another syntactically transitive verb found in the *nfr sw* construction, *mri* ((ii), (iv)) is itself found at least once in the same active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple:

(v) CT VI 220j L2Li

*i.mr=k nd=k irt=k m-ʕ ir[...] n=k*

‘I desire that you rescue your eye from the one who acts for you.’

267 On the long version of *Loyaliste* as an expansion from the short one, rather than the reverse, Stauder (2013a: 293-301); on this passage specifically, Stauder (2013a: 297-8).

268 Possibly also *Debate* 150-151 *mr wi ʕ3* (tentatively Vernus 1994: 331, n.24; other readings are possible, e.g. Allen 2011b: 109-10).

269 On semantic transitivity, as distinct from syntactic transitivity, Hopper & Thompson (1980). The concept is also relevant to the analysis of the accomplished passive paradigm: §4.3.4.1; §4.3.4.3; §4.3.5.5.1.

2.8.3 *Nfr sw* with passives: The *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* construction

A. When the participle in the *nfr sw* construction is passive, the construction is oriented on a participant—the O—that is inherently non-agentive. The events to be found in the *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* construction are therefore not subject to the strong constraints of very low semantic transitivity as just described for the case of active participles of transitive verbs in the same construction (§2.8.2.B). Accordingly, the construction *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* is found with a broader range of events and is significantly more common in text.

Typical contexts include self-eulogy (i)-(ii) and, more broadly, descriptions of state-of-affairs presented as not contingent upon time (iii)-(iv), including for example a description of a diving being (v):

(i) Senedjemib Inti, Inscription A, 12

(...) *n špss mnḥ mr w hr izzi r mrt(=i) nb*

‘(...) for I was eminent, efficient, and beloved with Isesi more than any peer of mine.’

With three participles for a single subject.

(ii) Senti (BM EA 574), 5

*hs wt m hrw pn r sf*

‘I am more praised today than yesterday.’

Sim. Wepwawetaa (Munich Gl. WAF 35), 17 *mr wt m stp-s3* ‘I was beloved in the palace’; also, outside a eulogistic context, but also with an event of praising, Ptahhotep 623 P *hs grt msy n=fsw* ‘Favored is the one to whom he was born.’

(iii) *Urk.* IV 99, 15-17 (Thutmosis I’s *Abydos Stela*)

*dsr st r ḥprt m pt*

*ḥ3p st r šhrw dw3t*

[w3š] *st r imiw-nnw*

‘They are more recondite than what has come to existence in the sky,  
more concealed than the conditions of the underworld,  
more exalted than those who are in the Nun.’

(iv) Book of the Dead 17, 107 Nu

*kd-wy pr=k tm*

*snt-wy ḥwt=k rwtj*

‘How well built is your house, Atum!  
How well founded is your abode, Ruti!’

(v) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 66

*rk sw r ḥnt*

‘He was bent to the front.’

According with the constructional semantics of the higher-order *nfr sw* construction, *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* is not uncommon in statements of general validity, thus in Middle Egyptian literary texts (vi)–(vii), and beyond (viii):

(vi) *Ptahhotep* 58

*dg3 mdt nfrt r w3d*

‘Fine speech is more hidden than malachite.’

(vii) *Merikare* E 130–131

*hn rmṯw ʿwt nt nṯr*

‘Mankind is taken care for, the cattle of the god.’

(viii) (Edel 1955–1964: §911)

*nfr s mḥ.t r wnn=s šw.t*

‘It (*scil.* the carrying chair) is nicer full than empty.’

Sim. Mereruka 53.

With *mri*—a verb denoting an event low in semantic transitivity (§2.8.2.B)—the same construction is also found in a zero-subject variant, with a cataphoric zero;<sup>270</sup> the A argument, an Experiencer, is morphosyntactically realized as a dative:

(ix) *Urk.* I 232, 10–12 (Werra)

*sk dd.n ḥm=f*

*mry ø n ḥ[m](=t) wd3=f wrt ny skr n=f*

*sk sw [špss] ḥr ḥm=f r z nb*

‘His Majesty said:

“It is My Majesty’s desire that he be very well without there being any striking at him.”

For he was eminent with His Majesty more than any man.’

Sim. *Urk.* I 70, 8 (Inti) *mry ø n=sn irt* ‘It was pleasant for them to work.’

B. Unlike the passive construction, *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* can not be combined with the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase—event though passive participles used in other environments very much can. This demonstrates how *smn sw<sub>O</sub>*, inheriting the constructional semantics of the higher-order *nfr sw*, does not accommodate dynamicity as would be implied by the *in N* phrase and more generally present in the passive construction.

In contrast to the pseudoparticiple oriented on O, which can also express non-dynamic state-of-affairs (secondary states), *smn sw<sub>O</sub>*—like *nfr sw* with active participles (§2.8.2)—expresses that a state-of-affairs is construed as having no temporal left bound (compare the contexts just illustrated, A). While the state-of-affairs described may have had an inception in the world of reference, the *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* construction thus serves to present these as if they had not. For example in (x), a ‘house’ must have been ‘founded’ at some point, but this is entirely irrelevant in the

270 For the broader cataphoric zero-subject construction, Vernus (in press: §2.2.3, §8.1).



perspective under which the state-of-affairs is here viewed (compare the immediately preceding clause, *3h-w bit (...)*). In (xi), the sequence of the clauses quoted directly implies that the current state-of-affairs is the result of the acts of ‘digging’ etc.: *NP PsP*, the dedicated Earlier Egyptian resultative construction, would therefore have been appropriate. Yet, in the context of a funerary text, a different perspective, unbound to time, is selected:

(x) Siut III, 12

*3h-w bit nfrt n irr s(i)*

**grg-w pr=f hr sh[r]**

‘How useful is a good character for the one who has earned it!

How well-founded is his house in the possession of (good) plans!’

(xi) CT VII 239i P.Gard.II

*iw šd.n=f š=f ir.n=f m3w=f*

**s<sup>c</sup>h sw smn sw m st=f**

‘He has dug his canal and performed his just deeds;

He is distinguished<sup>271</sup> and he is established in his place.’

Literary laments, by virtue of their general *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation, favor constructions that imply a left temporal bound, such as *A m B* and *NP PsP*. Alongside the latter, *nfr sw* with participles is found as well, the alternation between the two constructions being exploited for stylistic effect. Thus, with intransitives, *Neferti* 4d *t3 3k r-3w n hpr d3t* ‘The whole land is perished, no remnant has come into being’; *Neferti* 10b *3k t3 š3.tw r=f hpw* ‘the land is perished, laws are fated against it.’ In the following passage, *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* (in sequence to *nfr sw* with participles from intransitives) presents the situation the speaker is in as inherent. This situation may have had a beginning in real world, yet the linguistic perspective on the situation erases this—like the stages in Sinuhe’s progress (§2.8.1.B):

(xii) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 13

*snni wi hr ib=i*

*whd sw*

**h3p ht=t hr=f**

‘I am in distress because of my heart,

it suffers,

my body is concealed because of it.’

With a similar articulation, not in a literary lament, Book of the Dead 175<sup>272</sup> *snb-wy wi šw-wy hr=i sts-wy wi r wd(t)=k n hr=i hr hkrw* ‘How well I am! How free is my face! How relieved I am according to what you order to my face about the ornaments!’

271 With *s<sup>c</sup>h* ‘auszeichnen, in Binden hüllen’ (*Wb.* IV, 50.8-15; *TLA* #129110).

272 Vernus (1994: 331, ex.19).

C. The construction *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* can have further semantic effect. In particular, there are contexts in which a reading as a potential passive is invited, or even the preferable option.<sup>273</sup>

(xiii) *Merikare* E 128-129

*šsp bit nt k3-ib r iw3 n ir isft*

‘The character of the right-hearted one is more acceptable than the ox of the evil-doer.’

(xiv) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 3

(...) *hr-ntt rf whmw dddt iw dddt dd*

‘(...) for what has been said can only be repeated, yet what has been said is said.’

Also with *dd*, the much-discussed *Merikare* E 91<sup>274</sup> *dd swt n3 gr n pdt* (...) ‘Now, this can also be said about (lit., to) the Bow-people: (...)’.

## 2.9 Part I, opening up: Earlier Egyptian and early Semitic detransitive morphology in contrast

To provide a broader context to the above discussion, the Earlier Egyptian passive is set in a contrastive perspective with some relevant elements in Semitic detransitive voice. I first consider the unmarked passive participle and the perfective V-passive, two forms that involve stem alternations. I then discuss the Earlier Egyptian prefix *n*- and T-passives with a view on the related Semitic and Afroasiatic categories.

### 2.9.1 (Originally) perfective forms: Unmarked passive participles and the V-passive

#### 2.9.1.1 Passive participles

A. Earlier Egyptian has two passive participles, one unmarked, the other marked for imperfective semantics to do with verbal plurality (of participants and/or of the event).<sup>275</sup> These correspond to two active participles in a one-to-one relationship. The Earlier Egyptian participial paradigm is thereby quadripartite and symmetrical. This is not unremarkable typologically: many languages, including Semitic ones, have only two participles, one active, the other resultative and/or passive. Furthermore, in languages with bipartite paradigms, these two participles differ aspectually: they are not symmetrical to one another.

<sup>273</sup> These examples and the associated analyses by Vernus (1995: 9-11).

<sup>274</sup> Once interpreted as a V-passive (e.g. Westendorf 1953: 42-3; also Seibert 1967: 90, n.1; Loprieno 1988: 23, n.1); for the interpretation as a *nfr sw* construction, Quack (1992: 55, n.a).

<sup>275</sup> References to the discussion: §4.4.1.2, n.215.

In bipartite participial paradigms, active participles are typically imperfective. A participle is oriented on a noun that it elaborates semantically. Accordingly, an active participle typically expresses a habitual or general event. The correlation is also illustrated in the later history of Egyptian itself. Beginning in Earlier Egyptian already, analytic strategies for relativization in the relative present tense first develop, then spread and generalize, with progressive aspect (*nty hr sdm*). Meanwhile synthetic strategies (participles) remained productive with general or habitual events for centuries. In Late Egyptian, *nty hr sdm* thus contrasts with *sdm* in the relative present tense: the latter expresses general/habitual events.

In the same bipartite paradigms, non-active participles are typically perfective, and more precisely resultative. Being an attributive form oriented on a noun, a non-active participle often expresses a state or an event resulting in a state, in which a participant, a S or an O, finds itself. Bipartite participial paradigms and the associated aspectual screw are illustrated for example by Latin *scribens* vs. *scriptus*, English *writing* vs. *written*, Arabic *kaatib* vs. *maktuub*.<sup>276</sup> That the perfective participle tends to be more specifically resultative is illustrated for example by Latin *pransus* ‘having eaten breakfast’: with an event of ingestion, the orientation is here on the A, not on the O, because events of ingestion score low in semantic transitivity, do not affect their O, and can even be construed as affecting their A.

B. At least one of the two Earlier Egyptian unmarked participles, and possibly both, are morphologically related to Semitic forms. Based on converging Coptic evidence (lexicalized nouns for stressed forms and conjunct participles for unstressed ones), the Earlier Egyptian active participle was based on a stem Ca:CaC- (with nominal endings). This stem is morphologically similar to the present-active participle of the G-stem in Akkadian, *paarisu* (where the form has a limited functional yield)<sup>277</sup> and to the present-active participles in West Semitic languages, such as Biblical Hebrew *kooteb* or Arabic *kaatib* (where the same form functions as a regular participle). While the ultimate origin of the pattern is disputed, it goes back to proto-Semitic,<sup>278</sup> and beyond, at least to a level that includes Egyptian.

The evidence for reconstructing the Earlier Egyptian unmarked passive participle is sparse and in part difficult to interpret because not all Coptic deverbal nouns that may be possible lexicalized reflexes of the form go back to actual passive participles. With verbs of the major inflectional classes, the form was arguably based on an underlying stem \*\*CaC~C- (with nominal endings, resulting in forms with a stem CaCC-); with long verbs, this could have been based on a stem CaCaC-.<sup>279</sup> This stem would at least be compatible with the one of the Akkadian past participle (often referred to as ‘verbal adjective’), CaCaC-, semantically a resultative participle.<sup>280</sup> The form goes back to proto-Semitic, provides the basis of the Akkadian stative, and recurs in some forms of the West Semitic perfect.<sup>281</sup> It has been proposed that the

276 Haspelmath (1994).

277 Kouwenberg (2010a: 202-7).

278 Kouwenberg (2010a: 209-10).

279 Osing (1987).

280 E.g. Kouwenberg (2010a: 200-2).

281 Kouwenberg (2010a: 202-3).

Earlier Egyptian unmarked passive participle is in fact related to these Semitic forms.<sup>282</sup>

In view of this shared morphological material, the contrast between a bipartite, aspectually asymmetrical, participial paradigm in early Semitic languages and a quadripartite, aspectually symmetrical, participial paradigm in Earlier Egyptian is noteworthy.

C. In both the active and the passive, Earlier Egyptian participles contrast forms with a short stem (*mr-*) and such with a long stem (*mrr-*). The former—which are in part, and possibly in full, morphologically related to Semitic participles—are unmarked for aspect. The latter—which are specific to Egyptian—are marked for imperfective semantics to do with verbal plurality (of participants and/or of the event). In comparative perspective, the Earlier Egyptian aspectually marked forms represent a secondary development. While the reasons for this development lie beyond descriptive reach, the result was the Earlier Egyptian quadripartite paradigm as documented from the earliest texts on. In this paradigm, the two unmarked participles, the active and the passive, had aligned with one another aspectually.

Earlier Egyptian participles do not display the typologically common aspectual screw manifest notably in Semitic participles. As this aspectual screw concerns resultativity in non-present forms, the fact that the Earlier Egyptian non-active unmarked participle is passive—not resultative, like the possibly cognate East Semitic form—directly relates to it being part of an aspectually symmetrical paradigm.

In addition, Earlier Egyptian participles, and particularly passive ones, have extraordinarily developed functions in the domain of verbal relativization. In this as well, Earlier Egyptian stands in a marked contrast with early Semitic, in which participles mainly serve their primary function as a semantic elaboration of a noun. In Earlier Egyptian, the functions of participles in relativization are central, to the point that the syntax of relativization overrules the constraints of orientation and passivizability observed in finite passive constructions. This is seen in the complex construction in which the O of a passive participle is not coreferential to the antecedent; in the construction of passive participles with the *in N* phrase expressing the Agent in syntactic periphery; and, perhaps most remarkably of all, in the fact that passive participles are not subject to the general semantic condition for passivization to which finite passive forms are subject (§2.4.2).

In relation to the aspectually symmetrical nature of the Earlier Egyptian participial paradigm, Earlier Egyptian non-active participles are passive, not resultative. The development and primacy of syntactic functions in Earlier Egyptian participial constructions are no less remarkable, both typologically and when Earlier Egyptian is contrasted with early Semitic. In the above account, these are two sides of the same coin.

### 2.9.1.2 The perfective V-passive

A. The V-passive represents the outcome of an inner-Egyptian development.<sup>283</sup> Among V-passives, the prospective V-passive is syncretic with the prospective active

---

<sup>282</sup> Osing (1987).

in written form; whether the two forms were also syncretic in underlying morphological form, or not, can not be assessed further (§1.3.3.B). Focusing, therefore, on the perfective V-passive, this is not merely a passive of the accomplished—like the *sdm.n.t=f*, a T-passive of the *sdm.n=f*—but displays a distinguished association with perfective aspect on various levels (§4.3.5.3-4). The Earlier Egyptian perfective V-passive is thereby an illustration of a very general phenomenon, amply documented cross-linguistically and with a strong cognitive basis, namely the perfective skew of passives (§4.5.2). That aspectually biased passives are perfective reflects one major source construction from which passives can develop, resultative constructions.<sup>284</sup> On typological grounds, it is therefore a likely hypothesis that the Earlier Egyptian perfective V-passive could have had its origin in such a construction.

B. Earlier Egyptian has a resultative form, the pseudoparticiple. Extending the hypothesis, this suggests that the perfective V-passive and the pseudoparticiple could have had a historical connection of some sort. The hypothesis is difficult to prove or to disprove on direct grounds because of the great many uncertainties surrounding the morphology of the two forms. Some observations can be made nonetheless.

The written morphology of the perfective V-passive does not allow to reconstruct a stem with any certainty. However, there are indications—notably the rare written ending *-w*—that could tentatively be interpreted as pointing to a stem along the lines of <sup>?</sup>C<sup>?</sup>Cu(:)C- (for *3rad*; <sup>?</sup>Cu(:)C- for *2rad*). As regards the pseudoparticiple, Coptic forms derived from erstwhile delocutive forms imply a stem Cu:C- or Ci:C- for *2rad*. For *3rad*, they imply a stem CaCC- (with endings); based on the cognate Akkadian category, this goes back to *\*\*CaC<sup>?</sup>C-* with the second syllable being reduced by a regular morpho-phonological process. In Akkadian, the vowel in the second syllable was *-i-* or *-u-*, uncommonly *-a-*. With transitive verbs, which in the stative are overwhelmingly oriented on an O, the vowel was mostly *-u-*. The tentatively proposed reconstruction of the stem of the Earlier Egyptian perfective V-passive is therefore consistent with a morphological connection of some sort with the pseudoparticiple.

C. An additional indication in favor of such a connection is perhaps afforded by the following considerations. In written morphology, the perfective V-passive resembles unmarked passive participles: the same written endings (and mostly, lack of written endings) are found in the same inflectional classes and with the same relative frequencies. A connection of some sort between these two categories is therefore likely.<sup>285</sup> On the other hand, the unmarked passive participle is probably morpho-

283 In involving a stem alternation of some sort, Earlier Egyptian V-passives superficially resemble Semitic apophonic passives. These, however, reach their maximal productivity only in Classical Arabic, and represent an inner-West Semitic development (e.g. Retsö 1989): they do not project back to common Semitic, let alone any further.

284 Haspelmath (1990); Comrie (1982); also Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988: 45-9).

285 The origin of the perfective V-passive has thus been sought in a *nfr sw* construction with an unmarked passive participle as its predicate (e.g. Gardiner 1957<sup>3</sup>: §421; Westendorf 1953: 6-13). In this proposal, the shift from dependent to suffix pronouns remains unaccounted for. Furthermore, the *smn sw<sub>O</sub>* construction has distinctive semantics, expressing that the state-of-affairs denoted is not related to linguistic time (§2.8.3). This would have blocked any possible development leading to the rise of an inflectional passive category. In the present proposal, the

logically related to the Akkadian past participle (‘verbal adjective’) (§2.9.1.1.B). This, in turn, provides the basis for the Akkadian stative, the morphological relation of which to the Earlier Egyptian pseudoparticiple is clear.

D. Based on the above combined considerations, it is therefore likely that the perfective V-passive has its origin in a resultative construction which included a stem also found in the pseudoparticiple. The pseudoparticiple may have had different stems depending on individual verbs; of these, the one most commonly found with events oriented on an O—based on Akkadian, a stem in *-u-*—would have been selected and regularized to provide the stem of the perfective V-passive. Regularization would have occurred because the perfective V-passive, a syntactically oriented category, does not interact with the lexical semantics of the verbs with which it is formed, unlike the pseudoparticiple, a semantically oriented one also expressing the stative.

The perfective V-passive aligns morphosyntactically with the other forms of the suffix conjugation: the V-passive has a postverbal subject, no personal endings, and subject clitics for pronominal subjects. This morphosyntactic alignment reflects two broader issues. While the pseudoparticiple can express both dynamic and non-dynamic events—the latter being typologically primary (§2.3.1.2.B; §4.1.5)—the perfective V-passive only expresses dynamic events, like the suffix conjugation does. Related to this, the orientation of the pseudoparticiple is semantic; the orientation of the perfective V-passive is syntactic, like in the other forms of the suffix conjugation (§2.4.1).

NB. On grounds discussed in a previous section, the *sdm.n=f* is also likely to have been based on a resultative stem of some sort (§2.2.4.1.2). As the vowel *-i-* in the *sdm.n=f* implies, this would have been based on another resultative stem than the one which was regularized in the perfective V-passive. The two forms may be viewed as indirectly related, as both ultimately derive from resultative constructions, selecting and regularizing different stems in these.

## 2.9.2 Earlier Egyptian and Semitic affixal detransitive morphology

### 2.9.2.1 The prefix *n-*

Earlier Egyptian has a verbal prefix *n-* the productivity of which declined in historical times.<sup>286</sup> A connection of this with the Semitic (and Afroasiatic) prefix *n-* has been disputed on grounds that the former lacks the clearly detransitive functions, including passive ones which are prominent for example in the Akkadian N-stem and the Hebrew *Niphal*.<sup>287</sup> However, these medio-passive functions associated with the Semitic prefix *n-* represent a secondary development (§2.9.2.1.3). A possible connection between the Egyptian and the Semitic prefixes therefore merits a re-

---

relation between unmarked passive participles and the perfective V-passive is only an indirect one: both forms are ultimately related to a resultative stem, but none is prior to the other.

286 Previous discussions, with various foci: Vernus (2014; 2011), Reintges (1994); Cannuyer (1983); Conti (1980); Derchain-Urteil (1973).

287 Peust (2012: 243-4); Gundacker (2011: 52); Edel (1955-1964: §427).

examination. The following notes address only a subset of the issues associated with the Egyptian prefix *n-* and are explicitly presented as provisional only.

### 2.9.2.1.1 Morphological correlates

A. The Egyptian prefix *n-* is restricted to biradical roots, simple and reduplicated ones. Formations of the latter type are particularly common.<sup>288</sup> E.g.:

- n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>*:                      *n-k3* ‘ponder, reflect upon’ (cf. *k3i* ‘think, devise’)—  
    *n-hm* ‘shout’ (cf. *hmhmt* ‘war shout, etc.’);
- n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>*:                *n-gs-gs* ‘overflow’ (~ *gs-gs*)—*n-hm-hm* ‘yell’.

*N*-prefixed verbs from triradical roots are unattested (<sup>†</sup>*n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>3</sub>*). In view of the great many triradical roots in the language, the gap is significant. The prefix *n-* stands in a stark contrast with the prefix *s-* which is not subject to any restriction in this respect (e.g. *s-nfr*, *s-mnh*).

B. A great many of the *n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>* documented in Pyramid Texts<sup>289</sup> have a liquid of some sort as their second root consonant:

- *n-C<sub>3</sub>-C<sub>3</sub>*:                      *n-w3-w3* (meaning unknown)—*n-b3-b3* ‘slip’—*n-h3-h3*  
    ‘dangle’—*n-k3-k3* ‘fill out<sub>INTR</sub>(?)’—*n-g3-g3* ‘be  
    swollen’;
- *n-Cr-Cr*:                      *n-ḥr-ḥr* ‘rejoice’—*n-ḥr-ḥr* ‘be downcast, take  
    tumbles’—*n-ḳr-ḳr* ‘hurry’;
- *n-Cm/n-Cm/n*:                *n-hm-hm* ‘yell’—*n-zn-zn* ‘pass away’.

In addition, the Egyptian prefix *n-* is found with a few very short roots and with roots of the type *Ci*, however these are to be interpreted:

- Very short roots:                *n-di* ‘lay down’ (Pyr. 957c<sup>PMN</sup> (PT 477); cf. *w-di* ‘place,  
    put’)—*n-h*, *nh-nh* ‘spit out, expectorate’ (Pyr. 205a<sup>N</sup>  
    (PT 222), W *nšnš*, Nt *nšš*; cf. *ih-h/iš-š*)<sup>290</sup>—outside  
    Pyramid Texts, possibly also *n-t-t* ‘fetter’;<sup>291</sup>
- n-Ci-Ci*:                      *n-ḥi-ḥi* ‘endure, survive’—*n-ki-ki* ‘swell’—*n-gi-gi*  
    ‘cackle’ (cf. *g3g3*).<sup>292</sup>

Of a total of 24 probable verbs of the *n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>* type in Pyramid Texts, 14 (ca. 60%) are from one of the above special types.<sup>293</sup>

288 Specific studies: Vernus (2014; 2009); Conti (1980).

289 After Allen (1984: §746).

290 Edel (1955-1964: §429).

291 Stauder (in press a: §1.10); Edel (1955-1964: §427.Obs.).

292 Stauder (in press a: §1.8).

293 *N*-prefixed verbs in Pyramid Texts that do not fall under any of these special categories are *n-wt-wt* ‘totter’, *n-bd-bd* ‘bounce’, *n-hb-hb* ‘part<sub>INTR</sub>’, *n-sb-sb* ‘masticate, eat(?)’, *n-šf-šf* ‘drip’, *n-th-th* ‘chuckle’, *n-db-db* ‘sip’, *n-df-df* ‘drip’, *n-ds-ds* (meaning unknown), *n-dd-dd* ‘perdure’.

## 2.9.2.1.2 Semantics

A. *N*-prefixed verbs are intransitive and typically denote events in which the subject is the locus of the event, affected by the event, or self-affecting. While the Earlier Egyptian *n*- can not be described as a regular middle prefix, the verbs in which *n*- is found not uncommonly display semantics associated with the middle domain:<sup>294</sup>

(a) *Events of expressive vocal emission and of expressive emotion*

- *n-hm*, *n-hm-hm* ‘shout, yell’—*n-šny* ‘rage’ (cf. *šni* ‘storm’)—*n-gi-gi* ‘cackle’—*n-ti-ti/n-it-it* ‘stammer’ (cf. \**ti*<sup>295</sup>)—*n-th-th* ‘chuckle’;
- *n-ḥr-ḥr* ‘rejoice’ (cf. *nḥr-nḥr*)—*n-th-th* ‘rejoice’ (cf. *th-h*);

(b) *Events with self-affecting subjects*

- Self-benefactives, events of ‘taking’: *n-dri* ‘seize’ (cf. *drt* ‘hand’),<sup>296</sup>
- Events of ingestion (low in semantic transitivity): *n-šb-šb* ‘mastigate, eat(?)’ (cf. *w-šb m* ‘eat from sthg.’)—*n-db*, *n-db-db* ‘sip’ (cf. *s-db* ‘chew’),<sup>297</sup>
- Events of intellection (metaphorically, events of ‘mental ingestion’): *n-k3* ‘ponder, reflect upon’;

(c) *Events of involuntary, non-directed motion*

- n-wt-wt* ‘totter’—*n-b3-b3* ‘slip’—*n-bd-bd* ‘bounce’—*n-p3*, *n-p3-p3* ‘flutter’ (cf. *p3i* ‘flap the wings’)<sup>298</sup>—*n-ft-ft* ‘twitch’ (~ *ftft*)<sup>299</sup>—*n-nm* ‘err, go wrong’ (cf. *t-nm* ‘err, go astray’, *nm-nm* ‘go to and fro, quiver’)—*nh* ‘escape’ (cf. *w-hi* ‘escape’)—*n-hd-hd* ‘throb<sub>INTR</sub>’<sup>300</sup>—*n-h3*, *n-h3-h3* ‘dangle’<sup>301</sup>—*n-ḥr-ḥr* ‘be downcast, take tumbles’ (cf. *ḥr* ‘fall’)—*n-zn-zn* ‘pass’ (cf. *zni* ‘pass’)<sup>302</sup>—*n-šf-šf* ‘drip’—*n-gs-gs* ‘overflow’<sup>303</sup>—*n-df-df* ‘drip’;

(d) *Anticausative events*<sup>304</sup>

- n-fn-fn* ‘unroll<sub>INTR</sub>(?)’—\**n-fl-fl* ‘to be undone/untied’ (in *s-nfl-fl* and sim., ‘cause to be undone, untied’)—*n-hb-hb* ‘part<sub>INTR</sub>’<sup>305</sup>—*n-k3-k3* ‘fill out<sub>INTR</sub>(?)’—*n-ki-ki* ‘swell’—\**n-kt-kt* ‘become little’ (in *s-nkkt* ‘make to

294 For an introduction to middle voice and semantics, Woods (2008: 87-109); Bakker (1994); Kemmer (1993); Klaiman (1991).

295 Vernus (2009: 298).

296 Stauder (in press b: §1.1.E)

297 Vernus (2009: 295-6).

298 Vernus (2009: 296-7).

299 Dedicated study: Vernus (2014).

300 Vernus (2009: 296-8).

301 Vernus (2009: 296).

302 Vernus (2009: 301).

303 Vernus (2009: 294).

304 ‘Anticausatives’ are events happening all by themselves, without any Agent being implied.

305 Vernus (2009: 299, 303-4).



become little')<sup>306</sup>—*n-gb-gb* 'crack open<sub>INTR</sub>'<sup>307</sup>—*n-gm-gm* 'se prendre de remuelements',<sup>308</sup>

(e) *The subject otherwise the locus of event*

*n-i3-i3* 'be the object of repeated praise' (cf. *i3w* 'praise')<sup>309</sup>—*n-wn* 'dishevel, be disheveled' (cf. *wn* 'be bald')—\**n-b3-b3* 'be rooted' (in *s-nb3b3* 'cause to be rooted')—*n-bs*, *n-bs-bs* 'burn'<sup>310</sup>—*n-nj* 'be weary(?)'—*n-ḥi-ḥi* 'endure, survive'—*n-ḳd-d* 'sleep'—*n-g3-g3* 'be swollen'—*n-dd-dd* 'perdure' (cf. *ṇdd-ṇdd*, *ḏdi* 'endure').

B. *N*-prefixed verbs never express the passive. For example, they never co-occur with the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase ((<sup>†</sup>*n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>(C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>) in N*). When a *n*-prefixed verb expressing anticausative semantics (d) occurs in parallel to an inflectional passive (i), the perspective on the events is different: both affect their subjects, but only the latter implies an Agent. When additionally prefixed by *s-*, *n*-prefixed anticausatives can themselves be made passive (ii); the causativization adds an Agent to the event, making it possible to passivize:

(i) Pyr. 194a<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 220)

*wn* ʕ3wy 3ḥt  
*ṇḥbbḥb* q3nwt=s

The doors of the *Akhet* are (/have been) opened;  
Its bolts draw back.

Sim. CT VII 350-p T1C *ṇḥgbḥb* ʕ3wy *wn* rwtj ḥ3t 'The doors crack open, the door panels of the tomb are (/have been) opened.'

(ii) Pyr. 852d-e<sup>Na</sup> (PT 456)

*wn* <*n*>=k tḫwt ptrwt  
*snḥḥḥ* n=k nmtwt i3ḥw

'The caverns of the Sky windows have been opened for you;  
The movements of the sun-light have been made loose for you!'

P *sḥḥ*.

Sim. Pyr. 572d<sup>TN</sup> (PT 355) *wn* n=k ʕ3wy pt *snḥbbḥb* n=k zw wrw 'The doors of the sky have been opened for you, the great bolts have been drawn back for you'; PM *shbbḥb*.

306 Vernus (2009: 305; 2012: §5.1).

307 Vernus (2009: 299-300).

308 Vernus (2009: 307-11).

309 Vernus (2009: 305-7).

310 Vernus (2009: 298-9).

2.9.2.1.3 The Semitic/Afroasiatic prefix *n-*

As emerges from recent research, the passive functions of the Semitic N-stem are a secondary development, as is the N-stem itself.<sup>311</sup> The prefix *n-* is originally a verbalizer, serving to integrate segments that are not verbal or fail to conform to the prosodic forms of verbal roots, into the verbal conjugation. The development leading to the regular derivational-inflectional stem as in classical Semitic languages can be traced schematically in three steps:

(I) The prefix *n-* serves to verbalize short segments, often onomatopoeitic in nature, e.g. *nabaaḥu* ‘bark’ (‘to say *buh*’); *našaaqu* ‘kiss’ (‘to make a *šiq* sound’); *nataaku* ‘drip’ (‘to make a *tuk* sound’); etc.

As these verbs suggest, the prefix may ultimately go back to a ‘light verb’ *Vn-/nV-* with various traces in Afroasiatic and possibly meaning ‘to say’.<sup>312</sup> (On a decidedly more speculative note, one can not fail to be intrigued about the possibility that the Egyptian quotative index *in*, to which the particle *in* goes back (§2.2.4), may itself be related to this ‘light verb’ *Vn-/nV-*.)

(II) Still as a verbalizer, *n-* is added to long segments so that these can be conjugated as verbs. Documented in Akkadian, as well as in Geʿez and Modern South Arabic, these verbs often involve partial or complete reduplication and/or include a liquid consonant:

- *n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>3</sub>C<sub>4</sub>* with *C<sub>2</sub>* a liquid, e.g. *nabalkutu* ‘cross, rebel, etc.’; *naḥarmuṭu* ‘dissolve, cumble, melt’; *napalsuḥu* ‘fall to the ground, squat’; *napardū* ‘become bright, cheerful’; *naparqudu* ‘lie flat’, *naparšudu* ‘escape, flee’<sup>313</sup>—sim. in Geʿez, e.g. *ʾanfarʿaṣa* ‘exult, dance’;

- *n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>3</sub>C<sub>3</sub>* with *C<sub>2</sub>* a liquid (the least common of these groups), e.g. *naḥarmumu* ‘collapse’—sim. in Geʿez, e.g. *ʾanzaahlala* ‘become weak, languid’;

- *n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>2</sub>* with *C<sub>2</sub>* a liquid, e.g. *nadarruru* ‘to move about freely’; *nag/qarruru* ‘roll over’; *naparruru* ‘fall apart, become dispersed, confused’<sup>314</sup>—sim. in Geʿez, e.g. *ʾangagara* ‘wallow, roll’; *ʾansaahsʿha* ‘move back and forth’; *ʾansafsaṣa* ‘ooze’.

(III) The N-stem proper has its origin in a combination of the verbalizing prefix *n-* with the resultative participle *PaRiS* and the verbal adjective *PaRVs*.<sup>315</sup> The prefix serves to integrate a non-finite form of the verb into the finite conjugation, thereby making it dynamic. This yields the classical ingressive, middle, anticausative, and passive meanings and functions of the N-stem.

311 Kouwenberg (2010a: 314-23; 2004).

312 Kouwenberg (2010a: 317); Zaborski (2001: 595-8).

313 Kouwenberg (2010a: 307-14).

314 Kouwenberg (2010a: 301-5).

315 Testen (1998); Kouwenberg (2010a: 299-300).

Various Semitic languages occupy different positions along the sequence. The whole development is documented in East Semitic (Akkadian). In South Semitic languages, such as Ge'ez, only stages I and II are documented; stage III either did not develop or was abandoned. In West Semitic languages, such as Ugaritic, Arabic, and Hebrew, only stage III is documented.

#### 2.9.2.1.4 The Egyptian prefix *n-* in perspective

A. The connection between the Egyptian prefix *n-* and the Semitic (and beyond, Afroasiatic<sup>316</sup>) prefix *n-* is established on morphological grounds. The Egyptian prefix *n-* is found with bi-radical roots, not with tri-radical ones. Most verbs that include the prefix are reduplicated (*n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>*). In a statistically significant group of these, the second root radical is a liquid of some sort. Some of the Egyptian verbs that have the prefix *n-* consist in the combination of this with a reduplicated segment that is onomatopoeitic in origin (e.g. *n-gi-gi* 'cackle').

The semantic profile of the Egyptian prefix *n-* accords with this analysis. Originally a verbalizer, *n-* combines with onomatopoeitic segments to turn these into well-formed verbal segments (a). In the same function, it also combines with nouns, deriving verbs from these (b). In both cases, the outcomes are intransitive verbs; these not uncommonly denote events in which the subject is the locus of the event. From this derive the more general functions of *n-* as a deverbal derivational prefix, yielding intransitives in which the subject is the locus of the event. *N*-prefixed verbs can be derived from verbs or roots that are already intransitive, altering their meaning (c). They can also be derived from verbs that are otherwise transitive, in which case *n-* can be described as detransitive in function; the meaning often comes close to an anticausative (d):

(a) *N* - a verbalizer, combining with onomatopoeitic segments, e.g.

*n-gi-gi* 'cackle'<sup>317</sup>—possibly *n-šf-šf*, *n-df-df* 'drip'—possibly *n-h*, *n-h-n-h* 'spit out, expectorate'—possibly *n-th-th* 'chuckle';

(b) *N* - a verbalizer, combining with nominal segments, e.g.

*n-i3-i3* 'be the object of repeated praise' (*i3w* 'praise')—possibly *n-h-n* 'be young, a child' (*h* 'child'<sup>318</sup>)—*n-šny* 'rage' (*šni* 'storm');

(c) *N* - a derivational prefix, with intransitives, altering the meaning, e.g.

*n-p3*, *n-p3-p3* 'flutter' (*p3i* 'flap the wings')—*nh* 'escape' (*whi* 'escape')—*n-hr-hr* 'be downcast, take tumbles' (*hr* 'fall'<sup>319</sup>)—*n-k3* 'reflect upon, ponder' (*k3i* 'think, ponder')—*n-dd-dd* 'perdure' (*ddi* 'endure')—*n-zn-zn* 'pass' (*zni* 'pass');<sup>320</sup>

316 Liebermann (1986); for Cushitic, Mous (2012: 403-9); Gragg (2001: 613-7); Hayward (1975); for Berber, Kossmann (2012: 37-8, 83).

317 Stauder (in press a: §1.8).

318 The verb *hy* 'be young' is probably itself denominative.

319 On semantic grounds, *n-hr-hr* 'take tumbles' and *hr-hr* 'demolish' are probably independently derived from *hr* 'fall', rather than the former from the latter.

320 For a passage with *nznzn* and *zni* used alongside one another, Vernus (2009: 301).

(d) *N-* a derivational prefix, detransitive, often with anticausative meaning, e.g.

\**n-b3-b3* ‘be rooted’ (in *s-nb3b3* ‘cause to be rooted’;  $\sqrt{b3}$  ‘open the ground’)<sup>321</sup>—\**n-flh-flh* ‘to be undone/untied’ (in *s-nflhflh* and sim., ‘cause to be undone, untied’; *flh* ‘loose, release’)<sup>322</sup>—*n-gm-gm* ‘se prendre de remuements’ (*gm-gm* ‘crush, grind’).<sup>323</sup>

Egyptian *n-* thus shows an incipient development towards becoming a prefix associated with intransitive, detransitive, and even middle semantics, reflecting such that are present in the root or imparting these (b)-(d). Like for the related prefix in Semitic, this development has its ultimate roots in the functions of *n-* as a verbalizer, of which there are unmistakable traces in Egyptian as well (a)-(b).

B. Not contradicting this analysis, differences between the Egyptian and Semitic prefixes are to be noted as well. Beginning with issues of productivity, a great many verbs with the prefix *n-* are documented in the earliest texts already (notably in Pyramid Texts). Given their lexical semantics, other ones are documented only later, but this only reflects the uneven nature of the written record (notably specialized lexicon in medical texts, a type of texts only scarcely attested before the mid-second millennium). Candidates for verbs that may have been innovated only in the second millennium are very few (e.g. *n-k3* ‘think, ponder’<sup>324</sup>).

Changes occurring during the history of Earlier Egyptian similarly point to *n*-prefixed verbs being a very old layer in the Egyptian lexicon are. Unprefixed *C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>* tends to replace *n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>* with a given root (e.g. *n-ft-ft* and *ftft* ‘twitch’, the former becoming increasingly antiquated and ultimately obsolete<sup>325</sup>). In relation to this development, the contrast between *n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>* (intransitive or detransitive) and *C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>* (transitive) tends to be neutralized with various roots (a well-studied case in point is *n-gm-gm<sub>INTR</sub>* and *gm-gm<sub>TR</sub>*, the gradual obsolescence of the former leading the latter to become a S/O-ambitransitive<sup>326</sup>). As an overall result, the specific semantics associated with the prefix increasingly tend to be blurred during the second millennium. In addition, various cases are observed in which *n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>* and *n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>* based on the same root go individual trajectories resulting in lexically idiosyncratic contrasts between the two.<sup>327</sup> These combined phenomena suggest a thorough-going lexicalization of most *n*-prefixed verbs by the early second millennium, and possibly much earlier for some.

Another striking difference between Egyptian and Semitic *n*-prefixed verbs lies with the fact that the former can be subjected to further morphological processes. The causative prefix *s-* can thus be added to an already *n*-prefixed root. A *n*-prefixed verb

321 Vernus (2009: 304-5).

322 Vernus (2009: 304).

323 Vernus (2009: 298-9).

324 Stauder (2013a: 172-3).

325 Dedicated study: Vernus (2014).

326 Vernus (2009: 298-9).

327 Vernus (2009: 295-301).

can also be subject to reduplication, the prefix falling under the scope of reduplication:

*Secondary causativization by s-, e.g.*

*s-n-ḥb-ḥb* ‘destruct, break open’—*s-n-fḥ-fḥ* ‘loosen, make disappear’—*s-n-šm-šm* ‘sharpen’;

*N- under the scope of reduplication, e.g.*

*n-dd-ndd* ‘perdure’ (alongside *n-dd-dd*, with a similar meaning)—*nḥr-nḥr* ‘rejoice’ (alongside *n-ḥr-ḥr*, with a similar meaning)—*n-h-n-h* ‘spit out, expectorate’ (cf. *iḥ-h/iš-š*).

That the prefix *s-* is added to the left of the already *n*-prefixed root accords with the ‘principle of diagrammatic iconicity’.<sup>328</sup> In its primary functions as a verbalizer, the prefix *n-* is added directly to the segment to be verbalized. When the prefix also has a semantic profile beyond its morphological functions, it interacts strongly with the lexical semantics of the verb. The prefix *s-*, by contrast, has regular grammatical functions in valency-augmentation.<sup>329</sup> It accordingly comes last, being added to the external edge of the form.

Applied to *n*-prefixed verbs, both processes, causativization and reduplication, are specific to Egyptian. They are possible because Egyptian did not develop stage III, the stage in which *n-* would become a prefix associated with more regular grammatical functions. They also demonstrate a certain degree of lexicalization of the relevant *n*-prefixed verbs with which they are documented, confirming similar observations already made above on independent grounds.

C. The Egyptian prefix *n-* is related to the Semitic prefix *n-* and demonstrates a productive development of stages I and II. Unlike in Akkadian or in West Semitic languages such as Hebrew, Egyptian *n-* did not develop the more regular grammatical functions that define stage III, among which the passive. In Semitic languages that saw the process, the rise of a N-stem proper (stage III in the sequence) is associated with a decline, or partial refunctionalization, of the Gt-stem within the domain of detransitivity.<sup>330</sup> Conversely, the absence of a N-stem proper in other Semitic languages correlates with a high degree of productivity of the Gt-stem, or of reflected T-marked forms, for example in Geʿez.<sup>331</sup> In Egyptian, where the prefix *n-* did not develop into a N-stem proper, inflectional passives are highly productive. What is

328 Bybee (1985).

329 To be sure, the prefix *s-* also develops lexically idiosyncratic meanings with some verbs, e.g. *dd* ‘tell’, *sdd* ‘recount’; *ip* ‘count’, *sip* ‘inspect’; *ḥm* ‘ignore’, *šḥm* ‘forget’; *šm* ‘go’, *sšm* ‘guide’; *wḏ* ‘order’, *swḏ* ‘hand over, pass on assign’; *rḥ* ‘know’, *srḥ* ‘complain, accuse’. Moreover, *s*-prefixed verbs can themselves be intransitives, e.g. *w3i* ‘be far’, *sw3i* (*ḥr*) ‘pass by’; *sn* ‘smell, kiss (the ground)’, *ssn* ‘breathe, smell’. However, with many other verbs, the effect of the prefix *s-* is predictable, much more than with the prefix *n-*. Furthermore, lexically idiosyncratic meanings as selectively listed above may not be predictable, yet are in most cases at least retrospectively reconductible to the meaning of the base verb.

330 Kouwenberg (2010a: 322; 2010b: 623–4 for Akkadian specifically).

331 Kouwenberg (2010b: 627).

more, one of two major formations of Earlier Egyptian inflectional passives is the T-passive, which is argued in the next section to be itself related to the Semitic Gt-stem.

### 2.9.2.2 Earlier Egyptian T-passives and the Semitic T-stem

A. T-passives are inflectional passives in synchrony. Their origin can not be sought in an impersonal subject pronoun *tw* as has been proposed (§1.1.2); rather, the development goes the other way around, leading to the rise of an impersonal subject pronoun *tw* out of the inflectional marker of T-passives during the second millennium BCE (§5). A possible relation of Egyptian T-passives with T-marked forms in Semitic and beyond, in Afroasiatic, therefore merits serious consideration.<sup>332</sup>

The Semitic (and Afroasiatic) S-stem is related to Egyptian *s*-causatives. The Semitic (and Afroasiatic) prefix *n-*—of which the Semitic N-stem with its more regular grammatical functions is a secondary development—is also present in Egyptian (§2.9.2.1). Egyptian does not have a D-stem<sup>333</sup> but this is only expected given that the D-stem is a secondary development, specific to Semitic and not found in other branches of Afroasiatic.<sup>334</sup> Among the three major morphological means of verbal derivation that go back to Afroasiatic, two, *s-* and *n-*, are thus found in Egyptian. The third, *-t-*, has detransitive functions in Semitic and more broadly in Afroasiatic, as is also the case in Egyptian. This overall constellation makes a connection between Afroasiatic *-t-* and Egyptian T-passives very likely.

B. The main functions associated with Semitic and Afroasiatic *-t*<sup>335</sup> revolve around the reflexive, the reciprocal, the anticausative, the passive, and the middle, all inter-related within the broader domain of detransitive voice. Among these, the reflexive

332 The connection was proposed by Rössler (1950). In Loprieno's (1984; 1986: 38-50) subsequent elaboration, Egyptian {t} was viewed as part of a perfective archi-category, also including the *sdmt=f* (set in relation to the Akkadian perfect *iptaras*, itself related to the Gt-stem), the V-passive, and the prospective. However, Akkadian *iptaras* is an inner-Akkadian development (Kouwenberg (2010a: 155-60; 2010b: 633), and therefore not related to Egyptian *sdmt=f*; this is then itself unrelated to the T-passive (§1.4.3.2). Moreover, while the V-passive displays a distinguished association with perfectivity (§2.9.1.2; §4.3.5.3-5), T-passives do not: {t} has singular exponence, only expressing passive voice; the morpheme is, in other words, aspectually unmarked and combines both with accomplished and unaccomplished stems to yield forms that are componential semantically and morphologically (§1.1.3). In the accomplished, the T-passive (*sdm.n.t=f*) contrasts with the perfective V-passive: while the latter is perfective, the function of the former consists precisely in presenting an accomplished passive event as non-perfective (§4.3.5). That the perfective analysis of Egyptian {t} must be abandoned does of course not affect the more basic proposal, namely that Egyptian T-passives and Semitic T-stems may be related.

333 For morphological matters, Brose (2011), contra Breyer (2006), both with references to previous discussions. As regards S/O-ambitransitivity alternations of the type *wʿb* 'be clean' ~ 'cleanse', these are part of a much broader set of morphologically unmarked transitivity alternations of various kinds, including S/A-ambitransitivity alternations and variations in the agentivity of S (§2.6.2). Phenomena of ambitransitivity, also known as 'verbal lability', are not uncommon cross-linguistically; in the Afroasiatic domain, they are developed notably in Berber (Kossmann 2012: 81-3).

334 Kouwenberg (2010a: 280-7; 1997).

335 For Akkadian, Kouwenberg (2010b; 2005); Streck (2003); for early West Semitic, Tropper (2005); for Semitic more broadly, also Diem (1982); for Cushitic, Mous (2012: 403-9); Gragg (2001: 613-7); Hayward 1975 (206-9); for Berber, Kossmann (2012: 37-8, 83); for Afroasiatic, Lieberman (1986: 610-9).

function is often prominent. It is also primary on typological grounds. The reflexive allows a reciprocal interpretation by pluralization. By an extension to inanimate subject, the reflexive (an event in which an animate participant acts upon himself) leads to the anticausative (an event in which an inanimate participant is affected by this event). The anticausative, in turn, leads to the passive, when an Agent is added in semantic representation.<sup>336</sup> Based on an analysis of the functions of *-t-* in Semitic languages, a strong case has been made that this developed the historically documented functions along the cross-linguistically path of gradual extension and further grammaticalization just recalled.<sup>337</sup> The originally reflexive function further suggests that *-t-* is the thoroughly grammaticalized, and accordingly morphologically reduced, reflex of an erstwhile lexical expression of the reflexive, such as ‘head’, ‘body’, or ‘self’.<sup>338</sup>

In Semitic, *-t-* is prefixed or infixes after the first consonant of a form.<sup>339</sup> In Egyptian, it follows the stem, including any tense-aspect-modus morphology there may be. These different positions accord with the different positions of subject expressions in either domain, as personal prefixes to the left of the stem in Semitic and as subject clitics after the inflected stem in Egyptian. In the process of grammaticalizing, the reflexive expression would have coalesced with the stem at the place where it stood as an originally reflexive expression, on the same side of the verb as subject expressions. The analysis also accords with the most central determinant of T-passive morphology in historically documented Egyptian, namely the morphologically and semantically componential nature of T-passives and the position of {t} at the outer edge of the inflected form (§1.1.3).

### 2.9.2.3 Earlier Egyptian and Semitic detransitive voice in contrast

Among the various functions associated with *-t-* in Semitic and Afroasiatic, Earlier Egyptian displays only one, the passive. The loss of various functions of *-t-* is also observed in diverse Semitic languages, in each case in relation to varying intralinguistic configurations of detransitive voice.<sup>340</sup> Just like Egyptian T-passives, V-passives have no other functions in detransitive voice than expressing the passive itself. More generally, voice does not interact with lexical semantics in Earlier Egyptian. Earlier Egyptian passive morphology is strictly inflectional, differing from the typically more complex, inflectional-derivational nature of detransitive morphology, including T-stems, in most Semitic languages.

Differences extend to the passive construction itself. Many Semitic languages do not license passives from intransitives. By contrast, Earlier Egyptian has subjectless passives on a fully regular basis, using them in a great many functions ranging from discourse continuity to expressing an orientation on the event itself (§2.5.3; §2.6.1).

336 E.g. Heine & Kuteva (2002: 44); Givón (2001<sup>2</sup>: II, 104-5); Haspelmath (1990). For the extension of a reflexive marker to naturally reflexive situations, and thereby to middle semantics, e.g. Stempel (2002); Kazenin (2001); Kemmer (1993).

337 Kouwenberg (2010a: 369; 2010b: 621).

338 Kouwenberg (2010a: 369).

339 In Cushitic, *-t-* is found both as a prefix and as a suffix.

340 Kouwenberg (2010a: 370-5, 380-2).

Both the perfective V-passive and T-passives grammaticalize from constructions that imply a subject—a resultative construction for former, a reflexive one for the latter. The fully regular constructions with passives from intransitives constitute a secondary development, if one already completed or well advanced in times before the earliest written documentation of the language.

In a similar vein, many Semitic languages do not, or only marginally, license the expression of the passive Agent. By contrast, the Earlier Egyptian passive construction with an expressed Agent is regular and common in text, with passives from both transitives and intransitives. This as well is a secondary development, because the source construction from which both the perfective V-passive and T-passives grammaticalized first lead to passive constructions without an expressed Agent. The origin of the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase in an originally appositional clause (§2.2.4) fits this analysis.

While detransitive morphology often has a strongly semantic profile in Semitic languages, Earlier Egyptian centers on the discourse-pragmatic functions of detransitive voice (§2.5-2.6.1). When discourse requires that an event be made passive, this is regularly possible regardless of whether a verb is syntactically transitive or intransitive. When, for example, the relative discourse topicality of O and A (or of OBL and S) is at stake, constructions with an expressed Agent are regularly possible as well.

Various dimensions of a schematic contrast with Semitic were evoked above: the strictly inflectional nature of Earlier Egyptian detransitive morphology manifest in its lack of interaction with lexical semantics (except, limitedly, in the case of the pseudoparticiple) and in its concentration on the passive functions only; the regular constructions of passives from intransitives; and the regular possibility for expressing the Agent. These characteristics of Earlier Egyptian detransitive concern both V- and T-passives, the latter being historically related to Semitic and Afroasiatic detransitive forms marked in *-t-*. Against the Semitic background and on typological grounds, the above are all secondary developments, often specific to Earlier Egyptian. In their interrelation, these developments reflect the specialized subset of functions in detransitive voice—the passive as a construction with primarily discourse-pragmatic functions—on which Earlier Egyptian, possibly in relation to its rigid word order, concentrated.



## PART II:

### VOICE, ASPECT, AND PERSPECTIVE

If viewed merely as a syntactic transformation, remapping grammatical roles (A, O, and S) and grammatical relations (subject and object), the passive should not interact with aspect in any significant way. In particular, active and passive paradigms should be largely symmetrical to one another. This is not the case in general, nor is it the case in Earlier Egyptian. Both voice and aspect are linguistic domains to do with the perspective under which an event is viewed. In particular, the passive often views the event from its Endpoint, as does perfective aspect. In Earlier Egyptian, this is reflected in the different semantic resolutions of the passive and the active both in the unaccomplished and in the accomplished. In the unaccomplished, the passive makes less distinctions than the active. In the accomplished, the opposite is observed.

### 3 The passive in the unaccomplished and in the future

I first discuss passive subjects in the unmarked unaccomplished as to how they differ from active ones (§3.1). Active-passive counterpart relationships in the unaccomplished (§3.2) and expressions of the passive in the future (§3.3) are described in turn.

#### 3.1 Passive subjects in the unaccomplished

##### 3.1.1 $N(P) sdm=f - sdm.t NP$

A. In the active, the subject of the unmarked unaccomplished is in preverbal position in main clauses: always so when the subject is a full noun ( $N_i sdm=f_i$ ) and most commonly so when the subject is a pronoun ( $(iw P_i) sdm=f_{(i)}$ ); the overall construction is here represented as  $N(P) sdm=f$ . In for example *Shipwrecked Sailor* 17-18 *iw r3 n s nhm=f sw* ‘The speech of a man saves him’, the construction does not contrast with

one with a postverbal subject expression:  $\dagger n\dot{h}m\ sw\ r3\ n\ s$  is undocumented in Middle Egyptian.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the preverbal expression is synchronically the clausal subject, not a left-dislocated topic. The suffix pronoun in postverbal position, for its part, is synchronically an agreement marker on the verb.

In the passive, by contrast, the subject is in postverbal position.<sup>2</sup> The formal contrast between the active construction with preverbal subject,  $N(P)\ s\dot{d}m=f$ , and the passive construction with postverbal subject,  $s\dot{d}m.t\ NP$ , is illustrated in Middle Egyptian literary texts, where both constructions are most common, e.g.:<sup>3</sup>

(i) *Ptahhotep* 349 P

*iw in.tw ʿkw wn 3k*

‘Intimates are brought when there is ruin’;

And *passim*. In the active, e.g. 506 *iw wnft-ib sip=s ʿk33* ‘A joyful woman checks the *aqaa*-water.’

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 267

*iw mh.tw ib im=k*

‘You are trusted.’

In the active, e.g. B1 261-262 *iw wh ʿ hb3=f itrw* ‘The fisher ravages the river.’

(iii) *A Man to His Son* 9.3

*iw in.tw s hr sp hwrw*

‘A man is noticed (lit. distinguished) on a bad occasion.’

And *passim*. In the active, e.g. 1.10 *hn hwrw sw h3=f dd sw* ‘Bad speech makes the one who says it a fool.’

The paradigm of the unmarked unaccomplished is therefore as:

active  $N(P)\ s\dot{d}m=f$  – passive  $s\dot{d}m.t\ NP$

B. In accounting for the formal contrast between a construction with preverbal subject in the active and one with postverbal subject in the passive, the earlier history of the construction is of relevance. In the active,  $N(P)\ s\dot{d}m=f$  is the successor of  $s\dot{d}m\ NP$ , both based on the same form of the verb, the unaccomplished  $s\dot{d}m=f$ . The construction with a preverbal subject, which has the same temporal-aspectual value as the one with a postverbal subject,<sup>4</sup> developed first with topical subjects. In Pyramid

1 Despite a superficial similarity in form,  $N(P)\ s\dot{d}m=f$  thus differs syntactically from e.g.  $NP\ s\dot{d}m.n=f$ . The latter synchronically contrasts with the vastly more common  $s\dot{d}m.n\ NP$ . In the accomplished, the analysis is therefore as  $NP_{\text{topic}}-s\dot{d}m.n=f_{\text{subject}}$  (uncommon, marked) contrasting with  $s\dot{d}m.n\ NP_{\text{subject}}$  (very common, unmarked). In the unaccomplished, only one construction is found  $N(P)_{\text{subject-i}}\ s\dot{d}m=f_i$ .

2 Previously noted by Vernus (1986: 377 and n.10) and Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §462-3).

3 More extensive illustration, Stauder (2013a: 90-2).

4 It has been proposed that  $NP\ s\dot{d}m=f$  originally developed to provide an expression of progressive aspect, thus contrasting with  $s\dot{d}m\ NP$  as an expression of the unmarked unaccomplished (Allen 2013a: 135-7; 1984: §269-78; Vernus 1990: 183, 191). This analysis is contradicted by an early

Texts, the construction with a preverbal subject is thus found only with highly topical subjects, be these pronominal ones or full nouns, contrasting with *sdm NP* with non-topical subjects.<sup>5</sup> The extension of the construction with a preverbal subject to non-topical subjects, as in the examples from literary texts quoted above (§3.1.1, the active examples in each pair), is a secondary development, once *N(P) sdm=f* had been established as the regular expression of the unmarked unaccomplished, having superseded *sdm NP* in this function.

Passive subjects differ from active ones. In not being Agents, they are also often less topical than these. To be sure, passive subjects can be topical, and one motivation for the use of the passive construction in narrative and narrative discourse lies in respecting the natural flow of discourse in cases when the O is relatively more topical than the A (§2.5.1.A; §2.5.2.1; §2.5.2.4). In the unmarked unaccomplished, however, this situation only rarely obtains. The construction, which often supports a general or habitual reading, comes with an O low in topicality in the vast majority of cases. When a full noun, the O is mostly non-referential (e.g. (i) and (iii) above); occurrences with a topical O, be this a full noun or a pronoun, are, on the other hand, uncommon.<sup>6</sup> As just discussed, the rise of the preverbal-subject construction of the unmarked unaccomplished active began with topical subjects. In selecting typically non-topical subjects, the unmarked unaccomplished passive did not undergo the same development. The passive, in other words, preserved the construction in its earlier form.

---

Fourth Dynasty instance of *NP sdm=f* with a quantifier, implying a reading with habitual aspect: Petrie, *Medum*, 16 (Schweitzer 2005: §413) *niwt=s in=s prt-hrw r<sup>c</sup> nb* ‘His town brings the funerary offering daily.’ The analysis of *NP sdm=f* as originally expressing progressive aspect is also contradicted by early occurrences of the pattern in personal names, implying readings with general imperfective aspect, e.g. de Morgan, *Dahchour* I, fig.12 (Schweitzer 2005: §332, §413, §445) *k3(=i) h3=f* ‘My-ka-fights’. The pattern is also found in royal names, such as *r<sup>c</sup>-dd=f* ‘Re-endures’, *r<sup>c</sup>-h<sup>c</sup>=f* ‘Re-appears’, in which the divine subject and the nature of the event imply non-dynamic, respectively habitual, readings, not progressive ones. In Pyramid Texts themselves, Pyr. 411b<sup>W</sup> with a preverbal subject and 406a-c<sup>WT</sup> and Pyr. 408b<sup>WT</sup> with postverbal subjects, all from *Cannibal Hymn* (PT 273-4), do not differ aspectually in any way: Pyr. 411a-b<sup>W</sup> *fiw N nsb=f sbšw imiw dšrt iw=f w3h=f* (...) ‘N will be disgusted when licking the *shebsu*(?) which are in the Red Crown; he prospers (...)’; Pyr. 406a-c<sup>WT</sup> *iw phr imiw pt n N sšr.t n=f ktiwt m rdw nw hmw<sup>c</sup>=sn iw dbn n=f pti tm.ti phr n=f idbwi* ‘The ones in the sky serve N, hearthstones are wiped over for him with the legs of their women. Both skies united go around for him, the two shores serve him’; Pyr. 408b<sup>WT</sup> *iw phr n=f h3 iw wdn n=f šnt* ‘Thousands serve him, hundreds present offerings to him.’ Other occurrences of the construction with a preverbal subject in Pyramid Texts readily lend themselves to a rendering with a progressive aspect in a translation language that has a grammatical expression of such, e.g., among others, Pyr. 76c<sup>WTPNNU<sup>W</sup>d</sup> (PT 120) *wsir N m-n=k irt hr m s hbnbn=s* ‘Osiris N, take to yourself Horus’ eye: see, it jumps around (or: is jumping around).’ However, this is a contextual effect: at the level of grammar, the construction merely expresses an unmarked unaccomplished. A fuller study is in preparation.

- 5 For example in *Cannibal Hymn* (PT 273-4), Pyr. 411b<sup>W</sup> for the former, 406a-c<sup>WT</sup> and Pyr. 408b<sup>WT</sup> for the latter.
- 6 Among uncommon occurrences with a pronominal subject: *Ptahhotep* 59 *iw gm.t=s m-<sup>c</sup> hmw<sup>c</sup>t hr bnwt* ‘It (*scil.* fine speech) is found with maidservants on the millstones’; *Sinuhe* B 233-234 (§3.1.2, (i)); *Eloquent Peasant* B2 75-76 *iw sh3.t=f hr bw nfr* ‘It (*scil.* his name) is remembered because of goodness’; *Neferti* 11c *ktt it wr ipt h3.tw=s m wbn* ‘Little is the grain, large is the *oipe*. It is measured in the east(?)’.

## 3.1.2 Marked-topic constructions in the passive

In all cases when a nominal expression precedes a verb in the passive, this is a marked-topic construction. A short note on these constructions may thus be inserted. Thus, in the unaccomplished here under discussion (i), and similarly in the past (ii) and in the future (iii):

(i) *Sinuhe* B 233-234

*mw m itrw swr.t=f mr=k*

*t3w m pt hnm.t=f dd=k*

‘The water in the river—it is drunk as you wish.

The air in the sky—it is breathed as you say.’

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 327-329

*srw tr.n.tw ø r hsf r tyt*

*ibw pw n 3dw*

*srw tr.n.tw ø r hsf r grg*

*n rd.n snd=k spr(=i) n=k*

*n si3.n=k ib=i*

‘Officials—they were appointed to outlaw evil:

they are a shelter against the aggressor!

Officials—they were appointed to outlaw falsehood:

Yet fear of you does not make me appeal to you,

You do not perceive my heart.’

(iii) CT IV 49r-s L1Li<sup>7</sup>

*mk N iw shr.n N hftiw=f tp t3*

*ht N krs.t=s*

‘See, N has come, having felled his foes to the ground;

N’s corpse, it will be interred.’

Unlike in the active, marked-topic constructions are very uncommon in the passive. This is at least part related to one of the functions of the passive, namely its use in contexts of discourse continuity on the O: if the O is already well established in previous discourse, it need not be further topicalized. More broadly, the very low text frequency of marked-topic constructions in the passive reflects the lesser salience of O’s in comparison to A’s. This itself relates to the fact that O’s are not Agents: discourse tends to be organized around participants doing things rather than around participants to whom things are done. Accordingly, an O is less prone to be extraposed as a marked topic.

7 Proposed readings with past tense (Faulkner 1973-1977: I, 220; Malaise & Winand 1999: 418) must be rejected as they imply a construction with a pseudoparticiple (\**ht N krs.t*). The reading is future, like in 49q (*wnn N im* ‘N will be there’).

NB. *Ipuwer* displays a number of instances of a construction  $N_i \text{ } \underline{s\dot{d}m.t} \text{ } \emptyset_i$ . E.g.:<sup>8</sup>

(iv) *Ipuwer* 5.6

*iw ms msw srw hw.tw  $\emptyset$  r s3wt*

*hrdw nw nht d.tw  $\emptyset$  hr k3nr*

‘But now, the children of officials are beaten against the wall,  
children of prayer are placed on the high ground.’

In line of the overall articulation of the lament, these constructions could be interpreted as topic-presentative ones. Yet, this is probably only one element of the issue, which seems complex. In its specific form, the Ipuwerian construction  $N_i \text{ } \underline{s\dot{d}m.t} \text{ } \emptyset_i$  remains unparalleled in Middle Egyptian. In the same text, in otherwise similar environments and with similar events,  $N_i \text{ } \underline{s\dot{d}m.t} \text{ } \emptyset_i$  alternates with perfective constructions (particularly  $N_O \text{ } PsP$ , also *V-pass N*). The possibility of textual alterations must therefore be taken into serious account, all the more given the date of the single preserved manuscript of the composition (late Nineteenth Dynasty<sup>9</sup>). As a detailed examination suggests, at least some instances of  $N_i \text{ } \underline{s\dot{d}m.t} \text{ } \emptyset_i$  are probably secondary to an original  $N_O \text{ } PsP$ . By this reinterpretation, the pseudoparticiple would have been turned into a suffixal passive: a perfective construction, oriented on the Endpoint of the event and thereby on the lasting result thereof, would have been made a present-tense one. Syntactically, the preverbal subject would have become a left-extraposed topic: the process of alteration could thus have been supported by the presence of various other presentative-topic constructions in the composition, also with extraposed subjects. While there is some serious likelihood that the Ipuwerian construction  $N_i \text{ } \underline{s\dot{d}m.t} \text{ } \emptyset_i$  is thus the product of a textual history, the construction also made sense to the copyist of P. Leiden I 344 ro and to readers of this stage of the tradition of the text. With a view on language as consisting in changing repertoires, the construction belongs to Middle Egyptian, provided its particular status, possibly limited to one text and arguably an artifact of the textual transmission of that text, is duly noted.

## 3.2 Active-passive counterpart relationships in the unaccomplished

A. The rise of a detransitive construction isomorphic (‘morphologically symmetrical’) to the active progressive  $NP \text{ } \underline{hr} \text{ } \underline{s\dot{d}m}$  is a fairly late development in the history of Earlier Egyptian. As to be discussed in a subsequent chapter, this began in *wn*-auxiliated constructions during the Twelfth Dynasty (*wn.INFL.t hr sdm*: §5.1.2.1). An isomorphic detransitive pendant to non-*wn*-auxiliated constructions based on  $NP \text{ } \underline{hr} \text{ } \underline{s\dot{d}m}$  is first documented, still sporadically only, in the later Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom; it was to generalize fully only with the advent of Late Egyptian as a written standard (*(X)tw hr sdm*: §5.1.2.3). During most of the

8 Occurrences and further discussion, Stauder (2013a: 87-90).

9 On the date of P. Leiden I 344 ro, Enmarch (2005: 11).

history of Earlier Egyptian, the passive pendant to *NP hr sdm* was expressed by an altogether different construction, a T-passive of the unaccomplished *sdm=f*:

(i) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 332-334

*iw srw hr rdt n=k*

*iw=k hr itt in iw=k m ʿw3y*

*iw st3.tw n=k skw hnʿ=k r psšt šdwt*

‘Officials are giving to you;

Yet you are still taking—So are you a robber?

People are ushered in before you, and troops are with you for the division of land-plots!’<sup>10</sup>

(ii) *Ipuwer* 2.5-10

*iw ms [ib] shmw (...) wnhyt hr dd n(n) tkn im=s (...)*

*iw ms t3 hr msnh mi irr nhp (...)*

*iw ms itrw m snf swr.tw im=f niw.tw m rmt ib.tw mw*

‘But now, the heart is fierce (...) the (mummy)-binding speaks without approaching it (...)

But now, the land spins round as does a potter’s wheel (...)

But now, the River is blood and one drinks from it, one pushes people aside, one thirsts for water.’<sup>11</sup>

Sim., with the same event (*šm*) in the active and in the passive, 6.9-12 *iw ms hpw nw hn(r)t dw r hnty šm.tw {m}ms hr=s<n> m iwyt hwrw hr ngd im m-hnw mrwt{3} iw ms (...) iw ms hn(r)t-wr m pr-h3=f hwrw hr šmt itt m hwwt wryt* ‘But now, the rulings of the Labor Enclosure are cast out, one walks on them in the alleys, and wretches tear them up in the streets. But now, (...) But now, the Great Labor Enclosure is in commotion, wretches come and go in the great domains.’<sup>12</sup>

(iii) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 11 (also on O. Cairo JE 50249, 3-4)

*hnn.tw shrw ntrw*

*wn{t}.tw mhrw=sn*

‘The counsels of the gods are thrown into tumult, their directives are neglected.’

In the active, also expressing progressive aspect, ro 10 *hprw hr hpr* ‘changes are happening.’<sup>13</sup>

This establishes the counterpart relationship between active *NP hr sdm* and passive *sdm.t=f*. The latter also serves as the passive to *N(P) sdm=f*. In the unaccomplished, one construction thus provides the passive to two active constructions. In not

10 Translation slightly adapted from Parkinson (2012a: 269-70).

11 Translation slightly adapted from Enmarch (2008: 222-3).

12 Translation slightly adapted from Enmarch (2008: 228).

13 On progressive aspect in the tensing of *Khakheperreseneb*, Stauder (2013a: 148-9, 396).

expressing a semantic contrast expressed in the active, the passive has a lesser resolution than the active in the unaccomplished:

	unmarked	progressive
active:	$N(P) \text{ } \underline{s}dm=f$	$NP \text{ } \dot{h}r \text{ } \underline{s}dm$
passive:	$\longleftarrow \text{ } \underline{s}dm.t=f \text{ } \longrightarrow$	

B. In accounting for this paradigm, the profile of the unaccomplished  $\underline{s}dm=f$  must be discussed a little further. In early times, the form is the only expression of the unaccomplished. With the rise of  $NP \text{ } \dot{h}r \text{ } \underline{s}dm$ , grammaticalizing as a dedicated expression of the progressive already in the Old Kingdom,<sup>14</sup>  $N(P) \text{ } \underline{s}dm=f$  comes to be used most often in contexts that invite a habitual or general reading. Yet, the construction is still used in environments that do not support such readings, thus in reference to the ongoing speech situation, alternating with  $NP \text{ } \dot{h}r \text{ } \underline{s}dm$  in another text (a), or in a stock formula otherwise phrased with  $NP \text{ } \dot{h}r \text{ } \underline{s}dm$  (b). In all these cases,  $N(P) \text{ } \underline{s}dm=f$  is used as an unmarked unaccomplished in places where  $NP \text{ } \dot{h}r \text{ } \underline{s}dm$ , a marked expression of the progressive, could also have been used:<sup>15</sup>

(a) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 73-75 *iw mdw=k n=i nn wi hr sdm st* ‘You speak to me, yet I am not listening.’—In a similar context, with the dedicated progressive pattern, *Eloquent Peasant* B2 113-114 *mk wi hr spr n=k n sdm.n=k st* ‘Look, I am pleading to you, yet you do not hear it.’

(b) *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II, 33 (...) *st nbt hpt=s 2-nw=s* ‘(...) every woman hugged her fellow.’—In a similar context, with the dedicated progressive pattern, *Shipwrecked Sailor* 6 (...) *s nb hr hpt sn-nw=f* (...) ‘(...) everybody is hugging their fellows; (...)’.

Being an expression of the unmarked unaccomplished, the  $\underline{s}dm=f$ —in the construction  $N(P) \text{ } \underline{s}dm=f$  in the active—can thus be used for events that do not support habitual or general readings, including in environments in which  $NP \text{ } \dot{h}r \text{ } \underline{s}dm$  was otherwise used. By the same token, it could be recruited, made passive by {t}, to provide the passive counterpart to the progressive  $NP \text{ } \dot{h}r \text{ } \underline{s}dm$ .

Passive events with a progressive reading are very rare in the record. This reflects a functional basis in discourse. In the active, progressive aspect typically correlates with agentive subjects; when used in events that have only weakly agentive subjects, the progressive not uncommonly invites interpretations in which the agentivity of the subject is enhanced.<sup>16</sup> Passive events with a progressive interpretation are rare because passives have inherently non-agentive subjects. Put differently, a progressive expresses an event that is presented as ongoing with respect to a time of reference,

14 Vernus (1998b); Collier (1994: 60-7); Stauder-Porchet (2009: 69-74). The development is common cross-linguistically (e.g. Bybee et al. 1994: 127-33), including for example in Semitic languages (e.g. Cohen 1984).

15 In structuralist terminology, the opposition between  $NP \text{ } \dot{h}r \text{ } \underline{s}dm$  and  $N(P) \text{ } \underline{s}dm=f$  would be described as privative, not equipollent (as in Winand 2006: 188, 268-9).

16 Winand (2006: 81, 286-91).

typically related to the speech situation.<sup>17</sup> Presenting the event from the vantage point of its Endpoint (as in the passive), rather than that of its Agent, is unnatural.

When grammaticalizing, *NP hr sdm* did so first with active and positive events. As passive constructions with a progressive interpretation remained rare, no dedicated pattern for the expression of the passive progressive developed. Instead, the unaccomplished *sdm=f* was recruited and made passive by {t}. This resulted in a situation in which the active made a distinction between two constructions of the unaccomplished, one unmarked (*N(P) sdm=f*) and one marked for progressive aspect (*NP hr sdm*), while the passive had only one (*sdm.t NP*). The counterpart relationships was stable, holding for centuries, from the Old Kingdom until the later Second Intermediate Period and even later in most written registers (further, §5.1.2.3; §5.3.4).

### 3.3 Expressions of the passive in the future

In the future, processes of change affecting the passive result in situations in which passive paradigms are not always symmetrical to the active. In addition, the Earlier Egyptian passive interacts with modality on various levels, resulting in further configurations that are specific to the passive.

A. In early funerary corpora, the passive of the prospective involves two forms: a V-passive (possibly syncretic in underlying form with the active prospective), and the *sdmm=f*, arguably a secondary formation and thereby possibly a subtype of the V-passive (§1.2-3). These stand in complementary distribution to one another along inflectional classes, just like the formation of the active prospective may itself not have been uniform along the same inflectional classes. In relation to the ongoing obsolescence of the prospective V-passive and of the *sdmm=f*, the expression of the future passive is gradually taken over by a T-passive of the prospective in Coffin Texts (§1.2.2.2). Early symptoms of the change are detected already in Pyramid Texts, but remain rare. As far as can be assessed, this process of change does not involve dimensions other than morphological ones. As both the prospective V-passive (including the *sdmm=f*) and the T-passive of the prospective are pendants to the active prospective, the paradigm remains symmetrical. In addition, the perfective V-passive is rarely used for events yet to come, a construction made possible by the Endpoint orientation of the form (§1.2.3.2). This is the only point in which the expression of future passive is not symmetrical to the active in early funerary corpora:

#### *In Pyramid Texts*

active: *irw=f ~ sdm=f*

passive: *irw=f ~ sdmm=f* (rarely: perfective V-passive)

17 The formulation is here intentionally kept at an intuitive level; for a rigorous definition of the progressive, Winand (2006: 265-8).



*In Coffin Texts (and, only incipiently, in Pyramid Texts)*

active:  $irw=f \sim sdm=f$

passive:  $irw=f \sim sdm=f$  (rarely: perfective V-passive)  
 $/irw.t=f \sim sdm.t=f$

B. When initially grammaticalizing, *NP r sdm* expresses events that are bound to happen. Reflecting these highly specific semantics, the construction is semantically oriented: voice is not morphologically marked (§2.3.2; §2.4.1.2). In Old and earlier Middle Egyptian outside funerary corpuses, the paradigm is thus symmetrical:

	future	events bound to happen (rare)
active	$irw=f$	$NP_{A/S} r sdm$
passive	$irw.t=f^{18}$	$NP_O r sdm^{19}$

With *NP r sdm* semantically weakening into a future, in the early Middle Kingdom, the construction shifts to a syntactic orientation. In the passive, it must be marked for voice. At a time when *(X).tw r sdm* has not yet developed, the passive counterpart to the *NP r sdm* expressing a mere future is provided by the T-passive of the prospective (i),<sup>20</sup> a form that also provides the counterpart to the prospective, which is still productive in literary registers (ii):<sup>21</sup>

(i) *Sinuhe* B 189-196

*iw min is š3ʕ. n=k tni fh. n=k b33t sh3 n=k hrw n krs sbt r im3h*  
*wḏʕ. tw n=k h3wy m sft wt3w m ʕwy t3yt ir. tw n=k šms-wḏ3 hrw sm3-t3 (...)*  
*ir. tw hbb nnyw r r3 is=k nts. tw n=k dbht-htpw sft. tw r r3 ʕbw=k (...)*

‘For today you have begun to be old, you have lost virility. Have in mind the day of burial, the passing to blessedness!

A night-vigil will be assigned to you with holy oils and wrappings from the hands of Tayet; a funeral procession will be made for you on the day of joining the earth (...)

The dance of the Oblivious Ones will be performed at the entrance of your tomb; the invocation-offerings will be recited for you; sacrifices will be made at the entrance of your offering-chapel (...)

In the active, *Sinuhe* B 203-204 *iw k3=k r rḏt iry=i phwy hʕw=i m hnw* ‘Your *ka* will let me make an end with my body in the Residence’; B 234-235 *iw b3k im r swḏt <n> t3t ir. n b3k im m st tn* ‘This humble servant will hand over to the chicks that this humble servant has begotten in this place.’

18 Occurrences: §1.2.2.3.

19 In the Old Kingdom, e.g. *Urk.* I 219, 4-5 and passim (§2.3.2, (iii)); in the First Intermediate Period, Siut III, 64; IV, 79-80 (§2.3.2, (iv)); in a relative clause, Siut III, 1 (§2.3.2, (viii)).

20 For methodological issues in identifying the counterpart relationship, Stauder (2013a: 371-6).

21 Further examples of the T-passive of the prospective in Middle Kingdom literary texts, §1.2.2.3, (iv)-(v).

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 352-353*gmw.tw kft=s**sbw=s r imʒh*

‘When its (*scil. Maat*’s) revelation is found,  
it will conduct to blessedness!’

The paradigm has become asymmetrical. As a result of ongoing linguistic change, the same passive form, *irw.t=f*, serves as the counterpart to two active categories, *irw=f* and *NP r sdm*. The phenomenon by which a synthetic form of the verb serves as the passive counterpart of *NP r sdm* is similar to the one by which a synthetic form of the verb also serves as the negative counterpart of the same category (*NP r sdm*, *nn sdm=f*).<sup>22</sup> More remarkably, the same active construction, *NP r sdm* has two different passive counterparts, depending on its meaning. One is syntactically oriented (*irw.t=f*, expressing a mere future), the other semantically (*NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm*, expressing an event bound to happen):

	future	events bound to happen (rare)
active	<i>irw=f</i> /	<i>NP<sub>A/S</sub> r sdm</i>
passive	<i>←irw.t=f→</i>	<i>NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm</i> <sup>23</sup>

C. Beginning in the late Twelfth Dynasty, first in the relatively less formal written registers in which the active prospective had itself become obsolete, a new construction, *(X).tw r sdm* replaces *irw.t=f*, e.g. P. UC 32055, ro 9 *iw.tw r rdt rk p3 s 2 (...)* ‘The two men will be made to swear (...)’ (in more details, §5.1.2.2). In these registers, the semantically oriented *NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm* is maintained only in relative clauses, where it contrasts semantically with *nty.tw r sdm*:

## (iii.a) P. UC 32287, 2-3

*(...) ntt tw r irt*

‘(...) what will be done.’

## (iii.b) P. Berlin 10033, ro 2

*(...) ntt r irt r s[i]p*

‘(...) what is to be done and controlled.’

In non-relative clauses, the semantically oriented *NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm* may have been kept only in higher written registers after the late Twelfth dynasty (above, B). In relatively less formal registers, *(X).tw r sdm* is documented at least once expressing an event bound to happen; the syntactically oriented and morphologically symmetrical counterpart to *NP r sdm* has thus been extended even to the specific domain in which *NP r sdm* initially grammaticalized:

22 E.g. P. UC 32057, vso III.16 *iw=s r mst* ‘She will give birth’; P. UC 32057, vso III.17 *nn ms=s* ‘She will not give birth.’ Vernus (1990: 126-7); Stauder (2013a: 370-1).

23 *Ptahhotep* 407 (§2.3.2, (vii)); *Merikare* E 49 (§2.3.2, (vi)).

(iv) Uronarti Quay Inscription (*temp.* Senwosret III)<sup>24</sup>

*hw.tw r gmt mw (...)*

‘Water had to be found (...)’

The situation in relatively less formal registers in the late Twelfth Dynasty can thus be represented as follows:

	future	events bound to happen (rare)
active	←————— <i>NP r sdm</i> —————→	
passive	<i>(X.)tw r sdm</i>	<i>(?) (X.)tw r sdm</i> (documented once, (iv))
in rel. cl.	<i>nty.tw r sdm</i>	<i>nty<sub>O</sub> r sdm</i> <sup>25</sup>

D. Independently from the above developments, the perfective V-passive can be used at all times to express events yet to come, the construction conveying a strong modal effect derived from the perfective aspect of the form (§1.2.3.1). In this use, the perfective V-passive contrasts with the T-passive of the prospective, expressing a mere future:

(v.a) P. Berlin 9010, 3

*tr ʕ3 r ʕ33=f šr r šrr=f*

‘The great one shall be treated (*lit.* has been treated, thus will have been treated) according to how he is great, the small one according to how he is small.’

(v.b) Louvre Bowl, 9-15<sup>26</sup>

*pr.t-hrw n=k tr.t n=k h3kr tr.t n=k w3g rd.t n=k t3 hnkt hr wdhw n hnt-imntiw  
hd=k m <m>sktt hnt=k m <m>ʕndt rd.t n=k m3ʕ-hrw r-gs ntr nb*

‘Invocation offerings will be made for you, the *haker*-feast will be celebrated for you, the *wag*-feast will be celebrated for you, bread and beer will be given for you on the offering table of Khentimentiu.

You will sail north in the evening bark, you will sail south in the morning bark, a justification will be given to you on the side of every god.’

In *Sinuhe*, the perfective V-passive is used by Sinuhe addressing the king: the event has lasting validity and is strongly asserted as an effect of the perfective aspect of the form. In the passage to which this is a response, the king speaks with T-passives of the prospective. The king merely describes Sinuhe’s burial; being the king, he need not further underscore his assertion:

<sup>24</sup> Vernus (1990: 14, ex.29).

<sup>25</sup> E.g. P. Berlin 10033, ro 2 (iv); P. Berlin 10025, ro 4 (§2.3.2, (x)); P. Rhind Mathematical 82 (§2.3.2, (xi)).

<sup>26</sup> While most forms are indistinct in writing, the passage is phrased as a future, not as a wish, because *rd.t* is a T-passive of the prospective, not of the subjunctive.

(vi.a) *Sinuhe* B 212-213

**wḥm** *snd=k m t3w ḥ3swt* (...)

‘Fear of you shall be repeated in the lands and hill-countries (...)’

(vi.b) *Sinuhe* B 194-196 (full quotation, (i))

(...) **ir.tw** *ḥbb nnyw r r3 is=k nis.tw n=k dbḥt-ḥtpw sft.tw r r3 ʿbw=k* (...)

‘(...) The dance of the Oblivious Ones will be performed at the entrance of your tomb; the invocation-offerings will be recited for you; sacrifices will be made at the entrance of your offering-chapel (...)’

This use of an otherwise accomplished form to express events yet to come is limited to the passive (the *sḏm.n=f* can not be used with similar effect). Accordingly, the construction has no counterpart in the active.

## 4 The passive in the accomplished

In the accomplished, two inflectional passives are regularly used, a V-passive—the perfective V-passive—and a T-passive—the *sdm.n.t=f*. In addition, another construction is integral to the paradigm of the accomplished passive, *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* (*subject – pseudoparticiple*, only with pronominal subjects). The organization of passive voice in the accomplished is thus complex. I first discuss the complementary distribution between *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* and *V-pass non-P* with fully asserted positive events (§4.1). I then describe the diachronic change by which in earlier stages of Earlier Egyptian the *sdm.n.t=f* came to spread over, and ultimately to supersede, the perfective V-passive in certain well-defined environments, notably in the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions (§4.2). The third step consists in analyzing this change and the resulting contrast between the perfective V-passive and the *sdm.n.t=f* as observed in later stages of Earlier Egyptian (§4.3).

### 4.1 The complementary distribution *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* ~ *V-pass non-P*

With fully asserted positive events, the pseudoparticiple is used in complementary distribution to the perfective V-passive, the former with pronominal subjects, the latter with non-pronominal ones (full noun subjects, clausal subjects, and in subjectless constructions).<sup>1</sup> Since the pseudoparticiple is also used to express non-dynamic events with both pronominal and full noun subjects,<sup>2</sup> the relevant extract of the paradigm is as follows:

		↓ (b)	
non-dynamic	<i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP</i>	<i>N<sub>O</sub> PsP</i>	
dynamic	<i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP</i> (a)	<i>V-pass non-P</i>	← (c)

This is established stepwise. I first show that the pseudoparticiple oriented on O can express a dynamic event when the O is pronominal and is thereby a regular part of the accomplished passive paradigm (slot (a) in the above; §4.1.1). I go on showing that with non-pronominal O’s, the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive contrast with one another as two constructions expressing non-dynamic and dynamic events

1 Previously noted by Polotsky (1976: 37-8); Collier (1994: 77); Uljas (2009: 280).

2 For a more precise definition of what is meant by ‘non-dynamic’ and ‘dynamic’ events expressed by the pseudoparticiple, §4.3.3.1.

(column (b); §4.1.2). I then show that with positive fully asserted accomplished passives, the paradigm is split according to whether the O is pronominal or not (line (c); §4.1.3). The very rare exceptions to this complementary distribution  $P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$  are evoked in turn (§4.1.4). Final comments are devoted to what seems to be the functional rationale underlying the complementary distribution (§4.1.5).

#### 4.1.1 $P_O PsP$ as integral to the accomplished passive paradigm

A. The pseudoparticiple oriented on O regularly expresses non-dynamic events, with pronominal subjects and non-pronominal ones alike, e.g.:

(i) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 249-252

*wḥ3 mk tw pḥ.t*

*ḥm-ḥt mk tw wšd.t*

*pnḳ mwiw mk tw ʕk.t*

‘Fool, look now you are caught!

Ignoramus, look you are accused!

Bilge-baler, look you are noticed!’<sup>3</sup>

(ii) *Sinuhe* B 307-308 (the closing of the final section)

*iw twt=i šḥkr m nbw šndyt=f m dʕm*

‘My statue is overlaid with gold and its kilt with electrum.’

B. Only with pronominal subjects, the same construction can also express dynamic events. A dynamic reading is demonstrated by the fully regular occurrences of  $P_O PsP$  with the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase. By definition, the presence of the *in N* phrase implies that the semantic representation of the event includes an Agent and therefore that the event is dynamic; as also discussed, the *in N* phrase is near exclusively restricted to, and defining of, the passive construction in finite constructions (§2.2; §2.4.1):

(iii) *Hatnub* 6, 4

*iw(=i) ḥ3b.k r ḥwt-nbw in ḥ3t[i-ʕ ...]*

‘I was sent to Hatnub by the prince [...]

Sim. *Urk.* I 255, 5 (Qar of Edfu) *ḥz.k ḥr=s in nb(=i)* ‘I was praised about it by my lord’; *Seneni* (CG 20500), 6 *ḥs.kw ḥr=s in niwt mi-ḳd=s* ‘I was praised about it by the entire town’ (both with the first person singular preverbal subject omitted under relevance, as is regular in Old Kingdom and later autobiographies).

(iv) CT VI 63d-e B2L<sup>4</sup>

*iw=i twr.kw*

*iw=i ms.kw in šsmtt*

3 Transl. Parkinson (2012a: 206-7).

4 These Coffin Text occurrences noted by Polotsky (1976: 38).

‘I was conceived,  
I was born by Shesmetet.’

Sim. CT II 316a (mult. mss.)  $iw=i$  **bs.kw**  $hr=s$  **in sm** ‘I have been introduced to it by the *sem*-priest’; CT V 285a (mult. mss.)  $iw=i$  **h3b.kw in**  $\epsilon_3 pw$  (...) ‘I have been sent by this great one (...)’.

The compatibility of the pseudoparticiples oriented on O with the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase extends to uses in dependent clauses. In these, the implied intra-clausal subject of the pseudoparticiple is coreferential to some expression in the main clause and can thus be viewed as an anaphoric  $\emptyset$ :<sup>5</sup> [...  $NP_1$  ...]<sub>main\_clause</sub> [ $\emptyset_i PsP$ ]<sub>dependent\_clause</sub>. The construction is thus  $P_O PsP$ . E.g., in circumstantial clause (v) and in complement clauses (vi)-(vii):

(v) *Urk.* I 189, 18 (false door of Ptahhotep II)

$ir$   $n=f$   $nmt$   $\dot{s}$  **t.s3h** **in**  $wt$

‘The crossing of the pool will be carried out for him after he has been *akh*-ified by the embalmer priest.’

Sim. *Urk.* I 189, 17.

(vi) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla IV.25-26 (Inscription #10)<sup>6</sup>

$n$   $gmt=i$  **ir**  $is$   $pw$  **in**  $itw$   $tpw-\epsilon wy$

‘This is not something that I have found done by my fathers who had been here before.’

Sim. Mo<sup>c</sup>alla I.α.2-3 (Inscription #2)  $gm.n(=i)$   $pr$   $hww$   $ttf$   $mi$   $grgt$  **mkh3**  $n$   $iry=f$   $m$   $st-\epsilon$  (...) ‘I found the domain of Khuu inundated like a *gereget*, neglected by the one responsible for it and in charge (...)’.

C. According with one of the primary functions of the passive as an Agent-backgrounding construction, passive constructions with an expression of the Agent are in general less common than ones with no expression of such (§2.5.2.4.A). Accordingly, the above cases of  $P_O PsP$  with an Agent-expressing *in N* phrase are only a subset of the cases when  $P_O PsP$  expresses a dynamic event, i.e. functions as an accomplished passive construction.

A dynamic reading of  $P_O PsP$ —and therefore a passive interpretation—is for example implied in cases when the construction is used in the main narrative chain, most clearly perhaps in  $\epsilon h\epsilon$ -introduced clauses. Without and with overt expression of the Agent:

(vii) *Eloquent Peasant* B2 135

$\epsilon h\epsilon$   $n=f$  **in**

**ir** **wpwt**  $m$   $h[nw=f$   $nb^3]$

5 Further Peust (2007).

6 On this formula, §2.2.2.3.

‘Then he was brought  
and an inventory was made of all his goods.’

(viii) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 39-41

ʕḥ.n=i **rd.kw** r tw pn **tn** w3w n w3d-wr

‘I was given to this island by a wave of the sea.’

Sim. 109-110.

A dynamic reading of *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* also obtains for example in cases in which a certain type of adverbial expression has scope over the dynamic part of the event rather than over the state that results from it (ix).<sup>7</sup> In a great many instances, no formal criteria such as discussed above are given and the dynamic reading can only be inferred (x):

(ix) Weha (OIM 16956), 4-5

iw=i **sḥ.b.k** ḥnḥ s 120

‘I was circumcised with 120 men.’

In the context of the inscription, not: <sup>?</sup>‘I am now circumcised together with 120 men.’

(x) P. Berlin 10023A, ro 2

(...) r-dd **tw3.kw** ḥr s3=i (...)

‘(...) saying: “I have been robbed of my son” (...)’

#### 4.1.2 Non-pronominal O’s: *N<sub>O</sub> PsP* vs. *V-pass non-P*

A. As noted, the pseudoparticiples oriented on a pronominal O (*P<sub>O</sub> PsP*) can express dynamic (§4.1.1.B-C) and non-dynamic events (§4.1.1, (i)). With non-pronominal subjects, by contrast, the otherwise similar construction (*N<sub>O</sub> PsP*) expresses only non-dynamic events (§4.1.1, (ii)): an accomplished passive event with a non-pronominal O is always expressed by another construction, with the perfective V-passive (§4.1.3). That *N<sub>O</sub> PsP* is always non-dynamic is directly demonstrated by the fact that the two following constructions do not occur:

- (a) <sup>†</sup>*N<sub>O</sub> PsP in N*

*N<sub>O</sub> PsP* never co-occurs with the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase. This is significant because the same *in N* phrase is, on the other hand, perfectly compatible with the pseudoparticiple: with pronominal O’s, it is regularly found (§4.1.1.B; §4.1.1, (ix)). Moreover, another construction is always used whenever an accomplished passive with a non-pronominal O is to include the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase, namely the V-passive (illustration: *passim* in the present study).

<sup>7</sup> Examples are not many because adverbial expressions with such scope tend to occur mostly in the ‘emphatic’ construction (§4.3.4.1.3; §4.3.4.2-3; §4.3.5.5).



- (b)  $^{\dagger}h^c.n N_O PsP$ 

$N_O PsP$  is never found in a  $^{\dagger}h^c.n$ -introduced clause. This is significant because the pseudoparticle oriented on O is, on the other hand, regularly found in  $^{\dagger}h^c.n$ -introduced clauses, provided the O is pronominal (§4.1.1, (viii)–(ix)). Moreover, Another construction is always used in  $^{\dagger}h^c.n$ -introduced clauses whenever the O argument is non-pronominal, namely  $^{\dagger}h^c.n V\text{-pass non-}P$  (illustration: §4.1.3, (ii.b), also (iv), (x)).

B. The above considerations establish that  $N_O PsP$ —unlike  $P_O PsP$  (§4.1.1)—is restricted to the expression of non-dynamic events. An illustration of such use was given above (§4.1.1, (ii)); a few more may now be added.  $N_O PsP$  thus often occurs in descriptions, typically alongside situational predicate constructions (i). The non-dynamic value of  $N_O PsP$  is similarly illustrated after  $h\beta$ , in a wish for a state (ii). (In general, modal uses of the pseudoparticle concern only cases when the form expresses non-dynamic events: §4.3.3.4, (f).) Thus:

(i) *Sinuhe* R 8-11

*iw hnw m sgr ibw m gmw*  
*rwty wrty htmw*  
*[šnyt] m [tp]-hr-mβst p<sup>c</sup>t m imw*

‘The Residence was in silence, hearts were in mourning;  
 The Great Double Portal was shut;  
 The court was bowed down, the patricians were in grief.’

In the description of the court’s mourning upon Amenemhat’s apotheosis;  $N_O PsP$  is used once in central position in a five-fold piece otherwise consisting only in situational predicate constructions (a-a’ – b – a’’-a’’’). Sim. e.g. *Urk.* IV 339, 14-17 (*Punt Expedition*) (...) *hβtt <sup>c</sup>ntiw hr <sup>c</sup>w<sup>t</sup>=s nbt hnmw=s m idt ntr iw s<sup>t</sup>=s βbh m pwnt inm=s nb m d<sup>c</sup>m* (...) ‘(...) the best myrrh is on her every limb, her breath is as the god’s fragrance, her smell is united with Punt, her skin is overlaid with electrum (...); *passim*.

## (ii) Antef son of Senet (BM EA 562), 9

*hβ tβ mh m mitw=f*

‘May the land be filled with his likes!’

C. As noted,  $N_O PsP$  and  $V\text{-pass non-}P$  contrast with one another as expressing non-dynamic and dynamic events respectively. This can also be illustrated directly in the recurrent sequence  $V\text{-pass non-}P - N_O PsP$ . Although stylistic rather than grammatical in nature, the sequence is significant because it always comes in this order (the reverse sequence,  $^{\dagger}N_O PsP - V\text{-pass non-}P$ , is undocumented). The sequence thus leads from a dynamic to a non-dynamic event; the latter, by virtue of being non-dynamic, has closing force (for a similar type of patterning, §2.5.2.3.2):

(iii) Antef son of Myt (Berlin 13272), 8-11<sup>8</sup>

ḥꜥ.n *kd=s*

*in* ḥ3w ḥr *sntwt=s*      ḥntiw=*s* *tr* m m3wt (1a-b)

*tr* n=*s* sb3w m [i]nr      *tr.t* min m3wy n-mrwt [ḥnt] st=f r kw sꜥḥw (2a-b)

‘Then it (*scil.* the *ka*-chapel of the prince Nakhtiger) was rebuilt:

An extension was added to its foundation and its statues are made anew;

Doors were made for it in stone and it is today made anew so that its place be more prominent than any other nobles’ (places).’

In 1a-b, the sequence *V-pass N – N<sub>O</sub> PsP* is directly illustrated. In 2b, the use of a pseudoparticiple is for another reason, discussed below (§4.1.3.B), and therefore not directly illustrative here (as the pseudoparticiple is used for inter-clausal cohesion, its reading could also be dynamic, as far as grammar proper is concerned). However, the presence of *min* in 2b is significant, implying a non-dynamic reading. As the sequence is paralleled in ways that 1b and 2b are parallel to one another, this confirms the non-dynamic reading of 1b, with *N<sub>O</sub> PsP* (1b) contrasting semantically with the dynamic *V-pass N* (1a and 2a).

(iv) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 2-8

*mk ph.n.n* ḥnw

*šsp* ḥrp    ḥw mnit      ḥ3tt *rd.t* ḥr t3 (1a-c)

*rd* ḥknw    dw3 ntr      s nb ḥr ḥpt sn-nw=f (2a-c)

*iswt*{t}=n ii.t ꜥd.t nn ḥnw n mšꜥ=n

‘See, we have reached home:

The mallet has been taken, the mooring post has been driven in, the prow rope is put on the ground;

Thanks have been given, the god has been praised, everyone is hugging their fellows;

Our crew has come back sage, without any loss to our expedition.’

A famous description of successful return. The sequence is *V-pass N, V-pass N* (1a-b) – *N<sub>O</sub> PsP* (1c). Significantly, 2c, the pendant to 1c, has a progressive construction, with scope over the current situation; so has 1c, with *N<sub>O</sub> PsP*.

(v) *Sinuhe* B 300-308

*iw* ḥwsw n=*i* mr m inr (...)

ḥꜥw nb ddw r rwd *tr* hrt=f im

*rd* n=*i* ḥmw-k3 ir n=*i* š (...)

*iw* twt=*i* *shkr* m nbw šndyt=f m dꜥm

‘A pyramid of stone was constructed for me (...);

Every equipment that is put in the tomb shaft, its share thereof was made;

I was given funerary priests, a pool was made for me (...).

8 On the opening construction ḥꜥ.n *V-pass P*, which is unique, §4.1.4, (vii).

My statue is overlaid with gold and its kilt with electrum.’

In the final part of *Sinuhe*,  $V\text{-pass } N$  (three times) –  $N_O PsP$  is stretched over the whole sequence telling of the establishment of funerary equipment. The closing  $N_O PsP$  has conclusive force, expressing Sinuhe’s becoming a statue and thereby ultimate monumentalization in the framing fictionalized autobiography.

#### 4.1.3 Dynamic events: $P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$

With fully asserted positive events in the accomplished passive, the pseudoparticle and the V-passive are used in complementary distribution according to the nature of the subject, pronominal or non-pronominal.

A. The complementary distribution is regular in main clauses. This is illustrated first in (narrative) discourse after *iw* (i.a-b) or in narrative in  $^h\text{c}.n$ -introduced clauses (ii.a-b):

(i.a) CT VI 167a-b B4C

*iw=f rd n=s n nhmm=f m-c=s*

‘He (*scil.* her opponent) has been given to her, he will not be taken away from her.’

Sim. e.g. Hatnub 6, 4 (§4.1.1, (iii)); 9, 7; Weha 4-5 (§4.1.1, (iii)); *passim*.

(i.b) CT III 26c

*iw rd n=i hw (...)*

‘Nourishment has been given to me (...)’

Sim. e.g. *Urk.* I 128, 5 (Harkhuf) *iw si3 mdt nt md3t=k tn (...)* ‘The matter of this letter of yours (...) has been acknowledged (...)’; *passim*.

(ii.a) *Eloquent Peasant* B2 135

$^h\text{c}.n=f in (...)$

‘Then he was brought (...)’

Sim. e.g. *Shipwrecked Sailor* 39-41 (§4.1.1, (vii)); 109-110; *Urk.* IV 3, 3  $^h\text{c}.n=i \underline{it}.kw r p3 imw m\dot{h}ti hr knn=i$  ‘Then I was taken to the ‘Northern One’ because of my bravery’; *passim*.

(ii.b) *Cheops’ Court* 8.17-18

$^h\text{c}.n in n=f smn (...)$

‘Then a goose was brought to him (...)’

Sim. e.g. Hammamat 110, 6  $^h\text{c}.n \text{ } \text{ } \text{ } n\dot{h}bt=s$  ‘Then its neck was cut’; Ameniseneb (Louvre C12), 6  $^h\text{c}.n m3 n3 n k3wt$  ‘Then these works were seen’; *Urk.* IV 655, 15  $^h\text{c}.n w3\dot{h} ihw im$  ‘Then a camp was laid down there’; *passim*.

The complementary distribution  $P_o PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$  is illustrated further with the two accomplished passive events in direct sequence to one another:

(iii) *Sinuhe* B 290-291

**rd** sw3 rnpwt hr h<sup>c</sup>w=i

**β.kw**

**cb** šnw=i

‘The years were made to pass on my limbs:

I was shaven

and my hair was combed.’

(iv) *Eloquent Peasant* B2 135

h<sup>c</sup>.n=f **tn**

**tr** wpwt m h[nw=f nb<sup>?</sup>]

‘Then he was brought

and an inventory was made of all his goods.’

The complementary distribution  $P_o PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$  extends to all types of main clauses, for example to such marked as future by means of *wnn* (v.a-b) and to such marked as textually backgrounded by means of *ist/ti* (vi.a-b):

(v.a) *Ameny-ankh-ren* (CG 20458) b.3-4

ir grt s nb ir.t=fy d3t<sup>sic</sup> r {r}<m> h<sup>c</sup>t=i

wnn=i **wd<sup>c</sup>.kw** hn<sup>c</sup>=f m bw nty wd<sup>c</sup> mdw im

‘As to anybody who will do wrong against my tomb,

I will be judged with him in the place in which judgment is pronounced.’

This specific construction is not documented in the Old Kingdom, in which times another formulation is then used, *iw(=i) r wd<sup>c</sup>* (§2.3.2, (iii)).

(v.b) *Urk.* I 30, 12-13 (Nikaiankh)

(...) ir z nb hnn.t=f

wnn **wd<sup>c</sup>** mdw hn<sup>c</sup>=f

‘(...) as to every man who will disturb,

there will be a judgment with him.’

On *wd3* being a V-passive, §1.2.3, (ii).

(vi.a) *Sinuhe* R 13-14<sup>9</sup>

ti sw **h3b** r hwt h3swt r skr imiw thnw

‘He had been sent to strike the foreign countries, to smite those in Tjehenu.’

9 An interpolation of R: Stauder (2013a: 294); Parkinson (2009: 164-5); Gardiner (1916: 10).

(vi.b) *Sinuhe* R 22-23

ist **h3b** r msw-nsw (...)

‘Now, there had been sending to the royal children (...)’

With an O-detransitivized verb (§2.6.1.1); sim. B 173 (§2.6.1.1, (xi)). With a full noun subject, e.g. Ameniseneb (Louvre C11), 2 ist **iry snfr** twt pn m ḥsbt 22 ‘This statue was perfected in year 22’,<sup>10</sup> *passim*.<sup>11</sup>

B. When coreferential to some expression in the main clause, the implied intra-clausal subject of the pseudoparticiple in dependent clauses can be viewed as an anaphoric  $\emptyset$ . Under this provision, the complementary distribution  $P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$  extends to dependent clauses. Schematically:

[... $NP_i$ ...] <sub>main_clause</sub>	[ $\emptyset_i PsP$ ] <sub>dependent_clause</sub>
[... $NP_{i,j,k}$ ...] <sub>main_clause</sub>	[ $V\text{-pass } N_x$ ] <sub>dependent_clause</sub>

This distribution is observed in dependent clauses that are continuative, or even consecutive, with respect to an initial main clause and thereby belong to the main chain of events (vii); in dependent clauses that entertain a circumstantial relationship with the main clause (viii); and in dependent clauses that semantically relate to a noun phrase, as the Earlier Egyptian equivalent to e.g. English restrictive relative clause (‘virtual relative clauses’ in Gardinerian terms) (ix):

(vii) *Sinuhe* B 101-104

h3st nbt rwt.n=i r=s iw ir.n=i hd=i im=s<sub>i</sub>

{dd}<dr>.t<sub>i</sub> ḥr smw hnmwt=s

h3k.n=i mnmnt=s in<.n>=i ḥrw=s

**nḥm** wnmnt=sn

‘Every foreign country I marched against, I made my attack on it and it was repelled from its grasslands and wells;

I plundered its cattle, I brought back its dependents and its provisions were taken.’

## (viii.a) Hammamat 110, 6-7

ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n ṣ<sup>c</sup>w nḥbt=s<sub>i</sub> **wdn.t**<sub>i</sub> ḥr=f m sbi n sḏt

h3t pw ir.n=f m ḥtp

‘Then its (*scil.* the gazelle’s) neck was cut, after it had been sacrificed on it (*scil.* the stone) as a burnt-offering.

It (*scil.* the stone) came down safely.’

<sup>10</sup> Incidentally, an early instance of *iri*-periphrasis with a *caus-3rad* (Gardiner 1957<sup>3</sup>: §420).

<sup>11</sup> Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: 340, n.5-6).

(viii.b) Hammamat 192, 19-21

*sw 27 h3t ʕ3 n nb ʕnh pn (...)*

**rḥs** bḥsw **sft** ʕnhwt **ḏ** sntr ḥr sdt

*ist mšʕ (...)* ḥr šms=f m ḥtp r t3-mri

‘Day 27. The going down of the lid of this sarcophagus (...),  
after calves had been slaughtered, goats sacrificed and incense put on the fire.  
An expedition (...) was conveying it safely to Egypt.’

(ix) *Urk.* I 4, 10-14 (Metjen)

*(...) pr<sub>i</sub> 3w mḥ 200 šḥ mḥ 200*

**kd<sub>i</sub>** **ʕpr<sub>i</sub>**

**w3ḥ** ḥt nfr **tr** š im=f ʕ3 wrt **w3ḥ** d3bw i3rrwt

‘(...) an estate, 200 cubits long and 200 cubits broad,  
constructed and equipped,  
beautiful trees planted and a very large pool made in it, and fig trees and vines  
planted.’

Like in non-dependent clauses (above, A), the complementary distribution can be illustrated further with examples in which the two passive events stand in direct sequence to one another, in continuative dependency (x) or relating to a noun (xi):

(x) *Eloquent Peasant* R 11.3-4

*ʕḥ. n ʕ3g. n [=f] ḥr [ʕ] t=f nbt im=s*

**nḥm** ʕ3w=f<sub>i</sub>

**sʕk<sub>i</sub>** r niwt=f

‘Then he thrashed his every limb with it  
and his donkeys were taken  
and entered into his estate.’

(xi) *Urk.* I 220, 5-6 (Nekhebu)

*iw (...) ḥw[t-k3]<sub>i</sub> im*

**kd<sub>i</sub>** / **ḥwz<sub>i</sub>**

**dy** ḥtw ir<sub>j</sub>

**ndr<sub>j</sub>** m t3-mḥw

‘I (...) a *ka*-chapel there,  
built and constructed,  
the woodwork thereof placed (in position),  
having been cut in Lower Egypt.’

*Kd* and *ḥwz* in split column. Sim., with a clausal subject of the V-passive, *Urk.* I 108, 1-3 (Weni) *sh3.k n=f ḥtp pn<sub>i</sub> n hrw 17 wh3<sub>i</sub> m ḥwt-nbw rdy nʕ=f m ḥd m (w)sh<sub>t</sub> t[n]* ‘I had this offering table go down for him in 17 days, which had been quarried in Hatnub and made to travel downstream in this barge.’

NB. One passage in *Sinuhe* which has caused difficulties belongs to the present section:

(xii) *Sinuhe* B 159-160

*ptr wrt 'bt h3t=i m t3 ms.kw im=f*

The clause *ms.kw im=f* is generally read as a restrictive relative clause dependent on *t3* (thus ‘(...) a/the land in which I was born’).<sup>12</sup> The use of a pseudoparticiple in such context would be entirely unparalleled; moreover, the regular construction for the same function is another one, with an extended construction of the passive participle, e.g. *Urk. I 119, 1* (Djau of Abydos) (...) *sp3t mst w im=s tn hkr̥t-nsw nbt* (...) ‘(...) the district in which I was born by the royal ornament Nebet (...)’. In line with an ancient proposal that *t3* may here stand for Egypt (‘the Land’), *ms.kw* is dependent on the first person singular pronoun in the preceding clause: ‘What is greater than my being buried in the Land, seeing that I was born in it?’<sup>13</sup> That *ms.kw*, an event of ‘being born’, is thus syntactically hooked on an expression determining *h3t* ‘corpse’ may well be a stylistically intended effect.

C. The complementary distribution  $P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$  is regular in Earlier Egyptian grammar to the point that it extends to events that on semantic grounds are not prone to be used with a resultative form such as the pseudoparticiple (further, §4.3.3.2). Thus in the following pairs of sentences with events that are otherwise generally atelic and non subject-affecting, *sḏm* ‘hear’ and *wšd* ‘question’:

(xii.a) P. Brooklyn 35.1446, pl.V, B, 13

*mk st sḏm*

‘Look, it has been taken note of.’

(xii.b) P. Brooklyn 35.1446, pl.VI, C, 7

*mk sḏm irt*

‘Look, what has been done has been taken note of.’

(xiii.a) P. Berlin 10470, I.14

*mk st wšd hr=s*

‘Look, they have been questioned about it.’

(xiii.b) P. Berlin 10470, II.14

*mk wšd n3 n rmt iw (...)*

‘Look, these people who had come (...) have been questioned.’

<sup>12</sup> E.g., among many others, Parkinson (2009: 287); Feder, *TLA* (noting this as ‘problematisch’).

<sup>13</sup> Blackman (1936: 37).

## 4.1.4 Exceptions: V-passives in lieu of an expected pseudoparticiple

Exceptions to the complementary distribution  $P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$  are only exceptionally encountered. These concern cases where a V-passive is used in lieu of an expected pseudoparticiple—never the reverse—and are found only in earlier periods in Earlier Egyptian.

A. Among the few instances encountered, four are in broadly circumstantial environments. In these, the referent of the subject pronoun is present in the preceding clause; a pseudoparticiple, not a V-passive, would therefore be expected according to the regular distribution described above (§4.1.3.C). Yet the latter is found in the four following passages:

(i) Pyr. 474b-c<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 305)<sup>14</sup>

*šzpt rmt<sub>i</sub> krs=sn<sub>i</sub>*

*h3=s m t3 h3=s m hnkt*

*hr wdhw m hnt-imntiw*

‘What people receive when they have been buried,  
their thousand of bread and their thousand of offering,  
is on the offering table of Khentimentiu.’

(ii) *Urk.* I 134, 6-10 (Pepinakht)<sup>15</sup>

*iw in.n(=i) hk3wi n h3swt (i)ptn n hnw m htpw*

*iw3w wndw nhw<sub>i</sub> gm=sn<sub>i</sub> n hnw*

*hn<sup>c</sup> msw hk3 imiw-r3 šnw ntw hn<sup>c</sup>=s[n]*

‘I brought the two chiefs of these foreign countries to the Residence in peace,  
live oxen and goats that had been chosen for the Residence  
as well as the children of the chief and Nubian generals who where with  
them.’

(iii) Hatnub 28, 5<sup>16</sup>

*ir.n=i<sub>i</sub> w<sup>c</sup>b shnt=i<sub>i</sub> m hrd=[i]*

*n-<sup>c</sup>3[t]-n hss [w]i nb=i*

‘I became a *wab*-priest after I had been singled out in my childhood  
because my lord praised me so much.’

14 Noted by Allen (1984: §498); Polotsky (1976: 29).

15 Doret (1986: 94-5, ex.166).

16 Doret (1986: 171, ex.312). Díaz Hernández’ (2013: 97, ex.114) different interpretation runs counter to the implied sequence of events.



(iv) Neferiu, MMA 12.183.8, right jambs 3-4<sup>17</sup>

*in ikr ir n(=i)<sub>i</sub> st*

*sʕ3(=i)<sub>i</sub> r ʕ3w srw nw niwt(=i) r-dr=s m mtrt w(i)*

‘It was Iqer who made it (*scil.* the tomb)

after I had been promoted above great men—as all the officials of my town are my witness.’

These rare occurrences of  $V\text{-pass } P$  may be interpreted as bearing witness to the fact that in early times the complementary distribution  $P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass } P$  was not yet fully generalized in such circumstantial environments. Possibly significantly, these are environments in which the pseudoparticiples lack an overtly expressed intra-clausal subject (for the analysis, see above).

B. Altogether exceptional, and possibly each unique, are the following instances of  $V\text{-passives}$  with pronominal subjects in main clauses asyndetically linked to a preceding main clause (v), introduced by *iw* (vi), or introduced by  $\text{ʕ}h^c.n$  (vii).<sup>18</sup> The regular constructions are, respectively,  $P_O PsP$  (e.g. §4.1.3, (vii), (viii.a), (ix)-(xi)), *iw*  $P_O PsP$  (e.g. §4.1.1, (iii)-(iv); §4.1.3, (i.a)), and  $\text{ʕ}h^c.n$   $P_O PsP$  (§4.1.1, (vii); §4.1.3, (ii.a)):

(v) *Urk.* I 183, 15-16 (Kaiemtjenenet, the king speaking)

[...] *twt igr ir*

*sfh(=i) im=sn*

*ity(=i) n=f*

‘You are the one who acted,  
and I was set free from them (*scil.* the tempest)  
and taken to him.’

(vi) CT IV 45m-n B1C, B2L<sup>19</sup>

*iw hsy=i iw hst n=i*

‘I have been praised; praise is to me.’

In CT VI 311j B1Bo<sup>20</sup> *iw smsy=f r ʕ n nhḥ m hnt iwn nw* the text is problematic as it stands because *smṣi* ‘deliver’, ‘entbinden’, can hardly apply to a masculine O. Under a different segmentation and assuming that some segment of the clause has been lost, an at least plausible sense could be achieved: *iw=s <...> msy=f r ʕ (...)* ‘She <...> him whom he fashioned according to the decree (...)’.<sup>21</sup>

17 Doret (1986: 171, ex.314).

18 Herwerre (Sinai 90), 13 *wn=i mʕ=i r bi3 pn*, proposed by Díaz Hernández (2013: 97, ex.112) as another instance, is to be read actively with *mʕʕ r* used intransitively in the sense of ‘set out to’ (lit. ‘direct oneself to’, ‘se diriger vers’), thus ‘I used to set out to this mine’.

19 Schenkel (2005: 41); Polotsky (1976: 37); Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 78, ex.35); probably also 45p B2L *iw hsy{n}=i iw hst n=i* (Schenkel 2005: 41).

20 Schenkel (2005: 41), cautiously and with expressed discomfort about the causative.

21 Faulkner (1973-1977: II, 248 and 249, n.17).

(vii) Antef son of Myt (Berlin 13272), 7-11<sup>22</sup>

*gm.n(=i) ḥwt-k3 nt iri-pṯ nḥt-ikr w3s.t inbw is twtw=s nb ng n-wnt wn sh3 st*  
*ḥṣ.n ḳd=s*

*in ḥ3w ḥr snṯwt=s ḥntiw=s ir m m3wt*

*ir n=s sb3w m [i]nr ir.t min m3wy n-mrwt [ḥnt] st=f r kw sḥw*

‘I found the *ka*-chapel of the prince Nakhtiqer fallen into ruin, its walls old, all its statues broken, without there being one who could remember it.

Then it was rebuilt:

An extension was added to its foundation and its statues are made anew;

Doors were made for it in stone and it is today made anew so that its place be more prominent than any other nobles’.

In the case of (vii), a semantic account for the use of *ḥṣ.n ḳd=s* in lieu of the expected and otherwise regular *ḥṣ.n=s ḳd.t(i)* can probably be ventured. The clause *ḥṣ.n ḳd=s* introduces the sequence of restoration proper. The more detailed events of restoration that follow (*in ḥ3w (...)*: for these, §4.1.2, (iii)) are not temporally sequential to the event in this initial clause but provide an elaboration of the unspecific event of ‘(re)building’ (*ḳd*). Textually, the event in *ḥṣ.n ḳd=s* thus encapsulates the more specific elaborations of the same event that follow (*in ḥ3w (...)*). A V-passive may have been selected to make this relationship of encapsulation clear, as the pseudo-participle, a resultative form, would have implied that after *\*ḥṣ.n ḳd=s*, a new event is expressed by *in ḥ3w (...)*.

#### 4.1.5 The underlying functional basis

A. As just illustrated, exceptions to the complementary distribution *P<sub>O</sub> PsP ~ V-pass non-P* are rarely encountered in earlier times; these concern cases when *V-pass P* is found in lieu of an expected *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* (§4.1.4). Probably significant is that most occurrences concern dependent clauses, where the pseudoparticiple lacks an intra-clausal subject overtly expressed. That such occurrences are found at all demonstrates that the distribution under discussion ultimately reflects a functional basis of some sort, from which the regular complementary distribution was conventionalized into a near-exceptionless rule of grammar (in earlier times) to become one without any documented exceptions (in later times).

Personal pronouns are of all nominal expressions the ones that score highest on the scale of topicality: delocutive personal (i.e. third person) pronouns are anaphoric and thereby highly topical by definition; interlocutive (first and second person) pronouns are even more topical as they point to the speech act participants themselves. Non-pronominal subjects, by contrast, can be participants newly introduced in discourse; moreover, they need not be referential, can be clausal in nature, and include subjects that are very low in individuation. *V-pass non-P* is further used in subjectless

<sup>22</sup> Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §481); Polotsky (1976: 37); Doret (1986: 130, ex.224); Díaz Hernández (2013: 96-7, ex.111).

constructions of various sorts, with primary and secondary intransitives (§2.5.3; 2.6.1). The split in  $P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$  thus directly relates to hierarchies of topicality, and beyond these, to the Nominal Hierarchy:<sup>23</sup> personal pronouns—which score highest in topicality—select the pseudoparticiple, a resultative category; non-pronominal subjects—which score lower, much lower, or extremely low in topicality—select the perfective V-passive, an inflectional passive.

The distribution also fits into the more generally observed tendency of Earlier Egyptian subject-first constructions to select highly topical subjects.<sup>24</sup> Subjects—and particularly active ones—tend to be topical in all constructions because of their discourse function as the primary topic in the clause. This general tendency is reinforced in subject-first constructions because the subject-predicate order mirrors the natural flow of discourse, from Topic to Comment. Significantly, languages can thus develop strategies to avoid placing an indefinite subject in absolute clause-initial position in an otherwise subject-first construction, for example, *wn* developing in Later Egyptian,<sup>25</sup> or, reflecting a very similar principle, colloquial French *ya X<sub>INDEFINITE</sub> qui* (...) (near-compulsory with indefinite subjects). In the case of  $NP PsP$  specifically, the semantics of the pseudoparticiple additionally come into play. As a resultative, the pseudoparticiple is a quintessentially Endpoint-oriented category: the form is aspectually perfective, selects telic events, and is oriented on subjects that register a change-of-state (§4.3.3). That a subject be affected presupposes that it is individuated, a property that relates to definiteness and topicality (§4.3.4.1-2).

B. In appreciating the split in the accomplished passive more fully, the perspective must be broadened to subject-affecting intransitives (such as *iwi* ‘come’: §4.3.3.2). Unlike passives, these do not display a split in the accomplished. Whatever the nature of the subject,  $NP PsP$  is used:

*The pseudoparticiple expressing dynamic events*

Passive	$P_O PsP$	$V\text{-pass non-}P$
Subject-affecting intr. (e.g. <i>iwi</i> )	$P_S PsP$	$N_S PsP$

When expressing dynamic events—be this with transitives in the passive construction, or be this with subject-affected intransitives— $NP PsP$  has the exact same semantic properties reflecting the resultative nature of the form: telicity, perfectivity, subject affectedness, and high individuation and topicality of the subject. However, there is one fundamental difference, namely that an O is a passive subject, while a S is an active one. Active subjects, S’s likes A’s, are agentive and typically topical. Passive subjects, O’s, differ from these prototypical correlations in not being agentive; they can also be less topical and often are. No semantic constraints bear on the nature of the O of Earlier Egyptian inflectional passives (V-passives and T-passives alike),

23 Introduced by Silverstein (1976); subsequently e.g. Dixon (1994: 85-97). The scale was introduced first to describe and interpret phenomena of split ergativity, but has proven to have a much broader scope of application. While the complementary distribution here analyzed has nothing to do with split ergativity, it is, like split ergativity, a phenomenon to do with (split) alignment.

24 Based on text reading.

25 Descriptive study of the rise of the construction in Late Egyptian specifically: Winand (1989).

which can be indefinite, non-referential, clausal, or otherwise low in individuation (§2.1.1; §2.5.2.2 for zero-subject constructions); moreover, inflectional passives are commonly found in subjectless constructions (§2.1.2-3; §2.5.3; §2.6.1.1), that is, in constructions in which there is no O at all. That the non-prototypicality of passive subjects can have direct morphosyntactic effects was illustrated above in relation to an entirely unrelated construction, *sdm.t NP*, the pendant to active *N(P) sdm=f* (§3.1.1; further, §4.5.1).

The use of the pseudoparticiple to express dynamic events is historically secondary (further, §2.3.1.2.B). Typologically, the non-dynamic uses of a stative/resultative category are primary, and in many languages dynamic uses do not develop at all.<sup>26</sup> In Akkadian, the form cognate to the earlier Egyptian pseudoparticiple only marginally developed dynamic uses such as in Earlier Egyptian. These dynamic uses, an Egyptian innovation, would later retract: the Demotic and Coptic heir of the pseudoparticiple has by and large lost its capacity to express dynamic events. (The label common in Demotic and Coptic studies, where the form is referred to as a ‘stative’, aptly describes the functional profile of the form in these stages of the language.) When—in times prior to Old Egyptian—the pseudoparticiple developed the dynamic uses here under discussion with subject-affecting intransitives such as *iwi*, it did with all types of subjects: in subject-affecting intransitives, the subject is affected by the event, but also the agentive, controlling, and topical main participant of an active construction. When the same form developed dynamic uses with events oriented on O, it did only with pronominal subjects, i.e. the ones that score highest on the interrelated scales of topicality and individuation. That the innovation did not concern non-pronominal O’s—while fully extending to non-pronominal S’s—reflects the non-prototypical nature of passive subjects.

## 4.2 V- and T-passives in the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction

In Middle Egyptian literature and in other relatively later parts of the Earlier Egyptian record, the *sdm.n.t=f* is regularly used with passive accomplished events in the ‘emphatic’ construction. In earlier texts, the V-passive is used in similar environments, more commonly than the *sdm.n.t=f* or even near-exclusively.<sup>27</sup> In the present section, I describe this diachronic change in the record to provide a basis to the subsequent interpretive discussion (§4.3).

### 4.2.1 *V-pass P* (and *V-pass non-P* in similar environments)

With positive fully asserted events, *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* is the regular expression of the accomplished passive with pronominal subject, in complementary distribution to *V-pass non-P* (§4.1). Another expression of the accomplished passive with pronominal

<sup>26</sup> See the studies in Nedjalkov (1988).

<sup>27</sup> First noted by Edel (1958: 17-8).

subject is *V-pass P*. This contrasts with *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* not only formally but also in terms of the environments in which either construction is found: the ones in which *V-pass P* is found are similar to the ones which would later become the exclusive domain of the *sdm.n.t=f*. *V-pass non-P* is found in these environments as well:

Fully asserted events: *P<sub>O</sub> PsP*    *V-pass non-P* (§4.1)

Environments in which

the *sdm.n.t=f* would later develop: *V-pass P*    *V-pass non-P* (this section)

The presentation below focuses on occurrences with pronominal subject (*V-pass P*) because of the readily identified formal contrast with *P<sub>O</sub> PsP*. Occurrences of *V-pass non-P* plausibly interpreted as standing for similarly construed events are made mention of on a less systematic basis.

A. According with their particular contents and expression, Pyramid Texts commonly have the construction *V-pass P* (as well as *V-pass non-P*) with events of ‘having been born’ (*msi*) and of ‘having been conceived’ (*iwr*), and apparently only with these. With the same events, *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* is very uncommon; this is because a mere statement that the king was born is hardly any informative in texts that center around the king’s destiny—unless some very specific context is given:

(i) Pyr. 1965a-1967a<sup>N</sup> (PT 669)

*ms.n.t sw dn.n=t sw nh.n=t sw nhwt n rdwy=f n ʿwy=f*

*t(3)z=f ir=f m išt*

*in.k3.t bi3 pw (...)*

*t(3)[z]=f im=f (...) snhw[=f] im=f m-hnw ʿwy=tn in sn ntrw*

*mk r=k sw msy mk sw t(3)z mk sw hpr*

‘“You have given birth to him, you have shaped him, you have spat him out in a spitting, yet he has no legs, he has no arms.

With what will he be tied together?”

“This metal will then be brought (...)

It is with this that he will be tied together (...) It is with this that he will be made protected within yours arms” – say the gods.

“See, he is born, see, he is tied together, see, he is come into being.”’

In general, the scope of the assertion extends beyond the mere fact that the king was born or conceived. The event is thus presented in a perspective in which it is elaborated further by various elements of additional information, such as the circumstances (temporal or local) of such birth (ii), the ‘howness’ of the event (iii), a mention of the Agent in a context that is significantly focal also otherwise (iv), or a mention of the beneficiary for whom the event unfolds (v):

(ii) Pyr. 132a-d<sup>WTMN</sup> (PT 211)

*iwr N m grh ms N (/ms=f)<sup>TMN</sup> m grh*

*n sw imw-ht rʿ tpw-ʿw ntr dw3*

*twr N m nw ms=f(/ms N)<sup>TN</sup> m nw*  
*i.n=f(/i.n N)<sup>TMN</sup> in.n=f n=t3 t3 n gmw.n=f im*

‘N was conceived at night, N was born at night:

He belongs to those who are in Re’s following, who precede the morning god.

N was conceived in the Nun, he was born in the Nun:

He has come having gotten you the bread of those he found there.’

Sim. Pyr. 1443b<sup>PaM</sup> (PT 570) *ms ntr in pt hr ʿw šw hnʿ tfinwt hr ʿw(=i)* ‘The god was born by the sky upon the arms of Shu and Tefnut, upon my arms.’ (N with a pronominal subject, *ms(=i) in pt* [...]); Pyr. 1688c<sup>M</sup> (PT 606) *ms N pn rʿ nb mi rʿ* ‘This N was (re-)born every day like Re’; Pyr. 1701a<sup>N</sup> (PT 607) *ms N in nww hr drt=f i3bt* ‘N was born by Nu on his left hand.’ (M phrases actively, *ms.n nw N* (...).)

(iii) Pyr. 143a<sup>WT</sup> (PT 215)

*ms=k hr m rn=f nwrw n=f t3 sd3w n=f pt*

‘You were born, Horus, in his name the-one-at-whom-the-earth-shakes and the-one-at-whom-the-sky-trembles.’

Later pyramids (N and Wd) insert a preposition *n* before this clause: §4.4.2.1, (i).

(iv) Pyr. 262b<sup>W</sup> (PT 248)

*twr N in šhmt*  
*in šzmtt mst N*

‘N was conceived by Sakhmet;

It is Shesmetet who gave birth to N.’

The subject-clefting construction in the second clause is significant. As discussed above, an expressed passive Agent naturally attracts salience in discourse (§2.5.2.4; §2.5.3.3; §2.6.1.1.E). Note that this correlation does not necessarily trigger the use of the ‘emphatic’ construction; in the following sequence, the Agent has similar discourse salience but the event is presented under a different perspective with a *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* construction: CT VI 63d-e B2L *iw=i twr.kw iw=i ms.kw in šzmtt* ‘I was conceived, I was born by Shesmetet.’ Sim. Pyr. 2206c<sup>Nt</sup> (PT 704) *twr=s in šhmt ms N tn [i]n šzmtt* ‘She was conceived by Sakhmet, N was born by Shesmetet’; Pyr. 1701a<sup>N</sup> (PT 607) (ii). With a full noun subject, Pyr. 693c-d<sup>T</sup> (PT 398) *twr N n dʿʿmw ms N n dʿʿmw in dʿʿmw z n mwt=f im=f* ‘N was conceived for Djaamu, N was born for Djaamu, it is Djaamu who has gone to his mother with<sup>28</sup> him.’

(v) Pyr. 142c-144b<sup>WTN</sup> (PT 215)

*ms n=k pf twr n=k pn*  
*ms=k hr m rn=f nwrw n=f t3 sd3w n=f pt (...)*

<sup>28</sup> Following Faulkner (1969: 130).

*ms=k hr n wsir b3.n=k r=f shm.n=k r=f*  
*twr=k stš n gbb b3.n=k r=f shm.n=k r=f*

‘That one was born for you, this one was conceived for you.

You were born, O Horus, in his<sup>29</sup> name the-one-at-whom-the-earth-shakes and the-one-at-whom-the-sky-trembles. (...)’

You were born, O Horus, for Osiris; you have become more *ba* than he, you have become more powerful than he;

You were conceived, O Seth, for Geb; you have become more *ba* than he, you have become more powerful than he.’

With a different reading, but also with a beneficiary, Pyr. 142c<sup>Wd</sup> *ms=k n pf*  
*iwr=k n pn* ‘You were born for that one, you were conceived for this one.’ Sim.  
 Pyr. 211b<sup>WTNt</sup> (PT 222) *ms=k n hr twr=k n stš* ‘You were born for Horus, you were conceived for Seth’ (to X, to Y); Pyr. 1508a<sup>P</sup> (PT 576) *twr N n r<sup>c</sup> ms=f n r<sup>c</sup>*  
 ‘N was conceived for Re, he was born for Re.’

Regarding (v) specifically, an expression of the beneficiary is in Pyramid Texts overly common with passives of various sorts: events are often carried out *for* the king. The expression of the beneficiary is, on the other hand, exceedingly rare with the pseudo-participle. Significant of this generally observed correlation is the following sequence: after two instances of the construction *N<sub>O</sub> PsP* (*N hr*, *N t(3)z*), *V-pass N* follows with a change of subject and an expression of the beneficiary (*sd n=f swht*). In the context of spell 669, this occurs in parallel to another tripartite sequence with all three events in the *N<sub>O</sub> PsP* construction:

(vi) Pyr. 1969b-1970a<sup>N</sup> (PT 669)

*mk N hr mk N t(3)z mk sd n=f swht*

‘See, he is come into being, see, he is tied together, see, an egg was broken for him.’

Contrast Pyr. 1967a<sup>N</sup> (PT 669) *mk r=k sw msy mk sw t(3)z mk sw hr* ‘See, he is born, see, he is tied together, see, he is come into being’ (with fuller context, (i)).

Continuing elements of this tradition, Coffin Texts present similar examples of *V-pass P* (and *V-pass non-P*). In these texts as well, the events of ‘having been born’ and ‘having been conceived’ are hardly informative in themselves when concerning the speech-act participants and therefore typically given additional elaboration: the circumstances (temporal or local) of such birth (vii), the ‘howness’ of the event (viii), or the mention of a beneficiary (ix). *V-pass P* is also rarely found with other events (x):<sup>30</sup>

29 On the person of the pronoun, Faulkner (1969: 43, n.5).

30 For occurrences of *V-pass N* in similar environments, Schenkel (2005: 42-9).

(vii) CT VII 228n-q P. Gard.II

*ms=k n mw=f twr=k n mw=f*  
*ms(=i) m kddw twr=i m knmt*  
*n hprt t3 n hprt pt<sup>31</sup> n nnt rty m3tt s3t r<sup>c</sup>*

‘You were born from his liquid, you were conceived from his liquid;  
 I was born in sleep, I was conceived in obscurity,  
 as the earth had not come into being, the sky had not come into being, the jaws  
 of Matjet, the daughter of Re had not turned around.’

Sim. CT IV 94m B5C *twr=i m ddw msy=i m ddw* ‘I was conceived in Busiris, I  
 was born in Busiris.’

(viii) CT III 35b (var. mss.)

*msy=i m hr šsmti*

‘I was born as Horus of Shesemet.’

Sim., with negative polarity: CT II 3g B1C, B2L, B1P *n twr=i is iwrt* ‘I was not  
 conceived through a conception’; B1Bo *n ms=f is m msyt*; G1T *n msw=i is msyt*.

(ix) CT I 248e B4C (sim. in the other witnesses)<sup>32</sup>

*it=t pw*  
*msy=t n=f*

‘This is your father:  
 you were born to him.’

(x) CT VI 304a-d B1Bo

*irt nt N pn m hnt=f kmt=f m k33*  
*wḏ<sup>c</sup>=f m sf*  
*iw wsr=f m d3d3t*

‘This N’s eye is in his face, his complete eye is in potency(?)’<sup>33</sup>  
 He was judged yesterday  
 and his power is now in the tribunal.’

‘Yesterday’ is highlighted, so that the event of ‘having been judged’ can form the  
 basis for asserting the following clause.

B. In Old Kingdom tomb inscriptions, *V-pass P* is similarly with accomplished  
 passive events that would lack in informativeness if not further elaborated. In (xi), a  
 bare event of ‘having been raised’—in reference to the speaker and very owner of the  
 monument on which this segment of language is inscribed, now an accomplished  
 official—would hardly be informative in itself. The scope of assertion is thus  
 extended to include an additional elaboration of the event, as is also manifest in the  
 informative elaboration and sheer length of the adverbial expressions in both column

31 *t3* and *pt* in split column.

32 Similarly analyzed as an ‘emphatic’ construction by Schenkel (2006b: 76).

33 Following Faulkner (1973-1977: II, 244).



1 and 2. The thereby emphasized privilege of having been raised in the royal sphere is central to the inscription, which goes on telling of the speaker’s marriage with no one less than a royal daughter (col.3):

(xi) *Urk.* I 51, 12 - 52, 3 (Shepsesptah)<sup>34</sup>

<sup>1</sup>[*hrd ms m*] *rk mn-k3w-r<sup>c</sup>*

*šd=f mm msw-ns w m pr-<sup>c</sup>3 n ns w m hnw-<sup>c</sup> m ip3t-ns w*

*špss hr ns w r hrd nb špss-ptḥ*

<sup>2</sup>[*idw t(3)z mdḥ m*] *rk špss-k3=f*

*šd=f mm msw-ns w m pr-<sup>c</sup>3 n ns w m hnw-<sup>c</sup> m ip3t-ns w*

*špss hr ns w r id nb špss-ptḥ*

<sup>3</sup>[...]

[*r*]*d n=f hm=f s3t-ns w h<sup>c</sup>-m3<sup>c</sup>t m hmt=f*

*mr.n hm=f wnn=s hn<sup>c</sup>=f r s nb špss-ptḥ*

‘A child born in the time of Menkaure:

He was raised among the royal children in the palace of the king in the privy chambers in the royal apartments

—one more valuable with the king than any child, Shepsesptah.

A youth who tied the headband in the time of Shepseskaf:

He was raised among the royal children in the palace of the king in the privy chambers in the royal apartments

—one more valuable with the king than any youth, Shepsesptah.

[...]

His Majesty gave him the royal daughter Khamaat as his wife

for His Majesty wished that she be with him more than with any man—  
Shepsesptah.’

In the ‘formula of passing from life to death’,<sup>35</sup> the event of ‘having been buried’ (and related events of ‘having come’ from places associated with the living) is presupposed by the speech situation—the formula is inscribed on the funerary monument of the speaker—and accordingly in need of additional semantic elaboration:

(xii) *Urk.* I 57, 11-14 (Seshemnefer)<sup>36</sup>

*ii.n(=i) m niwt(=i) pr.n(=i) m sp3t(=i) krs(=i) m iz(=i) pn*

*dd.n(=i) m3<sup>c</sup>t mrrt ntr r<sup>c</sup> nb*

‘I have come from my town, I have gone forth from my district, I was buried in this tomb of mine,

only after I had spoken the *Maat* that the god loves every day.’

Similar semantics of *V-pass P* are observed in texts telling of the construction of the tomb. In these, the subject is mostly a demonstrative (*nw*)<sup>37</sup> or a full noun,<sup>38</sup> once a

34 For the recomposition of the text, Dorman (2002).

35 Lastly Stauder-Porchet (2008), with references to previous discussions.

36 Doret (1986: 85-6, ex.147); Polotsky (1965: 86 [16], §33).

37 Doret (1986: 87-8, ex.149-51).

third person pronoun (in the particular context of a marked topic construction: (xiii)). Unlike in (xi)-(xii), the subject is not in reference to the tomb owner, but remains deictically anchored to him ('this tomb of mine', 'this'). In the material context of the very monument on which the text is inscribed, the scope of assertion naturally extends beyond the mere 'building' itself, which is presupposed by the written discourse situation, to the circumstances of such building insisting on the due rightfulness of the process and/or on its purpose:

(xiii) Mehuakhti, B, 1-3<sup>39</sup>

*ir m iz(=i) pn n dt ir=f n(=i) hr t3 hnkt*  
*sk hmwt nb irt sw dw3=sn n(=i) ntrw nb*  
*sk rd.n(=i) n=sn hbs mrht hmti it ʕ3 wrt (...)*

'As regards this tomb of my funerary estate, it was done for me for bread and beer,

and all craftsmen who had done it praised all gods for me

—I had given them garment, oil, copper, and barley in great quantity—(...)'

With full noun subjects not deictically anchored to the speaker, the accomplished passive events are not similarly presupposed by the speech situation. Unlike in (xi)-(xiii), the events in (xiv)-(xv) could therefore have stood as semantically complete, if the speaker had wished so. In (xiv), the shift in perspective is manifest in the considerable textual elaboration of the two *sk*-headed clauses that follow the main clauses (for a similar patterning, (xiii)). In (xv), the event is presented in tight relation to a king's reign, and thereby to a king's name, always a textually salient element in an Old Kingdom private inscription:

(xiv) *Urk. I 39, 10-16* (Niankhsekhmet)<sup>40</sup>

*rd i3w n nsw ʕ3 dw3 ntr nb n s3hw-rʕ*  
*sk sw rh hnʕ šms r-dr=f ir is pry ht nb m r3 n hm=f hpr ø hr-ʕ*  
*sk rd.n n=f ntr si3 ht m ht n-ʕ3t špss=f r ntr nb*

'The king was greatly adored and the god was praised for Sahure because he (*scil.* Niankhsekhmet) knew and the whole retinue as well that if anything comes out of His Majesty's mouth, it occurs immediately, and because the god caused him to be perceptive in his body, and because he was more august than any god.'

Contrast, with bare events of 'giving' in sequence to one another:

Sabni son of Mekhu (*Urk. I 139, 9-16*)

*wn.in b3k im hr [dw3] ntr n nsw n-ʕ3t-nt hzz[.t b3]k im in šmsw-iti*  
*rd.t n(=i) ssdm ʕdt hr ʕntiw hr mrht*  
*rd.t <n>(=i) sšr h3tiw mh X m hbs 5*  
*rd.t n(=i) nbw [n] hzt r [ʕ3t wr]t rd n(=i) s3bw iwʕ3pdw*

38 Doret (1986: 85, ex.146).

39 Doret (1986: 86, ex.148).

40 Doret (1986: 88, ex.153).

‘Then this servant praised the god for the king on account of how much this servant had been praised by the sovereign’s followers.

I was given a chest of precious wood with myrrh and oil;

I was given X cubits of first-quality linen, consisting of five pieces of cloth;

I was given the gold of praise in very great quantity, after I had been given meals of meat and fowl.’

(xv) Isi of Edfu 5<sup>41</sup>

*rd n(=i) [i3t] m h3k3 hwt m rk wnīs*

‘I was installed as a district governor in the time of Unis.’

Contrast, in a similar formulation, also with mention of a king’s name:

*Urk. I 253, 18 - 254, 5 (Qar of Edfu)*

*wn(=i) m hwn t(3)z m3h m rk tti*

*tn.t(=i) n ppy r tzt mm msw hriw-tp*

*rd.t(=i) m smr w3t(i) imi-r3 hnti(w)-š pr-3 hr ppy*

*rd.in hm n mr-n-r3 hnt(=i) r wtzt-hr m smr w3t(i) hr-tp n sp3t m imi-r3 šm3  
imi-r3 hm(w)-ntr n ikr(=i) špss(=i) hr ib hm<=f>*

‘I was a youth who tied the girdle in the time of Teti.

I was brought to Pepi to be educated among the children of the chiefs.

I was installed as a sole friend and director of the *khentiu-she* of the Palace under Pepi.

Then the Majesty of Merenre had me go upstream to the Edfu nome as a sole companion, as a chief of district, as a director of Upper Egypt, and as a director of priests because of I was excellent and proficient on the heart of his Majesty.’

The beginning of the narrative part of an inscription that focuses on Qar’s activity and achievements in the Edfu nome. Merenre initially sends the official there (*rd.in* (...))<sup>42</sup> but then stays entirely out of focus for the rest of the text until the final mention of praise by the king.<sup>43</sup> Prior steps in Qar’s career under Teti and Pepi are only briefly evoked, merely a preamble.

In the First Intermediate Period, the construction *V-pass P* is used similarly.<sup>44</sup> In (xvi), the fact that the speaker, now an adult, must at some point ‘have been raised’ is presupposed by the very speech situation; the scope of assertion naturally extends to

41 Doret (1986: 88, ex.152).

42 Note the *sdm.in=f* form, which is generally uncommon in Sixth Dynasty event biographies and used only here in this text.

43 *Urk. I 255, 5*. On other innovative aspects of the inscription, which blurs the traditional divide between so-called ‘event’ and ‘ideal’ biography, Moreno García (1998).

44 In Tjetjī (BM EA 614), 11, *h3b* relates to the preceding segment (as (...) *tr nb n s3m h3b*), not to the following (*špss.kw 3.kw*), and is therefore not an instance of *V-pass P*, pace Polotsky (1976: 19, n.34). For possible instances of *V-pass N*, Díaz Hernández (2013: 91, ex.100-1).

include the circumstances of such event (also with an event of ‘having been raised’, (xi) above):

(xvi) Naga ed-Dêr #69, 4-5<sup>45</sup>

*ts(=t) m phwy pr it(=i)*

‘I was raised in the back of the house of my father.’

Outside traditional autobiographical formulations, the construction is productive as well and often invites a more strongly focal interpretation. In (xvii), it underscores the paradoxical situation in which the addressee finds himself. In (xviii), a much-discussed passage,<sup>46</sup> the construction receives a restrictive-focus interpretation, lexically underscored by *ds=f*. In (xix), an apparently unique instance of a subjectless V-passive in the ‘emphatic’ construction is found (further, §4.3.5.2.2, (v)):

(xvii) Berlin Bowl, ro 1

*in=t ʕ3 r niwt nt nhḥ nn špt=t nb r(=i)*

‘You were brought here to this town of eternity even though you have no anger directed against me.’

(xviii) Hammamat 191, 6

*n hr hr n rmt hr=s*

*wb3=s n hm=f ds=f*

*ist grt sdh.n=f s(i) (...)*

‘No sight of men fell on her.

It was revealed only to His Majesty himself.

He had concealed it (...)’

(xix) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.ε.2-3 (Inscription #6)

(...) *gm.n(=i) w3st gbtw mi-kd=s[n ...]=sn ithw iwn m sg3 smh=s*

*spr r(=i) r=s*

‘(...) and I found that Thebes and Coptos in their entirety had [...] the strongholds of Ermant in the hills of Semekhsen.

It was about this that one had reached out to me.’

C. In inscriptions after the Eleventh Dynasty, the construction *V-pass P* recurs only in one formula (xx). The event of ‘having been born’ is presupposed by the speech situation, just like the events of ‘having been raised’ discussed above ((xi) and (xvi)). The scope of assertion thus extends to include the regnal year and thereby the king’s name (similarly, (xv)). With a full noun subject,<sup>47</sup> (xxi) displays substantial

<sup>45</sup> Doret (1986: 167, ex.305).

<sup>46</sup> Polotsky (1976: 19, n.34); Doret (1986: 170, ex.311). An interpretive issue is whether *hm=f* refers to the king (e.g. Vernus 1987: 165) or to the god (e.g. Polotsky 1986; Borghouts 2010: II, 462); also Schenkel (1992, with a proposal to read actively, *wb3.n s(i) hm=f ds=f*) and Reintges (1992).

<sup>47</sup> Other instances of *V-pass N* in similar function that have been proposed (el-Hamrawi 2004: 93, n.14; Díaz Hernández 2013: 92, ex.102-4) are more dubious semantically; as regards the formal

elaboration (similarly, (xiv)); the event, an installation in office by the king, is similar to the one in (xv):

(xx) Samontu (BM EA 828), 4-5

*ms=i m rk hm n nsw-biti shtp-ib-r<sup>c</sup> m3<sup>c</sup>-hrw*

‘I was born in the time of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Seheteibre, the justified.’

Sim. Khusobek D.6 *msy=i m hsb t 27 hr hm n nsw-bity nbw-k3w-r<sup>c</sup> m3<sup>c</sup>-hrw* ‘I was born in regnal year 27 under the Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Nubkaure, the justified’; Khnumnakht (CG 20518), a.1 *msy=i m hsb t 1 n s3 r<sup>c</sup> imn-m-h3t* ‘I was born in regnal year 1 of the son of Re Amenemhat.’

(xxi) Semti (BM EA 574) 5-6<sup>48</sup>

*d srw r h<sup>c</sup>w=sn nd n=i i3wt m-b3h=sn m imi-hnt hr-{n}<s>st3 hm-ntr n sm<sup>c</sup>-s(i) mhw-s(i) (...)*

‘When officials were placed to their positions, an office was given to me in their presence as a chamberlain, guardian of the secret, priest of the White and Red Crowns (...)’

Both (xx) and (xxi) are in formulations that can be traced backed to older textual models and thereby appear to be phraseologically bound. In the same texts, other elements relating to past textual models include uses of the past tense *sdm=f* (e.g. Samontu<sup>49</sup>) and the construction of the pseudoparticiple oriented on an A (the ‘active-transitive’ pseudoparticiple) (e.g. Semti 14; §2.3.1.3.4). In these Twelfth Dynasty private inscriptions, *V-pass P* (and *V-pass non-P*) is one among several constructions by which these texts draw on older textual, and thereby in part linguistic, models. Rather than witnessing to a still productive status of the construction, these occurrences are tokens of broader phenomena of generic continuation.<sup>50</sup> In Middle Egyptian literature, *V-pass P* does not occur anymore.<sup>51</sup>

#### 4.2.2 Early occurrences of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction

A. In Pyramid Texts, the *sdm.n.t=f* is found only twice.<sup>52</sup> Both occurrences are with events of ‘having been born’, contrasting with more than a dozen occurrences of V-passives with the same events (§4.2.1, (ii)-(v)). The first is subjectless, with an O-detransitivized event (§2.6.1.1):

---

matter of the lack of *iw*, this could in all cases also be accounted for on grounds of macro-syntactic cohesion. I therefore remain agnostic as to whether any of these belongs here.

48 Also el-Hamrawi (2004: 93, ex.6), reading differently.

49 Vernus (1997: 70-7).

50 Contra el-Hamrawi (2004) who interprets such phenomena as ‘dialectal’.

51 Díaz Hernández (2013: 98-9), contra Reintges (1997: 151-4).

52 Allen (1984: §486.B, §554).

(i) Pyr. 179a<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 219)

*nwt s3=t pw pw-nn dd.n=t ir=f ms.n.t n(=i) i.t tn*

‘Nut, this one here is your son of whom you have said: “There was birth for me”—so you said.’

(ii) Pyr. 934b<sup>PAnMN</sup> (PT 473)

*ms.n.t N pn hr is 3hti is*

‘This N was born like Horus, like the One-of-the-Horizon.’

M reads *msi.n.ti*.<sup>53</sup>

Two further occurrences are found in the Old Kingdom, one from a private inscription, the other from a documentary text:<sup>54</sup>

(iii) Khentikaepi 8-9<sup>55</sup>

*nd.n.t n(=i) i3t nt hk3 wh3t*

[...] *w m hwn t(3)z mdh m hr-ib wrw*

*špss.k hr hm=f r hprw m-h3t(=i)*

‘I was named to the office of Governor of the Oasis  
[(while still)...] a youth who tied the girdle amongst the great ones,  
because I was more august with His Majesty than who came into being before me.’

(iv) P. Berlin 9010, 5 (Sixth Dynasty)<sup>56</sup>

(...) *mr ntt tr.n.t is zš pn hft dd wsr pn [im] (...)*

‘(...) to the effect that it is according to the words of this User that this piece of writing was made there (...)’

No occurrences have been noted in the First Intermediate Period inscriptional record.

B. In Coffin Texts, *sdm.n.t=f* has become fairly common in the ‘emphatic’ construction.<sup>57</sup> In several cases, it occurs side by side with V-passives:

## (v) CT I 344/5c S1C

*n ms.n.t=i is msyt*

‘I was not born through birth.’

Sim. B3C, B1Bo, B6C, M3C, M20C, M5C, M28C (further B1C, B2L, B1P *n ms.n.t=i n msyt*); V-passives in G1T *n msy=i is msyt* (sim. A1C; M4C); also *n ms.t=i (...)* (S2C, S14C, T3C, BH2C).

<sup>53</sup> Discussion: Allen (1984: §65.D).

<sup>54</sup> *Urk.* I 136, 16 (Sabni son of Mekhu), first quoted by Edel (1955-1964: §533.6 *fine*) as *gm.n.t*, is to be read *gm.n(=i)* (Edel 1955-1964: II, Nachträge, LXXV; Seyfried 2005: 314).

<sup>55</sup> Doret (1986: 88-9, ex.154).

<sup>56</sup> Edel (1955-1964: II, Nachträge, LXXV); Polotsky (1957: 112, ex.7); Doret (1986: 89, ex.155); Reintges (1997: 383, ex.39b).

<sup>57</sup> Van der Molen (2005: II, 1317-19, 1411); Polotsky (1957).

With the V-passive, CT II 3g B1C, B2L, B1P *n twr=t is iwr* ‘I was not conceived through a conception’; B1Bo *n ms=f is m msyt*; G1T *n msw=i is msyt*.

(vi) CT IV 134b-c S1P, S1Chass.

*nnk dfβw ir.n.t n=i htpwt*

‘Mine are the provisions, for me offerings have been made.’

With the V-passive, CT III 399a *rd n=i p nnk dpw* ‘I have been given Pe, Dep is mine’ (thus S1C, B2Bo, B5C; *rdw n=i* S10C); CT VII 125h M47C *n=k-im p rdw n=k dp* ‘Pe is yours, you have been given Dep.’

In Middle Kingdom inscriptional texts, the *sdm.n.t=f* has become the rule. Thus, with a tomb ‘having been built’ (for *V-pass P* in earlier times, §4.2.1, (xiii)):

(vii) Iki (Leiden V.68), a.9-11<sup>58</sup>

*is pn kd.n.tw=k n hb*

*snj.n.tw=k n bw nfr*

‘O this tomb, you have been built for celebration,  
you have been founded for happiness!’

With an event of ‘having been born’, the *sdm.n.t=f* is used similarly. Significantly, the context is not phraseologically bound like the ones in which *V-pass P* can still be found by the same time (§4.2.1, (xx)):

(viii) Wepwawetaa (Leiden V.4), 5-6<sup>59</sup>

*ms.n.t=t m s33=f-ir=f*

‘I was born as a He-is-prudent-when-he-acts.’

In Middle Egyptian literature, the *sdm.n.t=f* has fully superseded the V-passive in the ‘emphatic’ construction.<sup>60</sup>

### 4.2.3 The spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction

A. The above documents the gradual spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the environments in which *V-pass NP* was dominant by a wide margin in earlier times. In Pyramid Texts, the former is documented only twice (§4.2.2, (i)-(ii)) while the latter is found more than a dozen times (§4.2.1, (ii)-(v)). Relative frequencies are significant, as all occurrences are with similar events of ‘having been born’ (*msi*).

Outside Pyramid Texts, the *sdm.n.t=f* is in the Old Kingdom similarly less common than *V-pass NP* (§4.2.2, (iii)-(iv) and §4.2.1, (xi)-(xv), respectively). Of the two occurrences of the *sdm.n.t=f* that are found, one is from a documentary text; the other is from an inscriptional text fairly late in the Old Kingdom and from outside the

58 Polotsky (1957: 113).

59 El-Hamrawi (2004: 94, ex.8); transl. after Borghouts (2010: II, §68.a.2).

60 Occurrences (Westendorf 1953: 99-100): *Sinuhe* R 24 (*nis.n.tw n w<sup>c</sup> im*); B 72 (*ir.n.t=f*); B 200 (*šd.n.t=f*); *Eloquent Peasant* B1 265 (*rd.n.t=k*); B1 268 (*rd.n.t=k*); *Cheops’ Court* 8.24 (*ir.n.t r=f m-mitt*); probably also *Eloquent Peasant* B1 327-328 (*srw ir.n.tw ø*, twice: §2.5.2.2, (xv)).

Nile Valley (Khentikaepi, Dakhla). The *sdm.n.t=f* in the latter (*nd.n.t n(=i) i3t nt hk3 wh3t* (...)) contrasts with *V-pass non-P* as in e.g. Isi of Edfu (*rd n(=i) [i3t] m hk3 hwt* (...): §4.2.1, (xv)). The distribution could be interpreted as suggestive of a contrast in register.

It is only in Coffin Texts that the *sdm.n.t=f* becomes common. While *V-pass NP* is used notably in formulations harkening back to a Pyramid Text tradition (§4.2.1, (vii)-(ix)), the construction remains productive in the contexts as well (§4.2.1, (x)). In inscriptional texts from the First Intermediate Period and Eleventh Dynasty, *V-pass NP* is similarly productive (§4.2.1, (xvi)-(xvii)); whether the lack of attestation of the *sdm.n.t=f* in these is significant, possibly in terms of register, remains difficult to assess in view of the overall low numbers of the accomplished passive ‘emphatic’ construction in these texts. In inscriptional texts from the Twelfth Dynasty, *V-pass NP* has become restricted to phraseologically bound environments, particularly in texts that also otherwise relate to older textual models (§4.2.1, (xviii)-(xix)). Outside these, the *sdm.n.t=f* is regularly used (§4.2.2, (vii)-(viii)). In Middle Egyptian literature, only the *sdm.n.t=f* is found.

Of the four pre-Coffin Text occurrences of the *sdm.n.t=f*, three are with full noun subjects (§4.2.2, (ii)-(iv)), while the earliest one is in a subjectless construction (§4.2.2, (i)): none is with a pronominal subject. Despite the low numbers involved, the documented distribution is significant: in early times, pronominal subjects are found in similar environments more than a dozen times, in all cases with the V-passive (§4.2.1, (ii)-(iii) and (v) for Pyramid Texts; (xi)-(xiii) and (xvi)-(xvii) for Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period inscriptions). The *sdm.n.t=f* with pronominal subject is first documented in Coffin Texts,<sup>61</sup> alongside the older *V-pass P* (§4.2.1, (vii)-(x)). In Coffin Texts themselves, *V-pass P* is in the process of giving way to *sdm.n.t P*, as emerges from the broader set of events with which *sdm.n.t P* is found.<sup>62</sup> As the record thus documents, the *sdm.n.t=f* first developed with non-pronominal subjects (with full noun subjects and in subjectless constructions).

Schematically, the change can then be presented as follows, whereby the Coffin Texts present an intermediary situation:

I (in pre-Coffin Text parts of the record)

event fully asserted:	<i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP</i>	<i>V-pass non-P</i>
‘emphatic’ construction:	<i>V-pass P</i>	<i>V-pass non-P</i>
		(incipiently <i>sdm.n.t non-P</i> )

II (Twelfth Dynasty inscriptional texts and Middle Egyptian literature)

event fully asserted:	<i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP</i>	<i>V-pass non-P</i>
‘emphatic’ construction:	<i>sdm.n.t P</i>	<i>sdm.n.t non-P</i>

61 E.g. CT I 146d; CT I 172l; CT I 231g; CT I 344c; CT II 128b; CT II 391b; CT II 394c; CT II 398d; CT IV 194d; CT IV 262a; CT V 191b; CT V 205k.

62 Occurrences in van der Molen (2005: II, 1317-19).



B. Proposals that the perfective V-passive should be split into two morphologically distinct forms have remained very few, and wholly rely on theory-internal grounds.<sup>63</sup> In a detailed analysis of written forms in Coffin Texts, no differences were detected.<sup>64</sup> If two forms of the perfective V-passive are posited, then by the same theory-internal grounds, two should also be posited for the prospective V-passive in earlier corpora, resulting in four forms of the V-passive; how plausible this can be is left to the reader's appreciation.

On the other hand, the above analysis of the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* contains a strong, and in the present author's opinion conclusive, indication in favor of the unity of the perfective V-passive. With pronominal subjects, a formal contrast was given in early times already, between *Po PsP* and *V-pass P*. In developing first with non-pronominal subjects, the *sdm.n.t=f* developed where there was no such formal contrast (compare I above). If two morphologically distinct forms of the perfective V-passive are posited, the pattern of the early spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* remains unaccounted for.

### 4.3 Two inflectional passives in the accomplished

In interpreting the relationship between the two Earlier Egyptian inflectional passives of the accomplished—the perfective V-passive and the *sdm.n.t=f*—it has been proposed that the *sdm.n.t=f* should be analyzed as associated with a specific syntactic profile, as a ‘nominal’ or ‘abstract-relative’ form of the verb. In the same interpretive tradition, it has also been proposed that the morphological contrasts visible in the accomplished passive in Middle Egyptian could have been mirrored by similar contrasts in the active (that is, could possibly represent evidence to imply the existence of two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*). However, as the above description of the change consisting in the gradual replacement of the perfective V-passive by the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction (§4.2) may already be taken to suggest, rather different issues seem to be at stake. As a background to the main discussion, I preliminarily review hypotheses that have centered around syntactic interpretations and/or proposed that the morphological contrasts observed in the passive should extend to the active (§4.3.1). I then comment on the types of the morphological contrasts that are visible in written form, implying that the accomplished passive is a domain of its own, different from both the active and the unaccomplished (§4.3.2). After a discussion of the semantic profile of the pseudoparticiple (§4.3.3), I examine the earlier situation (prior to the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f*), when the contrast was between the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive (§4.3.4). The later situation, when the *sdm.n.t=f* had spread to become the regular expression of the accomplished passive in the ‘emphatic’ construction, is analyzed in turn (§4.3.5). After describing the various domains in which T-passives

63 Explicitly acknowledging this, and presenting the proposal as ‘tentativ’, Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.3.1.2.3.a, Diskussion); subsequently Díaz Hernández (2013: 93).

64 Schenkel (2004; 2005).

are observed to diachronically spread over the perfective V-passive, the discussion concerns the semantic profile of the *sdm.n.t=f*—both in the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction and in the negative unaccomplished *n sdm.n.t=f*—as this contrasts with the perfective V-passive.

#### 4.3.1 Previous analyses of the *sdm.n.t=f*

In a series of studies,<sup>65</sup> Polotsky demonstrated that the use of the *sdm.n.t=f* in main clauses correlates with contexts in which the scope of assertion extends beyond the verb and its direct arguments, the rhematic load of the verbal phrase is reduced, and/or the verbal phrase and its subject are demoted to the rank of a pragmatic presupposition. Doing so, the author also established that the *sdm.n=f* of intransitives such as *iwi*—and in the unaccomplished, the *mrr=f* similarly—are found in the same environments, contrasting with *NP PsP* and *N(P) mr=f* respectively, which do not occur in these; moreover, the same three forms are systematically absent in other environments, such as in adjunct clauses and after *iw*. These and other descriptive observations established that there is an ‘emphatic’ (and a set of closely related) constructions in Earlier Egyptian, related in some way to the Later Egyptian focusing tenses,<sup>66</sup> and that Gardiner’s aspectual theory of the *mrr=f*<sup>67</sup> is insufficient because it does not extend to the accomplished. They also offered a possible additional heuristic for defining the inventory of morphological categories of the verb (which has made much progress subsequently),<sup>68</sup> triggered various investigations on the expression and semantics of alternations in information structure in Earlier Egyptian,<sup>69</sup> and opened new perspectives on the conditions to which asyndetic dependency, which is widespread in Earlier Egyptian, is subject. For what concerns the present study specifically, Polotsky observed that the distribution of the two inflectional passives of the accomplished in Middle Egyptian—the perfective V-passive and the *sdm.n.t=f*—correlates with some of the dimensions just recalled. In particular, the *sdm.n.t=f* only exceptionnally occurs after *iw* (§4.4.1.1.1). In later stages of Earlier Egyptian (essentially from the Twelfth Dynasty literary texts on), the perfective V-passive does not occur in the ‘emphatic’ construction (in earlier times, the situation is entirely different).<sup>70</sup>

65 Polotsky (1944; 1957; 1965; 1976). Subsequent developments by other authors are too numerous to be mentioned in details: among various applications to specific corpora, e.g. Doret (1986); as a major theoretical reformulation, Junge (1989) is a classic; among recent presentations and studies, e.g. Nicacci (2006; 2009). The term ‘Standard Theory’ (Depuydt 1983), connoting similarly termed models in nuclear physics and/or contemporaneous generative grammar, does not do justice to the already then diverse configuration of various approaches.

66 With a view on the accomplished passive specifically, this also establishes that the contrast between the V-passive and the *sdm.n.t=f* is not one between full noun and pronominal subjects (as proposed by Westendorf 1953: 97–101), but one more fundamental in nature (Polotsky 1957: 110).

67 Gardiner (1947: 100); further, §4.4.1.2.

68 The main studies are Allen (1984); Doret (1986); Schenkel (2000b).

69 Among others, e.g. Junge (1989); Vernus (1991); Loprieno (1991a; 1991b; 1995).

70 Polotsky (1957, particularly 119 and n.2). In the context of the time, this led to the definite rejection of Westendorf’s (1953) only slightly earlier analysis, in which the distribution of the two accomplished passives in Middle Egyptian was interpreted in relation to the nature of their subject.

In interpreting the distributional correlations he observed, Polotsky proposed that the *sdm.n.t=f*, the *ii.n=f*, and the *mrr=f* belong to the same substitutional class associated with a specific syntactic profile, successively described as ‘abstract-relative’ or ‘nominal’. In particular, the ‘emphatic’ (and related) constructions would thereby differ from other main clauses in presenting a specific biclausal syntactic syntax whereby the articulation in information structure would be mirrored in syntax. Conversely, the correlating environments from which the three same formal categories are systematically absent were interpreted as ‘adverbial’. While the terms employed were necessarily provisional and are thereby subject to subsequent interpretation, this analysis carries various implications that are intrinsic to it, how ever the categories may be relabeled: syntax is considered a main parameter in the functional profile of the contrasting formal categories, and the ‘emphatic’ construction is analyzed as biclausal in structure. Most importantly for the present study, the morphological contrasts observed in the accomplished passive are not analyzed in what may be particular to passive voice in the accomplished: the organization of passive voice is assumed to be identical with the organization of active voice, so that inferences can be drawn from the former over to the latter.

While the distributional correlations identified by Polotsky in text do not stand to debate, their interpretation does. Because the *sdm.n.t=f* has been characterized as ‘nominal’ or ‘abstract-relative’ in contrast to the perfective V-passive, I first critically review some broader tenets and implications of these analyses (§4.3.1.1-2). I then critically discuss arguments that have been adduced to imply that the contrast between the perfective V-passive and the *sdm.n.t=f* should be essentially symmetrical to a similar contrast in the active (§4.3.1.3). This paves the way for subsequent sections of the present chapter in which I discuss what makes the specificity of passive voice in the accomplished, and why the accomplished passive has a different organization, and much higher complexity, than the active (§4.3.2-4.4).

#### 4.3.1.1 The nominal analysis

Under a nominal analysis of the *sdm.n.t=f* (and of the *ii.n=f* and the *mrr=f*), the ‘emphatic’ construction is analogized to the situational predicate construction. The distinctive verbal forms found in the ‘emphatic’ construction recur in other constructions such as after prepositions, in complement clauses, etc. These are also analogized to similar constructions with noun phrases, e.g.:

$[s\bar{d}m.n.t=f/(i\bar{i}.n=f/mrr=f) \dots]_{\text{theme/subject\_NP}}$	—	$[\dots]_{\text{rheme/predicate\_AP}}$
$NP_{\text{subject}}$	—	$AP_{\text{predicate}}$
<i>Preposition</i> $[s\bar{d}m.n.t=f/(i\bar{i}.n=f/mrr=f) \dots]_{\text{NP}}$		
<i>Preposition</i> $NP$		

The analysis presupposes that an analogization between constructions, more broadly paradigmatic substitution, is a valid syntactic heuristic. This has been subject to criticism, particularly with a view on ‘adverbiality’ as defined by similar arguments.<sup>71</sup>

71 The decisive studies are by Collier (1990; 1991a; 1991b; 1992; 1994).

The criticism then bears on the broader method by which not only ‘adverbiality’ but also ‘nominality’ were defined in the first place, casting doubt on the latter notion as well.<sup>72</sup> Yet, as ‘nominality’ had been much less the object of direct critique, a situation resulted from the 1990’s on by which—while ‘adverbiality’ was mostly abandoned—‘nominality’ (in various guises) was kept to account for at least some uses of some forms even as the analogization with the situational predicate construction was increasingly considered problematic.<sup>73</sup> Only more recently did analyses appear in which ‘nominality’ is itself abandoned entirely.<sup>74</sup>

A. The analogization of the ‘emphatic’ construction with the situational predicate construction collapses in the ‘second schème’ of the ‘emphatic’ construction.<sup>75</sup> In this, the first clause is backgrounded with respect to the second; that the second clause—which is the main clause in the two-clause construction thus defined—should be ‘adverbial’, i.e. not a main clause, is highly unlikely.<sup>76</sup> In addition, the first clause in the ‘second schème’ can be followed by a variety of patterns, including *iw*-headed verb-first clauses of diverse sorts. For example, in the unaccomplished active (a) and passive (b), and in the accomplished active (c) and passive (d):

(a) CT V 375e B9C<sup>77</sup> *ʒsh=f iw=i skʒ=i ʒsh=i* ‘When he reaps, I plow and reap.’

(b) CT III 391a-c S2Cb<sup>78</sup> *pr.[n=i] hʒ.n=i iw h[s].t [n]=i iw ir.[t n]=i [hny]* ‘When I had gone up and down, there was singing for me, a *heny*-acclamation was made for me.’

(c) *Eloquent Peasant* R 9.3-5 *ph.n=f rf dd mdt [tn i]w mh.n w<sup>c</sup> [m] nʒ n ʒ rʒ=f m bʒt nt it* ‘When he had completed this speech, one of the donkeys filled his mouth with a clump of barley.’<sup>79</sup>

(d) *Herdsmen* x+22 *hd.n rf tʒ dwʒ sp 2 iw ir mi dd=f* ‘When it had dawned, very early in the morning, it was done like he said.’

72 Particularly Collier (1992; 1994).

73 The syntactic categories ‘subject’ and ‘predicate’ were thus carefully distinguished from ‘theme’ and ‘rheme’ (to do with information structure), yet ‘nominality’ itself was not fully abandoned. Illustrative of this position are e.g. Allen (2014<sup>3</sup> [2000]: 427; 2013a: 177; the author has now abandoned this analysis (p.c. 29/3/2013)); similarly, but limited to the *mr=f*, Jenni (2010: 133, 139); Winand (2007); Malaise & Winand (1999: §612-22). A marginal reference to ‘nominality’ is also found in Loprieno (1995: 107) in the context of an analysis that otherwise focuses on the dimensions of information structure and discourse organization.

74 E.g. Uljas (2007a); also Schenkel’s (e.g. 2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.3.1.1.1-6, §7.3.1.2.2-5; 2009; 1998) more recent model of Middle Egyptian syntax (completely without ‘nominality’, yet inheriting certain elements historically associated with that analysis, such as the symmetrical paradigms in the accomplished and the possible relationship of the ‘abstract-relative’ forms with the relative forms).

75 Identified by Verns (1981a), with this label; previously intuited by Polotsky (1957: 114-5). Alternative labels include ‘setting construction’ (e.g. Uljas 2007a: 355) and ‘Rang-V Erweiterung’ (e.g. Schenkel 2012<sup>5</sup>: §8.3.4; 1998).

76 Similarly Uljas (2007a: 351).

77 Example from Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §8.3.4.2.3).

78 For the restorations, Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §8.3.4.1.1).

79 The restoration is ‘practically certain’ (Parkinson 1991: 11); also Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §8.3.4.2.3, Diskussion).

*Tw*-headed verb-first clauses can not be analyzed as ‘adverbial’ even in an extended sense of the notion. Given the tight relationship between the ‘emphatic’ construction and the ‘second schème’ thereof, the former can therefore not be analogized to the situational predicate construction. This in turn rules out a nominal analysis of the *sdm.n.t=f* (and of the *ii.n=f* and the *mrr=f*) in the ‘emphatic’ construction.

B. In the ‘second schème’ of the ‘emphatic’ construction, the first clause provides a setting, expressing background information to the second clause. In a somewhat extended functional sense, such setting can be viewed as a ‘clausal topic’.<sup>80</sup> Earlier Egyptian has constructions with nominal topics extraposed in the left periphery, e.g. *Sinuhe* B 101-102 [*h3st nbt rwt.n=i r=s*]<sub>NP/extraposed\_topic</sub> [*iw ir.n=i hd=i im=s (...)*]<sub>clause</sub> ‘Every foreign country I marched against, I made my attack on it (...)’.<sup>81</sup> Such outward family resemblance notwithstanding, clausal topics differ from nominal ones semantically: by definition, the former are not referentially accessible neither cataphorically nor anaphorically.<sup>82</sup> In Earlier Egyptian, a rich variety of clausal constructions can be found before the main clause, including but not limited to the first clause as in the ‘second schème’ of the ‘emphatic’ construction:

(a) The first clause of the ‘second schème’ of the ‘emphatic’ construction, e.g. *Sinuhe* B 199-200 *spr.n wd pn r=i h3.kw m hr-ib whwt=i šd.n.t=f n=i d.n(=i) wi hr ht=i (...)* ‘When this decree reached me, I was standing in the midst of my tribe. When it was read out to me, I put myself on my belly (...)’<sup>83</sup>

(b) A clause with a subjunctive, e.g. Antef (CG 20003), 2-3 *mr=tn nh msd=tn hpt iw=tn r drp n=i* ‘Should you love life, should you hate passing away, you will present offerings to me’; *Shipwrecked Sailor* 28-30 (below, D, (g)); *Duties of the Vizier* R 3-4 *pr prrt nbt m pr-nsw smi ø n=f k3 kt nbt r pr-nsw smi ø n=f* ‘Should whatever leaves the palace leave, it shall be reported to him; should whatever enters the palace enter, it shall be reported to him.’

(c) A clause with a *mrr=f*, e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* R 17.6-7 *mrr=k m3n=i snb.kw [si]h[m]=k sw 3 (...)* ‘Inasmuch as you wish to see me healthy, you should cause him to delay here (...)’

(d) A clause headed by a preposition, *m* or *mi*, e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 109-110 *m mrr=k m3=i snb.kw swdf=k sw 3 (...)* ‘As you wish to see me healthy, you should delay him here (...)’<sup>84</sup>

80 E.g. Uljas (2007a: 233-4 and n.35 for references in general linguistics).

81 The *iw* is secondarily inserted (Koch 1990: 44a; Parkinson 2012a: 47).

82 Givón (2001: II, 344-5), arguing that the very term ‘clausal topic’ is misleading; Uljas (2007a: 355, n.56).

83 For this as a setting construction, in details Stauder (2014a: Appendix.2); Schenkel (2014: §3, with extensive references to previous translations); similarly e.g. Parkinson (2009: 289); Uljas (2007a: 355); Loprieno (1995: 274-5); contra e.g. Winand (2000: 418, 430); Grandet (1998: 28). Long before the ‘second schème’ of the ‘emphatic’ construction was established, the same interpretation of the passage was intuited already by Polotsky (1957: 114-5, with a reference to the ‘cum inversum’). An in essence similar interpretation of the textual meaning of the passage, but cast in different analytic categories, is also by Depuydt (1993: 129-39).

84 Further examples with *m mrr=f*, *m mr=f*, *mi mrr=f*, Uljas (2007a: 232-6); Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §8.3.4.1.4).

(e) A clause headed by *ir* + *preposition*, e.g. Hatnub 22, 2-3 *ir m wn=i m hrd wn=i m smr* ‘As regards the time when I was a child, I was a companion’; Wahankh Antef II’s Stela (MMA 13.182.3), 4-5 *ir dr mrr=t ihy iw hhy n ihy n k3=t* ‘To the extent that you love music, there is music a million times for your ka’;<sup>85</sup> sim. with *ir r-s3 V*.<sup>86</sup>

(f) A pseudoparticiple, oriented on a S, e.g. Mo’alla IV.14-15 *hnt ph.n=f w3w3t hd ph.n=f t3-wr* ‘Having sailed upstream, he reached Wawat; having sailed downstream, he reached the Thinite nome’; oriented on an O, Semna Despatch IV, x+9 *w3d hr sh[r h3]st h3.n dd.n=sn n sdm=n ht nbt (...)* ‘Questioned about the condition of the desert, they said: “We have not heard anything (...)”’ (for the broader context, §2.5.2.3.1, (iii)).

(g) A *wn*-headed clause: Antefiqer’s *Girgawi Inscription* (Amenemhat I, year 29), 6-7 *wn.t hr kd hnrt pn h3.n sm3 nhsw spt nbt m w3w3t (...)* ‘While this enclosure was being built, the Nubians, the whole remainder of Wawat, were killed (...)’

(h) And other more.

Such variety demonstrates that the clausal left periphery is not in Earlier Egyptian a nominal environment. Yet the *sdm.n.t=f* is one form that can occur there. This speaks further against a nominal analysis of the *sdm.n.t=f* (and of the *ii.n=f* and the *mrr=f*) found in the first part of the ‘second schème’ of the ‘emphatic’ construction, and thereby in the ‘emphatic’ construction more generally.

C. Under a nominal analysis of the *sdm.n.t=f*, the form has the same syntactic status as the *mrr=f*, which is commonly found after prepositions. The *sdm.n.t=f* itself is also, if only rarely, found after prepositions (Hatnub 16, 10 *r ssnb.n.t=f*; in later times also *Urk. IV 1682*, 2 *mi ms.n.tw=k (...)*: §4.4.2.2.2).

In Middle Egyptian, prepositions can directly introduce any finite form of the verb; only subject-initial constructions (such as *NP hr sdm* or *NP PsP*) can not be embedded directly but must be preceded by a form of *wnn*.<sup>87</sup> With some prepositions, various forms alternate to express semantic contrasts or nuances (e.g. with *r*, roughly: *r sdm=f*<sub>subjunctive</sub> ‘so that he hears’; *r sdm=f* ‘until he hears’; *r sdm.n=f* ‘until he has heard’ (rare);<sup>88</sup> *r mrr=f* ‘as he likes’). With other prepositions, only some forms of the verb are found, not others (e.g. *r-tnw* apparently only with the *mrr=f*; *tp-ε* perhaps only with the subjunctive); with other prepositions, a strongly differential text frequency is observed between various forms of the verb (e.g. *dr*, mostly with the *sdmt=f*; occasionally with a *sdm.n=f*, only marginally with a *mrr=f*). Viewing things from the vantage point of verbal forms, the *mrr=f*—which has been analyzed as the nominal form par excellence—itself displays a strongly skewed distribution after prepositions, being common after some, very rare after others, and perhaps exclusive after yet other ones (§4.4.1.2.A).

<sup>85</sup> Uljas (2007a: 234, ex.265).

<sup>86</sup> Further occurrences of *ir r-s3 V*, Stauder (2013a: 177-8).

<sup>87</sup> An exception is only *m-ht*: §4.4.2.2.1.B.

<sup>88</sup> For the difference between *r sdm=f* and *r sdm.n=f*, which is subtle, §4.4.2.2.2.A.

As any form of the verb other than such used in subject-first constructions can come to order in the construction *preposition* –  $V_{finite}$ , syntactic status is not a parameter. Earlier Egyptian prepositions are more generally versatile;<sup>89</sup> in particular, they can introduce finite clauses: functionally speaking, they do double duty, as prepositions and as conjunctions depending on the nature of the segment that follows, a noun phrase or a verb-initial (or *wn*-introduced) clause.<sup>90</sup> The actual distribution of verbal forms after prepositions further documents that semantics is the relevant parameter in determining which form is used after which preposition to express what meaning (when several are possible). (Other things being of course different, similar comments apply to complement clauses where different verbal forms alternate with one another depending on the governing verb and for expressing different meaning.<sup>91</sup>)

D. Among verbal forms used after prepositions, one of the most common is the subjunctive  $sdm=f$  (a). The subjunctive is otherwise found in a variety of constructions, in main clauses modally profiled (b), in final or consecutive clauses (c), in continuation to a future construction (d), in continuation to an imperative (e), after particles such as *ih* or *h3* (f), or detached in the clausal left-periphery (g):

(a) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 33-34 (...)  $tp^c s3h=n t3$  ‘(...) before we had touched land.’

(b) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 139  $sdd=i b3w=k n ity$  ‘I wish to relate your might to the sovereign.’

(c) CT VI 53b-c S1C  $ii.n=i r bw nt hnwt=i m3=i nfr=s$  ‘I have come to the place where my mistress is so that I may see her beauty.’

(d) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 119-123  $iw dpt r iyt m hnw$  (...)  $sm=k hn^c=sn r hnw mwt=k m niwt=k$  ‘A boat will come from the Residence (...) and you will go with them to the Residence and die in your town.’

(e) *Sinuhe* B 188-189  $ir n=k iwt r kmt m3=k hnw hpr.n=k im=f sn=k t3 r rwt y wrty hnm=k smrw$  ‘Come back to Egypt and you will see the Residence where you grew up, kiss the earth at the Great Double Portal, and join the courtiers.’

(f) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 14  $ih wsb=k$  (...) ‘So you may answer (...)’; *Cheops’ Court* 11.7  $h3 d=tn p3 it$  ‘May you give this barley.’

89 Stauder-Porchet (2009: 31-76).

90 The capacity of prepositions to function as conjunctions in Middle Egyptian is of some interest in itself, particularly when Egyptian is contrasted with Standard Average European languages in which this is not, or only limitedly, possible (thus in French, only with *comme*; in English only with *after*, *before*, *as*, *like*). It could be that this is historically a secondary development, possibly even to be traced in the documented record. In the Old Egyptian record, the construction *preposition* –  $V_{finite}$  is conspicuously rare, while *preposition* – *infinitive* is, on the other hand, common (Edel 1955-1964: §712-21). Interestingly, the infinitive after a preposition in Old Egyptian often projects arguments realized with a finite syntax, i.e. *as if* the infinitive were a finite form (Edel 1955-1964: §700-2). It could then be that such earlier infinitive-based constructions provided the background against which the construction *preposition* –  $V_{finite}$  developed in Middle Egyptian, largely superseding the semantically underspecified Old Egyptian infinitive-based constructions. The matter merits a detailed empirical examination.

91 Dedicated study: Uljas (2007a).

(g) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 28-30  $m\dot{z}=sn\ pt\ m\dot{z}=sn\ t\dot{3}\ m^{\epsilon}k\dot{3}\ ib=sn\ r\ m\dot{3}iw$  ‘Did they see the sky, did they see land, their hearts were bolder than the ones of lions.’

None of the environments in (b)-(g) can be analyzed as nominal. Nor can the subjunctive  $\underline{s}dm=f$  therefore be analyzed as such. As the subjunctive  $\underline{s}dm=f$  is also used after prepositions (a)—and is in fact one of the more commonly used forms in such environments—this provides an independent confirmation that the construction *preposition* –  $V_{finite}$  does not define a nominal slot for the verb. As the  $\underline{m}rr=f$  is also commonly used in this construction, this also confirms that the  $\underline{m}rr=f$  is not a nominal form of the verb. A similar comment extends to the  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$ , also occasionally found after prepositions.

E. The  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  is found after *ir*, e.g. *Ipuwer* 12.6 *ir snm.n.tw=n* (...) ‘If we had been saddened (...)’. Two other forms of the verb are found in the same environment, the subjunctive  $\underline{s}dm=f$  and the prospective  $\underline{s}dm=f$ . The first is not ‘nominal’ (above, D). Nor is the second, which provides the regular expression of (non-modal) future tense prior to the semantic bleaching of *NP r sdm* during the Middle Kingdom. The construction *ir V* does not, therefore, define a nominal slot for the verb, notwithstanding a superficial formal similarity with *ir NP*. The  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  also occurs in the construction *ir V*, demonstrating that this form is not nominal either.

F. The  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  occurs in the negative construction  $n\ \underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  (§4.3.5.2). Another form of the verb that occurs after the same negation is the past tense  $\underline{s}dm=f$  ( $n\ \underline{s}dm=f$ ). The latter is not nominal,<sup>92</sup> accordingly, the  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  can not be either.<sup>93</sup>

#### 4.3.1.2 The ‘abstract-relative’ analysis

A notion of ‘nominality’ defined via an analogization of various constructions with one another runs into contradiction on the levels evoked above. In interpreting his descriptive findings, Polotsky also contemplated a differently defined notion of ‘nominality’: under the ‘abstract-relative’ analysis, as this might be termed, the  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  (and the  $\underline{i}i.n=f$  and  $\underline{m}rr=f$ ) would be relative forms, or forms closely related to the relative forms, used in the ‘emphatic’ construction; as under the ‘nominal’ analysis, this would be biclausal in syntax. This interpretation was based on two observations:

(x) Among various possible types of narrow-focus constructions, one consists in a biclausal structure in which the pragmatically downgraded segment is syntactically a relative construction of some sort; while there is a predicative nexus internal to that segment, there is also a higher-order predicative nexus by which the segment is part of the overall construction. This construction

92 The  $\underline{s}dm.n=f$  in the construction  $n\ \underline{s}dm.n=f$ , and therefore the passive  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  in the same construction, was analyzed as nominal by Polotsky (1976: 45; 1957: 116). This was then still possible, before Doret’s (1986) discussion of the past tense  $\underline{s}dm=f$ .

93 To be sure, infinitives and the  $\underline{s}dm.t=f$  (historically arguably derived from a verbal noun: §1.4.3) are found as well after negative *n*, but in dependency to a main clause.  $N\ \underline{s}dm.n=f$  (/passive  $n\ \underline{s}dm.n.t=f$ ) and past tense  $n\ \underline{s}dm=f$  (/passive  $n\ \underline{s}dm.t=f$ ), by contrast, can stand as main clauses and often do.



type is not uncommon cross-linguistically and within individual languages; thus in French cleft-constructions or in Earlier Egyptian itself, in the so-called ‘pseudo-cleft’ construction (*REL pw B*);

(y) In their morphology, the distinctive forms used in the ‘emphatic’ construction would seem to be closely related to the relative forms:

Relative forms	In the ‘emphatic’ construction
<i>ii.n=f</i>	<i>ii.n=f</i> (not <i>NP iw</i> )
<i>mrr=f</i>	<i>mrr=f</i> (not <i>N(P) mr=f</i> )

In the above, (x) defines only a possibility: while the construction type is common cross-linguistically, it remains to be seen whether it concerns the particular case of the Earlier Egyptian ‘emphatic’ construction. An argument that an ‘abstract-relative’ analysis should indeed apply therefore rests solely on (y).

A. That the *ii.n=f* and *mrr=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction are closely related morphologically to relative *ii.n=f* and *mrr=f* is obvious under any analysis. Whether this implies that the former should be analyzed as ‘abstract-relative’, i.e. as derived from the relative forms, is an altogether different issue, however.

In the accomplished, the *ii.n=f* contrasts functionally with *NP iw* in main clauses. The latter construction is also, if rarely, found in relative clauses (necessarily preceded by *nty*, as all subject-initial constructions must be). Thus, in close succession to one another:

(a) *Cheops’ Court* 11.9-10 *wḏ3 pw ir.n=s n r bw ii.n=sn im* ‘They proceeded to the place they had come from.’

(b) *Cheops’ Court* 11.10-12 *pty n3 ntt n iy.wyn r=s nn irt bi3yt n n3 n hrdw (...)*  
‘What have we come for, without doing a wonder for the children (...)?’

With a view not only on forms but on constructions, a fuller presentation of the accomplished is therefore as:

Relative constructions	Main clauses
<i>ii.n=f</i>	<i>ii.n=f</i> (‘emphatic’ constr.)
( <i>nty NP iw</i> (rare))	<i>NP iw</i>

That *nty NP PsP* is by far less common in text than relative *ii.n=f* is for a straightforward semantic reason. In the accomplished, the here relevant contrast in written forms can only be observed with subject-affecting intransitives. With these, as with intransitives more generally, the pivot of relativization is necessarily an oblique expression of some sort. This tends to highlight the dynamic part of the event; a form of the *sḏm.n=f* is therefore in most cases preferred over a construction that includes the pseudoparticiple, semantically a resultative, Endpoint-highlighting category (further, §4.3.3). Significantly, *nty NP PsP* in (b) is with a pivot that stresses the Endpoint of the event (*r=s*), while *ii.n=f* in (a) is with one (*im*) that stresses the origin of the motion and thus the dynamic part thereof. In highlighting the circumstances of the

event, the ‘emphatic’ construction similarly highlights the dynamic part of that event (further, §4.3.4.1.F; §4.3.4.2; §4.3.5.5). That a *sdm.n=f*—not a construction with the pseudoparticiple—is used with subject-affecting transitives in both the ‘emphatic’ construction and (most commonly) in relative constructions is thereby directly accounted for. The accomplished paradigm does not, therefore, provide any positive indication that the *ii.n=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction is ‘abstract-relative’, i.e. derived in some way or another from the relative *ii.n=f*: both forms could just as well be *sdm.n=f*s of *iwi*—for broadly similar reasons and independently of one another.

In the unaccomplished, the relative *mrr=f* and the *mrr=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction are both finite forms based on the same long stem *mrr-*. This need not, however, imply a derivation in one direction or another: both forms could have independently been based on the same stem, differently functionalized within their respective paradigms (further, §4.4.1.2). For an argument to be made that *mrr=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction is ‘abstract-relative’, i.e. in some way derived with respect to the attributive *mrr=f*, a similar argument must also be made in the accomplished: the argument must, in other words, bear on the correlation between the unaccomplished and accomplished domains. As just discussed, the accomplished *ii.n=f* fails to provide the here required independent evidence.

B. The above considerations show that there is no positive evidence in favor of an ‘abstract-relative’ analysis of the *ii.n=f* and *mrr=f* used in the ‘emphatic’ construction. On the other hand, positive evidence against this analysis is to be found in earlier stages of Earlier Egyptian times when the V-passive is routinely used in the ‘emphatic’ construction (§4.2.1). Unlike the *sdm.n.t=f*—which could be viewed as the T-passive of an hypothetical ‘abstract-relative’ form of the *sdm.n=f*—the V-passive can not be viewed as an ‘abstract-relative’ pendant to any relative form, nor derived from any.

Since the V-passive used in the ‘emphatic’ construction can not be analyzed as ‘abstract-relative’, this implies that the ‘emphatic’ construction when including a V-passive is not biclausal. Unless an altogether different syntactic analysis is posited for the otherwise similar ‘emphatic’ construction with the *sdm.n.t=f*—unless, that is, a biclausal analysis is posited for the construction with the *sdm.n.t=f* differing from the mono-clausal analysis established for the same construction with the V-passive—this further implies that the ‘emphatic’ construction in general is not syntactically biclausal. This in turn implies that the *sdm.n.t=f* (and the *ii.n=f* and the *mrr=f* consequently) can not be ‘abstract-relative’.

#### 4.3.1.3 Contrasts in verbal morphology across the board?

As discussed, the *sdm.n.t=f* (and the *ii.n=f* and *mrr=f*) can not be analyzed as ‘nominal’ (§4.3.1.1) nor as ‘abstract-relative’ (§4.3.1.2). There remains the question whether the contrasts observed in written form in the ‘emphatic’ construction in some cases extend to all cases in underlying form. In particular, the question is whether the contrast observed in the accomplished passive between the *sdm.n.t=f*, on the one hand, and *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* and *V-pass non-P* on the other, extends to non subject-affecting

active events, which in written form have a  $\underline{s}dm.n=f$  in both the ‘emphatic’ environments and in non-‘emphatic’ ones.

A. The question is generally answered positively on the following grounds. In the unaccomplished, a contrast in verbal morphology concerns all types of events, active and passive ones alike (thus in the active, *Eloquent Peasant* B1 298  $\underline{s}kdd$ ; in the passive, *Urk.* IV 19, 6  $dgg.tw=f$ ; both similarly forms of the  $mrr=f$ ). By way of analogy, it is then assumed that in the accomplished similarly, the contrast between a passive form in the ‘emphatic’ environments (the  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$ ) and other constructions in non-‘emphatic’ ones ( $P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$ ) should extend to active events; the  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  would thereby be the T-passive of one of the two hypothesized forms of the  $\underline{s}dm.n=f$ . The inference from the unaccomplished to accomplished is viewed as finding additional support in the accomplished active itself, as subject-affecting intransitives such as *iwi*, like passives, display a contrast manifest in written form:

Unaccomplished (uniform)		Accomplished	
( $\alpha$ ) $N(P) mrr=f$	— $mrr=f$	$\underline{s}dm.n=f_A$	— $\underline{s}dm.n=f_B$
( $\beta$ ) $N(P) ii=f$	— $iw=f$	$NP PsP$	— $ii.n=f$
( $\gamma$ ) $mr.t N(P)$	— $mrr.t=f$	$P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$	— $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$

( $\alpha$ ) Non subject-affecting actives; ( $\beta$ ) subject-affecting actives (such as *iwi*);  
( $\gamma$ ) passives.

The argument comes with one major presupposition, namely that morphological contrasts are uniform regardless of tense-aspect (inference from the unaccomplished to the accomplished), of voice (inference from the accomplished passive to the accomplished active), and of event semantics (inference from the accomplished active of subject-affecting events to non subject-affecting ones). This is a presupposition: technically, the overall argument is valid if and only if the presupposition itself is independently demonstrated to be valid. This necessary step has not been taken to the present date. (In fact, the reverse can be demonstrated, namely that the presupposition is not valid: §4.3.2.)

B. In Later Egyptian, contrasts in verbal morphology extend to all types of events uniformly, regardless of tense-aspect, voice, and event semantics. However, later language does here not provide evidence for Earlier Egyptian, which under any account differs from Later Egyptian on two major points:

- The Late Egyptian focusing tenses are dedicated forms, found only in this function; by contrast the Earlier Egyptian  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$ ,  $mrr=f$  and  $ii.n=f$  are found in a variety of other environments as well;
- The construction in which the Late Egyptian focusing tenses are found is fully marked by verbal morphology; in the Earlier Egyptian ‘emphatic’ construction, by contrast, issues of linguistic form are also essential, notably the systematic absence of *iw* (further, §4.4.1.1; §4.4.1.3).

Historically, the existence of dedicated focusing tenses from Late Egyptian on carries one major implication, and only one, namely that Earlier Egyptian had an ‘emphatic’ construction.<sup>94</sup> They provide confirmatory evidence—if need be—to Polotsky’s seminal discovery of the Earlier Egyptian ‘emphatic’ construction, already established on strictly synchronic grounds through a text-based description of correlations of form and function.<sup>95</sup> The existence of the Late Egyptian focusing tenses does not, on the other hand, carry any implication as to whether the Earlier Egyptian ‘emphatic’ construction was marked by contrasts in verbal morphology in all cases, as it would later be.<sup>96</sup>

C. In arguing for the existence of two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*, this then leaves only a direct examination of the written forms themselves.<sup>97</sup> One study has addressed the issue specifically, analyzing alternations in written forms of the *sdm.n=f* of *II.red* in Coffin Texts.<sup>98</sup> The author, Wolfgang Schenkel, interpreted these as pointing to two forms of the *sdm.n=f* distinguished by the position of stress, C<sup>~</sup>CC’v-n<sup>~</sup>- (in ‘predicative’ environments) and C<sup>~</sup>C’vC-n<sup>~</sup>- (in ‘abstract-relative’, i.e. ‘emphatic’, ones). As discussed in details elsewhere, the alternations of written forms in Coffin Texts are equally consistent with an analysis by which the *sdm.n=f* would be a unitary morphological category (C<sup>~</sup>C’vC-n<sup>~</sup>- in all environments).<sup>99</sup> In other words, the Coffin Text data that have been adduced to support the ‘split *sdm.n=f* hypothesis’ turn out to be inherently neutral as to whether Earlier Egyptian had one or two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*.

94 In details, Stauder (forthc.), with a discussion of the rise of Late Egyptian focusing verbal morphology as this relates to Earlier Egyptian forms (technically, the existence of Late Egyptian focusing morphology also implies the existence of a form such as the *mrr=f*).

95 That the Late Egyptian focusing tenses imply the existence of an ‘emphatic’ construction in Earlier Egyptian is evident in retrospect, once the existence of the ‘emphatic’ construction is established on independent grounds. The formulation in Polotsky (1957: 109-10) was cautious: ‘(...) it is perhaps not too fanciful to infer (...)’—in the context of a paper in which the ‘emphatic’ construction is in fact independently established.

96 Another indication that Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f* has been sought in the differential obsolescence of the *sdm.n=f* during the Eighteenth Dynasty, first in non-‘emphatic’ environments, only later in ‘emphatic’ ones (Kruchten 1999: 6-22). While the descriptive data seem correct, the argument itself presupposes that changes affecting the *sdm.n=f* are strictly conditioned by ‘sound change’. This is not the case: the relevant changes must be analyzed in relation to constructional environments and to how these interact with broader changes happening in the same periods in related functional domains of the language (in details, Stauder forthc.)

97 Two descriptive observations had been made some time ago, both phrased by their authors with the utmost caution. (a) With *rdi* ‘give’ a few early (‘petit nombre’) Middle Egyptian texts make a distinction between a stem with *r-* in ‘emphatic’ environments (*rd.n=f*) and a stem without *r-* in non-‘emphatic’ ones (*d.n=f*) (Polotsky 1976: 23, n.40). (b) Three early instances of a *sdm.n=f* of *iri* ‘do, make’ with a reed-leaf (<*i ir n*>) have been noted, all three in ‘emphatic’ environments (Doret 1986: 69, n.743-4; 152, n.1802). Neither observation provides evidence for distinguishing two forms of the *sdm.n=f*: Stauder (in press b: n.4).

98 Schenkel (2009a [2001]); further discussions: Schenkel (2006a: 61-7; 2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.3.1.1.1-2). Accepted by Werning (in press: §1); Ockinga (2012<sup>3</sup>: IX-X); Gundacker (2011: 59-60); Breyer (2006: 100). Critically, Uljas (2010a); Depuydt (2008a: 116-8).

99 Stauder (2014b; in press a).

The lack of evidence for a morphological distinction is of course not evidence for the lack of such distinction: given the nature and constraints of the Earlier Egyptian writing system, syncretism in written forms need not equate with syncretism in underlying morphological forms, and in many cases demonstrably does not. In the present case, however, a series of further arguments permits to restrict the field of options. Based on an examination of the written prefix *i* in the *sdm.n=f* in Pyramid Texts, it can be directly demonstrated that *2rad* did not have a finally stressed form of the *sdm.n=f* (i.e. a (C̣)CC'v-ṇ-, as hypothesized by Schenkel).<sup>100</sup> Based on an additional examination of flexivity in *2rad*'s and in finally stressed inflectional patterns, it appears that other inflectional classes similarly lacked the hypothesized C̣CC'v-ṇ-.<sup>101</sup> If Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*, these could have been distinguished only by vocalism, not by the position of stress as hypothesized by Schenkel.<sup>102</sup>

#### 4.3.2 The types of morphological contrasts associated with the 'emphatic' construction: Tense-aspect, voice, and subject affectedness

Under the hypothesis of a single form of the *sdm.n=f*, the part of the paradigm relevant to the present discussion is in Middle Egyptian as in (a); under the hypothesis of two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*, it is as in (b). In the accomplished, line (α) is for non subject-affecting events (transitives and intransitives such as *mšc* 'walk' or *mdw* 'speak'); line (β) is for subject-affecting intransitives (e.g. *iwi* 'come'); line (γ) is for passives:

##### (a) With a single form of the *sdm.n=f*

	fully asserted events		'emphatic' construction
unaccomplished			
(x)	<i>N(P) mr=f</i>	—	<i>mrr=f</i>
accomplished			
(α)	← <i>sdm.n=f</i> →		
(β)	<i>NP PsP</i>	—	<i>ii.n=f</i>
(γ)	<i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP ~ V-pass non-P</i>	—	<i>sdm.n.t=f</i>

<sup>100</sup> Stauder (in press b).

<sup>101</sup> Stauder (in press b: §2.3 specifically).

<sup>102</sup> Incidentally, this also provides a direct contradiction to Kruchten's interpretation of the differential obsolescence of the *sdm.n=f* in the Eighteenth Dynasty (above, n.96), which requires two forms distinguished by the position of stress.

(b) *With two morphologically distinct forms of the  $\underline{s\dot{d}m.n=f}$*

unaccomplished

(x)  $N(P) \text{ } mr=f$  —  $mrr=f$

accomplished

( $\alpha$ )  $\underline{s\dot{d}m.n=f}_A$  —  $\underline{s\dot{d}m.n=f}_B$   
 ( $\beta$ )  $NP \text{ } PsP$  —  $ii.n=f(\underline{s\dot{d}m.n=f}_B \text{ of } iwi)$   
 ( $\gamma$ )  $P_O \text{ } PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$  —  $\underline{s\dot{d}m.n.t=f}(\text{T-pass. of } \underline{s\dot{d}m.n=f}_B)$

A. Under hypothesis (b), the two morphologically distinct forms of the  $\underline{s\dot{d}m.n=f}$ —a  $\underline{s\dot{d}m.n=f}_A$  and a  $\underline{s\dot{d}m.n=f}_B$ —would be two instantiations of the same higher-order morphological category, marked as accomplished by an inflectional suffix {n}. Regardless of whether hypothesis (a) or (b) is correct, line ( $\alpha$ ) therefore differs from all other lines in the above paradigms: in ( $\beta$ ), two altogether different morphological categories are involved, a (form of) the  $\underline{s\dot{d}m.n=f}$  and the pseudoparticiple; in ( $\gamma$ ), three altogether different morphological categories are involved, a T-passive of (a form of) the  $\underline{s\dot{d}m.n=f}$ , a V-passive, and the pseudoparticiple. As regards the unaccomplished (x), two altogether different morphological categories are involved as well, unlike in ( $\alpha$ ): the  $mr=f$  and the  $mrr=f$ . Moreover, the contrast is the same regardless of voice and subject affectedness, unlike in the accomplished (( $\alpha$ ), ( $\beta$ ), and ( $\gamma$ ) combined). Three observations are then to be made:

- Regardless of whether hypothesis (a) or (b) is correct, the unaccomplished paradigm can be stated in one line (x); stating the accomplished paradigm, by contrast, requires three lines (( $\alpha$ )-( $\gamma$ )). Put equivalently, the morphological contrast involved in the unaccomplished domain is the same nature with non subject-affecting events ( $N(P) \text{ } mr=f$  vs.  $mrr=f$ ), with subject-affecting intransitives ( $N(P) \text{ } ii=f$  vs.  $iw=f$ ), and with passives ( $mr.t=f$  vs.  $mrr.t=f$ ). In the accomplished, by contrast, three altogether different types of contrasts are involved: a contrast that is internal to the  $\underline{s\dot{d}m.n=f}$  as a higher-order category (assuming there were two of these) or no contrast at all ( $\alpha$ ); a contrast that also involves the pseudoparticiple ( $\beta$ ); and one that in addition to the pseudoparticiple also involves the V-passive ( $\gamma$ ). Regardless of whether hypothesis (a) or (b) is correct, this implies that the unaccomplished is structured differently than the accomplished: tense-aspect is therefore a relevant parameter in analyzing the ‘emphatic’ construction. Inferring from the unaccomplished to the accomplished is not legitimate—unless independent grounds are given establishing that the inferral is warranted. Rather, the two domains must be analyzed for themselves and be set in perspective with one another only in a second step;

- Internally to the accomplished, three morphological categories are involved in the passive ( $\gamma$ ), while there are only two with subject-affecting intransitives ( $\beta$ ), and one or perhaps two with non subject-affecting events ( $\alpha$ ). Regardless of whether hypothesis (a) or (b) is correct, the accomplished is differently structured in the passive and in the active: voice is therefore a relevant

parameter in analyzing the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction. In practice, inferring from the passive to the active is not legitimate; the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction in the passive must first be analyzed for itself;

- Internally to the active accomplished, the morphological contrast with subject-affecting intransitives ( $\beta$ ) involves a form of the  $s\bar{d}m.n=f$  and an altogether different morphological category, the pseudoparticiple. Regardless of whether hypothesis (a) or (b) is correct, no similar type of morphological contrast is found with non subject-affecting active events ( $\alpha$ ). Accordingly, an inference from the former to the latter is not legitimate: subject affectedness is a relevant parameter in analyzing the ‘emphatic’ construction in the accomplished active.

An examination of relevant parts of the Middle Egyptian paradigm thus tells that tense-aspect, voice, and subject affectedness are all relevant parameters in analyzing the diverse morphological contrasts associated with the ‘emphatic’ construction. Regardless of whether Earlier Egyptian had one or two forms of the  $s\bar{d}m.n=f$ , event semantics—in ways to be specified below—appear to be a central parameter in the differential makeup of the morphological contrasts considered above.

In a study of the passive such as the present, the focus is on the accomplished, in which voice is a parameter. In entering the analysis of how event semantics play into the ‘emphatic’ construction in the accomplished, the stepping stone consists in the observation that in all cases when a morphological contrast is visible in written form—*put equivalently, in all cases when the morphological contrast implies two or more altogether different morphological categories*—one of these is the pseudo-participle:

(a) *With a single form of the  $s\bar{d}m.n=f$*

( $\alpha$ )	$\longleftarrow s\bar{d}m.n=f \longrightarrow$	
( $\beta$ )	<b>NP PsP</b>	— $ii.n=f$
( $\gamma$ )	<b>Po PsP</b> ~ <i>V-pass non-P</i>	— $s\bar{d}m.n.t=f$

(b) *With two morphologically distinct forms of the  $s\bar{d}m.n=f$*

( $\alpha$ )	$s\bar{d}m.n=f_A$	—	$s\bar{d}m.n=f_B$
( $\beta$ )	<b>NP PsP</b>	—	$ii.n=f(s\bar{d}m.n=f_B \text{ of } iwi)$
( $\gamma$ )	<b>Po PsP</b> ~ <i>V-pass non-P</i>	—	$s\bar{d}m.n.t=f(\text{T-pass. of } s\bar{d}m.n=f_B)$

B. The discussion has so far concerned the broadly Middle Egyptian paradigm, when the  $s\bar{d}m.n.t=f$  had become the regular expression of the accomplished passive in the ‘emphatic’ construction, thus resulting in a tripartite contrast in the passive. In earlier stages of Earlier Egyptian, the V-passive is regularly used in the ‘emphatic’ construction (§4.2.1). Even though the  $s\bar{d}m.n.t=f$  in the ‘emphatic’ construction is also rarely encountered in these early times (§4.2.2.A), an analysis of the spread of the latter form demonstrates that it constitutes a secondary development, initially and for a long while restricted to non-pronominal subjects (§4.2.3). In earlier times, line ( $\gamma$ ) is therefore as:





In comparison to the broadly Middle Egyptian paradigm discussed first (above, A), the earlier Early Egyptian paradigm is even more asymmetrical. This further demonstrates that tense-aspect, voice, and subject affectedness, more broadly event semantics, are relevant parameters in analyzing the Earlier Egyptian ‘emphatic’ construction. Moreover, like in the broadly Middle Egyptian paradigm, in all cases when a morphological contrast is visible in written form—put equivalently, in all cases when the morphological contrast implies two altogether different morphological categories—one of these is the pseudoparticiple.

C. The above discussion was entirely independent of whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*—of whether, in other words, the contrast observed in the accomplished with passives and with subject-affecting intransitives extends to non subject-affecting actives. Rather, two different observations were made:

- The type of the morphological marking associated with the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions varies depending on tense-aspect, voice, and subject affectedness. These are therefore relevant parameters in analyzing the ‘emphatic’ construction itself;
- Whenever a contrast is visible in written form in the accomplished—that is, whenever the contrast involves two or more morphologically unrelated categories—one of these is the pseudoparticiple.

Accordingly, the analysis is best begun with the pseudoparticiple.

### 4.3.3 The semantics of the pseudoparticiple: A very brief background

The Earlier Egyptian pseudoparticiple has long been recognized, explicitly or implicitly, in these or in other terms, as a resultative category.<sup>103</sup> In order to appreciate

103 E.g. Winand (2006: 226-34); Hannig (1991); Vernus (1986; 1984a); Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §320); similarly in various studies by Reintges. The definition of ‘resultativity’ here adopted differs from the extended one espoused in Winand (2006: 182-4, 188, 202-3, 226-50). In Winand’s definition, any accomplished telic event in discourse or narrative discourse and not in the ‘emphatic’ construction is described as ‘accompli résultatif’ (thus e.g. active *iw d.n=i t3 n hkr* (...) ‘I have given bread to the hungry (...)’ in ideal biographies), in ways not unsimilar to e.g. the English perfect (‘I have given (...)’). Major practical differences between these two definitions are the following: (a) In Winand’s broad definition, resultativity concerns the sphere of interests of the subject or the speech situation; resultativity is thereby defined in terms of a lasting relevance of some sort. In the present study, by contrast, resultativity concerns strictly the cases when the subject itself is directly affected by the event. Thus, e.g. *Shipwrecked Sailor* 39-40 *ḥf.n=i rd.kw* (...) ‘I was placed (...)’, with the subject undergoing a change in location; unlike *iw d.n=i t3 n hkr* (...), where the event has relevance to the subject participant, particularly in the context of ideal biographies, but does not directly affect him. (b) In being defined in terms of relevance, Winand’s extended notion of resultativity applies to a variety of telic event types, be these active or passive, subject-affecting or not. In the present study, by contrast, resultativity is defined in relation to subject affectedness; active events concerned are therefore only subject-affecting intransitives. (c) Winand’s ‘accompli résultatif’ is essentially coextensive with the general notion of ‘perfect’, while the definition in the present study is in line with typological definitions of ‘resultativity’ (e.g. Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988). To be sure, the two categories overlap to some degree, as is also manifest in a cross-linguistically common pathway of change, from resultative to perfect (e.g.

the alternations of forms in the accomplished passive, some further comments on the semantics of the form, and the semantic constraints to which its various uses are subject, are in order.

#### 4.3.3.1 Primary states, secondary states, dynamic events

When used to express a non-dynamic event, the form expresses that an entity is in a state, either primary (a) or resulting from some previous event thereby implied (b). When used to express a dynamic event, the same form expresses an event that implies a resulting state affecting the subject (c):

(a) *Debate* 90 (...) *m hrw rsf pt t3.t* ‘(...) on the day of the catch, when the sky is hot’;

(b) *Neferti* 4d *t3 3k r-3w* ‘the whole land is perished’;

(c) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 32-34 *d<sup>c</sup> pr iw=n m w3d-wr tp-<sup>c</sup> s3h=n t3* ‘A storm came about while we were at sea, before we had touched land.’

The semantic connection between the three uses are clear, from a state (a), to a state implying some previous event (b), to a dynamic event implying a resulting state affecting the subject (c). The interpretation is inferred by the hearer/reader.

A. One level concerns the distinction between a primary state, on the one hand, and a secondary state or a dynamic event on the other ((a) vs. (b)-(c)). In many cases, this is made naturally based on lexical semantics: primary states are with atelic (/‘unbounded’) events that can be conceived of as unfolding without any external import of energy—such as *t3* ‘be hot’. Secondary states and dynamic events, by contrast, are with telic events (events that imply a culminating point, at which the event ceases to unfold)—such as *3k* ‘perish’ or *pri* ‘go out’. With many verbs, dynamicity is not lexically specified, nor is therefore telicity—thus with verbs denoting qualities (e.g. *nfr* ‘be good’) or postures (e.g. *hmsi* ‘sit’).<sup>104</sup> With these, the distinction between a primary and a secondary state vanishes in practice.

B. The second level concerns the distinction between states, primary or secondary, on the one hand, and dynamic events on the other ((a)-(b) vs. (c)). This is mainly to be appreciated on contextual grounds: in a lament, *3k* ‘perish’ is interpreted as a secondary state (*Neferti* 4d, above); so is a verb of directed motion, e.g. *Neferti* 7c *bw-nfr nb rww* ‘All goodness is gone’. In a narrative context, the same events are

---

Bybee et al. 1994: 51-105), yet they differ on the various accounts just evoked. The perfect and the resultative also differ by their orientation, which is syntactic in the case of the perfect, but semantic in the case of the pseudoparticiple (§2.3.1). Related to this, the pseudoparticiple is subject to stronger semantic conditions than the perfect is (below, in the main text). (d) In Earlier Egyptian, the perfect (‘accompli résultatif’) is a valid semantic notion for translating text, but not one realized as a distinct morphosyntactic category (*sdm.n=f* is more generally anterior, and *iw sdm.n=f* similarly; an interpretation of the latter as expressing a perfect is co(n)textual). The resultative, by contrast, is a semantic category directly realized as a morphological one in Earlier Egyptian, the pseudoparticiple.

<sup>104</sup> For a slightly different view, Winand (2006: 120-1; see however also 245-6); this difference is inconsequential for the discussion in the present section.

generally interpreted dynamically, e.g. *Debate 73-74* (...) *pr hn<sup>c</sup> hmt=f msw=f 3k tp š* (...) ‘(...) he got out with his wife and his children, and they perished on a pool (...)’.

In other cases, either interpretation is possible: in *Debate 75* *dr.in=f hms* (...), the completive auxiliary *dr.in=f* only rules out an interpretation of *hms* as a primary state (which would have been possible as far as lexical semantics are concerned, since telicity is not lexically specified with *hms*); the passage can be rendered either as ‘He ended up seated (...)’ (or the like; a secondary state) or as ‘He finally sat down (...)’ (or the like; a dynamic event resulting in a state).<sup>105</sup>

C. When oriented on O, the pseudoparticiple is interpreted either as expressing a secondary state implying a previous event (b), or as expressing a dynamic event resulting in a state affecting the subject (c). This is because an event oriented on its second participant can not be construed as a primary state. As discussed, the pseudoparticiple oriented on a full noun O only expresses secondary states (§4.1.2): with dynamic events, the V-passive is used (non-dynamic *N<sub>O</sub> PsP* – dynamic *V-pass N*: §4.1.3). With a pronominal O, the pseudoparticiple can express either a secondary state or a dynamic event resulting in a state affecting the subject; the actual semantics in text are inferred by the hearer/reader along principles similar to the ones just evoked for intransitive events. As also discussed, *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* is an integral part of the accomplished passive paradigm when expressing a dynamic event, and thereby directly relevant to the Earlier Egyptian accomplished passive (§4.1.1; §4.1.3; §4.1.5).

#### 4.3.3.2 Telicity, subject affectedness, and Endpoint orientation

As a direct reflection of such semantics, the pseudoparticiple is semantically, not syntactically, oriented (§2.3.1). The semantic constraints to which the pseudoparticiple is subject when not expressing a primary state are similarly characteristic of resultative forms. Chief among these is the already mentioned constraint that the event must be telic.<sup>106</sup> Tightly related to this is also the observation that in the vast majority of cases, the subject is affected by the event.

A. Telicity and subject affectedness combined may be briefly illustrated with the case of events of motion. Among these, events of directed motion are telic (they imply a goal to the motion) and subject-affecting (they imply a change of location of the subject). With these, the pseudoparticiple provides the regular expression of the positive active accomplished when the full rhematic load lies on the verb itself. By contrast, events of manner of motion—such as *mš<sup>c</sup>* ‘walk’, *šhs* ‘run’, etc.—are atelic and not subject-affecting (that one for example may stop running after some while due to exhaustion pertains to real-worldly experience, not to linguistically relevant construals thereof). Accordingly, events of manner of motion are not conjugated in the pseudoparticiple.

A telling illustration of this correlation is afforded for example by the case of *wstn*, in its basic meaning ‘stride freely’. As an event denoting a manner of motion, *wstn* is not conjugated in the pseudoparticiple. When nonetheless used in the

<sup>105</sup> Thus, in two recent translations, Allen (2011b: 171) and Parkinson (2009: 318), respectively.

<sup>106</sup> Emphasized by Winand (2006: 227 and *passim*); cross-linguistically as well, Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988: 35).

pseudoparticiple, as occasionally happens, the same verb takes on a metaphorically extended meaning, not do with motion at all; *wstn* then expresses a primary state, as befits atelic events:

(i) Antef son of Tjefi (MMA 57.95), 10-11

*mdw(=i) wstn.k m dd ib(=i) mh m k3 n nb(=i)*

‘When speaking, I am unhindered in telling: my heart is full of righteousness for my lord.’

Sim. Rekhmire 11-12 (*Urk.* IV 1075, 2-4).

B. Beyond telicity, subject affectedness is a major parameter in describing the semantics of the pseudoparticiple. When the form expresses a secondary state, the subject is in a state resulting from some previous event thereby implied; when the form expresses a dynamic event similarly, the event results in a state thereby implied. Whenever the form does not express a primary state, the subject is typically affected.<sup>107</sup>

Related to this, telicity is only a necessary condition for the use of the pseudoparticiple, not a sufficient one. In the accomplished, a higher than usual proportion of telic events is observed in text; yet many of these—in particular, active transitive ones, which are non subject-affecting—are conjugated in the *sdm.n=f*, not in the pseudoparticiple.

Moreover, it is subject affectedness that accounts for the semantic orientation of the form, as opposed to the syntactic orientation of the forms of the suffix conjugation, among which the accomplished *sdm.n=f*.

NB. Telicity and subject affectedness are not only related to one another, they are also manifestations of the deeper notion of Endpoint orientation to be discussed more in depth below. The relevance of Endpoint orientation is seen directly in cases of events that are both telic and subject-affecting, yet display an alternation between the pseudoparticiple and the *sdm.n=f*. This is here illustrated by the case of *hpr*, which is in all cases telic. When the referent of the subject is an entity, *hpr* is subject-affecting ((ii), (iv)) while it is not when the subject has a situational referent ((iii), (v)). Criss-crossing the above, *hpr* is in the accomplished conjugated both in the pseudo-

<sup>107</sup> Instances of non subject-affecting events conjugated in the pseudoparticiple are of course encountered as well, e.g. *Sinuhe* B 168-169 (...) <n>-ntt <r>f i3w h3w wgg 3s.n=f wi (...) ‘(...) for now old age has descended: weakness, it has overtaken me (...)’. This is a case of metaphorical extension: when used with a subject referring to an entity (animate or inanimate), *h3i* expresses a change in location and is thereby subject-affecting; when extended to a subject with a situational referent, such as here *i3w* ‘old age’, the construction remains the same and the event is construed as if a (metaphorical) motion had occurred. Conversely, cases of subject-affecting events not conjugated in the pseudoparticiple can occasionally be found as well, e.g. *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II, 31-32 *mnmn=i r s3tw niwt tr 3ht* ‘I moved to the ground of the Town at Inundation season’ (with a very early occurrence of the Late Egyptian past tense *sdm=f*, not with *\*iw=i mnmn.kw r s3tw*). In its more common sense, the subject of *mnmn* ‘tremble, shake’, is the locus of the event but does not register a change-of-state resulting from that event. When *mnmn* is combined with a directional *r NP* phrase as is here the case, the event is made telic and the subject notionally undergoes a change of location; here as well the regular construction of *mnmn* is metaphorically extended, in the reverse way than in the preceding case.

participle ((ii)-(iii)) and in the *sdm.n=f*((iv)-(v))—in all instances quoted in environments that can not be analyzed as an ‘emphatic’ construction.<sup>108</sup> The difference—which therefore can not be accounted for neither by telicity nor by subject affectedness—lies with the stronger salience of the Endpoint in the pseudoparticiple. While in (ii) and (iii), the event of *hpr*-ing is part of the main narrative chain, it is not part of any such in (iv) and (v), in line with the strong Endpoint orientation of the pseudoparticiple:

(ii) Iykhernefret 6-7

*iw hpr.n=k is m sdti hm=i sb3ti w<sup>c</sup> n <sup>c</sup>h=i*  
*iw d.n tw hm=i r [smr] iw=k m hwn n rnpt 26 (...)*

‘For<sup>109</sup> you have grown up as a foster child of My Majesty, the sole pupil of my palace.

My Majesty has placed you as a companion although you were a young man of 26 years (...)’

(iii) Mentuhotep son of Hepy (UC 14333), 8-10

*iw hpr.n h<sup>c</sup>p šr hsb3t 25*  
*n rd=i hkr sp3t d.n(=i) n=s i šm<sup>c</sup> bty n rd(=i) hpr wgg im=s r iwrt h<sup>c</sup>pw <sup>c</sup>3w*  
*snm.n(=i) hr3w m dd(=i) wrh.n(=i) h3rwt (...)*

‘A low inundation occurred in year 25.

I did not allow the district to be hungry, I gave to it Upper Egyptian grain and emmer. I did not let misery occur in it until high inundations came again.

I nourished the children with my deeds, I anointed the widows (...)’

Sim. *Urk.* VII 16, 8 (Ameny); Merer (Cracow, MNK-XI-999), 2.<sup>110</sup>

(iv) Semti (BM EA 574), 3-5

*wn.in hm=f wšd=f wi <sup>c</sup>d=f bi3t(=i) nt r<sup>c</sup> nb*  
*wn.k rf m iw=f<sup>c</sup>3=f*  
*hs wi m hrw pn r sf*  
*hpr.k m iri-ht nsw m3<sup>c</sup> (...)*  
*šsp.n hm=f nmtwt=i*

‘Then His Majesty questioned me, assessing my everyday character:

Being thus someone on the way up,

I am more praised today than yesterday.

As I had become a true royal custodian,

His Majesty accepted my proceedings.’

108 Examples of the *sdm.n=f* of *hpr* after *iw* have been variously noted by Satzinger (2009: §6, ex.24); Winand (2007: §3, ex.32); Vernus (1997: 5-6, n.13); Allen (1991: 1, ex.1), Doret (1986: 126, ex.210-1).

109 As a rendering of *is*, following the analyses in Oréal (2011: 136, 161).

110 For other interpretive issues associated with this passage, Uljas (2007a: 197, ex.222 and n.57).

## (v) Hetepi 6-7

*iw grt snb-ib hpr m sp3t tn n rnpwt ʕ3wt*

*n-sp t3m hr n b3k im im*

*iw htiw wbd n 220 n m3hw*

*n-sp šsp=s w3h{tiw}<y> m-ʕ rmt nb rnpwt nt snb-ib*

*sk it wn n wn=f m sp3t mi-kd=s*

‘Moreover, dearth had occurred in this district for many years;

this servant was not lenient in these.

The threshing floor was sere with 220 sheaves;

it (*scil.* the district) did not receive harvest revenue from anyone in the years of dearth

when grain was non-existent in the entire district.’

## 4.3.3.3 With events oriented on an O

The above discussion was illustrated with syntactically intransitive events, i.e. with uses of the pseudoparticiple oriented on a S. When oriented on an O, the same semantic constraints apply: the event must be telic and it must affect the subject.

A. Exceptions that occur are highly significant, as they trigger observable semantic effects. This is briefly illustrated with the case of verbs of perception and utterance. Thus with *dd* ‘say’, the pseudoparticiple oriented on an O is exceedingly rare: an event of *dd*-ing can hardly be construed as telic in general nor as affecting its O (in terms of semantic roles, the O of *dd* is not a Patient; put differently, but equivalently, the O of *dd* (words, a segment of discourse, or the like) scores too low in individuation to be affectible). In the following passage, from a literary composition of highest rhetorical and linguistic elaboration, the meaning is significantly that the O, *dddt* ‘what has been said’ (itself a perfective passive participle), is now in such a condition that it ‘can only be repeated’;<sup>111</sup> in other words, the subject entity is presented as if affected by the event (‘what has been said’ has *become* unfit to support innovation), which is itself presented in terms of its salient result, i.e. as if telic:

(i) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 3

(...) *hr-ntt rf whmw dddt iw dddt dd*

‘(...) for what has been said can only be repeated, yet what has been said is said.’

Verbs of perception, such as *sdm* ‘hear, listen’ and *m33* ‘see’, are similarly construed as atelic in general and as not affecting their O’s (like with *dd*, the O of a verb of perception does not have the semantic role of Patient). Their use in the pseudoparticiple is accordingly rare. When it occurs nonetheless, the semantic effects observed are significant. Beginning with contexts that imply a dynamic interpretation

111 Vernus (1995: 11), concluding: ‘Ce que veut dire Khâkheperreseneb, c’est que quelque chose qui a été dit peut être répété, ou plus encore, est répétable par nature, mais qu’il ne comporte plus rien d’original du fait même de sa profération originelle.’

of the form, the use of *sḏm* in the pseudoparticiple results in a semantic effect that has long been observed, first with respect to a Ramesside occurrence ('the shade of meaning "grant" (instead of "hear") may make this form permissible here'<sup>112</sup>):

(ii) LEM 18, 13 (P. Anastasi II 10.4-5)

*n3y=i sprw (...) st sḏm m p3 hrw*

'My prayers (...), they are granted today.'

If in then necessarily less technical terms, this description is tantamount to saying that the use of *sḏm* in the pseudoparticiple has the effect of forcing a telic interpretation upon the event.<sup>113</sup> The same semantic effect is observed in Earlier Egyptian occurrences as well, thus, significantly, in a documentary context (iii). Similar effects are noted in Coffin Texts, with two different verbs of 'hearing', the first in a passage possibly mirroring legal diction (iv)-(v). The analysis extends to a verb such as *wšd* 'question', here as well in a legal context (xi).<sup>114</sup>

(iii) P. Brooklyn 35.1446, pl.V, B, 13<sup>115</sup>

*mk st sḏm*

'Look, it has been taken (due) note of.'

(iv) CT V 210b-c M1C<sup>116</sup>

*hrw=f p(w) sḏmw n m3.n.t=f*

'(The great tribunal which is in the Field of Rushes will then say: (...))

This means that his voice has been heard even though he can not be seen.'

(v) CT III 74i-75a S10Ca

*nḥm wi smt.k išt ink is k3 knst*

'Rescue me when I have been heard, for I am the bull of Kenset.'

(vi) P. Berlin 10470, I.14

*mk st wšd hr=s*

'Look, they have been questioned about it.'

<sup>112</sup> Černý (1957: 23a).

<sup>113</sup> Thus Winand (2006: 230).

<sup>114</sup> The same semantic effect is also observed with the perfective V-passive (on this being a genuinely perfective form, not merely an accomplished one, §4.3.5.4). Thus (iii) and, in the same text, P. Brooklyn 35.1446, pl.VI, C, 7 *mk sḏm irt* 'Look what has been done has been taken note of.' Similarly, (vi) and, in the same text, P. Berlin 10470, II.14 *mk wšd n3 n rmt iw (...)* 'Look, these people who had come (...) have been questioned.' This telicizing effect occasionally extends to the active accomplished, thus again in a documentary context, P. Berlin 10016, 2A *mk sḏm.n=i st* 'Look, I have taken note of it.' While more broadly related to how the accomplished can reinforce the salience of the Endpoint (Winand 2006: 194-262, particularly 181, 194), the difference with the V-passive and the pseudoparticiple is that these are oriented on O, that is, on the argument that itself directly relates to the Endpoint, while the active is oriented on A, the Initiator.

<sup>115</sup> Noted by Gilula (1977: 37).

<sup>116</sup> Noted by Satzinger (2006: 126).

B. Contexts that imply a non-dynamic interpretation of the pseudoparticiple differ semantically from the above. In these, uses of *m33* are similarly rare, thus in the following instances expressing a general characteristic—i.e. a state, as befits the atelic nature of the event. In some cases, particularly in the first quoted, this may even lend itself to a modal interpretation, as a so-called ‘potential passive’:

(vii) CT I 200g B12C (var. mss.)<sup>117</sup>

*hw tw m33.t r<sup>c</sup> nb*

‘Would that you be seen every day!’

(Or, as one possible interpretation: ‘Would that you *could* be seen every day!’)

(viii) *Ptahhotep* 568-569

*sšm r3=f r dddt n=f m3w m sdmw*

‘The one conducting his speech according to what has been said to him is regarded as a hearer.’

Like events of perception, events of ingestion—‘eating’, ‘drinking’—score low in semantic transitivity (on semantic transitivity, in more details, §4.3.4.1). Their A is agentive—hence the acceptability of these events in the passive in Earlier Egyptian—but their O is not affected by the event (and thereby semantically not a Patient); moreover, events of ingestion are typically atelic (‘eating’ does not imply a natural Endpoint to the event, as opposed to telic ‘eat up’, ‘auf-essen’, etc.). In the context of an eulogy, the following construction of *swr* in the pseudoparticiple expresses a state that is related to the acting of, and power emanating from, the king. As in (vii)-(viii) with *m33*, an event of perception,<sup>118</sup> a modal interpretation as a ‘potential passive’ is possible, or even invited.<sup>119</sup>

(ix) Mentuhotepi’s *Karnak Stela* 9

[...] *m3iw mw swri* (...)

‘[...] lions, so that water is (/can be) drunk (...)’

Contrasting with e.g. *Sinuhe* B 233-234 *mw m itrw swr.t=f mr=k* (...) ‘The water in the river—it is drunk as you wish.’ The difference between the constructions in Mentuhotepi’s *Karnak Stela* and in *Sinuhe* is that the latter views the event dynamically (the presence of an adjunct clause is significant), while the former views it as a state. In *Sinuhe*, the modal interpretation is a possible effect of the habitual/general interpretation of the unaccomplished, as is common elsewhere in the active and passive alike; in Mentuhotepi’s *Karnak Stela*, it is a possible effect of the non-dynamic view on the event.

117 A very similar interpretation is expressed in Winand’s (2006: 230, ex.276) rendition of this passage (‘Puisses-tu être un objet de contemplation chaque jour’), at odds with the author’s comment that the event should here be viewed as recategorized as telic.

118 As noted, events of perception and of ingestion share similar characteristics by which they score low on semantic transitivity; in a metaphorical way, events of perception can in fact be conceived of as events of ‘perceptual/sensory ingestion’.

119 Interpreting in a slightly differently way, Vernus (1989: 150-1, n.u).



## 4.3.3.4 Semantic characteristics of the pseudoparticiple expressing dynamic events

Major semantic characteristics of the pseudoparticiple expressing dynamic events—both with subject-affecting intransitives and with transitives oriented on a pronominal O (*P<sub>O</sub> PsP*)—can be summarized as follows:

(a) When expressing a dynamic event, the pseudoparticiple has perfective aspect. As such, it is an integral part of the paradigm of the accomplished with subject-affecting intransitives and with transitives oriented on O (only with pronominal subjects for the latter; §4.1.1; §4.1.3; §4.1.5).

(b) When expressing a dynamic event, the pseudoparticiple requires the event to be telic (the same constraint bears on uses of the form expressing a secondary state: §4.3.3.1.A, C; §4.3.3.2.A). When rarely used with events that are otherwise atelic, the form triggers a telic interpretation of these (§4.3.3.3.A).

(c) When expressing a dynamic event, the pseudoparticiple typically requires that the subject be affected by the event. (The same requirement bears on uses of the form expressing a secondary state; only by way of a metaphorical extension, the form can also be used with events that do not affect their subject: §4.3.3.2.B).

(d) When expressing a dynamic event, the pseudoparticiple strongly highlights the Endpoint of the event (§4.3.3.2, particularly §4.3.3.2.C).

(e) While zero-subject constructions of the pseudoparticiple are not uncommon,<sup>120</sup> subjectless constructions of the pseudoparticiple are not possible: with an intransitive verb, the pseudoparticiple reads actively.

(f) When expressing a dynamic event, the pseudoparticiple can not be negated directly.<sup>121</sup> Direct negative constructions of the pseudoparticiple are very rare in Earlier Egyptian overall and concern only cases when the form expresses a primary state<sup>122</sup> or a secondary one.<sup>123</sup>

(g) When expressing a dynamic event, the pseudoparticiple is non-modal. Modally interpreted uses of the form are common, but concern only cases when the construction expresses a primary state or a secondary one.<sup>124</sup>

120 E.g. *Stèle Juridique* 18 *iw ø 3k m-<sup>c</sup>=i* ‘It has perished at my hands.’ Further, Vernus (in press: §4.1).

121 Cross-linguistically, this is a recurrent characteristic of resultative constructions: Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988: 36-7).

122 Pyr. 1429d<sup>p</sup> (PT 566); Pyr. 1742c-d<sup>M</sup> (PT 615); CT I 220c; *Sinuhe* B 258-259 (for these two examples, Vernus in press: §8, ex.62 and 59); *Debate* 126-127; *Merikare* E 48.

123 Pyr. 145a<sup>WN</sup> (PT 215); *Duties of the Vizier* R 15 (*Urk.* IV 1109, 12).

124 For the former, e.g. *Urk.* I 232, 9 (Werra) *dd hm=f r=f wd3.ti hrw hm=f* ‘His Majesty said about him: “May you be safe!”—thus His Majesty said.’ For the latter, with examples oriented on O, with pronominal and with non-pronominal subjects, e.g. CT I 200g B12C (var. mss.) *hw tw m33.t r<sup>c</sup> nb* ‘Would that you be seen every day!’; Antef son of Senet (BM EA 562), 9 *h3 t3 mh m mitw=f* ‘May the land be filled with his likes!’.

#### 4.3.4 The earlier situation: The pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive in contrast, resultative semantics and deviations from these

In analyzing the earlier situation, prior to the spread of the *s<sub>dm</sub>.n=f*, two notions are worth introducing: semantic transitivity and Endpoint orientation. These permit two complementary—if ultimately equivalent—formulations of the distribution of, and thereby contrast between, the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive in earlier times.

##### 4.3.4.1 Semantic transitivity

###### 4.3.4.1.1 Introduction

In intuitive terms, semantic transitivity can be conceived of in relation to the metaphor of ‘transmittal’: in a prototypical semantically transitive event, a fully controlling and initiating Agent efficiently transmits energy onto a fully individuated Patient which registers a change-of-state as a result of, i.e. is saliently affected by, the event. In proper linguistic terms, the notion of semantic transitivity was introduced to account for the remarkable recurrence of a series of interrelated properties observed to typically correlate with each other in grammar and in discourse in individual languages as well as cross-linguistically.<sup>125</sup> The definition is multi-criterial and prototypical: semantic transitivity is a gradient, or scalar, category—differing from syntactic transitivity, which is discrete (any given event either has, or has not, two direct participants).

As a general illustration of the difference between semantic and syntactic transitivity, consider e.g. *he smashed the table* and *the topic merits further study*. Both are similarly transitive syntactically (both have two direct participants, a subject and a direct object). Yet, only the former is semantically transitive, with a controlling Agent as its subject, a fully affected Patient as its direct object, and an effective ‘transmittal’ between the two. In the latter, by contrast, the subject is not controlling (and thereby not an Agent); the direct object is not affected in any way (and thereby not a Patient); and no ‘transmittal’ of any sort takes place between the two. Illustrating some of the typically correlating dimensions involved, the agentive subject in the first clause has an animate referent, while the non-agentive subject in the second is inanimate. (Compare the impossible substitution <sup>†</sup>*the topic smashed the table; he merits further consideration* would for its part be possible, but only with a specific implication, such as (...) *for this position*.) Moreover, the direct object in the first clause, *the table*, is an entity fully individuated, or distinct, from the event, while the direct object in the second clause, *further study*, is not a concrete entity and not fully individuated from the event (reflected in English in the lack of determination). Finally, the event in the first clause, *smashed*, is dynamic, telic (some point is implied by which the table will

<sup>125</sup> The seminal paper is Hopper & Thompson (1980). Further discussion e.g. Næss (2007); Lazard (1998); for an introduction, e.g. Woods (2008: 55-62); Givón (2001<sup>2</sup>: II, 93). Semantic transitivity has previously played a role in Egyptian language studies on at least three occasions, in Collier (1994: 67-72, from a cognitive perspective), in Winand (2000, for the macro-syntactic correlates), and in Winand (2006: 34-150, on the relationship between semantic transitivity and Aktionsart, and thereby aspect).

be in pieces), and punctual (the smashing will occur all at once); by contrast, the event in the second clause, *merits*, is non-dynamic (and therefore extended over time and is atelic as well).

B. The set of properties which, in typically bundling together, define high semantic transitivity as a scalar category are reproduced below the way they were originally formulated.<sup>126</sup> The list is only re-ordered with a view on the following discussion (capital letters refer to the original ordering); groupings expressed in the sub-titles are mine:

	<i>High semantic tr.</i>	<i>Low semantic tr.</i>
(1) [A] Participants	2 or more participants, 1 participant A and O	
<i>(properties to do with A)</i>		
(2a) [H] Agency	A high in potency	A low in potency
(2b) [E] Volitionality	volitional	non-volitional
<i>(properties to do with O)</i>		
(3) [I] Affectedness of O	O totally affected	O not affected
(4) [J] Individuation of O	O highly individuated	O not individuated
<i>(aspect)</i>		
(5) [B] Kinesis	action	non-action
(6) [C] Aspect <sup>127</sup>	telic (/perfective)	atelic (/non-perfective)
(7) [D] Punctuality	punctual	non-punctual
<i>(properties to do with polarity and mode)</i>		
(8) [F] Polarity	affirmative	negative
(9) [G] Mode	realis	irrealis

C. In the present study, semantic transitivity has been a factor on already three occasions:

- In discussing the semantic orientation of the pseudoparticiple, it was noted that semantic transitivity is the key parameter for whether a syntactically transitive event is oriented on its O or its A (§2.3.1.3.1-2; 2.3.4.1);

- In discussing which events are found as active participles in the *nfr sw* construction and with what semantic effects, it was demonstrated that events low in semantic transitivity—such as *mri* ‘love’, *shd* ‘illuminate’, and, again, *rh* ‘know’—are the ones most commonly found in the construction (§2.8.2);

<sup>126</sup> Hopper & Thompson (1980: 252).

<sup>127</sup> The authors’ original formulation does bit distinguish between aspect and Aktionsart; with a view on the discussion to follow, I add ‘perfective’ and ‘non-perfective’. In Givón’s (2001<sup>2</sup>: II, 93) reformulation: ‘(...) a compact (telic, non-durative), bounded (perfective, non-lingering), realis (non-hypothetical) verb and tense-aspect modality (...)’.

- In discussing the semantic constraints that bear on the pseudoparticiple expressing a secondary state or a dynamic event, it was observed that the form is in almost every case used with events that are telic and subject-affecting (including by metaphorical extension) (§4.3.3.2). Semantic effects triggered by the use of the pseudoparticiple with events of ‘saying’ (*dd*), perception (*m33*, *sdm*, *wšd*), and ingestion (*swr*)—all low in semantic transitivity—were discussed in turn (§4.3.3.3).

#### 4.3.4.1.2 Semantic transitivity and accomplished passives outside the ‘emphatic’ construction

A. Discussing passives in relation to high semantic transitivity may at first seem paradoxical as passives serve to place a non-agentive argument in subject position. Accordingly, passives are semantically less transitive than actives inasmuch as they deviate from the prototypical correlations by which the first participant, the subject, is an Agent and the second participant, the direct object, is a Patient.

However, the de-emphasizing of the Agent is largely a matter of the relative topicality and/or salience of core participants and thereby of discourse (§2.5). Semantically, Earlier Egyptian passives imply an agent in the representation of the event, regardless of whether this Agent is given a formal expression in the clause or not; related to this, one major condition for passivization is that the event must be dynamic (§2.1). The construction *P<sub>O</sub> PsP*—which is an integral part of the passive paradigm when expressing a dynamic event (§4.1)—similarly implies an Agent in the semantic representation of the event, be this given a formal expression or not (§4.1.1). In general, therefore, Earlier Egyptian passive constructions imply an agentive participant (above, 2a-b) and are dynamic (5), just like the active events that may be conceived of as their pendants.

B. In the accomplished here under discussion, the constructions *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* and *V-pass non-P* share perfective aspect. As a resultative category, the pseudoparticiple is inherently perfective when expressing a dynamic event (§4.3.3). What in the present study is labeled the ‘perfective V-passive’ displays distinguished associations with perfective aspect as well, although these are not exclusive in earlier times (in details, §4.3.5.3-4; §4.4.3.3); among relevant phenomena already discussed, suffice it to mention the extended uses of the perfective V-passive for events yet to come, which are only possible qua the perfective aspect often associated with the form (§1.2.3).

The dynamic construction *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* is almost exclusively associated with telic events: occurrences with atelic events are very uncommon; moreover, there is a strong pressure to construe these events as if telic (§4.3.3.3.A; similarly for the pseudoparticiple oriented on a S: §4.3.3.2.A). The association of the perfective V-passive with telic events is less exclusive, yet noticeable as well: significant of the semantic profile of the form are semantic pressures similar to the ones observed with *P<sub>O</sub> PsP*, e.g.: P. Brooklyn 35.1446, pl.VI, C, 7 *mk sdm irt* ‘Look, what has been done has been taken note of’ (compare, with *P<sub>O</sub> PsP*, P. Brooklyn 35.1446, pl.V, B, 13 *mk st sdm* ‘Look, it has been taken note of’); P. Berlin 10470, II.14 *mk wšd n3 n rmt iw* (...) ‘Look, these people who had come (...) have been questioned’ (compare, with *P<sub>O</sub>*

*PsP*, P. Berlin 10470, I.14 *mk st wšd hr=s* ‘Look, they have been questioned about it’).<sup>128</sup>

Both *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* and *V-pass N* thus score high on the parameter of aspect/Aktionsart (6). By virtue of the near-exclusive, respectively distinguished, associations just evoked, these constructions in fact score higher on this parameter than any other Earlier Egyptian forms or constructions.

C. The two expressions of the accomplished passive in earlier times—*P<sub>O</sub> PsP* and the perfective V-passive—also differ from one another. As already evoked, the association with telicity and perfective aspect is not as exclusive with the perfective V-passive as it is with *P<sub>O</sub> PsP*. Turning to parameters more directly to do with the participants of the event, the O on which the construction *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* is oriented tends to score very high on the scales of individuation, animacy, and topicality. As a personal pronoun, it almost always refers to an entity, often animate (thus near-exclusively in interlocutive persons). Instances with an inanimate referent are rare (§4.3.3.3, (iv)), and such with a situational referent altogether exceptional (§4.3.3.3, (ii), (iii), and (vi)). By contrast, the O on which a perfective V-passive is oriented can be of any sort, pronominal or non-pronominal; when non-pronominal, the construction regularly occurs with any type of referent, animate, inanimate, or situational. In addition, the perfective V-passive can also govern complement clauses, which are not referring to any entity in the first place.

The pronominal O on which the construction *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* is oriented is highly topical by definition (further, §4.1.5). By contrast, the O on which a perfective V-passive is oriented can be pronominal, a definite full noun (that is, a full noun the referent of which is co(n)textually given or accessible), or an indefinite full noun. In addition, the form regularly governs complement clauses, in which case topicality is nil.

On the Nominal Hierarchy, which combines the interrelated and typically correlating properties of individuation, animacy, and discourse topicality,<sup>129</sup> the O on which *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* is oriented thus almost invariably scores very high; the O on which the perfective V-passive is oriented can score very high, lower, much lower, or even zero. Related to the above, the O on which *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* is oriented is typically affected by the event; by contrast, the O on which the perfective V-passive is oriented can be affected by the event, but it need not: for example, when the O is situational, or when the form governs a complement clause, it is not. On properties of semantic transitivity to do with the affectedness and individuation of the O argument (3)-(4), *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* thus almost invariably scores very high, while the perfective V-passive can also score much lower, and in text often does.

<sup>128</sup> Such telicizing effect is also occasionally observed in the accomplished active and is therefore more broadly related to how the accomplished can reinforce the salience of the Endpoint (Winand 2006: 194-262, particularly 181, 194). Thus in a comparable register and context, P. Berlin 10016, 2A *mk sdm.n=i st* ‘Look, I have taken note of it.’ The difference with the perfective V-passive (and *P<sub>O</sub> PsP*) is that these are oriented on O, that is, on the argument that represents the Endpoint, while the active is oriented on A, the Initiator. Accordingly, the correlation with telicity and associated semantic effects are more common and typically stronger with the perfective V-passive than with the accomplished active.

<sup>129</sup> Silverstein (1976); in the present study, §4.1.5.

D. While subjectless constructions of the pseudoparticiple are impossible (§4.3.3.4, (e)), they are fully regular with the perfective V-passive (§2.5.3; §2.6.1.1). The difference directly reflects the different nature of the orientation in the two forms, semantic in the former, syntactic in the latter (§2.4.1). While the construction  $P_O PsP$  scores high on the parameter by which semantic transitive implies two referentially distinct and fully individuated participants (above, (1)), the perfective V-passive can thus maximally low on the same parameter. This is related to the possibility for the perfective V-passive to score low on properties to do with the individuation and the affectedness of O (above, C). In the case of an O-detransitivized event (§2.6.1.1), the subjectless passive construction is with an event that lacks an O sufficiently individuated for it to be given a segmental expression (parameter (4)); such O then also fails to be affected by the event (parameter (3)). In the case of a passive of a primary intransitive (§2.5.3), there is no O that could possibly be affected (parameter (3)) and individuation is not an issue either (parameter (4)).

E. The Earlier Egyptian pseudoparticiple is only rarely used in negative constructions; whenever it is, this concerns only primary and secondary states (§4.3.3.4, (f)). Put differently, whenever the pseudoparticiple is used with accomplished passive events—in the construction  $P_O PsP$ —it can only be positive. The perfective V-passive, by contrast, is fully regular in negative constructions, notably in the accomplished ( $n V\text{-pass } P/\text{non-}P \rightarrow n sdm.t=f$  in later times): §4.3.5.1.3). With fully asserted events and pronominal O's—the ones in which the pseudoparticiple can be used as an expression of the accomplished passive—the counterpart relationship is thus as  $P_O PsP - n V\text{-pass } P$ . The use of the perfective V-passive in negative constructions extends further, to the unaccomplished ( $n V\text{-pass } P/\text{non-}P \rightarrow n sdm.n.t=f$  in later times): §4.3.5.2.1).

On polarity (parameter (8)), the pseudoparticiple expressing a dynamic event thus scores high on the scale of semantic transitivity, while the perfective V-passive can also score low.

F. On the parameters of semantic transitivity discussed so far, the pseudoparticiple in the construction  $P_O PsP$  and the perfective V-passive contrast as follows:

	<i>High semantic tr.</i>	<i>Low semantic tr.</i>
[(2a-b) Agency	←(EEg. passive constr. in general)→]	
[(5) Dynamicity	←(EEg. passive constr. in general)→]	
(6) <b>Telicity/Perfectivity</b>	$P_O PsP$	
	perf. V-pass	(perf. V-pass)
		(while strong, the association with telicity and perfectivity is not exclu- sive with the perf. V-pass)

(1)	<b>Participants</b>	$P_O PsP$	←————— perf. V-pass —————→
(3)	<b>Affectedness of O</b>	$P_O PsP$	←————— perf. V-pass —————→
(4)	<b>Individuation of O</b>	$P_O PsP$	←————— perf. V-pass —————→
(8)	<b>Polarity</b>	$P_O PsP$	←————— perf. V-pass —————→

Among these parameters on which the two constructions contrast,  $P_O PsP$  is invariably on the high end of semantic transitivity; on the same parameters, the perfective V-passive can score high, lower, and very low.

#### 4.3.4.1.3 Semantic transitivity and the ‘emphatic’ construction

A. The above contrasts correspond to the following distributions in Earlier Egyptian text:

- (a) *subject P*                      *subject non-P*                      (parameters (1), (3), (4))

$P_O PsP$

←————— perf. V-pass —————→

- (b) *positive*                      *negative*                      (parameter (8))

$P_O PsP$

←————— perf. V-pass —————→                      (§4.3.5.1.3; §4.3.5.2.1)

In addition, a third contrast is observed: only the perfective V-passive, not the pseudo-participle, is found in the ‘emphatic’ construction.

- (c) *event fully asserted*                      ‘emphatic’ construction

$P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$                        $V\text{-pass } P/\text{non-}P$  (§4.2)

(neg.: ←————— *n V-pass P/non-P* —————→)

To account for this third level on which the two constructions contrast with one another, the two parameters of semantic transitivity not considered so far are relevant, ‘punctuality’ (7) and ‘mode’ (9).

B. By ‘mode’, the authors here intend: ‘This refers to the distinction between a “realis” and “irrealis” encoding of events.<sup>130</sup> An action which either did not occur,<sup>131</sup> or which is presented as occurring in a non-real (contingent) world, is obviously less effective than one whose occurrence is actually *asserted* (emphasis AS) as

<sup>130</sup> For a more refined approach of the contrast between ‘realis’ and ‘irrealis’ in Earlier Egyptian, now Uljas (2007a), with references to the post-1980 general linguistic discussion.

<sup>131</sup> On polarity, already above, E.

corresponding directly with a real event.<sup>132</sup> Functionally, the ‘emphatic’ construction serves to express that the verb does not carry the whole rhematic load, which is more or less strongly attracted by some broadly adverbial expression. In other words, the construction expresses that the verbal event itself is less strongly asserted than it is under regular conditions, in non-‘emphatic’ environments. This is tantamount to a reduction on the parameter of semantic transitivity labeled ‘mode’.

The parameter of ‘punctuality’ is similarly relevant.<sup>133</sup> In making an adverbial expression be a salient part of the scope of assertion, the ‘emphatic’ construction often highlights the circumstances (broadly understood) of the event as this unfolds. The ‘emphatic’ construction thus presents the event under a perspective by which it is viewed as less punctual than under a strictly perfective perspective as in the construction *P<sub>O</sub> PsP*. The ‘emphatic’ construction thereby takes distance from another parameter of high semantic transitivity, ‘punctuality’. As the above formulation also implies, this twofold distance taken from both the parameters of ‘mode’ and ‘punctuality’ is directly related to one another.

C. The above table (§4.3.4.1.F) can then be completed as:

(7)	<b>Punctuality</b>	<i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP</i>		
		←————	perf. V-pass	————→
(9)	<b>Mode</b>	<i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP</i>		
		←————	perf. V-pass	————→

The pseudoparticiple expressing a dynamic event oriented on O underlies strong conditions of semantic transitivity. As discussed first, these conditions are manifest in the parameters of telicity/perfectivity (6), of two distinct core participants (1), of individuation and affectedness of the O (3-4), and of polarity (8) (§4.3.4.1.2). The Earlier Egyptian ‘emphatic’ and related constructions, for their part, imply a deviation from high semantic transitivity on the parameters of punctuality (7) and mode (9). In these, the pseudoparticiple is not used in Earlier Egyptian—like it is not in passives with O’s that are not individuated enough or not affectible, or in passives that lack an O altogether, or with negative passive events. In earlier periods of Earlier Egyptian, the perfective V-passive, which is less semantically over-determined than the pseudoparticiple, is used instead in all the above environments alike.

4.3.4.2 The Endpoint orientation of accomplished passives and deviations therefrom

A. An alternative formulation—not making reference to semantic transitivity yet touching upon ultimately similar issues—is possible through the notions of event perspective and Endpoint orientation. In very general terms, alternations in grammatical voice can be conceived of as serving to present events from different

132 Hopper & Thompson (1980: 252).  
133 ‘Punctuality’ is here understood in terms of event perspective, not of Aktionsart (as e.g. in Winand 2006). The two approaches are of course not mutually exclusive, provided the respective levels at which ‘punctuality’ is understood is duly specified: an event whose Aktionsart, lexically defined, would be durative can thus be viewed as punctual in actual conjugation in text (as in the pseudoparticiple).



perspectives. The active views the event from the perspective of the Initiator, the participant who puts energy into the event; by contrast, the passive views the event from the perspective of its Endpoint, the entity that saliently registers a change-in-state (further, §4.5.2). Other types of voice, such as middle or antipassive voice—when they exist in a given language—provide yet other perspectives on the event.<sup>134</sup>

The general Endpoint orientation of passives is prototypical only: for example, subjectless passives often lack an Endpoint, and are unprototypical notably for this reason (§2.5.3; §5.3.3.3). By the same token, passives from transitives with an O of low individuation are less Endpoint-oriented than passives with a highly individuated O that they can saliently affect. For obvious reasons, the Endpoint orientation of passives is stronger in the accomplished—which has to do with completion—than in the unaccomplished: unaccomplished passives, and particularly imperfective ones, are themselves less prototypical than accomplished ones (further, §4.5.2.B; §5.3.3.2).

B. The Earlier Egyptian pseudoparticiple—a resultative category—is a quintessentially Endpoint-oriented form. When used dynamically, as in the accomplished passive with pronominal subject, it expresses an event that results in a state, thereby implied, that affects the subject. The event is positive, perfective and telic; except in very few cases, the O scores high on the Nominal Hierarchy notably on individuation and is fully affected. In the ‘emphatic’ construction, by contrast, some broadly adverbial expression is highlighted: the perspective is thereby set on the circumstances (broadly understood) of the event as this unfolds or on dimensions often associated with the Agent of the event: this in turn highlights the dynamic part of the event. In comparison to the same event expressed in the pseudoparticiple, the ‘emphatic’ construction has the effect of de-emphasizing the Endpoint orientation characteristic of resultative semantics. To these ends, a perfective V-passive is used in earlier stages of Early Egyptian.

Put differently, the ‘emphatic’ construction is less strongly Endpoint-oriented than accomplished passives are in general. As initially noted, so are accomplished passives lacking an O (i.e., passives from intransitives) and accomplished passives with an O of low individuation (be this given a segmental expression or none). Also displaying a lesser Endpoint orientation are accomplished passives that are non-positive: as the event is said not to have gone to completion, the Endpoint orientation is necessarily reduced. In all these cases alike, the perfective V-passive, not the pseudoparticiple, is used.

#### 4.3.4.3 Two equivalent accounts

A. Two accounts were presented above for why a perfective V-passive, not the pseudoparticiple, is used in the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions in earlier stages of Early Egyptian. In the first (§4.3.4.1), it was argued that the pseudoparticiple expressing a dynamic event oriented on a pronominal O scores invariably high on all parameters of semantic transitivity. In the ‘emphatic’ construction, a lesser, or differently, assertive modality and a less punctual construal of the event imply a reduction of semantic transitivity on these two levels. To these ends, a form other than

---

<sup>134</sup> For an introduction, Woods (2008: 70-109).

the pseudoparticiple, the perfective V-passive, is used—as it is for other events that similarly deviate from high semantic transitivity on the parameters of ‘telicity/perfectivity’, ‘participants’, ‘affectedness and individuation of O’, and ‘polarity’. In the second account (§4.3.4.2), it was noted that the pseudoparticiple when used to express a dynamic event is semantically a quintessentially Endpoint-oriented category. The use of the perfective V-passive in the ‘emphatic’ construction then serves to present the event under a perspective that de-emphasizes the Endpoint orientation characteristic of the pseudoparticiple. Other environments and event types in the accomplished passive with which the perfective V-passive, not the pseudoparticiple, is used also imply a less Endpoint-oriented perspective on the event.

Both accounts are tightly related: the fact that the pseudoparticiple expressing a dynamic event oriented on a pronominal O scores invariably high on all parameters of semantic transitivity is a direct consequence of the resultative semantics of the form; so is the strong Endpoint orientation of the pseudoparticiple. In intuitive terms, and under both proposed analyses alike, the use of the perfective V-passive in the ‘emphatic’ construction in earlier Early Egyptian can then be viewed as serving to accommodate the ‘un-resultative’ semantics of that construction. ‘Un-resultative’ here has two meanings: with pronominal O’s and positive events, the perfective V-passive is used in the ‘emphatic’ construction formally contrasting with the pseudoparticiple—a resultative category—used in non-‘emphatic’ environments; with non-pronominal O’s and/or with negative events, the perfective V-passive is used in all environments alike. In both cases, ‘un-resultative’ refers to the fact that the perfective V-passive is not subject to the same semantic constraints to which the pseudoparticiple as a resultative category is, for its part, subject.

B. While the two accounts here presented ultimately point to the same phenomenon—the conditions under which a deviation occurs from the semantic constraints that bear on the pseudoparticiple as a resultative category—they are both useful. In their complementarity, they allow for a deeper appreciation of certain relevant parameters of high semantic transitivity as these have to do with Endpoint orientation, and vice-versa. In addition, the second approach also extends to subject-affecting events in the active. In these as well, a form other than the pseudoparticiple—in this case a *sdm.n=f*, as befits active voice—is used in the ‘emphatic’ construction, de-emphasizing the strong Endpoint orientation characteristic of the same events when presented under the resultative perspective characteristic of the pseudoparticiple.<sup>135</sup> Like the perfective V-passive, the *sdm.n=f* is not subject to resultative semantics. Thus:

---

135 For subject-affecting intransitives only, a similar view is expressed, if in different terms, by Winand (2007: §3, *fine*; 2006: 242-8).

(a) *Reduced semantic transitivity and de-emphasized Endpoint orientation*

- Accomplished passive with pronominal O's: the perfective V-passive—not the pseudoparticiple—in the 'emphatic' and related constructions:

$P_O PsP$  (non-'emph.') —  $V\text{-pass } P$  ('emph.');

- Perfective V-passive with non-pronominal O's:

$V\text{-pass non-}P$  (in 'emphatic' and non-'emphatic' environments);

- Perfective V-passive with negative events:

$V\text{-pass } P/\text{non-}P$  (in 'emphatic' and non-'emphatic' environments);

(b) *De-emphasized Endpoint orientation, also*

- Subject-affecting intransitives: a  $\underline{s}dm.n=f$ —not the pseudoparticiple—in the 'emphatic' and related constructions:

$NP_S PsP$  ('non-emph.') —  $ii.n=f$  ('emph.').

4.3.5 The later situation: The  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  in contrast to the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive

I now turn to the later, formally more complex, situation, when the  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  had become the regular expression of the accomplished passive in the 'emphatic' and related constructions resulting in a tripartite contrast in the accomplished passive. The spread of the  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  in the 'emphatic' construction as this can be described in the record was documented above (§4.2.2-3). I here analyze this process of spread by setting it into relation with broader phenomena of linguistic change of which it is only a part: a general tendency of T-passives to replace V-passives to be observed in other categories as well (§4.3.5.1), and the spread of the  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  itself in another construction, the negative unaccomplished ( $n \underline{s}dm.n.t=f$ : §4.3.5.2). This forms the background for contrasting V- and T-passives as is relevant to the main issue here at stake, the spread of the  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  over the V-passive in the accomplished 'emphatic' construction itself (§4.3.5.3-5).

4.3.5.1 The spread of T-passives in forms other than the  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$ 

The spread of the  $\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$  is part of a broader trend by which T-passives tend to replace V-passives during the linguistic history of Earlier Egyptian. It has been observed that in Pyramid Texts, V-passives are roughly ten times more common than T-passives;<sup>136</sup> in Middle Egyptian literary texts, by contrast, T-passives are by a rough estimate five to ten times more common than V-passives; in Old Kingdom tomb inscriptions, T-passives and V-passives are found in roughly similar proportions. These rough data merit qualifying comments because they not only reflect linguistic history but also a significant skew in the record:

---

<sup>136</sup> Allen (2013a: 122).

- The passive of the unmarked unaccomplished ( $N(P) \text{ } sdm=f$ ) is in  $\{t\}$  ( $sdm.t \text{ } NP$ : §3.1.1). Reflecting the diverse types of contents in various parts of the record, the unmarked unaccomplished, often with general or habitual interpretation, is very common in Middle Egyptian literature, particularly in teachings; it is, on the other hand, highly uncommon in tomb inscriptions, and altogether exceptional in Pyramid Texts (a rare example, significantly in dependency of a preceding clause, is Pyr. 406a-b<sup>WT</sup> (PT 273-274) *iw phr imiw pt n N ššr.t n=f ktiwt m rdw nw hmwt=sn* ‘The ones in the sky serve N while the hearthstones are poked for him with the legs of their women.’) This results in a very strong over-representation of T-passives in literary texts over non-literary ones;

- The passive of the past tense  $sdm=f$  is in  $\{t\}$ . For reasons to do with the tensing and rhetorical composition of these texts,<sup>137</sup> the past tense  $sdm=f$  is not uncommon in Sixth Dynasty so-called event biographies, alongside  $iw sdm.n=f$  also found in similar environments as far as grammar proper is concerned. In post-Old Kingdom times, and thereby for example in literary texts, the form is obsolete (for exceptional passives instances, §4.3.5.1.1). This results in a slight over-representation of T-passives in Sixth Dynasty so-called event biographies;

- According with their ritual-performative nature, Pyramid Texts are tensed in ways that can provisionally be described as perfective (for example, §1.2.3.2). In practice, most forms are either past or future. With passive events, this results in a strong over-representation of V-passives (perfective and prospective ones) in Pyramid Texts.

These parameters to do with the nature of the written record must be taken into due account as correcting factors to the relative proportions evoked first. The contrast between e.g. Pyramid Texts and Middle Egyptian literary texts is thereby not as extreme as the bare figures may at first suggest, yet it remains significant of ongoing linguistic change proper.

#### 4.3.5.1.1 The loss of the positive past tense $sdm.t=f$

A. Against the general tendency for T-passives to replace V-passives in certain constructions and environments, one case of an apparently contrary development is preliminarily evoked. While some Sixth Dynasty so-called event biographies have a T-passive of the non-negative past tense  $sdm.t=f$ , this is exceedingly rare in all later times. No occurrences are found in Pyramid Texts nor in the post-Old Kingdom inscriptional record.<sup>138</sup> One clear occurrence is in a literary composition; significantly,

<sup>137</sup> Stauder (in prep).

<sup>138</sup> Iykhnefret (CG 20140), b.2, mentioned by Borghouts (2010: I, §56.a.1, ex.1) as a T-passive of the non-negative past  $sdm=f$ , is an instance of the rare construction of the ‘narrative’ infinitive with  $\{t\}$  (as also in Wadi el-Hudi 10, 2: §5.1.3.1, (i)-(ii)). *It.tw* in early New Kingdom royal inscriptions (Borghouts 2010: §56.a.1, ex.4) is a segment of formulaic language, and could itself derive from or relate to the same ‘narrative’ construction of the infinitive (as *it.tw < it(t) tw*; e.g. *Urk.* IV 656, 14, §5.1.3.1, (iii)).

the verb is *rdi* in causative function and the Agent is royal, as in Sixth-Dynasty so-called event biographies:

(i) *Sinuhe* B 238-239<sup>139</sup>

*rd.t* iry=*i* hrw m i33 hr swdt ht=*i* n msw=*i* (...)

‘I was allowed to spend a day in Iaa handing over my property to my children (...)’

Two other possible occurrences are the following. These remain uncertain, however, as a T-passive of the unaccomplished *sdm=f* is possible as well:<sup>140</sup>

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 158-159

*iw* nswt m hnt *iw* hmw m ʕ=*k*

*rd.tw* iyt m h3w=*k*

‘The king is in front—the steering-oar is in your hand,  
yet evil is placed around you.’<sup>141</sup>

Sim. *Khakheperreseneb* ro 11 *rd.tw* m3ʕt <r->rwti isft m hn sh ‘Maat is put outside, *Isfet* is within the council.’

NB. It has also been proposed to read *Shipwrecked Sailor* 34 f3(.?)t t3w as a T-passive of the past *sdm=f*, thus f3.t t3w (...) ‘The wind was caught (lit. lifted up) (...)’.<sup>142</sup> Other interpretations are more likely: as a ‘narrative’ construction of the infinitive<sup>143</sup> as would be indexically appropriate in a context evoking expedition accounts<sup>144</sup> or as an unaccomplished *sdm=f*, in continuation to the paragraph-opening *dʕ pr* (...).<sup>145</sup>

Post-Old Kingdom occurrences of the T-passive of the non-negative past *sdm=f* are thus limited to literary texts and to the verb *rdi*, a high-frequency verb. If the verbs in (ii) are instances of this form, *rd.tw* would appear to be a frozen form and an index of a literary register. In the *Sinuhe* occurrence (i), the same form could also be interpreted as indexical, aligning with other similar elements of a linguistic over-determination to do with the broader palimpsestic tenor of that composition.<sup>146</sup> The two accounts are not mutually exclusive.

B. In the active, the non-negative past *sdm=f* is itself obsolescent during the Old Kingdom already: in the Sixth Dynasty, and leaving aside possible occurrences in Pyramid Texts,<sup>147</sup> the form is found only in so-called event biographies; other types of texts, such as letters or royal decrees consistently have *iw sdm.n=f* in similar environments. In Sixth Dynasty so-called event biographies themselves, past *sdm=f* is found

139 Feder’s (2004: 70-1) emendation is unjustified, see Schenkel (in press: §5).

140 Further discussion: Stauder (2013a: 160-1).

141 Transl. Parkinson (2012a: 134-5).

142 E.g. Borghouts (2010: I, §56.a.1, ex.3); also evoked as one possibility by Allen (forthc.: 18).

143 Stauder (2013a: 248-9, n.24); similarly e.g. Burkard (1993: 55).

144 For other aspects of such, Enmarch (2011); Blumenthal (1977).

145 Similarly e.g. Allen (forthc.: 18, the second possibility evoked).

146 Provisionally Stauder (2014a: §3).

147 See the preceding note.

only in some texts, while others consistently have *iw sdm.n=f* in similar environments. In post-Old Kingdom times, the distribution of past *sdm=f* is extremely reduced, being largely limited to phraseologically bound contexts including cases of outright phraseological inheritance from Old Kingdom textual models.<sup>148</sup> The same form is, on the other hand, fully regular in the bound negative pattern *n sdm=f*. The passive *n sdm.t=f* is similarly productive throughout Earlier Egyptian and is even spreading during that period (§4.3.5.1.3). The loss of the T-passive of the past *sdm=f* is therefore a direct effect of the loss of the past *sdm=f* itself: the change does not concern voice per se.

#### 4.3.5.1.2 Prospective V-passive → Prospective T-passive

In all other cases, it is T-passives that supersede V-passives. In the future, the prospective V-passive and the *sdmm=f* (in complementary distribution with the former according to inflectional classes) are thus replaced by a T-passive formed on the active prospective stem outside early funerary corpora (§1.2.2). Meanwhile, the active prospective remains productive outside these corpora, in the Old Kingdom and through earlier Middle Egyptian, including as the very stem based on which prospective T-passives are then formed. Unlike in the case discussed first (§4.3.5.1.1), therefore, the change here specifically concerns passive voice.

As far as can be determined, the prospective T-passive does not differ from the prospective V-passive (and the *sdmm=f*) on any semantic level. The change thus appears to be primarily a morphological one: descriptively, the prospective V-passive (and the *sdmm=f*) are not productive outside early funerary corpora. The replacement of the prospective V-passive (and of the *sdmm=f*) by a T-passive of the prospective

148 Main discussions: Schenkel (in press: §5); Vernus (1997: 70-7); Zonhoven (1993-1994); Kammerzell (1988). On phraseological inheritance in inscriptional texts, Vernus (1997: 72-6, discussing Samontu (BM EA 828)). Among other occurrences (Díaz Hernández 2013: 69-70, ex.62-4), the ones in Hammamat 19, 2-5 (Winand 2006: 252, ex.330) and in Hammamat 3042, 18; (Díaz Hernández 2013: 69-70, ex.63) are also phraseologically bound (*wd hm=f* (...)). In literary texts, *Sinuhe* B 265 *wd=s* is generally interpreted as a past *sdm=f* (e.g. Díaz Hernández 2013: 71, ex.65; Winand 2006: 252; Vernus 1997: 76, n.218); alternatively, the form could also be dependent on, or continuing, the preceding *dd.in=f*: B 264-266 *dd.in=f n hmt nsu* (...) *wd=s sbh ʕ wrt* ‘He said to the royal wife “(...)”, (and) she uttered a very great cry’ (an interpretation as a prospective *sdm=f* (Kammerzell 1988: 43) is more problematic on semantic grounds; further discussion, Schenkel in press: §5, *fine*; Zonhoven 1993-1994). Another candidate for a past tense *sdm=f* in a literary text is *Herdsman* x+23 (*hp*; Vernus 1997: 76), unless this is dependent on the preceding clause (e.g. Dils, *TLA*). *Eloquent Peasant* B1 58-60 *dd.in sḥti pn hw=k wi ʕw3=k hnw=i nhm=k rf nhwt m r3=i* does not belong here: although *hw=k* and *ʕw3=k* have been interpreted as past tense *sdm=f*s (Díaz Hernández 2013: 71-2, ex.66; Malaise & Winand 1999: §555, ex.779), these probably have present tense reference (with the lack of *iw* before the first being conditioned by its initial position in the speech): ‘This peasant said: “You beat me, you steal my belongings, and now you would even take the complaint from my mouth!”’ (similarly Vernus 1990: 22-3, n.85), unless they are modally colored (thus Parkinson 2012a: 56). The instances with a preposed subject in *Sinuhe* (R 17; R 21; B 113; B 242-243) merit further discussion as the construction would be different from the one in the Old Kingdom. An altogether different set of questions is raised by sequence-initial occurrences of intransitive verbs of motion, appearance, or coming onto the scene in funerary and ritual texts (e.g. Vernus 1980), continuing usages already documented in Pyramid Texts. Whether these are instances of the past tense *sdm=f* (e.g. Vernus 1997: 63-9) or not (e.g. Borghouts 2010: I, §56.a.2) requires further examination (a study is in preparation).

does not imply any further changes in the functional or semantic makeup of Earlier Egyptian passive voice.

#### 4.3.5.1.3 Past tense *n V-pass* (*/n sdm.t=f*) → *n sdm.t=f*

A. In the Old Kingdom and in earlier Middle Egyptian, the regular expression of the negative accomplished passive is with a V-passive, as *n V-pass*.<sup>149</sup> In Old Kingdom tomb inscriptions, the construction provides the negative counterpart to both the perfective V-passive (ii) and the T-passive of the past tense *sdm=f* (iii):

(i) Pyr. 949b-c<sup>P</sup> (PT 475)<sup>150</sup>

*ph{r}.n N pn k3w pt*

*n hsf N pn in wrw h-hd ir mskt shdw*

‘This N has reached the heights of the sky;

This N has not been barred from the Starry Stretch by the Great ones of the White Castle.’

In the second clause, M and N read actively *n hsf.n sw wrw h-hd* (...). Sim. Pyr. 334b<sup>T</sup> (PT 262)<sup>151</sup> *d3.n N m <m>hnt wrt n szp hmt im=s* ‘N has crossed in the great ferry boat; no fare has been taken in it.’

(ii) *Urk.* I 251, 1-2<sup>152</sup>

*nd.t n(=i) smr wct*

*sck.t(=i) r pr-nsu [...]*

*n ir o m s3r n rmt nb*

‘I was named sole companion

and I was introduced into the palace [...]

It had not been done as a favor to any man.’

(iii) *Urk.* I 131, 4-7 (Harkhuf)<sup>153</sup>

*iw in wd n hk3 niwt m3t (...)*

*n ir hwt im*

‘A decree was brought to the chief of new towns (...)

—no exception has been made therein.’

149 Some of the examples below are in non-initial position in a sequence (i)-(iii), and it has been suggested that the construction *n sdm NP* is then ‘circumstantial’ (Doret 1986: 96). Negative clauses are generally less common in past narrative as they do not contribute to moving the main chain of events forward; accordingly, they typically serve to elaborate some previous (set of) positive event(s) (for an introduction to these correlations applied to Egyptian textual material, Winand 2006: 424-6; 2000; negative polarity is one parameter of reduced semantic transitivity, correlating with the textual background: §4.3.4.1.1). It is therefore only expected that past negative passive events would often not occur in sequence-initial position (a discourse, or macro-syntactic, correlation); there is no implication, on the other hand, that these should be viewed as ‘circumstantial’ (a syntactic analysis). As the occurrences in non-narrative contexts (iv)-(viii) directly demonstrate, the construction *n V-pass* is not any inherently circumstantial.

150 Allen (1984: §506.A-B).

151 Further discussion, Allen (1984: §508).

152 Doret (1986: 96, ex.172).

153 Doret (1986: 96, ex.171).

(iv) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.α.2 (Inscription #5)<sup>154</sup>

*ink ḥ3t rmtw phwy rmtw*  
*dr-ntt n ḥpr mit(=i) nn sw r ḥpr*  
***n ms mit(=i) n ms[.t]=f***

‘I was the vanguard of men and the rearguard of men,  
 for someone like me has not come into being, nor is he to come into being,  
 someone like me has not been born, nor will he be born.’

(v) Hatnub 22, 7-8<sup>155</sup>

*n ʕw3=i ky ḥr išt=f*  
***n m3r nds m šdw=f***

‘I did not rob another of his property,  
 no citizen was driven from his plot.’

Sim. *Bersheh* 8, pl.21, bottom, 3 *n iw ḥn=f n gm sp=f* ‘There came no evil  
 utterance of his, nor was a bad deed of his found’; Siut III, 8 ***n tr iw r(=i)*** (...) ‘No  
 wrong was done against me (...)’.

(vi) CT II 3f B1C, B2L, B1P, B1Bo, G1T<sup>156</sup>

***n kd=i m ht***  
***n ts=i m swht***

‘I was not formed in the womb,  
 I was not tied together in the egg.’

B1Bo *n kd N pn, n ts=f*; G1T *n tsw=i*.

(vii) CT VI 304f B1Bo

*mdw=f n m3=f*

‘If he speaks, he has not been seen.’

(viii) P. BM EA 10567, ro 10<sup>157</sup>

(...) *ḥr-ntt n gm n3 n ḥrdw*

‘(...) because these children have not been found.’

B. In the same periods, instances of *n sdm.t=f* are very few. There may be only the following two in the Old Kingdom, one with a full noun subject, the other subjectless:

(ix) Pyr. 243<sup>w</sup> (PT 239)

*ḏd-mdw*  
*pr ḥdt ʕm.n=s wrt*  
***ʕm.n ns ḥdt wrt n m3.ti ns***

154 On this much-discussed passage, Stauder (2013a: 371, n.140); Díaz Hernández (2013: 88, ex.89); Loprieno (2003: 87); Vernus (1990: 130-1 and n.57); Doret (1986: 171, ex.315).

155 Díaz Hernández (2013: 88-9, ex.90-2).

156 Schenkel (2005: 41).

157 Borghouts (2010: I, §71.e, ex.23).



‘Recitation:

The White Crown emerges and it has now swallowed the great one.

The White Crown’s tongue has swallowed the great and the tongue has not been seen.’

In a subjectless construction, Pyr. 204a-b<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 222; sim. Pyr. 206a-b<sup>WNNt</sup>): §4.3.5.5.2, (i).

Prior to Middle Egyptian literary texts, *n sdm.t=f* remains rare and is possibly even confined to *nty*-headed clauses (x)-(xi) (on the early development of *nty*-headed relative passive clauses probably to ease processing, §2.5.1.NB). In one inscription, *n V-pass* is thus used in a main clause (v) while *n sdm.t=f* is used in a *nty*-headed relative clause in (x):

(x) Hatnub 22, 18<sup>158</sup>

*hw grt ir.n=i ntt n tr.t ø in kw rmt*

‘I did what had not been done by other men.’

(xi) Wepwawetaa (Leiden V.4), 8-9

*sm.n=i nty n sm.t=f*

‘I succored the one who had not been succored.’

In Middle Egyptian literary and documentary texts, *n V-pass* is not found anymore in the expression of the accomplished. Only *n sdm.t=f* is found, e.g.:<sup>159</sup>

(xii) *Sinuhe* B 226-228

*n snd=i n shs.t m-s³=i*

*n sdm=i ts hwrw n sdm.tw rn=i m r³ whmw*

‘I did not fear, I was not run after,

I did not hear reproaches, my name was not heard in the mouth of the herald.’

(xiii) P. Berlin 10063, ro 4

*n ir.t m mitt iry*

‘Nothing of the like was done.’

C. In the Old Kingdom, *n V-pass* could be used to express negative events both in the accomplished (this sub-section) and in the unaccomplished (the next). So could active *n sdm.n=f*.<sup>160</sup> As *n sdm.n=f* gradually ceased to be used to express accomplished events, so did its passive counterpart, *n V-pass*. At this level, the change whereby *n V-pass* was superseded by *n sdm.t=f* thus relates to a broader change in the

<sup>158</sup> Díaz Hernández (2013: 89, ex.93).

<sup>159</sup> Occurrences for literary texts: Westendorf (1953: 65); for documentary ones, also including the negative construction *nfr pw sdm.t=f*: Brose (2014: 252). Similarly in post-Middle Kingdom inscriptions, e.g. *Urk. IV 57, 11 k3t pw n ir.t=s dr b3hw* ‘This is work that had not been done since the ancestors; *Urk. IV 484, 9 n srh.tw=i mm šnyt (...)* ‘I was not denounced in the court (...)’.

<sup>160</sup> Winand (2006: 278-9, 350-2, discussing the principled correlations with the Aktionsart of events); Allen (1984: §506.A-B); Satzinger (1968: 19); Edel (1955-1964: §542-4).

categories involved: it is not specific to passive voice. As to be seen, however, elements to do with the semantics of voice were at play as well (§4.3.5.5.2).

#### 4.3.5.2 The spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the negative unaccomplished (*n sdm.n.t=f*)

To provide a background for subsequently appreciating the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction, the spread of the same morphological category in another construction, *n sdm.n.t=f*, is considered first.

##### 4.3.5.2.1 *N V-pass* for the unaccomplished in earlier texts

A. In early times, the regular expression of the passive of unaccomplished events, often with general or habitual interpretation—in other words, the regular passive counterpart to *n sdm.n=f*—is with a V-passive:

###### (i) Pyr. 247<sup>W</sup> (PT 242)<sup>161</sup>

*dd-mdw*

*hm sdt*

*n gm tk3 m pr hr nbwt(i)*

*hf3w pzḥ htḥt pr pzḥ=f imn=f im=f*

‘Recitation:

The fire has been (*i.e.* is) extinguished,

no lamp can be found in the house where the Ombite is.

The biting snake is all over the house of the one he would bite, hiding in it.’

In the ‘snake spells’, contrasting with *n sdm.t=f* as a distinct expression of the past Pyr. 243b<sup>W</sup> (PT 239) *n m3.ti ns* ‘the tongue has not been seen’ (with fuller context, §4.3.5.1.3, (ix)).

Sim. Pyr. 253a-b<sup>WNI</sup> (PT 246) *z3 tn hr dšr irti mr 3t n ḥsf b3=f* ‘Beware of Horus of the red eyes and painful striking power, whose *ba* can not be opposed’; Pyr. 1470c<sup>Pa</sup> (PT 571) *z3 rḥ hr N pn n wdḥ z3 rḥ hr N pn* ‘Re’s protection is on this N; Re’s protection can not be separated from this N.’

###### (ii) Nefermaat (panel OIM 9002)

*swt ir ntrw=f m zš n zin=f*

‘He is the one who did his godly (signs) in a writing that can not be rubbed off.’<sup>162</sup>

###### (iii) Siut IV, 33-34

*sdr rmt nb r ḥw=f*

*nn ḥ3 nn stt šsr*

161 These Pyramid Text examples after Allen (1984: §506.C-D); further discussion: Allen (1984: §506.E).

162 Like Schweitzer (2005: §367), I read with a finite construction. A non-finite construction (with an infinitive) is possible as well but less likely in view of the other examples quoted in the present section.

*n sh* hrd r-gs mwt=f nds r-gs hmt=f  
 nn h<sup>c</sup>d3 ht m mrrt nn 3wh r pr=f

‘Everyone spends the night by their (proper) places,  
 without fighting, without shooting an arrow;  
 —a child is not beaten beside his mother, a common man beside his wife—  
 without plundering in the street, without an act of violence against a (lit. his)  
 house.’<sup>163</sup>

B. In Middle Egyptian literary texts,<sup>164</sup> the construction has become restricted. Expressing the passive of unaccomplished events, *n V-pass* is found only with full noun subjects:

(iv) *Herdsmen* x+15-17

nn wn srwy=i m š3 pn rnpt h<sup>c</sup>p ʕ3 wd wdt n š3w t3  
**n tni** š r itrw

‘There is none who can remove me from this meadow in a year of high Nile,  
 who issues orders to the earth’s surface,  
 when the pool can not be distinguished from the river.’

Sim. *Ptahhotep* 229-31 P in ntr shnt st **n irw** rdw k3h ‘It is god who advances position; the jostler is not appointed’;<sup>165</sup> *Eloquent Peasant* B1 329-331 gr ʕnn sw r irt tst n=k n snd.n=f n tw3 n=f st **n in** sn=f r=k m-hnw mrrt ‘The quiet man who turns to make complaint to you, he does not fear the man he makes this supplication to, though no brother of his can be brought against you in the street’; *Neferti* 8c iw t3 pn r<sup>166</sup> itt-int **n rh** bsw hpr.t=fy imn m dd (...) ‘This land will move erratically, the outcome is unknown and what will happen concealed, according with the saying (...)’; *Ipuwer* 11.12-13 mtn sw hr d<sup>c</sup>[r kd ...] hr-m **n tni** sndw r shm-ib ‘Look, why does he seek to create [...] when the fearful man can not be distinguished from the fierce-hearted?’

In inscriptional texts dating to, or to the eve of, the early New Kingdom, *n V-pass* is still found to express the passive of the unaccomplished, similarly restricted to full noun subjects (v)-(vi):

163 Similar interpretation by Gunn (2012<sup>2</sup>: 133, ex.20). Different interpretations by Doret (1986: 163, ex.296), who emends into *n<n> sh*, and by Díaz Hernández (2013: 100, ex.120), who reads with a prospective V-passive. The text reads correctly as it stands, with *n sh* (...) being set off from the preceding and following *nn infinitive* – *nn infinitive* as a segment in which both the verb and the negation are gapped. As regards the future rendering, this may be tempting in translation but is not suggested by the Egyptian or the context, in which ‘the peaceful condition of the region is being described’ (Gunn 2012<sup>2</sup>: 133, ex.20).

164 Westendorf (1953: 61-4).

165 Transl. Parkinson (1997a: 254).

166 Thus T. Cairo 25224; Pet. with the *r* omitted.

(v) *Kamose Inscriptions* T.Carn. 6-7<sup>167</sup>

*sk3.tw n=n n<sup>c</sup> n 3hwt=s*

*k3w=n hr mny m idhw*

*bty h3b r rwt=n*

***n it*** *k3w=n*

*n dp r [...] hr=s*

‘The finest of their fields are ploughed for us,  
our cattle graze in the Delta;  
Emmer is sent for our swine.  
Our cattle are not taken away  
...(?)’

(vi) *Urk.* IV 484, 9-19 (Hapuseneb)

*n srh.tw=i mm šnyt*

***n gm*** *wn=i m rw-prw*

‘I was not denounced in the court,  
no fault of mine could be found in the temples.’

By this time, *n sdm.n.t=f* had long developed (§4.3.5.2.2) and *n V-pass*, restricted to full noun subjects, had become a token of elevated language. This can be directly illustrated: in (vi), the phrasing involves an alternation between *n sdm.t=f* (*n srh.tw=i*) for the accomplished and *n V-pass N* (*n gm wn=i*) for the unaccomplished. The same temporal articulation, also with events of *gmi*-ing, recurs in other contemporaneous private inscriptions, thus in Hormeni (vii). This has the more recent *n sdm.n.t=f* alternating with *n sdm.t=f*; the contrast demonstrates the antiquated flavor of the linguistic selection in Hapuseneb:

(vii) *Urk.* IV 76, 15 - 77, 7 (Hormeni)<sup>168</sup>

*it.n=i rnpwt š3wt m h3ti-<sup>c</sup> n nhn ms.n=i inw=s n nb t3wi hs.kw*

***n gm.tw*** *sp=i*

*ph.n=i i3wy m w3w3t iw=i m mh-ib n nbw=i*

*hdd=i hr inw=s n nsu tw-rnpt prr=i im m m3<sup>c</sup>-hrw*

***n gm.n.tw*** *d3t=i*

‘I spent many years as a mayor of Nekhen and I brought its tribute to the lord  
of the Two Lands so that I was praised;  
No fault of mine was found.  
I reached old age in Wawat being in the trust of my lord;  
I used to travel north with its tribute to the king every year and I used to come  
out from it vindicated;  
No failing of mine could be found.’

167 In line with the overall present tensing of the speech, I read *n it k3w=n* as unaccomplished (similarly e.g. Simpson 2003: 346, reading only the preceding pseudoparticiple differently); a past tense interpretation has been contemplated (e.g. Gunn 2012<sup>2</sup>: 131, ex.4; Gardiner 1957<sup>3</sup>: §424.1).

168 Discussed in Winand (2006: 357).

4.3.5.2.2 The rise and spread of *n sdm.n.t=f*

A. In texts earlier than or contemporaneous with early Middle Egyptian literature, *n sdm.n.t=f* is encountered only three times:

(i) Pyr. 617b<sup>TAnMNJp</sup> (PT 364)<sup>169</sup>

*dmd.n=f kw*

***n hn.n.ti im=k***

‘He has put you together:

There can be no disturbing on you.’

Sim. Pyr. 635b<sup>TPMNNt</sup> (PT 367); Pyr. 1610b<sup>MNNt</sup> (PT 590); possibly Pyr. 1831c<sup>N</sup> (PT 649), lacunous.

(ii) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.η.2 (Inscription #7)

***n pr.n.t n snd=f***

‘There was no going out for fear of them (*scil.* the troops).’

Sim. II.θ.2.

(iii) Hammamat 43, 6-7 (Amenemhat, *temp.* Amenemhat III)

***n kn(n).t m ib n hm=f sh nhs wn t3 nhs***

‘—one could not demonstrate bravery in the heart of His Majesty when the Nubian had been stricken and the land of the Asiatic had been opened—’<sup>170</sup>

These early occurrences of *n sdm.n.t=f* are all subjectless, as passives from primary intransitives (ii)-(iii) or as passives from an O-detransitivized event (i). In the same groups of texts, *n V-pass* is the regular expression of the negative unaccomplished passive with transitive events, both with pronominal and with full noun subjects (§4.3.5.2.1, (ii) for the former, (i) and (iii) for the latter). As far as can be told based on the record available, *n sdm.n.t=f* first developed with subjectless passives (further, §4.3.5.5.2).

B. In Middle Egyptian literary texts, *n sdm.n.t=f* has spread to become the regular expression of the negative unaccomplished passive. Meanwhile, the use of *n V-pass* has become limited: occurrences are not many, and the construction is restricted to full noun subjects (§4.3.5.2.1.B). In Middle Egyptian literary texts, *n sdm.n.t=f* is found in subjectless constructions as was the case already before (a), but also with pronominal subjects (b), and with full noun subjects (c), often with the same verbs with which the old *n V-pass* is still occasionally found:

<sup>169</sup> Allen (1984: §486.B).

<sup>170</sup> Against Díaz Hernández’ (2013: 89, ex.94) reading with a negative past tense (*n kn.t*), observe that the segment is parenthetically inserted in a sequence of laudatory epithets. For the spelling, Merikare E 93 *iw=f hr ‘h3 dr rk ntr n kn.n=f n kn(n).tw=f* ‘He is fighting since the era of the god: he can not prevail, nor can he be prevailed over’; *Eloquent Peasant* B1 340-341 *n sin(n).tw rn=f tp t3* (B2 *n sin.n.tw*) ‘His name can not be erased on earth’; P. Brooklyn 35.1446, pl.IV, 31.f *iw kn(n).tw* ‘It is completed’ (sim. *passim* in the same column: §4.4.1.1.1, (ii)). For Coffin Texts, Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.3.1.2.1.a, Diskussion).

(a) *Subjectless passives*

- From primary intransitives: *Ptahhotep* 480 (*n wh.n.tw*); *Sinuhe* B 55 (*n ḥḥ.n.tw*); *Merikare* E 32 (*n ii.n.tw*); *Ipuwer* 10.11 (*nn ḥḥ.n.tw*); 12.6 (*n i3š.n.tw*);
- From an O-detransitivized event: *Ipuwer* 2.4 (*n iwr.n.tw*).

(b) *With pronominal subjects*

- *Debate* 146 (*n ḥsf.n.tw=f*); *Amenemhat* 5c (*n m3.n.tw=f*); *Merikare* E 93 (*n kn(n).tw=f*); *Ptahhotep* 214 L2 (*nn ms.n.tw=f*); *Ipuwer* 9.7 (*n smi.n.tw=f*);
- In a zero-subject construction: *Ipuwer* 12.4 (*n gm.n.tw*: §2.5.2.2, (xiii)).

(c) *With full noun subjects*:

- With the same events with which *n V-pass* is still documented as well, in the same texts: *Ptahhotep* 127 (*n rh.n.tw bint*); *Ipuwer* 4.1 (*n tn.n.tw s3*); in other texts similarly, *n rh.n.tw N*: *Sinuhe* B 37 (*Kagemni* 2.2; *Eloquent Peasant* 214-215; B1 287; B1 304; *Cheops' Court* 6.23-24;
- With other events: *Eloquent Peasant* B1 340-341 (*n sin(n).tw N*; B2 75 *n sin.n.tw N*); *Merikare* E 108 (*n ḥd.n.tw N*); *Neferti* 11a (*nn whd.n.tw N*); *Ipuwer* 6.1-2 (*n gm.n.tw N*); 12.5-6 (*n m33.n.tw N*).

## 4.3.5.3 V- and T-passives in contrast

The *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction is sparsely found in the Old Kingdom already, both in Pyramid Texts and outside these; the form becomes more common only in Coffin Texts, and supersedes the V-passive fully only in Middle Egyptian literary texts (4.2.2-3). Early occurrences of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction are with full noun subjects or subjectless; the form spreads to clauses with pronominal subjects only in Coffin Texts. In analyzing the spread, I first discuss aspects by which V- and T-passives contrast with one another (this section). I go on to illustrate how the form that in the present study is referred to as the ‘perfective V-passive’ is indeed a perfective passive—rather than just a passive of the accomplished—thereby justifying the label itself (§4.3.5.4). I then analyze how the spread of *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction relates to the broader spread of T-passives over V-passives (§4.3.5.5).

A. Morphologically, both the V-passives and the T-passives are inflectional passives (§1.1-2). As far as the passive construction is concerned, passives of the two morphological types do not display any difference, neither morphosyntactic nor semantic (§2). There are differences, however, on other levels.

The most readily noted differences between the V-passives and the T-passives concern their distribution over tense-aspect. The perfective V-passive is part of the accomplished paradigm while the prospective V-passive—if not syncretic with the prospective active (§1.3.3.B)—is part of the future paradigm; there are no V-passives with an unaccomplished interpretation. Except for marginal instances in complement clauses in earlier texts, the prospective V-passive is not documented outside Pyramid

Texts and Coffin Texts: in the corpora that are most relevant to the interpretation of the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f*, the V-passive is therefore limited to the accomplished.

T-passives, by contrast, are found in the accomplished (the past *sdm.t=f* and the *sdm.n.t=f* here under discussion), in the unaccomplished (*sdm.t NP*, *mrr.t=f*), in the future (prospective *irw.t=f*), and with a modal profile (subjunctive *sdm.t=f*).

B. Another salient difference is the morphological type of either passive formation. As discussed, both are similarly inflectional, yet they correspond to different inflectional types. The perfective V-passive involves a specific stem, not reconductible to or derivable from any other inflectional stem. The stem of the perfective V-passive synthesizes—i.e. simultaneously expresses—two grammatical categories, tense-aspect and voice, in a portmanteau fashion. This is a rare exception to the general tendency of Earlier Egyptian verbal morphemes to display singular exponence (i.e. to express only one category). In direct relation, V-passive morphology can not be accommodated onto any of the active stems (with the possible exception of the incompletely understood case of the prospective V-passive, provided the active and passive forms are not syncretic with one another). For example, V-passive morphology can not be accommodated with the inflectional suffix {n} expressing the accomplished (*sdm.n-*), with the long stem (*mrr-*) often associated with imperfective shades of meaning (§4.4.1.2.A), or with the finally-stressed inflectional pattern ((C')CCá-) distinctive of the subjunctive.

T-passives, by contrast, can be formed of any active stem, to which {t} is appended after any marks of inflection there may also be. {T} has singular exponence, expressing voice only. T-passives are thus segmentable into an active stem (including marks of tense-aspect-mood there may be) and the morpheme {t}. Put differently, T-passives are componential, both morphologically and semantically: in expressing voice only, {t} is inherently neutral as to tense-aspect-mood, and can be combined with any expression of such. T-passives can thus be viewed as the formal pendants to the corresponding active forms based on the same stems, only secondarily made passive by appending {t} at the outer edge of the inflectional stem.

This contrasting correlation of morphological properties of V-passives and T-passives is principled and relates to the notion of ‘diagrammatic iconicity in stem-inflection relationships’.<sup>171</sup> In simple terms, the morphologically componential nature of T-passives reflects, and is reflected in, the semantically componential nature of these forms; contrasting with this, the synthetic nature of perfective V-passive morphology reflects, and is reflected in, the fact that the form is inherently marked for tense-aspect, and that the associated morphology can not be accommodated onto any other stem. In more specific terms, the following principles of ‘diagrammatic iconicity in stem-inflection relationships’ are directly illustrated by the contrast between Earlier Egyptian V- and T-passives:

- A T-passive is described as consisting in a stem identical to the one of a corresponding active form, secondarily made passive by appending the inflectional morpheme {t}; the latter is invariably located on the outer edge of the

<sup>171</sup> Bybee (1985: 11-2).

inflectional stem. That {t} is located after inflectional marks of tense-aspect-mood, not before these (thus e.g. *sḏm.n.t-*, not *\*sḏm.t.n-*), accords with principle (2), here reversed: ‘The more relevant a category is to the verb, the closer its marker will occur with respect to the verb stem’;

- Perfective V-passive morphology synthesizes voice and tense-aspect, consists in a specific stem not reductible to any other, and is not compatible with any other marks of inflection. This accords with principle (3): ‘The more relevant a morphological category is to the verb, the greater will be the morpho-phonological fusion of that category with the stem.’

#### 4.3.5.4 The ‘perfective V-passive’ as a perfective passive

A. While passive morphology in the T-passive has singular exponence, perfective V-passive morphology is synthetic, synthesizing tense-aspect and voice. In other words, the temporal-aspectual profile of the perfective V-passive is inherent to the passive nature of the form, unlike what is the case in T-passives. Such inherent relationship between tense-aspect and voice recurs in other forms and constructions in other languages; when it does, it always concerns perfect(ive) aspect.<sup>172</sup> What may thus be termed a ‘perfect(ive) skew’ of passives is primarily an empirical observation on a very robust cross-linguistic correlation.<sup>173</sup> It also has a cognitive foundation in that both perfective aspect and passive voice are Endpoint-oriented categories, thereby interacting with one another in complex and distinguished ways (further discussion: §4.5.2). It further reflects diachronics, in relation to the very general principle whereby the cross-linguistic variety of constructions in any given domain—here the passive—reflects the variety of source constructions from which constructions in that domain can grammaticalize. Passives can grammaticalize from a variety of source constructions but only one of these—the stative-resultative source construction—recurrently leads to passive forms or constructions that are inherently skewed for aspect; given the nature of the source construction, this skew is perfective (§2.9.1.2.A).

As a morphological type, the Earlier Egyptian V-passive is found only in part of the overall paradigm of passive forms and constructions, not for example in the unaccomplished or with events modally profiled as expressed by the subjunctive (§4.3.5.3.A). As a form, what in the present study is labeled the ‘perfective V-passive’ synthesizes tense-aspect and voice (§4.3.5.3.B). Against the broader background just outlined, this justifies the label used so far, expressing the relation of inherence between aspect and voice in the ‘perfective V-passive’. By contrast, the other inflectional passive used in the accomplished, the *sḏm.n.t=f*, is like all other T-passives analyzed componentially, quite literally as a T-passive of the *sḏm.n=f*—itself merely an accomplished. In other words, the perfective V-passive is perfective in the sense discussed above; it contrasts with the *sḏm.n.t=f* which does not have any

<sup>172</sup> While observations to that effect were made long before, the classical paper is Comrie (1982).

<sup>173</sup> Beyond Comrie (1982), e.g. Keenan & Dryer (2006: 340-2); with respect to the Earlier Egyptian passive, Reintges (1997: 367; 2007: §6.2).



specific aspectual profile, being a mere accomplished like the active form to which it is the morphological pendant.

B. Beyond the above morphological and typological considerations, the aspectual determination of the ‘perfective V-passive’ as a genuinely perfective passive, rather than merely a passive of the accomplished (further, §4.4.3.3), is also manifest in various semantic effects this form—and among Earlier Egyptian verbal categories other than the pseudoparticiple, only this form—can have in text:

- (a) In a main clause dependent on a preceding main clause, the perfective V-passive generally expresses an event that follows on the event in the main clause. Not uncommonly, the relationship between the two clauses can also be interpreted not merely as sequential (‘and (...)’) but as consecutive (‘with the result that (...)’, or the like: examples, §2.5.2.3.2). The same interpretation is possible with the pseudoparticiple, used in complementary distribution to the perfective V-passive in the same environment (§4.1.3.B). A consecutive interpretation is more common with the pseudoparticiple only because the pseudoparticiple is used in coreference to some expression in the preceding clause, a configuration that is particularly favorable for such an interpretation:

(i) Khusobek D.3-4

*ir.n=i n=i miḥʿt tw*

**s3ḥ.ti**

**smnh** *st=s r rwd ntr ʿ3*

‘I made for myself this tomb,  
it (*or*: so that it) was consecrated  
and its place was embellished at the staircase of the Great God.’

(ii) *Urk.* VII 16, 9-10 (Ameny)

*ʿḥʿ.n sk3.n=i 3ḥwt nbt nt m3-ḥd r t3š=f rst mḥt*

**sʿnh** *ḥrw=f ir šbw=f*

‘Then I plowed all the fields of the Oryx-Nome till its southern and northern boundary,  
and (*or*: so that) its people were nourished and its food was made.’

- (b) In Pyramid Texts, the perfective V-passive is found in contexts that imply an immediate present interpretation, in so-called ‘dramatic’ contexts. This use reflects the perfective aspect of the form: by virtue of its strong Endpoint orientation, the form serves to express a current state-of-affairs, coming close to a resultative. This use is more natural when no Agent is expressed (e.g. (iii)) because the expression of the Agent tends to highlight the dynamic part of the event; yet, cases with an expression of the Agent are found as well (iv):

(iii) Pyr. 1120a-c<sup>P</sup> (PT 509)

*dd-mdw*

*mdw pt sd3 t3*

*nmnm gbb nhmhm spti ntr*

*hbs t3 sk wdnt tp-<sup>c</sup>wi N pn <sup>c</sup>nh dd*

‘Recitation:

The sky speaks, the earth trembles,

Geb quakes, the god’s two districts yell,

the earth is (/has been) hacked up, an offering is (/has been) laid down before the king N, alive and enduring.’

(iv) Pyr. 225a-226b<sup>W</sup> (PT 226)

*dd-mdw*

*šn n<sup>c</sup>w in n<sup>c</sup>w šn bhz h3bw pr m hzp*

*t3 i. <sup>c</sup>m n=k prt im=k hiw sdr zbn*

*hr hm psdt m mw*

*hf3w pn<sup>c</sup> m3 tw r<sup>c</sup>*

‘Recitation:

Plait is (/has been) entwined by Plait, the toothless calf that emerged from the garden is (/has been) entwined.

Earth, swallow up what has emerged from you! Monster, lie down, crawl away!

The Sunshine’s Servant (*scil.* the Pelican) falls in the water.

Snake, overturn, that the Sun may see you!’

Note the tensing of the spell, with the V-passives in parallel to an unaccomplished *s<sub>dm</sub>=f*,<sup>174</sup> both expressing the current situation against which the imperatives are set:

Perfective V-passives (*šn, šn*) – imperatives (*i. <sup>c</sup>m, sdr zbn*)

*s<sub>dm</sub>=f(hr)* – imperative (*pn<sup>c</sup>*)

<sup>174</sup> This *s<sub>dm</sub>=f* has often been interpreted as an instance of the past tense *s<sub>dm</sub>=f*, thus in Allen’s (1984: §309-13) analysis of the construction; for the specific passage, Leitz (1996: 392); also Allen (2005: 17); Topmann, *TLA*; earlier already Faulkner (1969: 54). For reasons to be exposed elsewhere in more details, I analyze these bare initial forms of the *s<sub>dm</sub>=f* of intransitive verbs differently, detaching them from the past tense *s<sub>dm</sub>=f* found in contemporary autobiographies (only with transitive verbs). The forms are often sequence-initial, if not altogether spell-initial; rather than with intransitives in general, their distribution over the lexicon is more specifically with events of motion and of appearance, more broadly of ‘coming into the scene’; in addition, their subject is always a full noun, never a personal pronoun. Collectively, this substantiates an analysis of the construction asthetic, presenting the event en bloc and/or introducing a new participant to the scene (in adequate details, Stauder & Uljas in prep.; this is intuited in the traditional description of such uses as ‘dramatic’). In relation to this analysis, I also take the event to be set in the present, not in the past; I interpret cases where the same construction occurs in parallel with past tense forms in terms of a complex tensing in Pyramid Texts, not as implying that the construction under discussion must itself be past (a study is in preperation).

As discussed, rare Pyramid Text occurrences of the perfective V-passive with events yet to come similarly reflect the Endpoint orientation, and thus the perfective aspect, of the form (§1.2.3.B).

Similar effects are observed elsewhere in the record. For example in the following passage, where the oddity of renderings as <sup>21</sup>‘(...) on the day when fear had been placed (...)’ or <sup>21</sup>‘When (...), his deeds have been put (...)’ is obvious:

(v) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla I.β.3 (Inscription #3)

(...) *mdw r hrw=f p<sup>c</sup>t gr.t(i) hrw n dy snd šm<sup>c</sup> m sgr*

‘(...) who spoke according to his voice (i.e. freely) when the *pat* were silent, on the day when fear was placed, when Upper Egypt was in silence.’

(vi) Merikare E 55

*spp s m-ht mnit rdw spw=f r-gs=f m h<sup>3</sup>w*

‘When a man remains after mooring (*scil.* passing away), his deeds are put to his side in a heap.’

- (c) The perfective V-passive can be used for events yet to come, presented as if they had already occurred, and thereby associated with a strong assertive force (§1.2.3.A). These extended uses of the perfective V-passive (§1.2.3.A) are only possible qua the Endpoint orientation and perfective aspect of the form, e.g.:

(vii) Urk. I 13, 3-7 (a legal text of possibly Kaiemnefret)

*ir hm-k3 nb dt(=i) šn.t=f ht r sn-nw=f(...)*

*nhm <m>-f<sup>c</sup> ht rmt ht nb (...)*

‘As regards any funerary priest of my domain who shall go to law against his fellow (...),  
all fields, people, and things (...) shall be taken from him!’

(viii) Sinuhe B 212-213

*whm snd=k m t3w h3swt (...)*

‘Fear of you shall be repeated in the lands and hill-countries (...)’

Significantly, the *sdm.n=f* does not ever support an interpretation such as in (a): in a main clause dependent on a preceding one, the relationship is one of sequentiality or less commonly of encapsulation, not of consecutiveness. Nor can the *sdm.n=f* be used in environments implying an interpretation in relation to the current situation such as in (b).<sup>175</sup> Nor can the *sdm.n=f* refer to events yet to come under the conditions such as in (c); to be sure, the form can also refer to future events, but only as a relative tense, and thereby as an anterior, with the future time-reference being otherwise marked or

175 What comes closest to these is only the use of the *sdm.n=f* in performative speech acts (Vernus 1985); a significantly more specific textual environment is required to license such use.

contextually derived. While expressing an accomplished, the *sdm.n=f*—of which the *sdm.n.t=f* is a T-passive—is not perfective. The ‘perfective V-passive’ by contrast is—as is the pseudoparticle expressing a dynamic event (in a yet stronger sense, being a resultative).

#### 4.3.5.5 The spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction among other processes of spread of T-passives over V-passives

The perfective V-passive and the *sdm.n.t=f* differ from one another in that the former is a passive marked for perfective aspect (§4.3.5.3-4; further qualification, §4.4.3.3), while the latter is merely an accomplished turned passive by the morpheme {t}. This observation makes it now possible to describe the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction in relation to the observed broader tendency for T-passives to supersede the perfective V-passive in various environments during the history of Earlier Egyptian.

##### 4.3.5.5.1 The lower end of semantic transitivity

A. Constructions in which T-passives supersede the V-passive are the following. Of these, (d) concerns the prospective and is a primarily morphological phenomenon; (a)-(c) concern the perfective V-passive and are here of primary relevance:

(a) past tense	<i>n V-pass</i>	$\rightarrow n \text{ } \underline{\text{sdm.t=f}}$	(§4.3.5.1.3)
(b) unaccomplished	<i>n V-pass</i>	$\rightarrow n \text{ } \underline{\text{sdm.n.t=f}}$	(§4.3.5.2)
(c) ‘emphatic’ constr.	<i>V-pass</i>	$\rightarrow n \text{ } \underline{\text{sdm.n.t=f}}$	(§4.2)
[(d) prospective	prosp. V-pass	$\rightarrow \text{irw.t=f}$	(§1.2.2; §4.3.5.1.2)]

Equivalently, the change can be presented in terms of the relevant extract of the overall paradigm:

#### *Accomplished*

		‘emph.’ constr.
$P_O \text{ } P_sP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$		$V\text{-pass} \rightarrow \underline{\text{sdm.n.t=f}}$ (c)
Neg.: $n \text{ } V\text{-pass} \rightarrow n \text{ } \underline{\text{sdm.t=f}}$ (a)		$n \text{ } V\text{-pass} \rightarrow n \text{ } \underline{\text{sdm.n.t=f}}$ is (a) <sup>176</sup>

#### *Unaccomplished*

Neg.	$n \text{ } V\text{-pass} \rightarrow n \text{ } \underline{\text{sdm.n.t=f}}$ (b)
------	--

B. Among (a)-(c), (a) and (b) concern negative constructions; negative polarity is one parameter by which an event can score low on the scale of semantic transitivity (§4.3.4.1.1: (8)). In addition, (b) concerns the unaccomplished, in a construction that often receives a habitual or general interpretation; on the parameter of aspect, this also scores low on the scale of semantic transitivity (§4.3.4.1.1: (6)).

Two out of three changes in which the perfective V-passive is replaced by a T-passive during Earlier Egyptian thereby concern the lower end of semantic

<sup>176</sup> Illustration: §4.2.2, (v).

transitivity. The third (c) does as well. As discussed, the event in the ‘emphatic’ construction is presented in a perspective that implies a lower semantic transitivity on the parameters of ‘punctuality’ and ‘mode’ (§4.3.4.1.3). In all three cases—two of which concern the *sdm.n.t=f* itself—T-passives spread in constructions in which the event scores lower on one or several parameters associated with semantic transitivity.

In largely equivalent ways, the above can also be phrased in terms of Endpoint orientation. In expressing that the event did (/does) not occur, and thereby did (/does) not go to completion, negative constructions (a)-(b) de-emphasize the Endpoint otherwise salient in the passive. In unaccomplished constructions, and particularly in such that invite a habitual or general interpretation (b), the Endpoint, if any, is naturally marginalized. The ‘emphatic’ construction (c), for its part, highlights the dynamic part of the event, thereby similarly de-emphasizing the Endpoint otherwise salient in the patient (§4.3.4.2).

The three constructions in which the perfective V-passive is diachronically superseded by T-passives thereby all have to do with a lesser semantic transitivity—or equivalently with a lesser Endpoint orientation. In two of the three constructions in which T-passives supersede the perfective V-passive ((a) and (c)), it is a T-passive of the *sdm.n=f* that spreads: the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction is itself part of this overall process of change.

#### 4.3.5.5.2 Subjectless passives: The orientation on the event itself

As discussed, a lesser Endpoint orientation—or, in more abstract terms, a lesser semantic transitivity—is a major parameter in the overall process of spread of T-passives over V-passives in the negative accomplished, the negative unaccomplished, and the accomplished ‘emphatic’ constructions. The analysis finds a further confirmation in the over-representation of subjectless passives among early occurrences of all these constructions:

- In the negative accomplished,<sup>177</sup> one of only two Old Kingdom occurrences of *n sdm.t=f* is subjectless (i).<sup>178</sup> In the same period, the V-passive is not found in subjectless constructions,<sup>179</sup> nor is it in later times;
- Pre-Twelfth Dynasty occurrences of the negative unaccomplished *n sdm.n.t=f* are all subjectless (ii)-(iii);

177 Díaz Hernández (2013: 89) also proposes that *n sdm.t=f* developed first with subjectless passives. However, the author’s proposal is based on the general assumption that T-passives originated in an active impersonal construction, which is wrong (§1.1.2; §5). Furthermore, the argument is based on post-Old Kingdom examples, which is problematic for a hypothesis on historical development. Finally, the examples adduced (Díaz Hernández 2013: 89, ex.93-4) do not support the interpretation: the first (Hatnub 22, 18) is a zero-subject construction, not a subjectless one (semantically, the verb projects two arguments: §2.5.2.2, (xxii.a)); in the second (Hammamat 43, 6-7), the form of the verb is wrongly identified (*n kn.t* is for *n kn(.n).t*: §4.3.5.2.2, (iii)).

178 For the other occurrence, Pyr. 949b-c<sup>p</sup> (PT 475), with a full noun subject: §4.3.5.1.3, (ix).

179 Of four Old Kingdom instances of *n V-pass* expressing a negation of the accomplished (§4.3.5.1.3, (i)-(iii)), three are with full noun subjects: Pyr. 334b<sup>T</sup> (PT 262); Pyr. 949c<sup>p</sup> (PT 475); *Urk.* I 131, 4-7 (Harkhuf). The fourth, *Urk.* I 251, 1-2, is with a zero-subject construction, not with a subjectless one (§2.5.2.2, (xix)).

- One of only four pre-Coffin Text occurrences of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction<sup>180</sup> is itself subjectless (iv).

NB. Unlike in the negative unaccomplished *n sdm.n.t=f*, early occurrences of the same form in the ‘emphatic’ construction are thereby not limited to subjectless construction. Beyond the semantic issues discussed in the present section, an additional parameter determines the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction, namely the formal indistinctiveness of verbal morphology in this construction with full noun subjects (*V-pass non-P* being used in both ‘emphatic’ and non-‘emphatic’ environments before the rise of the *sdm.n.t=f*: §4.2.3).

In these subjectless constructions, which are observed to have played a major role in the early spread of T-passives, the events lack an Endpoint. The orientation is accordingly on the event itself. V-passives, by contrast, are oriented on the Endpoint in the same environments:

#### *Negative accomplished*

- (i) Pyr. 204a-b<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 222)

*htm{ti}.n=k tw m wr-hk3w stš imi nwbt nb t3 šm<sup>c</sup>*

***n fh.ti n=k n i3b.t n=k***

‘You have provided yourself as the Great-of-Magic, Seth who is Ombos, lord of Upper Egypt.

There has been no loss for you, there has been no cessation for you.’

Sim. Pyr. 206a-b<sup>WNNt</sup>. For the orientation on the event itself, §2.6.1.1.C. With a V-passive, and the event oriented on its Endpoint, e.g. Pyr. 334b<sup>T</sup> (PT 262) *d3.n N m <m>hnt wrt n šzp hmt im=s* ‘N has crossed in the great ferry boat; no fare has been taken in it.’

#### *Negative unaccomplished*

- (ii) Pyr. 617b<sup>TAnMNjp</sup> (PT 364)

*dmd.n=f kw*

***n hn.n.ti im=k***

‘He has put you together:

There can be no disturbing on you.’

Sim. Pyr. 635b<sup>TPMNNt</sup> (PT 367); Pyr. 1610b<sup>MNNt</sup> (PT 590); possibly Pyr. 1831c<sup>N</sup> (PT 649), lacunous. For the orientation on the event itself, §2.6.1.2.D. With a V-passive, and the event oriented on its Endpoint, e.g. Pyr. 1470c<sup>Pa</sup> (PT 571) *z3 r<sup>c</sup> hr N pn n wd<sup>c</sup> z3 r<sup>c</sup> hr N pn* ‘Re’s protection is on this N; Re’s protection can not be separated from this N.’

---

180 Occurrences: §4.2.2, (i)-(iv).

(iii) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.η.2 (Inscription #7)**n pr.n.t** n snd=f‘There was no going out for fear of them (*scil.* the troops).’

For the orientation on the event itself, §2.5.3.2.B. With a V-passive, and the event oriented on its Endpoint, e.g. Siut IV, 33-34 *sḏr rmt nb r ḥw=f nn ḥ3 nn stt šsr n šh hrd r-gs mwt=f nds r-gs hmt=f nn ḥd3 ht m mrrt nn 3wh r pr=f* ‘Everyone spends the night by their (proper) places, without fighting, without shooting an arrow—a child is not beaten beside his mother, a common man beside his wife—without plundering in the street, without an act of violence against a (lit. his) house.’

*Emphatic construction*(iv) Pyr. 179a<sup>WNNt</sup> (PT 219)*nwt s3=t pw pw-nn dd.n=t ir=f***ms.n.t** n(=i)*i.t tn*

‘Nūt, this one here is your son of whom you have said:

“There has been birth for me.”

—so you said.’

For the orientation on the event itself, §2.6.1.1.C. With a V-passive, and the event oriented on its Endpoint, e.g. Pyr. 693c-d<sup>T</sup> (PT 398) *twr N n d<sup>c</sup>mw ms N n d<sup>c</sup>mw in d<sup>c</sup>mw z n mwt=f im=f* ‘N was conceived to Djaamu, N was born to Djaamu, it is Djaamu who has gone to his mother with him.’

Particularly significant is (v), the only instance of a subjectless ‘emphatic’ construction with a V-passive. Contrasting with (iv), the event has an Endpoint, the Goal of the motion (here the speaker):

(v) Mo<sup>c</sup>alla II.ε.2-3 (Inscription #6)*(...) gm.n(=i) w3st gbtw mi-ḳd=s[n ...]=sn ithw iwn m sg3 smh=sn***spr** r(=i) r=s

‘(...) and I found that Thebes and Coptos in their entirety had [...] the strongholds of Ermant in the hills of Semekhsen.

It was about this that one had reached out to me.’

In the negative accomplished, the negative unaccomplished, and the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction alike, the early spread of T-passives over V-passives thus found a favorable context in subjectless constructions expressing an orientation away from the Endpoint and over on the event itself.

## 4.3.5.5.3 Two accomplished passives in contrast with one another

In the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions, the spread of the *sḏm.n.t=f* results in a situation—the paradigm in Earlier Egyptian II—in which the form contrasts with the pair constituted by the perfective V-passive and the pseudoparticiple in complemen-

tary distribution to one another. The *sdm.n.t=f* is morphologically componential, as a T-passive of the accomplished *sdm.n=f*: it thus contrasts with the perfective V-passive, a form that synthesizes voice and aspect in a way that is not further decomposable (§4.3.5.3-4.A). The V-passive is a perfective category (§4.3.5.4.B), as is the pseudoparticiple (§4.3.3). In the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions, the *sdm.n.t=f* serves to present the event as merely accomplished, under a perspective that de-emphasizes the Endpoint orientation and perfective aspect otherwise characteristic of accomplished passives.

Put only slightly differently, the *sdm.n.t=f* serves to present a completed passive event as merely accomplished, that is, in a way that is not Endpoint-oriented. Very significant in this respect is also the concentration of subjectless passives among early occurrences of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction, of the same form in the negative unaccomplished *n sdm.n.t=f*, and in the negative accomplished *n sdm.t=f* (§4.3.5.5.2). In all these constructions, early stages of the spread of T-passives over V-passives strongly revolve around constructions that are not oriented on the Endpoint of the event, but on the event itself—the Endpoint being accordingly out of focus.

Contrasting with the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive, the *sdm.n.t=f* thus developed to provide a distinctive expression to the fact that an accomplished event—even though passive—is not perfective. It did so in the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions like it did in the negative unaccomplished, *n sdm.n.t=f*—a construction that departs even further from the semantics of perfective passives in not even being accomplished.

## 4.4 Setting the analysis into a broader context

It was argued above that the contrasts in verbal morphology manifest in written form in the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction reflect aspectual determinations and that these are proper to passive voice and to subject-affecting events as event types that can be viewed under specific, contrasting perspectives in relation to their particular orientation. Although these can only be outlined in the present study, a series of further issues related to the ‘emphatic’ construction (§4.4.1) and to the accomplished passive (§4.4.2) merit mention. A final section summarizes the overall perspective that emerges from the analysis here proposed (§4.4.3).

### 4.4.1 Some additional notes on the Earlier Egyptian ‘emphatic’ construction

The Earlier Egyptian ‘emphatic’ construction comprises additional elements of linguistic form that have not been part of the discussion until this point:

- (a) There is also an ‘emphatic’ construction in the unaccomplished, associated with specific contrasts in verbal morphology (*mrr=f* vs. *N(P) mr=f*).



(b) Both in the accomplished and in the unaccomplished, the formal makeup of the ‘emphatic’ construction also involves an element not to do with verbal morphology, namely the systematic absence of *iw*; in the accomplished, this is in fact often the only element permitting an identification of the construction. (In addition, with negative events, *is* is a distinctive marker of the ‘emphatic’ construction.)

While an adequate analysis of these two dimensions vastly transcends the specific scope of the present study, some cursory remarks may be useful, notably as they in return bear on the analysis of the passive accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction itself.

#### 4.4.1.1 $\dagger iw$ *V-pass* *P*; $\dagger iw$ *sdm.n.t=f*; $\dagger iw$ *ii.n=f*; $\dagger iw$ *mrr=f*

One major empirical observation by Polotsky—and one that was instrumental in establishing the very existence of an ‘emphatic’ construction in Earlier Egyptian—is that *iw* is almost universally absent in that construction, in the unaccomplished and the accomplished alike, and in the latter regardless of voice and event semantics. The primary descriptive observation is thus that a series of verbal categories are not as a rule found after *iw*:  $\dagger iw$  *V-pass* *P*,  $\dagger iw$  *sdm.n.t=f*,  $\dagger iw$  *ii.n=f*, and  $\dagger iw$  *mrr=f*.

##### 4.4.1.1.1 Exceptions

A. Exceptions to the above generalizations are exceedingly rare. The following have been noted or are known to me:

*Tw V-pass P*

(i) CT IV 45m-n B1C, B2L

*tw hsy=i iw hst* (or: *hs.t*) *n=i*

‘I have been praised; praise is to me (or: I am praised).’

Probably sim. 45p B2L *tw hsy{n}=i iw hst* (or: *hs.t*) *n=i*.<sup>181</sup>

*Tw sdm.n.t=f*

(ii) P. Brooklyn 35.1446, pl.IV, ro 31.f

*tw kn(n).tw*

‘There has been completion.’

Sim. 37.f; 44-45.f; pl.VII, 57.f; 63.7. With a V-passive, *iw kn*, pl.IV, 53.f; pl.VII, 70-71.f.

*Tw kn(n).tw* is to be read, not *iw kn.tw*: an unaccomplished reading makes no sense in context (for the form with only one *n* written, §4.3.5.2.2, (iii) and the references in the associated footnote).<sup>182</sup>

<sup>181</sup> Schenkel (2005: 41).

<sup>182</sup> Brose’s (2014: 278-9) proposal to read with a pseudoparticiple with an ending *.tw* is ruled out by the early date of the text (as the author himself concedes).

(iii) P. Rhind Mathematical, title<sup>183</sup>

*tw ist grt sphr.n.tw šfdw pn m ḥsbt 33 (...) m snt r sš iswt iry m ḥ3w (...)*

‘This roll was copied in year 33 (...) according to an ancient writing made in the time of (...)’

*Tw ii.n=f* (subject-affecting intransitives, with verbs of directed motion (iv) and with verbs denoting (the acquisition of) a quality (v))

(iv) Merer (Cracow, MNK-XI-999), 5<sup>184</sup>

*tw ḥnt.n(=t) r ḥ3t tw sb.n(=t) r im3ḥ*

‘I have advanced to the fore, I have gone to *imakhu*-status.’

(v) *Fishing and Fowling* B2.10

*tw im3.n n=k šḥt im3.n n=k 3w=k*

‘Sekhet has become benevolent for you, your (throwing) sticks have become benevolent for you.’

*Tw mrr=f*

(vi) *Ptahhotep* 59 L2<sup>185</sup> (as a secondary reading)

*tw gmm.tw=s m-ḥ ḥmwt ḥr bnyt*

‘It (*scil.* fine speech) is found only with maidservants on the millstones’;

(vii) *Kemit* 8.b-c<sup>186</sup>

*tw mr rmm=s tw*

*tw rmm=s tw <ḥr> rmw=k n grḥ 3pdw=k nw hrw*

‘It is bitter that she beweeeps you.

She beweeeps you on account of your nightly fishes and your daily birds.’

B. The above exceptions to the generally observed distribution raise different issues. In accounting for phenomena that are hardly ever paralleled, comments that can be made necessarily remain partial.

Four of the above are from comparatively late manuscripts. In two of these (*Ptahhotep* 59 L2, (vi); *Kemit* 8.c, (vii)), the construction is clearly ‘emphatic’, with a restrictive focus interpretation in the former and a specifying focus interpretation in the latter. (Thus, the verbal event in *Kemit* 8.c is pragmatically presupposed, being given a prior expression in the preceding clause, 8.c.) In P. Rhind Mathematical (iii), the construction is ‘emphatic’ as well because the copying of the roll, noted on that very roll, is pragmatically presupposed. Whether the lexical parallelism in *Fishing*

183 Polotsky (1957: 111).

184 Doret (1986: 126-7, ex.212-3); Allen (1991: 1, ex.1).

185 Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §462, n.6).

186 Polotsky (1965: 79-80 [9-10], n.22). On the analysis of the first clause, Vernus (in press: §8, ex.67, with parallels); on the passage, Klotz (2009).

and Fowling, (v) should be taken as indicative of a balanced construction remains unclear.

In the case of *Ptahhotep* 59 L2 (vi), an earlier version of the same text is known, with the regular expression of the unaccomplished passive (§3.1-2).<sup>187</sup> P *iw gm.tw=s* (...). The alteration into a *mrr=f* in L2 is in line with other cases in the same composition in which L2 makes formally explicit an interpretation that is only implied in P. Thus, also with an unaccomplished, 349 P *iw in.tw ʕkw wn 3k* ‘Intimates are brought when there is ruin’, altered into L2 *inn.tw m ʕk wn 3hw* ‘To an intimate recourse is made when there is trouble’ (with an additional alteration into a Mediate Construction of O: §2.6.1.2, (vii)).<sup>188</sup> Unlike in 349, *iw* is left to stand in 59: as the comparison between the textual processes in 349 and 59 suggests, *iw gmm.tw=s* in the latter is an artifact of an incomplete adaptation. Whether the reading in *Kemit* 8.c (vii) is similarly secondary, or not, can not be assessed based on the extant manuscripts. The case of *Ptahhotep* 59 L2 may be taken to suggest this, but it need not imply it.

In *Fishing and Fowling* (v), there is no reason to doubt that the construction, although uncommon, is correct. As Merer (iv) further documents, subject-affecting intransitives can occasionally be presented under a dynamic perspective as provided by the *sdm.n=f* without this necessarily entailing that the event can not also be asserted in ways *iw* reflects. Significantly, the events of directed motion in Merer are not with e.g. *iwi*, *pri*, or *h3i*: the first is with the verb *hnti* ‘become foremost’ (thus ‘advance to the fore’), not unsimilar to *im3* ‘become benevolent’; the second is with the verb *sbi*, a S/A-ambitransitive of which the transitive alternant is the more common one (‘conduct<sub>TR</sub>’, here ‘conduct oneself<sub>INTR</sub>’). That subject-affecting intransitives are not a homogeneous group semantically is also demonstrated by the case of *hpr*, which is yet different (discussion: §4.3.3.2.NB).

In (i), *iw V-pass P* is best considered alongside other similarly exceptional occurrences of *V-pass P* in environments in which *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* would be expected: once in a main clause asyndetically linked to a preceding main clause (§4.1.4, (v)) and once after *ʕhʕ.n* (§4.1.4, (vii), with discussion). These exceptional occurrences of *V-pass P* are confined to earlier times, as are instances of *V-pass P* in circumstantial function (§4.1.4, (i)-(iv)), another environment in which the pseudoparticiple is the regular construction. As discussed, these collectively constitute traces of a situation in which the complementary distribution *P<sub>O</sub> PsP ~ V-pass non-P* was not yet as exclusive as it is otherwise documented to have become in most texts (§4.1.5.B).

In the title of P. Rhind Mathematical (iii), the ‘emphatic’ construction is preceded not only by *iw*, but also by *ist* and *grt*.<sup>189</sup> The construction is ‘emphatic’ to express that the main part of the assertion does not lie with the verbal event itself. The presence of *iw*, *ist*, and *grt*, for their part, probably relates to this being a title. In P. Brooklyn (ii), *iw kn(n).tw* is formulaic, in an administrative register, and in a list, not in a continuous text. *Tw* expresses a strongly assertive modality (‘there *has* been

187 In further details, Stauder (2013a: 77-8).

188 In a future/modal context: 293 P *pr.tw hr irt=f ib hr win=f* ‘One will renounce applying it, the heart rejecting it.’ → L2 *prr.tw hr irt[=f] ib hr win=f* ‘One will renounce applying it, because the heart rejects it.’

189 Similarly noted by Polotsky (1965: 79-80 [9-10], n.22).

completion'). A passive from a secondary intransitive, *kn(.n).tw* is without an adverbial phrase: the event is presented in its barest possible form and the statement has strongthetic force (§2.6.1.1, (iv)). This accounts for the use of a *sdm.n.t=f*, in alternation with the perfective V-passive, after *iw*: the *sdm.n.t=f*—a T-passive from a *sdm.n=f*—serves to present an accomplished event, even though passive, as merely accomplished, as befits the stronglythetic statement. The particular semantics of the construction here overrule the otherwise observed mutual exclusiveness of the *sdm.n.t=f* and *iw*.

#### 4.4.1.1.2 *Iw*: A very brief note

The above exceptions remain exceedingly rare. Put differently, the distributions <sup>†</sup>*iw V-pass P*, <sup>†</sup>*iw sdm.n.t=f*, <sup>†</sup>*iw ii.n=f*, and <sup>†</sup>*iw mrr=f* are very robust: they constitute the primary object that must be accounted for. In doing so, a first step consists in briefly reviewing the functions of *iw* itself. These, which can be sketched here only in the most summary terms, revolve around the two interrelated domains of anchoring and assertion.<sup>190</sup>

As has often been observed and analyzed, *iw* serves to anchor a statement to the sphere of the speaker,<sup>191</sup> to 'ground' it,<sup>192</sup> and thereby to express that the speaker asserts the utterance he is making,<sup>193</sup> that is, commits to the veracity and informativeness of this utterance.<sup>194</sup> These functions are observed throughout the Earlier Egyptian written record; they also account for example for the fact that *iw* does not precede the subjunctive *sdm=f*, a form that profiles the event modally (<sup>†</sup>*iw sdm=f<sub>subj</sub>*).<sup>195</sup> They are perhaps most spectacularly evidenced in oaths, where *iw* is licensed to occur even in constructions in which it does not otherwise occur<sup>196</sup> and similarly in exceptional instances of *iw ink NP*.<sup>197</sup> From this also derives for example the possibility of an occasionally contrastive interpretation of *iw*, e.g. *Sinuhe* B 50-51 *ntf d3r h3swt iw it=f m-hnw 'h=f* 'It is he (*scil.* Senowsret) who subjugated foreign countries, his father (*scil.* Amenemhat), for his part, stayed inside his palace.'<sup>198</sup>

190 Among previous discussions, e.g. Schenkel (2012<sup>5</sup>: §7.3.6.2.1; 2007a); Satzinger (2009); Uljas (2007a: 23-4, n.77; 358; *passim*, see the index); Loprieno (2006; 1995: 166-7); Winand (2006: 166, 374-5); Depuydt (1998); Vernus (1997: 26-9); Ritter (1995: 99); Collier (1994: 81-7); Junge (1989: 103-8); Allen (1986); Polotsky (1976: 34-6; 1965: 87 [17]), all with further references to an extensive bibliography.

191 Among others, e.g. Vernus (1997: 26-9); Polotsky (1976: 36 ('nynégocentrisme')).

192 Collier (1994: 81-7). 'The "ground" is the speech event, its participants (and their knowledge, interests and scope of attention) and its setting (both physical and linguistic)—it is the "vantage point" from which a linguistically-encoded "scene" is viewed (including physical, psychological, epistemic and temporal vantage points)' (Collier 1996: 77-8).

193 Among others, e.g. Loprieno (1995: 166); Eyre (1991: 113).

194 Uljas (2007a).

195 Uljas (2007a).

196 E.g. *Urk.* IV 38, 10-11 (Ahmes Pennekhbet) *w3h p3 h3k3 'nh dt iw n t3=i r nsu hr pri (...)* 'As the Ruler, living forever, endures, I did not swerve from the king on the battlefield (...)' Further examples: Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §468.1).

197 Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §468.3), noting that these show 'some detachment or emphasis'.

198 For the contrastive interpretation, Stauder (2013a: 495-6). Sim e.g. *Khakheperreseneb* ro 3 (...) *hr-ntt rf whmw dddt iw dddt dd (...)* 'for what has been said can only be repeated, yet what has been said is said' (for the contrastive interpretation, Vernus 1997: 11). Similarly after negation, e.g. in a self-presentation emphasizing the uniqueness of the speaker's achievements, Hatnub 16, 5-6 *ink ir*

In marking assertion, *iw* does so by relating the utterance to the sphere of the speaker and thereby also has the effect of anchoring a segment of speech in linguistic time. This is seen most directly through a consideration of non-verbal patterns in which *iw* is as a rule not found. Qualifying patterns, as well as identifying and classifying ones, are not bound to time, unlike the situational pattern, which is.<sup>199</sup> Significantly, *iw* is regular in the latter but is not found in the former: these are not asserted in relation to any particular moment in time (thus regularly *iw NP AP*, but  $\dagger iw nfr sw$ ,<sup>200</sup>  $\dagger iw NP NP$ ,<sup>201</sup>  $\dagger iw NP pw (NP)$ ).<sup>202</sup> Another often noted effect of this relationship of *iw* with time can be seen in the commonly invited interpretation of *iw sdm.n=f* in narrative discourse as a perfect.<sup>203</sup> Among inflectional categories of the verb, a similar account probably extends to the non-occurrence of *iw* before prospective *sdm=f* ( $\dagger iw irw=f$ ).<sup>204</sup>

In a sequence of clauses, these can be individually anchored, each preceded by *iw*, but often are not: the *iw* in the first clause then has scope over the whole sequence. In doing so, *iw* takes over a macro-syntactic function, delimitating, or chunking off, a segment of discourse from a preceding one. By the same token, it contributes to relate these to one another on a higher level: rather than to the sphere of the speaker, the anchoring is then cotextual.<sup>205</sup> These derived macro-syntactic effects and functions of *iw* are also manifest in cases in which a connective interpretation of *iw* is contextually possible or even invited.<sup>206</sup> Complementarily, the lack of *iw* can correlate with

---

[...]s m šdyt-š3 iw nn wn rmt hn<sup>c</sup>=i wpw-ḥr šmsw=i (...) ‘It is I who acted [...] in Shedyt-sha, while there was absolutely nobody with me except my followers (...);’ sim. *passim* in the Hatnub inscriptions (Kruchten 1999: 58); on the diachronic loss of the contrastive force in *iw nn*, Stauder (2013a: 277-8).

199 Winand (2006: 151-70).

200 Noteworthy is *Urk.* IV 1618, 14 (Nebamun’s installation, *temp.* Thutmosis IV) (...) *iw nfr sw m p3 hrw r sf* ‘(...) while it is better today than yesterday’, with what seems to be *iw* in its then innovative circumstantial function. The immediate context includes other linguistically innovative expressions. The segment is from a text that relates Nebamun’s installation in office and displays an intentional contrast in register with similar formulations in a funerary context in the same tomb, including the older formulation *nfr sw m hrw pn r sf* (*Urk.* IV 1622, 13) (Stauder 2013b: 83-4; Kroeber 1970: 58, 123-4). Other than this, I am not aware of any instances of  $\ast iw nfr sw$ ; Rediukhnum (CG 20543), 18-19 mentioned in Winand (2006: 166, n.8) does not belong here, but is an instance of *iw*  $\emptyset$  *PsP* with a subsequent cataphoric expansion of the zero subject (for the construction, Vernus in press: §2.3.3, §8.1).

201 For exceptional occurrences of *iw ink N*, above, n.197.

202 Similarly, Winand (2006: 166).

203 Lastly Winand (2006: 234-40, 374).

204 Also expressing future tense from Middle Egyptian on, the non-inflectional, subject-initial *NP r sdm*, regularly preceded by *iw*, patterns differently. Historically, the construction grammaticalized from a situational predicate construction, in which *iw* is similarly regular. Before weakening semantically into a mere expression of future tense, *NP r sdm* expressed that an event is bound to occur, thus relating that event to a certain current state-of-affairs.

205 E.g. *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II, 30-32 and 32-33 (Stauder 2013a: 48-9); *Sinuhe* R 5-8 and R 8-11. These functions in cotextual anchoring would evidently play a major role in the diachronic development that was ultimately to lead to the rise of the circumstantial *iw* of Later Egyptian.

206 E.g. in the overall macro-syntactic articulation of *Cannibal Hymn* (PT 273-4), with the recurrent sequences *NN pi* (...) *iw* (...) (*passim*); *in N sdm* (...) *iw* (...) (*passim*); *sdm=f<sub>prosp.</sub>* (...) *iw* (...) (Pyr. 411a-b; 411c-d); and Pyr. 395b (...) *mr itm it=f ms sw iw ms.n=f sw wsr sw r=f* ‘(...) like Atum, his father who fashioned him—(for) he fashioned him, and (yet) he (*scil.* the king) is more powerful than he (*scil.* Atum).’

paragraph or even speech initiality:<sup>207</sup> in the former case, the lack of *iw* has a discourse-discontinuative effect.

In the paragraph- or speech-initial contexts evoked last, the lack of *iw* signals or reflects that the clause does not relate to preceding discourse: the primary information structure of the clause thus deviates from the unmarked topic-comment articulation with a topic established in previous discourse.<sup>208</sup> The ‘emphatic’ construction is another construction which serves to express or reflect a deviation from the unmarked topic-comment articulation. *Iw* anchors an utterance to the sphere of the speaker, marking that he commits to the veracity and informativeness of his statement. Given such assertive functions of the particle, the lack of *iw* becomes a means to express or reflect a deviation from the unmarked topic-comment articulation, thus in the ‘emphatic’ construction.<sup>209</sup> By contrast, for example *mk* is regularly possible before e.g. the *mrr=f*:<sup>210</sup> *mk* has phatic and presentative functions, but none to do with assertion directly. (It may be worth repeating that the above is merely a sketch: a fully detailed functional profile of *iw*, including the often illuminating environments in which *iw* is not used, remains to be provided.)

#### 4.4.1.2 Different origins of one higher-order construction: The accomplished and the unaccomplished ‘emphatic’ constructions

Confronted with the challenge to his description of Middle Egyptian raised by Polotsky’s seminal discovery of the ‘emphatic’ construction,<sup>211</sup> Gardiner had the following words to say:<sup>212</sup>

‘It is agreed that one of the grounds for the use of the ‘Imperfective *sdm.f*’ was the desire to lay a predicative stress on an adverbial predicate. This result would naturally be best achieved by removing the stress from the verb-form in the sentence. It was thus important for the Egyptian to avoid saying positively that such and such an action happened or would actually happen. Now this avoidance of direct assertion may be effected by giving the verb-form a general or non-committal character.’

207 Vernus (1997: 57-62); Stauder (2013a: 365-7); Stauder & Uljas (in prep.).

208 For more substantial analyses, Stauder & Uljas (in prep.).

209 From a different angle, emphasizing the realis-irrealis contrast, but leading to substantially the same understanding, Uljas (2007a: 358). Among other accounts, Reintges (forthc.) argues that the *mrr=f* is generated on a different, deeper, level than other finite forms and must move all the way up to the COMP<sup>o</sup> position associated with illocutionary force and/or clausal subordination. In the generative framework selected by the author, this provides one possible account for the fact that the *mrr=f* is not as a rule preceded by *iw*, nor e.g. after *ntt*; however, the analysis fails to extend to the similar distributional restrictions in the accomplished domain (<sup>i</sup>*iw V-pass P*, <sup>i</sup>*iw sdm.n.t=f*, and <sup>i</sup>*iw ii.n=f*). Winand (2006: 374) suggests that the presence of *iw* implies an interpretation of the *sdm.n=f* as an ‘accompli résultatif’, with the ‘moment de référence’ selecting the ‘post-phase du procès’, and that such aspectual interpretation is incompatible with the semantics of the ‘emphatic’ construction (Winand 2007: §3). This account fails to extend to the unaccomplished where a similar distributional restriction is observed (<sup>i</sup>*iw mrr=f*).

210 E.g. Johnson (1984).

211 Polotsky (1944).

212 Gardiner (1947: 100).

While duly acknowledging the magnitude of Polotsky's discovery of the 'emphatic' construction, Gardiner thus suggested that the use of the *mrr=f* in that construction may have had an aspectual basis. Polotsky's response to Gardiner consisted in demonstrating that the 'emphatic' construction concerns not only the unaccomplished but extends to the accomplished.<sup>213</sup> As imperfectivity can not be a parameter in the accomplished, it long seemed that Gardiner's theory could be safely rejected. Polotsky's demonstration of the existence of an accomplished 'emphatic' construction was based on the alternations visible in written form with subject-affecting intransitives (*ii.n=f* as contrasting with *NP iw*) and with passives (*sdm.n.t=f* as contrasting with *P<sub>O</sub> PsP ~ V-pass non-P* (in the present study's terms)). As was argued above, these contrasts in the accomplished 'emphatic' construction also reflect determinations that are ultimately aspectual in nature, if of an altogether different sort than the ones hypothesized by Gardiner for the unaccomplished. This suggests revisiting the latter hypothesis.

A. The semantic and functional profile of the *mrr=f* is complex, and in part different in various constructional environments: it can not be reduced to any one singular denomination (unless this is to be phrased in formidably abstract terms, detached from actual constructions), neither aspectual nor otherwise.<sup>214</sup> While an overall description of the *mrr=f* falls much beyond the scope of the present study, I concentrate on the observation that in most constructions in which the *mrr=f* occurs, imperfectivity often 'shimmers through'. As the phrasing expresses, I do not mean to imply that the *mrr=f* can be synchronically described as imperfective, let alone fully characterized as such: there are constructions in which imperfective semantics may not ever be directly manifest in text (e.g. *nfr-n mrr=f*) and there are other ones where imperfective semantics are manifest in some occurrences in text but not in others (thus in the 'emphatic' construction: below). Moreover, the unmarked unaccomplished *N(P) sdm=f*—with which the *mrr=f* contrasts in principled ways—is most commonly used in text with habitual or general events, which are themselves closely connected to the imperfective. Rather, the point to be made is that imperfectivity is one among various components in the overall semantic and functional profile of the *mrr=f*, more or less saliently manifest depending on various constructions and on individual occurrences of these in text.

Beginning with the non-finite forms based on the long stem (*mrr-*), imperfective semantics are clearly manifest in participles. In schematic terms, marked participles (*mrr-*, active and passive) are associated with values such as repetition, intensity, possibly also verbal plurality depending on how this is defined; they thus contrast with participles based on the short stem (*mr-*, active and passive), which are

<sup>213</sup> Polotsky (1957).

<sup>214</sup> For this very reason, the label adopted for the form—a '*mrr=f*'—is here purely in reference to morphology. A label such as 'imperfective *sdm=f*', for example, would fall much short of accounting for the versatile profile of the form in which imperfectivity is only one component, as post-Gardinerian research has amply demonstrated. For reasons exposed above, the present author does not consider labels such as 'nominal (/abstract-relative) *sdm=f*' an option either (§4.3.1.1-2).

unmarked in this respect.<sup>215</sup> Turning to the *mrr=f* itself, imperfective shades of meaning have long been noted in complement clauses.<sup>216</sup> They are also clearly manifest in uses of the form after prepositions, once the differential distributions of forms and the associated semantic contrasts are considered:

- Semantic contrasts: with prepositions that can introduce a variety of inflected forms of the verb, these contrast semantically, e.g. *m mrr=f* ‘as, though (...)’,<sup>217</sup> contrasting with *m mr=f* ‘when (...)’; *r mrr=f* ‘according as (...)’,<sup>218</sup> contrasting with *r mr=f<sub>subj.</sub>* ‘so that (...)’ and *r sdm=f* ‘until (...)’ (for the rare *r sdm.n=f*, §4.4.2.2.2.A), e.g. P. Berlin 9010, 3 *ir ʕ3 r ʕ33=f šr r šrr=f* ‘The great one shall be treated according to how he is great, the small one according to how he is small’;
- Rare combinations: some prepositions are only rarely, or not at all, documented with the *mrr=f*, e.g. *dr* ‘since’,<sup>219</sup> *r-s3* ‘after’,<sup>220</sup> *m-ht* ‘after’;<sup>221</sup> *tp-ʕ* ‘before’;<sup>222</sup> in the rare occurrences that are found, some semantic effect often seems present;
- Privileged associations: unlike the above, other prepositions are used very commonly with the *mrr=f*, e.g. *hft* ‘when, according as’, *mi* ‘according as’;

215 Schenkel (1965); Allen (1984: §607-10, §638-43); Jansen-Winkel (1997); disputed by Depuydt (2008b). Schenkel (2011) questions the validity of the methodological assumptions underlying the initial analysis in Schenkel (1965), without however implying that the overall interpretation must be wrong. On the privative nature of the contrast, e.g. the (originally autobiographical) topos *ir m hps=f* ‘who acts with his strong arm’, which in a eulogizing context does not refer to a singular occurrence: rather, the recurrent nature of the action referred to is considered contextually so evident that the speaker renounces underscoring it by making recourse to the marked form. (Relative forms, which form a different paradigm, are organized around relative tense and do not seem to display any aspectual determination, even though they may themselves have originally displayed a formal contrast between a short stem *mr-* (Clère’s relative form, for which see now Schenkel 2010) and the long stem *mrr-*. Relative forms thus align more closely on the primary contrast in the non-attributive paradigm, which is also one of relative tense (accomplished vs. unaccomplished, i.e. broadly anterior vs. synchronous; aspectual contrasts are mainly internal to either domain). Another element of this alignment of relative forms onto non-attributive paradigms can be seen in the rise of the relative *sdm.n=f*, superseding Clère’s *mr=f* in anterior tense. This is in line with a strong cross-linguistic tendency by which in languages that have both participles and relative forms, the latter (which are finite) will tend to align more closely with non-attributive paradigms: Haspelmath 1994.)

216 Borghouts (1989); substantial elaboration in terms of an irrealis profile of the form, Uljas (2007a).

217 Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §162.11).

218 Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §163.10).

219 Rare; occurrences known to me are (in this and the following notes, Coffin Text occurrences are courtesy Wolfgang Schenkel, p.c. 29/3/2013): Wahankh Antef II’s Stela (MMA 13.182.3), 4-5 *ir dr mrr=t ihy iw hḥ n ihy n k3=t* ‘To the extent that you love music, there is music a million times for your ka’; probably also CT III 303h G1T, A1C, T3L *ink 3w nmtwt dr mrr=f* ‘I am one who strides to the limit of my desire’ (T3C {r} *dr mrr=s*).

220 Rare: CT IV 326j T2Be (sim. CT IV 342d B10C) *dd s r3 pn ʕk=f r imnt r-s3 prr=f* ‘A man should utter this spell when he enters the west every time(?) after he goes out.’ Another, much later, instance is perhaps *Duties of the Vizier* R 21 (...) *r-s3 irr=f m sšw* ‘(...) after he has put it in writing’.

221 Rare: CT V 333p B3L, B1L *dd s m-ht prr=f* ‘A man should say this every time(?) after he goes out.’

222 No occurrences known to me.



going further, other ones display a distinguished, or even exclusive, association with the *mrr=f*, e.g. *r-tnw mrr=f* ‘every time, whenever (...)’, *n-ʕ3t-n mrr=f* ‘inasmuch as (...)’.

In the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions themselves, imperfectivity is often shimmering through, most conspicuously in the ‘second schème’ of the ‘emphatic’ construction (a) and in the Wechselsatz (b), but also in the (‘premier schème’ of the) ‘emphatic’ construction (c), e.g.:

(a) *Merikare* E 135 *rmm=sn iw=f hr sdm* ‘When (i.e. when-ever) they (*scil.* mankind) cry, he (*scil.* the creator god) is listening.’

(b) *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 12 *ʕd.t r=f dd=f s3=f* ‘When (i.e. when-ever) one acts aggressively against him, he shows his back.’

(c) CT V 11c-d T1L *inn.t n=f r-tnw dbh=f sʕr.t n=f r-tnw ibb=f* ‘One brings to him every time he asks; one presents to him every time he is thirsty.’

Reinforcing the imperfective semantics, note the O-detransivized events (*inn.t n=f*, *sʕr.t n=f*: §2.6.1.1, (xii)) and, further, the adjunct clauses introduced by *r-tnw*.

In other cases, particularly in the (‘premier schème’ of the) ‘emphatic’ construction, and particularly when this functions as a narrow-focus construction, imperfective semantics are not directly manifest in text, e.g. in the locus classicus *Ptahhotep* 122-123 L2 *m dg3 r nty m-b3h=f dgg=k r nty m-b3h=k* ‘Do not look at what is in front of him: you should look only at what is in front of you!’ In the construction *nfr-n mrr=f* similarly, imperfective semantics are hardly manifest in actual text. As already emphasized, a synchronic characterization of the *mrr=f* as ‘imperfective’ would fall much short of providing an adequate account of the versatile functional profile of the form. Yet, even in those cases where imperfective semantics do not shimmer through in actual text, some connection can be seen. This is suggested by the possibility of a paraphrase<sup>223</sup> of the above along the lines of: ‘(...) should you look (i.e. when-ever you *might* look), this should be directed at what is in front of you!’ The way a restrictive focus interpretation can derive from imperfective semantics is seen more directly in e.g. Heqanakht II, ro 29-30 *dd=tn p3 ʕw n rmt=i iw=sn hr irt k3t* ‘You should give these rations to my people only when they are working’; paraphrasing, ‘You should give (...) when, and only when, they are working’, or ‘When-ever you might give (...), this should be when they are working.’ As the above suggests, imperfectivity remotely underlies the unaccomplished ‘emphatic’ construction, as does modality. (The ‘might’s’ and ‘should’s’ are here significant.) The former points to what Gardiner already expressed in more rigorous terms: ‘(...) this avoidance of direct assertion may be effected by giving the verb-form a general or non-committal

223 Such paraphrases are of course just as good—or bad—as e.g. ‘that’-paraphrases in ‘abstract-relative’ analyses of the construction (e.g. Polotsky 1965: 77 [7]). Whether what these paraphrases suggest is indeed relevant, or not, to the particular construction in the particular language under study must be assessed on independent grounds: in the present case, see the above discussion of various environments in which imperfective semantics of the Earlier Egyptian *mrr=f* do shimmer through.

character'. The latter is developed in substantial details in a more recent study revisiting Gardiner's proposal in the light of the realis-irrealis contrast.<sup>224</sup> In other environments in which the *mrr=f* comes to use without imperfectivity directly shimmering through in text, the relation between imperfectivity and reduced assertion is relevant as well, thus in the construction *nfr-n mrr=f*.<sup>225</sup> A similar account extends to uses of the *mrr=f* in headings (e.g. CT IV 390a B2La, B2Lb *hpy s m im3hy hr ntr* 'A man's going as an *imakhu* to the god'): by definition, headings do not involve assertion.<sup>226</sup>

Rather than to a synchronic analysis of the construction, Gardiner's proposal then points to an element of the semantic basis from which the unaccomplished 'emphatic' construction initially developed to become an autonomous construction with its proper functional profile—the level that synchronic description and analysis, for their part, target. Beyond the aspectual basis, a detailed account of the unaccomplished 'emphatic' construction must include relevant modal dimensions as these relate to a lesser assertion of the verbal event;<sup>227</sup> account for the process by which the construction evolved to adopt its synchronically observed functional profile; describe the different functions and shades of meaning of the construction in text; relate the construction to the 'second schème' thereof and to the Wechselsatz; and set Earlier Egyptian into perspective with relevant typological parallels.<sup>228</sup> This remains to be worked out in details. Another issue, more directly within the scope of the present study, is how the unaccomplished 'emphatic' construction relates to the accomplished 'emphatic' construction.

B. In addressing the last question, matters must be set into a broader context. Earlier Egyptian inflectional morphology includes two forms of the unaccomplished, one based on a short stem (the *mr=f*), the other based on the long stem (the *mrr=f*). With the latter, imperfective semantics shimmer through, more or less strongly or faintly depending on constructional environments and individual occurrences in text (above, A). The former is a bare unaccomplished, not aspectually marked any further: this is directly evident in circumstantial uses of the form. It is also manifest in the construction *N(P) mr=f*: although often associated with habitual or general events, the form is not in itself marked for such (further, §3.1-2). In non-finite forms as well, the basic contrast is between forms based on the short stem (the 'unmarked' participles, *mr-*) and forms based on the long stem (the 'marked' participles, *mrr-*). Taken together, these observations suggest an original contrast between the *mr=f* and the *mrr=f* along the lines of an aspectually unmarked form vs. one marked for imperfectivity in some sense not further to be specified.<sup>229</sup>

224 Uljas (2007a, particularly 347-59, and 356 for the reference to Gardiner).

225 Uljas (2007a: 210-20).

226 In addition, this use of the *mrr=f* may also relate to the 'howness' otherwise associated with the form (Borghouts 1989; Uljas 2007a: 89; thus Winand 2007: §3, ex.28, understanding the present example as 'comment l'homme s'en va, vénérable, auprès du dieu').

227 Uljas (2007a: 349-59).

228 A first step in this direction is by Peust (2004: 382-90).

229 Although evidently not an argument for the intralinguistic analysis of any individual language, the association of partial reduplication with imperfectivity is well documented cross-linguistically, including in Semitic; references: §1.3.4.A.

Against the background of this general contrast, two developments have taken place leading to the situation observed in historically documented Egyptian. As a result of the rise of a dedicated progressive construction (*NP hr sdm*), the aspectually unmarked *mr=f*—mostly in the construction *N(P) mr=f* (§3.1.1)—is in most cases in text associated with habitual and general events. Even earlier, before the earliest continuous texts in the record, the *mrr=f* had specialized in various constructions, differently in different ones; among these are notably the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions.

Turning back to the latter specifically, it was argued that the contrast in verbal forms observed in the accomplished is aspectually determined (§4.3.3-5). As the above suggests, there is also an aspectual basis to the use of the *mrr=f* in the unaccomplished ‘emphatic’ and related constructions, if an altogether different one. In the unaccomplished, the use of the *mrr=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction reflects a development and specialization of the originally imperfective functions of the form. In the accomplished, distinctive forms used in the ‘emphatic’ construction serve to express that the event—even though passive, respectively subject-affecting—is not viewed as primarily Endpoint-oriented. One major difference between the unaccomplished and accomplished ‘emphatic’ constructions is thereby that the aspectual basis only shimmers through in the former, while it is still fully effective synchronically in the latter.<sup>230</sup>

C. In the analysis here presented, both the unaccomplished and the accomplished ‘emphatic’ and related constructions have an aspectual basis, if an altogether different one. By definition, imperfectivity, which plays a role in the unaccomplished, does not in the accomplished. Conversely, a reduction in Endpoint orientation, which is a crucial parameter in the accomplished, does not play a role in relevant differentiations in the unaccomplished because unaccomplished events are not Endpoint-oriented in the first place. Moreover, as just noted, what is only an aspectual background in the unaccomplished ‘emphatic’ construction is fully effective synchronically in the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction.

The unaccomplished and accomplished ‘emphatic’ constructions differ on another level as well. In the former, it is a semantically marked form—the originally imperfective *mrr=f*, contrasting with the unmarked *mr=f*—that developed uses in the ‘emphatic’ construction. In the latter, by contrast, the semantically marked forms are the ones not used in the ‘emphatic’ construction: the pseudoparticiple (a resultative form) as contrasting with the *sdm.n=f* of subject-affecting intransitives and the

230 In the Gardiner-Polotsky debate briefly alluded to above, both turn out to have been right, and both only in part. As Polotsky demonstrated, there is an ‘emphatic’ construction in Earlier Egyptian extending to both the unaccomplished and the accomplished; Gardiner’s ‘imperfective’ proposal therefore falls short of accounting for the overall ‘emphatic’ construction. On the other hand, Gardiner was right in suggesting that the unaccomplished ‘emphatic’ construction has an aspectual basis; what was missing then was the realization that the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction also has an aspectual basis, if an altogether different one, and in fact a synchronically much more effective one. Ironically, it is notably based on the *sdm.n.t=f*—whose distinguished association with the ‘emphatic’ construction was a cornerstone in Polotsky’s rebuttal of Gardiner’s hypothesis—that this aspectual basis of the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction can be demonstrated.

perfective V-passive; later, the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive combined as contrasting with the T-passive of the *sdm.n=f*. Unlike the *mrr=f*, which developed uses in the ‘emphatic’ construction based on its inherent semantic profile, the T-passive of the *sdm.n=f* and the *sdm.n=f* of subject-affecting intransitives were thus used in the ‘emphatic’ construction precisely because they had a less distinctive semantic profile than other forms used with the same events in the accomplished.

There is, on the other hand, on a more abstract level, a connection to be seen between the two. In setting the perspective on the ‘inner structure’ of the event, an imperfective form is prone to be recruited in a construction that involves a lesser assertion of the verbal event and often highlights the circumstances of that event—its ‘howness’, as this has been put in admittedly intuitive terms. In the accomplished, the *sdm.n.t=f* (a T-passive of the *sdm.n=f*, itself a mere accomplished) and the *ii.n=f* (a *sdm.n=f* of *iwi*) express that an accomplished event—even though passive, respectively subject-affecting—is viewed as merely accomplished, and thereby as *non-perfective*.

#### 4.4.1.3 Formal contrasts in the ‘emphatic’ construction

A. One question regarding the linguistic form of the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction is whether the contrasts of verbal morphology that meet the eye in written form—with passives and with subject-affecting intransitives—are matched by similar contrasts in verbal morphology with non subject-affecting actives, not represented in written form due to the constraints of the Egyptian writing system.

Until this point, this question was not formally given an answer. Instead, it was preliminarily noted that ‘nominal’ and ‘abstract-relative’ analyses of the forms in the ‘emphatic’ construction—analyses that would directly imply symmetrical paradigms—do not hold (§4.3.1.1-2). It was then observed that an examination of written forms of the *sdm.n=f* of *Il.red* in Coffin Texts neither supports, nor contradicts, the hypothesis of two forms of the *sdm.n=f* distinguished by the position of stress; complementarily, an analysis of written forms of the *sdm.n=f* in Pyramid Texts directly implies that, should there have been two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*, these could at best have been distinguished by vocalic alternations, not by the position of stress (§4.3.1.3.C).

That the ‘emphatic’ construction need not have been marked in verbal morphology in all cases is suggested by the case of the perfective V-passive. This is regularly used in the ‘emphatic’ construction in early times, but also in non-‘emphatic’ environments with non-pronominal subjects (§4.2). A strong indication that the perfective V-passive was a unitary morphological category is indirectly afforded by an analysis of the pattern of the early spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* (§4.2.3.B).

The contrasts visible in written form are the cases when two or more morphological categories of an altogether different type—rather than possibly two forms of the *sdm.n=f*, which would then both be instantiations or variants of the same higher-order morphological category marked by {n}—are involved: thus the pseudoparticiple contrasting with (a form of) the *sdm.n=f* for subject-affecting intransitives, or the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive together contrasting with the *sdm.n.t=f*, a T-passive of (a form of) the *sdm.n=f*. Independently of whether Earlier Egyptian

had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*, an examination of relevant morphological contrasts associated with the ‘emphatic’ construction thus demonstrates that these differ in nature depending on tense-aspect, voice, and event semantics. These are all relevant parameters in analyzing the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction, which is not symmetrical to the unaccomplished ‘emphatic’ construction, nor internally symmetrical in the accomplished (§4.3.2).

In all cases when a morphological contrast is observed in the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction, one term of this contrast is the pseudoparticiple. When expressing a dynamic event, the pseudoparticiple underlies the constraints of resultative semantics and sets the perspective on the Endpoint of the event (§4.3.3-4). In the ‘emphatic’ construction, (a form of) the *sdm.n=f* is used with subject-affecting intransitives to express that the event is viewed under a perspective different from the strongly Endpoint-oriented perspective that the pseudoparticiple expresses with the same subject-affecting intransitives. In the passive, a V-passive is used for similar reasons in earlier times, contrasting with the pseudoparticiple only with events oriented on a pronominal O. In later times, a T-passive of the *sdm.n=f* develops as a distinctive expression of the fact that an accomplished event—even though passive—is not viewed as perfective, that is, is viewed under a perspective that is not Endpoint-oriented (§4.3.4-5). In all cases, therefore, morphological contrasts that can be observed in written form have to do, directly or indirectly, with the semantic constraints to which the pseudoparticiple is subject. More broadly, they all have directly to do with the Endpoint orientation generally characteristic of passives and subject-affecting intransitives in the accomplished. Non subject-affecting actives, on the other hand, are not concerned by similar aspectual issues to do with Endpoint orientation. In the ‘emphatic’ construction, they need not be marked as non-perfective. This demonstrates that the contrasts visible in written form do not carry over to other event types, in other words, that there were no two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*.

B. In terms of their formal marking, the unaccomplished and accomplished ‘emphatic’ constructions thus differ with respect to contrasts in verbal morphology. In the former, distinctive verbal morphology extends to all types of events while in the latter it concerns only some: passives (limited to pronominal O’s in earlier stages, then all passives) and subject-affecting intransitives. These differences directly reflect the altogether different aspectual basis, respectively determinations, of the unaccomplished and accomplished ‘emphatic’ constructions: unlike issues to do with Endpoint orientation in the latter, the imperfective semantics originally associated with the *mrr=f* do not interact with voice or subject-affectedness. These differences add up to other already noted differences, to which they are related: an aspectual basis, or background, in the unaccomplished ‘emphatic’ construction as against a fully effective aspectual determination in the accomplished one; and an inverse relationship of marked and unmarked categories (§4.4.1.2.C).

In addition to these asymmetrical contrasts in verbal morphology, the ‘emphatic’ construction is distinguished by the systematic absence of *iw*. (§4.3.6.1). While non-segmental, this is an element of linguistic form inasmuch as it contrasts with the

presence of *iw* in several otherwise similar, but non-‘emphatic’, environments. With non subject-affecting actives in the accomplished—and similarly with passives with non-pronominal subjects in an earlier stage—the absence of *iw* is in fact the only element of linguistic form that permits the identification of the construction, besides cotextual and contextual inferences. In the case of negative constructions in which the absence of *iw* can not be a formal discriminant, the presence of *is* is distinctive,<sup>231</sup> in addition to contrasts in verbal morphology or alone. The formal makeup of the ‘emphatic’ construction thus involves a division of labor between various elements of linguistic form: distinctive verbal morphology is only one of these and is not always present. (In the spoken chain, the construction may have additionally been marked suprasegmentally, in line with a strong tendency for sentential stress to move on the focused upon constituent in the clause:<sup>232</sup> this is irrecoverable in written text, like it was already inaccessible to ancient readers.)

*The division of labor in the ‘emphatic’ construction*

- no *iw* (when relevant)
- *is* (only in negative constructions)
- (stress(?), only in the spoken chain)
- verbal morphology: throughout in the unaccomplished; only with certain types of events in the accomplished:

*Unaccomplished*

(all events)	<i>mrr=f</i>	contrasting with <i>N(P) mr=f</i>
--------------	--------------	-----------------------------------

*Accomplished*

non subj.-affecting act.	—[no contrast]—	
subj.-affecting intr.	<i>ii.n=f</i>	(as contrasting with <i>NP<sub>s</sub> PsP</i> )
passive EEg. I, P	<i>V-pass P</i>	(as contrasting with <i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP</i> )
N	—[no contrast]—	(/rarely, <i>sdm.n.t non-P</i> as contrasting with <i>V-pass non-P</i> )
EEg. II	<i>sdm.n.t=f</i>	(as contrasting with <i>P<sub>O</sub> PsP</i> ~ <i>V-pass non-P</i> )

C. As one result of the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f*, a contrast in verbal morphology was newly introduced in the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction for passive events with non-pronominal subjects. The two following examples are near-contemporaneous and both involve events of promotion of the official speaking. In (ii), which has the innovative *sdm.n.t=f*, the ‘emphatic’ construction is directly signaled as such by verbal morphology. In (i), by contrast, an ‘emphatic’ construction can only be identified based on the absence of *iw*, provided this is here distinctive (an issue that must be assessed in relation to the broader macro-syntactic articulation of the

231 On *is* in negative constructions, e.g. Loprieno (1991a; 1991b); on *is* more generally, now Oréal (2011: 103-70).

232 Lambrecht (1994: 238-57), also discussing the iconic element here present.

context). It can also be inferred to some extent based on a knowledge of generic determinants of the texts considered. In Old Kingdom autobiographies, a royal name, particularly when an event of promotion is anchored to this name, is generally a salient element, often highlighted.<sup>233</sup>

(i) Isi of Edfu 5

*rd n(=i) [i3t] m hḳ3 hwt m rk wnīs*

‘I was installed as a district governor in the time of Unis.’

(ii) Khentikaepi 8-9

*nd.n.t n(=i) i3t nt hḳ3 wh3t*

[...]w m hwn t(3)z mdh m hr-ib wrw

špss.k hr hm=f r hprw m h3t(=i)

‘I was named to the office of Governor of the Oasis,  
[(while still) ...] a youth who tied the girdle amongst the great ones,  
because I was more august with His Majesty than who came into being before  
me.’

With passives oriented on pronominal O’s, the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction was associated with distinctive verbal morphology already in early times (§4.2.1). Significantly, the *sdm.n.t=f* first developed with non-pronominal subjects (such as in (i); §4.2.2.A); it was only later to spread to pronominal ones (first in Coffin Texts: §4.2.2.B; §4.2.3).

D. The above analysis also carries implications regarding the functional profile of the ‘emphatic’ construction. As mapping these out would entail a study of its own, these implications can only be evoked here in the most cursory terms. In some contexts, the ‘emphatic’ construction is associated with a narrow-focus interpretation (these contexts have of course been instrumental historically in establishing the very existence of the construction). However, as has been observed by many,<sup>234</sup> contexts in which the verbal event, rather than being deranked to a pragmatic presupposition, keeps some rhematic force are encountered as well and are in fact the most common: while the construction expresses a shift in information hierarchies, it does not in most cases warrant a narrow-focus interpretation. All formal things being equal, the more precise appreciation of the function of the ‘emphatic’ construction in any particular textual instantiation is then a matter of co(n)textual inferencing by the hearer/reader. In text, the *sdm.n.t=f* is often found with events such as *iri*, *rdi*, or *gmi* associated with certain arguments;<sup>235</sup> similar comments extend to the *V-pass P* construction common in earlier times, which displays a distinguished association with events of ‘being born’, ‘being conceived’, ‘being raised’, ‘being made’, and the like (§4.2.1). Lexical semantics thus play a significant role in triggering the use, or profiling the specific functions, of the ‘emphatic’ construction in text. It was further demonstrated that the

233 The correlation is of course not automatic: in a different textual function, *Urk.* I 253, 18 - 254, 5 (Qar of Edfu) (§4.2.1, (xv)).

234 Already Polostky (1957: 110, n.1).

235 Similarly already Polostky (1957: 110, n.1); for *gmi*, now Vernus (2012: 387-93).

contrasts in verbal morphology differ in the unaccomplished and the accomplished ‘emphatic’ constructions, and that in the latter the parameters of subject affectedness and voice are determining; in particular, the semantics of Endpoint orientation, and deviations thereof, are central to how the ‘emphatic’ construction contrasts with unmarked constructions expressing otherwise similar events (§4.3). In a detailed study of the ‘emphatic’ construction in text yet to be made, all the above parameters must therefore be taken into account: while there is a higher-order ‘emphatic’ construction, its functional profile, and the ways any particular instantiation of the construction in text is interpreted by the hearer/reader, will thus vary depending on the combined parameters of event semantics (lexical semantics and subject affectedness), tense-aspect, and voice.

#### 4.4.2 Accomplished passives in other environments

The above discussion has centered around main clauses, in ‘emphatic’ and non-‘emphatic’ environments, and for the latter on clauses that are initial in a sequence or asyndetically joined to a preceding main clause. In the present section, I review the other environments in which accomplished passives can be found, namely those that involve an embedding of the clause into a higher syntactic node. I begin with accomplished passives in *pw*-markedthetic and topic-presentative constructions, *ir*-introduced conditional clauses, and clauses dependent on a noun (§4.4.2.1). As accomplished passives after prepositions involve a set of further descriptive issues in the record, these are presented separately (§4.4.2.2).

##### 4.4.2.1 *Pw*-markedthetic and topic-presentative constructions, *ir*-introduced conditional clauses, and clauses dependent on a noun

In the afore mentioned environments, a general trend is observed by which the perfective V-passive, regularly used in earlier stages of Earlier Egyptian, is replaced by the *sdm.n.t=f* in later stages of Earlier Egyptian:

*Pw*-markedthetic and topic-presentative constructions<sup>236</sup>

(i) CT V 110g T1Be M2C<sup>237</sup>

*dpt tn pw n ꜥpr=s m 3h3h=s*

‘It is the case that this boat has not been equipped with its spars(?)’

(ii) Book of the Dead 18, 5-6 Nu

*ir s3wt sbiw ꜥtm.n.tw sm3yt swty pw*

‘As for “guarding the rebels”, this means that the cronies of Seth have been annihilated.’<sup>238</sup>

236 On *pw*-markedthetic and topic-presentative constructions in general, Uljas (2007a: 287-307); Loprieno (1995: 109-12); Vernus (1994: 341-8); Polotsky (1976: 41-4).

237 Polotsky (1976: 44).

238 Translation slightly adapted from Uljas (2007a: 288, ex.366).



*Ir-introduced conditional clauses*

(iii) CT II 174j Sq3Sq

*ir swt **h<sub>3</sub>tm** wd pw (...)*

‘If however this order has been sealed (...)’

If not a prospective, possibly also Heqanakht I, ro 12-13 *mk grt ir **tr** m it-mh (...)*‘If it (*scil.* the field) has been done with full barley (...)’(iv) *Ipuwer* 12.6*ir **snm.n.tw=n** (...)*

‘If we had been saddened (...)’

Sim. P. Berlin 10018, ro 6 *ir **[h<sub>3</sub>b].n.tw** nfr pw innt (...)* ‘If it was written: “There is nothing that is brought” (...)’*Clauses dependent on a noun*<sup>239</sup>(v) Pyr. 27d<sup>PNNt</sup> (PT 35)*(...) hrw **ms=f** im*

‘(...) the day he was born.’

Sim., with an indirect construction,<sup>240</sup> Mo<sup>c</sup>alla I.β.3 (Inscription #3) *(...) hrw n **dm<sub>3</sub>** sp3t (...)* *mdw r hrw=f p<sup>c</sup>t gr.t hrw n **dy**<sup>241</sup> snd šm<sup>c</sup> m sgr* ‘(...) on the day when the districts were united. (...) who spoke according to his voice (i.e. freely) when the *pat* were silent, on the day when fear was placed, when Upper Egypt was in silence.’(vi) *Tomb of Amenemhat*, p.56*(...) hrw **ms.n.tw=k** im=f (...)*

‘(...) the day you were born.’

## 4.4.2.2 Accomplished passives after prepositions

Accomplished passives—the perfective V-passive and the *s<sub>d</sub>m.n.t=f* alike—are only rarely documented after prepositions. This is unsurprising: accomplished events in adjunct clauses are in an anterior temporal relation to the main clause; as there is in general little need to specify the semantic relationship any further, the dependency is in most cases formally asyndetic. A few instances of accomplished passives after preposition occur nonetheless.

<sup>239</sup> Gunn (1949).

<sup>240</sup> Documenting the finite construction, not in the accomplished but also passive, e.g. *Urk.* I 232, 6 (Werra) *(...) hrw n šzp.t h3tt dpt-ntr* ‘(...) on the day of seizing the prow rope of the god’s boat’; also Schenkel (2006b: 77).

<sup>241</sup> On this formula, and its parallels in other texts, Vandier (1950: 177-9). Unlike Vandier, I do not interpret this as an infinitive: the Old Kingdom form cited by the author, <*d w*> in a caption to a pictorial scene, probably reads *wd*, for *wd(t)*; it does not, therefore, document an infinitive *dw* for *wdi*; as to *dy*, this is altogether undocumented as an infinitive of that verb. With a non-finite construction of *wdi*, CT IV 371b (mult. mss.) *hrw pw n wdt m B* ‘this day of placing in the earth’.

4.4.2.2.1 *Preposition V-pass*

A. In older texts, the V-passive is found once after a preposition, *n* ‘for’, apparently secondarily inserted:

(i) Pyr. 142c-143a<sup>NWd</sup> (PT 215)

*ms n=k pf iwr n=k pn*

***n ms=k hrw m rn=f nwrw n=f t3 sd3w n=f pt***

‘That one (*scil.* Horus) was born for you, this one (*scil.* Seth) was conceived for you;

For you have been born, Horus, in his name the-one-at-whom-the-earth-shakes and the-one-at-whom-the-sky-trembles.’<sup>242</sup>

Older pyramids do not have the preposition: Pyr. 143a<sup>WT</sup> (PT 215) ***ms=k hr m rn=f nwrw n=f t3 sd3w n=f pt*** ‘You were born, Horus, in his name the-one-at-whom-the-earth-shakes and the-one-at-whom-the-sky-trembles’ (for the fuller context, §4.2.1, (v)).

The construction recurs later in possibly only two contexts: in technical handbooks as *mi dd*,<sup>243</sup> and after *m-ht*. The former is specialized language; the latter merits a separate discussion.

B. One isolated early instance of *m-ht V-pass* is perhaps the following:

(ii) CT V 60/61c-64a S2C (and mult. mss., with some variation)

*ink wr s3 wr ink nsrw*

*rd n=f tp=f m-ht s<sup>c</sup>=f*

*n nhmm tp=i m-<sup>c</sup>=i m-ht hsk=f*

‘I am the Great One, son of the Great One, I am Neser,  
the one whose head has been given back to him after it was cut;  
My head will not be taken away from me after it was severed.’

This is uncertain, however, because the construction could just as well be *m-ht infinitive*. The latter is well established in the Old Kingdom,<sup>244</sup> including with an expression of the agent: *Urk.* I 189, 10 (false door of Ptahhotep II) (...) *m-ht s3ht=f in hrw-hbt* ‘(...) after he was *akh*-ified by the lector priest.’

Secure instances of *m-ht V-pass NP* are only found in Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptions, both with pronominal and with full noun subjects:

242 Transl. Allen (1984: §492).

243 Borghouts (2010: I, §71.c, *fine*).

244 Edel (1955-1964: §720).

(iii) *Urk.* IV 228, 1-3 (*Divine Birth*)<sup>245</sup>

[*i.t n ntr pn šps*] *r m33 s3t=f mrt=f nsw-bity m3't-k3-r' 'nh.ti m-ht msw=s*

‘This august god came to see his beloved daughter, the king of Upper and Lower Egypt Maatkare—may she live!—after she was born.’

(iv) *Urk.* IV 978, 15 (Min of This)

*iit m hwt-ntr m-ht ir hss[t imm nb nswt t3wy]*

‘Coming from the temple after what Amun, lord of the thrones of the Two Lands, praises had been done.’

Sim. *Urk.* IV 1282, 13 (Amenhotep II’s *Sphinx Stela*) *hr m-ht rd m hr n s3 nsw r mky m ssm tihw n nsw (...)* ‘And when the royal son had been given order to take care of the horses of the royal stable (...);’ *Urk.* IV 1795, 18 (High Steward Amenhotep) *hr m-ht snfrw k3wt tn (...)* ‘And after this work had been perfected (...).’

These Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptional occurrences of *m-ht V-pass NP* must be appreciated against the fact that the same preposition *m-ht* is found in earlier times with another construction to express the accomplished passive, *NP PsP*. The latter has attracted attention as this is the only construction in which a preposition can introduce a subject-initial pattern without this being embedded by means of the subjunctive form of *wnn*.<sup>246</sup> Instances of *m-ht NP PsP* expressing the accomplished are not overly common, yet can be documented with both pronominal and full noun subjects.<sup>247</sup>

(v) CT II 350a (mult. mss.)

*iw=tny r wd'ty hr m-ht tny gm.twny*

‘You will be the two severed parts of Horus after you have been found.’

(vi) Iti (CG 20001), 7

*iw d.n=i it šm' n iwni n hf3t m-ht iw-m-itrw s'nh.t*

‘I have given Upper Egyptian barley to Ermant and Mo'alla after Gebelein had been fed.’

245 The dating of the composition to the Eighteenth Dynasty is linguistically secure: Stauder (2013a: 322-36).

246 Ullas (2007a: 260-3, particularly 261); Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §327). Edel (1955-1964: §906cc, *fine*) speculates that the construction could have arisen through reanalysis: [... *m-ht*<sub>ADV</sub>]<sub>main\_clause</sub> *NP PsP* → [...]<sub>main\_clause</sub> *m-ht NP PsP*, or: [... *m-ht NP*]<sub>main\_clause</sub> *PsP* → [...]<sub>main\_clause</sub> *m-ht NP PsP*. Alternatively, or complementarily, the lexical semantics of *m-ht* interacting with the resultative semantics of the pseudoparticiple may have supported the development.

247 With intransitives, *m-ht Ns PsP* is found notably in fronted temporal expressions in Middle Egyptian narrative literature, where these function as an index of a specific register (Stauder 2013a:120-2): *Tale of P. Lythgoe* ro x+7-8 *hr m-ht m[š]rw hpr 'h' n rd.n=f [...]* ‘Now, after the evening had set, he gave [...];’ vso x+9-10 *hr m-ht 3bdw 'š3 sw3 'h' n nsw [...]* ‘Now, after many months had passed, the king [...];’ *Sasobek A.11 hr m-ht kt phryt sw3[.ti ...]* ‘Now, after another long period had pass[ed ...];’ *passim* in *Cheops’ Court* (Stauder 2013a: 120). Possibly relating to this broad tradition, a later instance outside literature is *Urk.* IV 1308, 2 *ir m-ht t3 h3d 2-nw hrw (...)* ‘When the land had dawned a second day (...)’. For occurrences of *m-ht Ns PsP* outside such fronted temporal expressions, below, the comment to (vi).

Variant formulations with intransitives are not oriented on an O and therefore not passives: Heqaib (BM EA 1671), 6-7 *iw d.n(=i) mrht n nhb m-ht niwt(=i) htp(.t)* ‘I have given oil to el-Kab after my town was satisfied’; Mo<sup>c</sup>alla IV.22-25 (Inscription #10) *iw grt s<sup>c</sup>nh.n(=i) pr n 3bw s<sup>c</sup>nh.n(=i) 3t ngn m rnpwt iptn m-ht hf3t hr-mr htp* ‘I have nourished the house of Elephantine and I have nourished Iat-negen during those years after Hefat and Horner were satisfied.’

As noted, secure instances of *m-ht V-pass NP* are limited to Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptional texts; on the other hand, another construction, *m-ht NP<sub>O</sub> PsP*, is in use in earlier times. Compounded with the fact that *preposition V-pass* is otherwise exceptional in all Earlier Egyptian times (above, A), this suggests that *m-ht V-pass NP* is an innovation in the written language of the early New Kingdom, rather than the outcome of a change that would have had its roots in regular linguistic interaction. Significantly, the linguistic typology of one of the texts in which the construction occurs, *Divine Birth* (and more generally Hatshepsut’s *Royal Cycle*), displays various other elements that can be interpreted as innovations in written language.<sup>248</sup>

#### 4.4.2.2.2 Preposition *sdm.n.t=f*

A. The construction *preposition sdm.n.t=f* is even rarer than *preposition V-pass*. Before the Eighteenth Dynasty only one instance has been noted:

(i) Hatnub 16, 9-10<sup>249</sup>

*wn=i m mn<sup>c</sup>t hr 3ty n i nb indw r ssnb.n.t=f*

‘I was a nurse and a caretaker for whoever came afflicted until he had been comforted.’

This apparently singular occurrence is to be appreciated in relation to alternations of verbal forms after *r*, in particular *r sdmt=f* and *r sdm.n=f*. The former is the regular expression for ‘until (...)’, thus in the active and in the passive (here in a subjectless construction):

(ii) Cheops’ Court 11.15-16

*h3 d=tn p3 it 3 m 3t htm.ti r twt=n*

‘Would that you put this grain here in a sealed room until we have come back.’

(iii) Heqanakht III, ro 5<sup>250</sup>

*ir grt r-s3 šdt st dd.t ø m pr sš=k 3.w.s. r twt r=s*

‘Now, after collecting it, it should be put in the house of Your Excellency L.P.H. until it has been come for.’

<sup>248</sup> On the linguistic typology of the *Royal Cycle*, Stauder (2013a: 322-36).

<sup>249</sup> Doret (1986: 167, ex.306).

<sup>250</sup> For the identification as *r sdmt=f*, cogently Allen (2002: 49). The author’s reading as a subjectless active is problematic because subjectless active constructions are hardly ever with agentive events (§2.7.3.1-2; on zero-subject constructions further §2.5.2.2). The reading is therefore with a subjectless passive, as is well documented for *twi* in both T- and V-passives (e.g. §2.1.2 (iii)).

As regards the much less common *r sdm.n.t=f*, an active occurrence to be compared with (i) is:

(iv) Siut V, 29

(...) *r hpr.n s3=s m nht-ε*

‘(...) until her son had grown up as a strongman.’

In terms of Aktionsart, both *hpr* in (iv) and *ssnb* in (i) can be contextually read as accomplishments (i.e. as durative telic events), while *iwi* in (ii)-(iii) necessarily reads as an achievement (i.e. as a non-durative telic event). On this level, (i) would thus be to (iv) (both with the rare *r sdm.n=f*, passive and active, respectively) as (iii) is to (ii) (both with the common *r sdm.t=f*, passively and actively read, respectively). *R sdm.t=f* ‘until (...)’ is a bare expression of the completion of the event; differing from this, the much rarer *r sdm.n=f*, also ‘until (...)’, seems to additionally highlight the temporal extension of the event. (In more explicit renditions: *wn=i (...) r ssnb.t=f* ‘I was (...) until he had been *fully* comforted’; (...) *r hpr.n s3=s m nht-ε* ‘(...) until his son had *finished* grow-*ing* up as a strongman’, contrasting with the impossible interpretations (...) *r iwt=n*, not <sup>21</sup>‘(...) until we have finished coming back’; (...) *r iwt r=s*, not <sup>21</sup>‘(...) until it has been fully come for.’) That *r sdm.n.t=f* should be documented only once is in line with the general rarity of *r sdm.n=f*, a construction with additional semantic import in comparison to the otherwise broadly similar *r sdm.t=f*, compounded with the more general lesser frequency of passives over actives.

B. One other instance of the construction *preposition sdm.n.t=f* has been noted, in the Eighteenth Dynasty, with *mi*:

(v) *Urk.* IV 1861, 20 - 1862, 2<sup>251</sup>

*mḥ.n=k t3w m nfrw=k mi pt st.ti m thnt mi ms.n.tw=k m itn m pt*

‘You have filled the lands with your beauty like the sky when it glitters as faience, as/because you were born as the sun-disc in the sky.’

As the documentation in the record suggests,<sup>252</sup> *mi sdm.n=f*, with this type of meaning, is probably itself an innovation in the written language of the early New Kingdom.

#### 4.4.3 *V-pass* → *sdm.n.t=f*: Summary

Although more sparsely documented in text, the diachronic developments just presented broadly align with similar processes of replacement of the perfective V-passive by the *sdm.n.t=f* in other environments described in this chapter.

<sup>251</sup> Uljas (2007a: 270, ex.328).

<sup>252</sup> Uljas (2007a: 266, ex.317-8 and n.6). Regarding ex.318 (*Berlin Leather Roll* 1.15), this text is probably an Eighteenth Dynasty composition in its present linguistic form (Stauder 2013a: 249-57, based on independent linguistic arguments). Occurrences of *mi sdm.n=f* extend at least into the early Nineteenth Dynasty, e.g. *KRI* 65, 11 (Sethi I’s *Kanais Inscription*). Detailed study of *mi*: Peust (2006b).

## 4.4.3.1 Environments in which the change occurred

A. In the course of Earlier Egyptian, the perfective V-passive was replaced by the *sdm.n.t=f* in the following environments:

- *Pw*-markedthetic and topic-presentative constructions, *ir*-introduced conditional clauses, clauses dependent on a noun, and, with a grain of salt, clauses introduced by a preposition (§4.4.2):

$$V\text{-pass } NP \rightarrow \textit{sdm.n.t=f}$$

- ‘Emphatic’ and related constructions (§4.2):

(I) With non-pronominal subjects:  $V\text{-pass non-}P \rightarrow \textit{sdm.n.t non-}P$

(II) Later also with pronominal subjects:  $V\text{-pass } P \rightarrow \textit{sdm.n.t } P$

- Negative unaccomplished (§4.3.5.2):

(I) In subjectless constructions:  $n \text{ } V\text{-pass} \rightarrow n \textit{sdm.n.t}$

(II) Later also with passives of transitives:  $n \text{ } V\text{-pass } NP \rightarrow n \textit{sdm.n.t } NP$

Broadening the perspective beyond the *sdm.n.t=f*, the perfective V-passive was also replaced by a T-passive in another negative construction:

- Negative accomplished (§4.3.5.1.3):

$$n \text{ } V\text{-pass} \rightarrow n \textit{sdm.t=f}$$

In all cases, the change consists in the replacement of the perfective V-passive by a T-passive—in all cases but one, by a T-passive of the accomplished *sdm.n=f*—never in the reverse. Descriptively, the development can be viewed as a general diachronic trend extending across environments.

B. As discussed (§4.3.5.3-5), the *sdm.n.t=f* developed and spread in the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions to provide a distinctive expression to the fact that an accomplished event—even though passive—is not viewed as primarily Endpoint-oriented. In the negative unaccomplished, the *sdm.n.t=f* developed in a construction that is non-accomplished and non-positive: in this, the Endpoint, if any, is not salient. In both these constructions, subjectless passives lacking an Endpoint and expressing an orientation on the event itself played a major role in the early spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* (§4.3.5.2). The *sdm.n.t=f* developed in both cases in environments that imply a departure from one or more parameters of high semantic transitivity otherwise associated with accomplished passives by virtue of their Endpoint orientation.

The environments discussed in the preceding section—*pw*-markedthetic and topic-presentative constructions, *ir*-introduced conditional clauses, clauses dependent on a noun, and clauses introduced by a preposition—have in common that the clause is embedded into a higher syntactic node. As such, the events in these clauses are not directly subject to assertion, unlike events in main clauses. This seems relevant to the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in these environments because assertion is itself one

parameter associated with semantic transitivity (§4.3.4.1.3), from which the *sdm.n.t=f* expresses a departure.

#### 4.4.3.2 Environments to which the *sdm.n.t=f* did not spread

A. Just as significant in the context of the present discussion are the environments in which the *sdm.n.t=f* did not spread—thus not only after *iw*, but also after *ḥꜥ.n* and in adjunct clauses. Once interpreted as ‘adverbial’,<sup>253</sup> these environments are now understood as main clauses and in terms of asyndetic linkage and dependency.<sup>254</sup> This leaves the question why the *sdm.n.t=f* does not occur in any of these.

As discussed, the *sdm.n.t=f*—a T-passive of the accomplished *sdm.n=f*—spread in the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions to express that an accomplished event—even though passive—is not Endpoint-oriented, and thereby not perfective, in contrast to the pseudoparticiple and perfective V-passive. The form did not spread to clauses introduced by *iw* because these are fully asserted and well-grounded: in such environments, there is no reason for an accomplished passive to be presented under a perspective other than as Endpoint-oriented. The same account directly extends to clauses introduced by *ḥꜥ.n*, which are similarly fully asserted and well-grounded.<sup>255</sup> For the same reason, the *sdm.n.t=f* did not spread to asyndetically linked main or dependent clauses: in these—and even more so when they are part of the textual background, as in circumstantial contexts—an accomplished passive event is naturally Endpoint-oriented. A form that in contrast to the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive serves to express an orientation away from the Endpoint does not come to use in such environments.

Similar comments extend to the *sdm.n=f* of subject-affecting intransitives. In ways similar to the *sdm.n.t=f*, this serves to express that an accomplished event—even though subject-affecting—is not Endpoint-oriented. Accordingly, the form does not come to order in fully asserted and well grounded clauses after *iw* and *ḥꜥ.n*, nor in asyndetically linked main or dependent clauses.<sup>256</sup>

B. That a *sdm.n.t=f*—in other words, a T-passive of the *sdm.n=f*—did not develop in certain environments is an explanandum under any approach to Middle Egyptian, and one that to the present author’s knowledge has never been addressed.<sup>257</sup>

253 E.g. Polotsky (1976).

254 E.g. Collier (1991a; 1991b; 1992).

255 On the grounding functions of *ḥꜥ.n*, in this respect comparable to those of *iw*, Collier (1994: 81-5).

256 As regards the *mrr=f*, the reasons for its incompatibility with *iw* were evoked above (§4.4.2.2 on the functions of *iw*, and §4.4.1.2 on the *mrr=f*; further Uljas 2007a, particularly 347-59). In adjunct clauses, an unaccomplished event is presented as a relative present with respect to the main clause without further aspectual or modal specification other than occasionally as progressive vs. unmarked; the *mrr=f* is semantically over-determined and can not, therefore, occur in these environments.

257 For example, the *sdm.n.t=f* was once declared ‘nominal’ and thereby incompatible with the here discussed environments, declared ‘adverbial’. This—and similarly various reformulations into which these sets of environments have been recast, such as ‘converbial’ for ‘adverbial’, or ‘abstract-relative’ vs. ‘predicative’ for the overall contrast—do not address the issue: under such analyses, there was an ‘adverbial’ (/‘converbial’ /‘predicative’) form, or use, of the *sdm.n=f*, yet no reason is given for why an ‘adverbial’ (/‘converbial’ /‘predicative’) T-passive of this form did not

In the present study, the semantic profile of the *sdm.n.t=f* is analyzed in relation to the interaction between voice, aspect, and perspective. While this analysis was developed to account for the uses of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions, it also accounts for why a T-passive of the *sdm.n=f* did not develop in those environments in which it did not develop. This affords an independent confirmation to the analysis of the *sdm.n.t=f* here proposed.

#### 4.4.3.3 The diachronic reduction of the functional yield of the perfective V-passive

In classical presentations of Middle Egyptian, the perfective V-passive is described as much-reduced in its distribution:<sup>258</sup> the form is restricted to non-pronominal subjects in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticiple; moreover, it is used only in clauses that are positive, fully asserted, and not syntactically embedded into a higher node. The presentation is of course descriptively correct, but the situation described constitutes only the ultimate outcome of a series of changes that occurred in the preceding centuries. In the Old Kingdom, the same form was regularly used with pronominal subjects, with negative events, in the ‘emphatic’ construction, and in clauses syntactically embedded into a higher node.

As discussed throughout this chapter, the accomplished and the passive entertain complex relations, one major dimension of which lies in the typically strong Endpoint orientation of accomplished passives. As such, accomplished passives—more than both accomplished actives and unaccomplished passives—interact with the parameters associated with semantic transitivity. The loss of the perfective V-passive in negative constructions (in the accomplished, *n V-pass* → *n sdm.n.t=f*; in the unaccomplished *n V-pass* → *n sdm.n.t=f*) reflects the fact that negative events score lower in semantic transitivity than positive events. In the ‘emphatic’ construction, the *sdm.n.t=f* spread to provide a distinctive expression that an accomplished event—even though passive—is not viewed as Endpoint-oriented. In clauses syntactically embedded into a higher node, a similar development seems related to the fact that in these environments assertion is not a relevant factor. The restriction of the perfective V-passive to non-pronominal subjects, for its part, is an epiphenomenon of all the above: in environments in which *V-pass P* was used in earlier times, the V-passive was more generally displaced by the *sdm.n.t=f*, with all types of subjects alike. By contrast, an accomplished passive event is viewed as Endpoint-oriented in fully asserted and well-grounded main clauses and in asyndetically linked main or dependent clauses. In these environments, the *sdm.n.t=f* did not spread.

In earlier times, the perfective V-passive could be used in a variety of contexts and environments, including those that depart from various parameters of high semantic transitivity and/or imply a less strongly Endpoint-oriented perspective on the event (§4.3.4). For these times, the characterization of the form as a ‘perfective passive’ refers to its morphological type, synthesizing voice and aspect, and to uses with semantic effects that are typically perfective. Such, or similar, uses are also

---

also develop while a T-passive of the ‘nominal’ (/‘abstract-relative’) did. Other approaches to Middle Egyptian have similarly eluded the issue.

258 E.g. Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §420, §422-423); Westendorf (1953: 6-66).



found with the pseudoparticiple, but not with the *sdm.n=f*, a mere accomplished (§4.3.5.3-4). The changes discussed above resulted in a situation in which in later stages of Earlier Egyptian, the perfective V-passive ended up being restricted to those environments in which an accomplished passive is strictly perfective. In all of these, the perfective V-passive stands in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticiple, itself a quintessentially Endpoint-oriented and perfective form. In this sense, the perfective V-passive can be described as having lost its functional autonomy in later stages of Earlier Egyptian.

## 4.5 Part II, opening up: Passive voice as an autonomous linguistic domain

In Earlier Egyptian, passive and active paradigms have different resolutions, both in the unaccomplished and in the accomplished. Moreover, passive subjects differ from active ones, with effects in text and in morphosyntax. Taking up the main theme of the present study, the passive is not merely a pendant to the active, but an autonomous domain of linguistic function.

### 4.5.1 The non-prototypicality of passive subjects

Passive subjects are not Agents. In addition, while active subjects typically score high on the scales of topicality and individuation, passive subjects can also score lower or even very low on these same scales. These various dimensions are interrelated: passive subjects often score lower than active ones on the Nominal Hierarchy. In doing so, passive subjects are less prototypical than actives ones.

In Earlier Egyptian, the lesser prototypicality of passive subjects has various effects in text. With transitive events, zero-subject constructions were observed to be common in the passive, unlike in the active, where they are rare (§2.5.2.2). The distribution reflects the general semantic conditions of low individuation licensing zero-subject constructions: these are regularly met by passive subjects but only rarely by active ones. It was also observed that marked-topic constructions are very uncommon in the passive, unlike in the active (§3.1.2). This is due to the fact that passive subjects are not Agents: discourse tends to be organized around participants that do things, not around such to whom things are done.

On two occasions, the lesser prototypicality of passive subjects was also observed to have direct morphosyntactic effects: in the unmarked unaccomplished and in the construction *subject – pseudoparticiple* expressing a dynamic event. In the unmarked unaccomplished (§3.1.1), active and passive constructions contrast formally with one another with respect to the position of the subject, which is preverbal in the former (*(N(P) sdm=f)*) and postverbal in the latter (*sdm.t NP*). As discussed, the active construction with a preverbal subject first developed with subjects that score high in topicality and only later generalized to all types of subjects, including non-referential ones. In selecting typically non-topical subjects, the unmarked unaccomplished

passive did not undergo the same development, but preserved the construction in its earlier form, with a postverbal subject.

In the accomplished, with fully asserted and positive events (§4.1), two constructions are used in complementary distribution in the passive ( $P_O PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$ ), standing against only one with subject-affecting intransitives such as *iwi* ( $NP_S PsP$ ). As discussed, the use of the pseudoparticiple, a resultative category, for expressing dynamic events is a secondary development, both typologically and historically (§2.3.1.2). When, in times prior than the earliest documented texts, the Earlier Egyptian pseudoparticiple developed uses to express dynamic events, it did so with all types of subjects with subject-affecting intransitives, but only with pronominal subjects with events oriented on an O. In dynamic constructions of the pseudoparticiple, both S's and O's are affected by the event, which is similarly perfective and telic in either case. However, only S's are simultaneously Agents. In being Agents, S's most commonly score high in topicality in these constructions, like pronominal O's do. Non-pronominal O's, which can also be indefinite or non-referential, or be lacking altogether (in the case of passives from intransitives, primary or secondary ones), can score high, lower, or very low in topicality. The failure of the construction  $NP PsP$  to spread to dynamic events oriented on a non-pronominal O—as opposed to the spread of the same construction to dynamic events oriented on non-pronominal S's—thus reflects the non-prototypical nature of passive subjects (§4.1.5).

#### 4.5.2 Different resolutions of passive and active paradigms: Voice and tense-aspect

Passive paradigms are often not symmetrical to active ones. The passive concerns the perspective by which an event is viewed. So does aspect. These two dimensions can therefore interact with one another, more or less strongly in individual languages. In Earlier Egyptian, this interaction is particularly rich.

A. In the future, ongoing linguistic change leads to a situation in the earlier Middle Kingdom when the same active category,  $NP r sdm$ , has two passive counterparts, depending on its semantics (§3.3.B). When the construction is used with its original semantics, to express that an event is bound to happen, the passive counterpart of  $NP r sdm$  is  $NP r sdm$  itself: the construction is semantically oriented, with no morphological marking of voice (§2.3.2; §2.4.1.2). When the same construction is used with weakened semantics, to express a mere future, the passive counterpart of  $NP r sdm$  is  $sdm.t=f$ , a T-passive of the prospective: the construction is then syntactically oriented, with a morphological marking of voice. In the later Middle Kingdom, first in relatively less formal written registers,  $sdm.t=f$  is replaced by  $(X).tw r sdm$ . The contrast with the semantically oriented passive construction  $NP_O r sdm$  remains the same, for as long as the latter remains productive. Also in the future, the perfective V-passive can be used to express events yet to come, the perfective aspect of the form conveying a strong modal effect (§1.2.3). This use of a form that belongs to the paradigm of the accomplished is limited to the passive, and to the perfective V-passive specifically (thus, the  $sdm.n=f$  can not be used with similar effect, nor can

the T-passive of the *sdm.n=f*). Its conditioning possibility lies with the Endpoint orientation of the passive: in setting the perspective on the Endpoint of the event, the perfective V-passive can be used to impart a strong injunction.

Yet more significant effects of the interaction between voice and aspect are observed in the unaccomplished and in the accomplished. In the former (§3.2), the passive expresses one category less than the active. The passive can thus be described as having a lesser semantic resolution than the active:

	unmarked	progressive
active	$N(P) \text{ } sdm=f$	$NP \text{ } hr \text{ } sdm$
passive	$\longleftrightarrow sdm.t=f \longrightarrow$	

In the accomplished, a reverse situation is observed, with additional complexities due to ongoing linguistic change during Earlier Egyptian. In a paradigm that is asymmetrical on various levels, the passive expresses more semantic distinctions than the active:

	non-‘emph.’	‘emph.’ constr.
	P	non-P
<i>active</i>		
non subject-affecting	$\longleftrightarrow sdm.n=f \longrightarrow$	
subject-affecting intr.	$\longleftrightarrow NP \text{ } PsP \longrightarrow$	$ii.n=f$
<i>passive</i>		
EEg. I	$P_O \text{ } PsP$	$\longleftrightarrow V\text{-}pass \longrightarrow$ (/ <i>sdm.n.t non-P</i> )
EEg. II	$P_O \text{ } PsP \sim V\text{-}pass \text{ } non\text{-}P$	$sdm.n.t=f$

B. In Earlier Egyptian, the passive thus has a lower semantic resolution than the active in the unaccomplished. In the accomplished, by contrast, the Earlier Egyptian passive has a higher semantic resolution than the active. This configuration reflects more general correlations.

Cross-linguistically, passives are often skewed toward perfective aspect. For example, it has been observed that whenever a language has a passive construction, this will at least cover perfective aspect. Furthermore, when a language has multiple passives, these typically differ by aspect.<sup>259</sup> In various languages, an overt expression of perfect aspect is possible only in the passive, not in the active.<sup>260</sup> Subject affectation has been included in the characterization of the passive prototype;<sup>261</sup> subject affectation can be thorough only in perfective aspect. Diachronically, one of the major sources from which passives can grammaticalize lies with resultative

259 Keenan & Dryer (2006: 340-1).

260 Comrie (1976: 84-6).

261 Shibatani (1985: 837).

constructions; passives that grammaticalize from these are perfective,<sup>262</sup> unlike passives that grammaticalize from other sources, which are a priori not marked for aspect.

On a cognitive level, the prototypical passive views the event from its Endpoint, while the active views the event from the vantage point of the Initiator.<sup>263</sup> The categories of Initiator and Endpoint ultimately rely on spatial metaphors. With respect to the speech situation, these imply a deictic component, and thereby also project in time. For reasons notably to do with empathy, speech participants identify with agentive participants (more than any other types of subjects, first and second person subjects tend to be agentive in discourse). On this cognitive level, a prototypical transitive event is thus seen as moving away from the speech situation to a more distal location, in place and time. In viewing the event from the perspective of its Initiator, the active views it from the perspective of a participant metaphorically associated with the here and now of the speech situation. The passive, by contrast, views the event from its Endpoint, and thereby from a place metaphorically distal with respect to the speech situation.

Linguistically, this is reflected in the markedness of the passive construction (§2.5.1), but also in the interrelations between voice and aspect. Perfective aspect highlights the culminating point of the event, most often its completion.<sup>264</sup> like the passive, perfective aspect places emphasis on the Endpoint of the event. Imperfective aspect, for its part, sets the perspective on the internal structure of the event. The Endpoint of the event, if any, is out of focus, and the perspective is set on the action itself, thereby also on the Agent—like in the active. As two categories that set the perspective on the Endpoint, passive voice and perfective aspect display strong interrelations, to be observed in many languages (above). Conversely, the anti-passive—a construction that moves the Endpoint entirely out of focus—displays a distinguished relationship with imperfective aspect.<sup>265</sup> Non-perfective passives, and particularly unaccomplished ones, are unprototypical because they consist in the combination of an Endpoint-oriented category (the passive) with one in which the Endpoint, if any, is not in focus, or even out of focus (the unaccomplished).

C. In Earlier Egyptian, the above correlations are illustrated on various levels. Of the two major types of inflectional passives, one is inherently neutral as to aspect (T-passives are componential, semantically and morphologically); the other is inherently marked for aspect, and specifically for perfective aspect (the perfective V-passive) (§1.1-2). Historically, the contrast also reflects the different sources of these two types of inflectional passives as these can be reconstructed (§2.9): while {t} arguably has its ultimate source in the regrammaticalization of a lexical marker of the reflexive, the perfective V-passive in all likelihood developed from a construction with a resultative stem.

---

262 Comrie (1982); Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988: 45-9); Haspelmath (1990).

263 An orientation into the issues alluded to in this paragraph is provided by Woods (2008: 66-8, 285-9), synthesizing the relevant literature.

264 Winand (2006: 194-6).

265 In general, e.g. Woods (2008: 77-80); in Earlier Egyptian, §2.6.1.

Most importantly, the above correlations find a reflection in the different resolutions of the unaccomplished and accomplished passive paradigms. As discussed, the Earlier Egyptian passive has a lesser semantic resolution than the active in the unaccomplished (§3.2). Specifically, Earlier Egyptian does not provide a distinct expression of the progressive in the passive. Even more than imperfective aspect in general, progressive aspect highlights the Agent. Viewing a progressive event from the perspective of its Endpoint is accordingly unnatural. In the Earlier Egyptian record, passive events that support or invite a progressive reading are expectedly uncommon. After the rise of a dedicated expression of the active progressive during the Old Kingdom, it took seven more centuries before a dedicated expression of the passive progressive developed, and several centuries further before this spread to all registers.

Conversely, the Earlier Egyptian accomplished passive has a higher semantic resolution than the active: the paradigm of the accomplished passive comprises three formal categories, while the active distinguishes only one (with non subject-affecting events) or two (with subject-affecting ones). An analysis of the historically shifting paradigm of the accomplished passive involves the interrelated categories of Endpoint orientation and high semantic transitivity, themselves related to perfective aspect (§4). As a resultative category, the pseudoparticiple can be used in the passive construction only when certain conditions of high semantic transitivity are met, differing from the perfective V-passive which does not require these conditions to be met. Superseding the perfective V-passive in various environments in the course of Earlier Egyptian, T-passives initially spread notably in subjectless constructions. Subjectless passives often lack an Endpoint, in which case they are oriented on the event itself: they are accordingly less perfective than the prototypical accomplished passive with a salient Endpoint. In the ‘emphatic’ construction in particular, the *sḏm.n.t=f* developed to provide a formally distinct expression to the fact that the perspective is set on the dynamic part of the event, in other words, that the Endpoint is out of focus. Put differently, the *sḏm.n.t=f*—a T-passive of the *sḏm.n=f*—developed to express that an accomplished event, even though passive, is not perfective, but merely accomplished. Contrasting with the perfective V-passive used in non-‘emphatic’ environments, the use of the *sḏm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction can thus be described as deperfectivizing.

Among the semantic dimensions just evoked, the conditions of high semantic transitivity that dynamic uses of the pseudoparticiple must satisfy, and thereby the formal contrasts involved when these conditions are not met, concern only subject-affecting intransitives in the active. The other dimensions are entirely irrelevant to the active. In particular, the active has no issue in expressing that the Endpoint is out of focus: the active is not an Endpoint-oriented category in the first place. In the accomplished, the active is much simpler than the passive.



## PART III:

### THE LOSS OF INFLECTIONAL PASSIVES

Earlier Egyptian has multiple types of inflectional passives (§1). These are used in a variety of passive constructions, with transitive and with intransitive events (primary and secondary ones), without and with an expressed Agent; passives are common in text, performing a rich variety of functions in discourse (§2). Over the course of the second millennium, the language gradually loses all of these forms and constructions. The process, sweeping as it may appear at first, is the overall outcome of a series of individual changes, some interrelated, others not. Various changes resulting in a reduction of the functional yield of V-passives were already described in previous sections of the present study (§1.2-3 for processes of morphological obsolescence affecting the V-passive and the *sdmm=f*; §4 for changes in the accomplished ‘emphatic’ construction and in negative constructions). In the present chapter, I concentrate on the process by which {t} is extended to new environments, leading to the rise of an impersonal subject pronoun *.tw* (§5.1-3). In the final section, the various changes affecting the passive in the longer Earlier Egyptian *durée* are set in perspective with one another (§5.4).

## 5 The rise of an impersonal subject pronoun *.tw* out of the inflectional marker of voice {t}

During the first half of the second millennium BCE, {t}—in earlier times exclusively an inflectional marker of passive—is extended to new environments and constructions, leading to the rise of an impersonal subject pronoun *.tw*.<sup>1</sup> As can be described in the record, the process of extension involves multiples dimensions, semantic and morphological ones (§5.1). The change, a rare instance of degrammaticalization (§5.2), is subsequently analyzed in its intralinguistic context and as to the mechanisms and circumstantial conditions that made it possible (§5.3). In a final section, the

---

1 First noted by Vernus (1998a, where it is analyzed as an instance of grammaticalization).

change is contextualized as one major component of the overall process by which Egyptian ultimately lost all inflectional passives and passive constructions (§5.4).

## 5.1 Describing the change in the record

In the earlier second millennium, {t} begins to be extended to constructions that on semantic or on morphological grounds can not be analyzed as passive anymore (§5.1.1-2). Other innovative constructions of {t} which are diagnostic, or possibly diagnostic, of ongoing change are discussed in turn (§5.1.3-4).

### 5.1.1 *Tw* with events and constructions that fail to meet the semantic condition of passivization

Beginning in the mid-Twelfth Dynasty, {t} is found with events and constructions that fail to meet the semantic condition for passivization in Earlier Egyptian, namely that the event must include an Agent in its semantic representation (§2.1). The process of extension of {t} as observed in the record is gradual, reaching increasingly further away from the semantic condition for passivization. It begins with events that lack an Agent in their semantic representation but are still dynamic, then extends to non-dynamic events (which, by definition, lack an Agent). The next step is reached when {t} can be combined with the pseudoparticiple, a semantically oriented construction; the process is complete when {t}, originally a marker of verbal inflection, comes to be used with the situational predicate construction, a non-verbal construction.

#### 5.1.1.1 *Tw* with dynamic events that lack an Agent in their semantic representation

From the mid-Twelfth Dynasty on, first in *Eloquent Peasant*, {t} is extended to dynamic events that lack an Agent in their semantic representation:<sup>2</sup>

(i) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 252-254 (mid-Twelfth Dynasty)

*s<sup>c</sup>nhw m rd m(w)t.tw*

*sh<sup>t</sup>m m rd htm.tw*

‘Lifegiver, let not die!

Destroyer, let not perish!’

Sim. B1 131-132 *sr<sup>f</sup>w hr rdt nšp.tw* ‘He who breathes calmly is making people pant’; B1 321-322 *iw hr.tw n hnt wš* ‘One falls far for greed.’

2 *Ptahhotep* 447 (only P) *s<sup>c</sup>nh(.).tw tr n sft=f* probably does not belong here. The verse is often read as ‘One lives for the time he is merciful’, but an interpretation with a qualifying pattern and a second person is more likely, ‘You are alive for the time he is merciful’ (Stauder 2013a: 458-9).



(ii) Antef's Sehel Graffito 8-9 (*temp.* Senwosret III)

3<sub>h</sub> st n irr st r irr w n=f st

n wrd.n.tw hr<sup>sic</sup>=s

3w pw m r3

‘It is more beneficial to him who does it than to him for whom it is done;  
one can not become weary because of it;  
this is the breath in the mouth.’

A variant finite construction of the formula *nn nw m wrdt hr=s* ‘this is not something through which one becomes weary’ (for the construction, §2.4.2.2).<sup>3</sup> The non-standard formulation is also manifest in other details such as the preposition (*hr* rather than *hr*) and could reflect a less formal register.

## (iii) Eighteenth Dynasty Menology 3

iw.tw r dhr

‘One will be sick.’<sup>4</sup>

Sim. 7 iw m(w)t.tw ‘One dies’; 8 iw.tw r m(w)t n r3-<sup>c</sup> w<sup>c</sup>b ‘One will die because of the activity of the *wab*-priest’; for the construction *iw.tw r sdm*, itself an extended use of {t}, §5.1.2.2.

None of the verbs *mwt* ‘die’, *htm* ‘perish’, *nšp* ‘pant’, *hr* ‘fall’, and *wrd* ‘become weary’ is ever attested in the V-passive. Nor are these ever attested with {t} before the mid-Twelfth Dynasty. When the animate direct participant is to be left unexpressed with a dynamic event lacking an Agent in its semantic representation, a zero-subject construction is used in earlier times: this provides the functional counterpart to the passive with events that fail to meet the condition for passivization (§2.7.3.3). Thus, in a text only slightly earlier than (i):

(a) Antef (BM EA 1628), 8 (*temp.* Amenemhat I?<sup>5</sup>) n rd=i m(w)t ø ‘I did not let die’;

With an event nominalization, and possibly a slightly different shade of meaning, yet also functioning as a counterpart to the passive with an event that by the time could not be passivized, Mo‘alla IV.17-18 (Inscription #10) n-sp d(=i) hpr m(w)t n hkr m sp3t tn ‘Never did I allow that there be starving in this district.’

## 5.1.1.2 Tw with non-dynamic events

By definition, non-dynamic events lack an Agent in their semantic representation. In being non-dynamic, they are one step further away from the semantic condition for passivization than dynamic events lacking an Agent (§5.1.1.1). Early occurrences of {t} with non-dynamic events are in a series of Middle Egyptian literary texts, none dating before the late Twelfth Dynasty and several probably dating much later.<sup>6</sup> Thus,

3 Vernus (1976); Spiegelberg (1908).

4 For the translation ‘be sick’, rather than ‘be bitter’, Vernus (1981b: 94-5, n.h).

5 Franke (2007: 167-74).

6 Stauder (2013a).

with events denoting physical states (i), bodily positions (ii), lack (iii), and ‘being free from’ (iv):

(i) *Amenemhat* 11c

*n ḥkr.tw m rnpwt=i*

*n ib.tw im*

‘One was not hungry in my years,  
one was not thirsty then.’

Sim. *Ipuwer* 2.10 *ib.tw mw* ‘One thirsts for water’ (with a rare transitive construction of *ibi*); *Hymn* 12.2 (about half of the mss.<sup>7</sup>) (...) *ḥr s33.tw m inw nfr n š3w* ‘(...) then one is sated with the good produce of the fields.’

(ii) *Amenemhat* 11d

*iw ḥms.tw m irt.n=i ḥr sddt im=i*

‘One could relax through what I had done, telling of me.’

Sim. *Ipuwer* 5.11 *ḥms.tw ḥr b3wt* ‘One sits in bushes’; *Kheti* 25.3 *iw ḥms.tw ḥn<sup>c</sup> ksm-ḥt* ‘One sits with the defiant man’;<sup>8</sup> *Neferti* 9c *nn sdr.tw ḥkr n m(w)t* ‘The night will not be spent starving to death.’

(iii) *Neferti* 7f

*g3.tw ḥnrt*

‘One will lack a stronghold.’

With a transitive construction of *g3w*. Sim. *Loyaliste* 9.9 *g3w/y.tw r=s šḥm šw3ww* ‘When one lacks it, poverty reigns’; *Hymn* 5.2 (...) *nn g3y.tw r=s* ‘(...) without one lacking it.’

(iv) *Ipuwer* 10.6

*nn šw.tw m [...]*

‘One will not be free of [...].’

NB. While ‘*nḥ m* ‘live on, feed on’ is agentive (§2.1.3, (v)), ‘*nḥ (m)* ‘live (in)’ is not. Whether ‘living’ is construed as dynamic or as non-dynamic in Earlier Egyptian, or possibly both depending on contexts, is difficult to determine. The following instances of ‘*nḥ* with {t} could thus fall under the present section or the preceding one:

7 The text is unstable and the manuscript tradition roughly evenly split between readings as *s33.tw* and as *s33(=)sn* (§2.7.1.1, (iii); Stauder 2013a: 224-6). The reading *s33.tw* may, or may not, be original; be this as it may, it documents that the construction was acceptable to New Kingdom scribes.

8 For the reading, which is original, Stauder (2013a: 460-1). In *Kheti* 6.3, two manuscripts (P. Sallier II and O. Leipzig 20) have *ḥms.tw*, in this case a secondary reading.

(v) *Neferti* 5d

*nn ḥḥ.tw ḥbs šn<sup>c</sup>*

‘One will not stay alive when clouds cover.’

Sim. 12d *ḥḥ.tw m ḥrt-ntr* ‘One will live in the necropolis.’

Non-dynamic events are never attested in the V-passive. Nor are these ever attested with {t} before later stages of Earlier Egyptian. When the animate direct participant is to be left unexpressed with a non-dynamic event, a zero-subject construction is used in earlier times, providing the functional counterpart to the passive (§2.7.3.3). Thus in early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary texts, with events denoting mental states (a), bodily positions (b), or lack (c):

(a) *Debate* 108 *ḥtp ḥ hr bin* ‘One is content about evil’; CT II 167b B2L (sim. B2P, Sq4C) *smn/iry iw ḥtp ḥ hr=s* ‘There has been creating, there has been establishing—One is content about it.’

In an inscriptional register, with an event nominalization, and with possibly a slightly different shade of meaning, yet also functioning as a counterpart to the passive with an event that by the time could not be passivized, *Urk.* VII 16, 11 (Ameny) *n ḥpr ḥkr im=f* ‘There was no hungry man in these (*scil.* in these years of hunger).’

(b) *Ptahhotep* 10 P *sdr ḥ n=f ḥdr r<sup>c</sup> nb* ‘Because of it one lies anguished every day’; *Sinuhe* B 59 *n rd.n=f ḥms ḥ<sup>A1-PLUR</sup> ḥ3 ib=f* ‘He does not allow that one rests around his heart’;

In an inscriptional register, with *s* ‘a man’ not in its common function of controlling subsequent anaphora (§2.7.2), Mentuwer (MMA 12.184), 11-12 *n sdr s ḥkrw r dmi=i* ‘One did not spend the night hungry in my town.’

(c) *Debate* 123-124 *iw šw ḥ m ḥ-k-ib* ‘One lacks intimates.’

#### 5.1.1.3 Further semantic extensions: *Tw* with the pseudoparticiple and in situational predicate constructions

Innovative uses of {t} with the pseudoparticiple and in the situational predicate construction are yet further away semantically from passives. Morphologically, these are also subject-first constructions: {t} is inserted in the subject slot and thereby has full constituent status (§5.1.2).

A. The pseudoparticiple, a resultative category, is semantically oriented (§2.3.1): it can not, therefore, accommodate further inflection for voice, which serves to signal a shift in syntactic orientation (§2.4.1.1-2). This demonstrates how far {t} has gone in these constructions to become a pronominal expression signaling non-specified reference.

Early occurrences are in texts that are also otherwise linguistically innovative, Ameniseneb’s autobiography,<sup>9</sup> Paheri’s *Reden und Rufe*, and *Neferti*.<sup>10</sup> The last is in a

<sup>9</sup> Stauder (2013a: 39, 43).

secondary predication, in a construction that is also innovative in combining {t} with a non-dynamic event (*sdr*: §5.1.1.2):

(i) Ameniseneb (Louvre C12), 16-17 (*temp*. Khendjer)

ḥꜥ.n m3 n3 n k3wt

ḥꜥ.n.tw ḥꜥw im wr r ht nbt

‘These works were inspected

and One was rejoiced over them more than anything.’

(ii) *Paheṛi*, pl.3, 3<sup>rd</sup> register from top, central horizontal inscription (*temp*. Thutmosis III)

hrw nfr tw.tw kb (...)

‘A good day: one is cool (...)’

(iii) *Neferti* 9c

nn sdr.tw hkr n m(w)t

‘The night will not be spent starving to death.’

B. The use of {t} in a situational predicate construction, a non-verbal construction, is yet further away from the passive, a verbal category. Early examples are with .tw standing for the king, that is, for a highly specific referent (‘royal detransitivity’: §2.5.2.1, (vi)-(viii)): this accords with the situational predicate construction typically having a highly topical subject:

(iv) *Urk*. IV 1995, 16-18 (hieratic note added to EA 27,<sup>11</sup> from Tushratta to Akhenaten)

[hsbt] 2<sup>3</sup> 3bd 1 prt [...]

iw.tw m niwt rst m p3 bhn n ḥꜥ-m-3ht

mitt n sꜥt nh[r]yn[3] (...)

‘Year 2<sup>3</sup>, the first month of winter, [day ...]:

One was in the Southern City in the complex of Haemakhet.

Copy of the letter of Naharina (...)’

Sim. Akhenaten’s *Second Proclamation*, Stela A, 1 (sim. B, Q, R, S, U) hrw pn iw.tw m 3ht-itn (...) ‘On this day, when One was in Akhetaten (...); *Urk*. IV 2031, 15 (Tutankhamun’s *Restoration Stela*) hrw pn iw.tw m ḥꜥ nfr imi pr ʿ3-hpr-k3-rꜥ m3ꜥ-hrw (...) ‘On this day, when One was in the beautiful palace which is in the Temple of Aakheperkare, the justified (...)’.

### 5.1.2 Tw with constituent status in preverbal position

As an inflectional marker of the passive, {t} is appended to the stem including any morphemes of tense-aspect-modus there may be (§1.1.3). Beginning in the Twelfth

10 Stauder (2013a: 337-443).

11 Sic, not ‘29’ as wrongly in *Urk*. IV and *TLA*.

Dynasty, {t} is extended to innovative uses in subject-first verbal patterns originally grammaticalized from situational predicate constructions. In these, {t} can not be analyzed as an inflectional marker of voice anymore; rather, in occupying the subject slot, {t} acquires full constituent status. The process is gradual, beginning in *wn*-auxiliated patterns (*wn.INFL.t hr sdm*), then extending to the analytic future ((*X.tw r sdm*), later to the progressive ((*X.tw hr sdm*). The process is completed when *.tw* is integrated as a morphological component in the impersonal form of the Late Egyptian new subject pronoun.

#### 5.1.2.1 *Wn.INFL.t hr sdm*

Beginning in the Twelfth Dynasty, the first step of the extension of {t} to subject-first verbal patterns is observed in *wn*-auxiliated constructions. In these, {t} occupies the subject slot, compare e.g. (ii) with *Eloquent Peasant* B1 55-56 *wn.in shṭy pn hr rmyt ʕw wrt* (...) ‘Then this peasant began weeping very much (...)’. These earliest constructions with {t} in preverbal position consist in *NP hr sdm* combined with the auxiliary *wn* inflected in the *sdm.n=f* (i),<sup>12</sup> the *sdm.in=f* (ii), and the *sdm.hr=f* (iii). At the same time, progressive *NP hr sdm* with no additional semantic specification does not yet accommodate {t} (§5.1.2.3). The extension of {t} to subject-first patterns thus begun with constructions that express specific semantics, a progressive set in the past tense in the textual background (i), a narrative construction possibly with inchoative value (ii), and a progressive combined with the specific value of *-hr-* (iii). This semantic specificity of constructions in which {t} was first extended to the subject slot is locally illustrated in (iii). In this, the synthetic *sdm.hr=f*, with {t} in its regular inflectional position (in the first and third clauses), contrasts with the analytic pattern combining *-hr-* with the progressive, with {t} in preverbal subject position (in the second clause):

(i) Antefiqer’s *Girgawi Inscription* 6-7 (*temp.* Amenemhat I)

*wn.t hr ḳd hnt pn*

*ʕḥ.n sm3 nḥsw spt nbt m w3w3t* (...)

‘While this enclosure was being built,  
the Nubians, the whole remainder of Wawat, were killed (...)’

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 115-116 (mid-Twelfth Dynasty)

*wn.in.tw hr rdt n=f t3 10 hnkt ds 2 rḥ nb*

‘Then one began giving him ten loaves of bread and two jars of beer daily.’

Sim. Hammamat 19, 10-12 (Meri, *temp.* Amenemhat III) *ʕḥ.n ir p3 sm3 wn.in.tw hr sfn n3 n mnw mi dd(t).n=f nbt* ‘The ramp was made and (the way for) these

12 For *wn* as the *sdm.n=f* of *wnn* (\**/winn~/-* < \**/w(ṇ)inn~/-*), Stauder (in press a: §3, with important input by Wolfgang Schenkel).

blocks was made smooth according to all he had said'; 3-4 *wn.in{.n}<.ḏ*<sup>13</sup> *hr hd inrw* (...) 'Then one began breaking the stones (...)'.<sup>14</sup>

(iii) P. UC 32036 (Kahun Veterinary Papyrus), 20-23

*rd.hr.t=f hr gs=f w<sup>c</sup>*

*wn.hr.t hr ntš=f m mw kb*

*sin.hr.t irty=f hn<sup>c</sup> drw=f hn<sup>c</sup> t=f nbt*

'It (*scil.* the bull being examined) is to be lain on its side,  
it is to be continuously sprinkled with fresh water,  
and its eyes are to be rubbed along with its flanks and all its limbs.'

### 5.1.2.2 (X.)*tw r sdm*

Beginning in relatively less formal written registers from the late Twelfth Dynasty on, {t} is extended to the future, *NP r sdm*. In this as well, {t} occupies the subject slot: compare the constructions below with e.g. P. Berlin 10025, ro 5-6 *pty [...] ntt sw r irt r b3k im* (...) 'What is [...] that he is to do against this servant (...)?' The development concerns only positive constructions: like in the active, the negative pendant is with a synthetic form, *nn sdm=f* (*nn sdm.t=f* in the passive), e.g. P. Berlin 10024A, ro 5 *irt nty nn gm.tw=f* (...) 'As regards the one who will not be found (...)'.<sup>15</sup>

#### 5.1.2.2.1 Early occurrences of (X.)*tw r sdm*

Early occurrences of (X.)*tw r sdm*—that is *tw r sdm* preceded by *iw*, *nty*, or bare *tw r sdm*—are from letters, accounts, and legal texts (including monumentally published ones), in main clauses (i) and in relative clauses (ii). Further early occurrences are in a graffito (iii) and in a personal name (iv):

(i) P. UC 32200, 20-21 (a letter)

*n iw.tw r gmt=i k3 ø nfr*

'Am I am going to be found, then good!'

Sim., in legal texts, P. UC 32055, ro 9 *iw.tw r rḏt rḏt p3 s 2* (...) 'The two men will be made to swear (...)'; *Stèle Juridique* 21 (Nebirierau, D.17) *iw.tw r rḏt rḏt=sn* (...) 'They will be made to swear (...)'.<sup>16</sup>

(ii) P. UC 32190A, ro III.5 (an account)

*ir.tw m ntt tw r wḏ*

'There will be acted according to what will be decreed.'

Sim., in a letter, P. UC 32287, 2-3 (...) *ntt tw r irt* '(...) what will be done'; in a legal text, *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep 5 (early D.13, originally

<sup>13</sup> Emendation after Schenkel (in press: §3.5).

<sup>14</sup> Common from the early Eighteenth Dynasty on, e.g. Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* ro 14-15 = vso 17 *wn.in.tw hr sh3t* (...) 'Then one remembered (...)'; *Urk.* IV 4, 3-4 (Ahmes son of Abana) *wn.in.tw hr ḥ3* (...) 'Then one fought (...)'; *Chapelle Rouge*, p.131: VII.12 (HHBT II 25, 5) *wn.in.tw hr irt sntr* 'Then one did the censuring'; *Urk.* IV 1297, 9/10 (Amenhotep II's *Syrian Campaigns*) *wn.in.tw hr ḥt p3 s 6* (...) 'Then one hung the six men (...)'.<sup>17</sup>

Ugaf?) *ir rf nty tw<sup>sic</sup> nb r gmt=f* (...) ‘As regards, however, anyone who will be found (...)’.

(iii) Uronarti Quay Inscription (*temp.* Senwosret III)<sup>15</sup>

*iw.tw r gmt mw* (...)

‘Water had to be found (...)’

(iv) A personal name (documented in the period D.13-18)<sup>16</sup>

*tw(-r)-mrt=s*

‘She-will-be-loved’

On bare *tw r sdm*, §5.1.2.2.2.

In Middle Egyptian literature, (*X*.)*tw r sdm* is found in the following places, mostly in one text, *Neferti*:

(a) In a relative clause: *Ipuwer* 4.6 *ptr nt<t> tw r irt* ‘What will one do?’<sup>17</sup>

(b) As bare *tw r sdm* (discussion: §5.1.2.2.2):

- as the original reading: *Neferti*, *passim*: *tw r sdm* (7x), *iw.tw r sdm* (1x);

- as a secondary reading: *Kheti* 3.5-6 (2x, about half of mss.); *Hymn* 6.4 (one ms.); *Neferti* 10e; *Ptahhotep* 72 L2; implied in *Ptahhotep* 82 L2.

In the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty, the construction is still confined to relatively less formal written registers, a letter, Thutmose III’s *Annals*, a menology, and in a caption:

(v) P. Berlin 10463, ro 1-2 (*temp.* Amenhotep II)

(...) *iw iw.tw r mni r hwt-shm*

‘(...) when one will moor in Hutsekhem.’

In a construction that also represents the earliest occurrence of the circumstantial future (*iw iw=f r sdm*).<sup>18</sup> *Sim. Urk.* IV 656, 2-4 (Thutmose III’s *Annals*) (...) *sspd h<sup>c</sup>w=tn r-ntt iw.tw r thn r h<sup>c</sup>3 hn<sup>c</sup> hr pf hsy m dw3* (...) ‘(...) get your weapons ready for one will engage in combat with this vile enemy in the morning (...)’; *sim.* 694, 7. Eighteenth Dynasty Menology 8 *iw.tw r m(w)t n r3-<sup>c</sup> w<sup>c</sup>b* ‘One will die because of the activity of the *wab*-priest’; *sim.* 3 (§5.1.1.1, (iii)). *Urk.* IV 1023, 15 (in a caption in the Theban Tomb of Amenmes, *temp.* Amenhotep III) *iw.tw r dd n nn k3w* (...) ‘One will say about (lit. to) these bulls (...)’.

Prior to the innovation of (*X*.)*tw r sdm*, as well as, after its innovation, in higher registers, synthetic *sdm.t=f*—a T-passive of the prospective—provides the regular passive counterpart to active *NP r sdm* (§3.3.B).

<sup>15</sup> Vernus (1990: 14, ex.29).

<sup>16</sup> Vernus (1990: 7, n.16).

<sup>17</sup> Stauder (2013a: 465).

<sup>18</sup> Kroeber (1970: 132, ex.1); Stauder (2013a: 12).

5.1.2.2.2 *Tw r sdm*

While a subtype of the higher-order *(X).tw r sdm*, bare *tw r sdm* merits additional comments. In the construction *(X).tw r sdm*—and in the construction *(X).tw hr sdm* to be discussed below similarly (§5.1.2.3)—*.tw* occupies the same slot as pronominal subjects, yet differs from these in not always requiring a default morphological host on which to cliticize, *iw*. This different behavior of *.tw* vis-à-vis pronominal subject expressions evidently reflects the different origin of the former: unlike pronominal expressions, *.tw* used in preverbal position derives from an inflectional marker of the passive.

The conditions under which *.tw* can be used without a default morphological host are analyzed through a consideration of the distribution of the construction *tw r sdm*. This occurs in:

- (a) A personal name *tw(-r)-mrt=s* ‘She-will-be-loved’ (§5.1.2.2.1, (iv));
- (b) In one literary composition, *Neferti*, in which it is integral to the original text: 6b; 7g; 7h (twice); 8f; 10h; 15a;
- (c) In New Kingdom manuscripts of Middle Egyptian literary compositions, as a secondary reading:
  - altered from bare *tw sdm*: *Kheti* 3.5-6 (about half of the mss.);<sup>19</sup> *Hymn* 6.4 (1 ms.: O. Var.Lit.A);<sup>20</sup> *Neferti* 10e (1 ms.: O. GC 90).<sup>21</sup>
  - altered from other constructions: *Ptahhotep* 72 L2; implied by 82 L2.<sup>22</sup>

Occurrences of the construction as a secondary reading (c) mainly demonstrate that the construction was deemed acceptable to early New Kingdom scribes in a Middle Egyptian literary register: they tell little of the grammatical conditions under which the construction was licensed, as (a) and (b) do. Turning to these, *tw r sdm* in (a) is in a personal name. When these are clausal as is here the case, personal names represent a segment of speech that is not part of continuous discourse. The functions of *iw*, on the other hand, revolve around the expression of an assertive modality and the anchoring of a segment of speech to the speech situation and/or its co(n)text—both domains to do with discourse. When not a mandatory default morphological host, *iw* is accordingly rare in personal names (e.g. *imn-ḥtp* ‘Amun-is-satisfied’, not *\*iw imn ḥtp*); this is precisely the case with *.tw*.<sup>23</sup>

Outside this personal name, *tw r sdm* occurs as a primary reading only in one text, *Neferti*. In this text, the construction is very common (seven occurrences), and is therefore to be analyzed in relation to broader aspects of the macro-syntactic articulation of the composition. One occurrence is in a sequence introduced by presentifying *d=i n=k*. Semantically, this has scope over a series of subject-first

19 Stauder (2013a: 384-8).

20 Stauder (2013a: 383).

21 Stauder (2013a: 377-82).

22 Stauder (2013a: 94-6, 358-61).

23 Further, Stauder (2013a: 364-5).



clauses that follow, all without *iw*. *Tw r sdm* patterns just like these (a similar analysis extends to occurrences of *tw sdm* in the same composition, §5.1.2.3.2):

(i) *Neferti* 10f-h

*d=i n=k nb m nhpw rwty htp (...)*

***tw r rdt ht m msdd r sgr r3 mdw (...)***

‘I will show you the lord in sorrow, the outsider satisfied, (...)’

Goods will be given with hatred to silence a speaking mouth (...)’

In most cases, bare *tw r sdm* stands in segment-initial position, often mirrored by the division of the composition in stanzas. The lack of *iw* in segment-initial position is regular in Middle Egyptian grammar, e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 135-136 *dd.in sh̄ty pn h3w n ʕhʕw hr si3t n=f* ‘This peasant said: “The measurer of heaps is cheating for himself!”’<sup>24</sup> The lack of *iw* can thus reflect that a clause opens a new segment of discourse, in other words, that it is not linguistically related to preceding discourse.<sup>25</sup> In *Neferti* similarly, clauses opening a new segment of discourse are without *iw*. By contrast, clauses that are within a given segment have *iw*. This macro-syntactic articulation holds with the active construction *NP r sdm* (ii), as it does when one or both constructions are passive (iii)-(iv).<sup>26</sup>

*Active – active*

(ii) *Neferti* 14a-e

*s3 n s r irt rn=f (...)*

*iw ʕ3mw r hr n sʕt=f (...)*

‘The son of a man will make his name (...);

(And) the Asiatics will fall to his slaughtering (...)’

*Passive – active*

(iii) *Neferti* 15a-e

***tw r kd inbw hk3 ʕ.w.s. (...)***

*iw m3ʕt r iit r st=s (...)*

‘The Walls of the Ruler L.P.H. will be built (...);

(And) *Maat* will return to its place (...)’

Sim., with the passive clause in direct continuation to a segment-initial non-verbal clause, *Neferti* 6a-e *iwtrw šw nw kmt (...)* ***tw r hhy mw n ʕhʕw r skdw=f (...)*** *iw r3-sw r hsf (...)* ‘The river of Egypt is dry (...); One will seek water for ships to travel it (...) (And) the south wind will oppose (...)’.

24 Vernus (1997: 57-61).

25 Stauder & Uljas (in prep.).

26 Further, Stauder (2013a: 365-7).

*Passive – passive*(iv) *Neferti* 8f-9a<sup>27</sup>***tw r šsp ḥꜣw nw ḥꜣ (...)******iw.tw r irt ḥꜣw m biꜣ (...)***

‘Weapons of combat will be taken up (...);

(And) arms will be made of copper (...)’

The segment includes the sole instance of *iw.tw r sdm* in *Neferti*. This occurs in the exact same macro-syntactic position as e.g. *iw ꜣmw r ḥr (...)* in 14e (ii), further demonstrating that the distribution between *tw r sdm* (seven times in *Neferti*) and *iw.tw r sdm* (once in *Neferti*) is principled.

In one passage, finally, three bare *tw r sdm* constructions follow directly upon one another, as if each would open a new segment of discourse. This deviation from the more general macro-syntactic articulation of the lament is interpreted as expressing a heightened sense of urgency. In not being related to preceding discourse, the events are each presented en bloc:

(v) *Neferti* 7g-h***tw r šk mꜣkt m grḥ******tw r ꜣḥnrwt******tw r snbt ꜣdd m irty***

‘A ladder will be waited for at night!

Strongholds will be entered!

Slumber in the eyes will be swept away!’

Like in the personal name discussed first, the lack of *iw* in bare *tw r sdm* in *Neferti* thus relates to broader aspects of the syntax of *iw*. It requires a complex macro-syntactic articulation such as is given in the lament in *Neferti* for *iw*-less constructions, active and passive ones alike, to be used. This makes the construction a de facto literary one.<sup>28</sup> As noted, the recurrence of the construction as a secondary reading in early New Kingdom manuscripts of some Middle Egyptian literary texts suggests that the construction may then have had a distinct literary flavor. This may even have derived from the de facto association of the construction with a literary register in *Neferti*, regardless of when this text was originally composed.<sup>29</sup>

5.1.2.3 (X.)*tw ḥr sdm* not preceded by an inflected form of *wnn*

The third step of the extension of {t} to subject-first verbal patterns concerns (X.)*NP ḥr sdm* not preceded by an inflected form of *wnn*.

27 The rubrum in 9a reflects editorial practices. As the semantic continuity and the macro-syntactic articulation imply, these verses form a sequence.

28 Further, Stauder (2013a: 367).

29 Stauder (2013a: 337-443).

5.1.2.3.1 Early occurrences of (X.)*tw hr sdm*

A. Early attestations of unauxiliated (X.)*tw hr sdm* expressing the progressive are found from the later Second Intermediate Period on, in circumstantial (i) and in non-circumstantial environments (ii) (on *tw sdm*, which also belongs here, §5.1.2.3.2):

(i) *Tale Involving the House of Life* X+5.2-4<sup>30</sup>

*ir.in.tw ḥꜥw r hrw 40 m ḥb nfr n [...]*

*iw.tw hr swr m [...]*

‘And a period up to forty days was spent in a beautiful festival of/for [...] drinking from/in [...]’

Sim. *Urk.* IV 649, 15-17 (Thutmose III’s *Annals*) *sw mi ih šmt hr mtn pn nty w3 r ḥns iw.tw hr smit r-dd (...)* ‘How will it be, walking on this path which has now become narrow, when it is reported that (...)?’ *Mutter und Kind* VIII.1-2<sup>31</sup> *dd.tw r3 pn iw.tw hr dt wnm hrd pnw psw r3-pw mwt=k<sup>sic</sup>* ‘One should recite this spell while one has either the child or his mother eat the cooked mouse.’<sup>32</sup>

(ii) *Astarte* (*temp.* Amenhotep II), I.x+10

*hr mk tw.tw hr in n=f inw [...]*

‘And look, one is bringing him tribute [...]’

Sim. *Paheri*, pl.3, 2<sup>nd</sup> register from bottom, 2<sup>nd</sup> inscription from the right, 10-11 *hr tw.tw hr 3s=n m šmt* ‘And they are hurrying us in (our) going’; *Urk.* IV 656, 5 (Thutmose III’s *Annals*) (...) *hr-ntt tw.tw [...]* ‘(...) because one [...]’.<sup>33</sup> Also, in a quotative expression, *Ipuwer* 14.11 *iw.tw hr* ‘One says’, contrasting in a similar position with *iw dd.tw* (12.1).<sup>34</sup>

As the textual distribution of the construction shows, it remains mostly associated with more generally innovative registers in pre-Amarna times.<sup>35</sup> In times prior to the innovation of (X.)*tw hr sdm*, as well as, after its innovation, in higher registers, synthetic *sdm.t NP*—a T-passive of the unaccomplished *sdm=f*—provides the regular passive counterpart to the active progressive *NP hr sdm* (§3.1.1).

B. In the early New Kingdom, {t} is extended to further constructions that include *NP hr sdm*, *ḥꜥ.n=f hr sdm* (iii) and sequential *iw=f hr sdm* (iv):

30 On the dating to the later Second Intermediate Period, Stauder (2013a: 212-3).

31 On the dating, provisionally Stauder (2013a: 393).

32 Sim. in a medical text in Middle Egyptian, P. Berlin 3038, 19.7 (manuscript dating to the Nineteenth Dynasty) *phrt swr irt iw.tw hr irt phrt* ‘A potion for drinking which is made while one is making a remedy.’

33 The construction can be restored as *tw.tw hr sdm*, not *tw.tw r sdm* (a rare construction, also documented: §5.1.2.4.B), based on the formal contrast in the expression of the subject with *Urk.* IV 656, 3 (...) *r-ntt iw.tw r thn* (§5.1.2.2.1, (v)).

34 Stauder (2013a: 394).

35 On *Astarte* in particular, a composition the linguistic typology of which can be described as genuinely transitional between Middle and Late Egyptian, Collombert & Coulon (2000: 211-6); Stauder (2013a: 33-5).

(iii) *Urk.* IV 7, 16 (Ahmes son of Abana)

*ḥᶜ.n.tw ḥr twᶜ=i m nbw (...)*

‘I was rewarded with gold (...)’

(iv) *Urk.* IV 1304, 2 (Amenhotep II’s *Syrian Campaigns*)

*(...) iw.tw ḥr rd(t) iry=sn sdfβ-iryt*

‘(...) and One (*scil.* the king) had them swear an oath of allegiance.’

Active *ḥᶜ.n=f ḥr sdm* is documented already in the Twelfth Dynasty,<sup>36</sup> but then remains fairly marginal against the more common *ḥᶜ.n sdm.n=f*. The passive pendant to the construction is then *ḥᶜ.n P<sub>O</sub> PsP ~ ḥᶜ.n V-pass N* (§4.1.1, (vii)-(viii); §4.1.3, (ii.a)-(ii.b)). Analytic *ḥᶜ.n=f ḥr sdm* would become more common only in the early New Kingdom, the very time when {t} was extended to it. As to sequential *iw=f ḥr sdm*, this is first documented in a fully developed form by the times of Thutmosis III and Amenhotep II, notably in documentary texts and in texts recounting military activities.<sup>37</sup> The first occurrence with {t} in the subject slot derives from the same period, and from one of the same texts.

C. In post-Amarna times, {t} is also with *NP ḥr sdm* expressing the unmarked unaccomplished, with a general or habitual interpretation:

(v) *Allen droht die Rekrutierung* 3-5

*tw.tw ḥr snh smdt nbt*

*tw.tw ḥr tšl nšy=sn nᶜ*

*tw.tw ḥr dīt pš r wᶜw pš mnḥ r mgi*

*pš šri tw.tw ḥr šhpr=f(...)*

‘All dependent personnel is drafted,

the best of them is taken;

The man is made a soldier, the young man a “young fighter”,

The child, he is raised (...)’

Some manuscripts omit *ḥr* in one or several of the above constructions, resulting in written forms as *tw.tw sdm*.<sup>38</sup> Sim. e.g. *KRI* I 238, 14-15 (P. Cairo 58075, 8) *ḥr tw.tw ḥr šd bškw=f m-di=i rnpt n rnpt* ‘And one was requesting its production from me year after year’; *passim*.

While isolated occurrences of *NP ḥr sdm* expressing a general or habitual event are found as early as the late Twelfth Dynasty,<sup>39</sup> the process by which *NP ḥr sdm* would completely supersede the regular expression of the unmarked unaccomplished, *N(P) sdm=f*, would take centuries. In the early New Kingdom, *N(P) sdm=f* was still productive in various registers,<sup>40</sup> and the full generalization of *NP ḥr sdm* as the sole

36 E.g. *Shipwrecked Sailor* 170 *ḥᶜ.n=i ḥr išš n mšᶜ (...)* ‘I called the troop (...)’.

37 On early steps in the rise of sequential *iw=f ḥr sdm*, Kroeber (1970: 126-31); Vernus (1990: 192-3); Kruchten (1999: 74-81); Collombert & Coulon (2000: 214); Stauder (2013a: 11, 39, 51).

38 Jäger (2004: 273).

39 Vernus (1990: 185-90).

40 Stauder (2013a: 152-5).

expression of the unaccomplished was completed only with the rise of Late Egyptian itself as a written standard. This is also the time when {t} was extended to *NP hr sdm* expressing not solely the progressive but also for general or habitual events. *X.tw hr sdm* expressing general or habitual events is therefore Late Egyptian.

#### 5.1.2.3.2 *Tw sdm*

The construction *tw sdm* is not recognized in grammars and grammatical studies and therefore merits a distinct discussion. Occurrences are in three Middle Egyptian literary texts:

##### (i) *Hymn 6.3-4*

*šms sw d3mw hrdw*

***tw nd hrt=f m nsw***

‘When a troop of children follows him,  
he is greeted as a king.’

All witnesses read *tw nd hrt=f* except one, O. Var.Lit.A, which alters to *tw r nd hrt=f*.

##### (ii) *Kheti 3.5-6*

*š3c.n=f w3d iw=f m hrd*

***tw nd hrt=f***

***tw h3b=f r irt wpt***

*n iy=f sw sd=f sw m d3iw*

‘When he has, still a child, begun to flourish,  
he is greeted;  
He is sent to carry out a mission:  
before he has returned, he clads himself in a kilt.’

The manuscript tradition is split roughly equally between readings as *tw nd-hrt=f* *tw h3b=f* and such as *tw r nd-hrt=f* *tw r h3b=f*. The former is original.<sup>41</sup>

##### (iii) *Neferti 10c-e*

*hdd m irt wš{.tw}<t> m gmyt irt m tmmt ir*

***tw nhm ht s r=f rdw n nty m rwty***

‘Destruction is in what had been done, what is lost is what had been found,  
what is done is what had not been done;  
A man’s property is taken from him to be given to the one who is outside.’

*Tw nhm* is generally emended into *tw <r> nhm*, but the text is demonstrably correct as it stands.<sup>42</sup>

41 On this, as well as on other textual issues in this passage, Stauder (2013a: 384-8).

42 Stauder (2013a: 377-82).

(iv) *Neferti* 12a-c

$\underline{d}=i\ n=k$      $t3\ m\ sny-mny$   
 $s3\text{-}^c\ m\ nb\ ^c$   
**tw nd-hrt nd-hrt**

$\underline{d}=i\ n=k$  (...)

‘I will show you the land in calamity,  
the weak of hand now a lord of force,  
the one who did the greeting being greeted.

I will show you (...)’

In (i) and (ii), *tw sdm* is after a clause that provides a setting to it (*Hymn* 6.3  $\underline{s}ms\ sw\ d3mw\ hrdw$ ; *Kheti* 3.5  $\underline{s}3\text{-}^c.n=f\ w3d\ iw=f\ m\ hrd$ ).<sup>43</sup> In the active, an unaccomplished main clause has the progressive *NP hr sdm* (v). That *tw sdm* provides a passive counterpart to the progressive *NP hr sdm* in *Hymn* and *Kheti* is confirmed by a contrast with (vi), where  $\underline{s}dm.t=f$  expresses the unmarked unaccomplished in a conditional construction:

(v) *Siut* III, 10

$i\ wh$   
 **$\underline{s}dr\ hr\ mtn\ hr\ rdt\ n(=i)\ i3(w)$**

‘When the night came,  
the man sleeping on the road used to praise me’;

Sim. e.g. *Urk.* IV 18, 10 - 19, 5 (Ahmose’s *Karnak Eulogy*)  $\underline{pr}r=f\ [pd]t=f\ hr\ gs=fy\ mi\ i^fh$  (...)  $\underline{h}3tiw\ hr\ ftft\ n=f$  ‘When he comes forth, his archery at his side like Iah (...), the hearts are shuddering for him’; *Merikare* E 135  $\underline{r}mm=sn\ iw=f\ hr\ \underline{s}dm$  ‘When they cry, he is listening.’

(vi) *Kheti* 14.3 (T. Louvre 693)

$ir\ \underline{h}b3=f\ hrw\ nn\ \underline{s}ht\{tw\}$   
 **$\underline{h}w.tw=f\ m\ \underline{s}sm\ 50$**

‘If he wastes a day without weaving,  
he is beaten with fifty whips.’

In (iii) and (iv), *tw sdm* is under the scope of a presentification of the event, expressed by the recurrent  $\underline{d}=i\ n=k$  (...) ‘I will show you (...)’.<sup>44</sup> According with the *Einst-Jetzt* articulation of the lament, situations and events under such scope refer to present tense situations (thus, with non-verbal and non-dynamic patterns, *NP m NP*, *NP PsP*, the former illustrated in (iii)-(iv)). In the active, dynamic events under the scope of presentification are in the progressive *NP hr sdm*, in *Neferti* (vii) and in other Middle Egyptian literary texts with a similar temporal-aspectual articulation (viii):

<sup>43</sup> Stauder (2013a: 383 and 385-6, respectively).

<sup>44</sup> Stauder (2013a: 382).

(vii) *Neferti* 9f

*q=t n=k s3 m hrwy sn m hft*  
*s hr sm3 it=f(...)*

‘I will show you the son an enemy, the brother an opponent,  
 a man killing his father (...)’

(viii) *A Man to His Son* 8.1-6

*m33=n h3st nbt hr hrtyt=f*  
*iw wrw=sn hr knb n=f sn (...)*  
*pwnt idbw h3w-nbwt iw ntr hr nwh n=f st (...)*

‘We see every foreign country dreading him:  
 Their great ones are inclining themselves to him (...);  
 Punt and the shores of the Hau-Nebu, the god is binding them for him (...)’

Sim. throughout *Kheti*.<sup>45</sup>

That the two instances of *tw sdm* in *Neferti* provide the passive counterpart to the active progressive *NP hr sdm* finds a further confirmation in an analysis of the broader temporal articulation of the lament.<sup>46</sup>

In all three texts in which it occurs, *tw sdm* therefore provides the passive counterpart to progressive *NP hr sdm*, after a setting clause (in *Hymn* and *Kheti*) and with events under the scope of presentification. This analysis also accounts for why *tw sdm* is *iw*-less. After a setting clause, progressive *NP hr sdm* is preceded by *iw* only when this is required as a default morphological host (v). As to constructions expressing situations and events under the scope of presentification, these similarly lack *iw*: for progressive *NP hr sdm*, this is illustrated in *Neferti* 9f (vii); in another text, e.g. *Kheti* 7.1 (stanza-initial) *h3kw hr h3k m phwy m3rw* ‘The barber is still shaving at the end of the evening.’<sup>47</sup>

Like in *tw r sdm*, the lack of *iw* in *tw sdm* thus relates to broader aspects of the syntax of *iw*. Like *tw r sdm*, *tw sdm* is similarly a de facto literary construction: although integral to regular Middle Egyptian grammar, the conditions under which *iw* can be omitted will typically be met in literature only.<sup>48</sup> For the purpose of the analysis of the change here under discussion, *tw sdm*—a passive counterpart to progressive *NP hr sdm* in a limited subset of Middle Egyptian literary texts—appears to be a subtype of the higher-order *(X.)tw hr sdm* discussed before (§5.1.2.3.1.A).

#### 5.1.2.4 Integration into the paradigm of the new subject pronoun: *Tw.tw*

A. In the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty, *.tw* is integrated into the paradigm of the newly innovated new subject pronoun. The impersonal form of this pronoun, *tw.tw*, is modeled on the forms in interlocutive persons (*tw=i*, *tw=k*, (...), *tw.tw*). Pre-Amarna

45 Stauder (2013a: 80-2).

46 Stauder (2013a: 379-82).

47 On aspects of the the presence or absence of *iw* in *Kheti* as relating to presentification, Stauder (2013a: 81-2).

48 On this and further aspects of the de facto literariness of the construction, Stauder (2013a: 389-90).

occurrences of *tw.tw* are the following, all from also otherwise innovative registers, in Paheri's Reden und Rufe (a), in Thutmosis III's *Annals* (b), and in *Astarte* (c):

(a) *Paheri*, pl.3, 2<sup>nd</sup> register from bottom, 2<sup>nd</sup> inscription from the right, 10-11 (*temp.* Thutmosis III) *hr tw.tw hr 3s=n m šmt* 'And they are hurrying us in (our) going'; pl.3, 3<sup>rd</sup> register from top, central horizontal inscription *hrw nfr tw.tw kb* (...) 'A good day: one is cool (...)';

(b) *Urk.* IV 656, 5 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*) (...) *hr-ntt tw.tw* [...] '(...) because one [...]';

(c) *Astarte* (*temp.* Amenhotep II), I.x+10 *hr mk tw.tw hr in n=f inw* [...] 'And look, one is bringing him tribute [...]'.<sup>49</sup>

The new subject pronoun was itself innovated only shortly before: the first attestation is in the late Seventeenth Dynasty (Antefnakht's Stela 3) and the pronoun remains strongly associated with innovative registers throughout pre-Amarna times.<sup>49</sup> Taking into account the lesser text frequency of an impersonal form over personal forms, it appears that *tw.tw* would have been possible as soon as the new subject pronoun itself was innovated. As a result of having gained constituent status in the constructions discussed above (§5.1.2.1-3), *.tw* was thus available for an immediate integration into the paradigm of the new subject pronoun as soon as it emerged.

B. In two instances, *tw.tw* is found in an impersonal construction of the Exploratory Future III (/‘Frühneuägyptisches Futur’<sup>50</sup>):

(i) O. Cairo 25372,<sup>51</sup> 1-2  
 [...] *tw.tw r mst*  
 [...] *tw r irt mw nw* (...)  
 '[...] one will give birth;  
 [...] one will do water of(?) (...)']

(ii) *KRI* I 69, 3 (Sethi I's *Kanais Inscription*, C, 12)  
*mk tw.[t]w r wšb=f m iwnw* (...)  
 'Look, he will be answered in Heliopolis (...)'

These occurrences align with other instances of the Exploratory Future III in the early New Kingdom.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Stauder (2013a: 221-2).

<sup>50</sup> Kroeber (1970: 93-7).

<sup>51</sup> On the problematic dating of this document, Stauder (2013a: 368-9).

<sup>52</sup> *Kamose Inscriptions* T. Carnarvon 4; Stela I 10 (Stauder 2013a: 45); *Ptahhotep* 82 L2 (a secondary reading: Stauder 2013a: 94-5); *Heavenly Cow* 215 S, R.III; 232 S, R.II (both secondary readings: Stauder 2013a: 303).



### 5.1.3 Further diagnostics

Other phenomena that are diagnostic of an ongoing change affecting {t} include rare occurrences of {t} with the ‘narrative’ construction of the infinitive (§5.1.3.1), equally rare instances of a written complementation of {t} with the plural strokes (§5.1.3.2), and constructions in which {t} is set twice, regular ones (§5.1.3.3) and exceptional ones (§5.1.3.4).

#### 5.1.3.1 {T} with the ‘narrative’ construction of the infinitive

The Earlier Egyptian infinitive can not accommodate inflectional morphology. When an infinitive is used in a passive construction, in the construction *NP<sub>O</sub> r sdm*, this is a feature of the construction, not of the form; the orientation is semantic (§2.3.2). The infinitive itself can be read passively, given the nominal orientation of the form (§2.3.3). In either case, the infinitive remains unmarked for voice. In very few cases, however, an infinitive is combined with a marker of voice, {t}. In these constructions, {t} functions as if it had constituent status.

All three occurrences of an infinitive marked for voice by {t} are with the so-called ‘narrative’ construction of the infinitive, a construction used in places where a predicative construction of the verb could have been used. The marking of the infinitive for voice is therefore through a non-regular analogical extension. The first two occurrences from the Twelfth Dynasty, the very period in which other signs of an incipient change affecting {t} are noticed (§5.1.1.1; §5.1.2.1-2). In these early occurrences, {t} is written *tw*. In text-initial position, this can not be for linguistic dissimilation and is therefore interpreted as signaling constituent status (§1.1.1.E, *fine*). The interpretation is confirmed by the written complementation of {t} by the plural strokes in (i), pointing to a referential content of the unexpressed Agent (§5.1.3.2), here the members of the expedition:

(i) Wadi el-Hudi 10, 1-4 (*temp.* Senwosret I)

*hsbt 22 prt tw<sup>PLUR</sup> r hsmn n hr ʿnh-mswt (...)*

‘Year 22. Going out for natron one did for the Horus Ankhmesut (...)’

(ii) Iykhernefret (CG 20140; *temp.* Amenemhat III), b.1-2

*hsbt 1 hr hm=f<sup>sc</sup> nsw-bit n-m3ʿt-rʿ ʿnh dt*

*sʿhʿ tw wd pn (...)*

‘Year 1 under His Majesty, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Nimaatre, living eternally.

Erecting this stela one did (...)’

(iii) *Urk. IV 656, 14-16 (Thutmose III's Annals)*<sup>53</sup>

*lṯt tw r dd n ḥm=f*

*mrw snb iw<sup>c</sup>yt rst mḥtt r-mitt*

‘The coming one did to tell His Majesty:

“The coast is clear, the southern and northern garrisons likewise.”’

### 5.1.3.2 Written expression of a referential content of {t}: *Tw*<sup>PLUR</sup>

Two cases of a written complementation of {t} by the plural strokes are found in the Twelfth Dynasty. The general connection between the (third person) plural and the passive is recurrent cross-linguistically: the third person plural is the grammatical person scoring lowest in individuation, while the unexpressed Agent of the passive, for its part, often has a plurality of (possible) referents (§2.7.1.1). In the later history of Egyptian, from the late New Kingdom on, a third person plural construction would replace all {t}-marked constructions. In Earlier Egyptian itself, a construction with a non-anaphoric third person plural subject serves as a marginal alternative to the passive (§2.7.1.2). Among the two occurrences of a written complementation of {t} by the plural strokes, one (i) is in a ‘narrative’ construction of the infinitive, in a construction, therefore, in which {t} is treated morphosyntactically as if it had constituent status (§5.1.3.1). The other (ii) is in a construction in which {t} occupies its old inflectional position after a verb implying an Agent in its semantic representation.<sup>54</sup> In both cases similarly, the written complementation implies that {t} was at least occasionally construed not as a marker of voice (a grammatical category), but as pointing to a referent. Put differently, these marginal instances imply that {t} was construed as itself having a referential content in some speakers’ representations. Significantly, both occurrences below are from expedition accounts, thereby probably from a less formal register of written performance:

(i) Wadi el-Hudi 10, 1-4 (*temp.* Senwosret I)

*ḥsbt 22 prt tw<sup>PLUR</sup> r ḥsmn n ḥr ḥnh-mswt (...)*

‘Year 22. Going out for natron one did for the Horus Ankhmesut (...)’

(ii) Hammamat 19, 8-10 (Meri, *temp.* Amenemhat III)

*ḥw-3 ir.t<sup>PLUR</sup> sm3 sfn inrw*

‘May a ramp be made that will make soft (the way for) the slabs!’

(An altogether different type of written complementation of *.tw* is found in Ramesside times: when referring to the king, the morpheme can then be complemented by the common classifier for divine beings, G7 (e.g. §5.1.4.4, (iii)).)

<sup>53</sup> Edel (1981); Barta (1995).

<sup>54</sup> The same inscription includes two instances of {t} in preverbal position in a *wn(X).t ḥr sdm* construction, as well as an instance of a perfective V-passive; while the latter is an inflectional passive, the former are active impersonal constructions morphologically (§5.1.2.1, (ii)).

5.1.3.3 Regular doubling of {t}: *K3.t sdm.t=f* and *hr.t sdm.t=f*

Constructions in which {t} can be regularly doubled are *k3.t sdm.t=f* and *hr.t sdm.t=f*. Despite their outward formal similarity, these have a partly different history, both in the passive and in the active.

A. In the Twelfth Dynasty, active *k3*-headed constructions include such in which *k3* precedes the pattern *NP sdm=f* (*k3 NP sdm=f*) and such in which *k3* precedes a subjunctive or a prospective (*k3 sdm=f*).<sup>55</sup> In the passive similarly, the morphological pendants of both these constructions are documented from the Twelfth Dynasty on: *k3.t sdm.t=f* and *k3 sdm.t=f*. The former is here of interest, because it implies a doubling of {t}:

(i) P. UC 32190A, ro III.8-9

*ir m-ht spr=sn k3.tw sdm.tw m hs iry*

‘After they have arrived, it will be heard by their return!’

For *k3 sdm.t=f*, with a transitive verb, P. UC 32055, ro 18-19 *k3 d.tw n=k [p3] tpi-r3* ‘Then you may be given the sum’; in a subjectless construction, P. UC 32287ii, ro 3 *k3 h3b.tw n=f hr=s* ‘Then there may be sending to him about it.’

(ii) *Urk.* IV 768, 11-2 (an inscription of Thutmose III in the temple of Ptah in Karnak)

*ir m-ht ht p hm n ntr pn špss m ht=f k3.tw d.tw pr h n wdn (...)*

‘When the Majesty of this august god is satisfied with his things, then the heap of offerings will be made to come out (...)’

Sim. *Urk.* IV 1068, 7 (Will of Senimose) (...) *k3.tw psš.tw hwt=f n msww=f [...]*  
‘(...) then his things will be divided for his children [...]’.

B. In the case of *hr*-headed constructions, only the construction in which *hr* precedes *NP sdm=f* (*hr NP sdm=f*) is found in the Twelfth Dynasty;<sup>56</sup> the construction in which *hr* precedes the subjunctive (*hr sdm=f*) is a later development, not documented before the Eighteenth Dynasty.<sup>57</sup> In the passive, *hr.t sdm.t=f* is found from the early Thirteenth Dynasty on:

(iii) *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep 5-6 (originally Ugaf?)

*ir rf nty tw nb r gmt=f (...)*

*hr.t wbd.t=f*

‘As regards, however, anyone who will be found (...),  
he must be burnt.’

Sim. *Stèle Juridique* 25-26 *fdk wd3 m s3=i N nn hrdw=f hr.tw d.tw p3y=i h3ti- n nhb n snw=f nw mwt=f* ‘The succession having been broken in my son N who is childless, my (office) of governor of Nekheb must be given to his maternal

<sup>55</sup> Vernus (1990: 85-99); Brose (2014: 271-4).

<sup>56</sup> Vernus (1990: 61-84); Brose (2014: 269-71).

<sup>57</sup> Vernus (1990: 66, n.41 and 65, n.39); Stauder (2013a: 226-31).

brothers.’ In the early New Kingdom, e.g. *Urk.* IV 1797, 13 (Memphite Statue of the High Steward Amenhotep) (...) *hr.tw ḏ.tw pr p3 t3 n b3k im* (...) ‘(...) then the bread is made to come out for this humble servant (...)’; *Urk.* IV 1892, 10 (*hr.tw mtr.tw*).

In alternation with synthetic *-hr-* marked forms, P. Smith 21, 9-14<sup>58</sup> *in.hr.tw* (...) *kn.kn.hr.tw* (...) *ir m-ht šww ø hr kd hr.tw ḏn.tw mi ḏn it h3h3.tw* (...) *ir hrpt nbt im hr.tw h3.tw* (...) ‘One is to fetch (...) one is to pound up (...) After it dries out completely, one is to thresh it like barley is threshed, one is to winnow (...) As to anything that comes from there, one is to measure (...)’.

In the early Eighteenth Dynasty *Vizieral Cycle*, *hr NP sdm=f* is found alongside the recently innovated *hr sdm=f*, the two alternating without any discernible difference in meaning or function. This transitional situation extends to the passive, with *hr.t sdm.t=f* alternating with *hr sdm.t=f*:

(iv.a) *Duties of the Vizier* R 3 (*Urk.* IV 1104, 15-16)

*ir dd hry nn sdm nb r-ε=i*

*hr.t ndr.t=f in wpwty[w] n t3ty*

‘If the higher official says “No one besides me is to be heard”,  
he must be arrested by the messengers of the vizier.’

Sim. *Duties* R 14 *hr.t smi.t swd.t*. In the active, *Installation of the Vizier* 21 *hr=k h3b=k*, *hr=k šn=k* [k]; *Duties* R 9 *hr=f d=f*; R 16 *hr=f pg3=f*; R 20 *hr=f šd=f*.

(iv.b) *Installation of the Vizier* 6-7

*ir ir=f nkt [...w r sp=f(...)*

*[h]r rh.tw hr r3 n wpy=f m dd st*

‘If he makes a wrongdoing(?) [...] regarding(?) his case (...),  
it is then known on account of the pronouncing of his decision in these words.’

Sim. *Duties* R 14 *hr w3h.t*; R 15 *hr it.t* (twice); R 20 *hr m3.t*. In the active, *Installation of the Vizier* 12-13 *hr rwd=f*; *Duties* R 5 *[h]r mnmn t3ty*.

C. In *k3.t sdm.t=f* and *hr.t sdm.t=f*, {t} is expressed twice. In Earlier Egyptian, inflectional morphology is doubled in only one case, *-n-* in the construction *h<sup>ε</sup>.n sdm.n=f*. This, however, has its origin in a serial construction, and thereby in a biclausal structure, grammaticalized and simplified.<sup>59</sup> Otherwise, doubling concerns only morphemes that have a referential content, thus in *NPi sdm=f*, and similarly in *k3-* and *hr-*headed patterns themselves. This is illustrated with both a pronominal subject and a full noun subject in the same text from which (i) derives, P. UC

<sup>58</sup> Vernus (1990: 86, ex.135).

<sup>59</sup> On *h<sup>ε</sup>.n sdm.n=f* as a grammaticalized construction, Vernus (2003: 238-40; 1997: 12). Similar, but less common and possibly less grammaticalized serial constructions are *pr.n sdm.n=f* (CT IV 278/279 BH1Br; *Cheops' Court* 6.14), *dr.n sdm.n=f* (*Kagemni* 2.4), *it.n sdm.n=f* (*Cheops' Court* 6.4), and *sdr.n sdm.n=f* (*Sinuhe* B 127) (further Stauder 2013a: 124-5). The source construction is illustrated by e.g. Qaw Bowl, inside, 4 (...) *n irt.n ddt.n s3=k im* (...) ‘(...) even though there is nothing that your son did or said (...)’ (with cotext, §2.6.1.1, (xv)).

32190A: ro III.1-2 (...) *hr=f<sub>i</sub> iw=f<sub>i</sub>* ‘(...) then he must come’; ro III.7-8 (...) *k3 t3ty<sub>i</sub> h3b=f<sub>i</sub> [wp]wtyw=f r=s* ‘(...) the vizier will then send his [en]voys for it.’ On morphological grounds, {t} in ro III.8-9 (...) *k3.tw sdm.tw* (...) ((i) and similarly in the other examples quoted) then itself appears to have a referential content and constituent status. In this respect, the construction would seem to be active impersonal.

However, in these same constructions, a singular pronominal O is coded as a suffix pronoun (*hr.t wbd.t=f* (iii); *hr.t ndr.t=f* (iv.a)), and thereby morphosyntactically as a subject. What is more, *k3*- and *hr*-headed constructions with doubled {t} license the expression of the Agent in syntactic periphery (*hr.t ndr.t=f in wpwtyw n t3ty* (iv.a)). With respect to both the O and the Agent, the construction is therefore passive.

In formal terms, *k3*- and *hr*-headed constructions are therefore hybrids. In their morphology, they are active impersonal: {t} is treated like expressions that have a referential content, and thereby not as an inflectional marker of voice. In their syntax, however, the same constructions are passive: the syntactic subject is the O, the Agent can be expressed in syntactic periphery; {t}, even though doubled, codes voice like it does in constructions in which it clearly is an inflectional morpheme. Such hybrid constructions—the first (*k3.t sdm.t=f*) documented since the late Twelfth Dynasty, the second (*hr.t sdm.t=f*) since the early Thirteenth—are yet other witnesses to ongoing change affecting {t} from the late Middle Kingdom on.

#### 5.1.3.4 Exceptional doubling of {t}

Unlike the *k3.t sdm.t=f* and *hr.t sdm.t=f*, other constructions in which {t} is doubled are exceptional. In (i), the very rare *iw.tw sdm.tw=f* (*/mk tw sdm.tw=f*) stands against the overly common *sdm.t NP* (§3.1.1). In (ii), the first of the two *tw*’s is initial, in an environment that does not meet the syntactic conditions for *tw* being initial (§5.1.2.2.2; §5.1.2.3.2). In addition, the construction includes the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase, resulting in a syntactic hybrid (bare initial *tw* with the *in N* phrase is otherwise documented only once, as the result of a process of textual alteration<sup>60</sup>).

##### (i) *Urk.* IV 344, 9 (*Punt Expedition*)

*iw.tw sdm.tw=f m r3 n r3 m sddw nw imiw-[h3t]*

‘He is heard from mouth to mouth in the recounts of the predecessors.’

Sim. *Installation of the Vizier* 14 *mk tw dd.tw* (...) ‘See, they say: (...)’; sim. 16; *Urk.* IV 1639, 7-9 (Djeserkareseneb) *hrw nfr iw.t sh3.tw nfrw [n imn] ndm-ib hn rdt-i3w r k3 n pt n-h3t.k* ‘A beautiful day: one remembers Amun’s beauty, sweetness of heart and giving praise to the height of the sky before you.’

##### (ii) *Urk.* IV 1281, 14-15 (Amenhotep II’s *Sphinx Stela*)

*tw sdm.tw m pr-nsw in it hr k3-nht h3-m-w3st*

‘There was hearing in the palace by the father, Horus, the victorious bull, Khaemwaset.’

60 *Ptahhotep* 72 L2 *tw r w3=f in sdm.yw* ‘He will be disapproved of by the hearers’ (§1.1.2, (i); Stauder 2013a: 94-6).

The constructions in (i) and (ii) are not documented before the Eighteenth Dynasty, and then only in inscriptional registers. They are therefore interpreted as part of a broader experimentation in written Middle Egyptian occurring in these registers in this time. Even if not part of regular Middle Egyptian grammar, these constructions contribute to demonstrating that the changes affecting {t} discussed in the present chapter had by then occurred.

#### 5.1.4 Constructions that are not, or only uncertainly, diagnostic of change

A series of other constructions with {t} are not, or only uncertainly, indicative of the change discussed in the present chapter.

##### 5.1.4.1 {T} with quotative expressions: *Hr.tw*, *k3.tw*

{T} is regularly found with quotative expressions, with *hr* ((i)-(ii), from the First Intermediate Period on) and with *k3* ((iii), from the Twelfth Dynasty on):

###### (i) Mo<sup>o</sup>alla I.β.4 (Inscription #4)

*i irtw hr.tw r s<sup>c</sup>h<sup>c</sup>(=i)*

‘“O woe!”—so one says about the one I had accused.’

###### (ii) P. Ramesseum 2, vso II.4

*smi hr=tw r rh*

*š3-r3 hr.tw r mdw*

‘“An accuser (lit. a reporter)!”—so one says about the one who knows;

“A gossip!”—so one says about the one who speaks.’

Sim., in the Eighteenth Dynasty, *HHBT* 110, 5; *Urk.* IV 649, 11; 893, 3; 1075, 10; 1092, 5; *passim*.

###### (iii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 160

*isšt pw<sup>nty im</sup> k3.tw*

‘“What is he, the one there”—so will be said.’

*Nty im* secondarily added.<sup>61</sup> Common in Ramesside times.<sup>62</sup>

The inflection of the quotative expressions *hr* and *k3* is defective: *hr* and *k3* are otherwise only inflected for person, not for the verbal categories of tense-aspect-modus. One could thus be tempted to interpret {t} in *hr.tw* and *k3.tw* as representing, not an inflectional marker of voice anymore, but already an impersonal subject pronoun. If so, (i) would bear witness to the very earliest stage of the change discussed in the present chapter, which would have begun with quotative expressions.

However, the paradigms of *hr* and *k3* are defective only because these are quotative expressions. Accordingly, *hr* and *k3* are not inflected for the categories of

<sup>61</sup> Parkinson (2012a: 137).

<sup>62</sup> *TLA* #162850.

tense-aspect-modus, which are in part expressed in the quotative expressions themselves or left unexpressed with these. There is no reason, on the other hand, why *hr* and *k3* should not have been inflected for voice. That a T-passive is formed with *hr* and *k3*, not a V-passive, reflects the aspectual determination of the V-passive as perfective, as opposed to T-passives in which passive morphology codes only voice and is thereby aspectually neutral. All that *hr.tw* and *k3.tw* demonstrate is therefore the very general morphological and semantic componentiality of T-passives, one element of which lies in the possibility to combine {t} with any active stem to mark it for voice (§1.1.3).

As regards the lack of attestation of *hr.tw* before the First Intermediate Period and of *k3.tw* before the Twelfth Dynasty, this could reflect either a linguistic innovation or a skew in the record. The latter possibility can not be discarded altogether because in the Old Kingdom *hr* and *k3* are generally uncommon even in the active. When *hr* introduces a set of non-specific speakers, *hr=sn* is used in the Old Kingdom, with the third person plural pronoun anaphoric either to another third person plural pronoun or to a generic *rmt* ‘people’ (§2.7.1.2, (ii)); the formulation is phraseological. Alternatively, *hr.tw*, and later *k3.tw*, could represent linguistic innovations when they first occur, at least in the written registers that constitute the preserved Earlier Egyptian record. Even if so, these forms need not be a symptom of changes affecting {t} itself: as already noted, all that *hr.tw* and *k3.tw* demonstrate is the general morphological and semantic componentiality of T-passives. In other words, *hr.tw* and *k3.tw* could have been innovated as T-passives of quotative expressions that are morphologically defective for tense-aspect-mood.

#### 5.1.4.2 {T} with relative forms

Among finite forms of the verb, T-passives from relative forms are very uncommon and their existence has been doubted altogether.<sup>63</sup> This is no doubt due to the fact that Earlier Egyptian makes an extremely productive use of passive participles in the functional domain of relativization (§2.4.2). A few instances of relative forms combined with {t} are found nonetheless; the ones that are uncertain are signaled by an interrogation mark:

(i) (?) *Chapelle Blanche* n°245, 2<sup>64</sup>

*htp.k hr[=f] mi irt=f mrrt.tl*

‘I am satisfied about him according to his doing what one likes.’

Sim. n°82, 2; n°180, 2-3 (§1.1.1.F). Other apparently similar constructions in *.ti* in other texts are probably to be analyzed differently.<sup>65</sup>

63 E.g. Gardiner (1957<sup>3</sup>: §388); also Polotsky (1976: 48, n.75); Sethe (1899: ii, §766 and p.486).

64 Thus Borghouts (2010: I, §79.d).

65 Borghouts (2010: I, §79.d).

(ii) *Semna Stela*, Year 8 (Berlin 14753), 1-6<sup>66</sup>

t3š rs iry m ḥsbt 8 (...)

r tm rd sn sw nḥs nb m ḥd (...)

ir(r)<sup>2</sup>.tw nbt nfr ḥn<sup>c</sup>=sn

nn swt rdt ssw3 (...)

‘Southern border made in year 8 (...)

not to let any Nubian pass it faring downstream (...)

Everything one does is good with them

—not however to let pass by (...)’

(iii) *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep 7-9

ir sw(t) ḥ3wt nb n t3 st dsrt

bw irrw n=sn rmt ḥ3wt im

ḥrs.tw im (...)

‘As regards, however, every tomb of the Sacred Place,

the place where people make tombs for themselves

and where they are buried (...)’

On the zero-subject construction, §2.5.2.2.B.

(iv) (?) Mentuhotepi’s *Karnak Stela* 2-3

(...) ir nsw m [...] wd imn m in.n mntw [...]

ḥ<sup>c</sup>.tw ḥr nhm r-ḥ3t=f

pr m pr=f ib=f [...]

‘(...) who is king in(?) [...] Amun’s order, whom Montu has brought [...]

before whom one rejoices shouting loudly,

who has gone out from his domain, his heart [...]

In a sequence of epithets. An alternative interpretation, with ḥ<sup>c</sup>.tw being a non-attributive construction of the *mrr=f* parenthetically inserted is possible as well. In the similar formulation in Akhenaten’s *Second Proclamation*, with a feminine antecedent, the construction with a relative form is clear in one witness: Stela S, 4 (...) ḥ<sup>c</sup>.tw n sdm ḥrw=s ‘(...) at hearing whose (*scil.* the queen’s) voice one exults.’ Other stelae (A, Q, and U) read ḥ<sup>c</sup>.tw (...), which could be either for a parenthetically inserted, non-attributive construction of the *mrr=f* or possibly haplographic for ḥ<sup>c</sup><ṯ>.tw (...). For the more common construction with a passive participle, e.g. *Urk.* IV 269, 8 ḥ<sup>c</sup>w m irt.n=f nbt ‘(...) at whose every doing one exults.’

(v) *Neferti* 10c-d

ḥdd m iryt

wš<ṯ>.tw m gmyt

iryt m tmmt ir

<sup>66</sup> Borghouts (2010: I, §103.d.2, ex.18).



‘Destruction is in what had been done,  
what is being lost is what had been found,  
what is done is what had not been done.’

In both Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses (Pet. *wš.[t]w*; C25224 *wš.tw*); a secondary reading for an original participle, *wš.t*.<sup>67</sup> Also as a secondary reading, here for an original infinitive (*sddt*), Amenemhat 11d<sup>68</sup> *iw ḥms.tw m irt.n=i ḥr sdd<ᵀ><sup>PLUR</sup>.tw im=i* ‘One could relax through what I had done, *on account of what was told of me*.’ In both cases, the {t}-marked relative forms are altered from forms with and ending -t, a participle and an infinitive, respectively. In both cases, an unspecified Agent is thereby introduced in the semantic representation of the event, altering the meaning only slightly in the first example, more significantly in the second.<sup>69</sup>

None of the above occurrences of {t} with a relative form is from the earliest periods, raising the question whether {t} is here the inflectional marker of passive voice or already the impersonal subject pronoun. If the former analysis is correct, T-passives of relative forms exist, if only marginally; if the latter is correct, {t}-marked relative forms are yet another symptom of changes affecting {t}, beyond the ones already discussed.

The issue can not be decided on any secure grounds. Being semantically and morphologically componential, T-passives can be formed on any active stem at all Earlier Egyptian times (§1.1.3). In particular, nothing prevents T-passives from having been formed with relative forms, which are finite forms just like non-attributive finite forms of the verb are. The lack of {t}-marked relative forms in very early times may point to these forms being a post-Old Kingdom innovation, at least in the written registers that make up the record. However, this innovation need not be a symptom of changes affecting {t}: {t}-marked relative forms could have been innovated as T-passives.

#### 5.1.4.3 {T} in control constructions

{T}-marked forms are found in control constructions. However, this need not imply that {t} in these constructions is the impersonal subject pronoun. In discussing the issue, control constructions of *r sdm* and *ḥr sdm* must be distinguished.<sup>70</sup>

A. In (i), one interpretation would seem to be that *r whd* is controlled by {t}, the impersonal subject pronoun in an active construction of *dw3*:

(i) *Khakheperreseneb* vso 4

*dw3.tw r whd{w} r<sup>c</sup>-nb*

‘Every day one wakes up in the morning to suffer.’

67 Similarly Quack (1993a: 78).

68 Stauder (2013a: 448-9).

69 Stauder (2013a: 448-9, 449-50).

70 On Earlier Egyptian control constructions more generally, Uljas (in press).

However, an examination of how *r sdm* can be controlled reveals a more complex picture. As is well known, *r sdm* can be controlled by active subjects. In addition, *r sdm* can also be controlled by passive subjects, both of inflectional passives (ii) and in the *P<sub>O</sub> PsP* construction (iii). The possibility for *r sdm* to be controlled by a passive subject extends even to cases when the infinitive is itself passively read (iv):

(ii) *Sinuhe* B 72-73

*ir.n.tw=f r hwt sti w r ptpt nmiw-s<sup>c</sup>*

‘He was made to smite the Asiatics and to crush the sand-farers.’

Sim. e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 327-329 *srw ir.n.tw ø r hsf r iyt (...)* *srw ir.n.tw ø r hsf r grg (...)* ‘Officials—they were appointed to outlaw evil: (...) Officials—they were appointed to outlaw falsehood: (...)’.

(iii) *Sinuhe* R 13-14<sup>71</sup>

*ti sw h3b r hwt h3swt r skr imiw thnw*

‘He had been sent to strike the foreign countries, to smite those in Tjehenu.’

(iv) *Urk.* I 254, 1 (Qar of Edfu)

*in.t(=f) n ppy r tzt mm msw hriw-tp*

‘I was brought to Pepi to be educated among the children of the chiefs.’

In addition, *r sdm* can be controlled by the implied Agent of a passive construction, thus by a participant that lacks any segmental expression:

(v) *P. Brooklyn* 35.1446, pl. VI, B, 5-6

*mk in.tw n=k wd pn n nsw r rdt rh=k ntt (...)*

‘See, this royal decree is brought to you to let you know that (...)’

In short, *r sdm* can be controlled by an active subject, by a passive subject, and by the Agent implied in a passive construction. In view of these various possibilities, it remains unclear whether *r whd* in (i) is controlled by {t}, an impersonal subject pronoun, or by the implied Agent of a passive construction, marked by the inflectional morpheme {t}.

B. Controlled *hr sdm* is found with {t}-marked constructions, both with transitives (vi) and with intransitives (vii) in the main clause:

(vi) *Ptahhotep* 284-288

*iw ngb.tw s h3 r 3ht n=f*

*3t ktt mitt rswt*

*iw ph.tw m(w)t hr rh st*

‘A thousand men are diverted from what is beneficial to them.

—a short moment, resembling a dream—

One reaches death striving to know it (*scil.* the short moment).’

71 An interpolation of R: Parkinson (2009: 164-5); Stauder (2013a: 294).

(vii) P. UC 32200, ro 13-14

*ir grt tw3.tw hr dd st (...)*

‘If however one complains saying it (...)’

Sim. P. UC 32209, ro II.5-6 *imi spr.tw r=f m t3 3t hr dd (...)* ‘May one get to him at once saying: (...)’; Mentuhotepi’s *Karnak Stela 3 (...)* *h<sup>c</sup>.tw hr nhm r-h3t=f (...)* ‘(...) before whom one rejoices shouting loudly (...)’.

Unlike *r sdm*, *hr sdm* can not be controlled by passive subjects: a subject controlling *hr sdm* must semantically be an Agent.<sup>72</sup> Whether the Agent controlling *hr sdm* must also be syntactically a subject is unclear. As the case of *r sdm* controlled by the implied Agent of an inflectional passive (v) shows, Earlier Egyptian is not alien to construction in which the controlled participant is not given a segmental expression.<sup>73</sup> It therefore remains unclear whether in (vi) and (vii), *hr sdm* is controlled by {t}, an impersonal subject pronoun, or by the implied Agent of a passive construction, marked by the inflectional morpheme {t}.

NB. A {t}-marked control construction with a pseudoparticiple is the following:

(viii) *Neferti 9c*

*nn sdr.tw hkr n m(w)t*

‘The night will not be spent starving to death.’

In itself, a controlled pseudoparticiple need not imply that {t} is an active impersonal subject: in another construction, a pseudoparticiple is seen to be controlled by an unexpressed participant, thus *Ptahhotep 10 P sdr ø n=f hdr r<sup>c</sup> nb* ‘Because of it one lies anguished every day’ (§2.7.3.3.A). However, the construction is here innovative on two other accounts, in its combining {t} with a non-dynamic event (*sdr*: §5.1.1.2) and in its combining {t} with the pseudoparticiple (*hkr*: §5.1.1.3).

#### 5.1.4.4 *Ib.tw r sdm*

Occurrences of *ib.tw r sdm*—the passive pendant to *ib=f r sdm*—are very few, yet they demonstrate the existence of the construction both in the Middle Kingdom (i) and in throughout the New Kingdom (ii)-(iii), and its use both with unspecified Agents (i)-(ii) and in reference to the king (iii):

(i) *Ptahhotep 81-82 P*<sup>74</sup>

*ksn pw hddw hwrw*

*ib.tw r irt ntt m ib=k*

<sup>72</sup> Uljas (in press).

<sup>73</sup> This possibility is of course not limited to Earlier Egyptian: for example in Sanskrit, the absolutive can be controlled by the implied Agent of a passive (possibly in the context of an ongoing change, Hock 1991<sup>2</sup>: 362-6).

<sup>74</sup> The text is generally segmented differently, as (...) *hwrw-ib | tw r irt (...)*, thereby projecting the segmentation of L2 (...) *hwrw-ib | sw r irt (...)* onto P. For the reading here advocated, and for the textual history of this passage, Stauder (2014c; in condensed form, 2013a: 358-61).

‘The one who destroys a wretch is a difficult person;  
One wishes to do what is in your heart.’

(ii) Nebamun, TT 90, pl.21, 3<sup>rd</sup> register from top, on the right

***ib.tw r m33 imn***

‘One desires to see Amun.’

(iii) *Satirical Letter*, P. Anastasi I, 17, 2

*smn.tw p3 mnw hr st=f ib.tw<sup>G7</sup> r ptr=f<sup>c</sup>n*

‘When the statue is established on its place, One desires to see it beautiful.’

Sim. KRI VI 72, 11 (P. Turin 1882, ro II.8-9) (...) *iw ib.tw<sup>G7</sup> r tr=f* (...) ‘(...) while  
One wished to do it (...)’.

Syntactically, the construction *ib=f r sdm* is a situational predicate construction (*[ib=f]*<sub>subject</sub> *[r sdm]*<sub>predicate</sub>).<sup>75</sup> In the passive pendant to this construction, *ib.tw r sdm*, {t} is therefore used in a non-verbal construction. This would at first seem to suggest an active impersonal analysis of the construction. However, the impersonal pronoun {t} is otherwise always a subject pronoun (for example, in the situational predicate construction, §5.1.1.3.B). In *ib.tw r sdm*, by contrast, {t} would be dependent on *ib*, the clausal subject: such syntax would be entirely unparalleled, demonstrating that *ib.tw r sdm* must be analyzed along altogether different lines.

In *ib=f r sdm*, the syntax is non-verbal, but the construction comes close to having verbal semantics on three accounts: it concentrates on a verbal content (*sdm*), it expresses modality (a mostly verbal category), and its main participant (=f in *ib=f*) is agentive. Like modality, the passive is a verbal category; in Earlier Egyptian, any event that implies an Agent can be made passive (§2.1). In *ib.tw r sdm*, syntax loses to semantics.

## 5.2 A rare instance of degrammaticalization

When extended to events that fail to meet the semantic condition for passivization (§5.1.1), constructions with {t} after the verbal stem (e.g. *hkr.tw* ‘one is hungry’) can not be analyzed as inflectional passives anymore. When extended to patterns in which {t} occupies the subject slot, constructions with {t} must be analyzed as active impersonal (e.g. P. UC 32200, 20-21 *n iw.tw r gmt=i* (...) ‘Am I going to be found, (...)’). In these, {t}, originally an inflectional marker of the passive, has achieved constituent status (that is, {t} is syntactically a subject constituent, like any other subject). These developments represent a rare change on various accounts.

A. Cross-linguistically, active impersonal constructions typically develop as a specialized use of constructions that are already active, with a third person plural or a

<sup>75</sup> Polis & Stauder (in press).

generic full noun subject.<sup>76</sup> In Earlier Egyptian, by contrast, an active impersonal construction develops through the extension of an inflectional marker of the passive to new constructional environments. This type of development has so far not been paralleled in other languages<sup>77</sup> and can therefore be assessed as generally uncommon.

While a diachronic connection between passive and active impersonal constructions is well-documented cross-linguistically, developments from the one into the other hardly ever seem to be complete. In particular, a passive or otherwise detransitive construction can develop innovative uses in which the syntax is in part active impersonal, with the O developing non-promotional properties (that is, patterning like a direct object). However, the marker of detransitive voice does not itself become the subject of an active construction.<sup>78</sup> Against this background, the innovative uses of Earlier Egyptian {t} in Subject-Verb patterns is very remarkable because {t} achieves full constituent status in these patterns (e.g. *iw.tw r sdm* : *iw NP r sdm*), to the point that it would be later extended to the situational pattern construction (*iw.tw m NP*) and integrated into the paradigm of the Late Egyptian new subject pronoun (*tw.tw*).

As to be seen below, the change by which {t} achieves full constituent status in some of its innovative uses qualifies as an instance of degrammaticalization, itself a very rare type of change. To avoid possible confusions, I first recall how ‘degrammaticalization’, a technical term, is defined, and particularly how the term does not denote a reversal of grammaticalization.

B. Degrammaticalization<sup>79</sup> is technically defined as a compound change that goes counter to certain dimensions associated with the general cline of grammaticality (further below, C-E). The term does not, therefore, denote a change that would consist in the reversal of grammaticalization. In particular, the term does not refer to the reversal of a particular process of grammaticalization within one language (‘token reversal’). Nor does it refer to the reversal of a general path of grammaticalization as documented in other languages (‘type reversal’, or ‘mirror-image reversal’).

‘Token reversal’—a possibly purely theoretical construct—would consist in the reversal of a change that would have previously occurred in the same language: this has been described as ‘fantastically unlikely’.<sup>80</sup> As regards Earlier Egyptian, the innovative uses of {t} in which this has constituent status develop out of an inflectional marker of the passive. This itself represents a specialization of the much broader detransitive functions of the same morpheme in Semitic and, beyond, in Afroasiatic. The latter arguably has its origin in a reflexive construction, with {t} probably representing the morphologically much reduced form of an erstwhile lexical expression of the reflexive such as ‘head’, ‘body’, ‘self’ (§2.9.2.2). The overall development thus goes from a lexical expression of the reflexive to a derivational-inflectional marker of detransitive voice, to an inflectional marker of the passive, and

76 E.g. Giacalone Ramat & Sansò (2007); Heine & Kuteva (2002: 208-9, 235-7); Haspelmath (1990: 49-50).

77 Siewierska (2008).

78 Siewierska (2008); Haspelmath (1990: 57-8).

79 Norde (2009).

80 Norde (2009: 59, 61); Haspelmath (2004: 28).

finally to an impersonal subject pronoun. At no point does {t} develop back to some previous stage.

‘Type reversal’, or ‘mirror-image reversal’—also a possibly purely theoretical construct—would consist in a change that would go a path of grammaticalization backwards. No case has been documented so far in any language, and such development has been argued to ‘verge on the impossible’.<sup>81</sup> In the very longue durée of Egyptian language history, early stages have inflectional passives and later stages have a third person plural active impersonal construction. Moreover, an inflectional marker of the passive, {t}, develops innovative uses in active impersonal constructions. However, this overall development does not represent a reversal of the grammaticalization path from third person plural active impersonal construction to passive (3PL > PASS). To begin with, the path 3PL > PASS<sup>82</sup> rarely ever yields full-blown passive constructions: rather, the development generally stops short of going the full way. The expression of the Agent in syntactic periphery often remains impossible, or is only marginally licensed, or is subject to various restrictions; moreover, the O argument often retains non-promotional properties (that is, for example, it continues to be coded as a direct object).<sup>83</sup> Earlier Egyptian passives, by contrast, are fully promotional (their O is syntactically a subject) and license the expression of the Agent on a fully regular basis. Furthermore, while {t} is extended to function as the subject in active impersonal constructions, these are not themselves the third person plural active impersonal constructions. Nor did the active impersonal construction with *.tw* evolve into the later third person plural active impersonal constructions, rather the latter would eventually replace the former. At this point, the condition of a preservation of constructional identity is not fulfilled anymore:

*Grammaticalization path: ‘3PL > PASS (incipient)’*

The passive often only incipient: O often retaining non-promotional syntax and the expression of the Agent often only limitedly possible.

*The Egyptian development: PASS (full-blown) > active impersonal (not 3PL)*

- The passive a full-blown passive: promotional syntax of the O; expression of the Agent regularly possible;
- The active impersonal construction not a third person plural one; ultimate replacement by third person plural construction (end of the New Kingdom).

Just like it is not an instance of token reversal, the Earlier Egyptian change under discussion is therefore not an instance of type reversal either.

C. Positively, ‘degrammaticalization’ is defined as ‘a composite change whereby a gram in a specific context gains in autonomy or substance on more than one linguistic level (semantics, morphology, syntax, or phonology)’.<sup>84</sup> This compact definition calls for three comments.

81 Norde (2009: 123).

82 E.g. Siewierska 2010; Heine & Kuteva (2002: 236-7); Haspelmath (1990: 49-50).

83 Siewierska (2010); Givón & Kawasha (2006).

84 Norde (2009: 120).

As already noted, degrammaticalization does not consist in the reversal of grammaticalization, neither as token reversal nor as type reversal, both of which remain undocumented to the present day in any language. Rather, the definition of degrammaticalization is indexed on the parameters associated with grammaticalization, itself a composite change.<sup>85</sup> When more than one of these parameters are reversed, partially or fully, in a change, this may qualify as an instance of degrammaticalization.

The change has to happen ‘in specific contexts’, that is, fulfill a condition of ‘preserving (constructional) identity’.<sup>86</sup> Various phenomena of lexicalization of affixes and other items of minor word-classes (such as *the pros and cons*, *isms*, etc.), which result in entirely new contexts of use for these segments, do not, therefore, fall under the scope of degrammaticalization.<sup>87</sup>

The change has to involve some ‘gain’. Degrammaticalization is thereby distinct from ‘retraction’, a change in which a morpheme merely loses a more grammatical function which it had previously developed alongside a less grammatical one.<sup>88</sup> Retraction can be schematized as AB → A (the less grammatical function, A, had been present all along).<sup>89</sup> By the same symbolism, degrammaticalization can be represented as B → AB (the less grammatical function, A, is new).

D. In the changes affecting Earlier Egyptian {t}, ‘constructional identity’ is preserved. While {t} is extended to new patterns, the functions of the morpheme remain within detransitive voice, and more particularly to permit a construction in which the Agent remains unexpressed (or unexpressed in subject position). (On the other hand, the much later process of replacement of the active impersonal constructions in .tw by third person plural ones do not preserve construction identity, since an entirely new morphological category, the third person plural pronouns, are made recourse to. Accordingly, this subsequent change does not belong to the process of degrammaticalization itself.)

The changes affecting Earlier Egyptian {t} do not represent a case of ‘retraction’ but genuine degrammaticalization, because {t} is extended to new environments, as is schematically expressed in the following table:

	<i>VS, passivizable</i>	<i>VS, non-passivizable</i>	<i>SV patterns</i>
Earlier EEg.	{t}	← counterpart relationships → (sdr ∅)	(sdm.t=f)
Later EEg.	{t}	{t} (sdr.tw)	{t} (iw.tw r sdm)

85 For the parameters of grammaticalization, Lehmann (1995); for an introduction to grammaticalization more generally, Hopper & Traugott (2003<sup>2</sup>).

86 Haspelmath (2004: 27-8).

87 Norde (2009: 9, 122-4); Haspelmath (2004: 27-33); Lehmann (2004: 174-7).

88 Haspelmath (2004: 33-5).

89 Concerning active impersonal constructions, a case of retraction is provided by English *man* (Haspelmath 2004: 34). In Old English *man* was used as a full noun (like German *Mann*) and as an impersonal subject pronoun (like German *man*). In Modern English, the latter use has been lost.

The changes affecting Earlier Egyptian {t} also represent a ‘compound change’, because several of the parameters associated with grammaticalization are reversed.<sup>90</sup> In the table below, ‘1°’ and ‘2°’ refer to parameters associated with primary and secondary grammaticalization, respectively:<sup>91</sup>

(a) Integrity:

- ‘*Resemanticization*’—√ for (2°), no change for (1°).

{T} has gained the function in expressing non-specified reference with non-passivizable events and in subject-first patterns (verbal and non-verbal). In the latter, {t} directly stands for the unspecified participant, rather than indirectly implying it, as in the passive construction. Resemanticization is also seen in the occasional cases of a written complementation of {t} by the plural strokes (§5.1.3.2) (2°). On the other hand, {t} does not develop lexical semantics such as e.g. *homo* or *Mann* (from which French *on* or German *man* developed in primary grammaticalization).

- ‘*Phonological strengthening*’ (2°)—No change.

As far as the Egyptian graphic system permits to tell, {t} does not seem to gain any phonological substance even when acquiring constituent status in subject-first constructions.

(In subject-first constructions, {t} is mostly written as *.tw*: this is primarily because subject-first constructions with {t} develop at a time when {t} was more generally written with the long allograph, including when an inflectional morpheme of the verb. Significantly, the very earliest instances of {t} in preverbal position are evenly split between short and long spellings (§1.1.1.B; compare with §1.1.1.D). As to spellings of {t} as *.tw* in preverbal position, these occasionally serve to signal constituent status, not that {t} had a fuller form (§1.1.1.E). In the spoken sequence, {t} in preverbal position may occasionally have been realized as \*/*tv*/, depending on the prosodic environments; the same phenomenon—not a morphological one—already obtained with {t} as an inflectional marker of the verb.)

- ‘*Recategorization*’ (1°)—No change.

While acquiring constituent status in subject-first constructions, {t} remains limited to the syntactic position of subject and can not control subsequent anaphoric reference. It thereby contrasts with other Earlier Egyptian expres-

90 The description follows Norde’s (2009) parameters of degrammaticalization, themselves indexed on Lehmann’s (1995) parameters of grammaticalization. Of the latter, the parameter of ‘structural scope’, a possibly problematic parameter in general (Norde 2009: 131), is here left out.

91 The terms ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ grammaticalization (Norde 2009: 124) go back to Kurylowicz’ (1975: 52) famous definition: ‘Grammaticalization consists in the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from a grammatical to a more grammatical status.’ In a complementary fashion, primary and secondary grammaticalization may be conceived of as associated respectively with the leftmost and rightmost parts of the ‘cline of grammaticality’: ‘content word > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix’ (Hopper & Traugott 2003<sup>2</sup>: 7).



sions used for expressing non-specified reference, most notably, *s* ‘a man’ (§2.7.2).

(There are two exceptions to this generalization, both marginal. The first is the rare construction *ib.tw r sdm*. As discussed, this construction, already documented in early times, is made possible by the constructional semantics which exceptionally overrule syntax: while syntactically non-verbal, the construction expresses verbal semantics to do with modality and the participant after *ib* is semantically agentive (§5.1.4.4). The second exception is the possibly singular construction in *KRI* IV 413, 14 (P. Salt 124, vso I.11) (...) *r p3y.tw šm* ‘(...) about the fact that one has gone.’ Here as well, the construction denotes an event even if with a nominal syntax, and *.tw* stands for the Agent of that event. The construction therefore seems to be analogical to finite constructions of the verb; its status is possibly exploratory.)

(b) Paradigmaticity: ‘*Deparadigmaticization*’—√ for (2°), no change for (1°).

To be used in the subject slot of SV patterns, {t} is extracted from its erstwhile exclusive inflectional slot, and thus ‘discharge(d) from an inflectional paradigm’, and acquires full constituent status (2°). On the other hand, {t} does not ‘move up’ to an open class (1°).

(c) Paradigmatic variability: ‘*Deobligatorification*’ (2° and 1°)—No change.

In all its uses, including newly innovated ones, {t} remains an obligatory expression of unspecified reference. Moreover, it remains the sole grammatical expression of this category.

(The construction with *s* ‘a man’ (§2.7.2) is used in strict complementary distribution to constructions in {t}: when controlling anaphoric reference and/or in syntactic positions other than subject. Other active impersonal constructions in Earlier Egyptian are extremely marginal (§2.7.1.2, §2.7.3.2). Moreover, all of these existed before the developments leading to the rise of the active impersonal construction with {t}.)

(d) Bondedness: ‘*Severance*’ (2°)—√.

In earlier times, {t} is exclusively an inflectional affix. When extended to SV patterns, {t} is extracted out of this inflectional position to occupy slots otherwise occupied by noun phrases.

(Deseverance does in the present case not imply any reduction in the degree of fusion: as an inflectional affix, {t} was agglutinated to the stem and the degree of fusion between the two was probably nil already then.)

(e) Syntagmatic variability: ‘*Flexibilization*’ (2° and 1°)—No change.

In all patterns and environments in which {t} is used, including newly innovated ones, its position remains uniquely determined.

E. In the innovative uses of {t}, particularly in subject-first constructions, several primitive changes associated with grammaticalization are thus seen to be reversed: in

these innovative uses, {t} undergoes resemanticization (a), deparadigmaticization (b), and severance (d). All primitive changes reversed concern parameters associated with secondary grammaticalization only: even when acquiring constituent status in subject-first patterns, {t} remains a grammatical word.

The specific types of primitive changes that are reversed in the case of Earlier Egyptian {t} correlate with each other in a principled way that has been analyzed for other instances of degrammaticalization in other languages.<sup>92</sup> Among the three types of degrammaticalization—degrammation, deinflectionalization, and debonding—the change affecting Earlier Egyptian {t} during the early/mid-second millennium can thus be characterized more specifically as an instance of deinflectionalization, ‘a composite change whereby an inflectional affix in a specific linguistic context gains a new function, while shifting to a less bound morpheme’.<sup>93</sup>

Instances of degrammaticalization documented in the literature number a dozen cross-linguistically and instances of deinflectionalization identified so far are only a handful.<sup>94</sup> To these, two more instances can be added from Earlier Egyptian: the change here under discussion, and the rise of the third person plural pronoun =*w* in the mid-second millennium (§5.3.5.NB). More instances of deinflectionalization will no doubt appear as the detailed description of individual languages or groups of languages, particularly such documented through historical data, progresses. Beyond Earlier Egyptian {t} itself, another case, also from Egyptian, is the rise of the third person plural pronoun =*w* in the mid-second millennium (§5.3.5.2.NB). Even so, the change described in the present chapter appears to be of a highly uncommon type.

### 5.3 Analyzing the change in its intralinguistic context

#### 5.3.1 Introduction: Extension without prior reanalysis and historical contingency

A. The change under discussion in the present chapter consists in a twofold process of extension affecting {t}. From the mid-Twelfth Dynasty on, {t}—in earlier times exclusively an inflectional marker of the passive—gradually develops innovative uses in constructions that on semantic grounds can not be analyzed as passives anymore (§5.1.1). By the same time, {t} begins being extended to the preverbal subject slot of Subject-Verb constructions in which the lexical verb is in the infinitive, a form that can not be directly inflected for voice: in these constructions, {t} has constituent status, as an impersonal subject pronoun (§5.1.2). In other innovative constructions as

92 ‘In deinflectionalization (the subtype of degrammaticalization here relevant, AS), the crucial parameter is paradigmaticity, because what is most characteristic of these cases is that inflectional suffixes cease to form part of inflectional paradigms (deparadigmaticization). Thus they develop into a less bound type of morpheme (severance), and they gain a new function or new meaning (resemanticization). However, they are not being recategorized, because they do not become members of a major word class’ (Norde 2009: 231).

93 Norde (2009: 152).

94 Norde (2009), gathering all cases previously discussed.

well, {t} has constituent status and/or referential content (§5.1.3). Further constructions may or may not be symptoms of the changes affecting {t} (§5.1.4). The overall result is the rise of an impersonal subject pronoun {t}.

This change is very remarkable on various interrelated accounts (§5.2). Impersonal subject pronouns commonly rise through the grammaticalization of lexical items in constructions that are already active. In Egyptian, however, the impersonal subject pronoun *.tw* has its origin in a grammatical item, an inflectional marker of passive voice. On the other hand, passive (and more broadly detransitive) constructions may develop uses in which they must be analyzed as active impersonal constructions, but such developments are not otherwise documented to have led to constructions in which the passive marker itself develops constituent status, as is the case in Egyptian. In relation to the above, the change occurring in Earlier Egyptian can be described as an instance of degrammaticalization, and, more specifically, as an instance of deinflectionalization, a very uncommon type of change. Although not the reversal of grammaticalization, neither as a type nor as a token, degrammaticalization is a type of change by which some parameters and primitive changes associated with grammaticalization are reversed. In this specific, technically defined sense, degrammaticalization, of which the changes affecting Earlier Egyptian {t} are an instance, therefore implies some element of counter-directionality.

B. In analyzing the change in its intralinguistic context, the following general observations are of relevance:

- (a) The change concerns only {t}. V-passive morphology is not extended to the preverbal subject slot of Subject-Verb constructions. In addition, V-passives remain strictly subject to the semantic condition for passivization in Earlier Egyptian. This latter observation is even more significant than the former, because it can not be related to the morphological type of V-passive morphology.
- (b) The changes affecting {t} consist in a twofold extension of the morpheme, to events that fail to meet the semantic condition for passivization in Earlier Egyptian and to constructions that fail to provide an inflectional position in which {t} could be accommodated. These are two aspects of the same change. The two processes of extension are observed in the record to begin roughly simultaneously, suggesting that they are interrelated. Even stronger is the following consideration. Viewed in isolation, the extension of {t} to events that fail to meet the semantic condition for passivization could be interpreted as a process of relaxation of this condition. However, if this were the case, the same relaxation should be observed with V-passives; it is not.
- (c) While {t} is being extended to events and constructions that fail to meet the semantic and morphological conditions for passivization, T-passives themselves do not undergo any formal change. In particular, singular pronominal O's continue to be realized as suffix pronouns, thereby as syntactic subjects. Moreover, the Agent of T-passives can still be expressed in syntactic periphery by the *in N* phrase. On both accounts, the construction of

T-passives is unaffected, and {t} in T-passives remains an inflectional marker of voice.

-(d) In the two domains to which {t} was extended, various other constructions were regularly used in earlier times to leave the (first) core participant unexpressed. With conjugational patterns of the Subject-Verb type, synthetic T-passives were used for centuries before the change began (*sdm.t NP* as a passive counterpart to *NP hr sdm*; prospective *sdm.t=f* as a passive counterpart to *NP r sdm* expressing a future: §3.1.1; §3.3.B). With events that fail to meet the semantic condition for passivization, notably a zero-subject construction was regularly used (*sdr* ∅: §2.7.3.3).

C. Observation (a) implies that one parameter in the analysis must account for why changes concern only {t}, in relation to relevant aspects of the difference between the two main inflectional types of passives in Earlier Egyptian, T-passives and V-passives. Observation (b) implies that an analysis of the change must provide an integrated account of both the morphological and the semantic dimensions at play: neither will be sufficient alone, nor even primary over the other.

Observations (c) and (d) are the most deeply consequential of all. In linguistic change, extension is often analyzed as the mapping out, or actualization, of a prior reanalysis of a given construction, extension being what makes this prior reanalysis visible. In the present case, this would imply that T-passives themselves had been reanalyzed as active impersonal constructions, so that {t} could then be extended to constructions such as Subject-Verb patterns in which it clearly has constituent status. However, as observation (c) implies, no such account can apply to the particular change here under discussion: the extension of {t} must be accounted for in a view that implies no prior reanalysis of T-passives themselves. Observation (d), finally, implies that the innovative constructions of {t} from the Twelfth Dynasty on were not a necessary change, one which had to occur. The analysis must therefore be phrased in such ways that it does not include any element of teleology.

In the following, the conditions for the innovative uses of {t} are therefore analyzed in terms of formal equivocation (§5.3.2) and alternative construals of T-passives including the discourse contexts that favor these (§5.3.3). Alternative construals, made possible by formal equivocation and encouraged in certain discourse contexts, happen in the (occasional) mental representations of (some) speakers. These provide sufficient, although not necessary, conditions for the extension of {t} to new environments, without T-passives themselves undergoing any reanalysis, nor indeed, at first, any change at all. Further conditions that more directly triggered the change are discussed in turn (§5.3.4), with an explicit understanding that these conditions may just as well not have had the effect they had. I conclude with a consideration of the mechanisms, factors, and circumstantial conditions at work in the present change, demonstrating that these are the same as, for example, in grammaticalization itself, even if the change here under discussion is in some respects counter-directional (§5.3.5).

### 5.3.2 Formal equivocation

Earlier Egyptian passive constructions—and particularly those with T-passives—afford considerable space for formal equivocation between promotional and non-promotional analyses.<sup>95</sup> In the analysis here presented, formal equivocation does not equate with actual reanalysis, but is important as opening the possibility for (occasional) alternative construals of the passive construction by (some) speakers. The conditions for such equivocation reside both with the coding of grammatical relations in Earlier Egyptian and with the specific morphological type of T-passives.

In Earlier Egyptian, grammatical relations are mostly coded by word order. When a clause has two direct participants (in the active, with transitive events), the relative order of these determines which is the subject and which is the object. In Verb-Subject constructions, a morphological distinction between subject and object concerns only singular pronominal clitics. Intraverbal agreement plays no role in these constructions. By definition, a passive construction has only one expressed direct participant, the O, or none at all (in the case of passives from intransitives, primary or secondary ones). The parameter of relative order is accordingly non-operative. At the level of the coding of grammatical relations, only nominal morphology establishes whether the O is a subject or not. When the O is a plural pronoun or a full noun, the construction is therefore equivocating between a promotional and a non-promotional analysis (a).

The syntactic status of the O as a subject—and thereby the promotional nature of the Earlier Egyptian passive construction—is of course unambiguously established as long as detransitive morphology on the verb is itself unambiguously passive. This is where T- and V-passives differ. Unlike V-passive morphology, which consists in a stem alternation and thereby probably in a discontinuous morpheme coding voice and aspect in a portmanteau fashion, T-passive morphology consists in a discrete morpheme, {t}, with singular exponence, and appended to the outer edge of the form, after the stem including any marks of tense-aspect-mood (§1.1.3). Unlike constructions with V-passives, therefore, constructions with T-passives offer space for a formal equivocation on the level of verbal morphology as well (b):

(a) *The coding of grammatical relations in Verb-Subject patterns*

- Intraverbal agreement: none;
- Nominal morphology: distinct only with singular pronominal clitics ('suffix' pronouns vs. 'dependent' pronouns);
- Word order: when a clause has two direct participants, the subject precedes the direct object (Verb-Subject-Object)—inoperative in passive constructions.

<sup>95</sup> In a promotional construction, the O is morphosyntactically coded as the subject (being 'promoted' to this position vis-à-vis the active, where it is a direct object). In a non-promotional construction, the O retains its morphosyntactical coding as a direct object.

(b) *T-passive morphology*

- Morphologically discrete;
- Singular exponence;
- Position at the outer edge of the inflected stem.

Compounded with the componential nature of T-passive morphology, the space for formal equivocation generally afforded by the coding of grammatical relations results in considerable space for an alternative non-promotional analysis of the passive construction of T-passives, in which {t} could itself be standing for the Agent, thus be associated with a semantic role and thereby have constituent status:

	<i>T-passives</i>	<i>(possible alternative construals)</i>
Non-equivocating:	$\underline{sdm}.t_{PASS}=f_{subject}$	/
Equivocating:	$\underline{sdm}.t_{PASS}=sn_{subject}$	$(\underline{sdm}.t_{Agent} \ sn_{direct\ object})$
	$\underline{sdm}.t_{PASS} \ N_{subject}$	$(\underline{sdm}.t_{Agent} \ N_{direct\ object})$
	$pr.t_{PASS}$	$(pr.t_{Agent})$

### 5.3.3 Alternative construals of T-passives and discourse contexts favoring these

Beyond the formal matters just evoked, alternative construals of constructions with T-passives imply semantic dimensions. Functionally, passive constructions and active impersonal ones overlap to a considerable degree, while also expressing different construals of the event (§5.3.3.1). Alternative construals of passive constructions are favored in imperfective contexts, in relation to the types of Agents these commonly imply (§5.3.3.2). They are also favored in subjectless passive constructions, in which the Agent-backgrounding dimension is particularly prominent (§5.3.3.3).

#### 5.3.3.1 Different construals of the event

A. Passive constructions and active impersonal ones display close affinities on various levels. Active impersonal constructions can be used in lieu of passive ones depending on discourse conditions and register in languages that have both construction types.<sup>96</sup> They can also fulfill the role of the passive in languages that lack passives altogether (for example, in the later stages of Egyptian itself, Demotic and Coptic). The connection between the two construction types is also diachronic.<sup>97</sup>

Earlier Egyptian itself has various constructions that can be described as active impersonal, interacting with the passive functionally. Some are alternatives to the passive while others are regular counterparts to the passive. In the written registers that constitute the preserved record of Earlier Egyptian, the former are very uncommon: the construction with a non-anaphoric third person plural subject (§2.7.1.2); and the zero-subject construction with an agentive unexpressed subject

96 E.g. Giacalone Ramat & Sansò (2007); Sansò (2006).

97 E.g. Siewierska (2010; 2008); Heine & Kuteva (2002: 236-7).

(§2.7.3.2). The latter, on the other hand, are fully regular, reflecting their status as functional counterparts to the passive: the construction with *s* ‘a man’ as its subject (when the non-specified subject controls anaphoric reference: §2.7.2.2); and the zero-subject construction with an animate unexpressed subject (with events that fail to meet the semantic condition for passivization: §2.7.3.3).

B. Schematically, the passive is a construction that differs syntactically from the active by a different mapping of the grammatical roles (A and O in the case of transitives, S in the case of intransitives) and grammatical relations (the subject and the object). In Earlier Egyptian, the passive is used with transitives to background the Agent and/or when the relative topicality of core arguments (A and O) differs from the prototypical hierarchies that obtain in the active; with intransitives, the passive is similarly used to background the Agent, and/or when discourse continuity bears on an oblique expression, and/or when the orientation is on the event itself (§2.5-2.6.1). By contrast, an active impersonal construction has an active syntax: for example, the grammatical role of O remains associated with the grammatical relation of object. Unlike in the prototypical active construction, however, the subject remains unspecified.

The morphosyntactic differences recalled above result in typical differences in the extension of the two construction types. One such difference concerns the event types with which either construction type is licensed. In many languages, the active is restricted to syntactically transitive verbs. In Earlier Egyptian, no such syntactic constraint obtains, but passivization is subject to the semantic condition that the event must imply an Agent in its representation. Active impersonal constructions, on the other hand, are subject to no such restriction: they can be used with all types of events, including intransitive ones that lack an Agent in their semantic representation or deviate even further from the condition for passivization in being non-dynamic, or not even verbal. Another difference concerns the reference of the unexpressed participant. The unexpressed participant in active impersonal constructions is typically human, non-specific, and non-singular.<sup>98</sup> In Earlier Egyptian, the A or S must be an Agent in the passive construction and is thereby animate and almost always human. However, there is no requirement that it be non-specific and non-singular (examples with singular and specific Agents in §2.2.1, §2.5.2.4-5, §2.5.3, §2.6.1). Active impersonal constructions are thereby less restrictive in terms of the event types they can express, but typically more restrictive in terms of the referents of the unspecified participant. This leaves a considerable overlap between the two construction types:

	Passive	Active impersonal
Events	<i>Agent in semantic representation</i>	(no restrictions)
Reference of the unspecified participant	(no restrictions)	<i>non-specific and non-singular</i>

---

<sup>98</sup> Sansò (2006).

C. In broader functional and cognitive terms, the difference between passive constructions and active impersonal ones has been described as one between a construction based on the relative prominence of the direct participants (the passive) and one based on the (lack of) specificity of the first participant (the active impersonal construction).<sup>99</sup> Such description also accounts for the functional proximity and overlaps between the two construction types. In discourse, a reduced prominence of the Agent (as in the passive) often comes with a lesser specificity. A lesser specificity of the first participant (as in an active impersonal construction) in turn often implies reduced prominence.<sup>100</sup>

The change from a passive construction into an active impersonal one can thus be described as a change from a prominence-based construction to a specificity-based one. Given the considerable functional overlap between the two construction types, alternative construals of a passive construction in terms of reduced specificity rather than in terms of relative prominence may easily occur in speakers' representations. By definition, occasional alternative construals are immaterial, all the more so in a written record. Remarkably, they can actually be documented in Earlier Egyptian, in the rare cases when {t} is complemented by the plural strokes in writing in the Twelfth Dynasty (§5.1.3.2). As discussed, the written complementation points to {t} being associated with referential content, rather than performing the abstract grammatical function of marking passive voice. Put in the cognitive terms just introduced, these rare instances of a written complementation of {t} imply that at least in some speakers' representation, the construction was occasionally construed in terms of the specificity of the Agent rather than in terms of the relative prominence of core participants. The two instances of a written complementation of {t} are from outside the Nile Valley, documenting a less standard form of written performance. Even if not more commonly visible in writing, alternative construals of T-passives would of course have been more widespread across the speech community.

The remainder of the present section is devoted to describing the discourse contexts in which alternative construals of the passive construction are particularly favored.

### 5.3.3.2 Imperfective environments

A. The unexpressed participant of an active impersonal construction is typically non-specific and non-singular. Accordingly, an alternative construal of a prominence-based construction (the passive) as a specificity-based construction (the active impersonal) is more strongly favored when the implied Agent is non-specific and non-singular, more generally when it is low in discourse topicality. For the same reason,

<sup>99</sup> Langacker (2006; 2004).

<sup>100</sup> In Langacker's (2006: 130) words: 'A participant not accorded its usual focal prominence (e.g., a passive agent) often remains unspecified. Conversely, failure to provide specific information about a participant renders it less salient. Absence of focal prominence and absence of specificity are mutually reinforcing strategies of defocusing. Each detracts from the optimal circumstances for viewing a given participant: the situation of a single, clearly delimited, fully identified individual put onstage as the specific focus of attention.'



such an alternative construal is disfavored when the implied Agent of the passive is specific, singular, and definite.

In discourse, passives implying a non-specific Agent tend to be found most frequently in non-perfective contexts, and yet more frequently in imperfective ones. Conversely, passives with a specific, or even singular, Agent tend to occur most commonly in perfective environments, because these refer to one particular occasion. Illustrations are to be found throughout the present study; a minimal local exemplification will therefore suffice:

*Perfective environments, in narrative and narrative discourse*

(a) The Agent is specific: P. UC 32055, ro 5 *ḥḥ.n wšd p3y=i it in imi-r3 3ḥwt mrsu* ‘My father was questioned by the overseer of fields, Mersu.’

Sim. e.g. *Shipwrecked Sailor* 39-41 *ḥḥ.n=i rd.kw r iw pn in w3w n w3d-wr* ‘I was given to this island by a wave of the sea.’ With a plural Agent, Semna Despatch IV, x+9 *wšd hr sh[r h3]st ḥḥ.n dd.n=sn* ‘Questioned about the condition of the desert, they said: (...)’. Common.

(b) The Agent is contextually retrievable: Antefiqer’s *Girgawi Inscription* 6-7 (...) *ḥḥ.n sm3 nḥsw spt nbt m w3w3t* (...) ‘(...) the Nubians, the whole remainder of Wawat, were killed (...) (*scil.* by the Egyptian troops).’

Sim. e.g. *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 13-15 *iw m3.n st ḥm=i nn iw-ms h3k.n=i ḥmwt=sn in.n=i hrw=sn pr r ḥnmwt=sn ḥw k3w=sn wh3 it=sn rd ht im* ‘My Majesty has seen it—no untruth—I have captured their wives, I have brought their dependents; Their wells have been gone to, their cattle has been stricken, their wheat has been pulled out, it has been set on fire’ (the implied Agent is the troops, as an extension of the king’s agency: §2.5.2.3.2); Ameniseneb (Louvre C12), 6 *ḥḥ.n m3 n3 n k3wt* (...) ‘Then these works were seen (...)’ (analysis: §2.5.2.1, (iv)). Common.

(c) The identity of the Agent is not contextually retrievable, but the particular occasion on which the event occurred implies that the Agent is not an open set of possible Agents. For example in administrative texts: P. UC 32166, ro II.3 *hr hr=s ḥḥ hr=s* ‘There was agreement about it. There was swearing about it.’

Sim. e.g. P. Brooklyn 35.1446 pl.IV, ro 31.f *iw kn(.n).tw* ‘There has been completion’; *Stèle Juridique* 18-19 *ḥḥ.n mdw r=s m h3 n whm n wḥrt mḥtt* (...) *ḥḥ r=s m mitt ḥnḥ dd* (...) *wšd r-dd* (...) ‘There was discussion about it in the office of the herald of the northern district (...). There was acquiescing to it likewise, and saying: (...)There was questioning in these terms: (...)’. In a literary register, e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B2 135 *ḥḥ.n=f in ir wpwt m h[nw=f nb<sup>2</sup>]* ‘Then he was brought and an inventory was made of all his goods.’ In an inscriptional one, e.g. Hammamat 110, 6 *ḥḥ.n šḥw nḥbt=s* (...) ‘Then its neck was cut (...)’.

(d) Entirely non-specific Agents are commonly found only in extended uses of the perfective V-passive. In these, the event is not in reference to a particular occasion (§1.2.3.1), e.g. *Sinuhe* B 212-213 *whm snd=k m t3w h3swt* (...) ‘Fear of you shall be repeated in the lands and hill-countries (...)’.

*Non-specific Agents in non-perfective environments, e.g.*

(e) With an accomplished passive, but negative, and therefore not perfective: *Sinuhe* B 227-228 (...) *n sdm.tw rn=i m r3 whmw* ‘(...) my name was not heard in the mouth of the herald.’ Common.

(f) In a conditional environment: Heqanakht III, ro 5 *ir grt r-s3 šdt st ddt ø m pr sš=k ʿ.w.s. r iwt r=s* ‘Now, after collecting it (*scil.* full barley and emmer), it should be put in the house of Your Excellency L.P.H. until it has been come for.’ Common.

*Non-specific Agents in imperfective environments, e.g.*

(g) Berlin Bowl, ro 1-2 *ir wnn irr.t nn skrw m-ʿ rh=t mt pr m-ʿ hrdw=t wgg m3 ir wnn irr.t ø m msdd=t ʿ3 it=t <m> hr-ntr* ‘If it is the case that these injuries are inflicted with your knowledge, see, the house is with your children yet misery is renewed. If it is the case that they are inflicted against your will, your father will be great in the necropolis.’

Sim. e.g. *Sinuhe* B 233-234 *mw m itrw swr.t=f mr=k t3w m pt hnm.t=f dd=k* ‘The water in the river—it is drunk as you wish. The air in the sky—it is breathed as you say’. Very common.

B. In addition to typically correlating with non-specific and non-singular Agents, imperfective environments provide a favorable context for alternative construals of a passive construction on yet another level, namely in their lesser Endpoint orientation. Imperfective passives lack the strong Endpoint orientation characteristic of perfective passives (for these, §2.9 and §4, particularly §4.3.4.2, §4.3.5): on this account, the former are less prototypical passives than the latter (§4.5.2). In being active, active impersonal constructions also lack an Endpoint orientation. Significantly, the O of imperfective passives is often indefinite, or even non-referential (also §3.1.1.B):

(h) *Ptahhotep* 284 *iw ngb.tw s h3 r 3ht n=f* ‘A thousand men are diverted from what is beneficial for them.’

Sim. e.g. *Amenemhat* 9b-d *in iw šd.tw hnnw m-hnw pr in iw wb3.tw mw ʿdd gbbw swb3.tw ndsw hr irt=s* ‘Are tumultuous people ever brought up in the House? Is water that hacks up the earth ever given an open way? Are commoners ever made into fools because of their actions?’ *Passim*, very common.

As previously noted, full noun O’s are formally equivocating (§5.3.2). With imperfective passives, the non-specificity of the Agent, the lack of an Endpoint, and formal equivocation of full noun O’s thus conspire to favor alternative construals of the passive construction.

C. As far as the passive construction is concerned, both V- and T-passives are equally compatible with all types of Agents. However, the distribution of V- and T-passives in the paradigm results in a situation in which these two types of passive formations tend to correlate with different types of Agents with significant skew in frequency.

Leaving aside the prospective V-passive, a form that was obsolescent before the changes here discussed began, the V-passive is marked for perfective aspect. In the negative constructions of the past and the unaccomplished, the V-passive was superseded by T-passives (past tense *n V-pass* → *n sdm.t=f*: §4.3.5.1.3; unaccomplished *n V-pass* → *n sdm.n=f*: §4.3.5.2). The process had reached a very advanced stage by the time the changes affecting {t} discussed in the present chapter would begin. By this time, non-perfective and imperfective environments had become the exclusive domain of T-passives. While occasionally found with V-passives, non-specific Agents are thus overwhelmingly more common with T-passives. Beyond the morphological issues discussed first (§5.3.2), this is yet another reason why {t}, but not V-passive morphology, was concerned by the change discussed in the present chapter.

### 5.3.3.3 Passives from intransitives

A. Morphosyntactically, passives from intransitives are regular passives, just like passives from transitives. Both imply inflectional passive morphology on the verb and both are used in the same passive construction, notably defined by the possibility of expressing the Agent in syntactic periphery by the *in N* phrase. On the other hand, passives from intransitives also differ from passives from transitives, in some of their discourse functions, and in their semantics. For reasons to be developed below, passives from intransitives have often been described as occupying an intermediary position between passives from transitives and active impersonal constructions.<sup>101</sup>

Like imperfective passives, passives from intransitives often have non-specific Agents.<sup>102</sup> As is illustrated below, Earlier Egyptian conforms to this general tendency. As already noted, non-specific Agents are typical of active impersonal constructions. In addition, passives from intransitives lack an O (by definition). The Agent-backgrounding component is accordingly central in both the functions and the construals of passives from intransitives.<sup>103</sup> In generally lacking an Endpoint, passives from intransitives are also less prototypical than passives from transitives (§4.5.2.B).<sup>104</sup> This lack of an Endpoint often results in an orientation of passives from intransitives on the event itself (§2.5.3; §2.6.1), which in turn reinforces the salience of the Agent in semantic representation. Perhaps surprisingly at first, passives from intransitives can thus be described as constructions that primarily revolve around the Agent—as is the case of active impersonal constructions themselves.

The following examples selectively illustrates various types of Agents in Earlier Egyptian subjectless passive constructions. Occurrences with specific Agents are found, but remain comparatively uncommon; all are from perfective environments (a)-(c). Considerably more common are occurrences with non-specific Agents (d)-(f).

101 E.g. Shibatani (1985); Frajzyngier (1982). The label commonly used for passives from intransitives, namely ‘impersonal passives’, reflects the position of these constructions to active impersonal ones.

102 E.g. Salvi (2008: 135-6); Pinkster (1992).

103 E.g. Shibatani (1988: 3); Comrie (1977).

104 In Shibatani’s (1985: 837) characterization of the passive prototype, subject affectedness is also a parameter; by definition, passives from intransitives lack a subject they could affect.

These are found in all types of environments, particularly in non-perfective and in imperfective ones. In many cases below, the events lack any Endpoint (exceptions are only with verbs of directed motion, where the Goal provides an Endpoint). The Agent-backgrounding component of the passive construction is accordingly prominent:

*With a specific Agent, in perfective environments (uncommon)*

(a) With a singular Agent: CT I 73d-74b B1P *iw h3 n=k in bik iw ng n=k in smn* ‘There has been screaming for you by the falcon, there has been cackling for you by the *semen*-goose.’

(b) With a non-singular Agent, also in a perfective environment: Semna Despatch I, x+13 *iw hnt r bw il.n=sn im m hrw pn* ‘They travelled south to the place where they had come from on this (same) day.’

(c) With the identity of the Agent being contextually retrievable: *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 13 (...) *pr r hnmwt=sn* (...) ‘(...) their wells have been gone to (...)’ (§2.5.2.3.2)

*With a non-specific Agent (common)*

(d) Perfective: Heqanakht II, ro 27-28 *mtn š3w m wnm rmt ʕ3* ‘Look, one has begun to eat people here!’;

Sim. e.g. *Ipuwer* 12.8 *ʕr hwt ntr* [...] ‘There has been entering the temple [...]’

(e) Non-perfective: Heqanakht II, ro 31-32 *mtn š3.tw grt m rdt p3 ʕkw* (...) ‘Look, one should now begin to give out these food provisions (...)!’

Sim. e.g. P. UC 32209, II.5-6 *imi spr.tw r=f m t3 3t hr dd* (...) ‘May one get to him at once saying: (...)’; Moʿalla II.β.2 (Inscription #5) *ir grt hnd.t hr sdwt=i mi msh* (...) ‘If, however, one treads on my tail like on a crocodile’s (...)’. *Passim*, very common.

(f) Imperfective: *Debate* 111-113 *dd=i n m min iw hʕd3.tw s nb hr itt snw=f* ‘To whom can I speak today? There is plundering, everyone is robbing their brothers.’

Sim. e.g. Moʿalla II.η.2 (Inscription #7)<sup>105</sup> *n pr.n.t n snd=f* ‘One could not go out for fear of them (*scil.* the troops)’; *Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 12 *3d.t r=f dd=f s3=f hm-hʕt.t w3=f r 3d* ‘Whenever one acts aggressively against him, he shows his back; whenever one retreats, he falls into aggression’; *Hammamat* 43, 6-7 *n km(n).t m ib n hm=f* (...) ‘One could not demonstrate bravery in the heart of His Majesty (...)’. *Passim*, very common.

B. The illustration above was with passives from primary intransitives. Passives from O-detransitivized events provide similarly favorable contexts for alternative construals of a prominence-based construction (the passive) as a specificity-based one (the active impersonal). Constructions with a specific Agent are occasionally found in

<sup>105</sup> With fuller context, §1.1.1, (I).

a perfective environment (g), but constructions with non-specific Agents are considerably more common both in perfective and in imperfective environments (h)-(i). As a direct result of O-detransitivization itself, the event lacks an Endpoint, and the Agent-backgrounding component is accordingly prominent:

*With a specific Agent, in a perfective environment (uncommon)*

(g) Mentuwoser (MMA 12.184), 7-8 *iw ip m-<sup>c</sup>=i m pr-nsw nhm n=i dw3 ntr n=i* ‘There was counting by me in the palace, there was joyful shouting for me, there was thanking the god for me.’

*With a non-specific Agent (common)*

(h) Perfective: *Ipuwer* 6.3 *iw ms it 3kw hr w3t nb sh3w m hbsw hs3 m mrht* ‘But now, barley has perished on every road. There has been stripping people of their clothes, there has been making them unanointed with oil.’

(i) Imperfective: CT V 11c-d T1L *inn.t n=f r-tnw dbh=f s<sup>c</sup>r.t n=f r-tnw ibb=f* ‘One brings to him every time he asks; one presents to him every time he is thirsty.’

Sim., in a negative clause: *Ipuwer* 2.4 *iw ms hmwt wsr<.ti> n iw[r].n.tw* ‘But now, wives are barren: there is no conceiving.’

The case of passives in the Mediate Construction of the O (§2.6.1.2) is slightly different because the construction includes an O, if one indirectly introduced, and thereby in some cases an Endpoint. Significantly, a construction with a specific Agent is found in a non-perfective environment (j). On the other hand, the Mediate Construction of the O displays distinguished associations with the imperfective (k). In such environments, the Agent is typically non-specific, and the imperfective aspect further favors alternative construals of the passive:

(j) CT VI 164b B1Bo *ir wd<sup>c</sup>.t m N pn in gbb (...)* ‘If there is a judgment on this N by Geb (...)’

(k) *Debate* 124-125 *iw šw ø m k-ib inn.tw m hmm r srht n=f* ‘There is a lack of intimates, one resorts even to an unknown man to complain to him.’

Sim., in a negative clause: Pyr. 617b<sup>TAnMNjp</sup> (PT 364) *dmd.n=f kw n hn.n.ti im=k* ‘He has put you together: there can be no disturbing on you.’

### 5.3.4 The spread of Subject-Verb constructions

Beyond the dimensions just addressed, the rise of the innovative constructions of {t} also relates to a broader, and in itself entirely unrelated, process of ongoing linguistic change, namely to the spread of Subject-Verb constructions. A detailed examination of the relative chronology of changes as documented in the record is here essential.

A. In all historical times, {t} has singular exponence (it codes only passive voice), does not display any fusion with other elements of verbal morphology ({t} is

agglutinated to the chain), and sits at the outer edge of the inflected form (just before personal clitic expressions). In addition, the parameters for a formal equivocation concerning the coding of grammatical relations (§5.3.2) were the same in the Old Kingdom and in the Middle Kingdom. Accordingly, {t} would have been available for an extraction out of its inflectional position by the Old Kingdom just as it was in the Twelfth Dynasty. In the active, Subject-Verb constructions developed in the Old Kingdom outside Pyramid Texts: *NP hr sdm* (including two *wn*-auxiliated constructions, *wn=f hr sdm* and *wn.in=f hr sdm*) and *NP r sdm*. Yet, the earliest occurrences of {t} in preverbal position in Subject-Verb constructions are not before the Twelfth Dynasty. As it thus appears, the early rise of Subject-Verb did not trigger the extraction of {t} out of its inflectional position.

Among the two major Subject-Verb constructions that developed in the Old Kingdom, *NP r sdm* grammaticalized to express highly specific semantics. In relation to these, the construction was semantically oriented. Voice was not marked morphologically, not by {t} nor in any other way (§2.3.2). *NP hr sdm*, for its part, expresses progressive aspect. As discussed, the combination of progressive aspect with passive voice is semantically unnatural and accordingly rare in discourse. The passive thus lacks a dedicated construction expressing progressive aspect, a T-passive of the unaccomplished *sdm=f* being recruited to provide the passive counterpart to the active *NP hr sdm* (§3.2).

B. The earliest occurrences of {t} in preverbal position in the Twelfth Dynasty are in constructions of the type *wn.INFL NP hr sdm* (*wn=f hr sdm*,<sup>106</sup> *wn.in=f hr sdm*, *wn.hr=f hr sdm*; §5.1.2.1). In particular, they are not with (unauxiliated) *NP hr sdm* itself, the passive counterpart of which remains *sdm.t=f* until the later Second Intermediate Period in all written registers, and until the late Eighteenth Dynasty in several. Differing from *NP hr sdm*, which expresses a mere progressive, constructions of the type *wn.INFL NP hr sdm* have additional semantic import associated with the inflected auxiliary. In more details, various cases must be distinguished.

*Wn.hr NP hr sdm*, which is documented from Coffin Texts on,<sup>107</sup> stands in a direct semantic contrast to *sdm.hr=f*. While both convey the semantics associated with *-hr-*, the former additionally expresses that the event is viewed in its extension, as in progressive aspect.<sup>108</sup> The development of a detransitive construction of *wn.hr NP hr sdm* thus permits an overt expression of the same semantic contrast as in the active:<sup>109</sup>

(i) P. UC 32036 (Kahun Veterinary Papyrus), 20-23

*rd.hr.t=f hr gs=f w<sup>c</sup>*

*wn.hr.t hr ntš=f m mw kb*

*sin.hr.t irty=f hn<sup>c</sup> drw=f hn<sup>c</sup> t=f nbt*

106 On *wn* in *wn=f hr sdm* being the *sdm.n=f*, and thereby an inflected form, of *wnn*, §5, n.12.

107 Vernus (1990: 63-5).

108 Vernus (1990: 62-3).

109 In the active, e.g. CT V 209g-j M1C (Vernus 1990: 62, ex.130).

‘It (*scil.* the bull being examined) is to be lain on its side,  
it is to be continuously sprinkled with fresh water,  
and its eyes are to be rubbed along with its flanks and all its limbs.’

By a similar general principle, *wn NP hr sdm* permits an overt expression of progressive aspect in the past tense. While the active construction is documented since the Old Kingdom,<sup>110</sup> its detransitive pendant is first documented in the early Twelfth Dynasty, opening the narrative part of the inscription in providing a setting to a main clause, itself with an inflectional passive (ii). In the Old Kingdom, passive events that provide a setting opening a following narrative sequence were expressed by T-passives, at least as far as the extant record goes (iii). The rise of *wn.t hr sdm* therefore appears to be related to broader innovations in narrative formulations in the Middle Kingdom:

(ii.a) Antefiqer’s *Girgawi Inscription* 6-7 (*temp.* Amenemhat I)

*wn.t hr kḏ hrnt pn*

‘*h*<sup>c</sup>.*n sm3* *nḥsw spt nbt m w3w3t (...)*

‘While this enclosure was being built,  
the Nubians, the whole remainder of Wawat, were killed (...)’

(ii.b) *Urk.* I 100, 13-14 (Weni)

*šn.t ht m ipt-nsw r hmt-nsw wrt-ḥts m sšt3*

*rd hm=f h3y(=i) r sdm w<sup>c</sup>.k (...)*

‘An inquiry was secretly conducted in the royal harem against the king’s wife,  
the great-of-affection.

His Majesty had me go to instruct the case alone (...)’

*Sim. Urk.* I 104, 12-15 *ḏḏ.t wnt btkw nḥt m ḥ3stiw pn (...)* *d3.k m nmiw ḥn<sup>c</sup> tẓwt*

*ptn (...)* ‘It was said that there were strong enemies among these foreigners (...) I  
crossed over in barges with these troops (...)’

Unlike *wn.hr=f hr sdm* and *sdm.hr=f*, *wn.in=f hr sdm* and *sdm.in=f* do not contrast semantically along the lines of marked vs. unmarked for progressive aspect.<sup>111</sup> Rather the synthetic and analytic *-in*-marked constructions alternate depending on various other, not directly semantic, factors (for example, high-frequency verbs, particularly in certain recurrent formulations in Middle Egyptian narrative, favor the former).<sup>112</sup> *Wn.in=f hr sdm* is documented twice in Sixth Dynasty autobiographies,<sup>113</sup> then again from the Middle Kingdom onwards, when it had become a regular construction in narrative. As to *sdm.in=f*, this was one of a common form in a subset of Fifth Dynasty

110 Doret (1986: 112-3).

111 As regards the inchoative reading often possible with *wn.in=f hr sdm*, and reflected in some of the translations proposed here, this is a natural effect of the combination of a past narrative tense with an atelic event (Winand 2006: 215-7), and is therefore not part of the grammatical semantics of the construction. Similarly in a forerunner construction of the sequential, Stauder (2013a: 39, (i)).

112 Provisionally, Stauder (2013a: 126-8); Schenkel (in press), with partly similar and partly different analyses.

113 Doret (1986: 114).

(auto)biographies (Washptah, Kaientjenenet, Niankhsekhmet), but *-in*-marked constructions are rare in the Sixth, and apparently not documented again before the early Middle Kingdom. Against this historically shifting pattern of documentation, the suddenly more widespread use of *wn.in=f hr sdm* in the Middle Kingdom relates to broader changes in narrative formulations. At this time, a detransitive pendant to the construction also first appeared, *wn.in.t hr sdm*.

As initially observed, early occurrences of {t} in preverbal position concern constructions of the type *wn.INFL NP hr sdm*, not *NP hr sdm* itself. As independently noted, the passive, an Endpoint-oriented category, views the event from a place that is metaphorically distal with respect to the speech situation (§4.5.2.B). Patterns of the type *wn.INFL NP hr sdm* express a past tense in the textual background (*wn=f hr sdm*), a past tense in the main narrative chain of events (*wn.in=f hr sdm*), and an event necessarily to occur given certain conditions, thus an event not referring to any particular occasion (*wn.hr=f hr sdm*). In all these cases, the event is removed from the here and now of the speech situation, unlike what is the case in the progressive (*NP hr sdm*).

C. By the late Twelfth Dynasty, beginning in relatively less formal registers, {t} is extended to the preverbal position in the construction *NP r sdm* (§5.1.2.2). A century or so earlier, by the early Middle Kingdom, *NP r sdm* had itself begun weakening into a future. Expressing this value, the construction is syntactically oriented, and voice has to be marked. To this end, the T-passive of the prospective was used (§3.3.B). In the late Twelfth Dynasty, in such registers in which the active prospective itself had been lost, (*X*).*tw r sdm* was innovated to provide the detransitive counterpart to *NP r sdm*. This was to spread to all written registers, probably fairly rapidly.

The counterpart relationship between *NP r sdm* and *irw.t=f* was thus short-lived, lasting for perhaps a century only. In this, the future contrasts with the progressive, for which the counterpart relationship between *NP hr sdm* and *sdm.t=f*, established earlier, also lasted longer, until the later Second Intermediate Period in some registers, and until the later Eighteenth Dynasty in others. This difference has historical reasons: the counterpart relationship between *NP r sdm* and *irw.t=f* came about only once *NP r sdm* had weakened into a future, not when it first grammaticalized. Furthermore, the stem on which the passive form was based, the prospective, was itself entering obsolescence soon after. On an altogether different level, it was noted that the combination of passive voice with progressive aspect is semantically unnatural and accordingly rare in discourse. There is nothing unnatural, by contrast, in a passive future: unlike the progressive, the future is deictically removed from the speech situation.

By the time (*X*).*tw r sdm* developed, early occurrences of *k3.t sdm.t=f* and *hr.t sdm.t=f* are found as well, in the same registers (§5.1.3.3). As discussed, these are morphosyntactic hybrids, combining features of a passive construction (the syntax of the O and the possibility to express the Agent in syntactic periphery by the *in N* phrase) with features of an active impersonal one (the doubling of {t}, a characteristic of morphemes that have functions in referring). The rise of these constructions by the same time and in the same registers as (*X*).*tw r sdm* is hardly coincidental.



D. In the late Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom, {t} is spreading further. From the late Second Intermediate Period on, early instances of (X).tw hr sdm expressing the progressive are found (§5.1.2.3.1.A). Yet, sdm.t=f as a passive counterpart to NP hr sdm was only abandoned by the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty, by the time, therefore, when the unaccomplished sdm=f itself was entering obsolescence. In the same period, and reflecting the same context of broader ongoing change, (X).tw hr sdm was also extended to the expression of non-progressive events (§5.1.2.3.1.C).

By the early Eighteenth Dynasty, {t} spread to new constructions as these themselves emerged. Early occurrences of {t} accommodated into the paradigm of the new subject pronoun (tw.tw), in the early Eighteenth Dynasty, are only slightly later than the earliest occurrences of that pronoun themselves; the time lag probably merely reflects the low density of attestation (§5.1.2.4). Early occurrences of {t} in the narrative construction ḥḥ.n=f hr sdm are also from the early Eighteenth Dynasty (§5.1.2.3.1.B). In the Middle Kingdom, ḥḥ.n=f hr sdm was rare, standing against the then common ḥḥ.n sdm.n=f (with a passive ḥḥ.n P<sub>O</sub> PsP ~ ḥḥ.n V-pass N). It was therefore not until ḥḥ.n=f hr sdm became more widespread that ḥḥ.n.tw hr sdm developed—both coexisting during the Eighteenth Dynasty with the older constructions, ḥḥ.n sdm.n=f and ḥḥ.n P PsP ~ ḥḥ.n V-pass N. Early occurrences of {t} in the sequential iw=f hr sdm, finally, are contemporaneous with early occurrences of the active construction itself, in the times of Thutmose III and Amenhotep II (§5.1.2.3.1.B). Collectively, these constructions demonstrate that by the early New Kingdom, {t} was fully established as an impersonal subject pronoun, to be extended to any innovative active construction as this itself emerged.

### 5.3.5 The circumstantial conditions and mechanisms of a rare change

#### 5.3.5.1 The intralinguistic context of the change

As initially exposed, an analysis of the change in its intralinguistic context is constrained by the following observations (§5.3.1):

- T-passives and V-passives are used in the same passive construction and under the same semantic conditions, yet the change concerns only {t}, not V-passive morphology. Particularities of T-passives—in their morphology and in their uses in text—are therefore a necessary component of the analysis;
- The change consists in a twofold extension of {t}, to constructions that can not be passivized on semantic grounds and to such that can not be passivized on morphological grounds. The change, therefore, is not solely a matter of morphology;
- In the environments to which {t} was extended, other constructions were in regular use in earlier times, providing a counterpart to the passive when this could not be used (e.g. pr.t – sdr ø; NP hr sdm – sdm.t=f). The change, therefore, could just as well not have happened;

- At times when {t} had long been extended to new environments, T-passives themselves continued to be used, unchanged. The change, therefore, can not be analyzed as the mapping out of a prior reanalysis of T-passives.

The change is therefore analyzed in terms of the intralinguistic preconditions for a formal equivocation of the passive construction as an active impersonal one, of the discourse contexts favoring alternative construals of the passive construction (a prominence-based construction type) as a specificity-based construction, and of a broader context of ongoing linguistic change to which changes affecting {t} relate.

Considerable space for a formal equivocation of the passive construction as an active impersonal one results from the coding properties of grammatical relations in Earlier Egyptian and from the nature of T-passive morphology (§5.3.2):

(a) *The coding properties of grammatical relations in Earlier Egyptian*—In Verb-Subject patterns, grammatical relations are coded mainly by word order, and only limited by nominal morphology (a contrast between the grammatical relations of object and subject concerns only singular pronomina clitics);

(b) *T-passive morphology*—{T} has singular exponence (it codes only passive voice), does not fuse with other elements of verbal morphology ({t} is agglutinated to the chain), and sits at the outer edge of the inflected form (after any markers of tense-aspect-mood and just before personal clitic expressions).<sup>114</sup>

Discourse contexts favoring alternative construals of the passive construction as a specificity-based construction are given when the implied Agent is non-specific and/or when the event lacks an Endpoint (§5.3.3). The following environments and constructions are therefore particularly favorable for alternative construals:

(c) *Non-perfective environments, and even more strongly so, imperfective ones*—Both typically correlate with non-specific Agents; the latter additionally imply a perspective on the event in which the Endpoint is entirely out of focus, further reinforcing the Agent-backgrounding component in the construal of the event. In Middle Egyptian, the V-passive has become restricted to perfective environments; both non-perfective and imperfective environments are thereby the exclusive domain of T-passives;

(d) *The widespread use of passives from intransitives*—In these, the Agent is often non-specific as well. Moreover, passives from intransitives generally lack an Endpoint, reinforcing the Agent-backgrounding component in the construal of the event. In Middle Egyptian, passives from intransitives (both primary and secondary ones) are fully regular, provided the event implies an Agent in its semantic representation. They are accordingly common in text.

---

114 A position at the outer edge of a form more generally seems to be a favorable precondition for deinflectionalization or debonding (Idiatov 2008: 160, discussing an instance of such change in Tura).

In addition, imperfective passives only rarely have pronominal O's (reflecting the diffuseness of their Endpoint) and passives from intransitives have no O at all (by definition). In both these cases, the semantic dimensions just recalled thereby combine with the conditions for a formal equivocation discussed first.

Innovative constructions of {t} first appear during the Twelfth Dynasty, at a time when Subject-Verb constructions were spreading in the language (§5.3.4):

(e) *The spread of Subject-Verb constructions*—Centuries after the initial rise of Subject-Verb constructions in the Old Kingdom, early occurrences of {t} in preverbal position are found at a time when Subject-Verb constructions were extending beyond their initially restricted domain of use: becoming more common in constructions of the type *wn.INFL NP hr sdm*, and weakening into a future in the case of *NP r sdm*. Early instances of morphologically innovative uses of {t} thus correlate with an increased frequency of use of Subject-Verb constructions, particularly in situations in which these do not relate to the here and now of the speech situation.

Among the above, morphology (b) and aspectual correlates (c) concern T-passives specifically. Both are important: if none of the Earlier Egyptian inflectional types of passives had had the specific morphological properties of T-passives, change could have failed to occur. If, conversely, T-passives had not had the specific aspectual correlates, alternative construals of T-passives may not have been favored as strongly as they were; change could then also have failed to occur.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that the above elements (a)-(e) are hardly any exceptional in isolation. Only the very considerable development of subjectless passive constructions in Earlier Egyptian is more remarkable (d), although it would not have sufficed alone to make the change possible. In retrospect, the specific ways by which Subject-Verb constructions spread in early second-millennium Egyptian (e)—not the mere fact that Subject-Verb constructions developed—also proved an important element of the broader intralinguistic context of the change: even more than in other known instances of deinflectionalization,<sup>115</sup> an entirely unrelated process of change is thus tightly associated with a rare change that otherwise could just as well not have happened. It was therefore the coincidental conjunction of a set of favorable conditions and circumstances, none exceptional in itself, that conspired to make the degrammaticalization of an inflectional marker of the passive—an exceptional change by all accounts—possible in early second-millennium Egyptian.<sup>116</sup>

### 5.3.5.2 The mechanisms of the change

In a usage-based perspective, linguistic change has its roots in discourse, happens in a community of speakers, and can be determined, at times strongly, by frequency

<sup>115</sup> For example the deinflectionalization of the *-s* genitive in Scandinavian and Germanic languages, which is analyzed in relation to the demise of the case system in these languages (Norde 2009: 235).

<sup>116</sup> In a similar vein, accounting for typologically unusual structures in other languages, Harris (2008).

effects.<sup>117</sup> Against this general background, the mechanisms involved in the change discussed in the present chapter are the following.

The extension of {t} to constructions in which it occupies the preverbal subject slot presupposes an occasional reanalysis of T-passives, as is made possible by the large space for a formal equivocation of Earlier Egyptian T-passive constructions. Meanwhile, and for centuries to follow, T-passives themselves remained unchanged in their morphosyntax: as already noted, this implies that the change does not represent the mapping out, or actualization, of a prior reanalysis of T-passives.<sup>118</sup> Rather, it was the potential for an occasional reanalysis in the mental representations of individual speakers that was instrumental in the change under discussion.<sup>119</sup> In terms of frequency effects, the considerable space for formal equivocation must be emphasized.

The second mechanism involved in the change is pragmatic enrichment. As an inflectional marker of the passive, {t} codes voice, a grammatical construction. In its innovative uses, both in Subject-Verb constructions and with events that fail to meet the semantic condition for passivization, {t} stands for a non-specific participant: while acquiring constituent status, the segment is thus invested with semantic content. As discussed, passive constructions with non-specific Agents and lacking an Endpoint—in other words, non-prototypical passives chief among which are imperfective ones and passives from intransitives—provide favorable conditions for an alternative construal of the passive as a specificity-based construction. It was in these environments that pragmatic enrichment could occur, again in the mental representations of individual speakers. In terms of frequency effects, the rich development of Earlier Egyptian passive constructions with intransitives, primary and secondary ones, was probably of direct relevance.

The third mechanism involved is context generalization: to events that could not be passivized on semantic grounds, and to such that could not be passivized on morphological ones. While different in nature, both processes are intimately interrelated (§5.3.1).

The mechanisms of change involved—potential for reanalysis, pragmatic enrichment, and context generalization—are all very ordinary ones, and, perhaps surprisingly at first, the very same ones also operating in grammaticalization itself. While counter-directional in reversing some of the primitive changes associated with some of the parameters of secondary grammaticalization, the deinflectionalization of Earlier Egyptian {t} ultimately reflects the exact same conditions and dynamics of linguistic interaction. That the change would go counter to strong general directional tendencies in linguistic change reflects the particular intralinguistic context of early

---

117 E.g. Bybee (2010); Croft (2000).

118 In the study of linguistic change, reanalysis is often considered a necessary mechanism (e.g. Harris & Campbell 1995: 61-96), including for grammaticalization (challenged by Haspelmath 1998). The change under discussion provides a counter-example.

119 On the potential for reanalysis, as against actual reanalysis, also Norde (2009: 102): ‘(...) affixal degrammaticalization is admittedly rare, but in case of *favourable circumstances*, such as some kind of internal Systemstörung (Plank 1995) and a *possibility of* morphosyntactic reanalysis, it is by no means impossible’ (emphasis mine).

second-millennium Egyptian: this was exceptional, but only as the exceptional coming together of a set of individually mostly unremarkable circumstances.

NB. Degrammaticalization is a very rare type of change, instances noted so far numbering just a dozen (§5.2). It is therefore worth mentioning that second-millennium Egyptian provides yet another case of degrammaticalization, beyond the one discussed in the present chapter: the rise of the third person plural =*w* out of an adverbial ending.<sup>120</sup> The change has its origin in the construction *sdm.n(v)*, a *sdm.n=f* with the prepositional adverb *n(v)* inserted for the (historically related) inflectional marker *-n-* (on the construction, §2.7.3.2; on the historical relation of the inflectional marker *-n-* to the preposition *n*, §2.2.4.1.2.A). It consists in a sequence of processes of extension, documented during the Eighteenth Dynasty: to forms of the Verb-Subject conjugation that do not include *-n-* (e.g. *sdm=w*); to subject slots other than solely verbal ones (e.g. *iw=w*); and finally to all syntactic positions in which an anaphoric pronoun can occur, not solely subject ones (e.g. *N=w*). The overall change implies resemanticization, deparadigmaticization, and severance, and therefore represents an instance of deinflectionalization.<sup>121</sup> Its mechanisms include extension, pragmatic enrichment, and reanalysis: like the degrammaticalization of {*t*}, the degrammaticalization of =*w* runs counter to certain primitive changes associated with secondary grammaticalization, but does not involve any mechanisms of change other than the ordinary ones. Also like the degrammaticalization of {*t*}, the degrammaticalization of =*w* was made possible by a set of circumstances, none exceptional individually, but remarkable in their conjunction. These include: (a) the existence of prepositional adverbs in Earlier Egyptian; (b) the existence of a form of the verb historically incorporating a preposition, the *sdm.n=f*; (c) the position of the adverbializing ending *-w*, at the outer edge of the form (e.g. *hnt-w* ‘before’)—just like {*t*} as an inflectional marker in T-passives; and (d) a broader context of change which saw increasing morphological syncretism in third person clitics.<sup>122</sup> Another point in common between the two changes is that the pragmatic enrichment of grammatical morphology (derivational *-w* in prepositional adverbs, the inflectional passive marker {*t*} in T-passives) in both cases results in pronominal expressions located at the very low end of the scale of topicality, a third person plural pronoun and an impersonal subject pronoun, respectively. This is probably not coincidental, and could point to some limits not commonly gone beyond in processes of pragmatic enrichment.

## 5.4 Part III, opening up: A sketch of the longer Earlier Egyptian durée

Various elements of linguistic change occurring during Earlier Egyptian have been described over the course of the present study. These can now be put in perspective

<sup>120</sup> Detailed descriptive study: Edel (1959).

<sup>121</sup> For this and further analytical considerations alluded to below, Stauder (in press c: §10).

<sup>122</sup> For very early manifestations of this process, Uljas (2010b).

with one another to provide a sketch of changes affecting passive voice during the longer Earlier Egyptian *durée*, beginning with its Semitic and Afroasiatic background.

A. The formal inventory of Earlier Egyptian detransitive morphology includes several elements in common with Semitic and Afroasiatic languages. {T}, the marker of T-passives (§1.1), is cognate to {t} in Semitic and Afroasiatic T-stems and T-marked forms (§2.9.2.2). The morpheme finds its probable origin in a lexical marker of the reflexive, grammaticalized into a grammatical marker of the same category, and subsequently extended to anticausative, middle, and passive functions. Of these functions, Earlier Egyptian {t} had specialized on the last exclusively. Another morphological category in common between Earlier Egyptian and Semitic and Afroasiatic languages is the resultative form, the pseudoparticiple in Earlier Egyptian. The uses of the form to express non-dynamic events are primary (§2.3.1.2): the development by which the pseudoparticiple became an integral part of the accomplished paradigm with certain types of events—with subject-affecting intransitives and in the passive construction, only with pronominal subjects for the latter (§4.1; 4.5.1)—represents an inner-Egyptian innovation. Yet another morphological category in common between Earlier Egyptian and Semitic and Afroasiatic languages is the prefix *n-* (§2.9.2.1). Possibly grammaticalized from a ‘light verb’ ‘say’ or the like, the Semitic prefix *n-* developed first as a verbalizer serving to conjugate segments that did not easily fit into the conjugational patterns, and only secondarily became a regular stem formation with derivational and grammatical functions, including the passive. Both morphologically and semantically, Earlier Egyptian *n-* relates to the early stages of this development, stopping short of developing regular derivational or grammatical functions. As comparative evidence suggests, the failure of *n-* to develop further into a regular derivational or grammatical prefix probably relates to the productivity of T-passives in Earlier Egyptian.

Other morphological categories represent inner-Egyptian innovations. The perfective V-passive (§1.2) has its probable origin in a construction with a resultative stem of some sort, and could thus be indirectly related to the Earlier Egyptian resultative form, the pseudoparticiple (§2.9.1.2). Like the perfective V-passive, unmarked passive participles find their likely origin in a resultative stem of some sort (§2.9.1.1). Passives associated with a reduplication of the last root consonant (§1.3) are not remnants of a supposedly very old type of passive inflection, but represent a secondary formation, and arguably a subtype of V-passives. Marginal finite forms that do not fit into any of the above types are unmarked for voice and/or non-finite in origin (§1.4).

In a marked contrast to most early Semitic languages, Earlier Egyptian detransitive morphology is strictly passive. Differences extend to the passive construction itself (§2). The expression of the Agent is regular in the Earlier Egyptian passive construction. Moreover, passives from intransitives are regular in Earlier Egyptian, and common in text. In early Semitic languages, both constructions are only marginally licensed or not at all. While detransitive voice typically combines semantic and discourse-pragmatic functions in early Semitic, Earlier Egyptian concentrates on the latter exclusively. Similar comments extend to non-finite passive constructions,

which in Earlier Egyptian revolve around syntactic functions in the domain of relativization (§2.4.2; §2.9.1.1). In view of the partly shared morphological repertoire, these differences in intralinguistic functionalization are noteworthy. (Venturing beyond the descriptive onto the more speculative, one wonders whether this difference could relate to the rigid word-order patterns of Earlier Egyptian, which do not permit certain discourse-pragmatic functions to be fulfilled by constituent movement.)

B. During Earlier Egyptian, T-passives spread, gradually replacing V-passives in many constructions. In general terms, this can be described as a process by which the morphologically and semantically componential T-passives came to fulfill increasingly many functions that were once the domain of V-passives.

The prospective V-passive and the *sḏmm=f*—in complementary distribution to one another according to inflectional classes—are confined to earlier funerary corpora, Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts. Outside these, T-passives of the prospective have replaced these forms (§1.2.2); the prospective V-passive survives only marginally in complement clauses, in earlier stages of Earlier Egyptian. In Coffin Texts themselves, the T-passive of the prospective is observed spreading, resulting in a situation in which it is used side by side with the prospective V-passive and the *sḏmm=f*; the very earliest stages of the process are observed in Pyramid Texts only. As no other factors seem to have been at play, the change is probably best interpreted as a process of morphological obsolescence. The obsolescence of the non-finite form associated with partial reduplication, the unmarked passive participle *ddd*, is a separate process (§1.3.1.3.B). Still productive in the Middle Kingdom (e.g. *tss* from *ts* < *ṯ(3)z*), the formation was increasingly moving toward becoming a derivational category, ultimately surviving only in individual lexicalized items.

In three other processes of change, the form replaced by a T-passive is the perfective V-passive: in the negative accomplished (*n V-pass* → *n sḏm.t=f*), in the negative unaccomplished (*n V-pass* → *n sḏm.n.t=f*), and in the ‘emphatic’ construction (*V-pass* → *sḏm.n.t=f*). In a first approximation, T-passives are thus seen superseding the perfective V-passive in environments in which the event scores low on one or more parameters associated with semantic transitivity: in negative clauses (*n V-pass* → *n sḏm.t=f*; *n V-pass* → *n sḏm.n.t=f*), in a construction in which assertion is not primarily about the verbal event itself (*V-pass* → *sḏm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction), and in a construction that expresses general or habitual aspect (*n V-pass* → *n sḏm.n.t=f*). In analyzing these processes further, individual details of the changes must be examined as these can be traced in the record, and a distinction must be made according to the form of the T-passive that superseded the perfective V-passive.

In the negative accomplished, the perfective V-passive is replaced by a T-passive of the past tense *sḏm=f* (*n V-pass* → *n sḏm.t=f*; §4.3.5.1.3). While *n sḏm.t=f* is found as early as Pyramid Texts (twice), *n V-pass* remains the regular construction in earlier stages of Earlier Egyptian. In Middle Kingdom non-literary texts, the two constructions coexist; in literary texts, *n sḏm.t=f* has become the rule. Meanwhile, a similar change concerned the active: while in earlier times, *n sḏm.n=f* and *n sḏm=f* coexisted as two negations of the accomplished, the latter has fully superseded the

former in later stages of Earlier Egyptian. In this particular change, the replacement of the perfective V-passive by a T-passive is therefore related to a broader change occurring in the language, and not specific to passive voice.

In the two other constructions mentioned above, the perfective V-passive is replaced by a T-passive of the *sdm.n=f*. In the negative unaccomplished (*n V-pass* → *n sdm.n.t=f*: §4.3.5.2), the V-passive is the form regularly used in earlier times. Early occurrences of the T-passive, in Pyramid Texts, in a First Intermediate Period inscription, and in a Middle Kingdom one, are very few; all are subjectless passives. *N sdm.n.t=f* spread to passives from transitives only in Middle Kingdom literary texts; in these, *n V-pass* has become confined to passives with full noun subjects, for which it is used alongside *n sdm.n.t=f*. In Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptions, *n V-pass* *N* and *n sdm.n.t=f* *N* still coexist with full noun subjects, the older construction having possibly become an index of an elevated register. In the ‘emphatic’ construction (*V-pass* → *sdm.n.t=f*: §4.2) similarly, the V-passive is the form regularly used in earlier times. Early occurrences of the T-passive, already in the Old Kingdom, are with full noun subjects and in a subjectless construction. It is only in Coffin Texts that the *sdm.n.t=f* becomes more common, alternating with the V-passive; the form is extended to pronominal subjects. In the Middle Kingdom, and except for a few remnants in phraseologically bound formulations, the *sdm.n.t=f* has replaced the V-passive in the ‘emphatic’ construction. As is thus appears, the replacement of the perfective V-passive by a T-passive of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the negative unaccomplished and in the ‘emphatic’ construction were protracted processes, begun in the Old Kingdom and completed only in the Twelfth Dynasty. In the case of the ‘emphatic’ construction, early occurrences of the *sdm.n.t=f* are in part with full noun subjects: this development relates to the fact that verbal morphology is otherwise indistinct in the same construction (*V-pass non-P* is used in earlier times both in the ‘emphatic’ construction and outside it: §4.2.3). The other early occurrences of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the ‘emphatic’ construction, as well as all pre-Twelfth Dynasty occurrences of the same form in the negative unaccomplished, are subjectless (§4.3.5.5.2). As the record thus documents, passives from intransitives played a central role in the early development of the T-passive of the *sdm.n=f*.

When the perspective is set on the dynamic part of an accomplished passive event rather than on its Endpoint (as in the ‘emphatic’ construction), or when the completion of a passive event is negated (as in the negative unaccomplished), the Endpoint of the event is out of focus, departing from the passive prototype. Unlike the perfective V-passive, which synthesizes passive voice and perfective aspect—two Endpoint-oriented categories—the *sdm.n.t=f* is morphologically a T-passive of the *sdm.n=f*, a mere accomplished. In early occurrences of the *sdm.n.t=f*, the event lacks an Endpoint and the construction is accordingly oriented on the event itself. In the same environments and in the same texts, the perfective V-passive is used for events that have a salient Endpoint, including, occasionally, in subjectless constructions themselves, when an expression of the Goal provides an Endpoint to the event. In constructions in which the Endpoint is out of focus (the negative unaccomplished and the ‘emphatic’ construction), the perfective V-passive (a prototypical, perfective and Endpoint-oriented passive) was thus replaced by the *sdm.n.t=f* (a mere morphological



pendant to the active accomplished). The development begun with passives from intransitives, that is, with passives that, in lacking an Endpoint, themselves depart very strongly from the passive prototype.

The exclusive use of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the accomplished passive construction is a secondary development, completed only in later stages of Earlier Egyptian. The form then provides the regular expression to the fact that an accomplished event, even though passive, is not perfective, but merely accomplished—in equivalent terms, that the Endpoint is out of focus even though the event is an accomplished passive. These semantic contrasts, as well as the dynamics of change just evoked, are illustrative of the higher semantic complexity of the passive over the active in the accomplished (§4.5.2). Completing the description, the T-passive of the *sdm.n=f* replaced the perfective V-passive in a series of further environments during Earlier Egyptian: in *pw*-markedthetic and topic-presentative constructions, in *ir*-introduced conditional clauses, in clauses dependent on a noun, and in clauses introduced by a preposition (§4.4.2-3). In these, the clause is embedded into a higher syntactic node, and the event is not subject to assertion like it is in main clauses: its Endpoint is accordingly less in focus. On the other hand, the T-passive of the *sdm.n=f* did not spread to main clauses such as introduced by *iw* or *ḥḥ.n*, and to asyndetically linked main or dependent clause: in these environments, the Endpoint remains fully in focus. As an overall result of these combined developments, the perfective V-passive is in later stages of Earlier Egyptian confined to uses in complementary distribution with the pseudo-participle (*P<sub>O</sub> PsP ~ V-pass non-P*): the former has lost its functional autonomy vis-à-vis the latter.

C. Beginning in the early second millennium, {t} was extended to new environments in which it can not be analyzed as an inflectional marker of the passive anymore (§5.1). These included events that fail to meet the semantic condition for passivization in Earlier Egyptian. {T} was thus extended successively to dynamic events lacking an Agent in their semantic representation (by the mid-Twelfth Dynasty), to non-dynamic events (by the later Twelfth Dynasty), and ultimately even to the situational predicate construction (in the Eighteenth Dynasty): an inflectional marker of voice—a verbal category—had thus come to be used in a construction that is not even verbal. By the same time, {t} began to be extended to constructions that could not accommodate an inflectional marker of the passive on morphological grounds, namely to Subject-Verb constructions with the lexical verb in the infinitive: first to constructions of the type *wn.INFL NP ḥr sdm* (in the Twelfth Dynasty), slightly later to *NP r sdm* (in innovative registers of the late Twelfth Dynasty), subsequently also to *NP ḥr sdm* expressing the progressive (in innovative registers of the later Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom), and, eventually, to other Subject-Verb constructions as these themselves developed during the early New Kingdom. Having acquired full constituent status in these constructions, {t} could be integrated into the paradigm of the new subject pronoun only a few decades after this itself emerged at the turn to the Eighteenth Dynasty.

The change discussed in this chapter consists in an extension of {t} to new environments without a prior reanalysis of T-passives themselves (§5.3). The coding

properties of grammatical relations in Earlier Egyptian (mainly by word order) and the componential nature of T-passive morphology (with {t} sitting at the outer edge of the inflected form) afforded an ample space for a formal equivocation of T-passive constructions. Imperfective passives (which had become the exclusive domain of T-passives by the early second millennium) and passives from intransitives (which were widespread in Earlier Egyptian) favored alternative construals of the passive as a specificity-based construction in the mental representations of individual speakers. The spread of Subject-Verb constructions in the early second millennium—not their initial rise in the mid-third—provided an additional element of intralinguistic context for the early stages of the change: early instances of morphologically innovative uses of {t} are found in constructions of the type *wn.INFL NP hr sdm* by the time these were themselves becoming more common, and in *NP r sdm* only a century or so after this had weakened into a future. Semantically, both construction types have in common to express events that do not relate to here and now of the speech situation, unlike for example the progressive *NP hr sdm*, to which {t} would spread only much later.

The change—a rare instance of degrammaticalization, and, more specifically, of deinflectionalization (§5.2)—was thus made possible by an extraordinary conjunction of circumstances, most of which are fairly ordinary in themselves (§5.3.5). Given this conjunction of circumstances in early second-millennium Egyptian, the mechanisms of the change—potential for reanalysis, pragmatic enrichment, and context generalization—are some of the most common ones in linguistic change, including in grammaticalization itself. Contemplated over the very longue durée, a morpheme that finds its likely origin in a lexical expression of the reflexive (reconstructed) had thus grammaticalized into a grammatical expression of the same category, developed further grammatical functions in anticausative, middle, and passive voice (thus in several Semitic languages), specialized on the last domain in Earlier Egyptian, and eventually given rise to an impersonal subject pronoun. As an active impersonal pronoun, {t} had regained constituent status, as it would have had, millennia before, as a lexical expression of the reflexive, yet it did not regain status as a lexical word: the primitive changes reversed in the deinflectionalization of {t} concern only the parameters associated with secondary grammaticalization, not the ones associated with primary grammaticalization.

D. In the early Eighteenth Dynasty, the Agent-expressing *in N* phrase was rapidly losing ground except in the most formal registers: this strongly suggests that T-passives were then themselves increasingly construed as specificity-based constructions (like active impersonal ones). The formal realization of singular pronominal O's as suffix pronouns was retained, illustrating a general principle in linguistic change whereby behavior is affected first, and coding only later or not at all.<sup>123</sup>

123 The principle goes by the name of 'behavior-before-coding' (Haspelmath 2010). For detransitive constructions in particular, Siewierska (2010); Givón 2006 & Kawasha (2006); Givón (2006). In the Earlier Egyptian case at hand, this formal retention did not result in any interpretive ambiguity, as the single core argument in a detransitive clause is immediately identified as the O regardless of how it is syntactically analyzed. Moreover, a constituency-based syntactic analysis may be

By the end of the Ramesside period, all {t}-marked constructions were replaced by a third person plural active impersonal construction.<sup>124</sup> The replacement concerned not only the constructions with {t} in preverbal position, but also the ones with {t} in postverbal position (in the by then much-reduced Verb-Subject conjugation, essentially limited to the past tense *sdm=f* and the subjunctive *sdm=f*). This further suggests that the formal descendants of T-passive had been increasingly construed as specificity-based constructions for some while already. Ironically, the impersonal subject pronoun {t}, which owes its origin to a process of deinflectionalization, was thereby replaced by =w, a pronoun that owes its origin to another process of deinflectionalization, from an originally adverbial ending (§5.3.5.2.NB).

The third person plural active construction also replaced *P<sub>O</sub> PsP ~ V-pass non-P*, which in relation to other changes in Late Egyptian had already been restricted to very limited uses. Earlier Egyptian had had a variety of inflectional passives, used in a variety of passive constructions, without and with an expressed Agent, and in passives from transitives and from intransitives. By the end of the second millennium, all these forms and constructions had been lost. The long-term change would seem sweeping, yet it represents only the overall result of a series of individual and largely unrelated changes. Among these, the most significant processes are the spread of T-passives over V-passives, and the deinflectionalization of {t}. While the two processes were independent in time and in nature, both contributed to the overall loss of inflectional passives in Egyptian.

These major processes of change also have one element in common, the role of passives from intransitives. The rich use of passives from intransitives in Earlier Egyptian was seen to be one facet of the specialization of Earlier Egyptian voice on discourse-pragmatic functions—in a strong contrast to Semitic voice, including Semitic {t}-marked forms. Passives from intransitives are unprototypical in often lacking the Endpoint orientation characteristic of passives: rather than on a participant, a subjectless passive is often oriented on the event itself. In Earlier Egyptian, subjectless passives played a distinguished role in both major processes of change documented in historical times: as the types of events with which the spread of T-passives over V-passives saw its first manifestations, and in providing discourse contexts in which alternative construals of the T-passive as a specificity-based construction were strongly favored in individual speakers' representations.

---

irrelevant here: in a dependency-based approach, the situation can be more simply represented as V-{t} ← O. With Verb-Subject patterns becoming increasingly marginal in the language, this formal retention, limited to singular pronouns, became a construction-specific idiosyncrasy, an island phenomenon that would ultimately be solved by the replacement of all {t}-marked constructions by the third person plural impersonal construction.

124 Černý & Groll (1984<sup>3</sup>: §2.4.1); Winand & Gohy (2011: 197); Vernus (in press: §13.3.1).



## APPENDIX



## TEXTS

Abkau (Louvre C15)	Barbotin (2005: 140-1).
Abutiu (Cairo JE 67573)	Fischer (1966: 57-60).
<i>Abydos Boundary Stela</i> usurped by Neferhotep	Leahy (1989); <i>HHBT</i> 18-9.
Ahmose's <i>Tempest Stela</i>	Wiener & Allen (1998); <i>HHBT</i> 104-10.
Akhenaten's <i>First Proclamation</i>	Murnane & van Siclen III (1993: 11-68).
Akhenaten's <i>Second Proclamation</i>	Murnane & van Siclen III (1993: 69-109).
<i>Allen droht die Rekrutierung</i>	Jäger (2004: 272-4).
<i>A Man to His Son</i>	Fischer-Elfert (1999).
<i>Amenemhat</i>	Adrom (2006).
Ameniseneb (Louvre C11 and C12)	Baines (2009); Kubisch (2008: 139-45); Simpson (1974: pl.80, ANOC 58.2 & 58.1); <i>HHBT</i> 7-9.
Ameny-ankh-ren (CG 20458)	Simpson (1974: pl.36, ANOC 24.1).
Antef (BM EA 1628)	Franke (2007).
Antef (CG 20003)	<i>TPPI</i> §2.
Antef (Strasbourg 345 + Florence 7595)	Fischer (1996b: 83-90).
Antef's Sehel Graffito	Habachi (1953).
Antef son of Myt (Berlin 13272)	<i>TPPI</i> §31.
Antef son of Senet (BM EA 562)	Simpson (1974: pl.12, ANOC 5.3); <i>HTBM</i> II, 8, pl.24.
Antef son of Tjefi (MMA 57.95)	Fischer (1960).
Antefiqer's <i>Girgawi Inscription</i> (RILN 73)	Žába (1974: 98-109).
<i>Astarte</i>	Collombert & Coulon (2000).
Beb (Leiden V.88)	Boeser (1909: pl.10).
Berlin Bowl	Gardiner & Sethe (1928: 5-7, pl.5-5a).
<i>Berlin Leather Roll</i>	de Buck (1938).
<i>Bersheh</i>	Newberry (1893-1894).
Bia	Edel (1958: 3-9); Fischer (1965).

- Book of the Dead (Nu)  
 Cairo Bowl  
*Chapelle Blanche*  
*Chapelle Rouge*  
  
*Cheops' Court*  
 CT  
*Debate (of a Man and His Soul)*  
*Deir el-Bahari*  
 Dramatic Ramesseum Papyrus  
*Duties of the Vizier*  
 Eighteenth Dynasty Menology  
*Eloquent Peasant*  
 Emhab  
  
*Fishing and Fowling*  
 Hammamat  
  
 Hatnub  
 Heqaib (BM EA 1671)  
*Heqaib* (sanctuary of)  
 Heqanakht  
*Herdsmen*  
 Herimeru  
 Herwerre (*Sinai* 90)  
  
 Hetepi  
*Hymn (to Hapi)*  
*IÄF* III  
 Iki (Leiden V.68)  
*Installation of the Vizier*  
  
*Ipuwer*  
 Irtysen (Louvre C14)  
 Isi of Edfu  
  
 Lapp (1997).  
 Gardiner & Sethe (1928: 7-8, pl.6-6a).  
 Lacau & Chevrier (1956-1969).  
 Lacau & Chevrier (1977-1979);  
*HHBT* II 7-33.  
 Blackman (1988).  
 de Buck (1935-1961).  
 Allen (2011b).  
 Naville (1895-1908).  
 Sethe (1928b).  
 van den Boorn (1988).  
 Vernus (1981b).  
 Parkinson (1991).  
 Klotz (2010); Kubisch (2008: 238-44);  
*HHBT* 97-8.  
 Caminos (1956: 1-21; pl.1-7).  
 Couyat & Montet (1912); for Hammamat 19  
 (Meri), also Goedicke (1964); for Hammamat  
 3042 (Imeny), Farout (1994).  
 Anthes (1928).  
 Polotsky (1930).  
 Habachi (1985); Franke (1994).  
 Allen (2002).  
 Schneider (2007).  
 Hassan (1931-1932: 76-8, fig.39).  
 Gardiner et al. (1952: pl.25a-26; 1955: 97-9);  
 Sethe (1928<sup>2</sup>a: 86).  
 Gabra (1976).  
 van der Plas (1986).  
 Kaplony (1963: vol. III).  
 Boeser (1909: pl.33).  
 Faulkner (1955); Dziobek (1998: 55-66,  
 pl.3a-b).  
 Enmarch (2005).  
 Barta (1970).  
 Edel (1954).



Iti (CG 20001)	Lange & Schäfer (1908: 1-2; 1925: pl.1).
Iunmenu	Hassan (1953: 18, fig.10).
Iykhernefret (Berlin 1204)	Simpson (1974: pl.1, ANOC 1.1); Roeder (1913: 169-75).
Iykhernefret (CG 20140)	Simpson (1974: pl.2, ANOC 1.3).
<i>Kagemni</i>	Gardiner (1946).
<i>Kamose Inscriptions</i>	<i>HHBT</i> 82-97.
<i>Kemit</i>	Petersmarck (2012).
<i>Khakheperreseneb</i>	Parkinson (1997b).
Khentika (Dakhla)	Osing et al. (1982: pl.4).
Khentika Ikhekhi	James (1953).
Khentikapepi	Osing et al. (1982: p.29, pl.60).
<i>Kheti</i>	Jäger (2004).
Khnumnakht (CG 20518)	Lange & Schäfer (1908: 113-4; 1925: pl.35).
Khufudjedef	Junker (1951: 53, fig.25).
Khusobek	Baines (1987); Simpson (1974: pl.31, ANOC 69.1); Sethe (1928 <sup>2</sup> a: 82-3); Peet (1914).
<i>KRI</i>	Kitchen (1975-1990).
<i>LEM</i>	Gardiner (1937).
Louvre Bowl	Piankoff & Clère (1934).
<i>Loyaliste</i>	Posener (1976).
Mehuakhti	Edel (1953).
Mentuhotep son of Hepy (UC 14333)	Goedicke (1962); Stewart (1979: pl.18).
Mentuhotepi's <i>Karnak Stela</i>	Vernus (1989).
Mentuwoser (MMA 12.184)	Ransom (1913); Sethe (1928 <sup>2</sup> a: 79-80).
Merer (Cracow MNK-XI-999)	Černý (1961).
<i>Merikare</i>	Quack (1992).
<i>Mersyankh III</i>	Dunham & Simpson (1974).
Mo <sup>c</sup> alla (Ankhtifi)	Vandier (1950).
<i>Mutter und Kind</i>	Yamazaki (2003).
Naga ed-Dêr #69	Dunham (1937: 80-2; pl.24, n°1).
Nebamun, TT 90	Davies (1923).
Neferhotep's <i>Great Abydos Stela</i>	<i>HHBT</i> 21-9.
Neferiu (MMA 12.183.8)	Fischer (1968: 207, fig.42); Hayes (1953-1959: 139-40, fig.82).

- Nefermaat (panel OIM 9002)  
*Neferti*  
 Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree*  
 O. Cairo 25372  
*Paheri*  
 P. Berlin 9010  
 P. Berlin 1046  
 P. Berlin 10470  
 P. Berlin, Illahun  
  
 P. Berlin Medical (P. Berlin 3038)  
 P. BM EA 10567  
 P. Brooklyn 35.1446  
 P. Bulaq 18  
 P. Cairo JE 49623  
 P. Ebers  
 P. Ramesseum 2  
  
 P. Ramesseum 10  
 P. Rhind Mathematical  
 P. Smith  
 Ptahemhat  
*Ptahhotep*  
 P. UC, Illahun (non-literary)  
 Pyr.  
 Qaw Bowl  
 Rediukhnum (CG 20543)  
 Rekhmire  
 Sabni son of Mekhu  
 Samontu (BM EA 828)  
*Sasobek*  
  
*Satirical Letter*  
 Semna Despatches  
*Semna Stela*, Year 8 (Berlin 14753)  
 Harpur (1987, fig.84).  
 Helck (1992<sup>2</sup>).  
 HHTB 73-4.  
 Kroeber (1970: 95-6).  
 Tylor & Griffith (1894).  
 Sethe (1926).  
 Caminos (1963).  
 Smither (1948); HHTB 50-4.  
 Luft (1992a; 1992b; 2012);  
 in details, Brose (2014: 507-8).  
 Grapow (1958).  
 James (1962: 94-7, pl.27-28a).  
 Hayes (1955).  
 Scharff (1922).  
 Gunn (1925).  
 Grapow (1958).  
 Barns (1956: 11-4, pl.7-9); Parkinson  
 (2012b).  
 Parkinson (2012b).  
 cited after Sethe (1928<sup>2</sup>a: 60-2).  
 Grapow (1958).  
 Moussa & Altenmüller (1980: 332-3, fig.9).  
 Žába (1956).  
 Collier & Quirke (2002; 2004; 2006).  
 Allen (2013b).  
 Gardiner & Sethe (1928: 3-4, pl.2-2a).  
 Lange & Schäfer (1908: 164-7).  
 Gardiner (1925); *Urk.* IV 1071-85.  
 Seyfried (2005).  
 Vernus (1997: 70-6); *HTBM* II, 8, pl.21.  
 Barns (1956: 1-10, pl.1-16);  
 Parkinson (2012b).  
 Fischer-Elfert (1983).  
 Smither (1945).  
 Sethe (1928<sup>2</sup>a: 84-5).

<i>Semna Stela</i> , Year 16 (Berlin 1157)	Sethe (1928 <sup>2</sup> a: 83-4).
Senti (BM EA 574)	<i>HTBM</i> II, 6, pl.8-9; Simpson (1974: pl.61, ANOC 42.2); Sethe (1928 <sup>2</sup> a: 75).
Senedjemib Inti	Brovarski (2001).
Seneni (CG 20500)	<i>TPPI</i> §9.
Senwosret (Louvre C174)	Simpson (1974: pl.17, ANOC 8.1).
<i>Shipwrecked Sailor</i>	Blackman (1932: 41-8).
<i>Sinuhe</i>	Koch (1990).
Siut	Griffith (1889); Edel (1984).
<i>Stèle Juridique</i>	Lacau (1949); <i>HHBT</i> 65-9.
<i>Tale Involving the House of Life</i>	Parkinson (1999).
<i>Tale of P. Lythgoe</i>	Simpson (1960).
Tija's Sehel Graffito	<i>HHBT</i> 121.
Tjetji (BM EA 614)	<i>TPPI</i> §20.
<i>Tomb of Amenemhat</i>	Davies & Gardiner (1915).
<i>TPPI</i>	Clère & Vandier (1948).
<i>Urk. I</i>	Sethe (1933); for Shepsesptah ( <i>Urk. I</i> 51-53), also Dorman (2002).
<i>Urk. IV</i>	Sethe & Helck (1914-1961).
<i>Urk. VII</i>	Sethe (1935).
Uronarti Quay Inscription	Dunham (1967: pl.XXV).
Wadi el-Hudi	Sadek (1980).
Wadi Hilâl	Vandekerckhove & Müller-Wollermann (2001).
Wahankh Antef II's <i>Dog Stela</i> (CG 20512)	<i>TPPI</i> §16.
Wahankh Antef II's <i>Stela</i> (MMA 13.182.3)	Winlock (1943: 258-9, pl. 36); Hayes (1953-1959: I, 151-2, fig.90); <i>TPPI</i> §15.
Weha (OIM 16956)	Dunham (1937: 102-4, pl.32, #84).
Wepwawetaa (Leiden V.4)	Boeser (1909: pl.4, n°5); Simpson (1974: pl.30, ANOC 20.1); Sethe (1928 <sup>2</sup> a: 72-3).
Wepwawetaa (Munich Gl. WAF 35)	Simpson (1974: pl.30, ANOC 20.2); Sethe (1928 <sup>2</sup> a: 73-4).
Wien ÄS 111	Hein & Satzinger (1989-1993: II, 48).



## REFERENCES

- Abraham, Werner. 1996. The Aspect-Case Typology Correlation: Perfectivity triggering split-ergativity, in: *Folia Linguistica* 30, 5-34.
- Adrom, Faried. 2006. *Die Lehre des Amenemhet*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 19, Turnhout.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2007. Typological Distinctions in Word-Formation, in: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume III: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon* (2nd edition), Cambridge, 1-65.
- Allen, James. 1982. Synthetic and Analytic Tenses in Old Egyptian, in: *L'égyptologie en 1979. Axes prioritaires de recherches*, CNRS, Paris, vol. I, 19-27.
- . 1984. *The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts*, Bibliotheca Aegyptia 2, Malibu.
- . 1986. Tense in Classical Egyptian, in: William Simpson (ed.), *Essays on Egyptian Grammar*, Yale Egyptological Studies 1, New Haven, 1-21.
- . 1991. Form, Function, and Meaning in the Early Egyptian Verb, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 1-32.
- . 1994. Colloquial Middle Egyptian: Some observations on the language of Heka-Nakht, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 4, 1-12.
- . 2002. *The Heqanakht Papyri*, Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 27, New York.
- . 2005. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, Writings from the Ancient World 23, Atlanta.
- . 2011a. Rethinking the *sdm.f*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 19, 1-16.
- . 2011b. *The Debate between a Man and His Soul. A Masterpiece of Ancient Egyptian Literature*, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 44, Leiden/Boston.
- . 2013a. *The Ancient Egyptian Language. An Historical Study*, Cambridge.
- . 2013b. *A New Concordance of the Pyramid Texts*, Brown University, Providence/RI.
- . 2014<sup>3</sup>. *Middle Egyptian. An Introduction the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs. Third Edition, Revised and Reorganized, with a New Analysis of the Verbal System*, Cambridge.
- . Forthc. *Middle Egyptian Literature. Eight Literary Works of the Middle Kingdom*, Cambridge.
- Andersen, Paul. 1991. *A New Look at the Passive*, Duisburger Arbeiten zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 11, Frankfurt.
- . 1994. *Empirical Studies in Diathesis*, Münster.
- Anthes, Rudolf. 1928. *Die Felsinschriften von Hatnub nach den Aufnahmen Georg Möllers*, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Aegyptens 9, Leipzig.
- Baines, John. 1987. The Stela of Khusobek: Private and royal military narrative and values, in: Jürgen Osing & Günter Dreyer (eds), *Form und Maß: Beiträge zur Literatur, Sprache und Kunst des alten Ägypten. Festschrift für Gerhard Fecht zum 62. Geburtstag am 6. Februar 1987*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 12, Wiesbaden, 43-61.
- . 2009. The Stelae of Amenisonbe from Abydos and Middle Kingdom Display of Personal Religion, in: Diana Magee, Jeanine Bourriau & Stephen Quirke (eds), *Sitting Beside Lepsius. Studies in Honour of Jaromir Malek at the Griffith Institute*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 185, Leuven, 1-22.
- Bakker, Egbert. 1994. Voice, Aspect, and Aktionsart: Middle and passive in Ancient Greek, in: Barbara Fox & Paul Hopper (eds), *Voice, Form and Function*, Typological Studies in Language 27, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 23-47.
- Barbotin, Christophe. 2005. *La voix des hiéroglyphes. Promenade au département des Antiquités égyptiennes du musée du Louvre*, Paris.
- Barns, John. 1956. *Five Ramesseum Papyri*, Oxford.
- Barta, Winfried. 1970. Das Selbstzeugnis eines altägyptischen Künstlers (Stele Louvre C14), Berlin.
- . 1988. *In* als Pleneschreibung der Präposition *n*, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 103, 7-11.
- . 1995. Bemerkungen zum Verständnis des 'Indefinitpronomen' *tw*, in: Dieter Kessler & Regine Schulz (eds), *Gedenkschrift für Winfried Barta*, Münchner Ägyptologische Untersuchungen 4, 17-8.

- Baumann, Andrew. 1998. *The Suffix Conjugation of Earlier Egyptian as Evidenced in the Underworld Books* (UMI), Ann Arbor.
- Bendjaballah, Sabrina & Chris Reintges. 2007. Réduplication et temps-aspect-mode: l'exemple de l'égyptien ancien, in: Alexis Michaud & Aliyah Morgenstern (eds), *La reduplication*, Faits de langues 29, Paris, 145-160.
- Bickel, Balthasar & Johanna Nichols. 2007. Inflectional Morphology, in: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume III: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon (2nd edition)*, Cambridge, 169-240.
- Blackman, Aylward. 1932. *Middle-Egyptian Stories. Part I*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 2, Bruxelles.
- . 1936. Some Notes on the Story of Sinuhe and Other Egyptian Texts, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 22, 35-44.
- . 1988. *The Story of King Kheops and the Magicians: Transcribed from Papyrus Westcar (Berlin Papyrus 3033)*, Reading/MA.
- Blumenthal, Elke. 1977. Die Textgattung Expeditionsbericht in Ägypten, in: Jan Assmann, Erika Feucht & Reinhard Grieshammer (eds), *Fragen an die altägyptische Literatur: Studien zum Gedenken an Eberhard Otto*, Wiesbaden, 85-118.
- Boeser, Pieter. 1909. *Beschrijving van de Egyptische Verzameling in het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden, vol. II*, Den Haag.
- Borghouts, Joris. 1989. Aspectual Values of the Second Tenses in Middle Egyptian, in: Silvia Schoske, Hartwig Altenmüller & Dietrich Wildung (eds), *Linguistik, Philologie, Religion. Akten des vierten Internationalen Ägyptologen-Kongresses, München 1985*, Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur, Beihefte 3, Hamburg, 29-42.
- . 2001. On Certain Uses of the Stative, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 9, 11-35.
- . 2010. *Egyptian. An Introduction to the Writing and Language of the Middle Kingdom*, Egyptologische Uitgaven 24, Leuven/Leiden.
- Bossong, Georg. 1998. Le marquage différentiel de l'objet dans les langues d'Europe, in: Jack Feuillet (ed.), *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*, Eurotyp 2, Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Typology 20.2, Berlin, 193-258.
- Breyer, Francis. 2006. Ein Faktitiv-Stamm im Ägyptischen, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 97-105.
- Brose, Marc. 2011. Zur Existenz von Faktitivstämmen im Ägyptischen, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 19, 17-35.
- . 2014. *Grammatik der dokumentarischen Texte des Mittleren Reiches*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 13, Hamburg.
- Brovarski, Edward. 2001. *The Senejdemib Complex, Part I. The Mastabas of Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), Khnumenti (G 2374), and Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378)*, Giza Mastabas 7, Boston.
- Buccellati, Giorgio. 1968. An Interpretation of the Akkadian Stative as a Nominal Sentence, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 27, 1-12.
- Burkard, Günter. 1993. Überlegungen zur Form der ägyptischen Literatur. Die Geschichte des Schiffbrüchigen als literarisches Kunstwerk, Ägypten und Altes Testament 22, Wiesbaden.
- Bybee, Joan. 1985. Diagrammatic Iconicity in Stem-Inflection Relations, in: John Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax*, Typological Studies in Language 6, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 11-48.
- . 2010. *Language, Usage, and Cognition*, Cambridge.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago.
- Caminos, Ricardo. 1956. *Literary Fragments in the Hieratic Script*, Oxford.
- . 1963. Papyrus Berlin 10463, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 49, 29-37.
- Cannuyer, Christian. 1983. Les formes dérivées du verbe en ancien égyptien, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 63, 25-35.
- Černý, Jaroslav. 1957. Review of Adriaan De Buck, Grammaire élémentaire du moyen égyptien, in: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 14, 22-3.
- . 1961. The Stela of Merer in Cracow, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 47, 5-9.
- . 1969. Stela of Emhab from Tell Edfu, in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 24, 87-92.
- Černý, Jaroslav & Sarah Groll. 1984<sup>3</sup>. *A Late Egyptian Grammar*, Studia Pohl, Series Maior 3, Rome.
- Clère, Jacques Jean & Jacques Vandier. 1948. *Textes de la Première Période Intermédiaire et de la XI<sup>ème</sup> Dynastie*, 1<sup>er</sup> fascicule, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 10, Bruxelles.

- Coghill, Eleanor & Guy Deutscher. 2002. The Origin of Ergativity in Sumerian, and the 'Inversion' in Pronominal Agreement: A historical explanation based on Neo-Aramaic parallels, in: *Orientalia* 71, 267-90.
- Cohen, David. 1984. *La phrase nominale et l'évolution du système verbal en sémitique. Études de syntaxe historique*, Leuven/Paris.
- Collier, Mark. 1990. The Circumstantial *sdm(.f)/sdm.n(.f)* as Verbal Verb-Forms in Middle Egyptian, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 76, 73-85.
- . 1991a. Circumstantially Adverbial? The circumstantial *sdm(.f)/sdm.n(.f)* reconsidered, in: Stephen Quirke (ed.), *Middle Kingdom Studies*, New Malden, 21-50.
- . 1991b. The Relative Clause and the Verb in Middle Egyptian, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 77, 23-42.
- . 1992. Predication and the Circumstantial *sdm(=f)/sdm.n(=f)*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 2, 17-65.
- . 1994. Grounding, Cognition and Metaphor in the Grammar of Middle Egyptian. The role of human experience in grammar as an alternative to the Standard Theory notion of paradigmatic substitution, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 4, 57-87.
- . 1996. The Language of Literature: On grammar and texture, in: Antonio Loprieno (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 10, Leiden/Boston, 531-53.
- Collier, Mark & Stephen Quirke. 2002. *The UCL Lahun Papyri: Letters*, BAR International Series 1083, Oxford.
- . 2004. *The UCL Lahun Papyri: Religious, Literary, Legal, Mathematical and Medical*, BAR International Series 1209, Oxford.
- . 2006. *The UCL Lahun Papyri: Accounts*, BAR International Series 1471, Oxford.
- Collombert, Philippe & Laurent Coulon. 2000. Les dieux contre la mer. Le début du 'papyrus d'Astarté' (pBN 202), in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 100, 193-242.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics, Cambridge.
- . 1977. In Defense of Spontaneous Demotion: The impersonal passive, in: Peter Cole & Jerrold Sadock (eds), *Grammatical Relations*, Syntax and Semantics 8, New York, 47-58.
- . 1982. Aspect and Voice: Some reflections on perfect and passive, in: Philip Tedeschi & Annie Zaenen (eds), *Tense and Aspect*, Syntax and Semantics 14, New York, 65-78.
- Conti, Giovanni. 1980. *Studi sul bilinguismo in semitico e in egiziano. Vol.1: Il tema verbale N1212*, Quaderni di Semitistica 9, Florence.
- Cooreman, Ann. 1994. A Functional Typology of Antipassives, in: Barbara Fox & Paul Hopper (eds), *Voice, Form and Function*, Typological Studies in Language 27, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 49-88.
- Couyat, Jean & Pierre Montet. 1912. *Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât*, Mémoires de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale 34, Cairo.
- Croft, William. 1991. *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: The Cognitive Organization of Discourse*, Chicago.
- . 2000. *Explaining Language Change*, Harlow.
- Cuzzolin, Pierluigi. 2002. Vorläufige Bemerkungen über die Impersonalien im Lateinischen und im Keltischen, in: Lea Sawicki & Donna Shalev (eds), *Donum Grammaticum. Studies in Latin and Celtic Linguistics in Honour of Hannah Rosén*, Orbis Supplementa 18, Leuven, 99-108.
- Davies, Nina de Garis & Alan Gardiner. 1915. *The Tomb of Amenemhet (No. 82)*, Theban Tomb Series 1, London.
- Davies, Norman de Garis. 1923. *The Tombs of Two Officials of Tuthmosis the Fourth (Nos. 75 and 90)*, Theban Tomb Series 3, London.
- De Buck, Adriaan. 1935-1961. *The Egyptian Coffin Texts*, Oriental Institute Publications 34, 49, 64, 67, 73, 81, 87, Chicago.
- . 1938. The Building Inscription of the Berlin Leather Roll. *Studia Aegyptiaca* I, in: *Analecta Orientalia* 17, 48-57.
- Depuydt, Leo. 1983. The Standard Theory of the 'Emphatic' Forms in Classical (Middle) Egyptian: A historical survey, in: *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 14, 13-54.
- . 1993. *Conjunction, Contiguity, Contingency: On relationships Between Events in the Egyptian and Coptic Verbal Systems*, New York.
- . 1995. On the Stative Ending *tj / t*, in: *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 26, 21-7.
- . 1996. Twixt Relative Verb Form and Passive Participle in Egyptian, in: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 146, 1-24.

- . 1997. Agent-less Indirect Adjectival Verb Forms in Egyptian and Arabic: The case of *jrrw n.f* and *maf'ul lahu* 'for whom one acts', in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117, 487-505.
- . 1998. The Meaning of Old and Middle Egyptian *Jw* in light of the Distinction between Narration and Discussion, in: Irene Shirun-Grumach (ed.), *Jerusalem Studies in Egyptology, Ägypten und Altes Testament* 40, Wiesbaden, 19-36.
- . 2003. The Origin of the Egyptian Suffix Conjugation, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 11, 23-47.
- . 2008a. *The Other Mathematics. Language and Logic in Egyptian and in General*, Piscataway/NJ.
- . 2008b. Zum Nebeneinander von An- und Abwesenheit der Geminatio in der Wendung *mrj j.t.f mrrw snw.f*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 16, 27-38.
- Derchain-Urteil, Marie-Thérèse. 1973. Das *n*-Präfix im Ägyptischen, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 6, 39-54.
- Diem, Werner. 1982. Die Entwicklung des Derivationsmorphems der *t*-Stämme im Semitischen, in: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 132, 29-84.
- Díaz Hernández, Roberto. 2013. *Tradition and Innovation in der offiziellen Sprache des Mittleren Reiches. Ein strukturalistischer Vergleich der historisch-biographischen mit den literarischen Texten der 1. Zwischenzeit und der 12. Dynastie*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 56, Wiesbaden.
- Dixon, Robert. 1994. *Ergativity*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 69, Cambridge.
- Doret, Éric. 1986. *The Narrative Verbal System of Old and Middle Egyptian*, Cahiers d'Orientalisme 12, Genève.
- Dorman, Peter. 2002. The Biographical Inscription of Ptahshepses: A newly identified fragment, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 88, 95-110.
- Dressler, Wolfgang. 1968. *Studien zur verbalen Pluralität*, Graz.
- Drinka, Bridget. 2001. The Formation of Periphrastic Perfects and Passives in Europe: An areal approach, in: Barry Blake & Kate Burridge (eds), *Historical Linguistics 2001. Selected Papers from the 15<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Melbourne, 13-17 August 2001*, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 237, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 105-28.
- Dunham, Dows. 1937. *Naga ed-Dêr Stelae of the First Intermediate Period*, London.
- . 1967. *Second Cataract Forts II. Uronarti, Shalfak, and Mirgissa*, Cambridge.
- Dunham, Dows & William Simpson. 1974. *The Mastaba of Queen Mersyankh III (G 7530-7540)*, Giza Mastabas 1, Boston.
- Dziobek, Eberhard. 1998. *Die Denkmäler des Vezirs User-Amun*, Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens 18, Heidelberg.
- Edel, Elmar. 1944. Untersuchungen zur Phraseologie der ägyptischen Inschriften des Alten Reiches, *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 13, 1.
- . 1953. Inschriften des Alten Reiches III. Die Stele des *Mḥw-3ḥty* (Reisner G 2375), in: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 1, 327-33.
- . 1954. Inschriften des Alten Reiches IV. Die Biographie des Gaufürsten von Edfu, *Jzj*, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 79, 11-7.
- . 1955-1964. *Altägyptische Grammatik*, Analecta Orientalia 34/39, Roma.
- . 1958. Inschriften des Alten Reiches VII-X, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 83, 3-18.
- . 1959. Die Herkunft des neuägyptisch-koptischen Personalsuffixes der 3. Person Plural -w, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 84, 17-38.
- . 1981. Das absolut gebrauchte Infinitiv mit -tw 'man' als Subjekt, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 44, 15-6.
- . 1984. *Die Inschriften der Grabfronten der Siut-Gräber in Mittelägypten aus der Herakleopolitenzeit. Eine Wiederherstellung nach den Zeichnungen der Description de l'Égypte*, Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 71, Düsseldorf.
- Eichler, Eckhard. 1991. Untersuchungen zu den Königsbriefen des Alten Reiches, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 18, 141-71.
- Engsheden, Åke. 2006. Über die Markierung des direkten Objekts im Koptischen, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 199-222.
- Enmarch, Roland. 2005. *The Dialogue of Ipuwer and the Lord of All*, Oxford.
- . 2008. *A World Upturned: Commentary on and Analysis of The Dialogue of Ipuwer and the Lord of All*, Oxford.
- . 2011. Of Spice and Mine: The Tale of the Shipwrecked Sailor and Middle Kingdom expedition inscriptions, in: Fredrik Hagen, John Johnston, Wendy Monkhouse, Kathryn Piquette, John Tait &



- Martin Worthington (eds), *Narratives of Egypt and the Ancient Near East. Literary and Linguistic Approaches*, Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 189, Leuven, 97-121.
- Erman, Adolf. 1919. *Reden, Rufe und Lieder auf Gräberbildern des Alten Reiches*, Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jahrgang 1918, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 15, Berlin.
- Eyre, Christopher. 1990. The Semna Stelae: Quotation, genre, and functions of literature, in: Sarah Israelit-Groll (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology. Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, Jerusalem, vol. I, 134-65.
- Farout, Dominique. 1994. La carrière du ouhemou Ameny et l'organisation des expéditions au Ouadi Hammamat au Moyen Empire, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 94, 143-72.
- Faulkner, Raymond. 1935. The Verb *I* 'to Say' and Its Developments, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 21, 177-90.
- . 1955. The Installation of the Vizier, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 41, 18-29.
- . 1969. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts. Translated into English by R. O. Faulkner*, Oxford.
- . 1973-1977. *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts. Translated and Edited by R. O. Faulkner*, Warminster.
- Feder, Frank. 2004. Das Ende des 'narrativen' Infinitivs im Sinuhe, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 12, 53-74.
- Firchow, Otto. 1953a. Innere Kausative ägyptischer Verben, in: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientalforschung* 1, 16-26.
- . 1953b. *Grundzüge der Stilistik in den altägyptischen Pyramidentexten*, Untersuchungen zur ägyptischen Stilistik 2, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientalforschung, Veröffentlichung 21, Berlin.
- Fischer, Henri. 1960. The Inscription of *In-it.f* Born of *Tjfi*, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 19, 258-68.
- . 1965. *Bi3* and the Deified Vizier *Mḥw*, in: *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 4, 49-53.
- . 1966. An Old Kingdom Monogram, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 93, 56-69.
- . 1968. *Dendera in the Third Millennium B.C.*, New York.
- . 1989. Occurrences of *jn*, Agential and Dative, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 107, 69-75.
- . 1996a. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective in Theophoric Names, in: Henri Fischer, *Varia Nova*, Egyptian Studies 3, New York, 61-6.
- . 1996b. Provincial Inscriptions of the Heracleopolitan Period, in: Henri Fischer, *Varia Nova*, Egyptian Studies 3, New York, 79-90.
- Fischer-Elfert, Hans-Werner. 1983. *Die satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I*, Kleine Ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden.
- . 1999. *Die Lehre eines Mannes für seinen Sohn: Eine Etappe auf dem 'Gottsweg' des loyalen und solidarischen Beamten des Mittleren Reiches*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 60, Wiesbaden.
- Foley, William. 2006. A Typology of Information Packaging in the Clause, in: Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume I: Clause Structure (second edition)*, Cambridge, 362-446.
- Franke, Detlef. 1994. *Das Heiligtum des Heqaib auf Elephantine: Geschichte eines Provinzheiligtums im Mittleren Reich*, Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Ägyptens 9, Heidelberg.
- . 2007. The Good Shepherd Antef (Stela BM EA 1628), in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 93, 149-74.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1982. Indefinite Agent, Passive, and Impersonal Passive: A functional study, in: *Lingua* 58, 267-90.
- Fugier, Huguette. 2002. Transitivité et passivation en syntaxe latine, in: Lea Sawicki & Donna Shalev (eds), *Donum Grammaticum. Studies in Latin and Celtic Linguistics in Honour of Hannah Rosén*, Orbis Supplementa 18, Leuven, 133-40.
- Funk, Wolf-Peter. 1978. Toward a Synchronic Morphology of Coptic, in: Robert Wilson (ed.), *The Future of Coptic Studies*, Leiden, 104-24.
- Gabra, Gawdat. 1976. Preliminary Report on the Stela of *Htpi* from El-Kab from the Time of Wahankh Inyötef II, in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 32, 45-56, pl.14.

- Gardiner, Alan. 1916. *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe*, Paris.
- . 1925. The Autobiography of Rekhmere<sup>c</sup>, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 60, 62-76.
- . 1937. *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 7, Bruxelles.
- . 1946. The Instruction Addressed to Kagemni and His Brethren, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 32, 71-4.
- . 1947. Review of Hans Jakob Polotsky, *Études de syntaxe copte*, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 33, 95-101.
- . 1957<sup>3</sup>. *Egyptian Grammar. Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*, Oxford.
- Gardiner, Alan & Kurth Sethe. 1928. *Egyptian Letters to the Dead*, London.
- Gardiner, Alan, Thomas Peet & Jaroslav Černý. 1952-1955. *The Inscriptions of Sinai*, Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund 45, London.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna & Andrea Sansò. 2007. The Spread and Decline of Indefinite *man*-Constructions in European Languages, in: Paolo Ramat & Elisa Roma (eds), *Europe and the Mediterranean as Linguistic Areas*, Studies in Language Companion Series 88, Amsterdam, 95-131.
- Gilula, Mordechai. 1977. The Stative Form of the Verb *sdm* 'To Hear', in: *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 14, 37-40.
- Givón, Talmy. 2001<sup>2</sup>. *Syntax. An Introduction*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- . 2006. Grammatical Relations in Passive Clauses: A diachronic perspective, in Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö (eds), *Passivization and Typology: Form and Function*, Typological Studies in Language 68, Amsterdam, 337-50.
- Givón, Talmy & Boniface Kawasha. 2006. Indiscrete Grammatical Relations: The Lunda passive, in: Tasaku Tsunoda & Taro Kageyama (eds), *Voice and Grammatical Relations. In Honor of Masayoshi Shibatani*, Typological Studies in Language 65, Amsterdam, 15-41.
- Goedicke, Hans. 1962. A Neglected Wisdom Text, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 48, 25-35.
- . 1964. Some Remarks on Stone Quarrying in the Egyptian Middle Kingdom (2060-1786 B.C.), in: *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 3, 43-50.
- Gragg, Gene. 2001. Cushitic Languages: Some comparative/contrastive data, in: Burkhart Kienast, *Historische semitische Sprachwissenschaft*, Wiesbaden, 574-617.
- Grandet, Pierre. 1998. *Contes de l'Égypte ancienne*, Paris.
- Grandet, Pierre & Bernard Mathieu. 1993. La construction ergative de l'accompli égyptien, in: *Sesto congresso internazionale di egittologia. Atti*, Turin, vol. II, 145-51.
- Grapow, Hermann. 1958. *Die medizinischen Texte in hieroglyphischer Umschreibung autographiert*, Grundriss der Medizin der alten Ägypter 5, Berlin.
- Griffith, Francis. 1889. *The Inscriptions of Siût and Dêr Rifêh*, London.
- Grossman, Eitan & Stéphane Polis. 2012. Navigating Polyfunctionality in the Lexicon: Semantic maps and Ancient Egyptian lexical semantics, in: Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis & Jean Winand (eds), *Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian*, *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica* 9, Hamburg, 175-225.
- . In press. On the Pragmatics of Subjectification. The emergence and grammaticalization of a verbless Allative Future in Ancient Egyptian, in: *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*.
- Göldemann, Tom. In press. How Typology Can Inform Philology: Quotative *jn* in Earlier Egyptian, in: Sebastian Richter, Eitan Grossman & Martin Haspelmath (eds), *Linguistic Typology and Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics*, Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, Berlin.
- Gundacker, Roman. 2011. On the Etymology of the Egyptian Crown Name *mṛsw.t*: An 'irregular' subgroup of *m*-prefix formations, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 19, 37-86.
- . 2012. Hypomnemata Naufrage. Die grammatische Struktur von Schiffbrüchiger lin. 183-186, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 20, 51-97.
- Gunn, Battiscombe. 1925. A Sixth Dynasty Letter from Saqqara, in: *Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte* 39, 242-55.
- . 1949. A Special Use of the *sdm.f* and *sdm.n.f* Form, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 35, 21-4.
- . 2012<sup>2</sup>. *Studies in Egyptian Syntax. Second Edition Including Previously Unpublished Chapters*, Edited by R. S. Simpson, Oxford.
- Habachi, Labib. 1953. Graffito of the Chamberlain and Controller of Works Antef at Sehel, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 39, 50-9.

- . 1985. *The Sanctuary of Heqaib (Elephantine IV)*, Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 33, Mainz.
- el-Hamrawi, Mahmud. 2004. Alte-Reichs-Sprache und Mittlere-Reichs-Sprache in abydenischen Texten der 11.-12. Dynastie, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 12, 89-122.
- Hannig, Rainer. 1991. *Pseudopartizip und sdm.n=f. Der Kernbereich des mittelägyptischen Verbal-systems 2*, Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge 32, Hildesheim.
- Harpur, Yvonne. 1987. *Decoration in Egyptian Tombs of the Old Kingdom. Studies in Orientation and Scene Content*, London.
- Harris, Alice. 2008. On the Explanation of Typologically Unusual Structures, in: Jeff Good (ed.), *Linguistic Universals and Language Change*, Oxford, 54-76.
- Harris, Alice & Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 74, Cambridge.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The Grammaticalization of Passive Morphology, in: *Studies in Language* 14, 25-72.
- . 1994. Passive Participles Across Languages, in: Barbara Fox & Paul Hopper (eds), *Voice: Form and Function*, Typological Studies in Language 27, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 151-77.
- . 1998. Does Grammaticalization Need Reanalysis?, in: *Studies in Language* 22, 49-85.
- . 2004. On Directionality in Language Change With Particular Reference to Grammaticalization, in: Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde & Harry Perridon (eds), *Up and Down the Cline. The Nature of Grammaticalization*, Typological Studies in Language 59, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 17-44.
- . 2010. The Behaviour-before-Coding Principle in Syntactic Change, in: Franck Floricic (ed.), *Mélanges Denis Creissels*, Paris, 493-506.
- Hassan, Selim. 1931-1932. *Excavations at Giza 3*, Cairo.
- . 1953. *Excavations at Giza 7: 1935-1936. The Mastabas of the Seventh Season and Their Description*, Oxford.
- Hayes, William. 1953-1959. *The Scepter of Egypt. A Background for the Study of the Egyptian Antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York.
- . 1955. *A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum (Papyrus Brooklyn 35.1446)*, Brooklyn.
- Hays, Harold. 2012. *The Organization of the Pyramid Texts. Typology and Disposition*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 31, Leiden.
- Hayward, Richard. 1975. Middle Voice Verb Forms in Eastern Cushitic, in: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1975, 203-24.
- Hein, Irmgard & Helmut Satzinger. 1989-1993. *Stelen des Mittleren Reiches. Einschliesslich der I. und II. Zwischenzeit*, Corpus Antiquitatum Aegyptiacarum, Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, Ägyptisch-orientalische Sammlung, Lieferung 6, Mainz.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, Cambridge.
- Helck, Wolfgang. 1983<sup>2</sup>. *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie*, Kleine ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden.
- . 1992<sup>2</sup>. *Die Prophezeiung des Neferti*, Kleine ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden.
- Hock, Hans. 1991<sup>2</sup>. *Principles of Historical Linguistics*, Berlin/New York.
- Hopper, Paul & Sandra Tompson. 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse, in: *Language* 56, 251-99.
- Hopper, Paul & Elisabeth Traugott. 2003<sup>2</sup>. *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge.
- Huehnergard, John. 1987. 'Stative', Predicative From, Pseudo-Verb, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 46, 215-32.
- Idiatov, Dmitry. 2008. Antigrammaticalization, Antimorphologization, and the Case of Tura, in: Elena Seoane & Maria José Lopez Couso (eds), *Theoretical and Empirical Issues in Grammaticalization*, Typological Studies in Language 77, Amsterdam, 151-69.
- Jäger, Stephan. 2004. *Altägyptische Berufstypologien*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 4, Göttingen.
- Jakobson, Roman & Linda Waugh. 2002<sup>3</sup>. *The Sound Shape of Language*, Berlin/New York.
- James, Thomas. 1953. *The Mastaba of Khentika Called Ikhekhi*, Archaeological Survey of Egypt 30, London.
- . 1962. *The Hekanakhte Papers, and Other Early Middle Kingdom Documents*, Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 19, New York.

- Jansen-Winkeln, Karl. 1991. Zur Schreibung des Pseudopartizips in den Pyramidentexten, in: *Bulletin de la Société d'Égyptologie de Genève* 15, 43-56.
- . 1997. Intensivformen und 'verbale Pluralität' im Ägyptischen, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 5, 123-36.
- . 2012. Zu Sprache und Datierung des Amduat, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 98, 87-106.
- Jenni, Hanna. 2005. Die pronominalen Erweiterung beim Imperativ und der Ausdruck verbaler Reflexivität im Ägyptischen, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 132, 112-22.
- . 2007. Diathese und Modus des ägyptischen Pseudopartizips, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 134, 116-33.
- . 2010. *Lehrbuch der klassisch-ägyptischen Sprache*, Basel.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The Philosophy of Grammar*, London.
- Johnson, Janet. 1984. The Use of the Particle *mk* in Middle Kingdom Letters, in: Friedrich Junge (ed.), *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*, Göttingen, vol. I, 71-85.
- Joüon, Paul & Takamitsu Muraoka, 2006<sup>2</sup>. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Subsidia Biblica 27, Rome.
- Junge, Friedrich. 1989. 'Emphasis' and Sentential Meaning in Middle Egyptian, Göttinger Orientalforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 20, Wiesbaden.
- . 2003. *Die Lehre Ptahhoteps und die Tugenden der ägyptischen Welt*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 193, Fribourg/Göttingen.
- Junker, Hermann. 1951. *Giza X. Der Friedhof südlich der Cheopspyramide. Westteil*, Wien.
- Kahl, Jochem, Nicole Kloth & Ursula Zimmermann. 1995. *Die Inschriften der 3. Dynastie. Eine Bestandsaufnahme*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 56, Wiesbaden.
- Kammerzell, Frank. 1988. Norm, Relikt oder Fiktion. Zweifel an der Existenz einer morphologisch-syntaktischen Kategorie 'indikativ-perfektivisches *sdm=f*' im Mäg., in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 102, 41-57.
- . 1990. Funktion und Form. Zur Opposition von Perfekt und Pseudopartizip im Alt- und Mittel-ägyptischen, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 117/118, 181-202.
- . 1991a. Augment, Stamm und Endung. Zur morphologischen Entwicklung der Stativkonjugation, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 165-99.
- . 1991b. Personalpronomina und Personalendungen im Altägyptischen, in: Daniela Mendel & Ulrike Claudi (eds), *Ägypten im Afro-Orientalischen Kontext: Aufsätze zur Archäologie, Geschichte und Sprache eines unbegrenzten Raumes. Gedenkschrift Peter Behrens*, Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere, Schriftenreihe des Kölner Instituts für Afrikanistik, Sondernummer, 177-203.
- . 1999. *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel im Alten Ägypten* (unpubl. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Göttingen).
- Kaplony, Peter. 1963. *Die Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 8, Wiesbaden.
- Kazenin, Konstantin. 2001. Verbal Reflexives and the Middle Voice, in: Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds), *Language Typology and Language Universals*, Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 20, Berlin, 916-27.
- Keenan, Edward. 1985. Passive in the World's Languages, in: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Universals and Syntactic Description. Volume I: Clause Structure*, Cambridge, 243-81.
- Keenan, Edward & Matthew Dryer 2006. Passive in the World's Languages, in: Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume I: Clause Structure (second edition)*, Cambridge, 325-61.
- Kemmer, Susanne. 1993. *The Middle Voice*, Typological Studies in Language 23, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Kitchen, Kenneth. 1975-1990. *Ramesside Inscriptions. Historical and Biographical*, Oxford.
- Klaiman, M. H. 1991. *Grammatical Voice*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 59, Cambridge.
- Kloth, Nicole. 2002. *Die (auto-)biographischen Inschriften des ägyptischen Alten Reiches: Untersuchungen zu Phraseologie und Entwicklung*, Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur Beihefte 8, Hamburg.
- Klotz, David. 2009. Fish at Night and Birds by Day (Kemit VIII), in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 136, 136-140.
- . 2010. Emhah Versus the *Tmrhtn*: Monomachy and the expulsion of the Hyksos, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 39, 211-41.

- Koch, Roland. 1990. *Die Erzählung des Sinuhe*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 17, Bruxelles.
- Korostovtsev, Michail. 1972. Les verbes diffus, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 136, 17-20.
- Kossmann, Maarten. 2012. *Berber*, in: Zygmunt Frajsyngier & Erin Shay (eds), *The Afroasiatic Languages*, Cambridge Language Surveys, Cambridge, 18-101.
- Kouwenberg, N. J. C. 1997. *Gemination in the Akkadian Verb*, Studia Semitica Neerlandica 33, Assen.
- . 2000. Nouns as Verbs: The verbal nature of the Akkadian stative, in: *Orientalia* 69, 21-71.
- . 2004. Assyrian Light on the History of the N-Stem, in: Jan Dercksen (ed.), *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*, Leiden, 333-52.
- . 2005. Reflections on the Gt-Stem in Akkadian, in: *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 95, 77-103.
- . 2010a. *The Akkadian Verb and Its Semitic Background*, Languages of the Ancient Near East, Winona Lake/IN.
- . 2010b. The Recycling of the T-Infix in Prehistoric Akkadian: A case of exaptation, in: Leonid Kogan et al. (eds), *Proceedings of the 53e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Vol.1: Language in the Ancient Near East*, Winona Lake/IN, 617-46.
- Kraus, Fritz. 1984. *Nominalsätze in altbabylonischen Briefen und der Stativ*, Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde Nieuwe Reeks 47, 2, Amsterdam.
- Kroeber, Burkhart. 1970. *Die Neuägyptizismen vor der Amarnazeit. Studien zur Entwicklung der ägyptischen Sprache vom Mittleren zum Neuen Reich*, Tübingen.
- Kruchten, Jean-Marie. 1999. From Middle to Late Egyptian, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 6, 1-97.
- Kubisch, Sabine. 2008. *Lebensbilder der 2. Zwischenzeit: Biographische Inschriften der 13.-17. Dynastie*, Sonderschriften des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo 34, Berlin.
- Kurilowicz, Jerzy. 1975. The Evolution of Grammatical Categories, in: Jerzy Kurilowicz, *Esquisses Linguistiques II*, München, 38-54.
- Lacau, Pierre. 1949. *Une stèle juridique de Karnak*, Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte, Supplément 13, Cairo.
- Lacau, Pierre & Henri Chevrier. 1956-1969. *Une chapelle de Sésostri Ier à Karnak*, Cairo.
- . 1977-1979. *Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout à Karnak*, Cairo.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 1998. L'impersonnel, in: Jack Feuillet (ed.), *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*, Eurotyp 2, Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Typology 20.2, Berlin, 295-345.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 71, Cambridge.
- Langacker, Ronald. 2004. Grammar as Image: The case of voice, in: Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk & Alina Kwiatkowska (eds), *Imagery in Language: Festschrift in Honour of Professor Ronald W. Langacker*, Łódź Studies in Language 10, Frankfurt, 63-114.
- . 2006. Dimensions of Defocusing, in: Tasaku Tsunoda & Taro Kageyama (eds), *Voice and Grammatical Relations. In Honor of Masayoshi Shibatani*, Typological Studies in Language 65, Amsterdam, 115-37.
- Lange, Hans & Heinrich Schäfer. 1908. *Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reichs im Museum von Kairo, No. 20001-20780. II: Text zu No. 20400-20780*, Cairo.
- . 1925. *Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reichs im Museum von Kairo, No. 20001-20780. IV: Tafeln*, Cairo.
- Lapp, Günter. 1997. *The Papyrus of Nu*, Catalogue of the Books of the Dead in the British Museum 1, London.
- Layton, Bentley. 2011<sup>3</sup>. *A Coptic Grammar*, Porta Linguarum Orientalium 20, Wiesbaden.
- Lazard, Gilbert. 1994. *L'actance*, Linguistique Nouvelle, Paris.
- . 1995. La notion de distance actancielle, in: Janine Bouscaren, Jean-Jacques Franckel & Stéphane Robert (eds), *Langues et langage. Problèmes et raisonnements en linguistique. Mélanges offerts à Antonie Culioli*, Paris, 135-46.
- . 1997. Ergativity, in: *Linguistic Typology* 1, 243-68.
- . 1998. De la transitivité restreinte à la transitivité généralisée, in: André Rousseau, *La transitivité*, Paris, 55-84.
- . 2001. Le marquage différentiel de l'objet, in: Martin Haspelmath, Ekkerhard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds), *Language Typology and Language Universals, Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft* 20, Berlin, 873-85.

- Leahy, Anthony. 1989. A Protective Measure in Abydos in the Thirteenth Dynasty, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 75, 41-60.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. München/Newcastle.
- . 2004. Theory and Method in Grammaticalization, in: *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 32.2, 152-87.
- Leitz, Christian. 1996. Die Schlangensprüche in den Pyramidentexten, in: *Orientalia* 65, 381-427.
- Lemaréchal, Alain. 1997. *Zéro(s)*, Linguistique Nouvelle, Paris.
- Lichtenberk, Frank. 1985. Multiple Uses of Reciprocal Constructions, in: *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 5, 19-41.
- Liebermann, Stephen. 1986. The Afro-Asiatic Background of the Semitic N-Stem: Towards the origins of the stem-afformatives of the Semitic and Afro-Asiatic verb, in: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 43, 577-628.
- Loprieno, Antonio. 1980. The Form *sdmt.f*: Verbal predicate or 'transposition', in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 37, 17-29.
- . 1984. Aspekt und Diathese im Ägyptischen, in: Friedrich Junge (ed.), *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*, Göttingen, vol. I, 87-102.
- . 1986. *Das Verbalsystem im Ägyptischen und Semitischen. Zur Grundlegung einer Aspekttheorie*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 17, Wiesbaden.
- . 1988. *Topos und Mimesis: Zum Ausländer in der ägyptischen Literatur*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 48, Wiesbaden.
- . 1991a. Focus, Mood, and Negative Forms: Middle Egyptian syntactic paradigms and diachrony, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 201-26.
- . 1991b. Topic in Egyptian Negations, in: Daniela Mendel & Ulrike Claudi (eds), *Ägypten im afro-orientalischen Kontext. Aufsätze zur Archäologie, Geschichte und Sprache eines unbegrenzten Raumes. Gedenkschrift Peter Behrens*, Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere Universität Köln, special issue, 213-35.
- . 1995. *Ancient Egyptian. A Linguistic Introduction*, Cambridge.
- . 2003. Egyptian Linguistics in the Year 2000, in: Zahi Hawass (ed.), *Egyptology at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century. Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, Cairo, 2000*, Cairo, vol. III, 73-90.
- . 2006. On Fuzzy Boundaries in Egyptian Syntax, in: Gerald Moers, Heike Behlmer, Katja Demuss & Kai Widmaier (eds), *jn.t dr.w – Festschrift für Friedrich Junge*, Göttingen, vol. II, 429-41.
- Luft, Ulrich. 1992a. *Das Archiv von Illahun: Briefe, Hieratische Papyri aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*, Preussischer Kulturbesitz Lieferung 1, Berlin.
- . 1992b. *Die chronologische Fixierung des ägyptischen Mittleren Reiches nach dem Tempelarchiv von Illahun*, Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 598, Wien.
- . 2006. *Urkunden zur Chronologie der späten 12. Dynastie*, Denkschriften der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 34, Wien.
- Malaise, Michel & Jean Winand. 1999. *Grammaire raisonnée de l'égyptien classique*, Aegyptiaca Leodiensia 6, Liège.
- Maslov, Jurij. 1988. Resultative, Perfect, and Aspect, in: Vladimir Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions (Translation edited by Bernard Comrie)*, Typological Studies in Language 12, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 63-85.
- Mathieu, Bernard. 1996. L'emploi du *yod* prothétique dans les textes de la pyramide d'Ounas et son intérêt pour la vocalisation de l'égyptien, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 96, 313-37.
- . 2013. Grammaire et politique. Réflexions sur quelques empreintes idéologiques dans la terminologie linguistique des grammaires de l'égyptien ancien, in: Susanne Bickel, Hans-Werner Fischer-Elfert, Antonio Loprieno & Sebastian Richter (eds), *Ägyptologen und Ägyptologien zwischen Kaiserreich und Gründung der beiden deutschen Staaten*, Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde, Beihefte 1, Berlin, 437-56.
- Mayerthaler, Willi. 1981. *Morphologische Natürlichkeit*, Linguistische Forschungen 28, Wiesbaden.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. Reduplicative Constructions, in: Joseph Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Human Language. Vol. 3: Word Structure*, Stanford, 297-334.

- Moreno García, Juan Carlos. 1997. *Études sur l'administration, le pouvoir et l'idéologie en Égypte, de l'Ancien au Moyen Empire*, Aegyptiaca Leodiensia 4, 1997.
- . 1998. De l'Ancien Empire à la Première Période Intermédiaire: l'autobiographie de Qar d'Edfou, entre tradition et innovation, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 49, 151-60.
- Morschauer, Scott. 1991. *Threat-Formulae in Ancient Egypt: A Study of the History, Structure, and Use of Threats and Curses in Ancient Egypt*, Baltimore.
- Mous, Maarten. 2012. Cushitic, in: Zygmunt Frajsyngier & Erin Shay (eds), *The Afroasiatic Languages*, Cambridge Language Surveys, Cambridge, 342-422.
- Moussa, Ahmed & Hartwig Altenmüller. 1980. Bericht über die Grabungen des ägyptischen Antikendienstes im Osten der Ptahhotepgruppe in Saqqara im Jahre 1975, in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 36, 319-47.
- Murnane, William & Charles van Siclen III. 1993. *The Boundary Stelae of Akhenaten*, Studies in Egyptology, London/New York.
- Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical Transitivity*, Typological Studies in Language 72, Amsterdam/New York.
- Naville, Edouard. 1895-1908. *The Temple of Deir el-Bahari*, Memoirs of the Egypt Exploration Fund 13-14, 16, 19, 27, 29, London.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir. (ed.). 1988. *Typology of Resultative Constructions (Translation edited by Bernard Comrie)*, Typological Studies in Language 12, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir & Sergej Jaxontov. 1988. The Typology of Resultative Constructions, in: Vladimir Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions (Translation edited by Bernard Comrie)*, Typological Studies in Language 12, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 3-62.
- Neu, Erich. 1985. Das frühindogermanische Diathesensystem. Funktion und Geschichte, in: Bernfried Schlerath & Veronica Rittner (eds), *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte*, Wiesbaden, 273-95.
- . 1989. Dichotomie im grundsprachlichen Verbalsystem des Indogermanischen, in: Karin Heller, Oswald Panagi & Johann Tischler (eds), *Indogermanica Europaea. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 60. Geburtstag am 12.11.1989*, Grazer Linguistische Monographien 4, 153-75.
- Newberry, Percy. 1893-1894. *El Bersheh*, London.
- Newman, Paul. 2000. *The Hausa Language. An Encyclopedic Reference Grammar*. New Haven/London.
- Niccacci, Alviero. 2006. On the Heritage of H. J. Polotsky: Assessment of new insights and an attempt to combine his theory with a text-linguistic approach to Classical Egyptian narrative, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 409-32.
- . 2009. Polotsky's Contribution to the Egyptian Verb-System with a Comparison to Biblical Hebrew, in: Gideon Goldenberg & Ariel Shisha-Halevy (eds), *Egyptian, Semitic and General Grammar. Studies in Memory of H. J. Polotsky*, Jerusalem, 401-65.
- Norde, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*, Oxford.
- Ockinga, Boyo. 2012<sup>3</sup>. *Mittelägyptische Grundgrammatik: Abriss der mittelägyptischen Grammatik*, Darmstadt.
- Oréal, Elsa. 2007. Fracture d'actance et dynamique morphosyntaxique: le renouvellement du perfectif en Ancien égyptien, in: *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 102, 365-95.
- . 2009. Same Source, Different Outcomes? A reassessment of the parallel between Ancient Egyptian and Akkadian 'stative' conjugations, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 183-200.
- . 2010. Traces of a Stative-Eventive Opposition in Ancient Egypt: Rethinking pseudoparticiples as old perfective, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 137, 145-56.
- . 2011. *Les particules en égyptien ancien. De l'ancien égyptien à l'égyptien classique*, Bibliothèque d'étude 152, Cairo.
- Osing, Jürgen. 1977. Zur Syntax der Biographie des Wnj, in: *Orientalia* 46, 165-82.
- . 1987. Die Partizipien im Ägyptischen und in den semitischen Sprachen, in: Jürgen Osing & Günther Dreyer (eds), *Form und Maß: Beiträge zur Literatur, Sprache und Kunst des Alten Ägypten. Festschrift für Gerhard Fecht zum 65. Geburtstag am 6. Februar 1987*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 12, Wiesbaden, 337-60.
- Osing, Jürgen et al. 1982. *Denkmäler der Oase Dachla aus dem Nachlass von Ahmed Fakhry*, Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 20, Mainz.

- Palmer, Frank. 1994. *Grammatical Roles and Relations*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics, Cambridge.
- Parkinson, Richard. 1991. *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant*, Oxford.
- . 1997a. *The Tale of Sinuhe and Other Ancient Egyptian Poems 1940-1640 BC*, Oxford.
- . 1997b. The Text of *Khakheperreseneb*: New readings of EA 5645, and an unpublished ostrakon, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 83, 55-68.
- . 1999. Two New 'Literary Texts' on a Second Intermediate Period Papyrus? A preliminary account of P. BM EA 10475, in: Jan Assmann & Elke Blumenthal (eds), *Literatur und Politik im pharaonischen und ptolomäischen Ägypten. Vorträge der Tagung zum Gedenken an Georges Posener 5.-10. September 1996 in Leipzig*, Bibliothèque d'étude 127, Cairo, 177-96.
- . 2009. *Reading Ancient Egyptian Poetry. Among Other Histories*, Chichester (UK)/Malden (MA).
- . 2012a. *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant. A Reader's Commentary*, *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica* 10, Hamburg.
- . 2012b. *The Ramesseum Papyri*, The British Museum Online Research Catalogues. [http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/publications/online\\_research\\_catalogues.aspx](http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/publications/online_research_catalogues.aspx).
- Peet, Thomas. 1914. *The Stela of Sebek-khu. The Earliest Record of an Egyptian Campaign in Asia*, Manchester.
- Perlmutter, David. 1978. Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis, in: Jeri Jaeger, Anthony Woodbury & Farrel Ackerman (eds), *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, Berkeley, 157-89.
- Perlmutter, David & Paul Postal. 1983. Towards a Universal Characterization of Passivization, in: David Perlmutter (ed), *Studies in Relational Grammar* 1, Chicago, 3-29.
- Petersmark, Edina. 2012. *Die Kemit. Ostraka, Schreibtafeln und ein Papyrus*, Göttinger Miszellen, Beihefte 12, Göttingen.
- Peust, Carsten. 1999. *Egyptian Phonology. An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language*, Monographien zur ägyptischen Sprache 2, Göttingen.
- . 2004. Das Ägyptische als afrikanische Sprache, in: Thomas Schneider (ed.), *Das Ägyptische und die Sprachen Vorderasiens, Nordafrikas und der Ägäis. Akten des Basler Kolloquiums zum ägyptisch-nichtsemitischen Sprachkontakt, Basel 9.-11. Juli 2003*, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 319, Münster, 321-407.
- . 2006a. *Rdj* + Pseudopartizip – eine mögliche Konstruktion, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 211, 67-70.
- . 2006b. Die Syntax des Vergleichs mit *mj* 'wie' im Älteren Ägyptisch, in: Gerald Moers, Heike Behlmer, Katja Demuss & Kai Widmaier (eds), *jn.t dr.w – Festschrift für Friedrich Junge*, Göttingen, vol. II, 485-519.
- . 2007. Ellipsis of Shared Subjects and Direct Objects from Subsequent Predications in Earlier Egyptian, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 93, 211-22.
- . 2008. Wie fokussiert man im Ägyptischen ein direktes Objekt?, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 135, 78-87.
- . 2012. On the Subgrouping of Afroasiatic, or: How to use an unrooted phylogenetic tree in historical linguistics, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 20, 221-51.
- Piankoff, Alexandre & Jacques Jean Clère. 1934. A Letter to the Dead on a Bowl in the Louvre, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 20, 157-69, pl.20-1.
- Pieke, Gabrielle. Forthc. Playing with Traditions. The tomb decoration of Djehutyhotep II at Deir el-Bersha, in: Lubica Hudáková, Peter Jánosi & Andrea Kahlbacher (eds), *Change and Innovation in Middle Kingdom Art. Proceedings of the Meketre Study Day Held in Vienne, 3rd May 2013*, Vienna.
- Pinkster, Harm. 1992. The Latin Impersonal Passive, in: *Mnemosyne* 45.2, 159-77.
- Plank, Frans. 1995. Entgrammatisierung: Spiegelbild der Grammmatisierung?, in: Norbert Boretzky et al. (eds), *Natürlichkeitstheorie und Sprachwandel*, Bochum, 199-219.
- Polis, Stéphane & Andréas Stauder. In press. The Construction *ib=f r sdm*, in: Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, Andréas Stauder & Jean Winand (eds), *New Directions in Egyptian Syntax. Proceedings* (provisional title), *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica*, Hamburg.
- Polotsky, Hans Jakob. 1930. The Stela of Heka-Yeb, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 16, 194-99.
- . 1944. *Études de syntaxe copte*, Cairo.
- . 1957. The Emphatic *sdm.n=f* Form, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 11, 109-17.



- . 1965. *Egyptian Tenses*, The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Proceedings II/5, Jerusalem.
- . 1976. Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique, in: *Israel Oriental Studies* 6, 1-50.
- . 1986. 'His Majesty' in Hammamat 191, in: William Simpson (ed.), *Essays on Egyptian Grammar*, Yale Egyptological Studies 1, New Haven, 31-3.
- Posener, Georges. 1976. *L'enseignement loyaliste. Sagesse égyptienne du Moyen Empire*, Hautes Études Orientales 5, Genève.
- Quack, Joachim. 1992. *Studien zur Lehre des Merikare*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 23, Wiesbaden.
- . 1993a. Beiträge zur Textkritik der Prophezeiung des Neferti, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 135, 77-9.
- . 1993b. Ein altägyptisches Sprachtabu, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 3, 59-79.
- . 2000. Review of Zeidler, Pfortenbuchstudien, in: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 57, 541-59.
- Quecke, Hans. 1979. Review of Janet Johnson, The Demotic Verbal System, in: *Orientalia* 48, 435-7.
- . 1987. Zur Passivumschreibung im Koptischen, in: Jürgen Osing & Günter Dreyer (eds), *Form und Maß: Beiträge zur Literatur, Sprache und Kunst des alten Ägypten. Festschrift für Gerhard Fecht zum 62. Geburtstag am 6. Februar 1987*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 12, Wiesbaden, 395-404.
- Ransom, Caroline. 1913. The Stela of Menthu-weser, in: *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* 8, 216-8.
- Ray, John. 2003. The Vocalisation of the Passive Participle in Egyptian and the Origins of the *sdm=f* and *sdm.n=f* Forms, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 11, 117-30.
- Reintges, Chris. 1992. A Functional Reexamination of Hammamat 191:6, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 129, 87-98.
- . 1994. Egyptian Root-and-Pattern Morphology, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 4, 213-44.
- . 1996. The *sdm.tw=f* as a Morphological Passive, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 153, 79-99.
- . 1997. *Passive Voice in Older Egyptian. A Morpho-Syntactic Study*, HIL Dissertations 28, Deen Haag.
- . 1998a. Mapping Information Structure to Syntactic Structure: One syntax for *jn*, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 49, 196-220.
- . 1998b. Ancient Egyptian in 3D: Synchrony, diachrony and typology of a dead language, in: *Orientalia* 67, 447-76.
- . 2003. The Reduplicative Passive in Older Egyptian: Description and typology, in: Lionel Bender, Gábor Takács & David Appleyard (eds), *Selected Comparative-Historical Afroasian Linguistic Studies. In Memory of Igor M. Diakonoff* (LINCOM Studies in Afroasiatic Linguistics 14), 175-86.
- . 2004. The Older Egyptian *sdm(.w)=f* Passive Revisited, in: *Folia Orientalia* 40, 51-70.
- . 2005. On Passive Participles and Relative Forms, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 13, 103-39.
- . 2006. The Older Egyptian Stative Revisited, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 115-34.
- . The Diachronic Typology of Passive and Stative Voice in Ancient Egyptian, in: Leonid Kulikov & Seppo Kittilä (eds), *The Diachronic Typology of Voice and Valency-changing Categories*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- . 2011. The Oral-Compositional Form of Pyramid Text Discourse, in: Fredrik Hagen, John Johnston, Wendy Monkhouse, Kathryn Piquette, John Tait & Martin Worthington (eds), *Narratives of Egypt and the Ancient Near East. Literary and Linguistic Approaches*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 189, Leuven, 3-54.
- . Forthc. Word Order Variation, Clausal Structure and the Morphology-Syntax Interface in Earlier Egyptian, in: James Allen, Mark Collier & Andréas Stauder (eds), *Workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar, Brown University, March 27-29, 2013*, Wilbour Studies in Egyptology and Ancient Western Asia, Atlanta.
- Retsö, Jan. 1989. *Diathesis in the Semitic Languages. A Comparative Morphological Study*, Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 14, Leiden.
- Ritter, Thomas. 1995. *Das Verbalssystem der königlichen und privaten Inschriften. XVIII. Dynastie bis einschließlich Amenophis III.*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 30, Wiesbaden.
- Roccati, Alessandro. 1964. La scrittura del formante *tw* del passivo nel medio regno, in: *Rivista degli studi orientali* 39, 174-9.
- . 1997. Studi tipologici. I. Sull'ergatività dell'egiziano, in: Alessandro Bausi & Mauro Tosco (eds), *Afroasiatica Neapolitana. Contributi presentati all'8° Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semitica)*, Studi Africanistici. Serie Etiopica 6, Napoli, 113-22.

- . 2006. Die aktiv/passiven Verbalformen des Ägyptischen, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 135-8.
- Roeder, Günther. 1913. *Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin. Band 1, Inschriften von der ältesten Zeit bis zum Ende der Hyksoszeit*, Leipzig.
- Rössler, Otto. 1950. Verbalbau und Verbalflexion in den Semitohamitischen Sprachen, in: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 100, 461-514.
- Rowton, Michael. 1962. The Use of the Permansive in Classic Babylonian, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 21, 233-303.
- Sadek, Ashraf. 1980. *The Amethyst Mining Inscriptions of Wadi el-Hudi*, vol. I, Warminster.
- Sansò, Andrea. 2006. 'Agent Defocusing' Revisited: Passive and impersonal constructions in some European languages, in: Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö (eds), *Passivization and Typology. Form and Function*, Typological Studies in Language 68, Amsterdam, 232-73.
- Satzinger, Helmut. 1968. *Die negativen Konstruktionen im Alt- und Mittellägyptischen*, Münchner Ägyptologische Studien 12, Berlin.
- . 1971. 'Schliesslich hörte er', in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 57, 58-69.
- . 1984. Attribut und Relativsatz im älteren Ägyptisch, in: Friedrich Junge (ed.), *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*, Göttingen, vol. I, 125-56.
- . 1998. Varieties of the Old Perfective in Old Egyptian, in: Christopher Eyre (ed.), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Egyptologists, Cambridge, 3-9 September 1995*, Leuven, 1021-28.
- . 2001. On Ergativity in Egyptian, in: Andrzej Zaborski (ed.), *New Data and New Methods in Afroasiatic Linguistics. Robert Hetzron in Memoriam*, Wiesbaden, 173-82.
- . 2003. The Egyptian Conjugations Within the Afroasiatic Framework, in: Zahi Hawass (ed.), *Egyptology at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century. Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, Cairo, 2000*, Cairo, vol. III, 392-400.
- . 2006. Wege zum Mittellägyptischen – eine repräsentative Darstellung in französischer Sprache (Rezensionsartikel zu Michel Malaise und Jean Winand, *Grammaire raisonnée de l'égyptien classique*), in: *Chronique d'Égypte* 81, 116-27.
- . 2009. On Some Aspects of *jw* in Middle Egyptian, in: Gideon Goldenberg & Ariel Shisha-Halevy (eds), *Egyptian, Semitic and General Grammar. Studies in Memory of H. J. Polotsky*, Jerusalem, 61-9.
- Scharff, Alexander. 1922. Ein Rechnungsbuch des königlichen Hofes der 13. Dynastie, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 51-68, pl.1-24.
- Schenkel, Wolfgang. 1965. 'Singularisches' und 'pluralisches' Partizip, in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 20, 110-4.
- . 1971. Das altägyptische Pseudopartizip und das indogermanische Medium/Perfekt', in: *Orientalia* 40, 301-16.
- . 1975. *Die altägyptische Suffixkonjugation. Theorie der innerägyptischen Entstehung aus Nomina actionis*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 32, Wiesbaden.
- . 1985. Zur Verbalflexion in den Pyramidentexten, in: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 42, 481-94.
- . 1992. Hamm. M 191, 6: Ein Vorschlag zur Güte, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 2, 155-6.
- . 1994. *Sdm.t*-Perfekt und *sdm.ti*-Stative: Die beiden Pseudopartizipien des Ägyptischen nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte, in: Heike Behlmer (ed.), *Quaerentes Scientiam. Festgabe für Wolfhart Westendorf zu seinem 70. Geburtstag überreicht von seine Schülern*, Göttingen, 157-82.
- . 1998. Standardtheorie und invertierte Standardtheorie, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 125, 140-60.
- . 1999. *s*-Kausativa, *t*-Kausativa und 'innere' Kausativa: Die *s*-Kausativa der Verben *I.s* in den Sargtexten, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 27, 313-52.
- . 2000a. Die Endungen des Negativkomplements im Spiegel der Befunde der Sargtexte, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 7, 1-26.
- . 2000b. Die Endungen des Prospektivs und des Subjunktivs (*sdm=f*, *sdm.w=f*, *sdm.y=f*) nach Befunden der Sargtexte. Mit einem Anhang zum prospektivischen Partizip *sdm.t(i)=f(i)*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 7, 27-112.
- . 2004. Das *sdm(w)=f*-Passiv, Perfekt vs. Futur, nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte, 1. Teil, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 131, 173-88.

- . 2005. Das *sdm(.w)=f*-Passiv, Perfekt vs. Futur, nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte, 2. Teil, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 132, 40-54.
- . 2006a. Von der Morphologie zur Syntax und zurück, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 55-82.
- . 2006b. Ein vermeintlicher Sonderfall der agenslosen Relativkonstruktion, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 209, 75-9.
- . 2007a. Die Partikel *iw* und die Intuition des Interpreten, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 15, 161-201.
- . 2007b. *Rdj* + Pseudopartizip – eine nach-klassische Konstruktion?, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 215, 109-12.
- . 2009a. Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sdm.n=f*, in: Gideon Goldenberg & Ariel Shisha-Halevy (eds), *Egyptian, Semitic and General Grammar. Studies in Memory of H. J. Polotsky*, Jerusalem, 40-60.
- . 2009b. Zur Silbenstruktur des Ägyptischen, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 259-76.
- . 2010. Die Clèresche Relativform, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 137, 66-90.
- . 2011. Merkmalloses versus pluralisches/distributives/intensives Partizip: Kritik der Ausgangsbeobachtungen, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 138, 63-78.
- . 2012<sup>5</sup>. *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift*, Tübingen.
- . 2014. Syntax und Sinnzusammenhang. Emphatische Konstruktion, Rang-V-Erweiterung und anderes mehr, in: Harold Hays, Frank Feder & Ludwig Morenz (eds), *Interpretations of Sinuhe. Inspired by Two Passages (Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Leiden University, 27-29 November 2009)*, Egyptologische Uitgaven 27, Leuven, 81-172.
- . In press. Kontingenter Hintergrund. Beobachtungen zum Gebrauch des *sdm.in=f* in erzählenden Texten, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 21.
- . Forthc. Grenzen und Chancen bei der Erschließung des älteren Ägyptisch, in: James Allen, Mark Collier & Andréas Stauder (eds), *Workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar, Brown University, March 27-29, 2013*, Wilbour Studies in Egyptology and Ancient Western Asia, Atlanta.
- Schneider, Thomas. 2007. Contextualizing the Tale of the Herdsman, in: Thomas Schneider & Kasia Szpakowska (eds), *Egyptian Stories. A British Egyptological Tribute to Alan B. Lloyd on the Occasion of His Retirement*, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 347, Münster, 309-18.
- Schweitzer, Simon. 2005. *Schrift und Sprache der 4. Dynastie, Menes*. Studien zur Kultur und Sprache der ägyptischen Frühzeit und des Alten Reiches 3, Wiesbaden.
- Seibert, Peter. 1967. *Die Charakteristik. Untersuchungen zu einer altägyptischen Sprechsitte und ihren Ausprägungen in Folklore und Literatur*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 17, Wiesbaden.
- Sethe, Kurth. 1899. *Das ägyptische Verbum im Altägyptischen, Neuägyptischen und Koptischen*, Leipzig.
- . 1916. *Der Nominalsatz im Ägyptischen und Koptischen*, Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 33.3, Leipzig.
- . 1918. Zum partizipialen Ursprung der Suffixkonjugation, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 54, 98-103.
- . 1926. Ein Prozessurteil aus dem Alten Reich, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 61, 67-70.
- . 1928<sup>2</sup>a. *Ägyptische Lesestücke zum Gebrauch im akademischen Unterricht. Texte des Mittleren Reiches*, Leipzig.
- . 1928b. *Dramatische Texte zu Altägyptischen Mysterienspielen*, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens 10.1, Leipzig.
- . 1933. *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums I. Urkunden des Alten Reiches*, Leipzig.
- . 1935. *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums VII.1. Historisch-biographische Urkunden des Mittleren Reiches I*, Leipzig.
- Sethe, Kurt & Wolfgang Helck. 1914-1961. *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums IV. Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*, Leipzig & Graz.
- Seyfried, Karl-Joachim. 2005. Qubbet el-Hawa: Stand und Perspektiven der Bearbeitung, in: Stephan Seidlmayer (ed.), *Texte und Denkmäler des Alten Reiches*, *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* 3, 309-34.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1985. Passives and Related Constructions: A prototype analysis, in: *Language* 61, 821-48.

- . 1988. Introduction, in: Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *Passive and Voice*, Typological Studies in Language 16, Amsterdam, 1-9.
- Shisha-Halevy, Ariel. 1986. *Coptic Grammatical Categories. Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Sahidic*, Analecta Orientalia 53, Rome.
- Siewierska, Anna. 1984. *The Passive. A Comparative Linguistic Analysis*, London.
- . 2008. The Impersonal-to-Passive Highway: An instance of bidirectional change (paper read at the 23th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics, Uppsala University, 1-3 October 2008).
- . 2010. From 3pl to Passive: Incipient, emergent and established passives, in: *Diachronica* 27, 73-109.
- Silverman, David. 1980. An Emphasized Object of a Nominal Verb in Middle Egyptian, in: *Orientalia* 49, 199-203.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity, in: Robert Dixon (ed.), *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Linguistic Studies 22, 112-71, Canberra.
- Simpson, Robert. 1996. *Demotic Grammar in the Ptolemaic Sacerdotal Decrees*, Oxford.
- Simpson, William. 1960. Papyrus Lythgoe: A fragment of a literary text of the Middle Kingdom from el-Lisht, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 46, 65-70.
- . 1974. *The Terrace of the Great God at Abydos. The Offering Chapels of Dynasties 12 and 13*, Publications of the Pennsylvania-Yale Expedition to Egypt 5, New Haven.
- . 2003. *The Literature of Ancient Egypt. An Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry*, New Haven.
- Smither, Paul. 1945. The Semnah Despatches, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 31, 3-10.
- . 1948. The Report Concerning the Slave-Girl Senbet, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 34, 31-4.
- Spiegelberg, Walter. 1908. Eine Formel der Grabsteine, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 45, 67-71.
- Starke, Frank. 1981. Zur Deutung der Arzaa-Briefstelle VBoT 1, 25-27, in: *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 71, 221-31.
- Stauder, Andréas. 2008. Earlier Egyptian Passive Forms Associated with Reduplication, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 16, 171-96.
- . 2013a. *Linguistic Dating of Middle Egyptian Literary Texts*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 12, Hamburg.
- . 2013b. L'émulation du passé à l'époque thoutmoside: la dimension linguistique, in: Susanne Bickel (ed.), *Vergangenheit und Zukunft. Studien zum historischen Bewusstsein in der Thutmosidenzeit*, Aegyptiaca Helvetica 22, Basel, 77-125.
- . 2014a. Linguistic Dissonance in *Sinuhe*, in: Harold Hays, Frank Feder & Ludwig Morenz (eds), *Interpretations of Sinuhe. Inspired by Two Passages (Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Leiden University, 27-29 November 2009)*, Egyptologische Uitgaven 27, Leuven, 173-88.
- . 2014b. Splitting the *sdm.n=f*? A discussion of written forms in Coffin Texts, part I, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 141.1.
- . 2014c. Ptahhotep 82 P, in: *Festschrift for a Distinguished Colleague*.
- . In press a. Splitting the *sdm.n=f*? A discussion of written forms in Coffin Texts, part II, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 141.2.
- . In press b. Interpreting Written Morphology: The *sdm.n=f* in Pyramid Texts, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 73.2.
- . In press c. A Rare Change: The degrammaticalization of an inflectional passive marker into an impersonal subject pronoun in Earlier Egyptian, in: Sebastian Richter, Eitan Grossman & Martin Haspelmath (eds), *Linguistic Typology and Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics*, Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, Berlin.
- . Forthc. The Earlier Egyptian Emphatic Construction: An alternative analysis, in: James Allen, Mark Collier & Andréas Stauder (eds), *Workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar, Brown University, March 27-29, 2013*, Wilbour Studies in Egyptology and Ancient Western Asia, Atlanta.
- . In prep. *Verbal Rhetorics in the Old Kingdom: Weni's Inscription*.
- Stauder-Porchet, Julie. 2008. Une formule de la biographie éthique. Traduction et commentaire, in: *Revue de d'Égyptologie* 59, 369-80.

- . 2009. *La préposition en égyptien de la première phase. Approche sémantique*, Aegyptiaca Helvetica 21, Basel.
- Stempel, Reinhard. 2002. *Movetur – se movet*. On the development of the middle voice in Latin, in: Lea Sawicki & Donna Shalev (eds), *Donum Grammaticum. Studies in Latin and Celtic Linguistics in Honour of Hannah Rosén*, Orbis Supplementa 18, Leuven, 329-36.
- Stewart, Harry. 1979. *Egyptian Stelae, Reliefs and Paintings from the Petrie Collection. II: Archaic to Second Intermediate Period*, Warminster.
- Streck, Michael. 2003. *Die akkadischen Verbalstämme mit ta-Infix*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 303, Münster.
- Testen, David. 1998. The Derivational Role of the Semitic N-Stem, in: *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 88, 127-45.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2003. *Constructing a Language. A Usage-Based Theory of Language Acquisition*, Cambridge (MA)/London.
- Tropper, Josef. 1995. Die semitische 'Suffixkonjugation' im Wandel. Von der Prädikativform zum Perfekt, in: Manfred Dietrich & Oswald Loretz (eds), *Vom Alten Orient zum Alten Testament. Festschrift für Wolfram Freiherrn von Soden zum 85. Geburtstag am 19. Juni 1993*, Kevelaar, 491-516.
- . 2005. Die T-Verbalsämme des Biblisch-Hebräischen, in: Bogdan Burtea, Josef Tropper & Helen Younansardaroud (eds), *Studia Semitica et Semitohamitica. Festschrift für Rainer Voigt anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstag am 17. Januar 2004*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 317, Münster, 417-24.
- Tylor, John & Francis Griffith. 1894. *The Tomb of Paheri at el-Kab*, The Egypt Exploration Fund, Memoir 11, London.
- Uljas, Sami. 2005. The 'Intrusive' <m> of Late Egyptian Independent Pronouns, in: *Göttinger Miscellen* 206, 87-90.
- . 2007a. *The Modal System of Earlier Egyptian Complement Clauses. A Study in Pragmatics in a Dead Language*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 26, Leiden.
- . 2007b. Why (not) Leave it 'Virtual'? More on grammar and texture in Earlier Egyptian, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 15, 251-62.
- . 2009. Radiality in Middle Egyptian Grammar, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 277-90.
- . 2010a. Formally Speaking. Observations on a recent theory of the Earlier Egyptian *sdm.n=f*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 18, 253-61.
- . 2010b. Archaeology of Language. A case study from Middle Kingdom/Second Intermediate Period Egypt and Nubia, in: *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 39, 373-82.
- . 2011. Syncretism and the Earlier Egyptian *sdm=f*: Speculations on morphological interconnections across paradigms, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 19, 155-74.
- . 2013. Agreement Domains and Resumption in Earlier Egyptian, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 140, 78-83.
- . In press. On Earlier Egyptian Control Constructions, in: Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, Andréas Stauder & Jean Winand (eds), *New Directions in Egyptian Syntax. Proceedings* (provisional title), Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica, Hamburg.
- . Forthc. To See an Invisible Form: Paradigms, parallels and practises once again, in: James Allen, Mark Collier & Andréas Stauder (eds), *Workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar, Brown University, March 27-29, 2013*, Wilbour Studies in Egyptology and Ancient Western Asia, Atlanta.
- Van den Boorn, Guido. 1988. *The Duties of the Vizier. Civil Administration in the Early New Kingdom*, Studies in Egyptology, London.
- Vandekerckhove, Hans & Renate Müller-Wollermann. 2001. *Die Felsinschriften des Wadi Hilâl*, Elkab 6, Turnhout.
- Van der Molen, Rami. 2005. *An Analytical Concordance of the Verb, the Negation and the Syntax in Egyptian Coffin Texts*, Handbuch der Orientalistik 77, Leiden/Boston.
- Van der Plas, Dirk. 1986. *L'Hymne à la crue du Nil*, Egyptologische Uitgaven 4, Leiden.
- Vandier, Jacques. 1950. *Mo<sup>c</sup>alla. La tombe d'Ankhtifi et la tombe de Sébekhotep*, Bibliothèque d'étude 18, Cairo.
- Van Valin, Robert. 1990. Semantic Parameters of Split Intransitivity, in: *Language* 66, 221-60.

- Vergote, Joseph. 1955. La fonction du pseudoparticipe, in: Otto Firkow (ed.), *Ägyptologische Studien. Hermann Grapow zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Orientforschung 29, Berlin, 338-61.
- Vernus, Pascal. 1976. La formule 'le souffle de la bouche' au Moyen Empire, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 28, 139-45.
- . 1980. Surcodages de l'opposition *sdm.f/ sdm.n.f* dans un hymne du P. Ramésseum VI. Études de philologie et de linguistique I, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 32, 117-21.
- . 1981a. Formes 'emphatiques' en fonction non 'emphatique' dans la protase d'un système corrélatif, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 43, 73-88.
- . 1981b. Omina calendériques et comptabilité d'offrandes sur une tablette hiératique de la XVIIIe dynastie, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 33, 89-124.
- . 1984a. Sujet + *sdm.f* et sujet + pseudoparticipe avec les verbes de qualité: dialectique de l'aspect et de l'Aktionsart, in: Friedrich Junge (ed.), *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*, Göttingen, vol. I, 197-212.
- . 1984b. Le *sdm.n=f* des verbes de qualité. Dialectique de l'aspect et de l'Aktionsart. Études de philologie et de linguistique III, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 35, 171-84.
- . 1985. 'Ritual' *sdm.n=f* and Some Values of the 'Accompli' in the Bible and in the Koran, in: Sarah Groll (ed.), *Pharaonic Egypt. The Bible and Christianity*, Jerusalem, 307-16.
- . 1986. Aspect and Morphosyntactic Patterns in Middle Egyptian, in: Gertie Englund & Paul Frandsen (ed.), *Crossroad: Chaos or the Beginning of a New Paradigm. Papers from the Conference on Egyptian Grammar, Helsingør 28-30 May 1986*, Carsten Niehbur Institute Publications 1, Copenhagen, 375-88.
- . 1987. Études de philologie et de linguistique (VI), in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 38, 163-81.
- . 1989. La stèle du pharaon *Mntw-htpi* à Karnak: un nouveau témoignage sur la situation politique et militaire au début de la D.P.I., in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 40, 145-61.
- . 1990. *Future at Issue. Tense, Mood and Aspect in Middle Egyptian: Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, Yale Egyptological Studies 4, New Haven.
- . 1991. Le rhème marqué: typologie des emplois et effets de sens en moyen égyptien, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 333-55.
- . 1994. Observations sur la prédication de classe ('Nominal Predicate'), in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 4, 325-48.
- . 1995. *Essai sur la conscience de l'histoire dans l'Égypte pharaonique*, Bibliothèque de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, Sciences Historiques et Philologiques 332, Paris.
- . 1996. La position linguistique des Textes des Sarcophages, in: Harco Willems (ed.), *The World of the Coffin Texts*, Egyptologische Uitgaven 9, Leuven, 143-96.
- . 1997. *Les parties du discours en Moyen Égyptien: autopsie d'une théorie*, Cahiers de la Société d'Égyptologie 5, Genève.
- . 1998a. Processus de grammaticalisation dans la langue égyptienne, in: *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 142, 191-200.
- . 1998b. La grammaticalisation en égyptien ancien: phrase nominale et morphogenèse de l'inaccompli et du futur, in: *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 5, 63-83.
- . 2001. Le nom d'action et étymologique comme modificateur du verbe: une construction égyptienne proche du *maf'ul mu'tlaq*, in: Josep Cervelló Autuori & Alberto J. Quevedo Álvarez (eds), *Ir a buscar leña. Estudios dedicados al Profesor Jesús López*, Aula Aegyptiaca Studia 2, Barcelona, 193-202.
- . 2003. Lexique et grammaire en égyptien: lexicalisation en substantif préassigné, in: Ingelore Hafemann (ed.), *Wege zu einem digitalen Corpus ägyptischer Texte. Akten der Tagung 'Datenbanken im Verbund' (Berlin, 30. September - 2. Oktober 1999)*, Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae 2, Berlin, 237-76.
- . 2006. Pronoms interrogatifs en égyptien de la première phase, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 145-78.
- . 2009. Le préformant *n* et la détransitivité: formation *n-C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>* versus *C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>*. À propos de la racine *gm* 'notion de trituration', in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 291-317.
- . 2010<sup>2</sup>. *Sagesses de l'Égypte ancienne*, Paris.

- . 2012. Le verbe *gm(j)*: essai de sémantique lexicale, in: Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis & Jean Winand (eds), *Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian*, *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica* 9, Hamburg, 387-438.
- . 2014. Élaboration littéraire et affectation archaïsante. Comment Sinuhé sait se mettre en avant en se mettant à l'écart, in: Harold Hays, Frank Feder & Ludwig Morenz (eds), *Interpretations of Sinuhe. Inspired by Two Passages (Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Leiden University, 27-29 November 2009)*, *Egyptologische Uitgaven* 27, Leuven, 189-214.
- . In press. La non représentation segmentale du (premier) participant direct ('sujet') et la notion de  $\phi$ , in: Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, Andréas Stauder & Jean Winand (eds), *New Directions in Egyptian Syntax. Proceedings* (provisional title), *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica*, Hamburg.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1957. Ein passives Partizip im Ägyptischen und im Hausa (British Nigeria). Die Konjugation *sdmm.f*, in: *Le Muséon* 70, 353-6.
- Werning, Daniel. 2008. Aspect vs. Relative Tense, and the Typological Classification of the Ancient Egyptian *sdm.n=f*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 18, 261-92.
- . 2013. Linguistic Dating of the Netherworld Books Attested in the New Kingdom: A critical review, in: Gerald Moers, Antonia Giewekemeyer & Kai Widmaier (eds), *Dating Egyptian Literary Texts. Proceedings of the Conference Göttingen 9-12.6.2010*, *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica* 11, Hamburg, 237-81.
- . In press. Uninflected Relative Verb Forms as Converbs and Verbal Rhemes: The two schemes of the emphatic construction as a detached adjectival phrase construction and as a truncated balanced sentence, in: Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, Andréas Stauder & Jean Winand (eds), *New Directions in Egyptian Syntax. Proceedings* (provisional title), *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica*, Hamburg.
- . Forthc. Hypotheses on Glides and Matres Lectionis in Earlier Egyptian, paper read at the *Workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar*, Brown University, March 27-29, 2013, to be published in: James Allen, Mark Collier & Andréas Stauder (eds), *Workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar, Brown University, March 27-29, 2013*, *Wilbour Studies in Egyptology and Ancient Western Asia*, Atlanta.
- Westendorf, Wolfhart. 1953. *Der Gebrauch des Passivs in der klassischen Literatur der Ägypter*, Berlin.
- . 1959. Das geminierte passive *sdm.f (mrr.f)*: imperfektisch oder emphatisch?, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 84, 147-55.
- . 1962. *Grundriss der Medizin der alten Ägypter VIII. Grammatik der medizinischen Texte*, Berlin.
- Wiener, Malcom & James Allen. 1998. Separate Lives: The Ahmose Tempest Stela and the Thera eruption, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57, 1-28.
- Willems, Harco. 1990. Crime, Cult, and Capital Punishment (Moalla Inscription 8), in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 76, 27-54.
- Winand, Jean. 1989. L'expression du sujet nominal au présent I en néo-égyptien, in: *Chronique d'Égypte* 64, 159-71.
- . 1995. La grammaire au secours de la datation des textes, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 46, 187-202.
- . 2000. La progression au sein de la narration en égyptien. Éléments d'une grammaire du texte, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 100, 403-35.
- . 2004. La non-expression de l'objet direct en égyptien ancien (Études valenciennes I), in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 12, 205-34.
- . 2006. *Temps et aspect: une approche sémantique*, *Probleme der Ägyptologie* 25, Leiden/Boston.
- . 2007. Les formes nominalisées en égyptien ancien, in: *Faits de langue* 30, 69-82.
- . 2009. Zeros in Egyptian. Can nothing mean something?, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 319-39.
- . In press. The Oblique Expression of the Object in Ancient Egyptian, in: Sebastian Richter, Eitan Grossman & Martin Haspelmath (eds), *Linguistic Typology and Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics, Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*, Berlin.
- Winand, Jean & Stéphanie Gohy. 2011. La grammaire du Papyrus Magique Harris, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 19, 175-245.
- Winlock, Herbert. 1943. The Eleventh Egyptian Dynasty, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 2, 249-83.
- Woods, Christopher. 2005. Deixis, Person, and Case in Sumerian, *Acta Sumerologica* 22, 303-34.

- . 2008. *The Grammar of Perspective. The Sumerian Conjugation Prefixes as a System of Voice*, Cuneiform Monographs 32, Leiden/Boston.
- Yamazaki, Naoko. 2003. *Zaubersprüche für Mutter und Kind: Papyrus Berlin 3027*, Berlin.
- Žába, Zbyněk. 1956. *Les maximes de Ptahhotep. Texte, traduction et commentaire*, Prague.
- . 1974. *The Rock Inscriptions of Lower Nubia*, Prague.
- Zaborski, Andrzej. 2001. Verbale Flexion und Derivation mit T und M/N: ein etymologischer Versuch. Stefan Wild & Hartmut Schild (eds), *Akten des 27. Deutschen Orientalistentages (Bonn, 28. September bis 2. Oktober 1998)*, Würzburg, 593-9.
- . 2003. Les formes verbales intensives avec l'objet direct au pluriel comme une des sources du présent en chamito-sémitique, in: Jérôme Lentin & Antoine Lonnet (eds), *Mélanges David Cohen, Études sur le langage, les langues, les dialectes, les littératures, offertes par ses élèves, ses collègues, ses amis présentées à l'occasion de son quatre-vingtième anniversaire*, Paris, 723-7.
- Zeidler, Jürgen. 1992. Review of Karel Petrůček, *Vergleichende Studien*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 2, 214-5.
- . 1999. *Pfortenbuchstudien*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 36, Wiesbaden.
- Zonhoven, Louis. 1993-1994. Polotsky, Sinuhe, Negation and the *sdm.n=f*: On the existence of an indicative *sdm=f* in Middle Egyptian, in: *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap 'Ex Oriente Lux'* 33, 39-108.
- . 1996. Studies on the *sdm.t=f* Verb Form in Classical Egyptian, I: The construction *dr sdm.t=f*, in: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 53, 613-44.
- . 1997. Studies on the *sdm.t=f* Verb Form in Classical Egyptian, III: The active *n sdm.t=f* construction, in: Jacobus van Dijk (ed.), *Essays on Ancient Egypt in Honour of Herman te Velde*, Groningen, 383-400.
- . 1998a. Studies on the *sdm.t=f* Verb Form in Classical Egyptian, IV: The passive *sdm.t=fms.(y)t=f*, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 125, 78-92.
- . 1998b. Studies on the *sdm.t=f* Verb Form in Classical Egyptian, V: The relative future tense *sdm.t=f*, in: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 55, 600-42.
- . 1998c. Studies on the *sdm.t=f* Verb Form in Classical Egyptian, VI: The future marker written *t*, *ti* or *ty* and future/prospective participial forms, in: *Chronique d'Égypte* 73, 5-28.

### Abbreviations beyond the usual ones:

- AL* = Dimitri Meeks, *Année Lexicographique*, I-III, Paris, 1977-1979.
- FCD* = Raymond Faulkner. *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, Oxford 1972.
- HannLex* 5 = Rainer Hannig. *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch II. Mittleres Reich und Zweite Zwischenzeit*, Hannig Lexika 5, Mainz 2006.
- HHT* = Wolfgang Helck. *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie*, Kleine ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden 1983<sup>2</sup>.
- HHT* II = Wolfgang Helck. *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie. Nachträge*, Kleine ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden 1995.
- TPPI* = Jacques Jean Clère & Jacques Vandier. *Textes de la Première Période Intermédiaire et de la XI<sup>ème</sup> Dynastie*, 1<sup>er</sup> fascicule, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 10, Bruxelles 1948.



## INDEX LOCORUM

### Abkau (Louvre C15)

x+3 2.2.4.1.2.A

### Abutiu (Cairo JE 67573)

3-9 1.2.2.1, (ii)

### *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep

5 5.1.2.2.1, (ii)  
5-6 1.1.1, (n);  
5.1.3.3, (iii)  
6-7 1.2.2.3, (i)  
7-9 2.5.2.2, (xi);  
5.1.4.2, (iii)  
9 1.1.1, (k)

### Ahmose's *Tempest Stela*

ro 14-15 = vso 17 5, n.14

### Akhenaten's *First Proclamation*

Stela X, 3 2, n.231

### Akhenaten's *Second Proclamation*

Stela A, 1 2.5.2.1, (viii);  
5.1.1.3, (iv)  
Stela S, 4 5.1.4.2, (iv)

### *Allen droht die Rekrutierung*

3-5 5.1.2.3.1, (v)

### *A Man to His Son*

1a 2.7.2.1, (a)  
3.3 2.6.1.2, (v)  
8.1-6 5.1.2.3.2, (viii)  
9.3 3.1.1, (iii)  
10.7 2, n.5

### *Amenemhat*

3b 2.7.2.1, (b)  
6f 2, n.114  
9b-d 2.5.2.1, (ii);  
5.3.3.2, (h)  
11c 5.1.1.2, (i)  
11d 5.1.1.2, (ii);  
5.1.4.2, (v)

### Ameniseneb (Louvre C11)

1 1, n.116  
2 4.1.3, (vi.b)  
3-4 2, n.7; 2.3.3, (i)

### Ameniseneb (Louvre C12)

6 2, n.7; 4.1.3, (ii.b);  
5.3.3.2, (b)  
7-17 2.5.2.1, (xiv)  
16 1, n.116  
16-17 5.1.1.3, (i)

### Ameny-ankh-ren (CG 20458)

b.3-4 4.1.3, (v.a)

### Antef (BM EA 1628)

8 2.1.2, (xv);  
2.7.3.3, (i);  
5.1.1.1, (a)

### Antef (CG 20003)

2-3 4.3.1.1.B, (b)  
2-4 2.2.3, (ii.a)

### Antef (Strasbourg 345 + Florence 7595)

4-6 2.7.3.1, (ii)

### Antef's Sehel Graffito

8-9 5.1.1.1, (ii)

### Antef son of Myt (Berlin 13272)

7-11 4.1.4, (vii)  
8-11 4.1.2, (iii)  
9 2, n.6

Antef son of Senet (BM EA 562)		inside, 5-7	2.2.2.3, (i); 2.2.3, (ii.b); 2.7.3.1, (v)
9	4.1.2, (ii); 4, n.124		
Antef son of Tjefi (MMA 57.95)		<i>Chapelle Blanche</i>	
10-11	4.3.3.2, (i)	n°180, 2-3	1.1.1.F
		n°245, 2	5.1.4.2, (i)
Antefiqer's <i>Girgawi Inscription</i> (RILN 73)		<i>Chapelle Rouge</i>	
6	1.1.1, (d)	p.98: I.2-3	2.2.4.1.2.A
6-7	2.5.2.3.1, (ii); 4.3.1.1.B, (g); 5.1.2.1, (i); 5.3.3.2, (b); 5.3.4, (ii.a)	p.120: V.7-8	2.2.4.1.2.A
		p.131: VII.12	5, n.14
<i>Astarte</i>		<i>Cheops' Court</i>	
I.x+10	5.1.2.3.1, (ii); 5.1.2.4, (c)	5.3-7	2.3.2, (v)
		5.6-7	2.2.2.2, (ix)
Beb (Leiden V.88)		5.11	1.4.3.1, (iv)
10-11	2.4.2.1, (i)	8.11-12	2.5.3.1, (v)
		8.12	2.1.2, (vi.a)
Berlin Bowl		8.15	1.2.3.1, (iv)
ro 1	4.2.1, (xvii)	8.17-18	4.1.3, (ii.b)
ro 1-2	2.5.2.2, (vii); 5.3.3.2, (g)	9.20	1.2.3.1, (iv)
		11.7	4.3.1.1.D, (f)
<i>Berlin Leather Roll</i>		11.9-10	4.3.1.2, (a)
I.10	1.4.3.1, (i)	11.10-12	4.3.1.2, (b)
<i>Bersheh 8</i>		11.15-16	4.4.2.2.2, (ii)
pl.21, bottom, 3	4.3.5.1.3, (v)	12, 3	2.4.2.1, (i)
Bia		CT I	
A, 6-7	2.7.1.2, (ii)	73d-74b	2.7.3.1, (ix.b); 5.3.3.3, (a)
Book of the Dead (Nu)		73d-74f	2.5.3.3, (iii)
17, 107	2.8.3, (iv)	74b	1, n.116
18, 5-6	4.4.2.1, (ii)	199f	2.3.3, (i)
151, II.16	2.3.3, (xii)	200g	4.3.3.3, (vii); 4, n.124
Cairo Bowl		212e	1.2.2.2, (i)
inside, 4-5	2.6.2.2, (iii)	215a-216a	2.5.3.3, (ii)
inside, 5	2.7.3.2, (iv)	220c	4, n.122
		248e	2.4.2.1, (iv); 4.2.1, (ix)
		286a-d	1.4.2, (ii)
		307h	2.6.2.1, (b)
		344/5c	4.2.2, (v)
		397b-398b	1.1.1, (i); 1.1.1, (j); 1.3.1.2, (i)-(ii)
		CT II	
		3f	4.3.5.1.3, (vi)

3g	4.2.1, (viii); 4.2.2, (v)	11c-d	4.4.1.2, (c); 5.3.3.3, (i)
34b-d	1.4.3.1, (ii)	27a	2.2.3, (vii)
58c	1.4.3.1, (v)	27d-e	2.2.4.3, (iv)
166k-167b	2.6.1.1, (viii); 2.7.3.3, (vi)	60/61c-64a	4.4.2.2.1, (ii)
167b	5.1.1.2, (a)	62/63b-c	1.3.1.3, (v)
174j	4.4.2.1, (iii)	110g	4.4.2.1, (i)
260e-f	1, n.121	203i	2.6.2.1, (h)
280/281d	2.6.2.1, (d)	2031	1.4.3.1, (v)
302/303d	1.1.1, (i)	207c	1.4.3.1, (v)
316a	4.1.1, (iv)	210b-c	4.3.3.3, (iv)
344a	2.2.2.1, (v); 2.2.4.3.B	285a	4.1.1, (iv)
350a	4.4.2.2.1, (v)	333p	4, n.221
400a	1.4.3.1, (iv)	375e	4.3.1.1.A, (a)
401b	1.4.3.1, (vi)		
CT III		CT VI	
26c	4.1.3, (i.b)	53b-c	4.3.1.1.D, (c)
35b	4.2.1, (viii)	63d-e	4.1.1, (iv); 4.2.1, (iv)
74i-75a	4.3.3.3, (v)	84e	1.3.1.3, (iii)
169h	2.3.3, (xiv)	164a	2.2.3, (viii)
199a	2.7.2.2, (iii)	164a-b	2.6.1.2, (ix)
200f	2.5.2.2, (ii)	164b	5.3.3.3, (j)
204a	2.7.2.2, (iii)	167a-b	4.1.3, (i.a)
296c-h	1.3.1.3, (vi)	220j	2.3.1.3.2, (ii); 2.8.2, (v)
303h	4, n.219	304a-d	4.2.1, (x)
391a-c	4.3.1.1.A, (b)	304f	4.3.5.1.3, (vii)
399a	4.2.2, (vi)	311j	4.1.4, (vi)
		315h	1, n.116
		331f	2.2.3, (vi)
CT IV		CT VII	
45m-n	4.1.4, (vi); 4.4.1.1.1, (i)	125h	4.2.2, (vi)
45p	4, n.19; 4.4.1.1.1, (i)	228n-q	4.2.1, (vii)
49r-s	3.1.2, (iii)	237i	2.6.2.1, (g)
51e-g	2, n.107	239i	2.8.3, (xi)
94m	4.2.1, (vii)	389b	2.3.3, (xii)
134b-c	4.2.2, (vi)	412a	2.2.1.1, (iii)
181l-m	1.4.3.1, (i)	468b	2.6.2.1, (i)
181l-n	1.4.3.1, (iv)	506a-b	2.5.2.2, (v)
236j	2.7.2.2, (iii)		
326j	4, n.220		
342d	4, n.220		
344b	2.6.2.1, (f)		
390a	4.4.1.2.A		
CT V		<i>Debate</i>	
11b-d	2.6.1.1, (xii)	6	2.3.3, (xvi)
		73-74	4.3.3.1
		74-75	2.2.2, (ii)
		75	4.3.3.1
		77-78	2, n.72
		90	4.3.3.1, (a)
		104	2.2.4.1.2.A

108	2.7.3.3, (iv); 5.1.1.2, (a)	B1 49 (R 10.5)	1.2.2.3, (v)
108-125	2.7.3.3, (ix)	B1 77-79	2.3.3, (viii)
109-111	2.7.2.2, (ii.a)	B1 109-110	4.3.1.1.B, (d)
111-113	2.5.3.2, (vi); 2.7.2.2, (iv); 5.3.3.3, (f)	B1 110-111	2.2.4.1.1, (c)
116-118	2.7.2.2, (ii.b)	B1 115	1.1.1, (d)
117-118	2.6.1.2, (vii)	B1 115-116	5.1.2.1, (ii)
121	2.7.1.2, (iv.b)	B1 131-132	5.1.1.1, (i)
123-124	2.7.3.3, (v); 5.1.1.2, (c)	B1 148-149	2.6.2.1, (j); 2.8.2, (e)
124-125	2.6.1.2, (vii); 5.3.3.3, (k)	B1 158-159	4.3.5.1.1, (ii)
126-127	4, n.122	B1 160	5.1.4.1, (iii)
140-142	2.7.1.1, (ii)	B1 178	2.4.2, (a)
<i>Deir el Bahari IV</i>		B1 213-214	1.2.2.3, (v)
pl.116	1.4.3.1, (vi)	B1 225-226	2.7.3.2, (i)
<i>Dramatic Ramesseum Papyrus</i>		B1 249-252	4.1.1, (i)
83	1.2.2.1, (iii)	B1 252-254	5.1.1.1, (i)
<i>Duties of the Vizier</i>		B1 267	3.1.1, (ii)
R 2-3	1.2.3.1, (viii); 2.3.3, (i)	B1 306-308	2.7.3.1, (iv)
R 3	5.1.3.3, (iv.a)	B1 307-308	2.7.3.1, (viii.a)
R 3-4	1.2.3.1, (viii); 2.5.2.2, (xxi); 4.3.1.1.B, (b)	B1 321-322	5.1.1.1, (i)
R 4	2.7.1.1, (i)	B1 327-329	2.5.2.2, (xv); 3.1.2, (ii); 5.1.4.3, (ii)
R 12-13	2.5.2.4, (xi)	B1 329-331	4.3.5.2.1, (iv)
R 14	5.1.3.3, (iv.a); 5.1.3.3, (iv.b)	B1 332-334	3.2, (i)
R 15	4, n.123; 5.1.3.3, (iv.b)	B1 340-341	4, n.170
R 20	5.1.3.3, (iv.b)	B1 352-353	1.2.2.3, (v); 3.3, (ii)
R 21	4, n.220	B2 75-76	3, n.6
R 34	2.4.2.1, (i)	B2 135	2.3.1.1, (ii); 4.1.1, (vii); 4.1.3, (ii.a); 4.1.3, (iv); 5.3.3.2, (c)
<i>Eighteenth Dynasty Menology</i>		R 9.3-5	4.3.1.1.A, (c)
3	5.1.1.1, (iii)	R 11.3-4	2.5.2.3.2, (vii); 4.1.3, (x)
7	5.1.1.1, (iii)	R 17-6-7	4.3.1.1.B, (c)
8	2.2.3, (i); 5.1.1.1, (iii); 5.1.2.2.1, (v)	<i>Fishing and Fowling</i>	
<i>Eloquent Peasant</i>		B2.10	4.4.1.1.1, (v)
B1 34 (R 8.6)	1.2.3.1, (iv)	<i>Hammat</i>	
		19, 3	1.1.1, (e)
		19, 3-4	5.1.2.1, (ii)
		19, 8-10	5.1.3.2, (ii)
		19, 10-12	2.6.2.2, (iv); 5.1.2.1, (ii)
		19, 11	1.1.1, (e)
		43, 6-7	2.1.2, (xii); 4.3.5.2.2, (iii); 5.3.3.3, (f)

110, 2-3	2, n.23	II, ro 27	1.1.1, (f)
110, 6	1.2.4.3; 4.1.3, (ii.b); 5.3.3.2, (c)	II, ro 27-28	1.2.4.3; 2.1.2, (ix.a); 2.5.3.1, (ii)
110, 6-7	4.1.3, (viii.a)	II, ro 29-30	4.4.1.2.A
113, 9-10	2.5.2.3.2, (iv)	II, ro 31	1.1.1, (f)
191, 6	4.2.1, (xviii)	II, ro 31-32	2.1.2, (ix.b); 5.3.3.3, (e)
192, 19-21	4.1.3, (viii.b)	II, ro 42-43	1.2.2.1, (iv)
<i>Hatnub</i>		II, vso 1	1.1.1, (h)
4, 4	2.2.3, (iv); 2.5.2.5, (i)	II, vso 2	1.1.1, (h)
6, 4	2.3.1.1, (i); 4.1.1, (iii)	III, ro 5	2.1.2, (iii.b); 2.5.2.2, (iii); 4.4.2.2.2, (iii); 5.3.3.2, (f)
6, 8	2.2.2.1, (ii.a)	III, ro 6	2.4.2.1, (i)
8, 3-4	2.2.2.3, (iii)	<i>Herdsmen</i>	
16, 5-6	4, n.198	x+15-17	4.3.5.2.1, (iv)
16, 9-10	4.4.2.2.2, (i)	x+22	4.3.1.1.A, (d)
22, 2-3	4.3.1.1.B, (e)	x+23	2.6.2.1, (d)
22, 7-8	2.5.2.3.2, (iii); 4.3.5.1.3, (v)	<i>Hetepi</i>	
22, 14	1.2.4.3	6-7	4.3.3.2, (v)
22, 18	2.5.1, (i); 2.5.2.2, (xxii.a); 4.3.5.1.3, (x)	<i>Hymn</i>	
28, 5	4.1.4, (iii)	2.7	2.6.1.2, (v)
<i>Heavenly Cow</i>		2.10	5.1.1.2, (i)
77-78	2.3.3, (vii)	5.2	5.1.1.2, (iii)
99-100	2.3.3, (xiii)	6.3-4	5.1.2.3.2, (i)
165	2.3.3, (xiii)	6.4	5.1.2.2.2, (c)
<i>Heqaib (BM EA 1671)</i>		6.7-8	2.6.1.2, (iv)
6-7	4.4.2.2.1, (vi)	12.1-2	2.7.1.1, (iii)
11	2.2.3.A	<i>IäF III</i>	
<i>Heqaib, Stela #9</i>		326, c	1.2.3.1, (i); 2.5.2.2, (xii)
x+21-23	1.2.2.3, (i)	<i>Iki (Leiden V.68)</i>	
x+22	1.1.1, (h)	a, 9-11	4.2.2, (vii)
<i>Heqaib, Stela #10</i>		<i>Installation of the Vizier</i>	
x+16	1.1.1, (f)	6-7	5.1.3.3, (iv.b)
x+19-20	2.2.4.3, (iii)	14	5.1.3.4, (i)
<i>Heqanakht</i>		15	2.4.2, (a)
I, ro 2	1.2.2.1, (iv)	16	5.1.3.4, (i)
I, ro 8-9	2.2.3, (iii.a)		
I, ro 12-13	4.4.2.1, (iii)		
I, ro 14	2.7.2.2, (v)		

*Ipuwer*

2.4	2.2.2.4, (i); 2.6.1.1, (xiii); 5.3.3.3, (i)
2.5-10	3.2, (ii)
2.10	2.6.1.2, (iv); 5.1.1.2, (i)
3.4	2.2.2.4, (ii)
3.6-7	2.1.2, (iv.b); 2.7.3.1, (ix.b)
3.10-11	2.7.3.2, (iii)
3.13	2, n.13
4.1	4.3.5.2.2, (c)
4.6	5.1.2.2.1, (a)
5.2	5.1.1.2, (iii)
5.6	2.5.2.2.B, NB; 3.1.2, (iv)
5.11	5.1.1.2, (ii)
5.12	1.2.3.1, (vi)
6.1	2.6.1.2, (iv)
6.3	2.6.1.1, (ix); 5.3.3.3, (h)
6.6-7	2.3.3, (iii)
6.9-12	3.2, (ii)
7.1-4	2.1.2, (v); 2.3.3, (iv)
10.6	5.1.1.2, (iv)
11.12-13	4.3.5.2.1, (iv)
12.4	2.5.2.2, (xiii)
12.6	2.1.2, (vii.b); 2.5.3.1, (vi); 4.3.1.1.E; 4.4.2.1 (iv)
12.8	2.5.3.2, (v)
12.13-14	2.6.1.2, (ii)
13.5	1.2.3.1, (vi)
14.11	5.1.2.3.1, (ii)

*Irtysen (Louvre C14)*

12	2.7.3.2, (v)
----	--------------

*Isi of Edfu*

5	4.2.1, (xv); 4.4.1.3, (i)
---	------------------------------

*Iti (CG 20001)*

7	4.4.2.2.1, (vi)
---	-----------------

*Iunmenu*

1.2.2.1, (i)
--------------

*Iykhernefret (Berlin 1204)*

6-7	4.3.3.2, (ii)
10	2.3.1.3.4, (ii)

*Iykhernefret (CG 20140)*

b.1-2	1.1.1, (m); 5.1.3.1, (ii)
-------	------------------------------

*Kagemni*

I.6	2.2.4.1.2.A
-----	-------------

*Kamose Inscriptions*

T. Carn.6-7	4.3.5.2.1, (v)
St. II, 31-32	4, n.107
St. II, 33	3.2, (b)

*Kemit*

8.b-c	2.6.2.1, (c); 4.4.1.1.1, (vii)
-------	-----------------------------------

*Khakheperreseneb*

ro 3	2.8.3, (xiv); 4.3.3.3, (i); 4, n.198
ro 11	2.6.2.2, (i); 3.2, (iii); 4.3.5.1.1, (ii)
ro 13	2.8.3, (xii)
vso 2-3	1.4.1, (i); 2.8, (i)
vso 3	2.3.3, (xv)
vso 4	5.1.4.3, (i)

*Khentika (Dakhla)*

right, lower part, col.2-3	1.4.2, (i)
----------------------------	------------

*Khentika Ikhekhi*

V B 15-16	2.1.1, (i.b); 2.5.2.4, (v)
-----------	-------------------------------

*Khentikaepi*

8-9	4.2.2, (iii); 4.4.1.3, (ii)
-----	--------------------------------

*Kheti*

3.5-6	5.1.2.2.2, (c); 5.1.2.3.2, (ii)
7.1	5.1.2.3.2
14.3	5.1.2.3.2, (vi)
25.3	5.1.1.2, (ii)

*Khnumnakht (CG 20518)*

a.1	4.2.1, (xx)
-----	-------------

*Khufudjedef*

1.2.2.1, (i); 2.5.2.2, (i)
-------------------------------

*Khusobek*

C.4	2.2.1.1, (i); 2.5.2.4, (iv)
D.3-4	2.5.2.3.2, (viii); 4.3.5.4, (i)
D.6	4.2.1, (xx)

*KRI I*

69, 3	5.1.2.4, (ii)
238, 14-15	5.1.2.3.1, (v)

*KRI IV*

19, 8	1.1.2.B
155, 13	1.1.2.B
413, 14	5.2.D, (a)

*KRI VI*

72, 11	5.1.4.4, (iii)
--------	----------------

*LEM*

18, 13	4.3.3.3, (ii)
--------	---------------

*Louvre Bowl*

9-15	3.3, (v.b)
------	------------

*Loyaliste*

2.7	2.4.2.2, (iii)
2.9	2.4.2, (b)
2.10-3.3	2.8.2, (iii)
3.6	2.3.3, (vi)

8.5	2.6.2.1, (a)
9.8	2.1.3, (v)
9.9	5.1.1.2, (iii)
10.3	2.2.4.1.2.A
11.12	2.6.2.1, (i)

*Mehuakhti*

B 1-3	4.2.1, (xiii)
-------	---------------

*Mentuhotep son of Hepy (UC 14333)*

8-10	4.3.3.2, (iii)
------	----------------

*Mentuhotepi's Karnak Stela*

2-3	5.1.4.2, (iv)
3	2.1.2, (viii.b); 5.1.4.3, (vii)
4	2.4.2.2, (iii)
9	4.3.3.3, (ix)

*Mentuwoser (MMA 12.184)*

7-8	2.1.2, (viii.a); 2.2.1.2, (ii); 2.6.1.1, (xiv); 5.3.3.3, (g)
11-12	2.1.2, (xiv); 2.7.2.2, (i); 5.1.1.2, (b)

*Merer (Cracow, MNK-XI-999)*

2	4.3.3.2, (iii)
5	4.4.1.1.1, (iv)

*Merikare*

E 32-33	2.1.2, (iii.b)
E 48	4, n.122
E 49	2.2.2.2, (ix); 2.3.2, (vi)
E 55	4.3.5.4, (vi)
E 78-79	1.4.2, (i)
E 81	2.2.2.4, (ii)
E 91	2.8.3, (xiv)
E 92	2.2.2.4, (ii)
E 93	4, n.170
E 97	1.4.3.1, (v)
E 106	2.2.4.1.2.A
E 107-108	2.2.2, (iii)
E 118	2.3.3, (iii)
E 119-121	2.5.2.2, (xvi)

E 120	2.2.2.2, (ii)		
E 128	2.7.1.2, (iv.a)		
E 128-129	2.8.3, (xiii)		
E 130-131	2.8.3, (vii)		
E 135	4.4.1.2, (a)		
E 137-138	2.7.2.2, (iii)		
<i>Mersyankh III</i>			
fig.7	1.2.2.1, (i)		
<i>Mo<sup>c</sup>alla</i>			
I.α.2-3	2.2.4.1.1, (iv.b); 4.1.1, (vi)		
I.β.3	4.3.5.4, (v); 4.4.2.1, (v)		
I.β.4	1.1.1, (f); 5.1.4.1, (i)		
II.α.2	1.2.2.3, (ii); 4.3.5.1.3, (iv)		
II.β.2	1.1.1, (g); 2.1.2, (x.b); 2.5.3.1, (i); 5.3.3.3, (e)		
II.δ.2-3	2.2.2.3, (iii); 2.2.4.1.1, (iv.a); 2.5.2.4, (vii)		
II.ε.2-3	4.2.1, (xvii); 4.3.5.5.2, (v)		
II.ε.3	2.1.2, (i.a)		
II.ζ.2 - II.θ.2	1.1.1, (l)		
II.η.2	1.1.1, (g); 2.1.2, (ii.b); 2.5.3.2, (iii); 2.7.3.1, (viii.b); 4.3.5.2.2, (ii); 4.3.5.5.2, (iii); 5.3.3.3, (f)		
II.η.2 - II.θ.1	2.5.3.1, (ix)		
II.η.2 - II.θ.3	2.1.2, (x.a)		
II.θ.2	1.1.1, (f); 1.1.1, (g); 4.3.5.2.2, (ii)		
II.θ.3 - III.1	1.2.2.3, (i)		
III.1	1.1.1, (h)		
IV.14-15	2.5.2.3.1, (iii); 4.3.1.1.B, (f)		
IV.17-18	2.1.2, (xiii); 5.1.1.1, (a)		
IV.19-20	2.2.2.3, (iv)		
IV.22-25	4.4.2.2.1, (vi)		
IV.25-26	2.2.2.3, (iii); 4.1.1, (vi)		
<i>Mutter und Kind</i>			
V.10-VI.1	2.3.1.3.4		
VIII.1-2	5.1.2.3.1, (i)		
<i>Naga ed-Dêr #69</i>			
4-5	4.2.1, (xvi)		
<i>Nebamun, TT 90</i>			
pl.21, 3 <sup>rd</sup> register from top, on the right	5.1.4.4, (ii)		
<i>Neferhotep's Great Abydos Stela</i>			
10	2.2.2.2, (vi)		
16	1.1.1, (k)		
18	1.2.4.3		
35	1.1.1, (k)		
<i>Neferiu (MMA 12.183.8)</i>			
right jambs 3-4	4.1.4, (iv)		
<i>Nefermaat (panel OIM 9002)</i>			
	4.3.5.2.1, (ii)		
<i>Neferti</i>			
3f	2.6.2.1, (c)		
3h	1.4.2, (ii)		
3i	2.8, (i)		
4d	2.8.3; 4.3.3.1, (b)		
5d	5.1.1.2, (v)		
6a-e	5.1.2.2.2, (iii)		
7c	4.3.3.1		
7f	5.1.1.2, (iii)		
7g-h	5.1.2.2.2, (v)		
8c	4.3.5.2.1, (iv)		
8f-9a	5.1.2.2.2, (iv)		
9b	2.5.3.2, (iv)		
9c	2.7.2.2, (i); 5.1.1.2, (ii); 5.1.1.3, (iii); 5.1.4.3, (viii)		
9e	2.7.2.2, (iii)		
9f	5.1.2.3.2, (vii)		
10a	2.8.2, (iv)		
10b	2.8.3		
10c-d	2.6.2.2, (iii); 5.1.4.2, (v)		
10c-e	5.1.2.3.2, (iii)		



10d-e	2.7.2.1, (d)	10018, ro 6	4.4.2.1, (iv)
10e	5.1.2.2.2, (c)	10018, ro 8a	2.2.1.2, (i)
10f-h	5.1.2.2.2, (i)	10023A, ro 2	4.1.1, (x)
11c	3, n.6	10024A, ro 5	5.1.2.2
12a-c	5.1.2.3.2, (iv)	10024B, ro 4	2.5.3.1, (iii)
12d	5.1.1.2, (v)	10025, ro 4	2.3.2, (x)
14a-e	5.1.2.2.2, (ii)	10025, ro 5-6	1.4.3.1, (ii)
15a-e	5.1.2.2.2, (iii)	10026, ro 15-16	2.2.4.1.1, (v)
		10033, ro 2	2.3.2, (ix); 3.3, (iii.b)
Nubkheperre Antef's <i>Coptos Decree</i>		10063, ro 3	2.2.1.2, (i)
5-6	1, n.38	10063, ro 4	4.3.5.1.3, (xiii)
6	1.2.4.3		
O. Cairo 25372		P. Berlin Medical	
1-2	5.1.2.4, (i)	III.7	1.2.3.1, (vii)
		III.9	2.1.1, (ii.a)
<i>Paheri</i>		P. BM EA 10567	
pl.3, 2 <sup>nd</sup> register from bottom, 2 <sup>nd</sup> inscription from the right, 10-11	2.6.2.2, (v); 5.1.2.3.1, (ii); 5.1.2.4, (a)	ro 10	4.3.5.1.3, (viii)
pl.3, 3 <sup>rd</sup> register from top, central horizontal inscription	5.1.1.3, (ii); 5.1.2.4, (a)	P. Brooklyn 35.1446	
		pl.IV, ro 31.f	2.6.1.1, (v); 5.3.3.2, (c)
		pl.IV, ro 37.f	4.4.1.1.1, (ii)
		pl.V, B, 11-12	2.1.1, (iii.b)
		pl.V, B, 13	4.1.3, (xii.a); 4.3.3.3, (iii); 4.3.4.1.2.B
		pl.VI, B, 5-6	5.1.4.3, (v)
		pl.VI, C, 7	2, n.2; 4.1.3, (xii.b); 4, n.114; 4.3.4.1.2.B
P. Berlin 9010		P. Bulaq 18	
3	1.2.3.1, (i); 3.3, (v.a); 4.4.1.2.A	XIX.2.2-3	2.6.1.1, (iii)
5	4.2.2, (iv)		
P. Berlin 10463		P. Cairo JE 49623	
ro 1-2	5.1.2.2.1, (v)	3	1.2.4.3
P. Berlin 10470		P. Ebers	
I.13; I.15; I.16	1, n.142	100, 11-12	2.2.4.1.2.A
I.14	4.1.3, (xiii.a); 4.3.3.3, (vi); 4.3.4.1.2.B	100, 21	2, n.34
II.8	2, n.7	101, 7	2.2.2.2, (v)
II.14	4.1.3, (xiii.b); 4, n.114; 4.3.4.1.2.B	101, 17	2.2.2.2, (i)
		102, 4-5	2.2.3, (i)
P. Berlin, Illahun		P. Ramesseum 2	
10016, 2A	4, n.114; 4, n.128	vso II.4	5.1.4.1, (ii)
10018, ro 3a	2.5.3.1, (iii)		

P. Ramesseum 10		447	5, n.2
I.4-6	1.4.3.1, (vii)	482	2.7.3.1, (vi)
P. Rhind Mathematical		509-511	2.2.2.2, (i)
title	4.4.1.1.1, (iii)	512-514	2.7.3.1, (iii)
82	2.3.2, (xi)	520-521	2.2.2.1, (i.a)
P. Smith		543-544	2.2.2.2, (iii)
21, 9-14	5.1.3.3, (iii)	568-569	4.3.3.3, (viii)
Ptahemhat		581	2.2.2.2, (vi); 2.4.2.2, (iv)
lintel, 3-5	1.2.2.1, (i)	586-587	2.2.2.4, (iii)
<i>Ptahhotep</i>		623	2.4.2.1, (i); 2.8.3, (ii)
10	2.7.2.2; 2.7.3.3, (ii); 2.7.3.3, (vii); 5.1.1.2, (b); 5.1.4.3, (viii)	641-644	2.2.2.4, (i)
33	2.7.1.1, (iv)	P. UC	
58	2.8.3, (vi)	32036, 20-23	5.1.2.1, (iii); 5.3.4, (i)
59	2.2.3, (iii.a); 3, n.6; 4.4.1.1.1, (vi)	32036, 21-22	1.1.1, (d)
71	2.6.2.1, (b)	32055, ro 5	2.1.1, (iii.a); 2.5.2.4, (i); 5.3.3.2, (a)
72	1.1.2, (i); 2.3.3, (x); 5.1.2.2.2, (c); 5, n.60	32055, ro 9	5.1.2.2.1, (i)
81-82	5.1.4.4, (i)	32055, ro 18-19	5.1.3.3, (i)
82	5.1.2.2.2, (c)	32166, ro II.3	2.1.3, (ii); 2.5.3.2, (vii); 5.3.3.2, (c)
122-123	4.4.1.2.A	32190A, ro III.5	5.1.2.2.1, (ii)
127	4.3.5.2.2, (c)	32190A, ro III.6-7	2.5.3.1, (iii)
229-231	4.3.5.2.1, (iv)	32190A, ro III.8-9	5.1.3.3, (i)
284	2.5.2.1, (i); 5.3.3.2, (h)	32197, ro II.9	2, n.34
284-288	5.1.4.3, (vi)	32200, 7-9	2.2.1.2, (iii.b); 2.3.3, (i)
292-293	1.2.2.3, (iv)	32200, 10-12	2.2.1.2, (iii.a); 2.5.2.2, (xiv); 2.5.2.2, (xxiii.a); 2.5.2.5, (ii)
293	2.7.3.3, (vii); 4, n.188	32200, 13-14	5.1.4.3, (vii)
296-297	2.2.2.1, (iii)	32200, 20-21	5.1.2.2.1, (i)
303	2.2.4.1.2.A	32201, ro 13-14	2.2.4.3, (v); 2.7.3.2, (vii)
343	2.7.2.2	32201, vso 8-10	2.2.4.1.1, (b)
349	2.6.1.2, (vii); 3.1.1, (i); 4.4.1.1.1.B	32201, vso 12-13	2.6.1.2, (i)
353-354	2.7.3.2, (vi)	32205, ro 12-13	2.2.4.1.1, (d)
403	2.2.2.2, (vii)	32209, ro II.5-6	1, n.38; 2.1.2, (i.b); 5.1.4.3, (vii); 5.3.3.3, (e)
407	2.2.2.2, (ix); 2.3.2, (vii)	32213, ro 9	1.2.4.3
410	2.2.2.2, (vii); 2.8.2, (a)	32287, 2-3	3.3, (iii.a); 5.1.2.2.1, (ii)
		32287ii, ro 3	5.1.3.3, (i)

Pyr.		492a-d	1.2.1, (i)
16c	1, n.202	602a	2.2.1.1, (iv); 2.5.1, (ii)
22b	2.2.2.2, (iv)	616a-c	2.7.3.2, (i)
23a	2.2.2.2, (iv)	617b	2.6.1.2, (viii); 4.3.5.2.2, (i); 4.3.5.5.2, (ii); 5.3.3.3, (k)
27d	2.4.2.1, (iii); 4.4.2.1, (v)	635b	4.3.5.2.2, (i); 4.3.5.5.2, (ii)
76c	3, n.4	657a-d	1, n.193
132a-c	1.2.1, (ii)	657d	2.5.2.4, (viii)
132a-d	4.2.1, (ii)	658d	1.3.1.3, (i)
142c	1.2.1, (ii)	689b	2, n.186
142c-143a	4.4.2.2.1, (i)	693c-d	1.2.1, (ii); 2.5.2.1, (v); 4.2.1, (iv); 4.3.5.5.2, (iv)
142c-144b	4.2.1, (v)	750a	2.6.2.1.NB
143a	4.2.1, (iii)	779b	1.4.3.1, (iii)
144a-b	1.2.1, (ii)	786a	2, n.107
145a	4, n.123	820e	1, n.3
179a	2.6.1.1, (vi); 4.2.2, (i); 4.3.5.5.2, (iv)	852d-e	2.9.2.1.2, (ii)
194a	2.9.2.1.2, (i)	934b	4.2.2, (ii)
195b	1, n.163	949b-c	4.3.5.1.3, (i)
204a-b	2.6.1.1, (vii); 4.3.5.5.2, (i)	1005d	1, n.163
206a-b	4.3.5.5.2, (i)	1026a-b	1.3.1.3, (iv)
211b	1.2.1, (ii); 4.2.1, (v)	1040c	1.4.2, (ii)
225a	2.2.2, (i)	1078a-d	1.2.1, (vi)
225a-226b	4.3.5.4, (iv)	1120a-c	4.3.5.4, (iii)
243	4.3.5.1.3, (ix)	1164d	1.2.1, (iv.a)
243b	4.3.5.2.1, (i)	1245a-e	2.6.2.2, (ii)
247	4.3.5.2.1, (i)	1270c	2, n.25
253a-b	4.3.5.2.1, (i)	1272b	2, n.107
262b	2.2.1.1, (i); 2.5.1, (ii); 4.2.1, (iv)	1273c	2.4.2.1, (ii)
278c	2, n.186	1300b-c	2.3.1.3.2, (i)
282c	1.3.3.C	1343d	2.2.4.1.1, (i)
293c	2.6.2.1, (h)	1346a-1347b	1.2.1, (v)
334b	4.3.5.1.3, (i); 4.3.5.5.2, (i)	1355a-b	2.5.3.2, (iv)
341a-b	2, n.186	1405a	2.2.2.1, (vi); 2.2.4.3.B
344a	2, n.186	1429d	4, n.122
345a-346b	2.5.3.3, (i)	1437a-b	1, n.72
346a	2.1.2, (vi.b)	1443b	2.2.1.1, (iv); 4.2.1, (ii)
356a	1, n.163	1466c	1.4.3.1, (iii)
360a	2, n.186	1470c	4.3.5.2.1, (i); 4.3.5.5.2, (ii)
373c	1.2.1, (i)	1473a-1474b	2.6.1.1, (xvii)
388b	2.6.2.1, (l)	1506b	2.2.1.1, (iii)
406a-b	4.3.5.1	1508a	1.2.1, (ii); 4.2.1, (v)
406a-c	3, n.4	1527a-c	1.2.1, (iii)
408b	3, n.4	1527b-c	2.2.1.1, (iv)
411a-b	3, n.4		
472a	2.2.4.3, (ii)		
472a-d	2.5.2.4, (xii); 2.5.3.2, (ii)		
474b-c	4.1.4, (i)		

1561-1562	1.2.3.2, (i)
1610b	4.3.5.2.2, (i); 4.3.5.5.2, (ii)
1650b-1651e	2.2.4.1.1.B
1651a-d	1.2.1, (i)
1688c	4.2.1, (ii)
1699a	2.4.2, (c); 2.5.2.4, (ix)
1701a	4.2.1, (ii)
1704b	2.2.4.3, (i)
1742c-d	4, n.122
1831c	4.3.5.2.2, (i); 4.3.5.5.2, (ii)
1905c	1.2.3.2, (ii); 2.5.3.2, (iv)
1960b-c	1.2.1, (i)
1965a-c	2.5.2.1, (ix); 2.5.2.2, (xxiii.b); 2.5.3.2, (ii)
1965a-1967a	1.2.3.2, (iii); 4.2.1, (i)
1967a	4.2.1, (vi)
1969b-1970a	4.2.1, (vi)
1970a-c	1.2.1, (v); 1.2.3.2, after (iii)
1975a	1, n.163
1981a	2, n.186
2059a	1.2.1, (i)
2108a-2110d	2.3.1.3.2, (iii)
2110a-b	2.2.1.1, (iv)
2205	1.3.1.3, (ii)
2206c	1.2.1, (ii); 2.5.2.1, (v); 4.2.1, (iv)
Qaw Bowl	
inside, 4	2.6.1.1, (xv)
Rediukhnum (CG 20543)	
13	2.5.2.3.2, (viii)
Sabni son of Mekhu	
4	2.3.1.3.4, (iii); 2.5.2.4, (iii)
11	2.6.1.1, (ii)
14-16	4.2.1, (xiv)
Samontu (BM EA 828)	
4-5	4.2.1, (xx)

*Sasobek*

B1 19	2.5.2.2, (xx)
-------	---------------

*Satirical Letter*, P. Anastasi I

17, 2	5.1.4.4, (iii)
-------	----------------

*Semna Despatches*

I, x+12-13	2.5.3.1, (vii)
I, x+13	2.1.2, (iv.a); 2.7.3.1, (ix.b); 5.3.3.3, (b)
IV, x+7-10	2.5.2.3.1, (iii)
IV, x+9	2, n.4; 4.3.1.1.B, (f); 5.3.3.2, (a)
IV, x+9-11	2.5.2.2, (ix)
IV, x+10	2.2.2.4, (i)

*Semna Stela*, Year 8 (Berlin 14753)

1-6	5.1.4.2, (ii)
-----	---------------

*Semna Stela*, Year 16 (Berlin 1157)

5-6	2.2.3, (ix)
8	2.1.3, (iii)
9-10	2.1.3, (iii)
12	2.1.2, (xi); 2.5.3.1, (iv); 4.4.1.2, (b); 5.3.3.3, (f)
13	2.1.2, (ii.a); 2.3.3, (ix); 2.5.3.2, (iii); 2.7.3.1, (viii.b); 5.3.3.3, (c)
13-15	2.5.2.3.2, (i); 2.5.3.1, (viii); 5.3.3.2, (b)

*Semti* (BM EA 574)

2-3	2.5.2.1, (xii)
3-5	4.3.3.2, (iv)
5	2.8.3, (ii)
5-6	4.2.1, (xxi)

*Senedjemib Inti*

A, 12	2.8.3, (i)
C, 23	2.3.3, (i)

## Seneni (CG 20500)

- 6 2.2.1.1, (ii);  
2.5.2.4, (vi);  
4.1.1, (iii)

## Senwosret (Louvre C174)

- 5-7 2.5.2.1, (xiii)

*Shipwrecked Sailor*

- 2-8 4.1.2, (iv)  
14 4.3.1.1.D, (f)  
17-18 2.7.2.1, (c)  
28-30 4.3.1.1.D, (g)  
32-34 4.3.3.1, (c)  
33-34 4.3.1.1.D, (a)  
34 4.3.5.1.1, (ii)  
39-41 2.2.1.1, (iv);  
2.2.2.2, (x);  
2.5.2.4, (ii);  
4.1.1, (viii);  
5.3.3.2, (a)  
66 2.8.3, (v)  
73 2.5.1, (i)  
73-75 3.2, (a)  
119-123 4.3.1.1.D, (d)  
124 2.8.2, (d)  
129-130 2.2.2.2, (x)  
132-133 2.5.2.1, (iii)  
139 4.3.1.1.D, (b)  
166-167 1.2.2.3, (vi)  
184-186 2, n.79  
185-186 2.3.3, (vii)

## Sinai

- 136 W 1 2.7.3.2, (ii)

*Sinuhe*

- R 8-11 4.1.2, (i)  
R 13-14 4.1.3, (vi.a);  
5.1.4.3, (iii)  
R 22-23 4.1.3, (vi.b)  
R 22-24 2.6.1.1, (x)  
R 23-24 2, n.14  
B 10 2.6.2.1, (d)  
B 21-22 2.6.2.1, (k)  
B 26-27 2.5.2.3.2, (vii)  
B 31 2.8.1, (ii)  
B 36-38 2.5.2.2, (xvii)  
B 40-41 2.5.3.1, (vi)

- B 48-50 2.3.3, (xi)  
B 50-51 4.4.1.1.2  
B 55-59 2.1.3, (iv);  
2.7.3.3, (viii)  
B 59 2.7.3.3, (iii);  
5.1.1.2, (b)  
B 66-67 2.8.2, (c)  
B 69 1, n.211;  
1.4.3.1, (iv)  
B 72-73 5.1.4.3, (ii)  
B 75-76 2.8.1, (i)  
B 87-91 2.5.2.2, (iv)  
B 101-102 4.3.1.1.B  
B 101-104 2.5.2.3.2, (v);  
4.1.3, (vii)  
B 149-156 2.7.2.1, (i)  
B 159-160 4.1.3, (xii)  
B 167-171 2.7.1.2, (iii)  
B 168-169 2.6.2.1, (k); 4, n.107  
B 170-171 2.8.1, (iii); 2.8.2, (b)  
B 172-175 2.6.1.1, (xi)  
B 188-189 4.3.1.1.D, (e)  
B 189-196 2.5.2.1, (xi); 3.3, (i)  
B 192 2.2.3.A  
B 194-196 3.3, (vi.b)  
B 199-200 2.5.2.3.1, (i);  
4.3.1.1.B, (a)  
B 205-206 2.2.1.1, (iii);  
2.5.2.1, (vii)  
B 212 4.3.5.4, (viii)  
B 212-213 1.2.3.1, (v);  
3.3, (vi.a);  
5.3.3.2, (d)  
B 226-228 2.5.3.1, (vi);  
4.3.5.1.3, (xii)  
B 227-228 2, n.3; 2.5.2.1, (x);  
5.3.3.2, (e)  
B 233-234 2.1.1, (ii.b);  
2.6.1.2, (iv); 3, n.6;  
3.1.2, (i);  
4.3.3.3, (ix);  
5.3.3.2, (g)  
B 236 2.1.3, (v)  
B 238-239 4.3.5.1.1, (i)  
B 246-249 2.5.3.2, (ix)  
B 247 2.3.3, (xi)  
B 248 2.1.2, (iii.a);  
2.1.2, (vii.a)  
B 248-249 2.2.1.3, (ii)  
B 258-259 4, n.122  
B 259 2.3.3, (xii)  
B 263-264 2, n.247  
B 280-281 1.2.2.3, (iii)

B 290-291	4.1.3, (iii)	13, 3-7	1.2.3.1, (iii);
B 300	1.2.4.3		4.3.5.4, (vii)
B 300-308	4.1.2, (v)	13, 9	1, n.194
B 307-308	4.1.1, (ii)	30, 12-13	4.1.3, (v.b)
		36, 6-7	1.4.2, (i)
Siut		36, 13-14	1.4.2, (iii)
I, 289	2, n.34	36, 17 - 37, 2	2.5.2.2, (x)
I, 294-295	2, n.26	37, 1	1.2.3.1, (iii)
I, 295	2, n.148	38, 16	2.1.1, (iv.b);
I, 314	1.4.2, (i)		2.6.1.2, (iii)
III, 1	2.3.2, (viii)	39, 10	2, n.6
III, 8	4.3.5.1.3, (v)	39, 10-16	4.2.1, (xiv)
III, 10	5.1.2.3.2, (v)	39, 12-14	2.7.3.1, (iii)
III, 12	2.8.3, (x)	46, 11-12	1.2.3.1, (ii)
III, 64	2.3.2, (iv)	51, 12 - 52, 3	4.2.1, (xi)
IV, 19-20	2.8.2, (ii)	57, 11-14	4.2.1, (xii)
IV, 33-34	4.3.5.2.1, (iii);	70, 8	2.8.3, (ix)
	4.3.5.5.2, (iii)	71, 3	2.3.3, (i)
IV, 79-80	2.3.2, (iv)	73, 2	2, n.186
V, 10	2.2.2.3, (v)	99, 10-11	2.3.1.3.3, (iii.a)
V, 29	4.4.2.2.2, (iv)	99, 12-15	2.2.3, (v)
		99, 15	2.2.2.1, (ii.a);
			2.7.3.1, (vii.a)
Stèle Juridique		100, 11	2.3.1.3.4, (ii)
6	1.2.3.1, (viii)	100, 13	2.5.2.1, (iv);
10	1.1.1, (k)		2.5.3.2, (i)
11-12	2.2.1.1, (ii);	100, 13-14	5.3.4, (ii.b)
	2.6.1.1, (xvi)	103, 4-5	2.5.2.2, (viii)
18	2.2.2.1, (iv)	103, 5	2.2.4.1.1, (ii.b)
18-19	2.5.3.2, (viii);	104, 9	2.3.1.3.3, (ii.a)
	5.3.3.2, (c)	104, 12-13	2.1.1, (v.b)
21	2.1.3, (ii);	104, 12-15	5.3.4, (ii.b)
	5.1.2.2.1, (i)	105, 2-4	2.5.2.3.2, (ix)
25-26	5.1.3.3, (iii)	106, 3	2.2.4.1.1, (ii.a)
		107, 7	2.1.3.A;
			2.2.2.1, (ii.b);
Tale Involving the House of Life			2.7.3.1, (vii.b);
X+5.2-4	5.1.2.3.1, (i)		2.7.3.1, (ix.a)
		108, 1-3	4.1.3, (xi)
Tjetji (BM EA 614)		108, 1-4	2.3.1.3.3, (i)
6	2.2.3.A	108, 3	2.1.1, (v.a)
13-14	2.2.3.B	108, 10	2.2.2.1, (i.b);
			2.7.3.1, (ix.a)
Tomb of Amenemhat		109, 3-6	2.5.2.3.2, (ii)
p.56	4.4.2.1, (vi)	118, 14 - 119, 2	2.5.2.4, (x)
		119, 7	2.3.2, (i)
Urk. I		121, 6	2.2.4.1.1, (iii.a)
4, 10-14	4.1.3, (ix)	121, 11-16	2.5.2.3.2, (vi)
4, 15-16	2.6.1.1, (i)	122, 18	2.2.2.2, (viii)
		125, 10-11	2.2.2.3, (iii);
			2.2.4.1.1, (iii.b)
		128, 5	4.1.3, (i.b)
		128, 5-9	2.5.2.1, (vi)

129, 5	2.8.2, (i)	76, 15 - 77, 7	4.3.5.2.1, (vii)
131, 4-7	4.3.5.1.3, (iii)	98, 8-10	2.7.3.1, (i)
133, 11	2.3.1.3.3, (ii.b)	99, 15-17	2.8.3, (iii)
134, 6-10	4.1.4, (ii)	138, 14	2.2.4.1.2.A
141, 2	2.3.1.3.4, (i)	162, 8	1.4.2, (ii)
147, 13-14	2.3.1.3.3, (iii.b); 2.3.3, (i)	228, 1-3	4.4.2.2.1, (iii)
171, 3-4	2.1.3, (i)	269, 8	5.1.4.2, (iv)
171, 4	2.4.2, (d)	339, 14-17	4.1.2, (i)
183, 15-16	4.1.4, (v)	344, 9	5.1.3.4, (i)
184, 1	2.4.2, (b)	358, 5-6	2.3.3, (iii)
189, 10	2.3.3, (iii); 4.4.2.2.1.B	365, 11	1.1.1, (k)
189, 18	2.1.1, (iv.a); 2.3.3, (iii); 4.1.1, (v)	415, 13	2.3.3, (ix)
199, 3	2.5.2.3.2, (vi)	484, 9	4, n.159
204, 9-10	2, n.17	484, 9-19	4.3.5.2.1, (vi)
213, 7	1, n.190	498, 4	2.3.3, (xiii)
218, 6	2.4.2.2, (i)	521, 10-12	2.3.3, (ii)
219, 4-5	2.3.2, (iii)	649, 15-17	5.1.2.3.1, (i)
219, 16 - 220, 7	2.5.2.2, (xviii); 2.5.2.5, (i)	655, 15	4.1.3, (ii.b)
220, 5-6	4.1.3, (xi)	656, 2-4	5.1.2.2.1, (v)
220, 7	2.2.1.2, (ii)	656, 5	5.1.2.3.1, (ii); 5.1.2.4, (b)
223, 9	2.3.3, (iii)	656, 14-16	5.1.3.1, (iii)
224, 4-6	1.2.3.1, (ii)	658, 4	1.1.2.A
224, 6	2.6.1.1, (iv)	684, 16	1.1.1, (k)
224, 10	2.2.2.1, (iii)	694, 7	5.1.2.2.1, (v)
232, 5	2.3.3, (vii)	768, 11-12	5.1.3.3, (ii)
232, 6	4, n.240	972, 14	2.5.2.4, (viii)
232, 8	2, n.48	978, 15	4.4.2.2.1, (iv)
232, 10-12	2.6.1.2, (vi); 2.8.3, (ix)	1023, 15	5.1.2.2.1, (v)
251, 1-2	2.5.2.2, (xix); 4.3.5.1.3, (ii)	1068, 7	5.1.3.3, (ii)
253, 18 - 254, 5	4.2.1, (xv)	1072, 16	2.3.3, (viii)
254, 1	2.3.3, (v); 5.1.4.3, (iv)	1073, 4	2.2.4.1.2.A
254, 10	2.2.2.3, (ii); 2.2.3, (iii.b)	1075, 2-4	4.3.3.2, (i)
255, 5	4.1.1, (iii)	1075, 7-8	2.2.2.2, (v)
263, 14	2.2.2, (iv); 2.4.2.2, (i)	1234, 14	2.2.2.1, (i.a)
292, 7	2.3.3, (i)	1281, 14-15	1.1.2, (ii); 5.1.3.4, (ii)
<i>Urk. IV</i>		1282, 13	4.4.2.2.1, (iv)
3, 3	4.1.3, (ii.a)	1297, 9/10	5, n.14
3, 14	1.1.1, (k)	1304, 2	2.5.2.1, (viii); 5.1.2.3.1, (iv)
4, 3-4	5, n.14	1510, 3	2.6.2.1.NB
7, 16	5.1.2.3.1, (iii)	1618, 14	4, n.200
57, 11	4, n.159	1622, 13	4, n.200
65, 9	2.3.3, (xii)	1639, 7-9	5.1.3.4, (i)
		1795, 18	4.4.2.2.1, (iv)
		1797, 13	5.1.3.3, (iii)
		1861, 20 - 1862, 2	4.4.2.2.2, (iv)
		1892, 10	5.1.3.3, (iii)
		1995, 16-18	5.1.1.3, (iv)
		2031, 15	5.1.1.3, (iv)

*Urk. VII*

16, 8	4.3.3.2, (iii)
16, 9-10	2.5.2.3.2, (x); 4.3.5.4, (ii)
16, 11	5.1.1.2, (a)
31, 10-11	1.2.4.3
47, 14	2.3.1.3.4, (iii)
48, 15	1.1.1.F

## Uronarti Quay Inscription

3.3, (iv);
5.1.2.2.1, (iii)

## Wadi el-Hudi

10, 1-4	5.1.3.1, (i); 5.1.3.2, (i)
10, 2	1.1.1, (m)
14, 10	2.3.1.3.4, (i)
143, 13-14	2.5.2.2, (vi)
143, 14	2.3.1.3.4, (i)

## Wadi Hilâl

N 6, 4-5	2.2.2.1, (i.a)
N 9, 7-8	2.2.2.1, (i.a)
O 74, 14-15	2.2.1.3, (i)

Wahankh Antef II's *Dog Stela*  
(CG 20512)

1	2.2.2.3, (iii)
2-4	2.5.2.3.2, (viii)
3	1.2.4.3

Wahankh Antef II's *Stela*  
(MMA 13.182.3)

4-5	4.3.1.1.B, (e); 4, n.219
-----	-----------------------------

## Weha (OIM 16956)

4-5	1.4.1, (i); 4.1.1, (ix)
6-7	2.2.2.3, (ii)

## Wepwawetaa (Leiden V.4)

4-5	2, n.18
5-6	4.2.2, (viii)
8-9	4.3.5.1.3, (xi)

9	2.5.1, (i); 2.5.2.2, (xxii.b)
12	2.3.3, (ix)

## Wepwawetaa (Munich Gl. WAF 35)

17	2.8.3, (ii)
----	-------------



Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica  
Recent Publications and Backlist

ISSN: 0946-8641



*Dating Egyptian Literary Texts*

Gerald Moers, Kai Widmaier, Antonia Giewekemeyer,  
Arndt Lümers & Ralf Ernst (eds.)

“Dating Egyptian Literary Texts” Göttingen, 9–12 June 2010, Volume 1

A central issue of Egyptological research is the question of dating the original composition of religious or literary texts. Very prominent is a lively debate about the date of composition of a number of literary texts, traditionally dated to the Late First Intermediate Period or the Early Middle Kingdom but known only from New Kingdom manuscripts. Over the last years, several attempts have been made to date the production of some of these texts much closer to their first physical appearance. More recently the discussion has heated up considerably with contributions that argue for a New Kingdom origin of Merikare, Neferti, and Amenemhet—a reassessment based on conceptions of Egyptian cultural history or on linguistic analysis. On the other hand, there is an equally strong tendency to retain at least the early datings or to propose even earlier ones for some literary and many more religious texts.

This volume presents both overviews and in-depth case studies of current Egyptological dating practices and methods. While giving the ‘state of the art’ of dating Egyptian literary texts, the book also addresses important methodological issues to provide a basis for future research.

LingAeg StudMon 11,  
cloth, xiv+653 pages  
(incl. 17 b/w figures and  
11 color illustrations)  
ISSN: 0946-8641  
ISBN: 978-3-943955-11-8  
Hamburg 2013  
€ 95 (subscribers’ price: € 79)  
incl. German VAT (7 %)

**Contents**

*Introduction:* Gerald Moers, ‘Vom Verschwinden der Gewissheiten’

**I Materiality**

Andreas Dorn, ‘Kulturelle Topografie literarischer Texte. Versuch einer Funktions- und Bedeutungsbestimmung literarischer Texte im Mittleren Reich anhand ihrer archäologischen Kontexte’ — Ogden Goelet, Jr., ‘Reflections on the Format and Paleography of the Kemyt. Implications for the Sitz im Leben of Middle Egyptian Literature in the Ramesside Period’ — R. B. Parkinson, ‘Sailing Past Ellsinore. Interpreting the Materiality of Middle Kingdom Poetry’ — Ursula Verhoeven, ‘Literatur im Grab – der Sonderfall Assiut’

**II Linguistics**

Alexandra von Lieven, ‘Why Should We Date Texts by Historic Linguistic Dating?’ — Simon D. Schweitzer, ‘Dating Egyptian Literary Texts: Lexical Approaches’ — Pascal Vernus, ‘La datation de L’Enseignement d’Aménémopé. Le littéraire et le linguistique’ — Daniel A. Werning, ‘Linguistic Dating of the Netherworld Books Attested in the New Kingdom. A Critical Review’

**III Texts and Methods: The Egyptological Discussion**

Antonia Giewekemeyer, ‘Perspektiven und Grenzen der Nutzung literarischer Texte als historische Quellen. Zu Versuchen, ‘Geschichte’ aus der Geschichte über die Vorhersagen des Neferti herauszulesen’ — Andrea M. Gnirs, ‘Geschichte und Literatur. Wie „historisch“ sind ägyptische literarische Texte?’ — Joachim Friedrich Quack, ‘Irrungen, Wirrungen? Forscherische Ansätze zur Datierung der älteren ägyptischen Literatur’ — Dirk van der Plas, ‘Dating the Hymn to Hapi. An Update of the Late Date’ — Kai Widmaier, ‘Die Lehre des Cheti und ihre Kontexte. Zu Berufen und Berufsbildern im Neuen Reich’

**IV Texts and Methods: Comparative Perspectives**

Michael Stolz, ‘Early versions in medieval textual traditions. Wolfram’s Parzival as a test case’ — John Van Seters, ‘Dating the Admonitions of Ipuwer and Biblical Narrative Texts. A Comparative Study’ — Stuart Weeks, ‘Texts without Contexts. The Dating of Biblical Texts’

## *Linguistic Dating of Middle Egyptian Literary Texts*

Andréas Stauder

“Dating Egyptian Literary Texts” Göttingen, 9–12 June 2010, Volume 2

The study addresses the dating of Middle Egyptian literary texts from the perspective that has merited the least attention so far, language. General discussions concern aspects of the linguistic situation in early/mid-second millennium BCE Egypt, the nature of the record in which the primary linguistic description is necessarily carried out, processes of textual alteration in the course of transmission, and the configurations of Middle Egyptian in literature.

In the case of Middle Egyptian literary texts, the major strategy for dating consists in studying phenomena of written innovation and obsolescence in relevant registers in order to define upper and lower temporal bounds for a composition to be dated. In a complementary approach, not indexed on linguistic change, distinctive linguistic repertoires and phenomena of linguistic re-composition are directly targeted.

Implications that spring from the proposed datings are outlined with a view on how these could affect the discussion of the cultural functions and of the historical development of Middle Egyptian literature. Beyond dating, the book is more broadly a study of the language of Middle Egyptian literature, of differences internal to this tradition, and of how it productively relates to other written discourses on linguistic levels as much as on semantic ones.

LingAeg StudMon 12,  
cloth, xx+568 pages  
ISSN: 0946-8641  
ISBN: 978-3-943955-12-5  
Hamburg 2013  
€ 85 (subscribers' price: € 69)  
incl. German VAT (7 %)

### Content overview

#### *Introduction*

- 1 *Aspects of the linguistic situation in the early/mid-second millennium BCE*
  - 1.1 Ongoing linguistic change documented in lower written registers — 1.2 Higher written registers in the early Eighteenth Dynasty — 1.3 Configurations of written language in the Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom — 1.4 Possible linguistic registers of literature in the early Eighteenth Dynasty
- 2 *Conditions and strategies for linguistic dating*
  - 2.1 Describing linguistic change in a low-density and highly formal record — 2.2 Expressions that can provide dating criteria — 2.3 Textual alterations in a manuscript culture — 2.4 Language in Middle Egyptian literature — 2.5 Interim summary: Horizons of expectation — 2.6 Devising and applying a linguistic argument: Venus' aspectual criteria — 2.7 The limitations of linguistic dating 1: Khakheperreseneb — 2.8 The limitations of linguistic dating 2: The Teaching for Merikare
- 3 *Narrow dating 'by squeezing'*
  - 3.1 Introduction — 3.2 Fishing and Fowling — 3.3 P. BM EA 10475 ro and vso — 3.4 Hymn to Hapi
- 4 *Direct dating: Targeting specific configurations in written language*
  - 4.1 Introduction — 4.2 Berlin Leather Roll — 4.3 Sporting King — 4.4 Neferkare and Sisene — 4.5 Enseignement Loyaliste — 4.6 Heavenly Cow — 4.7 The Royal Cycle
- 5 *Neferti*
  - 5.1 The early dating: A distinguished option? — 5.2 Neferti, passim: *Tw r sdm* — 5.3 Neferti 12b, 10e: *Tw sdm* — 5.4 Neferti 7f, 9c: *Tw* with non-dynamic events — 5.5 Lexical indications for dating — 5.6 Further indications: The prologue — 5.7 Dating Neferti — 5.8 Appendix: The early New Kingdom horizon
- 6 *The Teaching of Amenemhat*
  - 6.1 Evidence for an early dating? — 6.2 Amenemhat 11c-d: *Tw* with non-dynamic events — 6.3 Possible indications — 6.4 Dating Amenemhat
- 7 *Conclusion*
  - 7.1 Methods and strategies — 7.2 Proposed datings and ranges for dating — 7.3 Some implications — 7.4 Prospects

*Appendix* — Texts — References — Index locorum

# *Grammatik der dokumentarischen Texte des Mittleren Reiches*

Marc Brose

Documentary texts—documents of daily life like letters, contracts, accounts etc.—are one of the quantitatively most underrepresented text corpora in grammars of Middle Egyptian. Although publications dealing with special questions rely quite often on documentary texts these studies have in most cases a limited scope and they do not address observed phenomena as characteristics of documentary texts. The work presented here wants to close these gaps pursuing three goals: first, the collection and documentation of all grammatical and scribal phenomena; second, the identification of the characteristic features of the lowest text register “documentary texts” including both a synchronic comparison with the “Sprachstufe” Middle Egyptian as drawn in grammars and a general linguistic dating within the language development. Third, this work is designed to serve as a grammatical repertory and collection of examples for future research in linguistics of Middle Egyptian.

LingAeg StudMon 13,  
cloth, xx+553 pages  
German text  
ISSN: 0946-8641  
ISBN: 978-3-943955-13-2  
Hamburg 2014  
€ 85 (subscribers' price: € 69)  
incl. German VAT (7 %)

The volume consists of the following main parts: (1) Introduction and sources (§ 1–13); (2) Scribal conventions and developments (§ 14–28); (3) Word morphology and syntax (§ 29–338); (4) Clause syntax and additions (negations, tense and mood system, direct and reported speech) (§ 339–404); (5) A large appendix giving an overview over the epistolary formulae of the Middle Kingdom.

## Inhaltsübersicht

- Kapitel 1: Einführung (§ 1–9)
- Kapitel 2: Quellen (§ 10–13)
- Kapitel 3: Schriftkonventionen und Schriftentwicklung (§ 14–28)
- Kapitel 4: Pronomina (§ 29–61)
- Kapitel 5: Substantive (§ 62–84)
- Kapitel 6: Adjektive und adjektivische Ausdrücke (§ 85–97)
- Kapitel 7: Zahlen und Gezähltes (§ 98–104)
- Kapitel 8: Präpositionen (§ 105–142)
- Kapitel 9: Adverbien und adverbiale Ausdrücke (§ 143–161)
- Kapitel 10: Konjunktionen (§ 162–169)
- Kapitel 11: Das Verb (§ 170–315)
- Kapitel 12: Partikeln (§ 316–338)
- Kapitel 13: Satzsyntax (§ 339–378)
- Kapitel 14: Negationen (§ 379–387)
- Kapitel 15: Ergänzungen zum Temporal- und Modalsystem (§ 388–401)
- Kapitel 16: Direkte und indirekte Rede (§ 402–404)
- Kapitel 17: Der Zustand der Sprache der dokumentarischen Texte (§ 405)
- Appendix: Das Briefformular des Mittleren Reiches (§ 406–425)
- Anhang (u.a. Quellenübersicht, Sachregister und Belegstellenindex)

## Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica 9

### *Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian*

Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis & Jean Winand (eds.)

This volume is the first to be devoted specifically to the study of lexical semantics in Ancient Egyptian. While much research has been dedicated to a wide range of grammatical issues in past decades, lexical semantics has rarely been treated in a systematic fashion. The papers collected here treat a range of semantic phenomena, from the lexical semantics of spatial expressions, to the problems of analyzing polyfunctionality and even to the semantics of the Egyptian writing system. The scope of these issues goes well beyond the individual 'word' or lexical item, as a number of papers address the semantics of syntactic constructions. Some authors call into question the distinction between lexicon and grammar, or analyze the lexical semantics of items usually considered 'grammatical' or 'function' words, such as discourse particles. This volume also spans a number of theoretical frameworks and methodologies that have not been prominent in Egyptian linguistics and philology, such as typologically-oriented semantic maps and other visual tools.

The papers in this volume do not aim to define the 'state of the art,' but rather seek to stimulate the study of meaning in Ancient Egyptian, to point to innovative avenues for future research, and to engage in a broader dialogue between Egyptian linguistics and philology, on the one hand, and the research frameworks and agendas of general linguistics, on the other.

LingAeg StudMon 9,  
cloth, vi+490 pages  
ISSN: 0946-8641  
ISBN: 978-3-943955-09-5  
Hamburg 2012  
€ 69 (subscribers' price: € 59)  
incl. German VAT (7 %)

## Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica 10

### *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant: A Reader's Commentary*

R. B. Parkinson

The book provides a commentary on one of the best known poems from the Middle Kingdom, *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant*, from c. 1840 BC. An introduction covers issues of composition and reception in the Middle Kingdom; language and imagery; naturalism, artifice and immediacy; cultural themes; and later and modern receptions. The commentary includes the text in transliteration and translation with a line by line commentary discussing points of philology, lexicography, style, intertext, context, meaning and possible emotional and aesthetic impact. The volume is intended to assist anyone wishing to read the poem in its original language, and is laid out with text and commentary on the same page to enable an integrated experience of reading, following the precedent of other academic commentaries on classic works of world literature. Figures are included to help embed the poem in its material culture and landscape. An index of words is also provided. The book complements the existing text edition of the poem and the new photographic publications of the main manuscripts by the author.

LingAeg StudMon 10,  
cloth, xii+384 pages  
(incl. 26 figures)  
ISSN: 0946-8641  
ISBN: 978-3-943955-10-1  
Hamburg 2012  
€ 59 (subscribers' price: € 49)  
incl. German VAT (7 %)

# Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica

ISSN: 0946-8641

Back issues (published by the Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie Göttingen) are now distributed by Widmaier Verlag and available at reduced prices:

- 2 Gerald Moers (ed.), *Definitely: Egyptian Literature: Proceedings of the symposion "Ancient Egyptian literature: history and forms", Los Angeles, March 24–26, 1995.* 1999 (hardcover, X+142 pages), ~~€36~~, now **€ 25**
- 3 Dörte Borchers, Frank Kammerzell & Stefan Weninger (eds.), *Hieroglyphen – Alphabete – Schriftreformen: Studien zu Multiliteralismus, Schriftwechsel und Orthographieneuregelungen.* 2001 (hardcover, VI+270 pages), ~~€49~~, now **€ 30**
- 4 Stephan Jäger, *Altägyptische Berufstypologien.* 2004 (hardcover, X+340+xlvi+XCIV pages), ~~€79~~, now **€ 45**
- 5 José M. Galán, *Four Journeys in Ancient Egyptian Literature.* 2005 (hardcover, V+186 pages), **out of print**
- 6 Anthony Spalinger, *Five Views on Egypt.* 2006 (hardcover, VIII+176 pages), ~~€49~~, now **€ 35**
- 7 H.J. Polotsky, *Scripta Posteriora on Egyptian and Coptic*, edited by Verena M. Lepper & Leo Depuydt. 2007 (hardcover, VI+230 pages), ~~€49~~, now **€ 35**
- 8 Petra Andrassy, Julia Budka & Frank Kammerzell (eds.), *Non-Textual Marking Systems, Writing and Pseudo Script from Prehistory to Modern Times.* 2009 (hardcover, VIII+312 pages), ~~€59~~, now **€ 49**

Packages are offered with an additional discount:

Studia Monographica 2 & 3:	€ 40	( <del>€55</del> )
Studia Monographica 2, 4 & 6:	€ 80	( <del>€105</del> )
Studia Monographica 2–4 & 6–8:	€ 180	( <del>€219</del> )

All prices include German VAT (7%).

For orders, standing orders and further information please contact:  
orders@widmaier-verlag.de

North American customers may also contact the official distributor Eisenbrauns  
(for issues since volume 9):  
www.eisenbrauns.com

