Andréas Stauder

Linguistic Dating
of Middle Egyptian Literary Texts

Lingua Aegyptia

Studia Monographica

Herausgegeben von
Frank Kammerzell, Gerald Moers und Kai Widmaier

Band 12

"Dating Egyptian Literary Texts"

Göttingen, 9–12 June 2010

edited by
Gerald Moers, Kai Widmaier,
Antonia Giewekemeyer,
Arndt Lümers & Ralf Ernst

Volume 2

Institut für Archäologie
Humboldt Universität
Berlin

Widmaier Verlag
Hamburg

Institut für Ägyptologie
Universität Wien
Wien

Linguistic Dating
of Middle Egyptian Literary Texts

Andréas Stauder

Widmaier Verlag · Hamburg

2013

À Julie, Albane et Isaure

Acknowledgments

Basel, 26.10.2013

Content overview

Contents

INTRODUCTION

Language is language in use, therefore language in use in culture. Accordingly, language history does not provide a linear and orderly sequence to which texts, let alone literary ones, could be straightforwardly anchored.

Strategies for linguistic dating deal with written registers of language, literary ones and such that are otherwise documented in the preserved record. Linguistic dating can therefore never be disentangled from the largely extra-linguistic factors that preside over the historically shifting and synchronically fluid configurations of written language in early/mid-second millennium BCE Egypt. In addition, the low density of both the literary corpus and the external record weighs heavily on the temporal resolution of linguistic criteria, often even on the possibility of devising such. The basis for linguistic arguments then rests with dimensions that are not unsimilar to the ones to which non-linguistic perspectives for dating are themselves exposed: an overall low-density textual record, texts as complex cultural objects, cultural and linguistic polyphony at any given time, and human behavior.

In dating Middle Egyptian literary texts, language is only one among several strategies to be pursued, yet not to be dismissed either if properly addressed in all its phenomenal complexity and with due caution. The present study is focused on language for two reasons. Unlike other dimensions, this has attracted only limited attention so far[1] and progress at this level is therefore to be expected. Moreover, working on language requires much concentration because it necessarily involves multiple dimensions including the nature of language in literature, possible textual histories in a manuscript culture, and, not least, much additional study of Middle Egyptian grammar itself, which in many ways remains insufficiently understood. No check-lists of linguistic criteria are given a priori, nor do texts generally present phenomena that would lend themselves to immediate conclusions. Substantial inter-pretive work is required in many cases and several among the main arguments to be introduced below must be established step by step often in lengthy developments.

---

1   Only one dating criterion with broader application has ever been devised (Vernus 1990a: 185-90; 1990b; critical discussion below, §2.6). Isolated notes on individual expressions include Baines 1996: 160, n.20 (for the *Moscow Mythological Tale*; see §4.3.4.B.NB); Enmarch 2008: 20-1 (for *Ipuwer*; see §6.2.2.5); Oréal 2011: 222 (for *Loyaliste* 5.5-6; see §4.5.2); Oréal 2011: 138, n.81 (for *mtn is* in *Ipuwer*; see §6.2.2.5, (vi)); Oréal 2011: 234-5, Jay 2008: 102, 125-6, and Posener 1957: 132-3 (for *Neferkare and Sisene*; see §4.4); Parkinson 1999: 193, n.107 (for the two compositions on P. BM EA 10475 ro and vso; see §3.3); van der Plas 1986: 189 (for *Hymn to Hapi*; see §3.4.1; §3.4.3); Vernus 2006: 153 (for *Ptahhotep*; see §2.4.3.2, (xviii)); Winand 2013: 86-8 (for *Ipuwer* 12.14; see §6.2.2.5, (vii)).

The present study falls in two parts. In a preliminary chapter, I examine aspects of the linguistic situation after the Twelfth Dynasty down to the early Eighteenth with a view on varing configurations of written language (§1). I go on to discuss possible strategies for linguistic dating, and limitations thereof, for the specific time period and types of texts here considered, that is early/mid-second millennium BCE Egypt and Middle Egyptian literature (§2). In the second part of the study, devoted to individual texts, the exposition is according to various situations that can be encountered, permitting different types of dating: to a narrow range in time (§3), to a specific horizon in the configuration of written language (§4), and to a broader range in time, possibly to be narrowed down secondarily through further indications (§5-6). In several cases, temporal ranges for dating remain fairly broad; a more precise dating may then require the combined appreciation of all types of evidence available, linguistic and non-linguistic alike, a communal enterprise that transcends the more limited scope of the present study.

The goals pursued are threefold. As a report of a necessarily open ended work, the study intends to illustrate the tenets and ramifications of linguistic dating as these have appeared in work on texts, to delineate possibilities for and intrinsic limitations of linguistic arguments, and to suggest lines of investigation that could be fruitfully pursued in further studies. For individual texts, the study proposes ranges for dating, narrow or broader ones, as these can be defined linguistically. Even when not as narrow as ideally wished for, well defined temporal ranges are valuable as they can make certain options, including some that have enjoyed a distinguished status in past discussions, implausible or outright impossible. Beyond dating, the study is intended as a contribution toward a better understanding of the diverse configurations of Middle Egyptian in the early/mid-second millennium BCE. Inasmuch as it targets language in high-cultural contexts, its objects include Middle Egyptian written culture as defined and supported by the use of Middle Egyptian, and Middle Egyptian itself as a cultural phenomenon, not just a stage in language history—which it is only in part.

As noted, the dating of Middle Egyptian literary texts can not be a solely linguistic matter.[2] It is hoped that the concentration here pursued will permit linguistic evidence to take its proper place, at times ambiguous in interpretation or limited in its Aussagekraft, yet contributing to the debate as one among several approaches and in some matters decisive. Language in culture is an object of deception under strictly positivistic approaches, because it is a rich phenomenon. The present study is then also a plea for an interpretive approach to grammar in text, which is often directly relevant to the study of grammar as it is to reading the texts for their place in Middle Egyptian written culture and the significations they convey.

---

2   For a collection of recent studies, with references to previous discussions, Moers et al. 2013.

1 ASPECTS OF THE LINGUISTIC SITUATION IN THE EARLY/MID-SECOND MILLENNIUM BCE

Middle Egyptian literature is written in Middle Egyptian—by definition of what present-day Egyptology, and to a large extent ancient readers already, recognize as 'Middle Egyptian'.

Since Middle Egyptian was used for composing literature in the Middle Kingdom, it has on occasions been claimed that for literary works composed in 'genuine' Middle Egyptian their language would be evidence for a dating to the Middle Kingdom.[3] In part equivalent to this is the expectation that early New Kingdom literature, if any was then newly composed, should have been written in some 'advanced' stage of Middle Egyptian.[4] The possible literary language of post-Middle Kingdom times has also been described as 'Late Middle Egyptian'.[5] Yet, in the absence of hardly any literary works currently dated to the early New Kingdom,[6] these are only hypotheses. The notion of 'Late Middle Egyptian', for its part, remains abstract as long as not associated with a set of linguistic features that would define it in substance, as a stage in language history different from what would then be 'Middle Egyptian (proper)'.[7]

A preliminary modeling of the linguistic situation after the Middle Kingdom is therefore required. In highly schematic terms, situations that could obtain may be contrasted as follows:

---

3   This is rarely said in such explicit terms. One exception is Jäger 2004: 190: '(...) so sprechen doch die Grundtendenz des Textes (*scil. The Teaching of Kheti*) als Werbeschrift, *seine Sprache*[214] (emphasis AS) und einzelne gedankliche Konzepte für eine Datierung an den Beginn des Mittleren Reiches', with n.214: 'Trotz der schlechten Beleglage dürfte die Sprache als reines Mittelägyptisch angesehen werden.' 'Reines Mittelägyptisch', which is not defined any further, is thereby taken to be a granted notion. In a similar vein, von Lieven (2007: 239-40): '(...) bei gutem Mittelägyptisch ist das MR anzusetzen, bei „gemässigtem", d.h. Frühneuägyptisch, z.B. die 2. Zw.Zt.' Both 'gute(s) Mittelägyptisch' and 'Frühneuägyptisch' are taken to be well-defined notions. That they are not, or at least not in the sense intended by von Lieven, is demonstrated throughout the present study.

4   This as well is more often implicit than explicit. One formulation is by Fischer-Elfert (2003: 119): '(...) were still couched in the language of Classical Egyptian, albeit of a rather advanced stage.'

5   E.g. Lepper 2008: 291-2 (discussing *Cheops' Court*); upon closer examination, linguistic register in this composition turns out to be more complex than might seem at first: §2.4.4.

6   On *Astarte*, which is exceptional in various ways: §1.3.2.2; other literary compositions securely dated to the early New Kingdom include the praise of a city on O. Nakhtmin 87/173 (§1.3.2.1) and the *Teaching of Aametju* (§1.3.2.3).

7   It may be worth recalling that the notion of 'Late Middle Egyptian' ('Spätmittelägyptisch') was initially introduced by Junge (1985; 1984a) in relation to a discussion of *registers*. As discussed in additional details below, the features named by Junge, as well as other ones recurrently associated with these in the same (groups of) texts, are indeed to be interpreted in terms of register (§2.4.4.2-4).

(a) ('Genuine') Middle Egyptian is demonstrably not used any more as a vehicle for new literary productions from some point in time on, prior to the time of the first manuscript attestation of a given literary text to be dated. If so, a general terminus *post quem non* results for that text, narrowing down the range of options for dating it.

(b) Middle Egyptian is demonstrably still used as a vehicle for new literary productions down to the period of the first manuscript attestation of a text to be dated. (Alternatively, the evidence available simply does not warrant any definite claims in either direction, with similar practical consequences.) If so, no *general* terminus *post quem non* is given, either because there is none, or because none can be established. Linguistic dating is then to be carried out through a detailed examination of *individual* expressions present, or absent, in a given text.

As the above directly implies, issues relating to written registers and their shifting configurations over time lie at the core of the problem at hand. For instance, an hypothesis as in (a)—here specified for the early New Kingdom (similar structure for any other period)—falls into two constituent parts, both of which are required for the overall inference to be valid:[8]

(c) Changes would have been accumulating since the Middle Kingdom; the linguistic distance with respect to the language of that period had become significant by the early New Kingdom.

(d) Possible literary registers in the early New Kingdom would have accommodated at least some among the innovative expressions otherwise characteristic of the language of the time. Accordingly, literary texts possibly newly composed in the early New Kingdom would have been couched in an idiom linguistically more advanced than 'genuine' Middle Egyptian.

In dating literary works composed in Middle Egyptian, but first documented in early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty manuscript witnesses, a first step therefore consists in assessing the linguistic background against which these texts are to be dated, during the time span considered (roughly 2000-1450 BCE). Such discussion can not be limited to phenomena of innovation and obsolescence conceived of in absolute terms. Rather, innovation and obsolescence are here necessarily defined in relation to written registers, particularly to such that are relevant to possible literary registers. The notion of 'genuine' Middle Egyptian, for its part, needs to be associated with substance, or abandoned.

In this preliminary chapter, I begin with a general review of ongoing language change after the Middle Kingdom as this can be traced in relatively lower written

---

8   This twofold articulation is implicit in all hypotheses that postulate that ('genuine') Middle Egyptian was not a vehicle for literature in the early New Kingdom, and that accordingly texts composed in ('genuine') Middle Egyptian must date to the Middle Kingdom based on their language. Explicitly von Lieven 2007: 222-50 (with a scope over the whole written history of Egyptian).

registers documented in the record, thereby assessing the linguistic distance to the Middle Kingdom in post-Middle Kingdom times (§1.1). I go on to consider aspects of the continued use of Middle Egyptian in higher written registers after the Middle Kingdom, to which literary registers would more closely relate (§1.2). The configuration of written registers in the Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom is discussed in turn, with a view on assessing how possible literary registers, if any literature was newly composed in the time period considered, may have been configured (§1.3). The whole discussion is necessarily schematic at this stage: while literary registers are not expected to be any simple, almost no single literary text is currently dated to the early New Kingdom; most of the evidence discussed in the present chapter must therefore be of an indirect nature.

1.1 Ongoing linguistic change documented in lower written registers

Language is constantly changing. On the other hand, much of the earlier second millennium BCE written evidence derives from highly formal registers, which are largely opaque to such ongoing change. Stopping at this point, one possible hypothesis, often held, is that by the early New Kingdom the 'vernacular language' had already diverged significantly from Middle Egyptian, in a process largely hidden in the extant written record.[9] The present section examines this hypothesis inasmuch as it constitutes one of the two components required for the general inference recalled above to be valid (part (c)). As it turns out, the hypothesis relies on a series of assumptions which are problematic, conceptually and in substance (§1.1.1). In a second step, aspects of the limited empirical evidence provided by lower written registers during the time period considered are reviewed, leading to a different interpretation (§1.1.2).

1.1.1 The 'underlying language' hypothesis

A. The hypothesis of an 'underlying language' already much divorced from Middle Egyptian by the early New Kingdom is based on a variety of observations that are related to each other. In nachkonstruierter form, these may be summarized as follows:

> (a) Language change is gradual and continuous, proceeding at its own pace and by its own dynamics which are essentially independent from whatever cultural dimensions preside over written performance in the mostly formal written record. With an increasing chronological distance to the Middle Kingdom, the linguistic distance must have increased accordingly.

---

9   E.g. Kroeber 1970: XVI; taken up e.g. in von Lieven 2007; historically, the hypothesis famously underlay Sethe's 'Kataklismentheorie' and subsequent adjustments, which despite criticism has remained influential in subsequent approaches (compare the critical review in Kammerzell 1999: 61-8). One author to explicitly challenge this approach is Kruchten (1999: 92; also 2010). On general models of Egyptian language history, e.g. Quack 2013; Kammerzell 1999; Junge 1985; 1984a, all with references to previous discussions.

(b) In the context of a reconfiguration of written standards in Amarna and post-Amarna times, some form of what may be called 'early Late Egyptian' appears in such written registers from which it had been largely absent, and does so relatively suddenly. Given that linguistic change itself is gradual, some sort of 'proto'-Late Egyptian must have been building up for a (longer) while, even if previously concealed under the 'conservative' surface of most written registers.

(c) In less formal written registers (documentary texts, 'Reden und Rufe', etc.), linguistic features conceived of as diagnostic of 'Late Egyptian' to come are occasionally spotted before Amarna times, and increasingly so during the Eighteenth Dynasty.[10] Given the relative scarcity of preserved documentary registers, such occasional 'Frühneuägyptizismen' should be interpreted as the tip of the iceberg.

B. In the above model, the very notion of 'underlying language' is conceptually murky. 'Spoken language' remains an entirely hypothetical construct, never itself visible in the extant record, including in such textual loci that purport to feature excerpts of spoken language (§1.3.3.3.A; also §1.3.3.2.B). Moreover, 'spoken language' is internally diverse, geographically and socially; documented written standards were demonstrably not based on a single underlying spoken variety which could then be modeled as changing in a continuous and linear fashion.[11] Practically, the notion of 'spoken language', not a unity, therefore dissolves into a set of innovative expressions as these become subsequently visible in *written* registers. Such set is not itself a linguistic variety, but a linguist's collection. Individual innovative expressions may themselves have had diverse origins in spoken varieties and need not point to a cohesive underlying variety either.

---

10 A classical descriptive study is Kroeber 1970.

11 *Underlying* geographical variation has to be posited considering the extension of the country and the lack of homogeneizing forces such as mass education. Such underlying diversity, however, remains largely invisible in the pre-Coptic record, due to the centralized nature of political and cultural models (for traces that have been interpreted as dialectal at various periods, Díaz Hernández 2013: 121-4; Gundacker 2010: 97-103; Allen 2004; Winand 1992: 21-2; Peust 1999: 34, with references to previous studies). For what matters here, written Egyptian as documented in the record almost always appears in a heavily standardized form. *Written standards* at various periods may have been based in part on different geographical varieties, reflecting political and cultural factors. It has been argued that Old Egyptian was based on a Northern ('Memphite'?) variety, while Archaic Egyptian may have been based on a different, possibly Southern, one (Kammerzell 2005). Elements of discontinuity between Old and Middle Egyptian are emphasized by Gundacker (2010) who interprets Middle Egyptian as a Southern variety; Díaz Hernández (2013: 119-20, 123-4) views Middle Egyptian as the result of an encounter between the Memphite tradition and Southern varieties. Based on different sets of diachronic isoglosses, Middle Egyptian has been considered a Northern variety and Late Egyptian a Southern one (Schenkel 1993: 148; Zeidler 1992: 208), or the reverse (Edgerton 1951; Allen 2004). Isoglosses between Old and Late Egyptian, as opposed to Middle Egyptian, are discussed by Winand in press b. While geographically induced elements of discontinuity are real, a stronger continuity between written standards at various periods is also observed, reflecting the general continuity of high written culture.

Accordingly, more recent models of (Earlier) Egyptian language history have recast the perspective on written language itself.[12] They describe issues in the (dia-chronic) definition of *written* registers, patterns in the gradual spread of innovations across various *written* registers, and historical discontinuities in *written* standards. At any given moment in time, a complex, multi-faceted reality of registers is thereby posited. Language in use, both written and spoken, displays an *intrinsic thickness* of registers, a plasticity that is integral to its capacity to fulfill its social and cultural functions. Although much of this thickness is invisible in the extant record, elements thereof are detectable in favorable occasions.[13] Much more is assumed to have existed, because second millennium BCE Egyptian, as a natural language, was no different in this respect than other natural languages.[14]

Current discussions have thereby renounced any binary divides between 'written language' and 'underlying language'. What remains is merely the obvious fact that innovations typically occur in spoken language, and typically only later spread to written registers, if they do. Moreover, spoken varieties in Egypt may have been, and probably were, vastly different from *any* written varieties at *any* time. Beyond such universally valid observations, the notion of 'underlying language'—not a descriptive category, let alone a realistic one—is void, in substance and for all practical purposes.

C. A second major problem in the 'underlying language hypothesis' lies with the assumption that chronological distance should imply linguistic distance in a roughly linear way. To be sure, linguistic change is piecemeal, and thus characterized by its gradualness. Yet, this does not imply that language change must be linear over time. Linguistic change happens in social interaction, and is the overall and indirect result of the multiple agencies of speakers, none of which aimed at changing language.[15] Individual changes, to begin with these, are therefore unpredictable.[16]

Turning to overall grammatical change over a period of time, the pace thereof is similarly unpredictable, for two reasons. Developments in one domain of grammar may trigger adjustments in other domains. A whole series of (even apparently unre-lated) developments may thus bundle together or occur in close succession to each

---

12 Kammerzell 1999; Junge 2008[3]: 16-22; 1985; 1984a; taking part in a similar shift of perspective, studies by Goldwasser (1999; 1991) on variation in Ramesside Egyptian are all on written registers.

13 In the second millennium BCE, the evidence is densest, and the studies accordingly most advanced, for Ramesside times. E.g. Polis in press; Gohy 2012; Goldwasser 1999; 1991; 1990; Jansen-Winkeln 1995: 92-102; Winand 1992: 10-30; Vernus 1978. For Amarna, Kruchten 2010; Silverman 1991. For the (mostly earlier) Thutmoside period, Stauder 2013.

14 The above remark of course bears on the general issue only. The precise configuration of registers varies, sometimes widely, between individual languages, as well as over time within one language, reflecting a variety of extra-linguistic factors such as literacy, social structure, the role of a high cultural tradition (written and/or oral), the spheres of written performance, etc.

15 For invisible-hand models of linguistic change, e.g. Mufwene 2008; Croft 2000; Keller 1994.

16 Predictability in individual changes only bears on restricting the *types* of changes that typically happen (e.g. Haspelmath 2004; Hopper & Traugott 2003[2]; Bybee et al. 1994), and, more marginally, on the favorable intra-linguistic *conditions* under which a given change may occur (e.g. Harris & Campbell 1995). It does not bear on whether a specific change in a given language *will* happen—it may just as well not happen—and even less so on *when* it will happen, should it happen.

other.[17] In addition, the number of possible grammatical changes is low over the relatively short time span here considered (roughly half a millennium).[18] The overall picture therefore remains, quite literally, the sum of a limited number of individual changes, all of which individually unpredictable. Consequently, no law of large numbers even remotely here applies.[19]

In sum, linguistic change in the domains traditionally considered (morpho-syntax mainly) can not be assumed to have been any linear in early/mid-second millennium BCE Egyptian. Nor can growing linguistic distance to Middle Egyptian, be assumed to map in any linear fashion over the growing chronological distance to the Middle Kingdom.

D. 'Frühneuägyptizismen', traditionally defined as innovative features occasionally documented in pre-Amarna times, have been interpreted as providing direct, if fragmentary, evidence to the posited underlying continuous evolution. Upon closer examination however, such 'Frühneuägyptizismen' turn out to be relatively few in number, and mostly late in attestation (§1.1.2).[20] For them to be safely interpreted as tokens of a broader phenomenon, the notion of an 'underlying language' is then itself preliminary required: as discussed above, the conceptual foundations of the latter notion do not resist scrutiny (above, B-C). No general argument can therefore be made guaranteeing that documented 'Frühneuägyptizismen' would stand, pars pro toto, as tokens of a whole innovative *layer* of language, underlying the otherwise mostly formal written registers. Consequently, the nature of the evidence provided by 'Frühneuägyptizismen' is to be interpreted for each such expression in individual details.

---

17 Illustrations in the Egyptian domain for the time period here considered include: (a) the extension of the inflectional passive marker *tw* to 'active impersonal constructions', partly triggered by the simultaneous (and per se entirely unrelated) process consisting in the spread of Subject-Verb patterns previously grammaticalized from situational predicates (Stauder in press b: §4-6, 9); (b) correlations in the rise of Late Egyptian verbal categories (Kruchten 1999; 2010; the general tableau of correlations is largely valid even if the analysis of such correlations is problematic in being too mechanical: see §1.1.2.C, (e)).

18 Note that in the case of Egyptian the number of changes to be considered is even more limited given that morphological change largely lies in a dead angle due to the under-representation of inflectional morphology in the writing system (§2.2.1).

19 In theory, some law of larger numbers may perhaps apply to lexical renewal. Yet, whatever picture would emerge at this level would remain dissociated from the entirely independent dimension of morpho-syntactic change on which classical accounts of language change in early/mid-second millennium BCE Egypt are based. Moreover, the study of rates of lexical change comes with considerable practical problems: this is again due to the short time span considered, here compounded by the broad unreliability of patterns of attestation of all but the most common individual lexemes (§2.2.2). In addition, 'half-time decay' and similar metaphors applied to measuring lexical distance ignore the socio-linguistic factors of change (for the importance of which, e.g. Mufwene 2008): glottochronological and related methods therefore fail to provide a reliable mapping of lexical distance over time, even when much longer stretches of time are considered.

20 The main case of an expression of old attestation, the *pꜣ/tꜣ/nꜣ* demonstratives (already documented by the later Old Kingdom, and common in Middle Kingdom documentary registers), has to be appreciated in relation to two additional dimensions, the deictic force the expressions carried well into the early New Kingdom (e.g. §1.3.2.1; §2.4.4.1.B; §2.4.4.2.2) and the indexical associations they demonstrably had (§2.4.4.2.1-2).

1.1.2 Innovative expressions in pre-Amarna times

As the above discussion implies, a model of ongoing language change must be based on a detailed examination of the empirical evidence. To these ends, I briefly review some major innovations that have been identified in previous studies as they first appear in the extant record.[21]

A. With respect to scope and method, a few preliminary observations are in order. In highly schematic terms, the spread of innovations can in most cases be represented as follows (in more details below, §2.1):

(I) exploratory innovation by some speakers in social interaction

   (II) → wider acceptance in some spoken registers

      (III) → spread to 'lower' written registers

         (IV) → spread to 'higher' written registers

As to be expected, first occurrences in the record as listed below are almost exclusively from relatively lower written registers (III), rather than from higher ones (IV). By definition, no direct claim can be made as to when a given innovative expression may have been first innovated in spoken interaction (I), nor when it may have found wider acceptance in spoken varieties of the language (II). The issue is also irrelevant to the present study, which is exclusively concerned with written registers, lower and higher ones (III)-(IV). In assessing the general linguistic distance to the Middle Kingdom in post-Middle Kingdom times, the present section limits itself to discussing the spread of innovative expressions to relatively lower written registers (III). The spread to higher written registers (IV)—of major importance in modeling possible literary registers—will be taken up in turn (§1.2-3).

Empirically, serious complications arise from the low density of written registers in the extant pre-Ramesside record. As a result, the date of the first attestation of a given expression in lower registers can not a priori be equated with the date of its spread to that register (III), which may well have been earlier. Patterns of attestation must therefore themselves be subjected to interpretation as to their representativeness; various strategies can be pursued to these ends (§1.1.2.C).

Finally, the list of first occurrences provided below limits itself to those expressions classically considered in studies of the transition to Late Egyptian. The picture is thereby heavily biased toward a limited subset of mainly morpho-syntactic features. This is conditioned by the foci of past research, the nature of the extant record, the nature of the writing system, and the possibility of bounding uncertainties in patterns of attestation, mainly for such expressions that relate to core functions in language and are therefore reasonably common in attestation. In a study devoted to a description and analysis of the rise of Late Egyptian, this skewed perspective would be a severe limitation; for the more limited issue at hand, however, this is less prob-

---

21   The rise of Late Egyptian has yet to be studied and analyzed in full details. The seminal study remains Kroeber 1970. Major subsequent contributions include Kruchten 2010; 2000; 1999; Winand 1992: *passim*. See also Collombert & Coulon 2000: 211-6.

lematic, given that the expressions here mentioned are precisely the ones that are usually evoked when it is suggested that literature, if any was composed in post-Middle Kingdom times, should have displayed innovative features.

B. Expressions typically evoked in presenting the rise of Late Egyptian include the following (only a selection is given):

(a) *Pronouns and demonstratives*

- Third person plural clitic =*w*:[22]

(i) as subject in Verb-Subject forms (*sḏm=w*) – Kamose;[23]

(ii) with non-verbal subjects (*iw=w* (...)) – Hatshepsut;[24]

(iii) in non-subject slots (e.g. possessive *N=w*) – Akhenaton;[25] already Amenhotep II?[26]

- 'New subject pronoun' (*tw=i*, etc.) – late D.17 (§3.4.1.3).

- *P3/t3/n3*:[27]

(i) as a formal category – early Middle Kingdom documentary registers (earlier already in Old Kingdom 'Reden und Rufe' and personal names);

(ii) weakening in deictic force – a gradual process, only incipient in late Middle Kingdom documentary texts;

(iii) fully weakened into an article – during D.18, in texts of lesser formality.

- *P3y=f* possessives:

(i) as a formal category, with deictic force – late D.12;

(ii) weakening in deictic force – D.13;

(iii) weakened into a possessive article – late D.18.[28]

- *P3y/t3y/n3y* demonstratives – Thutmosis III.[29]

---

22 After Edel 1959: 30-7; Kroeber 1970: 35-40.
23 *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 18.
24 *Speos Artemidos* 30 (*Urk.* IV 388, 16); *Urk.* IV 54, 10 (Ineni).
25 Edel 1959: 17 (*fnḏw=w* 'their nose').
26 Kroeber 1970: 39-40.
27 Kroeber 1970: 13-30; also below, §2.4.4.2.
28 In O. Nakhtmin 87/173 (*temp.* Hatshepsut/Thutmosis III), for example, the expression still has clear deictic force and contrasts with suffixed possessives (§1.3.2.1).
29 Kroeber 1970: 40-1.

(b) *Elements in the morpho-syntax of clause-combining*

- *ꞽw* as a marker of circumstantial clauses:

> (in subject-initial clauses with pronominal subjects – First Intermediate Period)

(i) circumstantial *ꞽw* in patterns of non-existence – Ahmose,[30] already Kamose?[31]

(ii) circumstantial *ꞽw* in subject-initial clauses with full noun subjects – not before early/mid-D.18;[32]

(iii) circumstantial *ꞽw* in Verb-Subject patterns – later D.18/early D.19.

- *ꞽw* introducing object clauses – incipiently by Thutmosis III/Amenhotep II (with specific governing verbs only).[33]

- Sequential *ꞽw=f ḥr sḏm*:[34]

> (a forerunner construction – twice in a mid-D.13 text[35])

sequential proper – Thutmosis III[36]/Amenhotep II.[37]

- Conjunctive:[38]

> (*ḥnꜥ sḏm*, mainly in continuation to an imperative or to a subjunctive *sḏm=f* – first in a D.8 decree;[39] the overt expression of the agent, as *ḥnꜥ sḏm ntf*, remains altogether exceptional)

---

30 Ahmes-Nefertari's *Donation Stela* 19-20 (quoted below, §4.4.3.2, (iv)).

31 *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 10-11: this is insecure, since *ꞽw* may here still be assertoric (discussion: §4.4.3.2, (iii)).

32 Early instances are *Urk.* IV 649, 17; 655, 14 (both from Thutmosis III's *Annals*; quoted below, §5.3.4.2, (ii) and §4.4.4, (viii), respectively); P. Berlin 10463 ro 1-2 (*temp.* Amenhotep II; quoted below, §5.2.4.A, (a)). Kruchten 1999: 59 discusses an occurrence in *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 31-33 which in his view would be the earliest instances of circumstantial *ꞽw* before a full noun. I interpret differently, with *ꞽw* serving a macro-syntactic function in relating the string of clauses it introduces (all main clauses) to the preceding clause (§1.3.3.2, (xiv)). The clause preceding *ꞽw* is part of the main narrative chain of events, while the clauses following *ꞽw* contribute information of a more descriptive type. This is thereby one among various environments favorable to the development of circumstantial *ꞽw* before full nouns. However, a favorable context, including the potential for interpretive ambiguity, is only a pre-condition for, not the initial stage of, actual change.

33 With a verb of perception (*mꜣꜣ*), *Urk.* IV 1164, 13-14 (a song in Rekhmire's tomb, quoted below, §3.2.2.B); with a verb of desiring (*mrꞽ*), *Urk.* IV 890, 11 (Amenemhab, quoted below, §1.3.3.3.B; Polis 2009: 223-4).

34 Kruchten 1999: 74-81; Vernus 1990a: 192-3; Kroeber 1970: 126-31.

35 Ameniseneb, Louvre C12, 4-5 and 5-8; discussed below, §1.3.3.1, (i).

36 Senimose's Will 5-9 (Kruchten 1999: 76); in Thutmosis III's *Annals* (*Urk.* IV 658, 1-2; 658, 10; *passim*).

37 P. Berlin 10463 ro 1-2 (Kroeber 1970: 131, ex.6); *Urk.* IV 894, 5-10 (Amenemhab); *Urk.* IV 1302, 9; 1304, 2; 1307, 10-11; 1308, 5 (Amenhotep II's *Syrian Campaigns*); *Astarte, passim* (Collombert & Coulon 2000: 214). See Kroeber 1970: 126-31; Vernus 1990a: 192-3.

38 Winand 1992: 457-73; Kroeber 1970: 140-70; Gardiner 1928.

39 Kroeber 1970: 153-61; also §2.4.4.3, (ii)-(iii) (in literary texts); §1.3.3.1.C (in Second Intermediate Period documentary texts).

(i) *ḥnꜥ-ntf sḏm*, in similar functions, with mandatory expression of the agent, before the verbal lexeme – Amenhotep II,[40] already Hatshepsut?[41]

(ii) *mtw=f sḏm*, with the full functional range of the conjunctive – Akhenaten.[42]

(c) *Analytic paradigms*

- 'Present I':

(*NP ḥr sḏm* as a formal category, expressing progressive aspect – Old Kingdom)

(weakening into an unmarked relative present tense – a gradual process begun in the late Middle Kingdom[43])

with the new subject pronouns (*tw=i*, etc.) – Kamose.

- 'Future III':

(*NP r sḏm* as a formal category – Old Kingdom)

(weakening into a future tense – Middle Kingdom[44])

(i) isomorphic (/'symmetric') negation (*nn iw=f r sḏm*) – Thutmosis III;[45]

(ii) *iw* as an integral component of the construction[46] – combined with *nn* (Thutmosis III),[47] *r-ntt* (Thutmosis III),[48] *nty* (Amenhotep II),[49] and circumstantial *iw* (Amenhotep II);[50]

(iii) complementary distribution with pronominal and full noun subjects, *iw P ~ iri N*, with verbal and non-verbal predicates – late in the reign of Amenhotep III or Akhenaten.[51]

---

40 P. Berlin 10463 ro 3-4 (Kroeber 1970: 162, ex.2); *Astarte* II.x+4-5; II.x+16; 14y (Collombert & Coulon 2000: 212).

41 P. BM 10102 ro 13-16 (Kroeber 1970: 162, ex.1), provided the author's dating of the document ('aus der Zeit der Hatschepsut') is correct; see however Kruchten 1999: 5 ('no precise dating').

42 Kroeber 1970: 169-70.

43 Vernus 1990a: 183-91; also below, §2.6; §5.3.5.2.

44 Identifying future values, as opposed to modal ones, is methodologically difficult, because the contexts for these two values largely overlap. A future value is best established in previsional contexts implying a speaker-oriented inference, as in birth prognoses, e.g. P. UC 32057 vso III.16 *iw=s r mst* (...) 'She will give birth (...)'. (I thank Stéphane Polis for discussion of this issue).

45 *Paheri*, pl.7, 2nd register from bottom, to the right (Kroeber 1970: 147, ex.1): *mt nn iw=i r wꜣḥ=t* 'Look, I am not going to abandon you.' In one much earlier text, *nn sw r ḫpr* is once found (Moꜥalla II.α.1): this is probably an altogether different construction, not a negation of *NP r sḏm* (§5, n.140).

46 Kroeber 1970: 132, 135-9.

47 *Paheri*, pl.7, 2nd register from bottom, quoted two notes above.

48 *Urk*. IV 656, 3 (Kroeber 1970: 137, ex.2).

49 P. Berlin 10463 ro 5 (Kroeber 1970: 138, ex.4).

50 P. Berlin 10463 ro 1-2 (Kroeber 1970: 132, ex.1).

51 Kruchten 2010.

(d) *Synthetic and iri-auxiliated paradigms*

- Past tense *sdm=f* – Kamose.[52]

- *Iri*-auxiliated formations:

> (with long stems and verbs of directed motion – Old Kingdom[53])

> (i) in the negative imperative – Thutmosis III;[54]

> (ii) in attributive paradigms – in relative forms, Akhenaten;[55] in participles, Horemheb;[56]

> (iii) in focusing tenses – *ir=f sdm*, Akhenaten;[57] *ir.n=f sdm*, early Ramesside (a 'transitional' form, subsequently lost);[58]

> (iv) in other formal categories – beginning in early Ramesside times (gradual spread over the *longue durée*).[59]

C. Such listing of first attestations only provides raw data: in a corpus language, and all the more so in one documented in a fairly low-density written record, patterns of attestation need to be interpreted as to their representativeness. Various strategies for doing so will be exposed in a subsequent chapter (§2.1) and illustrated throughout the present study; in the present context, a series of observations inspired by these strategies may suffice:

> (a) Most of the forms and constructions listed above express core functions in language: pronouns, demonstratives, major categories in the verbal system, subordination. The expected text frequency of such expressions is thereby relatively higher than for forms and constructions expressing more marginal functions. (For the very same reason the latter are also less easily identified by the present-day Egyptologist, and therefore typically not present in collections such as the one above). On a general level, the patterns of attestation of the above expressions typically evoked in describing the early rise of Late Egyptian will therefore be relatively more reliable than the patterns of attestation of other expressions that are less common in text.

---

52 Kruchten 1999: 6-13.
53 Kammerzell 1999: 179-93.
54 Vernus 2010a.
55 Kruchten 1999: 25.
56 Horemheb's *Decree* 34 (Winand 1992: §573, ex.899; Kruchten 1999: 25); for *iri*-periphrased forms in *Duties of the Vizier*, Kruchten 2010: 153-4; 1999: 25-6 (different analysis in Winand 1992: §573, n.49).
57 P. Mond 1, 16-17; P. Mond 2, 26 (Kruchten 1999: 24-5); also *r-dd=k* in P. BM 10102 ro 7 (dating uncertain, see Kruchten 1999: 23); for *iri*-periphrased form in *Duties of the Vizier*, Kruchten 2010: 153-4; 1999: 25 (different analysis in Winand 1992: §447).
58 Winand 1992: §445-6; Wente 1969.
59 Kruchten 2000.

(b) For several expressions, first attestations cluster in time in remarkable ways. Examples include:

- The new subject pronouns: the pattern of early attestations is dense and consistent (§3.4.1.3).

- The sequential: early attestations, in documentary texts, in royal inscriptions, in a private inscription, and in one text relating to 'literature' all cluster in the same period (Thutmosis III – Amenhotep II).

- The Future III: early attestations of *iw* combined with *nn*, *r-ntt*, *nty*, and circumstantial *iw* are all from the same decades (Thutmosis III – Amenhotep II).

(c) For several expressions, *other* expressions were demonstrably in use to express similar functions in only slightly earlier times, in similar registers.[60] Examples include:

- Past tense *sḏm=f* is first documented by Kamose; in documentary registers down to the late Seventeenth Dynasty, *iw sḏm.n=f* is consistently used in similar functions.[61]

- The sequential is first documented by the time of Thutmosis III – Amenhotep II, notably in royal inscriptions; in earlier Thutmoside royal inscriptions, the 'continuative' function is common as well, and expressed differently, consistently with a *sḏm.n=f* asyndetically linked to the preceding clause.

- The isomorphic ('symmetric') negation of the Future (*nn iw=f r sḏm*) is first documented in an innovative register by Thutmosis III; not much earlier, *Kamose Inscriptions*, also with registers that are otherwise open to innovations, still have the non-isomorphic negation (St.II 10 *nn wꜣḥ=i tw* (...) 'I will not let you be (...)').

(d) In cases when change affects function rather than form, the evolution can be traced through time, across exponents of similar registers. The classical example is the weakening of *pꜣ* into an article, not completed before the early New Kingdom. As a form *pꜣ* is overly common in e.g. Illahun: the fact that it is then never used then as an article therefore directly demonstrates that such functions had not developed yet.[62]

(e) When individual changes are part of broader processes of change, the former can be analyzed as to how they relate to the latter. If the relative chronology of individual changes as documented in the record is consistent with functional aspects of linguistic change, the pattern of attestation is broadly representative. Examples among the expressions listed above include:

---

60   This type of argument is also recurrently made by Kruchten (1999; 2010).
61   Kruchten 1999: 6.
62   The same argument underlies Kroeber's (1970: 13-30) exposition.

- *P3y/t3y/n3y* demonstratives: these are first documented by Thutmosis III, roughly the time when *p3/t3/n3*, itself a demonstrative in earlier times, completes its process of weakening into an article. The correlation is obvious.[63]

- The rise of the 'Future III', implying the recategorialization of *iw* in this pattern: early occurrences for all relevant sub-constructions cluster in the time of Thutmosis III – Amenhotep II (above, (b)). Significantly, changes affecting the functions of *iw* in other domains are themselves not before the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty (above, B, (b)).

- The gradual spread of the third person plural suffix pronoun =*w* across various constructional environments: the documented sequence mirrors the process of spread that can be reconstructed linguistically as a series of successive extensions. (I) The morpheme, which has its origin in a 'Präpositionaladverb', is originally restricted to the *sḏm.n(i)* construction (with a *sḏm.n=f*, a form that historically incorporates the preposition *n*, and the formation of which was probably still transparent enough at the time *sḏm.n(i)* was innovated). (II) =*w* is extended to other Verb-Subject forms that do not have the morpheme -*n*-, or not any more; in the process, the morpheme acquires full syntactic constituent status (first documented by Kamose). (III) =*w* is freed from its erstwhile exclusively inflectional slot and extended to other subject slots (first documented by Hatshepsut). (IV) =*w* begins being extended to all slots in which the old third person plural clitic =*sn* is used, including non-subject slots (first documented by Akhenaton, perhaps already Amenhotep II).[64] In the above sequence, each step can be analyzed as involving a relaxation of distributional restrictions inherited from the morpheme's past history.[65] The relative chronology of developments as documented in the extant record is therefore representative.

- The process of obsolescence of the *sḏm.n=f*, with two main steps to be distinguished:[66] (I) in positive and asserted environments, past tense *sḏm=f* is first documented superseding *sḏm.n=f* by the time of Kamose; (II) in focusing and negative environments, on the other hand, new forms (based on the auxiliary *iri*) are not attested before Amarna. The first step in the

---

63 Similar analysis by Kroeber 1970: 40.

64 Such extension is itself very gradual, continuing during Ramesside times and completed only by the early Third Intermediate Period: its progress then depends on constructions and registers in complexly interrelated ways (Winand 1995).

65 Detailed analysis in Stauder in press b: §10. In terms of the broader linguistic context, the change was probably favored by the phonological reduction of the old third person plural clitics (=*sn*), increasingly resulting in formal identity (technically: syncretism) with third person singular clitics (=*s(i)*, *sw*), all similarly pronounced along the long lines of */sv/*. Typologically, the overall process is described as an instance of the rare, and remarkable, type of change referred to as 'degrammaticalization' (in the sense of Norde 2009), more specifically consisting here in a case of 'deinflectionalization'.

66 Descriptive study by Kruchten 1999: 6-22.

process is interpreted in relation to broader changes affecting the verbal system during the Second Intermediate Period, notably the gradual obsolescence of *N(P) sḏm=f*, itself a consequence of the extension and semantic weakening of *NP ḥr sḏm* into a general relative present tense. In the context of a growing obsolescence of the simple (/'aorist') *sḏm=f*, the marker *-n-* in the *sḏm.n=f* becomes increasingly redundant in its distinctive function, in positive and fully asserted environments.[67] Meanwhile, other environments in which the *sḏm.n=f* was used (negative and not fully asserted ones) remain unaffected by this altered intra-linguistic situation. Changes in these environments happen only later, in relation to other developments in the verbal system, such as the obsolescence of forms based on the long stem (*mrr-*) and the spread of *iri*-auxiliation. In short, the stepwise replacement of the *sḏm.n=f* by other formal categories, as observed in the record, is consistent with a constructional analysis of the overall process, in relation to various other processes of change occurring in the language.

D. The above combined observations demonstrate that the above tableau of first attestations in relatively lower written registers is not an effect of the vagaries of attestation. To be sure, the documentation of lower written registers—to which innovative expressions typically spread first—remains limited in the Second Intermediate Period, and poor until the reign of Hatshepsut. Yet, arguments such as just made allow to bound uncertainties in all cases evoked.

The rise of Late Egyptian is traditionally described in relation to a limited set of mainly morpho-syntactic innovations. Of these, most did not gain acceptance in relatively lower written registers until the very late Seventeenth, early Eighteenth, mid-Eighteenth, or even late Eighteenth Dynasties, while other ones would appear yet later. In some cases individual changes can be related to broader processes of change, and arguments can then even be made implying that the associated innovations did not occur much earlier in spoken interaction itself (above, C, (e)). Only two expressions reach deeper in time, *p3* and *ḥnꜥ sḏm*, both well attested in Twelfth Dynasty documentary registers: two expressions do not define an 'underlying evolution'. In addition, these are only the forerunners of actual Late Egyptian categories. Moreover, both these expressions are strongly sensitive to register (§2.4.4.2; §2.4.4.3.B) and accordingly only limitedly present in higher written registers of any pre-Amarna

---

67 I thereby concur with Kruchten that Late Egyptian past tense *sḏm=f* is derived from earlier *sḏm.n=f* (similarly el-Hamrawi 2008), yet differ as to the interpretation of the process of change. In Kruchten's view (1999: 86), the loss of *-n-* is determined by 'sound change' (in the author's terms) and the differential obsolescence of the *sḏm.n=f* in various environments would reflect the existence of two forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, with different syllable structure. Yet, *-n-* in the *sḏm.n=f* does not stand at the outer edge of the prosodic word, unlike in third person plural clitics mentioned by the author in support of his interpretation (*/svn/ > */sv/*). Kruchten's line of reasoning also takes for granted that 'sound change' operates blindly, a view once classical in the wake of neo-grammarian approaches to linguistic change, but abandoned in more recent research on morphology and morphological change. In addition, it can be demonstrated that Earlier Egyptian did not have two forms of the *sḏm.n=f* distinguished by syllable structure (Stauder in press f; also Stauder in press d-e, discussing the proposal in Schenkel 2009 and 2012[5]: 192-7).

times, in the Twelfth and in the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasties similarly. The two expressions, one documented since the Eighth Dynasty, the other one even earlier, are tokens of registers that form an integral part of Middle Egyptian itself, conceived of in its 'thickness'. These are not 'Frühneuägyptizismen'.

The above is in contradiction to views that hypothesize a 'long hidden evolution' leading up to the emergence of Late Egyptian in the late Eighteenth Dynasty written record.[68] If narrowly defined in terms of a limited set of mostly morpho-syntactic features, the rise of 'Late Egyptian' is best described as an episode of linguistic 'punctuation', following a longer period of relative 'equilibrium': the process involved a series of changes closely following upon, and in part favoring or even triggering, each other, during the Eighteenth Dynasty itself or only slightly before.[69]

(In actually studying the rise of Late Egyptian, morpho-centristic sets of features such as the above should in fact be abandoned altogether, and work should be toward a tableau that comprises many more expressions, syntactic, lexical, and otherwise, also taking into account functions as these change over time. This, however, transcends the limited scope of the present discussion, which was only concerned with assessing traditional views at the level at which these had themselves been formulated.)

1.2   Higher written registers in the early Eighteenth Dynasty

Early occurrences of innovative expressions in the Eighteenth Dynasty are from relatively lower written registers (compare the references in the above tableau of such expressions, §1.1.2.B, and the discussion below, §1.3.3). In assessing the linguistic situation of the time, contemporaneous higher written registers are considered in turn, in two successive steps. I first examine the typology of Middle Egyptian in such registers (this section), then go on to discuss aspects of the broader configuration of registers in the early Eighteenth Dynasty and before (§1.3).

The Middle Egyptian of Thutmoside royal and non-royal inscriptions is largely free of interferences from other contemporaneous varieties. Interferences are very few in numbers; when they occur, they are mostly cases of a targeted, and thereby controlled, opening up of registers. This is not yet equivalent, however, to declaring that Thutmoside Middle Egyptian is 'genuine' Middle Egyptian: the Thutmoside repertoires of Middle Egyptian expressions and constructions could for example have been reduced with respect to earlier times.

---

68 I thus find myself in substantial agreement with the position expressed in Kruchten (1999: 92; 2010). Our views differ on the linguistic analysis of the processes, mechanisms, and factors of changes, with Kruchten espousing a too narrowly mechanical view on change, often interpreted in terms of push-shift or push-drag shifts.

69 These notions of 'punctuation' and 'equilibrium', borrowed from evolutionary biology, have gained some currency in recent discussions of linguistic change. Episodes of change clustering at certain periods are thereby described as 'punctuation', contrasting with more stable periods, described as (relative) 'equilibrium'.

To be assessed is therefore whether Thutmoside Middle Egyptian was full, or not: if a set of Middle Egyptian expressions could be identified that were demonstrably not part of Thutmoside composers' repertoires any more, these could immediately be turned into a series of *post quem non* criteria to be applied to literary compositions including these same expressions. If, on the other hand, the repertoires of Middle Egyptian were to appear complete in the post-Middle Kingdom times relevant to the present study, no such direct criteria could be devised.[70] The issue would then become one of appreciating the configuration of post-Middle Kingdom written registers, including possible literary ones, as to how they relate to each other (§1.3).

A. Three aspects of method are preliminarily made explicit. To begin with, the perspective is here restricted to inscriptional registers. A detailed assessment of the linguistic typology of the Book of the Dead, for example, would be highly rewarding, yet currently remains a desideratum. Funerary productions are also deeply embedded in past textual tradition in ways of their own, a dimension resulting in much additional interpretive complexity. To be sure, inscriptional productions themselves entertain productive relations with the past textual tradition, including cases of outright phraseological inheritance.[71] The phenomenon, however, is only expected in the context of a culture in which innovations in cultural productions, textual and non-textual ones, are naturally embedded into, rather than opposed to, tradition;[72] similar comments extend to literature, which, no more than inscriptional productions, was an object of free composition. Provided, therefore, that cases of formulaic language are identified as such, and provided that phenomena to do with tradition are analyzed as to their implications for language, inscriptional productions offer valuable evidence for assessing the linguistic repertoires of early Thutmoside Middle Egyptian in high registers.

Individual expressions are considered. Upon reading across Thutmoside inscriptional texts, these differ from Middle Egyptian literary texts of insecure dating in what may be termed their 'textual flavor': their texture is different, as are the types of expressions commonly featured and at times the textual functions these perform. Such differences are only expected given the differences in subject matter, cultural functions, and associated modes of circulation and consumption of these two broad types of written discourses. For the specific issue at hand, a perspective on individual expressions therefore remains a valid, and practically the sole possible, strategy.

Lastly, a targeted strategy must be pursued as putting together a comprehensive descriptive grammar of Thutmoside inscriptional productions would imply an enterprise of monographic proportions.[73] To this end, a notion of 'linguistic accessibility',

---

70 The discussion is strictly on language in use as documented in texts, not on reflexive awareness of linguistic structure. On the general paucity of metalinguistic discourses in ancient Egypt, contrasting with a high sensitivity to register, rhetoric, and past varieties of the language, Stauder in press g; Uljas 2013; Borghouts 2000; Johnson 1994; Junge 1984b.

71 With a view on the implications for analyzing language, e.g. Stauder 2013: §5.2.

72 For various approaches to these and related issues in early New Kingdom material and immaterial culture, compare the studies gathered in Bickel 2013b, particularly Laboury 2013.

73 This remains a desideratum. Ritter 1995 concerns aspects of the verbal system only and is flawed in treating the material as if a transitional variety between Middle and Late Egyptian, failing to address the nature of written language in Thutmoside inscriptions (see Winand 1997). Preliminary

informally defined, is introduced. In intuitive terms, 'accessibility' as here understood may be viewed in terms of 'salience' or 'concreteness'. Linguistic form (e.g. morpho-syntax) is generally more concrete, and thereby more salient, than linguistic function and meaning. Similarly, morphology is generally more concrete than syntax, because it is associated with discrete segments of form while syntax has to do with relation-ships, distributions, generalizations on these, and at times fairly abstract structure. Crisscrossing the above hierarchies, expressions frequent in use are more salient than less frequent ones, because their higher token frequency implies higher exposure of language users to these.[74] In the present section, the focus is set on expressions that are least 'accessible': if it can be demonstrated that these are part of the repertoires of early Thutmoside composers, expressions more easily accessible will be as well.

B. The following is a selection of expressions and constructions that are typical of Middle Egyptian, have disappeared in Late Egyptian, and score low on the scale of accessibility just introduced. The appreciation of their lesser accessibility is based on the combined dimensions of lesser formal salience and lower text frequency, compounded with the relatively more recent date by which an expression has received a fairly adequate description in Egyptological discussion. For each expression, an example is given in Middle Kingdom (or First Intermediate Period) Middle Egyptian (α) and one in early Thutmoside inscriptional productions (β); whenever available, an instance in a Middle Egyptian literary composition of insecure dating is added (γ).

(a) *Aspectual contrasts*

(i) *NP ḥr sḏm* vs. *N(P) sḏm=f*,[75] with the associated semantic contrast:

Fully productive in Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptions, in all relevant details: discussion below, §2.6.3; §2.8.2.3; §5.1.4.1.

> (A contrast in aspect is involved, a dimension that eludes easy description. This was described only in the later part of the twentieth century,[76] three and half decades after *N(P) sḏm=f* had been identified as a distinct construction

---

remarks toward a dynamic typology of Middle Egyptian in early Thutmoside inscriptional productions are in Stauder 2013; for 'particles' specifically, Oréal 2011 includes rich observations on uses in Thutmoside inscriptions.

74 It may be worth emphasizing that the notion of 'accessibility' (as long as kept on an informal level as is the case here) is cross-culturally valid, because it is ultimately grounded in very general dimensions such as formal salience and frequency of use (and thereby intensity of exposition), which are independent of cultural specifics. In lieu of further developments, suffice it to mention some of the various domains in which the scale finds application: these include the gradualness in foreign language acquisition (both naturalistic and in training); the relative ease for elicitation in linguistic fieldwork; the availability of expressions for use as socio-linguistic indices (for a case in Middle Egyptian, §2.4.4.2.1); the historical sequence of development of linguistics, both general and Egyptian; etc.

75 Sigla, here and throughout the present study: *N* for full noun; *P* for pronoun; *NP* for noun phrase, regardless of whether this is pronominal, a full noun, or more complex. For example *N(P) sḏm=f* stands as an overall label for the constructions *N sḏm=f* (with full noun subject), (*iw*) *sḏm=f* (with pronominal subject, post-verbal), and (*iw*) *P sḏm=f* (also with pronominal subject, pre-verbal).

76 Initially Vernus 1986; 1990a: 143-91.

on formal grounds[77] and almost a century after Berlin School philologists had made initial breakthroughs in identifying the main morphological categories of the language.)

––––––

(b) *Syntax, 1: Setting constructions of various types*[78]

(ii) *Mrr=f – NP ḥr sḏm*:[79]

(α) Siut III (Iti-ibi), 10

i wḫ
sḏr ḥr mtn ḥr rḏt n(=i) iȝ(w)
'Whenever the night came,
the man sleeping on the road used to praise me.'

(β) Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* 14-17 (*Urk.* IV 18, 10 - 19, 5)

prr=f [pḏ]t=f ḥr gs=fy mi iʿḥ (...)
ḥȝtiw ḥr ftft n=f
'Whenever he comes forth his archery at his side like Iah (...),
the hearts are shuddering for him.'

(γ) *Merikare* E 135

rmm=sn
iw=f ḥr sḏm
'Whenever they cry,
he is listening.'

> (A first step in the identification of the construction was reached only with Hans-Jacob Polotsky's work, who treated this as an 'emphatic' construction and rightly, if in different terms, described its functions as having to do with interclausal cohesion and backgrounding of the event in the first clause relative to the one in the second. A more adequate description of the setting construction as related to, yet distinct from, the 'emphatic' construction had to wait several decades longer.[80] This has become more broadly accepted only in the past decade.)

––––––––––––

77 Westendorf 1953.
78 Defined as constructions in which a first clause provides a setting (temporal or otherwise) to a following main clause.
79 Labels include 'setting construction' (e.g. Uljas 2007a), 'second schème' (Vernus 1981), and 'Rang V-Erweiterung' (Schenkel 2012[5]; 1998).
80 Vernus 1981.

(iii) Sequence *pseudoparticiple – sḏm.n=f* (...):[81]

(α) *Sinuhe* B 292-294

sd.kw m pȝḳt gs.kw m tpt sḏr.kw ḥr ḥnkyt
ḏ.n=i šꜥ n {imiw}<nmiw>[82]*=f* (...)

'I was clad in fine linen, I was anointed with fine oil, I slept on a bed—
I gave the sand back to the ones who fare it (...)'

(β) *Speos Artemidos* 38-40 (*Urk.* IV 390, 9-16)

(...) *ḥḳȝ=sn m-ḫmt rꜥ n ir=f m wḏ-nṯr nfryt-r ḥmt=i*

mn.kwi ḥr nswt rꜥ

sr.n.tw=i r ḫnty rnpwt m ḫpr=s-it

i.kwi m ḥr wꜥtt ḥr nsry r ḫftiw=i

sḥr.n=i bwt nṯr ꜥȝ (...)

'(...) they ruled without Re and he did not act by divine decree until My Majesty.

I am now established on the thrones of Re—

I have been announced from the ends of years as a born-conqueror;

I am now come as the unique Horus firing on my enemies—
I have dispelled the abomination of the great god (...)'[83]

(γ) *Amenemhat* 10b

ꜥḥꜥ.kw ḥr ḏrw tȝ
mȝ.n=i ḳȝb=f

'Standing at the borders of the land,
I saw its heart.'

(iv) Sim., with a person other than the first singular:

(α) Moꜥalla IV.14-15

ḫnt pḥ.n=f wȝwȝt
ḫd pḥ.n=f tȝ-wr

'Having fared upstream, he has reached Wawat;
having fared downstream, he has reached the Thinite nome.'

---

81 E.g. Schenkel 2012[5]: 308-9; Vergote 1955: 352-3 (with some examples quoted in the latter study to be analyzed differently). In this construction, the first clause is interpreted as providing a setting to the second, an interpretation that naturally derives from the non-dynamic semantics of the pseudoparticiple.

82 Emendation after Feder, *TLA*.

83 Phraseological in nature are instances in funerary contexts such as *Urk.* IV 119, 10-11 (Paheri) *ḏd.kw ḥr mḫȝt [p]r.n=i* [...] *ip.kw mḥ.kw wḏȝ.kw* 'Having been placed on the scale, I have came forth (...) counted, complete, whole'; *Urk.* IV 10, 5-6 (Ahmose son of Abana) *tni.kw pḥ.n=i iȝwy* 'Having become elderly, I have reached old age.'

(β) *Urk*. IV 54, 15-16 (Ineni)

pr r pt

ẖnm.n=f itn ꜣbḫ.n=f pr.n=f [*im=f*]

'Having gone forth to the sky,
he joined the Sun-disk and united with the one he had come forth from.'

> Sim., in a shorter variant, *Urk.* IV 59, 13-14 (from the same text).

> The formulation is reminiscent of the royal apotheosis in *Sinuhe* R 7-8, which is probably quoted in a private inscription only slightly later than Ineni, in Amenemhab (*Urk.* IV 896, 1-3).[84] Unlike Amenemhab, Ineni has a formulation different from the literary text, probably not a quotation:[85] this may be either an allusion or in reference to a formulary to do with royal succession; in view of *Sinuhe* R 7-8, the former is more likely. For what matters here, the formulations in Ineni and *Sinuhe* are different in several ways, and the former is therefore original, including in its language.

>> (The construction is very rare in text: the examples quoted above are the only ones I am familiar with.)

(v) Sim., with a *wn*-headed construction:

(α) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 136-137

wn.k(w) rf dmꜣ.kw ḥr ẖt=i

dmi.n=i sꜣtw m-bꜣḥ=f

'Finding myself thus stretched out on my body,
I touched the ground in front of him.'

(β) *Speos Artemidos* 9-10 (*Urk*. IV 385, 3-4)

wn.kw [*r*]*f m ḥꜥw wꜥ ḥnꜥ=f*

sḫpr.n=f wi r rḏt wsr kꜣꜣt=f m tꜣ pn (...)

'While I was thus a unique body with him,
he raised me in order that the respect he inspires be powerful in this land (...)'

> (From an inscriptional text of insecure dating:)

(γ) *Tod Inscription* 26-27[86]

wn.k(w) r=i ḥr mꜣꜣ st tn r-pr pn iw=f ḫft-ḥr ḥm n nṯr nb nṯrw wꜣ r wnn m <m>ꜣ́twnw m mw (...)

'I was looking at this place, at this temple which was in front of the chapel of the god lord of the gods, having come to be a fighting arena[87] in water (...)'

---

84 Parkinson 2009: 177-9; Stauder 2013: §7.3; Gnirs 2013b: 144, n.134.

85 Parkinson (2009: 176) speaks of 'a possible quotation'.

86 The inscription, which mentions 'Senwosret', is often ascribed to Senwosret I (e.g. Barbotin & Clère 1991; Quack 1992: 128-30); this has been challenged by Buchberger 2006. At present, the dating must be considered open.

(The construction is very rare: only two further instances have been noted, *Sinuhe* B 252-253 and Khentemsemti (*temp.* Amenemhat II), 4-5. These texts resonate with each other on various levels, of which the present construction is one: for *Sinuhe* and *Khentemsemti*, §4.1.3.C (with full quotations); for *Tod Inscription* and *Speos Artemidos*, §5.1.3.3.C.)

―――――

(c) *Syntax, 2: Thetic constructions*[88]

(vi) *ꜣw*-less subject-first constructions (also below, §5.1.4.2, (i)-(iii)):

(α) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 135-136

ḏd.in sḫty pn
ḫꜣw n ꜥḥꜥw ḥr siꜣt n=f

'And this peasant said:
"The measurer of heaps is cheating for himself!" '

(β) *Urk*. IV 656, 14-16 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*)

iit tw[sic] *r ḏd n ḥm=f*
mrw snb iwꜥyt rst mḫtt r-mitt

'The coming one did to tell His Majesty:
"The coast is clear, the southern and northern garrisons likewise." '

(γ) *Kheti* 7.1

ḫꜥḳw ḥr ḫꜥḳ m pḥwy mšrw

'The barber is (still) shaving at the end of the evening.'[89]

   Stanza-initial.

   (The construction has come under scrutiny only recently, once sufficient research on *iw* itself had been accomplished to permit an appreciation of the functional correlates of *iw*-lessness. While the correlation with paragraph- or discourse-initiality is sufficiently clear, a full analysis of the functional profile of the construction remains to be done.[90])

---

87 I follow Brose, *TLA* (similarly already Barbotin & Clère 1991: 9, 18 with n.78). Quack (1992: 128-9; 1993b: 63, ex.7) reads without haplography (...) *m ṯwnw m mw* '(...) eine Anhöhe im Wasser'.

88 A 'thetic' clause presents a state-of-affairs en bloc rather than relating it to a preceding segment of discourse (for an introduction, Lambrecht 1994: ch.1). Theticity was first introduced to Egyptological discussion by Loprieno (1995: 109-12, *passim*) with a view on the second construction below (vii). A fuller study (Stauder & Uljas in prep.) is in prepration.

89 Jäger (2004: 68, 134) emends into (...) *r pḥt=f mšrw* '(...) until he reaches evening'.

90 Important preliminary observations are by Vernus (1997: 45-61) and Junge (1989: 104). The construction will be studied further in Stauder & Uljas in prep.

(vii) *Pw*-marked thetic and topic-presentative constructions:

Fully productive in the Eighteenth Dynasty: §2.7.2.1, (iv); §5.1.4.2, (iv)-(vi).

> (While the constructions themselves have long been noted, their more refined functional description is fairly recent and still being worked on.[91])

———

(d) *Particles, used in the whole range of their Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian functions*

(viii) *ꜣ*, expressing restrictive identification:[92]

(α) *Eloquent Peasant* B2 125

wnm=i ꜣ ᵐ[93] tꜣ=k
swr=i ꜣ [ḥnḳ]t=k r nḥḥ

'May I feed only on your bread,
drink only your beer, forever!'

(β) Thutmosis II's *Aswan Inscription* 13-14 (*Urk.* IV 140, 12-14)[94]

(...) *wpw-ḥr wᶜ m nn n msw nw wr n kš ẖst in ᶜnẖ m sḳr-ᶜnẖ ḥnᶜ ḥrw=sn r bw ẖr ḥm=f*
ḏw ꜣ ẖr rdwy n nṯr nfr (...)

'(...) except one of these children of the chief of vile Kush brought alive as a prisoner with their people to the place where His Majesty was,
so that he may only be placed under the feet of the perfect god (...)'

>   Further examples: §6.1.3.1, (ii).

(γ) *Fishing & Fowling* B4.4-5

ḥḏ tꜣ wšᶜ=i wꜣy=i šm=i ꜣ m st-ib=i

'At dawn, I would chew a bite, be far away, and walk only by my desire.'[95]

>   Sim. e.g. *Amenemhat* 7c (§6.1.3.1, (i))

---

91 Loprieno 1995: 109-12. Stauder & Uljas in prep.
92 Following Oréal's (2011: 39-48) analysis, from which the examples and references quoted below have also been drawn.
93 The *m*, only after *wnm*, not however after the following verb of ingestion *swr*, was secondarily added (Parkinson 2012a: 308-9).
94 Semantic analysis: Oréal 2011: 41.
95 On this passage, lastly Widmaier 2009: 136-7.

(ix) Discourse-connective *is*:[96]

(α) *Sinuhe* B 189-190

iw min is š3ꜥ.n=k tni

'(Come back to Egypt ...) For today you have begun ageing.'

(β) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.99: I.16-17 (H*HBT* II 9, 9-10)

išst pw mrt.n=k ḫpr
iry=i is ḫft wḏ

'What do you wish to happen?
For I will act according to the decree.'

(γ) *Ipuwer* 2.6-7[97]

iw ms mwtw ꜥš3w ḳrs m itrw nwy m ḥꜥt
ḫpr is wꜥbt m nwy

'But now, many dead are buried in the river, the flood being a grave,
for the *wabet* has become a flood.'

> Sim. e.g. *Neferti* 2n (§5.1.4.2, (vii)); 5e; 11i; with a slightly different shade of meaning, but falling within the same broader type of uses of *is*,[98] e.g. *Merikare* E 120-121 (§2.8.2.1, (ii)); *Ipuwer* 5.9, 12.1.

(x) Polemic *swt*, expressing divergence in dialogue:[99] §5.1.4.2, (x)-(xi).

> (While particles are easily identified in their form, an accurate appreciation of their functions is far from easy as this implies dimensions such as textual cohesion, modality, and argumentation. Significant progress on these levels has been achieved only recently.[100])

—————

(e) *Uncommon constructions*

(xi) *N sḏm.n*:[101]

(α) Abkau (Eleventh Dynasty), x+3[102]

inbw=s pḥ.n ḳ3 pt

'Its walls, they reached the height of the sky.'

---

96 Oréal 2011: 134-8, 143-5, from which the references are also drawn.
97 Semantic analysis: Oréal 2011: 143-4.
98 '*Js* modalisateur' (Oréal 2011: 138-42).
99 Oréal 2011: 423-5.
100 Oréal 2011.
101 Edel 1959: 30-7; the related negative construction (*n sḏm.n(i)*) is not uncommon in literary texts.
102 Edel 1959: 31, ex.24.

(β) Thutmosis II's *Aswan Inscription* 6 (*Urk.* IV 138, 14)

wnw m nḏt nt nb t3wy ḫmt.n k3t

'The ones who used to be subjects of the lord of the Dual Land, they have conceived plots.'

> Sim. e.g. Rekhmire 5 (*Urk.* IV 1073, 4) *smrw ḫ3m.n s3=sn* 'The companions, they bent their backs'; *Chapelle Rouge*, p.98: I.2-3 (H*HBT* II 7, 11: §3.4.4, (iii); §4.3.2.1, (v)); p.120: V.7-8 (H*HBT* II 19, 2: §3.4.4, (iv)).

(γ) *Kheti* 8.3, reading as the text stands (§5.3.2.2, (i)).

> (The construction, which was fully identified only in 1959,[103] remains undiscussed in several recent grammars of Middle Egyptian and is generally deemed worthy a note when encountered.[104])

C. The above demonstrates that the Middle Egyptian repertoires of early Thutmoside composers of inscriptional texts were complete. More precisely, the early Thutmoside performance of Middle Egyptian at least matches the current Egyptological description of Middle Egyptian. This is not surprising after all, since early Thutmoside composers were performing in what by then amounted to a high variety of their own language in the context of a continued textual and cultural tradition. Egyptologists, by contrast, stand outside this tradition and can expose themselves to a limited textual record only.

One immediate consequence is a general difficulty in devising *post quem non* criteria for the time period prior to the first manuscript attestation of as yet insecurely dated Middle Egyptian literary texts. For progress to be made in this domain, more fine-tuned descriptive study of Middle Egyptian grammar is needed: this may lead to identifying usages documented in the Middle Kingdom, but not any more in early New Kingdom inscriptional registers. If so, and if it can be made plausible that the then possibly observed lack of early New Kingdom attestation is not a mere documentary gap, *post quem non* criteria for Middle Egyptian literary compositions could result. The quest will be a painstaking one: retrospectively, it now appears that the performance of Middle Egyptian by early Thutmoside composers not only matched, but in effect beat, the best Egyptological descriptions until the 1980's (in the above, e.g. (i) and (ii)) and beyond (e.g. (vi), (viii), and (ix)).

Illustrative of the practical implications of such linguistic continuity in higher registers across Middle Egyptian written culture is a Gedankenexperiment in dating the *Speos Artemidos Inscription* on strictly linguistic grounds. The text is fairly long and internally diverse, no less than most Middle Egyptian literary texts to which this study is devoted. One may then be tempted to argue along the following lines:

---

103 Edel 1959.
104 E.g. Junge 2003: 254.

- *Speos Artemidos* avoids any linguistically innovative features, except one, the third person plural pronoun =*w* in col.30 (*Urk*. IV 388, 16). Had the text been transmitted in manuscript form (as literary compositions are), this singular instance of =*w* would have to be appreciated with the utmost caution given the possibility that it could have arisen in the course of textual transmission.[105]

- The Middle Egyptian in *Speos Artemidos* is rich. Several among the constructions evoked above as typical of higher Middle Kingdom registers are thus included: *N sḏm=f* used in its all aspectual functions ((i); below, §2.6.3.1, (iii)); strategies of asyndetic clause-combining including the sequence *pseudo-participle – sḏm.n=f* (iii); and the exceptional construction with an initial form of the pseudoparticiple of *wnn* (v). Various other expressions, both grammatical and lexical, are fairly rare and some possibly recherché.[106] Linguistically, nothing would speak against a dating to the Twelfth Dynasty.

- In view of the 'Sinuhean' construction in *Speos Artemidos* (v), compounded with further elements in common between *Speos Artemidos* and *Tod Inscription* (§5.1.3.3.C)—a text that is itself often assumed to date to Senwosret I— one may even be tempted to date *Speos Artemidos* to the earlier Twelfth Dynasty specifically.

Similar comments extend to other compositions of the period. Among the ones evoked above is Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy*, which for example has the aspectual contrast between *N(P) sḏm=f* and *NP ḥr sḏm* (§2.8.2.3, (iii)-(iv) and §5.1.4.1, (ii)) and the setting construction *mrr=f – NP ḥr sḏm*; above, (ii)). Similarly, Thutmosis II's *Aswan Inscription* for example has *ꜣ* (viii) and *N sḏm.n*: (xi)),[107] while *Chapelle Rouge* has *is* (ix) and *N sḏm.n* (xi) (detailed discussion of this composition: §4.1.2). The list could be easily extended.

1.3   Configurations of written language in the Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom

It was argued above that the rise of Late Egyptian (as traditionally defined in terms of a limited set of mostly morpho-syntactic features) was as an episode of 'punctuation', occurring relatively late and rapidly, mostly during the early New Kingdom itself (§1.1). The process was described based on evidence from relatively lower written registers mostly. Complementarily, it was demonstrated that the performance of

---

105 This is not theoretical: for example, it has been proposed that *iw=w r* [...] in *Moscow Mythological Story* P. Moscow 167 frg. II.11 should be emended in view of the otherwise 'overhelmingly classical' linguistic typology of the composition (Quack 2004: 359).

106 Compare the notes in Allen 2002b.

107 Also significant is that Thutmosis II's *Aswan Inscription* is included among Borghouts' reading texts (Borghouts 2010: II, 432-3, 475-7). The text's high linguistic level is matched on the graphic level, in several 'studied' spellings that breach conventional orthography (Borghouts 2010: II, 475).

Middle Egyptian in early Thutmoside inscriptions at least matches current Egyptological descriptions of Middle Egyptian (§1.2). The observation was based on inscriptional registers, which typically lie at the higher end of the continuum of written registers at any given time.

The linguistic situation in the Early New Kingdom therefore consists in a variety of written registers, such that accommodate recently innovated expressions to varying degrees, and such that accommodate few or none. In modeling possible literary registers in the same period, the issue lies in appreciating how these may have been configured against the general background just outlined. Answering the question is made no easier by the fact that many literary texts, which would ideally provide the primary evidence here needed, remain insecurely dated. Unless the discussion is to become circular, these texts must be left out of the picture at this stage, thereby resulting in a dearth of direct evidence: more than in the preceding sections, the argument is therefore here to be indirect.

In the following, a series of complementary perspectives, all of which necessarily partial, are woven together with the aim of developing some sense of possible literary registers in the three centuries after the end of the Twelfth Dynasty (1750-1450 BCE). I preliminarily discuss an approach which might be termed a 'rough modeling' of 'spheres of written performance' at different periods in the second millennium BCE (§1.3.1). I go on to examine the scanty direct evidence for literary registers in the early New Kingdom and discuss this for its representativeness (§1.3.2). The textual loci in which innovative expressions are encountered in this period are considered in turn (§1.3.3).

1.3.1   'Spheres of written performance'

The configuration of registers at any given time is typically complex and internally dynamic, with the written record showing only a small subset of the variety that existed. The extant pre-Ramesside record particularly presents the Egyptologist with massive gaps on two levels: most registers are not represented at all, and those registers that are represented are mostly represented only partially. Given such mismatch between the question raised and the evidence available to address it, an intentionally schematizing perspective may be adopted as a preliminary approximation. This consists in considering very broad 'spheres of written performance', inscriptional, literary, and documentary, as to how they relate to each other.[108] Spheres of written performance are defined per a set of typically correlating dimensions such as

---

[108] The notion of spheres of written performance, long implicit, was formalized in the seminal contributions by Junge 1985 (in particular 21-34); 1984a (in particular Tabelle 2, 1190-1). Details in this (by then necessarily largely prospective) presentation have been subsequently refined (e.g. Jansen-Winkeln 1995), yet the overall model stands, if appreciated at its proper level of generality (spheres, not registers). The following discussion is partly recast in the present author's own terms, for the sake of expository ease in the present context. For similar practical purposes, the original quadripartite Jungean model is simplified into a tripartite one, with the 'theologische' and 'staatliche' spheres being collapsed into a single one, termed 'inscriptional'.

modes of publication and circulation (e.g. monumental vs. portable),[109] types of subject matters and associated constraints of decorum, cultural status and degree of embedding into past textual tradition. Spheres of written performance are Egypto-logical constructs, and explicitly conceived of as higher-order idealizations. They are not actual registers, which are vastly more complex, internally differentiated, and fluid: each sphere consists in a multiplicity of registers.

However schematic, a consideration of spheres of written performance remains useful in providing a description of general hierarchies in written language in ancient Egypt, and for expressing how these hierarchies changed over time. In very broad terms, the inscriptional sphere in some periods tends to be linguistically more conservative, in other words to accommodate less innovations, than the literary sphere, which in turn tends to be more conservative than the documentary sphere. What changes over time is the linguistic thickness of each sphere, the overlaps between different spheres in their linguistic selections, and their relative linguistic distance to each other. Such shifting definitions relate to changes in broader cultural constellations, which they reflect.

A. Beginning with the relationship between the literary and the documentary spheres, the main observation is that the former is distinguished from the latter throughout the second millennium BCE. In Ramesside times, literary registers include innovative expressions while avoiding other ones. They also accommodate a whole set of older expressions, to varying degrees depending on individual types of literary discourses, periods, and texts. The overall result, internally variable, is a linguistic variety ('néo-égyptien mixte') that differs from the one found in contemporaneous lower written registers ('néo-égyptien complet').[110] As Winand's labels here evoked further express, this variety is composite in nature: it never existed as such in spoken usage, not at the time it was used in writing, nor at any previous time. In the Middle Kingdom alike, literary registers are differentiated from contemporaneous lower written registers (letters, business documents). The former by and large avoid some innovative expressions that are observed spreading in the latter. They also include expressions that were by then obsolescent and/or had never been in use at all in lower registers (§2.4.3.2).

For the Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom, it is therefore to be assumed that whatever registers of literature there may have been were similarly differentiated from contemporaneous lower written registers. Such possible registers of literature would have accommodated only some, or none, among the innovative features found in lower registers, while also including a series of expressions not found in these.

B. Turning to the relationship between the literary and the inscriptional spheres, major changes over time are observed. The contrast between the two spheres is most strongly marked in the first millennium, a period that may have been instrumental in

---

109 On modes of publication and circulation as complexly correlating with registers of both language and writing, Vernus 1990c.
110 Winand 1992: 10-30. The presentation is here simplified with respect to Winand's, since the contrast between the overlapping types of 'néo-égyptien mixte' and 'néo-égyptien partiel' is also in part diachronic, resulting in a more complex actual picture.

suggesting the very hierarchy in the first place. This reflects a broader cultural situation, one major linguistic correlate of which lies in the full emergence of Traditional Egyptian proper.[111] The latter, not a cohesive variety but an internally diverse phenomenon and an inherently dynamic practice,[112] is typical of many textual productions in the inscriptional sphere. According with their entirely different cultural loci, literary productions of the later first millennium are for their part largely immune to these dialectics with the textual, and thereby linguistic, tradition of the past. The result is a linguistic divorce between for example Demotic literature and contemporary inscriptional texts.[113]

Moving backwards, the contrast is already considerably less extreme in Ramesside times. Reference may be made again to Winand's categories of 'néo-égyptien partiel', defined as accommodating a few innovative features only, and 'néo-égyptien mixte', accommodating more innovative features.[114] The former linguistic type is broadly associated with the inscriptional sphere, while the latter is typically, although not exclusively, associated with the literary sphere.[115] A hierarchy is therefore observed at a general level, yet the contrast implies no discontinuity: significantly, the categories overlap to a substantial degree.[116] Moreover, the inscriptional and the literary spheres both display considerable internal variation, often resulting in a blurring, or even outright suspension, of the hierarchy in individual cases. Ramesside textual productions in the inscriptional and literary spheres thus bear witness to a complex and dynamic continuum of higher written registers. This continuum is productive, in contrast to the more divorced situation that was to emerge later in relation to the rise of Traditional Egyptian proper.

Turning to the Middle Kingdom, no such hierarchy is observed any more. Linguistic registers of literature only occasionally accommodate expressions not otherwise found in inscriptional texts. These are in most cases associated with specific selections in registers, such as in what has been described as a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature (§2.4.4).[117] Inscriptional compositions, on the other hand, occasionally display archaizing features, survivals or revivals. So, however, do literary texts, to the same extent, and often with the very same expressions (§2.4.3.2; §2.4.3.3.B). Middle Kingdom inscriptions and literary texts share the same linguistic repertoires, down to details (e.g. §4.1.3.C). The intense linguistic communication between the two spheres is demonstrated further by cases where both diverge from regular standards of written Middle Egyptian, paradigmatically in *Sinuhe* (§4.1.3).

While Middle Egyptian literature is a 'differentiated' mode of written discourse, notably in terms of its decorum,[118] the associated linguistic registers are not. The productive tensions Middle Kingdom literature entertains with contemporaneous

---

111 E.g. Vernus 1996a.
112 E.g. Vernus in prep.; Engsheden 2003.
113 The actual situation is of course vastly more complex, e.g. Quack 2010a; 1995.
114 Winand 1992: 10-30. Also Jansen-Winkeln 1995.
115 Here as well, the actual situation is vastly more complex, see the studies quoted in §2.4.1.
116 E.g. Winand 1992: 30.
117 For the 'low tradition' as defined in literary terms, Parkinson 2002: 138-46.
118 Parkinson 2002: 15-6, 91-8, and *passim*.

high-cultural written discourses presuppose an intense communication with these. This is mirrored in the language common to the two modes of written discourse. In the Middle Kingdom, there is no specific literary variety of Middle Egyptian.

C. In schematic terms, spheres of written performance in the second millennium BCE may then be represented as follows ('≥' stands for significant overlaps, '>' for a contrast, and '>>' for a divorced contrast; the thickness internal to each sphere is left unrepresented, as are all details that will be the prime object of the present study):

    - Middle Kingdom: inscriptional =   literary >   documentary
    - *SIP – early NK*   ???
    - Ramesside: inscriptional ≥   literary >   documentary
    [- first millennium: inscriptional >> literary (≥/> documentary?)]

Literary registers are distinguished from relatively lower written registers at all times throughout the second millennium BCE. Moreover, they are never fully divorced from inscriptional registers at any time in the second millennium BCE, as they would later become. While the relationship with inscriptional registers is productive in Ramesside times, the linguistic repertoires of the inscriptional and literary spheres are in the Middle Kingdom the same. As the phenomena involved are inherently complex, the gap resulting from the current dearth in literary texts securely dated to periods from the Second Intermediate Period through the early New Kingdom can not be filled by any simple interpolation.

1.3.2 Direct evidence for linguistic registers of literature in the early New Kingdom

At this stage, only three literary compositions are securely dated into the early New Kingdom, the short praise of a city inscribed on O. Nakhtmin 87/173, *Astarte*, and *Teaching of Aametju*. Of these, the first two may at first be taken to suggest that literary registers in that period would have broadly accommodated linguistically innovative features. Upon closer consideration, a different picture emerges.

1.3.2.1   O. Nakhtmin 87/173

The short text inscribed on O. Nakhtmin 87/173[119] is currently the earliest known exponent of a praise to a city, a type of literary discourse that was to enjoy considerable popularity in Ramesside times.[120] The text receives a terminus *post quem non* by Hatshepsut/Thutmosis III by its archeological context.[121] The composition itself is not much older: its brevity accords with its position at the very beginning of a tradition.[122] Linguistically, the composition may seem to include so-called 'Frühneuägyptizismen'; a closer examination reveals otherwise.

---

119 Text: Guksch 1994. Studies: Ragazzoli 2008: 26, 100-1; Verhoeven 2005: 74-5. I quote following the strophic structure of the text.
120 Study: Ragazzoli 2008.
121 Guksch 1994: 106.
122 Ragazzoli 2008: 101.

The text has a series of *pꜣy=k* possessives. A look at the strophic structure is here relevant. The composition consists in a sequence of three similarly structured strophes.[123] *Pꜣy=k* possessives occur in the first verses of each strophe (1; 4; 7); suffixed possessives, for their part, are used in strophe-internal position, in the second verses of the first and second strophes (2; 5). The contrast is deictic in nature:[124] the preposed possessives in strophe-initial position point the reader/hearer's attention to an entity; in strophe-internal position, this referent is already established in the sphere of discourse. In short, the preposed possessives carry full demonstrative force, while the suffixed possessives lack such force. Compare, in the first strophe, where the referent of *niwt(i)w* in the second verse is established, if by a different word, in the first verse (*dmi*):

O. Nakhtmin 87/173, 1-2

imn im wi m pꜣy=k dmi
nḏm ꜥnḫ mrrw m niwt(i)w=k (...)

'Amun, place me into this town of yours;
Sweet to live in, and beloved of your citizens (...)'

Similar uses, also strongly deictic, are documented in Twelfth Dynasty literary registers, in *Kagemni* 2.3 (§2.4.4.2.2.A) and *Eloquent Peasant* B2 128 (§2.4.4.2.2, (iii)). In O. Nakhtmin 87/173 similarly, *pꜣy=k* is not a 'Late Egyptianism': to be one, it would have to lack deictic force. (In addition, preposed possessives in *Kagemni* and *Eloquent Peasant*, in both cases in the framing sections of these compositions, are indices of register, according with the general indexical associations of *pꜣ*-based expressions (§2.4.4.2). In O. Nakhtmin 87/173 similarly, the accommodation of preposed possessives may have had some indexical quality, in this case reflecting the novelty of a type of literary discourse in the process of being innovated.)

Other apparent 'Frühneuägyptizismen' belong to the graphic level. Most notable is a spelling *n* for the preposition *m*: O. Nakhtmin 87/173, 3 (...) *r irt iꜣwt n kty niwt* '(...) than spending old age in another town'. This is genuinely a late feature, documented elsewhere in Eighteenth Dynasty texts,[125] and perhaps only once before.[126] If encountered in a text of as yet insecure dating, this could not be safely used for analysis: such spelling could well have arisen in the course of textual transmission (§2.3.1.1, (vii), with instances in *Fishing and Fowling* B2.6-7, possibly also in *Merikare* E 70-71).

The composition inscribed on O. Nakhtmin 87/173 is firmly dated to the early Eighteenth Dynasty on non-linguistic grounds (archeological context and history of the type of literary discourse it belongs to). Its linguistic typology, however, would be compatible with a dating to any other time from the mid-Twelfth Dynasty on. (The

---

123 For further analysis of this brief, yet very rich, text, Ragazzoli 2008: 100-1.
124 I thank Pascal Vernus (p.c. 6/2010) for discussion.
125 Kroeber 1970: 41-4.
126 The only pre-Eighteenth Dynasty instance that comes to my mind is Seankhenre Mentuhotepi's Stela 5 *ink nsw n-ḫn wꜣst* 'I am king within Thebes.'

linguistically undistinctive nature of the composition is of course also in large part due to its sheer brevity.)

1.3.2.2 *Astarte*

Unlike P. Nakhtmin 87/173, *Astarte* (P. BN 202 + P. Amherst IX)[127] displays a rich set of linguistically innovative features. The composition, previously dated to Horemheb, has now been convincingly redated to the reign of Amenhotep II.[128] Its language, which compares with contemporaneous documentary registers, may be characterized as a variety transitional between Middle and Late Egyptian.[129] *Astarte* thus provides a plain instance of a 'literary' text in pre-Amarna times composed in a register that is wide open to innovative expressions. This does not, however, support any generalization to possible literary registers overall, let alone in the pre-Amarna period as a whole.

In non-linguistic terms as well, *Astarte* is highly innovative. Based on the longer fragment in P. Amherst IX, the composition had been considered a 'mythological tale', a type of written discourse that is already documented in the Middle Kingdom[130] and would undergo considerable development in the New Kingdom.[131] The rejoinder of the long missing beginning of the text (P. BN 202) now imposes nuancing this generic characterization. The royal protocole, dating, and title of the composition converge in suggesting a specific Sitz im Leben, probably as a celebratory act of some sort.[132] In addition, explicit generic indications internal to the text relate the composition to celebrations of heroic deeds (*sḏd nḫtw*), a 'genre' developing precisely during the times of Thutmosis III and Amenhotep II.[133] The linguistic register of the composition is thereby to be appreciated in relation to its generic determinations: innovation is on both accounts similarly.

It is of some further significance that the composition is dated to the reign of Amenhotep II: this is slightly later, if by a few decades only, than the lowest datings proposed for Middle Egyptian compositions, to the *early* Thutmoside era. A sizeable amount of the innovative expressions featured in *Astarte* is first documented in the reigns of Thutmosis III or even Amenhotep II, even in lower registers.[134] In the inscriptional sphere itself, innovative features are by then accommodated in texts to

---

127 Text and study: Collombert & Coulon 2000.

128 Collombert & Coulon 2000: 209-16.

129 Collombert & Coulon 2000: 211-6.

130 Parkinson 2002: 294-5.

131 Collombert & Coulon 2000: 224, n.172-3.

132 Collombert & Coulon 2000: 222-3; Fischer-Elfert 2003: 135-6.

133 In the editors' (Collombert & Coulon 2000: 224) own terms: 'Selon notre interprétation, après le protocole royal et le titre, débute un discours aux résonances épiques qui annonce le projet général du locuteur: le récit (*sḏd*) et la glorification (*sḳȝ*) des hauts faits (*nḫtw/tnr*) du héros triomphateur de la mer. Ce genre de la "geste" héroïque est précisément désigné en égyptien par l'expression *sḏd nḫtw*, lit. "récit des exploits". Il s'est considérablement développé sous Thoutmosis III (...)'.

134 These notably comprise the bulk of innovative features in the verbal system of *Astarte*: the conjunctive *ḥnꜥ ntf sḏm* (first securely documented under Amenhotep II); the *iw*-based paradigm of the future III (first documented under Thutmosis III); the sequential *iw=f ḥr sḏm* (first documented under Thutmosis III and Amenhotep II). Compare Collombert & Coulon 2000: 216-22 and above, §1.1.2.B.

do with war and celebrating royal deeds and prowess (§1.3.3.3.B).[135] These are precisely the types of written discourse to which *Astarte* itself displays closest connections. The reigns of Thutmosis III and Amenhotep II thus witnessed early stages in a reconfiguration of some written registers, to which *Astarte* itself is a token.

The register of *Astarte* is essentially identical to documentary registers of its time.[136] In this, the composition differs from all literary composition in the second millennium BCE, including all Late Egyptian literature except *Wenamun*. In the latter text, the linguistic register selected, close to documentary ones,[137] serves to frame this work, which is truly literary, as a report. In *Astarte,* this uniqueness accords with the subject matter and Sitz im Leben of the composition and its also otherwise highly innovative features in terms of 'genre'; it fits into the broader context of other such experiments in the times of Amenhotep II as outlined above. Noteworthy in this context are also the great many loanwords the composition includes: such abundance is untypical for any other Eighteenth Dynasty text of any sort.[138] The phenomenon stands in obvious relation to the foreign influences otherwise manifest in the composition and that are here being integrated into Egyptian ideology.[139] The density of loanwords in *Astarte* further accords with the war-like aspects of the composition,[140] a correlation also otherwise observed:[141] the indexical load of language is obvious here as well.

Inasmuch as its linguistic register correlates with other features that are similarly innovative, *Astarte* may be described as a forerunner of Ramesside modernism to come.[142] The composition also offers a glimpse on an experimentation in written registers in the period leading up to Amarna, paralleled in other texts to do with royal prowess of the times of Amenhotep II. Given its date, and most importantly its highly specific nature, the composition supports no extrapolation on how possible Eighteenth

---

135 To give but one illustration, Amenhotep II's *Karnak Stela* thus has in one sentence *r-ḏd* introducing an object clause after a verb of perception (*Urk.* IV 1312, 7), *r-bl* 'out' (*Urk.* IV 1312, 10), and *pꜣ*'s in much weakened deictic force. Continuous quotation of *Urk.* IV 1312, 7-11 below, n.220.

136 Compare e.g. with Amenhotep II's letter to Usersatet (*Urk.* IV 1343-4); see Collombert & Coulon 2000: 225 and n.187.

137 On the linguistic typology of *Wenamun*, Winand 2011.

138 Collombert & Coulon 2000: 220-1.

139 The subject matter of the composition is derived from Eastern (Canaanite/Hurrian) traditions, however direct or indirect one wishes to model such influence (Schneider 2004; 2003). The composition thereby stands as a token of intensive cultural contacts in the period, among which the promotion of foreign cults under Amenhotep II particularly in the Memphite area (Collombert & Coulon 2000: 217-22). The editors further observe (Collombert & Coulon 2000: 226): 'Le texte illustre d'une manière éclatante la manière dont les apports étrangers sont intégrés à une vision élargie de l'univers égyptien, et comment, *dans ce qu'il nous faut appeler "littérature"* (emphasis AS), la mythologie est mobilisée pour *ancrer dans le temps des dieux une idéologie royale fondée sur le culte du héros guerrier* (emphasis AS). En cela, la mise en évidence du *Sitz im Leben* propre à ce récit invite à reconsidérer une nouvelle fois le statut de cette œuvre, et, plus généralement, celui des "contes mythologiques".'

140 E.g. *tl* 'force' (the earliest instance in any Egyptian text), a word borrowed from Hurrian *adal*, where it occurs for instance in royal names (Schneider 1999b).

141 E.g. Schneider 2008. A famous instance of such association is of course the *Satirical Letter*.

142 Collombert & Coulon 2000: 225. For Ramesside modernism, Baines 1996.

Dynasty literary registers may have been configured in general in the earlier Thutmoside period.[143]

1.3.2.3 *Teaching of Aametju*

The fragmentarily preserved *Teaching of Aametju*[144] is inscribed in the more display-oriented of User's two Theban tombs (TT 131; *temp*. Thutmosis III). The composition is a component of the larger cycle, textual[145] and visual,[146] elaborated for the self-presentation of the Aametju-User-Rekhmire dynasty. Its composition thereby dates to the time of its inscription.

A. Even in its very badly damaged state, the text appears to be composed in a highly formal register of Middle Egyptian, e.g.:

> (i) *Aametju* 43
>
> *ḥȝt$^?$ rȝ sgrḥ=s* [...]
>
> 'The beginning(?) of a speech makes cease [...]'[147]
>
>> Sim. *Aametju* 13 *ẖt nbt dg$^?$=s imt=s* (...) 'Every belly conceals what is in it (...)'.[148]
>> In the *Vizieral Cycle* also e.g. *Appointment* 8 (*Urk.* IV 1381, 2) (§2.6.3.1, (ii)).
>>
>> *N(P) sḏm=f* expressing the unaccomplished unextensive aspect (§1.2, (i); §2.6.3).

> (ii) *Aametju* 20
>
> *šsȝ.ti m mdwt ꜥšȝwt ib n s nb tp ḏbꜥw=f*
>
> 'Be wise in abundant words, for every man's heart is on their fingers.'
>
>> Asyndetic linkage of the second clause to the first; pseudoparticiple used as the non-dynamic counterpart of the imperative.

What little is preserved of *Aametju* also includes various recherché expressions, grammatical or lexical:

> (iii) *Aametju* 24
>
> *n-wnt sp=f ḫft mȝꜥt*
>
> 'He has no action conforming to Maat.'

---

143 A similar word of caution is voiced by Jay (2008: 83, n.11): '(...) any conclusions drawn from the tale must be extremely tentative.'

144 Text: Dziobek 1998: 23-43, pl.2, with the much improved readings by Vernus 2010²b: 59-61, 71-2. Studies: Gnirs 2013b: 138-42; Vernus 2010²b: 59-62; Dziobek 1998: 44-54.

145 The *Vizieral Cycle* also includes *Appointment of the Vizier* (/*Berufung*: Dziobek 1998: 3-21; Helck 1955a), *Installation of the Vizier* (/*Einsetzung*: Faulkner 1955a; Dziobek 1998: 55-66), and *Duties of the Vizier* (van den Boorn 1988; Tallet 2010; 2005; a new publication of the text in TT 29 (Amenemope) is in preparation by the Mission Archéologique de la Nécropole Thébaine). Among these, *Duties* are debated as to their original date of composition: see §2.8.3.5.

146 I thank Dimitri Laboury for discussion of the visual and architectural dimensions of display associated with the *Vizieral Cycle*.

147 Following Vernus 2010²b: 72, n.127-8.

148 Following Vernus 2010²b: 71, n.102.

The negation *n-wnt*[149] goes back to the Old Kingdom, is found in Coffin Texts, in First Intermediate Period inscriptions, and in Letters to the Dead, and recurs in some Second Intermediate Period texts. It is, however, fairly rare in the Middle Kingdom,[150] when it is found only in two literary texts (the monostich maxims on P. Ramesseum II vso I.6 and *Sasobek* B1.30; B2.10; F1.1; F1.2). In the Eighteenth Dynasty, the negation enjoys considerable popularity in higher registers specifically,[151] mainly in inscriptions.[152] It also features twice in the L2 version of *Ptahhotep*, in 212 L2 (this verse is not in P; L1 is not preserved for this section) and in 315 L2 (P and L1 have *nn wn*, as is more common in Middle Kingdom literature). The recherché character of the construction is further demonstrated by occasional instances where it is subjected to linguistic dissimilation with *nn wn*, including once in a text that directly relates the *Vizieral Cycle* itself, Rekhmire 35 (*Urk.* IV 1082, 1-2).[153] Similarly subjected to linguistic dissimilation is an occurrence in Amenhotep II's *Sphinx Stela* 11-12 (*Urk.* IV 1279, 12-14).[154]

(iv) *Aametju* 42 *iptn* 'these'

On the distribution of these archaizing demonstratives in the Middle Egyptian record, §4.6.3.A; also §4.7.1 and §4.3.4.A.

(v) *Aametju* 43

sts[?]*=k ib=sn snf ib=k m nfr-ib* (...)

'You should raise(?) their spirits. It is through pleasure that your heart makes breathe(?) (...)'

Snf is an uncommon expression.[155] More remarkable is *nfr-ib* 'pleasure', which recurs in only one other text, *Amenemhat*[156] (6b and 14f, echoing each other: *wnwt nt nfr-ib* 'an hour of pleasure'; §2.2.2, (ix)). In *Aametju*, the expression *nfr-ib* phonetically resonates with the preceding *snf ib*. The immediate context is full of *ib*'s, by a trope that is common in Middle Egyptian literature (with *ib*'s them-

---

149 Detailed studies by Vernus in prep. (§20-5 in the preprint, focusing on the more specific verbal construction, *n-wnt sḏm=f*); Gunn 2012²: 164-8; additional examples from other corpuses in *TLA* #450141.
150 E.g. *Bersheh* II, pl.XXI, top, 14 (quoted by Borghouts 2010: I, §92c, (ii)).
151 For the verbal construction studied by him (*n-wnt sḏm=f*), Vernus in prep. (heading the section §20-5 in the preprint) writes of an outright 'revival' in higher written registers, since this construction seems to be entirely lacking in any preserved Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period texts. The case of the non-verbal construction here considered (*n-wnt NP*) is different, since this undergoes no discontinuation in use in the Middle Kingdom or Second Intermediate Period; the suddenly fairly common use of the construction in Eighteenth Dynasty higher written registers is no less noteworthy.
152 E.g. *Tempest Stela* ro 7/vso 9 (H*HBT* 106, 7/8); *Urk.* IV 159, 9; 363, 12; 388, 5; 519, 3; 973, 11; 993, 1; 994, 5; 1818, 6. After the Eighteenth Dynasty also in inscriptions by Sethi I (Vernus in prep.: §23).
153 With Gardiner's (1925) collation; noted by Gunn 2012²: 167.
154 Stauder 2013: §5.1, n.88.
155 Noted by Dziobek 1998: 38; on *snf*, further Parkinson 2012a: 250.
156 Noted by Dziobek 1998: 38.

selves, compare *Ptahhotep* 60-83;[157] with a word-play with the root *ibi* 'be thirsty', *Eloquent Peasant* B2 117-119;[158] *Kagemni* 1.5-6).

B. Expression and tropes in *Aametju* are also typical of Middle Egyptian teachings, or literature more broadly:

(vi) *Aametju* 30

ib s nb m mkt hnw=f

'Every man's attention is the protection of their family(?)'

> A generalized statement with *s* 'a man', here quantified, as is common in Middle Egyptian teachings and discourses (similarly in *Aametju* 20: (ii)).

(vii) *Aametju* 19

kkw pw ḫdw tp-rd=s

'The one who disobeys its (*scil*. Maat's) rules is a thing of darkness.'

> Semantically a classifying pattern, expressing a categorization. Compare e.g. *Merikare* E 91 *is ʿȝmw ḫs ḳsn pw n bw nt=f im* 'Behold, the vile Asiatic, he is a painful thing for the place where he is'; *Ptahhotep* 81 P *ḳsn pw ḫdḏw ḥwrw*[159] 'The one who destroys the wretched is a thing of pain.'

(viii) *Aametju* 25

[...] *ḥr grgw=f m3ȝ=f st mi gs3t* [*n*] *ib*

'[...] because of his lies. He sees them like the tilting of the heart.'

> A trope consisting in a paradoxical comparison with an event of 'seeing' or 'finding' in an 'emphatic construction'.[160] Compare e.g. *Merikare* E 55 *m3ȝ=sn ʿḥʿw m wnwt* 'They see lifetime as an hour'; P. Ramesseum II vso II.3 *gmm=f ḫt mitw=f mi ḫpr biȝt* 'He appreciates a thing of his like (i.e. commensurate with him, or with his status) as if a wonder was happening.'

(ix) *Aametju* 29-32

mk tw m mkt snḏ s3w ib [...]
mk tw m [...]
mk tw wrḥ.ti ḥr ḏfȝ [...]
mk tw m imḏr ḫsf ḏwt [...]

'Look, you are a protection of the fearful, one who comforts [...]
Look, you are [...]
Look, you are anointed while nourishing(?) [...]
Look, you are a rampart, one who repels evil [...]'

---

157 Stauder in press c: §5.
158 Parkinson 2012a: 304-5; 2002: 127-8.
159 On the reading *ḥwrw*, rather than *ḥwrw-ib*, Stauder in press c.
160 Vernus 2010²b: 206-7, with these, and more, examples.

A sequence of assimilations expressed by *mk tw*-headed clauses as in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 199-210 ('heralded' by B1 192-193[161]). *ꞽmdr* 'rampart' is noteworthy as well: a very rare word, this recurs perhaps only in P. UC 32157 ro (Senwosret III's *Illahun Hymns*), II.14 (said of the king).[162]

C. *Aametju*, a 'teaching' (*sbꞽyt*, col.1), adopts the classical setting of this type of written discourse, as a set of instructions spoken by an ageing father to his son to whom he is to hand over office. The text includes various intertextual references to the paradigmatic exponent of the 'genre', *Ptahhotep*.[163] *Aametju* displays connections, thematic and in phraseology, also to other Middle Egyptian teachings, notably *Merikare* and *A Man to His Son*.[164] The language and expression of *Aametju* accord with such continuity in format and motifs.

The two contrasting linguistic registers of *Aametju* and of the slightly more recent *Astarte* may be viewed as polar opposites. The former, composed in Middle Egyptian, relates to a type of written discourse with a long written tradition. The latter is highly innovative in its linguistic register, as it is in other relevant aspects, including its cultural setting and 'genre', which does not make reference to a preceding tradition.

1.3.3   The textual loci of innovative expressions

In appreciating the spread of innovations in written registers, the textual loci in which innovative expressions are found in the Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom merit consideration. The distribution is principled.

1.3.3.1   The Second Intermediate Period

A. Second Intermediate Period inscriptional registers occasionally accommodate innovative expressions. Examples from the (mid-)Thirteenth Dynasty[165] include:

---

161 Parkinson 2012a: 163.

162 CT VII 484h (mentioned by Hann*Lex* 5: 274b) is to be read as *ꞽmi-ḏrw*.

163 This includes one case of a quotation adapted from *Ptahhotep* (*Aametju* 23; *Ptahhotep* 265-269: see Hagen 2012a: 194-6; Vernus 2010²b: 61-2; Dziobek 1998: 29-30). The same passage is also quoted in *Installation of the Vizier*, which includes yet another quotation, explicitly marked as such (Hagen 2012a: 189-94; Moers 2001: 127-8, both with references to previous literature; Fischer-Elfert 1994: 45). Interestingly, the L2 version of *Ptahhotep* shows some textual amplification right after 269. In this context, the mention of the 'staff of old age' (*mdw ꞽꜣwt*: *Aametju* 26) is significant as well (e.g. Gnirs 2013b: 137; on the expression more generally, Blumenthal 1987), as is an allusion to the Ptahhotepian motif of old age in *Appointment of the Vizier* 8-11. The figure of Ptahhotep is a prominent reference in the self-presentation of the Aametju-User-Rekhmire dynasty: as an analysis of the strings of vizieral titles held by these viziers demonstrates, these compare tightly with the titles of Ptahhotep in the Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses of the *Teaching* (Hagen 2012a: 223-6).

164 Dziobek 1998: 23-39, 49-52. For *Merikare*, also §2.8.3.7, (d).

165 In an historian's perspective, the early and mid-Thirteenth Dynasty still belong to the late Middle Kingdom, in view of the substantial continuity in institutions and productions of material culture (e.g. Grajetzki 2006). Examples from the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty are included here since they display some linguistic features not present in similar texts from the late Twelfth Dynasty. Moreover, some of these features recur in the Seventeenth Dynasty, justifying a common presentation in this section.

A forerunner to the sequential

(i) Ameniseneb, Louvre C12 (*temp.* Khendjer), 4-5[166]

ꜥḥꜥ.n wḏ rḏt m ḥr=i m ḏd

bꜣk sipty nb nty m pꜣ r-pr

iw=i ḥr irt mi wddt nbt

'It was ordered to command me with these words:
"Carry out the inspection of everything there is in this temple!"
And I begun acting[167] like all that had been ordered.'

> Sim. 5-8 *iw rḏ.n(=i)* (...) *iw=i ḥr ẖrp ib=i* (...) 'I caused (...) And I begun conducting my heart (...)'.

> In Ameniseneb, the sequential is almost seen emerging from the circumstantial function of *iw=f ḥr sḏm* in narrative context. In both instances, a strictly circumstantial interpretation has become impossible (thus: ꜥ[!?]It was ordered to me (...) while I was acting (...)'),[168] yet an interpretation as textual background is still possible (thus: 'It was ordered to me (...); I was (then) acting (...)'). The sequential proper, where no interpretation other than in the main narrative chain is possible, is first documented by Thutmosis III – Amenhotep II (§1.1.2.B, (b)).

Innovative uses of tw

- *Nty tw r sḏm*:

(ii) *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep (early D.13), 5

ir rf nty tw[sic] *nb r gmt=f* (...)

'As regards, however, the one who will be found (...)'

> The first occurrence on stone; the construction is found in documentary texts since the late Twelfth Dynasty (§5.2.4.A).

- *ꜥḥꜥ.n.tw – pseudoparticiple*:

(iii) Ameniseneb, Louvre C11, 16-17

ꜥḥꜥ.n mꜣ nꜣ n kꜣwt

ꜥḥꜥ.n.tw ḥꜥw im wr r ẖt nbt

'These works were inspected
One (*scil.* the king) was much rejoiced about them, more than anything.'

> The first instance of *tw* combined with *ꜥḥꜥ.n* and the only one before the early New Kingdom.[169]

---

166 Noted by Vernus 1990a: 193.

167 The inchoative meaning need not reflect an early stage of development of the construction, since it may be an effect of the atelic Aktionsart of the event (Jean Winand, p.c. 6/2013).

168 Vernus 1990a: 193.

169 This also the first occurrence of *tw* with the pseudoparticiple. The combination would remain rare at all subsequent times, for semantic reasons: the pseudoparticiple, a stative-resultative form,

Turning to texts of the Seventeenth Dynasty, examples of innovative expressions include:

Ỉw.tw r sḏm

(iv) *Stèle Juridique* (Nebirierau, D.17), 21

iw.tw r rḏt ꜥrḳ=sn (...)

'They will be made to swear (...)'

> The first occurrence on stone; the construction is found in documentary texts since the late Twelfth Dynasty: §5.2.4.1.

New subject pronoun

(v) Antefnakht's Stela (later D.17), 3

it=k m nḫt-ꜥ tw=k m nsw (...)

'May you seize as a strong-armed one. You are king (...)'

> Sim. Emhab 11 (quoted below, §3.4.1.4, (iii)); *Kamose Inscriptions*, *passim* (§3.4.1.3, (a)).

> The first occurrence of the new subject pronouns;[170] see §3.4.1.3.

Morphologically overt embedding of the secondary predication (iw=f ḥr sḏm,
rather than older ḥr sḏm) after an expression of 'spending time':

(vi) Emhab 8-9: discussed below, §3.3.1, (iii)

> The second oldest occurrence of the construction.

Analytical setting construction (wnn=f ḥr sdm rather than older mrr=f)

(vii) Emhab 11-12
wnn=f ḥr ẖdb iw=i ḥr sꜥnḫ
'Whenever he kills, I sustain.'

> This is the first occurrence of the construction and has accordingly attracted commentary;[171] so has the motif.[172]

(*Varia in Kamose Inscriptions:* below, §1.3.3.2.)

B. In the same periods, other texts do not include any innovative expressions. In the early Thirteenth Dynasty, Sobekhotep I's *Abydos Stela*, a text dealing with 'religious' or 'ritual' topics, has the bare construction of the first person singular pseudo-

---

strongly privileges topical subjects; *tw*, on the other hand, serves to express non-specified reference. In Ameniseneb, the clause *ꜥḥꜥ.n.tw ḥꜥw* (...) concludes the inspection of works, hence the use of a pseudoparticiple, with, as often, paragraph-conclusive force. The inspection is conducted by the king (10-11 *ḥw-bꜣk*), hence the use of a *tw*-marked construction to keep the royal participant unexpressed; in such 'honorific passive' construction, the unexpressed participant is highly topical.

170 Noted by Vernus 1996c: 834 and n.m; subsequently Morenz 2012b: 203-5.
171 Full references in Klotz 2010: 234, n.203.
172 Klotz 2010: 234-6, 241, n.254; Baines 1987.

participle, which is associated with higher written registers in Middle Egyptian. The text also has some antiquated flavor in the use of *wnt* (for by then regular *ntt*) to introduce an object clause:

> (viii) Sobekhotep I's *Abydos Stela* 8-11
>
> *i.kw ḫr=k* (...) *i.kw ḫr=k* (...)
> *i.ḏd=k*[a] *n ḥr wnt wi ḥꜥ.kw* (...)
>
> 'I have come to you (...) I have come to you (...)
> May you say to Horus that I am excited (...)'
>
> a) This spelling of the subjunctive is untypical of any Eleventh or Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian orthographic standards, but common in the Old Kingdom, particularly in Pyramid Texts. In the later Thirteenth Dynasty, it recurs in Horemkhauef 5. Whether some archaizing intent is involved in these two cases or not remains difficult to assess.

In the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty, Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela* differs from e.g. *Sinuhe* in narrative style and displays connections with other literary compositions such as *Cheops' Court* that have been discussed as exponents of a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian literature, already documented in the late Twelfth Dynasty (§2.4.4.3). As regards language proper, however, the composition is fully in Middle Egyptian, with no innovative features at all. In particular, the old contrast between *N(P) sḏm=f* and *NP ḥr sḏm* as expressions of unextensive and extensive aspect, respectively, is significant (§2.6.3.1, (iv)).[173] Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela* also accommodates the antiquated plural demonstrative *ipn*. As the association of the expressions with the 'companions' (*smrw*) in dialogue with the king implies, this selection is related to the format of the 'Royal Tale', of which the composition is an early exponent (for this association, further §4.3.4.A; §4.6.3.A). In view of other more superficially archaizing elements in the inscription, the selection of *ipn* may additionally be set in relation to the search for old texts, concerned in the inscription itself,[174] and to other archaizing tendencies manifest in the reign of Neferhotep.[175] A token of stylistic elaboration lies in the linguistic dissimilation with other demonstratives used in similar contexts in the same composition[176] (for dissimilation of demonstratives, further §2.4.4.2.1; §4.6.3.B):

> (ix) Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela*:
>
> 12   *ḏd.in smrw ipn* (...)
> 6, 14   *ḏd.in nn n smrw* (...)
>
> 'These companions said (...)'

From the (mid?-)Seventeenth Dynasty,[177] Rahotep's *Coptos Stela* is another early exponent of the 'Royal Tale'.[178] Although much shorter than Neferhotep's *Great*

---

173 Similarly in Sobekhotep IV's *Karnak Stela* 5 (§2.6.3.1, (i)).
174 Stauder 2013: §10.2 and n.312-5.
175 Laboury 2013.
176 Vernus 1996b: 164.
177 The position of Rahotep in the Seventeenth Dynasty is disputed: see Bennett 2002, with references to the previous discussion.

Abydos Stela and incompletely preserved, the text appears to be similarly written in a Middle Egyptian variety with no innovative features. As a token of the high linguistic register of the inscription, note for instance the use of discourse-connective *is* (§1.2, (ix)):

> (x) Rahotep's *Coptos Stela* 3-4
>
> *w[ḏ]t kȝ=k ḫprt=sn ity nb=n*
> *ḥw is pw nty m rȝ=k*
> *siȝ [is p]w n[ty m ib=k]*
>
> 'What you Ka orders is what will happen, sovereign our lord,
>   for the one in your mouth is Hu,
>   for the one in your heart is Sia.'

Yet another token of the high standards of written Middle Egyptian cultivated in the Second Intermediate Period is Wadi el-Hôl #8,[179] from the initial stages of the Theban Seventeenth Dynasty.[180] Although the text is short and damaged, its language seems to include no innovative expressions. From its incipt ([ḥȝ]ti-ꜥ [m ...]t.n (...)) to its closing (*rš=f pw* (...)[181]), the inscription is replete with literary echoes and motifs, and displays strong literarizing features.[182]

C. Registers that accommodate innovative expressions such as discussed first (above, A) are to be appreciated in the context of a period that also saw the production of texts accommodating no innovative expressions and composed in a high register of Middle Egyptian (B).

Among texts with innovative expressions, a first group includes the *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep (ii) and *Stèle Juridique* (iv): the innovative expressions discussed in these texts are first documented in late Twelfth Dynasty documentary registers (A, with cross-references). The same texts make a broad use of *pȝ*'s and *pȝy=f* possessives,[183] which are equally widespread in the same late Twelfth Dynasty documentary texts. This is significant in terms of register, given the indexical load of *pȝ*'s (§2.4.4.2.1): while published on stone, *Abydos Boundary Stela* and *Stèle Juridique* thus relate to a documentary register, which in its configuration reaches back to the late Twelfth Dynasty (and in part beyond). Significant of such register is also the use of the precursor construction of the conjunctive, *ḥnꜥ sḏm*. The construction, which is first documented in an Eighth Dynasty royal decree, is in common use in Twelfth Dynasty documentary registers and letters and recurs in similar registers in the Thirteenth Dynasty (mainly P. Brooklyn 34.1446[184] and P. Berlin 10470[185]). In

---

178 E.g. Hofmann 2004: 100-4.
179 Darnell 2002: 107-19.
180 Darnell (2002: 118-9) suggests a dating to Antef V.
181 Possibly in echo to *Sinuhe* B 60-61; see Darnell 2002: 114, n.hh.
182 Analyzed in details by the editor in his textual notes and commentary; more general comments, Darnell 2002: 115.
183 E.g. *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep 3; *Stèle Juridique* 5. As to be expected, the expressions still carry deictic force by the time, e.g. *Abydos Boundary Stela* 3 *pȝ tȝ-ḏsr* 'this sacred land' (*scil.* the land which the very boundary stela is to delimit).
184 Two royal decrees, perhaps from the reign of Khendjer (H*HBT* 11-2): I.11; II.6; *passim*.

inscriptionally published documentary texts of the Second Intermediate Period, it is found for instance in Sobekemsaf's *Medamud Endowment Inscription* 6 and in Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree* 10 (negative construction) and 11 (positive construction). As expected, the same texts also accommodate the indexically loaded *p3*'s and related preposed possessives.[186] According with such register, Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree* further has two early instances of *tm + infinitive* (6 *tm sḫ3t*; 10 *tm rḏt*).

Two other innovative expressions discussed above—a forerunner construction of the sequential and an innovative construction of *tw*—are from the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty inscriptions of Ameniseneb (Louvre C11 and C12: (i) and (iii)), one of the few private inscriptions of the period to go beyond phraseologically bound formulations. Significantly, the Ameniseneb texts accommodate *p3*'s and related preposed possessives.[187] Their register is also marked by its decidedly simple narrative style. The texts consist mostly in main clauses, which in Louvre C11 are almost invariably based on a *ʿḥʿ.n*-construction in direct sequence to each other. A similar type of patterning is found in the late Twelfth Dynasty Semna Dispatches,[188] in a contemporaneous biography that recounts military activity, Khusobek, and in literary texts associated with what has been described as a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian literature (§2.4.4.3, (i)). The patterning in Ameniseneb is extreme in its simplicity.

Innovative expressions are found in yet another group of texts, clustering at the very end of the Second Intermediate Period: *Kamose Inscriptions*, Emhab, and Antefnakht. Beyond linguistic register and time, these are also allied by subject matter and therefore warrant a joint discussion (the next section).

1.3.3.2 *Kamose Inscriptions*, Emhab, Antefnakht

The discussion is best begun with the longest, and stylistically most elaborate, of these texts, *Kamose Inscriptions*. While it is commonplace to observe that these are replete with innovative expressions, their register turns out to be complex.

A. *Kamose Inscriptions*[189] accommodate many innovative expressions, more than any other text in the preceding centuries, and more than any other non-documentary text in the following centuries until at least Amarna, if not later (with the singular exception of *Astarte*: §1.3.2.2). A selection includes:

---

185 A legal document (Smither 1948; H*HBT* 50-4); *passim*.

186 Sobekemsaf's *Medamud Endowment Inscription* 4-5 and *passim*; Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree* 4-5 and *passim*.

187 As always in the Second Intermediate Period, these are still deictic, e.g. Louvre C12, 3 *ir i3wy=k nfr m t3 ḥwt-ntr nt p3y=k ntr* 'Do your good old age in this temple of this god of yours' (inscribed on a stela relating Ameniseneb's works for this very god in this very temple).

188 E.g. Semna Dispatches (Smither 1945) 2, x+13-14 *ʿḥʿ.n wšd.n=i n3 n md3yw r ḏd i.n.tn tnw ʿḥʿ.n ḏd.n=sn i.n=n ḥr ḫnmt i[b]hyt* 'And then I addressed these Nubians thus: "Where have you come from?" And then they said: "We have come through the well of Ibhat." '

189 Text: H*HBT* 82-98.

Broad use of the new subject pronouns tw=i, etc.

Passim. The occurrences in *Kamose Inscriptions* are among the earliest. Early occurrences, including for two centuries after *Kamose Inscriptions*, are mostly from lower written registers (compare the tableau of early attestation below, §3.4.1.3).

Past tense sḏm=f

Passim (one example quoted below: §1.3.3.2, (xiv)). The occurrences in *Kamose Inscriptions* are the first.[190]

Balanced construction k3 (...) k3 (...)

(i) *Kamose Inscriptions* T. Carn. 7

sw ḥr t3 [n] ꜥ3mw tw=n ḥ[r] kmt
k3 iy nt[y] ḥr [irt r=n] k[3] ir=n r=f

'He holds the land of the Asiatics, we hold Egypt.
As the one acting against us may come, we will act against him.'

This seems to be the first occurrence in any text preserved.

Exclamative ḫy

(ii) *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 30-31

ḫy p3 ḫnt nfr n p3 ḥḳ3 ꜥ.w.s. ḥr mšꜥ=f r-ḥ3t=f

'What a beautiful sailing upstream of this ruler L.P.H. with his army before him!'

What is probably the same particle is documented once, used interrogatively, in a much earlier text, significantly a letter (Heqanakht I vso 4; 15). Further early occurrences of *ḫy* in interrogative use are from the Eighteenth Dynasty, again in epistolary contexts.[191] Related to these are exclamatory uses such as the one in *Kamose Inscriptions*.[192] These would become common in the New Kingdom, in texts relating to royal ideology and 'personal piety'.[193] The instance in *Kamose Inscriptions* is the first.

Ḥmsi evolving toward an auxiliary (?)

(iii) *Kamose Inscriptions* T. Carn. 3

(...) *ḥms.kw sm3.kw m ꜥ3my*[sic] *nḥsy*

'(...) me finding myself (lit. sitting) associated with an Asiatic and a Nubian.'

Ḥmsi used as an auxiliary is not uncommon in Late Egyptian.[194] In (iii), the semantics of *ḥmsi* as a full lexical verb still shimmer through, contributing nega-

---

190 Provisionally Kruchten 1999: 8-14, 19-20.
191 Vernus 2006: 156, ex.50-2.
192 That the two uses are tightly related to each other is convincingly argued by Vernus 2006: 156-7, who also quotes the instance in *Kamose Inscriptions* (156, n.84).
193 Vernus 2006: 156, n.84, with further references.
194 Winand 2006: 329-33.

tive overtones of idleness,[195] a topic central in Kamose's debate with the court. An alternative rendering, equally possible, would be as '(...) me sitting (idle) associated with (...)'.

Lexicon, military, e.g.:

(iv) St.II 13 *ꜥ-nt-ḥtr* 'chariotry(?)' (the first occurrence);

(v) St.II 34 'sickle-shaped sword' (the first occurrence: §5.5.1.1).

Lexicon, other, e.g.:

(vi) T. Carn. 4 and *passim*: *šꜥ-r* 'until' (only one earlier securely dated occurrence, in P. Bulaq 18 (D.13): §2.7.3.3, (i)).

Very significant is also the presence of the 'exploratory Future III',[196] a construction consisting in the use of the new subject pronoun in the *NP r sḏm* pattern. Not only are the two *Kamose Inscriptions* occurrences the first. What is more, the expression would rapidly disappear in those written standards that make up the preserved written record of Egyptian, being superseded in these by the regular, *iw*-introduced, Late Egyptian 'Future III' (documented by Thutmosis III: §1.1.2.B, (c)). The 'exploratory Future III' is therefore a construction that did not catch on in written standards as these begun being redefined in the early Eighteenth Dynasty. It offers a rare glimpse on other, non-standard, varieties of Egyptian that existed simultaneously:

(vii) *Kamose Inscriptions* T. Carn. 4

tw=i r ṯḥn ḥnꜥ=f sd=i ẖt=f

'I am going to engage in battle with him and I will break his body.'

Sim. St.I 10 *t[w]=i [r] ẖd* (...) 'I am going to sail downstream (...)'.

B. These innovative features in *Kamose Inscriptions* cluster in dialogal exchange (between Kamose and the courtiers, then in Kamose's direct speech to Apopi, and in Apopi's letter to the Nubian ruler). Beyond linguistic register, dialogal exchange is more broadly characterized as such in *Kamose Inscriptions* by other devices, evoking a more 'spontaneous' performance of grammar, or 'oral' style. Among these, instances of cataphoric anticipation of pronouns in questions are diagnostic, be the cataphoric pronoun the object of the interrogation (viii), or not (ix):

(viii) *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 20 (Apopi speaking)

ḥr m ꜥḥꜥ=k m ḥḳꜣ nn rḏt rḫ=i

'You stand up as a ruler on what account, without letting me know?'

The more formal phrasing would have been with the interrogative *in situ*, e.g. *Cheops' Court* 5.20-21 *tm=t ẖn [ḥr m]* 'Why don't you row?' (note that *Cheops' Court* itself also has the alternative construction as in *Kamose Inscriptions*: §2.4.4.7, (i)). The construction in *Kamose Inscriptions* compares with e.g.

---

195 For *ḥmsi* associated with idleness, e.g. *Amenemhat* 11d (with positive overtones).
196 Or 'Frühneuägyptisches Futur' in Kroeber's (1970: 93-7) terms.

P. Louvre 3230B (Tay to Ahmes Peniati; *temp.* Hatshepsut), 2 *ḥr m pȝ nḥm tȝ bȝkt wnt ḥnꜥ=i rḏ.ti n ky* 'Why this taking away of the servant that was with me so that she will be given to someone else?'[197]

(ix) *Kamose Inscriptions* T. Carn. 3 (Kamose speaking)

siȝ=i sw r iḫ pȝy=i nḫt (...)

'On what shall I recognize it, this victory of mine (...)?'

> Cataphoric *sw*, with the full lexical expression of the object phrase right-dislocated (instead of more formal, and less easily processed, **siȝ=i pȝy=i nḫt r iḫ*). In another context that purports to present speech as if spontaneous, also in a war council, compare *Urk.* IV 649, 15-17 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*) *sw mi iḫ šmt ḥr mtn pn nty wȝ r ḥns iw.tw ḥr smit r-ḏd* (...) 'How will it be, walking on this path which has now become narrow, when it is reported that (...)?'

Such strategies aim at a characterization, yet the result, which is stylized, does not come anywhere close to whatever actual '*sermo quotidianus*' may have been: the evoked 'dialogal register' is itself a construct. The accommodation of innovative features is selective: presentative/phatic *mk*, for instance, is used consistently (T. Carn. 4; *passim*), even though *ptr* had long been innovated in similar usage, and had found acceptance in some literary registers (§2.4.3.1, (i)). Moreover, tokens of 'spontaneous performance' are not exclusive of a high degree of formal elaboration and matching syntactic complexity. The following broader segment of speech, for example, includes the cataphoric construction just described (ix) and one of the innovative expressions noted above (*ḥmsi* evolving to uses as an auxiliary: (iii)), yet is semantically balanced on various levels. Its syntax is highly complex as well: *ḥms.kw smȝ.kw*, asyndetically embedded,[198] has its antecedent not in the previous clause (*wr m* ...), but in the clause before (*siȝ=i sw* ...). Pronominal cohesion thereby bridges over an intervening clause; the construction is as difficult to process (long-distance dependency) as it is rare in the Egyptian written record:[199]

---

197 Noted by Vernus 2006: 169-70, ex.113, who draws the parallel with *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 20 (169, ex.112).

198 Morphologically overt embedding is also found in *Kamose Inscriptions*, e.g., also with a pseudo-participle, St.II 3 *sḏm.t(w) hmhmt nt pȝy=i mšꜥ tw=i mni.kw r pr-ḏd-ḳn ib=i ȝw* 'One will hear the war-cry of this army of mine, when I am moored at Per-Djed-Qen, my heart dilated.' The contrast may be one of register, but it need not: in St.II 3, *iw* may also have some contrastive or assertoric force.

199 A rare parallel that comes to mind is from Weni, a text of highest linguistic and stylistic elaboration: 44-45 (*Urk.* I 108, 3-9): (...) *wsḫt* (...) *sp.t(i)* (...) *st n wn* (...) *mni r* (...) '(...) a barge (...), assembled (...), and, although there was no (...), moored to (...)'. *Sp.t(i)* and *mni r* are here dependent on *wsḫt*, the sequence of the two interrupted by an intervening background clause, *st n wn* (...).

(x) *Kamose Inscriptions* T. Carn. 3

si҆ꜣ=i sw r iḫ pꜣy=i nḫt
    wr m ḥwt-wꜥrt ky m kši
ḥms.kw smꜣ.kw m ꜥꜣmy nḥsy
    s nb ḫr fdḳ=f m tꜣ kmt <ḥr> psš tꜣ ḥnꜥ=i

'On what shall I recognize it, this victory of mine,
    when there is a chief in Avaris, another one in Kush,
me finding myself (lit. me sitting (idle)) associated with an Asiatic and a Nubian
    and everyone having their share of this Egypt, dividing the land with me?'

C. Just as for the great many innovative expressions they accommodate, *Kamose Inscriptions* are remarkable for their high level of Middle Egyptian, of which the following may serve as an illustration.

The first example (xi), from Kamose's account of early military activities, includes various instances of asyndetic dependency (*mšꜥ=i* (...), *pḏwt* (...); *iꜣbtt* (...), *mšꜥ* (...)). Long-distance inter-clausal integration is signaled by the lack of *iw* in the first clause (*ḫd.n=i* (...)).[200] Rather remarkably, this main verbal event (*ḫd.n=i*) is gapped before the second set of *r + infinitive* (*r ḫḫy* (...); *r dr* (...)):

(xi) *Kamose Inscriptions* T. Carn. 10-12

ḫd.n=i n nḫt=i   r sꜣsꜣ ꜥꜣmw m wḏ imn mty sḫrw
    mšꜥ=i ḳn r-ḫꜣt=i mi hhy n sḏt
    pḏwt nt mḏꜣyw (m) ḥrt tꜣrt=n
—   *r ḫḫy sttyw r dr swt=sn*
    iꜣbtt imntt ḥr ꜥd iry
    mšꜥ ḥr ḏfꜣw m ḥwt m st nbt
sb.n=i (...)

'I fared downstream owing to my strength to drive back the Asiatics, as a decreed mission of Amun of right designs,
    my brave army in front of me like the fiery breath of a flame,
    the *Medjai*-troops on top of our encampments;
—   to seek out the *Setetiu*-Asiatics, to subdue their places,
    east and west carrying their fat,
    the army feeding on things in every place.
I sent out (...)'

Kamose's pièce de bravoure (xii) is based on parallelism, with amplification in the second round (*wbd=i* (...)) and ultimate closure (1sg, 1sg, 1sg → 3pl *btꜣ.n=sn*):

subjunctive (*wꜣḥ=i*)	–	anterior (*ḫbꜣ.n=i*)
subjunctive (*wbd=i*)	–	(...) anterior (*btꜣ.n=sn*)

---

200 In an elementary form, a similar sequence is in the Eleventh Dynasty *Deir el-Ballas Inscription* x+9. This probably formed a basic elements of such texts. Contrastively, this highlights the extraordinary elaboration given to the same element in *Kamose Inscriptions*.

The patterning, which highlights *ḫb3.n=i* and *bt3.n=sn*, is expressive of a major point made by Kamose, his pledge to destroy the enemy's towns in reciprocity for their betrayal of Egypt, 'their mistress':

(xii) *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 17-19

w3ḥ=i st m wš{3} nn rmṯ im
    ḫb3.n=i niwwt=sn

wbd=i swt=sn ir m i3wt ḏsrwt n ḏt
        ḥr p3 ḥḏt ir=sn m-ẖnw t3 kmt ḏw st ḥr sḏm i3ˤš n ˤ3mw
            bt3.n=sn kmt ḥnwt=sn

'I shall lay them void, nobody in them
    when I have laid their towns waste;

I shall burn their places so that they will be turned into red mounds forever,
        because of this destruction they do within this Egypt, those who have
        placed themselves in the service of the Asiatics,
            when they have transgressed Egypt, their mistress.'

D. The extracts quoted are illustrative of entire sections of *Kamose Inscriptions* composed in Middle Egyptian. Significantly, such elevated linguistic and stylistic register can on occasions itself accommodate innovative expressions: the linguistic selections of *Kamose Inscriptions* are inclusive.

In the following passage (xiii), the second clause begins with a new subject pronoun, a saliently innovative expression by Kamose's times. The first clause, with which the second clause forms a higher-order unit, has a pseudoparticiple used in setting function (*spr.kw*), a construction that relates to the highest registers of Middle Egyptian (§1.2, (iii)-(v)). The two constructions, which belong to altogether different layers of language, are here naturally accommodated to each other:

(xiii) *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 4-5

spr.kw r inyt-nt-ẖnt
tw=i ḏ3.kw n=sn r wšd st

'Having reached Inyt-net-khenet,
I crossed over to them to address them.'

The closing sequence of final return (xiv) is introduced, saliently so, by *hy*, an expression associated with registers otherwise documented in letters (§1.3.3.2, (ii)). The main event in the narrative chain (*mnmn=i*) is a past tense *sḏm=f*, yet another innovative expression, first documented in *Kamose Inscriptions* themselves. The following string of clauses, which provides descriptive information (compare the non-dynamic constructions), is introduced by *iw*. The exact same macro-syntactic articulation is found in the opening of *Sinuhe*, where the five clauses on the court's mourning (R 8-11) are similarly related to the preceding paragraph (Amenemhat's apotheosis: R 5-8).[201] The whole section is reminiscent of earlier expedition accounts, for instance,

---

[201] I disagree with Kruchten 1999: 59, who here views *iw* as circumstantial in function: if so, a similar analysis should extend to the opening of *Sinuhe* as well. Further above, n.32.

in a literalized form, the opening of *Shipwrecked Sailor*.[202] While *Shipwrecked Sailor* 2-6 has a progressive construction (*s nb ḥr ḥpt* (...)), *Kamose Inscriptions* have *N(P) sḏm=f* (discussed below, §2.6.3.1.C): both constructions are consistent with literary registers of Middle Egyptian, but the one in *Kamose Inscriptions* of a yet higher level:

> (xiv) *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 30-33
>
> *ḫy pꜣ ḫnt nfr* (...)
>
> *mnmn=i r sꜣtw niwt tr ꜣḫt*
>
> *iw ḥr nb ḥḏ tꜣ m rsf mryt ꜥbꜥb.ti wꜣst m ḥb ḥmwt ṯꜣw iw r mꜣn=i*
> *st nbt ḥpt=s 2-nw=s nn ḥr ḫr rmyt*
>
> 'What a beautiful sailing upstream (...)!
>
> I moved to the ground of the Town at Inundation season.
>
> Every face was illuminated, the land in exuberance, the shore excited, Thebes in celebration, women and men had come to see me,
> every woman hugged her fellow, no face shedding a tear.'

E. The linguistic register of *Kamose Inscriptions* is composed: the linguistic spectrum of *Kamose Inscriptions* is broad, ranging from numerous innovative expressions, some of which here documented for the first time, to whole sequences in a rich and complex Middle Egyptian. Linguistic contrasts are established between different parts of the text, yet linguistic inclusiveness is also within individual sentences, in dialogal and non-dialogal parts alike. The contrasts in linguistic selections are mirrored on the level of rhythm. Sections accommodating innovative expressions in some density typically also have a more direct rhythm, while sections composed in interference-free Middle Egyptian display long and complexly articulated periods. The former sections involve various participants with whom the king interacts, while the latter consist in pledges and narratives uttered by the king to a broader, text-external, and in part prospective audience. The sense of immediacy and urgency conveyed in the former sections is contrastively set against, and thereby highlights, the high diction, and august self-confidence expressed in royal speeches. Stylistically, linguistic selections and rhythm combine in supporting a major component of the projected meaning of the text.

Innovative expressions cluster in what may be termed a 'dialogal register', which is entirely artificial, a construct. They also relate to what may be termed a 'war register': while resonating with Middle Egyptian literature, *Kamose Inscriptions* are simultaneously highly innovative in format and subject matter, with little direct antecedents in Middle Egyptian written culture. Significantly, the contemporaneous biographical inscription of Emhab, in reference to the same events, is also distinguished by the great many linguistically innovative selections it makes:

---

202 In addition, a modern reader may feel tempted to relate the description of the gathering of Thebes' people to welcome Kamose ((...) *ḥmwt ṯꜣw iw r mꜣn=i*) to the description of the gathering of Retjenu to support Sinuhe before his fight with the strongman of Retjenu (B 131-133). Whether an actual allusion is intended remains uncertain, however.

(xv) *Innovative expressions in Emhab*

- l.8-9: secondary predication with overt morphological marking after an expression of 'spending time' (§3.3.1, (iii));

- l.11: new subject pronoun (§3.4.1.3, (a); §3.4.1.4, (iii));

- l.11-12: analytical setting construction (§1.3.3.1, (vii)).

The very earliest documented occurrence of the new subject pronoun is itself from a text that strongly emphasizes similar aspects, Antefnakht's Stela (§1.3.3.1, (v)).[203] The selection of innovative expressions in *Kamose Inscriptions* and in contemporaneous texts that relate to a similar 'war register' indexes such novelty in a self-conscious, and in the given historical context self-asserting, manner.

1.3.3.3   The early Eighteenth Dynasty

A. As emerges from a listing presented above (§1.1.2.B), innovative expressions cluster in two types of texts in the early Eighteenth Dynasty: documentary ones (letters and legal texts,[204] including monumentalized publications thereof[205]) and 'Reden und Rufe'.[206] The inclusion of innovative expressions in documentary registers was already observed in the Second Intermediate Period and reaches back to the Twelfth Dynasty (§1.3.3.1.A; C). Literary registers differ substantially from documentary ones in all periods throughout the second millennium BCE (§1.3.1), the single exception being *Astarte* (§1.3.3.2 and below, C). Documentary registers are therefore irrelevant for modeling the configurations of linguistic registers of literature possibly composed after the Middle Kingdom.

'Reden und Rufe' are not tokens of whatever 'spoken language' may have been[207] (nor is, in fact, any other segment of written text in the second millennium[208]). Yet they purport to evoke such spoken language, if in a conventionalized and highly stylized form.[209] Their linguistic selections, including a great many expressions meant to be felt precisely for their innovative quality, are highly indexical. The language of

---

203 Compare the analysis of the text in Vernus 1996c.

204 Compare the corpuses in the classical studies by Kroeber 1970 and Kruchten 1999.

205 Examples include Ahmes-Nefertari's *Donation Stela* (H*HBT* 100-3) or Senimose's Will (*Urk.* IV 1065-70; *temp.* Thutmosis III). Noteworthy is also Amenhotep II's letter to Usersatet, inscriptionally published (*Urk.* IV 1343-4; Helck 1955b; on the closing part, also Morschauser 1997), and notorious for its linguistic register similar to contemporaneous letters.

206 E.g. *Paheri* (Tylor & Griffith 1894), *Rekhmire* (Davies 1943: pl.39), Sennefer (*Urk.* IV 1419-20). See Guglielmi 1973 and compare the indices in Kroeber 1970.

207 E.g., discussing the distribution of *m-ir sḏm* and *m sḏm* as expressions of the negative imperative, Vernus 2010a.

208 For later times, Winand (in press c) for example demonstrates that 'word of thieves' in the Tomb Robbery Papyri are heavily edited to fit a set format. What individual thieves may have said, probably under torture, was not committed to writing.

209 Vernus 2010c. An eloquent example of the fabricated nature of the language of 'Reden und Rufe' is given by Oréal (2011: 424-5): 'Ces deux occurrences (*scil.* from Deir el-Bahari, AS) illustrent le fait que les scènes du quotidien représentées dans les tombes ou les temples du Nouvel Empire *s'inscrivent dans une tradition* (emphasis AS) qui inclut la reconstitution d'une langue orale plus proche de celle qu'ont pu employer les bouchers de l'Ancien Empire que les contemporains, comme le montre l'absence de *swt* dans les textes de la pratique.'

'Reden und Rufe' is therefore similarly irrelevant for modeling possible linguistic registers of literature.

B. In the times of Thutmosis III and Amenhotep II, innovative expressions are also found in some inscriptionally published texts and in one text that has literary features, *Astarte* (also Amenhotep II). Beginning with the former, innovative expressions are mainly in Thutmosis III's *Annals* and Amenhotep II's *Syrian Campaigns*. In *Annals*, they cluster in the military council before the Megiddo battle,[210] contributing to characterize dialogal exchanges *as if* spontaneous.[211] In narrative parts, innovative expressions for instance include sequential *iw=f ḥr sḏm*,[212] first documented in these very same reigns in documentary registers.[213]

The sequential recurs in Amenemhab's biographical inscription.[214] This significantly refers to military events under Amenhotep II in which the official played a distinguished role, foregrounded in the inscription. The sequential occurs in the episode of the mare,[215] which is thereby linguistically emphasized:[216] set against the general linguistic inclusiveness of the text,[217] the selection of such innovative expression serves to index a specific register developing at the same time in royal military narratives.[218] Linguistic selections thereby provide a correlate to the projected meaning of the text, a self-presentation of the tomb owner as Amenhotep II's intimate follower in his campaigns. In Amenemhab's own words: '(...) for he (*scil*. A.II) desired me to be the companion of his feet' (*mr=f iw=i m iry rdwy=f, Urk*. IV 890, 11—in a phrasing which itself includes a highly innovative expression, *iw* introducing an object clause after *mri*[219]).

A similar constellation was observed on the eve of the New Kingdom, in *Kamose Inscriptions*, Emhab, and Antefnakht (§1.3.3.2.E). In comparison to *Kamose*

---

210 Within a few clauses of each other, a selection includes the new subject pronoun *sw* (*Urk*. IV 649, 7; 649, 15); interrogative *is-bn* (*Urk*. IV 650, 3); combined *r-ḏd r-n*[*tt*] introducing direct discourse (*Urk*. IV 649, 4-5). A use of circumstantial *iw* with a clause with full noun subject is perhaps the following, although some contrastive force is probably still involved: *Urk*. IV 650, 5-7 *in-iw wnn* [*t*]*ȝ ḥȝ*[*t*] *n=n-imy ḥr ʿḥȝ iw n3 n* [*pḥwy*] *ʿḥ ʿȝ m ʿȝ-rw-n3 n ʿḥʿ.n=sn* 'Shall our vanguard be fighting while the rearguard is waiting here in Aruna, unable to fight?'

211 E.g. the cataphoric construction in *Urk*. IV 649, 15-17 *sw mi iḫ šm*[*t ḥr m*]*tn pn* (...)' 'How will it be, walking on this path (...)?' (§1.3.3.2, (ix)).

212 In Thutmosis III's *Annals, Urk*. IV 658, 1-2; 658, 10; *passim*. In Amenhotep II's *Syrian Campaigns* (Memphis Stela), *Urk*. IV 1302, 9; 1304, 2; 1304, 5; 1304, 6; 1307, 11-12; 1308, 5.

213 Senimose's Will 5-9 (*temp*. Thutmosis III); P. Berlin 10463 ro 1-2 (*temp*. Amenhotep II).

214 *Urk*. IV 889-97. Tomb TT 85, including its biographical inscription, is currently under preparation for publication by Heike Heye; as the author tells me (p.c. 11/2011), changes with respect to the text as in *Urk*. IV are very minor. A study of the inscription is announced by Baines.

215 *Urk*. IV 894, 5-10 *ʿḥʿ.n rd.n p3 wr n kdšw pr wʿt ssmt iw*[*=s ḫȝḫ.ti*] *ḥr rdwy=s iw=s ḥr ʿk m-ḫnw p3 mšʿ iw=i ḥr sḫsḫ m-s3=s ḥr rdwy ḥr p3y=i mšw iw=i ḥr wn ḫt=s* 'The chief of Qadesh then made a mare go out which was swift on its feet; it penetrated into the army and I run after it on my feet with my dagger and I opened her belly.' In this extract, also note the preposed possessive in the phrase *p3y=i mšw*, with little deictic force.

216 Discussion in Stauder 2013: §7.3.

217 The overall linguistic typology of Amenemhab's biographical inscription is rich, as are its references, which may include *Sinuhe*: Stauder 2013: §7.3.

218 Significant of such communication with contemporaneous royal inscriptions is further the use of the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive: Stauder 2013: §7.3.

219 Polis 2009: 223, ex.42.

Inscriptions, the register in military narratives of Thutmosis III and Amenhotep II is both less innovative and much simpler. Innovative expressions in Amenhotep II's inscriptions are accommodated into a broader Middle Egyptian background.[220] In a different historical context, the extremely innovative selections in *Kamose Inscriptions* (and, similarly, in Emhab) express a self-asserting claim to novelty, stronger than in military narratives of the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty. *Kamose Inscriptions* are also thoroughly complex in their language, including strong references to the highest written standards of Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian: just as the texts themselves, their linguistic register is composed. In this respect, *Kamose Inscriptions* have a literarizing quality,[221] which is also demonstrated, if secondarily, in their circulation (compare T. Carnarvon I, on which the first stela of *Kamose Inscriptions* was transmitted alongside *Ptahhotep*).[222]

Inscriptions recounting military activity are also preserved from the earlier Eighteenth Dynasty (thus Thutmosis I's *Tombos Inscription* and Thutmosis II's *Aswan Inscription*). These, and particularly the latter, are composed in the highest Middle Egyptian standards.[223] Linguistic register accords with the general format adopted in, and significations expressed by, these texts, which also have antecedents in earlier texts to do with royal ideology. In this respect, *Tombos Inscription* and *Aswan Inscription* compare with *Speos Artemidos* or with Senwosret III's *Semna Stela*, not with Thutmosis III's *Annals* and Amenhotep II's *Syrian Campaigns*, even less with *Kamose Inscriptions*.

---

220 With Vernus 1990a: 192, note for instance that the Karnak version of Amenhotep II's *Syrian Campaigns* has ʿḥʿ.n sḏm.n=f (*Urk.* IV 1311, 4) where the Memphis version has sequential *iw=f ḥr sḏm* (*Urk.* IV 1302, 9), as two different expressions of a similar functional category (next stage in the main narrative chain). Linguistic inclusiveness extends further in these texts, to expressions that had by then some antiquated flavor. E.g., also in Amenhotep's *Syrian Campaings* (Karnak Stela) 11-12 (*Urk.* IV 1312, 7-11) *ist sḏm.n ḥm=f r-ḏd nhy* [*m*] *nȝ n stiw nty m dmi n jkt ḥr ngmgm r irt sḥr n ḫȝʿ tȝ iwʿyt n ḥm=f* [*r-b*]*l m pȝ dmi r pnʿ ḥr pȝ* [*wr n ikt*] *nty ḥr mw n ḥm=f* 'His Majesty had heard that some of these Asiatics who were in the town of Ikutj were in upheaval to make a plan of throwing His Majesty's garrison out of the city and to overturn the Chief of Ikutj who was loyal to His Majesty.' Alongside innovative expressions (*r-ḏd* introducing an object clause; *r-bl* 'out (of)'; also the broad use of *pȝ* as an index of register), the passage has *ngmgm*, based on a by then obsolescent derivational pattern, *n-ABAB* (Vernus 2009a: 308-9; I thank Pascal Vernus, p.c. 11/2009, for further discussion of this passage).

221 Literarizing tendencies are manifest in similes, e.g. St.II 7-8 (...) *mi wnn ḏ*[*p*]*yw ḥr ḥtt ḥr ḏʿt ḥwt-wʿrt* '(...) as if a carrion bird were plucking over the *djat*'s (*scil.* a type of land) of Avaris.' The composition may also include elements reminiscent of Twelfth Dynasty narrative literature, thus, possibly echoing the narrative of Sinuhe's flight, T. Carn. 13-14 *sḫȝ.n=i m dpt=i ib=i nfr ḥḏ.n tȝ iw=i ḥr=f mi wn bik ḫpr.n nw n sty-rȝ sȝsȝ=i sw ḫbȝ.n=i sbty=f smȝ=i rmt=f ḏ=i hȝ ḥmt=f r mryt* (...) 'I spent the night in my boat, with a happy heart. When it was dawn, I was on him like a falcon is. When the time of lunch came, I repelled him. I destroyed his walls, killed his men, had his wife go down to the quay (...)'. Similarly, the successful return (St.II 32-33: §1.3.3.2, (xiv); §2.6.3.1.C) is phrased in terms reminiscent of Middle Kingdom expedition narratives and may echo the beginning of *Shipwrecked Sailor*. On echoes of *Sinuhe* in other Seventeenth Dynasty inscriptions, further Darnell 2002: 115, n.47; Vernus 1989: 150-1, n.k and u.

222 On T. Carnarvon I, now Hagen 2012a: 174-9; on the phenomenon of a secondary literary reception of royal inscriptional compositions, also otherwise documented, Vernus 2011.

223 See §1.2.C, *fine*; further §4.5.2, (iii); §6.1.3.1, (ii).

C. In all these cases, the selection of linguistic register is thoroughly indexical. In an extended sense of the concept, compositions that accommodate innovative expressions in higher numbers may be described as precursors of 'Ramesside modernism' to come.[224] Their linguistic selections express a deliberate intent to move away from previous tradition, or, equivalently, a self-conscious assertion of their broader novelty.

Astarte fits into the same picture. The composition has experimental features on multiple levels, its linguistic register (which is more innovative than *any* literary text of the second millennium BCE), its Sitz im Leben as can be modeled, and the types of contemporaneous written discourses it relates to, which are themselves highly innovative (§1.3.2.2). Another element in *Astarte* is combat, related to royal ideology: significantly, the composition dates to the very reign (Amenhotep II) in which experimentation in register is documented in military narratives as well, also with a strong ideological component.

1.4 Possible linguistic registers of literature in the early Eighteenth Dynasty

A. The notion of a 'hidden language evolution', supposedly underlying Middle Egyptian as documented in the written record, is void conceptually and for all practical purposes (§1.1.1). Despite the low density of the written record, it can be demonstrated that expressions first documented in relatively lower early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty registers did not gain acceptance in any written registers until roughly the time of their first actual attestation (§1.1.2.B). In some cases, it can even be demonstrated that their actual innovation (in grammaticalization, extension, and other processes of linguistic change) must itself have been recent (§1.1.2.C). The rise of 'Late Egyptian' as traditionally defined, based on a limited set of mainly morpho-syntactic features, was therefore fairly rapid, occurred mostly during the Eighteenth Dynasty itself, and can be described as an episode of linguistic 'punctuation' (§1.1.2.D). As regards what has been termed 'Late Middle Egyptian', this is a collection of expressions to do with register, not a stage in language history. Such expressions are documented in the late Twelfth Dynasty, some in the Eighth Dynasty already. From the mid-Twelfth Dynasty on, several can be accommodated into literary texts, always in a targeted distribution indexical of register, not of time (further, §2.4.4).

Innovative expressions occasionally encountered in the Second Intermediate Period are from documentary registers (including in monumentally published texts), from a private inscription which in its linguistic repertoires has elements also found in the 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature, and, toward the very end of the period, from a series of texts to do with military action in a context of reconquista (§1.3.3.1). In the last group of texts, the selection of an innovative register of language contributes indexing their novelty in format and contents on a linguistic level, in a self-asserting manner; significantly, such highly innovative register is in *Kamose*

---

224 On 'Ramesside modernism', Baines 1996.

Inscriptions combined with elements of a very elevated Middle Egyptian harkening back to the tradition of Middle Kingdom narrative literature and according with the literarizing tendencies also observed in this composition (§1.3.3.2). In the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty, innovative expressions cluster in documentary texts (including monumentalized ones), in 'Reden und Rufe', and in military narratives of the times of Thutmosis III and Amenhotep II (§1.3.3.3.A-B). Dating to the latter reign, *Astarte* is highly innovative linguistically, as it is on all other levels: the linguistic register, which is experimental as this type of texts itself then was, relates to the more generally modernistic character of the composition, anticipating on aspects of Ramesside written culture to come (§1.3.2.2; §1.3.3.3.C).

The distribution of linguistic registers is therefore in all cases principled. Linguistically innovative selections are not expected to have generally extended to literature possibly composed in the same periods. Documentary registers, for instance, differ from literary ones in all periods in the second millennium BCE (§1.3.1). The stylized evocation of 'spoken language' in 'Reden und Rufe' stands for its own, as do innovative linguistic selections in military narratives, which are similarly indexical. Meanwhile, higher written registers, as in inscriptional compositions other than the ones just alluded to, are overwhelmingly free from innovative expressions and display a rich and complete Middle Egyptian, often indistinguishable from higher registers of Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian (§1.2). A similar characterization applies to one early Eighteenth composition framed as a teaching, *Aametju* (§1.3.2.3). Middle Egyptian was the regular vehicle for written expressions of high culture down to the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty.

Possible linguistic registers of literature in the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty would probably have variable, depending on the types of literary discourses that may then have been cultivated. As regards the insecurely dated Middle Egyptian literary texts that form the object of the present study, these are part of a Middle Egyptian literary tradition defined by cultural themes, intertext and motifs, elements of form, etc., regardless of when they may have been composed. For such types of texts, Middle Egyptian, possibly with some internal differentiation, would have naturally been selected down to the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty.

B.   This does of course not imply that any single one among the presently insecurely dated Middle Egyptian literary texts should date to the early Eighteenth Dynasty. It may be the case that no new literature was composed in this period: literary production is not necessarily homogeneous over time.[225] Or it may be that new compositions were in types of literary discourses that had patterns of circulation in society and/or in geography such that these compositions would not become part of the now preserved record.[226] What the above discussion does imply, however, is the following: Middle Egyptian language itself is no indication for dating any presently insecurely dated literary text to a period prior to the early Eighteenth Dynasty, let alone to the Middle Kingdom. In all cases, a detailed individual examination is required.

---

225 E.g. Baines 1996, evoking the possibility that textual creativity may have been more strongly focused on other, non literary, types of written discourses in the early New Kingdom.
226 This possibility is discussed by Fischer-Elfert 2003: 119-20.

One further implication is that a Middle Egyptian literary text possibly composed in the early Eighteenth Dynasty would look fairly similar to Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian literary texts: linguistic differences would not be striking. In the quest for such possible subtle differences, a first step then lies in devising strategies for dating, in defining ways to critically assess the reliability of proposed dating criteria, and in defining horizons of expectation with which a text to be dated can be approached.

2 CONDITIONS AND STRATEGIES FOR LINGUISTIC DATING

In the present chapter, I discuss the conditions under which a linguistic dating is possible for the specific time period considered, the early/mid-second millennium BCE, and the specific types of texts here to be dated, Middle Egyptian literary compositions. This discussion is placed toward the beginning of the present study for expository reasons, but consists in a reflexive consideration of a set of practices that have gradually emerged over the years. The chapter includes many case studies, reflecting how the general principles set out were developed and adjusted inductively from working on the texts. All topics here addressed are discussed in more depth in the following chapters.

2.1 Describing linguistic change in a low-density and highly formal record

In most cases, criteria for linguistic dating are based on changes in language that occur during the time period considered. Linguistic dating therefore presupposes a model of how changes—innovation and obsolescence—spread across written registers during the period relevant for dating, and of how such spread can be expected to be reflected in the extant written record. The resolution, and at times the very possibility, of linguistic dating is thereby contingent upon the conditions under which changes in language can themselves be documented and described in the written record of the time period considered.

2.1.1 General models of change: The thickness of language in use

A. Linguistic change happens in linguistic interaction: variants of extant expressions and entirely new expressions are constantly innovated by speakers.[1] Many among these innovative variants or expressions remain at an exploratory stage, while other ones 'catch on', being selected by the broader speech community. Older variants or expressions may then enter obsolescence, or not, or they may enter obsolescence only much later.

---

1 For general usage-based models of linguistic change, e.g. Keller 1994; Croft 2001; Mufwene 2008.

At any given time, language is thus characterized by the simultaneous presence of variant realizations of a given expression, and of variant expressions performing partly overlapping functions. Synchronic variation is, in other words, a necessary component of, and indeed a condition for, linguistic change. Accordingly, the process by which an innovative expression B supersedes an older expression A may be represented schematically as below (exploratory expressions in small type):

(a) General model of linguistic change:

$(...) \rightarrow A, B\ (c, d, e) \rightarrow B, C\ (d, f) \rightarrow C, F\ (g) \rightarrow (...)$

B. In addition, changes spread only gradually, across registers, across constructions, and within individual registers and constructions. A given expression B may thus have gained a fully regular status in one register, while still being rare in another register, and possibly lacking altogether in yet another one. Similar comments apply to the differential rates of obsolescence of older expressions.

Illustrating this general configuration, a few well-studied cases in mid-/late second millennium BCE Egyptian include:

- The spread of *m-ir* + *infinitive* for expressing the negative imperative, gradually superseding *m* + *negative complement* across different written registers during the Eighteenth Dynasty;[2]

- The gradual spread of *=w* over *=sn* in Ramesside written registers, a protracted process that extended over centuries and proceeded at a markedly different pace depending on various constructions and various registers, in complexly interrelated ways;[3]

- The spread of *irm* over *ḥnꜤ* 'with', gradual and protracted in Ramesside times.[4]

For earlier times, detailed case studies are made more difficult by the low density and high formality of the extant record. The general principle remains of course the same. A few illustrations are the following:

- The replacement of synthetic *sḏm.ḥr=f* by analytic *wn.ḥr=f ḥr sḏm* in the First Intermediate Period and early Middle Kingdom: in Coffin Texts for example, both constructions are used side by side.[5] In the same period similarly, circumstantial *iw P predicate* gradually superseding circumstantial *sk P predicate*, a process not completed before the early Middle Kingdom (§2.4.3.2, (xv));

- The gradual neutralization of the aspectual contrast between *NP ḥr sḏm* and *N(P) sḏm=f*, a process begun in the Late Middle Kingdom and extending throughout the Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom (§2.6);

---

2   Vernus 2010a.
3   Winand 1995.
4   Winand in prep.
5   Vernus 1990a: 63-5, 68-71.

- The replacement of older *ḥr NP sḏm=f* by the bound construction *ḥr-sḏm=f* during the Eighteenth Dynasty, resulting in a situation in which the two constructions were used side by side in the same texts (§3.4.2.2.C).

Taking into account the continuum of registers present in language at any given time, the above model (a) is then refined as follows (exploratory expressions now left out; rare expressions in parentheses):

(b) General model of linguistic change, taking into account registers:

Reg. (x): (...) A → A, B   →   B   →   B, E   (...)
Reg. (y): (...) A   → A (B)→ A, B → (A) B   →   B   (...)
Reg. (z): (...) X, A   (X) A   →   A, B   →   (A) B (...)

C. Language at any given time is thereby characterized by what for the present practical purpose I propose to term a synchronic 'thickness' (take any vertical slice in (b), or any synchronic situation in (a)). Such thickness, across registers and/or within a given register, provides for the essential plasticity of natural language as a tool of communication, allowing speakers to express themselves, and to act upon each other, in subtly differentiated manners. For linguistic dating, the practical implications are twofold, to be developed further in subsequent sub-sections:

- The obsolescence of a variant/expression A is to be dissociated chronologically from the innovation of a variant/expression B with similar functions (for a detailed case study, §2.6.3);

- Issues of register are an integral component of any argument for dating (see §1.3, §2.4, and throughout the present study).

2.1.2 Studying linguistic change in the early/mid-second millennium record

Changes in language are inferred from the extant written record. In the case of early/mid-second millennium BCE Egyptian, the task is made difficult by the nature of this record, which is low in density, and, for the most part of it, highly formal. Only written registers are documented. Direct empirical evidence for change therefore points to the integration of a given variant or expression in a given written register, not to its integration into 'written Egyptian' overall, let alone to its innovation in the 'spoken language' (§1.1).

Middle Egyptian literary texts securely dated to a period after the Twelfth Dynasty are currently very few (§1.3.2) and the study of ongoing linguistic change must be based mostly on other types of written discourse. In the time period here relevant, the written record is heavily biased toward more formal registers as it is uneven across time: some registers, notably less formal ones, are poorly documented in all periods here relevant, and some periods, notably the often crucial Second Intermediate Period, are poorly documented in all registers. In addition, part of the linguistic material provided by inscriptional registers is phraseological in nature: in such cases, the date

of an inscription may have to be dissociated from the linguistic age of an expression it includes.

On a practical level, only a part of grammar and lexicon is represented in the preserved record: what is known of Egyptian is a small subset of what Egyptian may have been and depends heavily on the contents of texts committed to writing at any given time, and thereby, indirectly, on conventions of form and of decorum in various types of writing discourses that were then cultivated. Incomplete attestation becomes even more critical when potential differences between written registers are taken into account: as already emphasized, empirical evidence for the integration of an expression in a written register does not necessarily imply its integration into 'written Egyptian' overall. The reverse caveat must be voiced as well: an expression may be lacking at some point in time in those written registers that are documented in the record, yet may have been fully accepted in other written registers, not documented in the record, by the same period already. In short, much of Egyptian is simply unknown, and only part of this can be known through additional research.

2.1.3 Demonstrating innovation and obsolescence in the record

The synchronic thickness of language at any given time is compounded by considerable practical difficulties in studying linguistic change as these result from the nature of the written record in which this change is to be studied. This has major practical implications for possible dating strategies; the issues at play, to be recurrently encountered throughout the present study, are preliminarily presented here in a general and condensed form.

A. While innovation can be difficult to demonstrate, obsolescence is even more difficult to demonstrate. For obvious reasons, demonstrating the presence of something is empirically easier than demonstrating its absence (compare the quantifiers, existential in the first case, universal in the second). In addition, formal registers tend to keep to ancient expressions long after these had dropped out of use in less formal written registers. Written obsolescence can be a very protracted process, whose dynamics are defined by a multiplicity of ultimately high-cultural conditions; these parameters are complex to handle, making most statements on the obsolescence of an individual expression tentative.

Possible criteria based on obsolescence (*post quem non* criteria) thus come with a considerably broader degree of temporal imprecision than possible criteria based on innovation (*ante quem non* criteria). Such imbalance between *ante quem non* and *post quem non* criteria springs from the intrinsic logic of either type of dating arguments themselves; as regrettable as it may be, the imbalance is structural. A detailed illustration is presented below (§2.6.3).

B. Patterns of attestation stand a better chance to be representative with expressions that are common in the language, and therefore expected to be common in and across the record. With such expressions, issues of representativeness that arise from the low density of the preserved record are best kept in check, as are similar issues that stem from the specific contents and linguistic form of the texts that make up that record. In

general, dating criteria based on frequent expressions will therefore be more reliable and/or more precise in their temporal resolution. With *ante quem non* criteria specifically, reliability will be enhanced if the first attestations of a given expression cluster in time, and if such clustering in time can be shown not to be an effect of the nature of the record itself, such as a higher overall density of the record at this moment in time.

C. With an *ante quem non* criterion, the temporal imprecision can sometimes be narrowed down by considering the distribution of other expressions with similar or related functions. For an expression X first documented in a given written register by a time T, it is to be demonstrated that before this time T some other expression Y was demonstrably used for expressing similar meanings and/or performing similar functions. If such usage of Y is consistent and exclusive, and if it extends to a time close to T, the possibility that X was integrated into the register considered not much earlier than its first documented occurrence at time T will be substantiated somewhat further.

While useful, this strategy does not permit to reduce all temporal imprecision: as already discussed, language in use is characterized by its synchronic 'thickness'. Moreover, the strategy is applicable only to domains of linguistic meaning and function that are themselves reasonably common in language. Here again, therefore, less common expressions are bound to remain more problematic when it comes to assessing whether the indications they may provide for dating are reliable.

D. An additional twist associated with *ante quem non* criteria springs from the low density of the record, most notably in the Second Intermediate Period. On several occasions in the present study, an argument can be made that an expression did not have currency in relevant registers in the Twelfth Dynasty. The earliest documented occurrences of that same expression are, however, not in the Thirteenth Dynasty but much later only, for example in the very late Second Intermediate Period or early Eighteenth Dynasty. When the expression considered was first innovated then remains unclear: possibilities range from the earliest moment in time for which it can not be demonstrated any more that it had not been innovated (e.g. the early Thirteenth Dynasty) to the earliest moment in time for which it can be demonstrated that it had been innovated (e.g. the late Seventeenth or early Eighteenth Dynasty).

Two types of *ante quem non* criteria must therefore distinguished. These differ, not by the nature of the linguistic phenomena considered, but by how the nature of the record, itself an artifactual object, determines the possibilities for studying linguistic change:

(Type-A) ante quem non
It can be demonstrated that an expression has not been innovated before time T. There is also evidence, or significant indirect indications, that it has been innovated by that same time T. The terminus *ante quem non* can then be straightforwardly set to T.

Type-B ante quem non

It can be demonstrated that an expression has not been innovated before T_1. It can also be shown that it has been innovated by T_2, whereby T_2 may be centuries later than T_1. T_1 is the latest moment in time from which on it can not be demonstrated any more that the expression did not have currency, not necessarily the earliest moment in time in which it actually had currency.

(*Unless further specified, ante quem non criteria are of the A-type in the present study.*)

Type-B *ante quem non* criteria can be viewed as defining second-order termini *ante quem non*. What is aimed for is a terminus *ante quem non* from which on an expression was first innovated, and therefore possible in a text to be dated. However, all that can be securely established is until when this expression was certainly not innovated (T_1: defined through a double negation). In other words, a type-B terminus *ante quem non* is a terminus *ante quem non* (set to T_1) for an actual terminus *ante quem non* (at some point in time not to be determined between T_1 and T_2).

By definition of a type-B terminus, the nature of the evidence available is of a sort that this second-order terminus (T_1) can not be reduced to a first-order one (some point between T_1 and T_2). In practice, type-B *ante quem non* criteria must therefore be treated *as if* they were pointing to T_1. This is required methodologically, in order to keep the criterion as secure as possible. In the process, it possibly loses some or much of the temporal resolution it could have had, since T_1 may well be earlier than the actual innovation of the expression considered. Type-B *ante quem non* criteria are therefore to be appreciated as possibly pointing to a later terminus than the one for which they can be used in the present study.

E. For the sake of subsequent reference, the four general dimensions discussed above are here summarized:

(a) *Post quem non* criteria (based on written obsolescence) are temporally more diffuse than *ante quem non* criteria (based on first written occurrence). In the case of Middle Egyptian literary texts, they typically point to a period no earlier, or even later, than the first manuscript attestation of a text to be dated; whenever this is the case, they are of course useless in practice.

(b) In devising *post quem non* and *ante quem non* criteria alike, expressions that are common in language, and expected to be common in the extant record, provide more reliable, and temporally more precise, dating criteria than less common expressions. This is a heavily restrictive condition on possible dating criteria.

(c) With *ante quem non* criteria specifically, an ideal situation is when for an expression X first documented by time T, it can also be demonstrated that some other expression Y was consistently in use before time T in similar functions. *Ante quem non* criteria meeting this and the previous conditions are the strongest. This is another heavily restrictive condition on possible dating

criteria: the condition is mostly met with common domains of meaning or function only.

(d) With some *ante quem non* criteria, it can happen that a given expression is documented since T_2 and demonstrably did not have currency before T_1, whereby, due to the nature of the record, T_2 and T_1 can not be made to coincide. For methodological reasons, such type-B *ante quem non* criteria have to be treated in practice as if pointing to a terminus *ante quem non* by T_1, even though the expression considered may in fact have been innovated only at some later moment in time, between T_1 and T_2.

2.2 Expressions that can provide dating criteria

Language could be expected to provide a wealth of indications for dating in various domains. In the case of early/mid-second millennium BCE Egyptian, however, various factors conspire to the effect that possible dating criteria are limited in practice.

2.2.1 Morphology

In most languages, morphological change will provide an important set of criteria for dating. The opposite is the case in early/mid-second millennium BCE Egyptian, because of the nature of the writing system. Contrasts in written forms of the verb are by and large limited to some endings (in some inflectional categories only) and alternations between short and long written stems (in some inflectional classes only); morphological contrasts on the levels of syllable structure, stress, and vowel melody are left almost entirely unrepresented, as are the possibly changing outcomes of morpho-phonological processes and differential behavior of inflectional classes. The bulk of verbal morphology thus remains concealed underneath the opaque surface of written forms.[6] Similar comments extend to nominal morphology: while grammatical endings (gender and number) and some derivational affixes (such as *m-*) are represented in writing, the bulk of morphological alternations in derivational patterns remains unrepresented in written forms.[7] More generally, the Egyptian writing system does not primarily target phonetic strings, and only partly word-forms: in significant

---

6   As a mere illustration of how far the phenomenon extends, the following example is given. The Egyptian writing system at least occasionally selects mono- and bi-consonantal phonograms in ways to reflect the syllable structure of a word (e.g. Schenkel 1981; Kahl 1994: 91-3, 121-8). It would then have been technically possible to extend this principle to the written representation of inflected word-*forms*. The step was not taken: the different syllable structures of the stem in */naḥ$'ma-/ (subjunctive) and */na$'ḥa:$ma-/ (or the like: *mrr=f*), etc., all display the same written stem <*n-ḥm*-SEMOGRAM>.

7   E.g. Schenkel 1983; Osing 1976.

ways, it also targets lexical representations (words)[8] or yet more abstract representations (roots).[9]

In a writing system such as the Egyptian, morphological change remains by and large invisible when it affects pre-existing forms. (A rare exception is the loss of *-n* in the *sḏm.n=f*, beginning in the mid-second millennium.) Morphological change will be visible only when it consists in the renewal of the inventory of morphological categories, i.e. when entirely new forms arise (e.g. the 'new subject pronouns' *tw=i*, etc.). Both types of change, which account for some of the classically evoked contrasts between Middle and Late Egyptian, turn out to be very rare in the time period and written registers relevant for dating Middle Egyptian literary texts. Unlike in other languages, and unlike in other periods in Egypt itself, morphological change by and large lies in a dead angle (compare further below, §2.3.1.1).

2.2.2 Lexicon

The lexicon comprises a wealth of individual items that can undergo change in meaning, or be innovated, or enter obsolescence: unlike changes in grammar, individual changes in the lexicon are potentially numerous. On the other hand, lexical arguments possibly to be made are exposed to the notoriously unreliable patterns of attestation of individual words in the record. In addition, lexical expressions do not relate as tightly to their contexts as grammatical ones often do; this makes it comparatively more difficult to assess whether a given lexical expression may have been altered in the course of textual transmission (§2.3.2.2).

A. Lexical expressions differ from grammatical ones on three accounts, all ultimately to do with the fact the defining fact that lexical expressions have lexical meaning. These add up to make patterns of attestation of the lexical expressions much less reliable in general.

> (a) Lexical expressions have a more specific meaning than grammatical ones, implying a generally lower text frequency of the former. In many cases, this makes patterns of attestation of lexical expressions particularly sensitive to the vagaries of documentation in a low-density corpus language.

> (b) Patterns of attestation of lexical expressions can be strongly skewed across time in relation to different types of written discourse, registers, and subject matters documented in different periods. This results in an unequal attestation of individual words, semantic fields, and lexical registers. Grammatical expressions, which carry a different type of linguistic meaning, are less exposed to such issues and tend do be more homogeneously spread in the record (as a general tendency: there are of course many exceptions).

> (c) The rise or loss of words, or changes in the meaning of existing words, are individual histories: unlike in grammatical change, these histories can not be

---

8   See e.g. the case of the *sḏm.n=f* of *ult.n non-II.red* in Coffin Texts, Stauder in press e: §2; Schenkel 2009: 57-8.

9   E.g. Schenkel 2003; Vernus 2003b.

interpreted in relation to broader processes, or contexts, of linguistic change. Patterns of attestation of individual lexemes therefore tend to remain raw empirical observations, often difficult to assess further as to their representativeness.

B. Particularly the semantic ranges of individual words are incompletely attested at all times: changes at this level remain generally impossible to track, except over much longer periods of time than the one here relevant, and only for the best documented words. Lexical arguments are then often limited to discussing the innovation or obsolescence of a word, regardless of its meaning, substantially reducing the evidence that could have been available. Patterns of attestation of words themselves often remain unreliable; some illustration is given below, with a perspective on Middle Egyptian literary texts of insecure dating.

(a) *Artifactual conditions of preservation*

(i) *ʾIsḳ* 'wait for' (*Neferti* 7g)

The word is fairly common in the early New Kingdom[10] and would therefore seem typical of the lexicon of that period. Yet, one earlier instance is in Mentuwoser (*temp*. Senwosret I), 12. A likely fate for this stela, as for every other written document in early second millennium BCE Egypt, would have been not to survive to the present day. *ʾIsḳ* would then have appeared to the present-day Egyptologist as undocumented prior to the New Kingdom.

(ii) *Ftft* 'leap, twitch' (*Hymn* 12.8)

In a yet more literally physical manner than the above, *ftft* is common in New Kingdom hymns (§3.4.6, (iv)). Yet, it is also found once in the Middle Kingdom (Dramatic Ramesseum Papyrus 29), just before a lacuna. Over a period of 4000 years, this lacuna could well have extended just a few centimeters further, to include *ftft*.

(b) *Subject matters featured at various periods*

(iii) *Mtwn* '(fighting) arena' (*Amenemhat* 5d)

The word is not uncommon in New Kingdom royal inscriptions,[11] but not securely documented before the New Kingdom. An early attestation, however, could be in *Tod Inscription* 27, if *mtwn* is indeed to be read,[12] and assuming that this text is to be dated to the Senwosret I, which is disputed as well.[13] However, the lack of a secure direct early attestation prior to the early New Kingdom could well be a gap in the documentation, reflecting the fact that military subject matters addressed in non-generic terms are themselves uncommon in the written record before the early New Kingdom.

---

10 See *TLA* #31730.
11 *DZA* 24.458.930; .870; .910; .980. Outside royal inscriptions also in P. Leiden 347 III.12 (*DZA* 24.458.970).
12 On the reading, which has been disputed, §1.2, (v.γ).
13 See §1, n.86, and §5.1.3.3.C.

(iv) *Mwnf* 'garrison' (*Amenemhat* 7b and *Neferti* 7f)

The word is not uncommon in the Eighteenth Dynasty.[14] It is attested only once in earlier times, but with a different meaning: Siut III 3 'I was (...) a protector (*mwnf*) of the poor.' Yet, this can not be taken as evidence that the military meaning developed only later, for the reasons just discussed (iii). Not only the meaning is different in Siut III 3, the context is as well: in an ideal-biographical context, a meaning 'garrison' would hardly be expected, if it then existed. It is perhaps not unsignificant that this early occurrence of the word is in the context of a tomb, Iti-ibi's, that also has one of the very few pre-New Kingdom texts to develop military matters in specific terms. In short, the meaning 'garrison', securely documented in much later times only, may or may not have existed in these early times. The case of *mwnf* is more broadly illustrative of the near-impossibility to track changes in meaning and in semantic ranges in the time period here relevant.

(c) *Indirect attestation*

(v) *Mṯwn* 'arena' (above, (iii))

As mentioned, the word is not securely documented before the early New Kingdom. However, an indirect attestation seems to be given in an Old Kingdom toponym.[15]

(vi) *Snsi* 'praise$_{VERB}$' (*Loyaliste* 2.2 long version (the short version reads differently: §2.3.2.2, (ii)); *Loyaliste* 6.7 (this verse only in the long version))

This verb remains undocumented before the New Kingdom. However, the morphologically derived noun *snsw* 'praise$_{NOUN}$, etc.', once in CT VII 239a, probably implies the existence of the verb before the New Kingdom.

(d) *Contingencies in working with lexical tools available at a given time*

(vii) *Ꞽsḳ* (above, (i))

The word had been noted as 'Nur Dyn 18 bis Ende nR' in *DZA*[16] and subsequently as 'belegt seit D.18' in *Wb.* I 133. The file may have been compiled before the publication of Mentuwoser's Stela (by Ransom in 1913).

C. Occasionally, individual expressions can provide a reliable dating criterion if additional context is given, typically extending beyond language itself. This can be the case with loanwords, provided, however, that a loanword can be securely identified as such and that the time of borrowing can itself be securely dated; these conditions are not always fulfilled (e.g. *ꜥꝪgsw* 'belt': §6.2.2.6.3, (ii)). Another favorable circumstance is when the introduction of a new word or expression in the lexicon can be related to the introduction of the real-word referent of that word (e.g. *ꜥ-rsi* 'Southern Region': §2.8.3.6.B; *ḫpš* 'sickle-shaped sword': §5.5.1; *bḥ* 'forced labor':

---

14 E.g. *Urk.* IV 505, 12; 730, 17. In a literary context also later, in *Satirical Letter* (*TLA* #69290).
15 Petrie 1892: 19; F*CD* 121 (with references to the discussion on *mṯwn*). For early attestations of the root *twn*, further Borghouts 2010: II, 42 (sub E 2+).
16 *DZA* 21.305.070.

§5.5.2). Strictly speaking, the argument has then ceased to be a purely linguistic one, since the temporal anchoring is provided by a change in the cultural encyclopedia.

D. Given the uncertainties generally attached to individual lexical expressions, lexical evidence is best appreciated as cumulative. In assessing the overall lexicon of a composition, various quantitative approaches have been proposed.[17] Such methods are valuable for appreciating the relative lexical variety of individual texts, the lexical distance of texts to each other, and how different types of written discourses relate to, or differ from, each other in their lexical typology. Whether these methods can provide indications for dating remains unclear: many factors are at play, including the complexly interrelated dimensions of register, subject matter, and type of written discourse. Measures of lexical variety or distance therefore do not easily project over time, at least not for the fairly short time period relevant to the present study. In this, lexical evidence will therefore come in the intentionally unsophisticated form of an informally weighted list.

The list is weighted qualitatively in relation to how reliable or unreliable the patterns of attestation of individual expressions could be. In general, the likelihood for a lexical pattern of attestation to be reasonably reliable is highest when the following conditions are met, ideally simultaneously: (a) the expression is common; (b) it is not technical or otherwise specialized language and it is not semantically specific in ways that its pattern of attestation could be over-determined by the configuration of the record itself; (c) some other expression is documented in earlier times with similar meaning. Illustrative of how low-frequency words in particular must be given very little weight are the following cases in point:

(viii) Rare words in *Fowler*

The composition has a few rare words otherwise undocumented before the New Kingdom.[18] Yet, the text itself is documented in a late Twelfth Dynasty manuscript, P. Butler.

(ix) *Amenemhat* 6b *šsp.n=i wnwt nt nfr-ib* 'I had taken an hour of pleasure.'

The expression *šsp wnwt* is apparently documented only once otherwise, in a Twelfth Dynasty 'letter' with satirical intent, P. UC 32204 vso 2-3 *mk šsp=n wnwt bint* 'Look, we can have a bad hour (*scil.* together).'[19] The expression *nfr-ib* (also in *Amenemhat* 14f, echoing 6b[20]) is otherwise documented only in an early Eighteenth Dynasty composition, *Teaching of Aametju* 43 (discussion, §1.3.2.3, (v)). Both expressions are equally rare, and it therefore comes as no surprise that direct parallels for these should be in different periods.

Even in such cumulative form, lexical evidence often remains insecure. In addition to the dimensions evoked above, this is also due to the fairly low number of individual items that can be considered within a given composition: most texts to be dated are

---

17 E.g. Schweitzer 2013; Lepper 2012; Konrad 1999, all with references to previous studies.
18 Parkinson 2004: 111.
19 I thank Jean Winand (p.c. 3/2011) for drawing this parallel to my attention.
20 Parkinson 2002: 246.

concise. The lexical distinctiveness of texts is also reduced by the highly intertextual nature of Middle Egyptian literature, resulting in a high amount of shared lexicon between various compositions (some of which may themselves be insecurely dated). Possible lexical evidence will then typically consist in relatively few words; except in specific favorable cases, this can only be appreciated as complementary to other types of evidence. With such caveat being made explicit, lexical evidence should be taken into account in an appreciation of the overall linguistic typology of a composition being studied.

2.2.3 Grammar

A. Patterns of documentation of grammatical change, in form or in function, can often be interpreted as to their degree of reliability. Unlike most lexical ones, grammatical expressions can be fairly common in language and are less strongly sensitive to the subject matters documented in different types of written discourses. Moreover, changes in grammar can in several cases be related to broader processes of linguistic change: a relative chronology of developments, or even an absolute temporal anchoring of changes, can then be established. Strategies for assessing the reliability of patterns of documentation of grammatical change have been outlined above in general terms (§2.1.3; also §1.1.2.C) and will be exemplified further throughout subsequent parts of the present study. An important motivation for such type of discussion is also the requirement to make it explicit how strong or weak an individual grammatical expression is: various situations are encountered, extending all the way from altogether uncertain through suggestive through fully conclusive.

   The present study mainly relies on grammatical criteria for dating, yet these come with one limitation of their own, namely that they will remain fairly low in number. In the relatively short time span here considered (ca. 2000-1450 BCE), changes in grammar are not expected to be sweeping. The substantial linguistic continuity in high-cultural written expressions of the period also weighs in, with only little change expected to be manifest in literary texts and in other relevant, mostly equally formal, registers in the non-literary record. The current state of description of Middle Egyptian, incomplete notably as regards internal diachronic developments, further reduces the number of criteria possibly to be devised: in some cases, these can be established within the present study, while in other cases dedicated grammatical studies would be preliminarily required.

B. Among grammatical criteria, the best are often the ones to do with changes in the function rather than in the form of grammatical expressions. One important example is Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion (§2.6.2), the only criterion of wider application that had been proposed so far. This targets a change in the functions of *NP ḥr sḏm*, a construction that as far as form is concerned remains stable. That changes in the mapping of form and function are often fruitful for dating relates to the fact that linguistic function is less directly accessible to language users and therefore less open to being manipulated by these, notably in the higher written registers here relevant. For the very same reason, changes in linguistic function are also the ones currently

least described. The possibly best grammatical criteria are not readily given; they must be established by additional investigation of Middle Egyptian grammar itself, in several cases in lenghty developments.

In devising the relatively subtle grammatical criteria that will be most important to the present study, the nature of the record can exercise some limiting effect: this features only a selection of constructions, at times in a restricted range of uses and functions only, and in varying, at times critically low, densities in various periods. In practice, only a subset of changes can be identified and described with a degree of accuracy sufficient enough to derive reliable dating criteria, and not always with the wished for temporal resolution. Yet, work can be done: in subsequent chapters, dating criteria based on changes in grammar—in form, and for the stronger ones often in the mapping of form and function—are discussed or newly introduced. The emphasis on changes in the use of *tw* (§5.2; §5.3; §6.2) reflects the fact that changes happened to occur in passive voice during the time period considered, that these changes affected the functions of a morpheme rather than its form, and that the present author has worked on passive voice in Middle Egyptian: various levels, all contingent, here favorably play together. In a similar vein, Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion, made possible because a change in form-function mapping happened to occur on this level in the later Twelfth Dynasty, came only as a culmination of this author's near prolonged research on aspect in Middle Egyptian. Given the remaining gaps in grammatical description as of 2013, it seems a fair guess that additional criteria based on grammatical change will emerge as a result of further studies in descriptive Middle Egyptian grammar.

2.3   Textual alterations in a manuscript culture

Texts can be affected during their transmission in a manuscript culture, intentionally and unintentionally. One very basic issue is therefore to determine what is being dated linguistically: the surface of a text as presented by its oldest (set of) preserved manuscript(s), its original composition, some intermediary stage in textual history, or even a mixture of all these.

Irrespective of their date of composition, early New Kingdom copies of Middle Egyptian compositions are tokens of an early New Kingdom literary culture and must be interpreted as such. This basic epistemological principle, which has been recently reemphasized by proponents of 'material philology' notably, holds similarly for the compositions that are also documented in the Middle Kingdom[21] and for the ones that are not.[22] When it comes to dating the original composition, however, strategies must be defined to identify the possible effects of textual transmission. The goal can not be to reconstruct an Urtext, an object which is often out of reach in practice, and, in some

---

21 E.g. Hagen 2012a (*Ptahhotep*); Parkinson 2009: 173-218 (*Sinuhe*).

22 Widmaier 2013 and Hoch 1992 (*Kheti*); van der Plas 1986 (*Hymn to Hapi*; explicitly, 25).

cases, possibly fictional in substance.[23] What matters is to assess the textual status of individual expressions and constructions that could be criterial for dating. As to be discussed throughout the present study, the likelihood for an expression to be integral to the original composition can vary considerably depending on a multiplicity of factors; the type of expression considered, and the ways it relates to its context or not, are essential.

2.3.1 Aspects of orthography in Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts

In orthography, Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts display a surface of their own, different from manuscripts of earlier times. The following comments are descriptive only: in the current stage, no argument for dating can be devised on this level, and it remains uncertain whether one could ever be.

2.3.1.1 Written grammatical morphology

An illustration of typical features is given below; this is representative of the general phenomenon, but selective only. Examples in Middle Egyptian literary texts of insecure dating are set in perspective with examples in texts that securely date to the early Eighteenth Dynasty. Most examples are from verbal morphology (i)-(vi); cases in non-verbal grammatical morphology are presented in turn (vii)-(viii).

(i) Long written stems of *II.red* in the *sḏm.n=f*:[24]

Sporting King A2.2 *iw m33.n=i*; sim. *Fishing and Fowling* B3.8; *Kheti* 4.2; *Mutter und Kind* vso 4.3

– compare Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* 10 (*Urk.* IV 17, 7-8) *iw ḥfˁ.n=f* (...) *3mm.n=f*; *Urk.* IV 1004, 4 (Tjanuni) *iw m33.n=i*; *Heavenly Cow* 126 *ˁḥˁ<.n> m33.n=sn*;

Kheti 3.2 *n m33.n=f*; sim. *Kheti* 4.2; *Fishing and Fowling* B2.7 *n m3[3].n=f*

– compare *Urk.* IV 367, 12 (from Hatshepsut's Karnak Obelisk) *n ˁnn.n=i*.

NB. Two forms in *Merikare* are generally cited in this context: E 33 *n tkk.n* and E 68 *n ḳbb.n*. As discussed elsewhere, these may not be 'post-classical' at all.[25]

(ii) Long written stems of *II.red* in the subjunctive:

Neferti 2e *m33 ḥm=f* (sim. 5c).

(iii) Subjunctive of *ult.3* in *-3y*:

Amenemhat 1d (P. Millingen, etc.) *ḥḳ3y=k*

– compare *Astarte* I.3 *sḳ3y[=i]*.[26]

---

23 In a performance culture, different, possibly authorial, versions of a composition may thus have coexisted from the outset, none privileged over the other (e.g. Stolz 2013, for Wolfram's *Parzival*; Winand in press a, for *Sinuhe*).

24 Discussion by Stauder in press d: §1.6; Schenkel 2006: 63-4.

25 Stauder in press d: §1.6.B, *fine*.

26 Further examples in Collombert & Coulon 2000: 225.

(iv) -*w* as a written ending of the subjunctive:

with *III.inf*, *Neferti* 3f *rmw=k*;[27] 9b *nn rmw.tw*;

with *3rad*, *Merikare* E 12 *sm3w=k*.

(v) Relative forms and passive participles in -*ti*:

(attested in the Middle Kingdom, but increasingly common in, and in this sense more typical of, the early New Kingdom[28])

Amenemhat 1d *ḏd.ti=i*; *Khakheperreseneb* ro 5 *ḏd.ti=f*; *Neferti* 3h *ḏd.ti*

   – compare Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription* 16 (*Urk.* IV 162, 8) *mr.ti k3=f pw ir.ti* 'what his *ka* will desire is what will be done'; sim. Thutmosis I's *Abydos Stela* 5 (*Urk.* IV 96, 16) *mr.ti k3=k* 'what your *ka* will desire'.

(vi) Infinitive for negatival complement:

Ipuwer 2.4-5 *tm irt n=f tbty* 'he who could not make sandals for himself';[29] *Neferti* 4c O. DeM 1188 *tmmt irt* (Pet. *tmt ir*) 'what has not been done'

   – compare *Urk.* IV 32, 10; 331, 12; etc.[30]

(vii) *N* for *m* (preposition):[31]

Fishing and Fowling B2.6-7 *iw=i n ḳbw rmw=i n šw* 'I am in the cool, my fishes are in the sun';[32] perhaps also *Merikare* E 70-71 *n-mitt*[33]

   – compare O. Nakhtmin 87/173, 3 (§1.3.2.1).

Conversely, *m* for *n*, only under assimilation to the following word: *Merikare* E 118 *m-mryt* (C *m-mr[y]t*), E 114 *m-mrt* (C *m-mryt*)

   – compare *Urk.* IV 1796, 8; also in Book of the Dead.[34]

(viii) *St* for *sn*:

Merikare E 56; 85 (*st* suffix pronoun);[35] *Heavenly Cow*, *passim* (*st* in various uses);[36] also *st* for =s (*Neferti* 2n *ḫpr.t=s{t}(y)*)

   – compare *Urk.* IV 658, 4 *itḥ.tw st*.

---

27 The identification of the form as a subjunctive, rather than a prospective, is secured by its use in continuation of an imperative: *ḥws ib=i rmw=k t3 pn* (...) 'Stir, my heart, and beweep this land (...)'.

28 Data in Zonhoven 1997.

29 Kroeber 1970: 172, ex.3.

30 *EG*, p.263, n.6.

31 Kroeber 1970: 41-4. The oldest occurrence I am aware of is Seankhenre Mentuhotepi's Stela 5 (§1, n.126).

32 Kroeber 1970: 44, ex.8.

33 If to be read as (...) *mi irt.n {n} tḥ{t} n-mitt m-ꜥ nṯr* '(...) in accordance with what one who has strayed thus from god did' (proposed by Enmarch 2007: 79, 80, n.m); different interpretation by Quack 1992: 42-3.

34 *TLA* #79190.

35 Quack 1992: 37, n.b.

36 See §4, n.273, (d).

Unlike in other traditions,[37] no indication for dating can be based on such ortho-graphic phenomena for the case of Middle Egyptian literary texts, nor has this ever been claimed. Two illustrations may therefore suffice:

(ix) *Amenemhat* 1d *ḥḳꜣy=k*

The spelling *ḥḳꜣy=k* is in the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty P. Millingen (and in most other witnesses). The more classical spelling, *ḥḳꜣ=k*, is found in a slightly earlier witness, Assiut graffito 1c, 3.[38]

(x) *Ptahhotep* 208 L2 (this verse not in P) *tm=f irt*[39]

The composition is documented in Twelfth Dynasty manuscripts.

Genuine morphological change no doubt affected the verb during the time period considered; if accessible, this could have been criterial for dating. What is visible in written forms, however, primarily pertains to scribal conventions. As already discussed, morphology largely lies in a dead angle for dating (§2.2.1).

2.3.1.2   Written lexical morphology: A case study in *Neferti*

Written lexical morphology can also be late in Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts. The phenomenon is illustrated in a text in which it is particularly strong, *Neferti*.[40]

(a) *In conformity with general trends of early New Kingdom orthography*

(i) Reflecting sound change, e.g.:

Neferti 1j *ꜣꜥš* 'call' (sim. e.g. *Fishing and Fowling* B3.5) is a mixed, historical (*ꜣ*-) and phonological (-*ꜥš*), spelling, typical of the New Kingdom; in an inscriptional register, e.g. Rekhmire 4 (*Urk*. IV 1072, 16).

(ii) On the level of classification:

Neferti 5c[41] has *itn* 'sun-disk' followed by a semogram of the divine (G7).[42]

(b) *Differences in written morphology possibly not reflecting sound change*

(iii) Possibly to be interpreted as by-forms that could have existed before in other varieties of the language, but were not part of documented written standards before the New Kingdom; alternatively, as indirectly reflecting sound change:

---

37   Noam Mizrahi (p.c. 2/2011) tells me that in the Hebrew Bible the relative proportions of short and *plene* writings have occasionally been considered as indicative for dating. For dating strategies in the Hebrew Bible more generally, e.g. Hurwitz 2000.

38   Verhoeven 2012a: 207, n.29.

39   *EG* §344.

40   For a selective illustration in other texts, also below, n.373 (*Khakheperreseneb*); n.450 (*Merikare*); §4, n.273 (*Heavenly Cow*). Noteworthy is also *Fishing and Fowling* B2.7 (sim. A2.10), <*rrmw*> for *rmw* 'fish' (alongside B2.6 <*rmw*>: Kroeber 1970: 50, n.7).

41   Pet. and O. DeM 1074

42   On semograms with *itn* in a classifier perspective, Goldwasser 2002: 111-31.

Neferti 5d *šnˁ* 'storm cloud(?)' is typical of the New Kingdom and later periods;[43] in an inscriptional register, e.g. Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* ro 7/vso 8-9 (H*HBT* 106, 7-8: verbally); in older times, the same word appears as *šnit*. The difference in written morphology may reflect two different morphological formations. Alternatively, it may reflect sound change, with a redefinition of the value of the grapheme ˁ in final position (redefinition of 'grapho-phonemische Korrespondenzregeln'[44]).

(iv) Possibly to be interpreted as an instance of morphological renewal; alternatively, as indirectly reflecting sound change:

Neferti 14h *ˁrˁt* 'uraeus', rather than older *iˁrt*, compares with similar written forms of the word such as *iˁrˁt*, *ˁrˁwt*, or *ˁrˁrt* (Book of the Dead);[45] *iˁrˁt* is also in *Ipuwer* 7.3. (*I*)*ˁrˁt* may be a genuine instance of morphological renewal, as *ˁrˁrt* certainly is.

(c) *Some remarkable spellings*

(v) *Ỉw-* for *i-*:

Neferti 6a *iwtrw* 'river',[46] alternating with the older *itrw* (8a), is a spelling typical of the early New Kingdom. Compare e.g. in the perfective active participle of *2rad*, on Hapuseneb's statues (*Urk.* IV 481, 17 *iwrḫw* 'who know'; *Urk.* IV 480, 9 *iwḫmw* 'who do not know');[47] in *Chapelle Rouge*, p.116: IV.13-14 (H*HBT* II 17, 7-8 *iwḫmw-sk* 'the indestructible (i.e. circumpolar) stars'; *iwḫmw-wrḏ* 'the unwarying (i.e. not circumpolar) stars'); or in the overly common *iwgrt* 'Necropolis (lit., the silent one)'.[48]

(vi) Early occurrences of late spellings:

Neferti 6e <*r3-sw*>[49] is a New Kingdom spelling for *rsw* 'South wind';[50]

Neferti 13f *pḫr-iḥy*[51] includes a late spelling *iḥy* for *3ḥt* 'field'.[52]

Neferti as documented in Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts thus presents the reader with a distinctively Eighteenth Dynasty surface in orthography (see also §2.3.1.1 for written grammatical morphology). Dating the original composition is an altogether different issue, however. Among the above, elements of the type presented in (a) are entirely unreliable, as is evidenced e.g. by a consideration of New Kingdom manuscripts of *Sinuhe*. Regarding (i), *i3š* in B (248) has been altered to *i3ˁš* in AOS and P2.

---

43   *TLA* #155760; *Wb.* IV 507.3-9; *DZA* 30.164.860 ('Dyn. 18 bis griechisch').
44   For this notion more broadly, Kammerzell 1999.
45   *TLA* #21780; also *DZA* 20.304.700-710.
46   Preserved only in Pet. The text is to be read as *iwtrw* (...), not as *iw* (*i*)*trw* (...), because subject-initial constructions in paragraph-initial position are regularly *iw*-less in *Neferti*; compare e.g. 8a (*ˁwt ḫ3st r swri* (...)); 10a (*r3 nb mḥ* (...)); 11a (*ḫn n mdt ḥr ib* (...)); 15a (*tw r ḳd* (...)). For the only apparent exception in 9a (stanza-initial in the extant mss., but not paragraph-initial), §5.2.3.3, (v). On aspects of *iw*-lessness in paragraph-initial position in *Neferti*, §5.2.3.
47   *EG* §272.
48   *DZA* 21.334.710-720.
49   In all witnesses (Pet.; O. DeM 1074; O. Petrie 38); noted by Helck 1992[2]: 28.
50   *DZA* 26.077.040-050.
51   Both Pet. and Cairo 25224; noted by Helck 1992[2]: 53.
52   *DZA* 21.912.960-970.

Regarding (ii), the spelling of *itn* without the divine semogram G7 in R 7 is kept in S, but has been altered to include the semogram in G (as well as subsequently, with cartouche, in AOS, C, B3). The spellings presented above in (b) and (c) are not as easily paralleled in New Kingdom manuscripts of compositions also documented in Middle Kingdom copies, and would, if *Neferti* is old, constitute more substantial alterations, including possible by-forms in the lexicon (iii), possible instances of genuine morphological renewal (iv), and distinctively late spellings (c). It may also be observed that the density of recent spellings in *Neferti* is higher than in other Middle Egyptian compositions. Yet, individual histories must be reckoned with when it comes to phenomena that are ultimately scribal in nature.

In sum, any arguments based on orthography are bound to remain highly uncertain and should be renounced at this stage, even in a case such as *Neferti* where the phenomenon is dense. The situation with written lexical morphology is thus similar to the one described above for written grammatical morphology. Inasmuch as possible changes in morphology can only manifest themselves as changes in written morphology, this illustrates once again how morphological change is largely trapped in a dead angle for the case of Middle Egyptian literary texts. Only in exceptional cases can an argument on a change in written lexical morphology be made, always to be related to further considerations (*sḏꜣḏꜣ*, §4.6.7, (i); *ꜥnꜥn*, §4.6.7, (ii); *ḥw-n-rꜣ-ḥr*, §6.3.2.2).

2.3.2   The linguistic phenomenology of Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts

While orthography remains unreliable for dating, and morphology therefore largely inaccessible, a different situation obtains with grammar. Per se, any element in a text could be altered in the course of textual transmission. However, the likelihood for this to actually happen, varies greatly depending on a variety of factors. Beyond the obvious—the quality of the witness considered—parameters include the mode of transmission of a composition, the type of linguistic expression considered, and the ways by which this fits, tightly or not so tightly, into its context. The following observations mainly concern Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts, in which texts to be discussed for dating are first documented; more substantial alterations are observed in Ramesside manuscripts.[53]

2.3.2.1   Different textual histories

Textual transmission, and therefore textual (in)stability, depends on the type of texts considered.[54] The transmission of Middle Egyptian literary texts in pre-Ramesside times was variable and not fully reproductive in all aspects, but not of an 'open' type.[55] *Ptahhotep* is known in two substantially different traditions already in the

---

53 E.g. Parkinson 2009: 187-207 and Köhler 2009: 5-56 (*Sinuhe*); Burkard 1977 (for teachings); Jäger 2004: 5-192 (*Kheti*); Fischer-Elfert 1992 (on textual interferences between compositions). For different versions of a Ramesside composition, also Spalinger 2002: 332-4 (Qadesh).

54 Contrast for instance with the Coffin Texts, where issues such as the 'actualization' of a (group of) spell(s) on a given coffin could play a major role; see e.g. Vernus 1996b.

55 Parkinson 2002: 50-3. 'Open transmission' was introduced to egyptological discussion by Quack (1994: 18-23), mainly with a view on later texts.

Middle Kingdom (P and L1), while Eighteenth Dynasty versions, which tend to follow the more regular Middle Kingdom tradition (L1), display evidence of further redaction.[56] Middle Kingdom versions of *Sinuhe* and *Eloquent Peasant* also show some variation, but not comparable to *Ptahhotep*.[57] This variation may in part go back to different performance versions;[58] in addition, the R tradition demonstrates regularizing tendencies,[59] and very few instances of local interpolations.[60] Early New Kingdom versions seem 'less free and more rigidly reproductive',[61] and do not present traces of a wholesale redaction comparable to the one to which *Ptahhotep* was subjected.[62] *Loyaliste* is the only Middle Egyptian composition to be documented in a shorter and in a much longer version, the first inscribed on a later Twelfth Dynasty stela, the latter documented through New Kingdom portable witnesses; this *Sonderfall* affords a discussion of its own (§4.5).

Among works of as yet uncertain dating, *Amenemhat* is a *sbꜣyt* (1a) in name, but only in an extended sense: the composition has narrative parts and includes many elements of fictionality.[63] Both *Amenemhat* and *Neferti* are composed in a tightly concentric pattern, with multiple long-distance echoes and symmetries that are integral to the core meanings these compositions project.[64] In terms of their structure and composition, *Amenemhat* and *Neferti* are therefore closer to *Sinuhe*, which is also concentrically patterned, than to the more additively patterned teachings, *Ptahhotep* and *Loyaliste*. Such structure is strong in Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts of *Amenemhat* and *Neferti* and implies that the text of these compostions—whenever they may have been originally composed—was more stable than in teachings such as *Ptahhotep* and *Loyaliste*. No similar comment extends to e.g. *Merikare*, which in its more additive structure conforms to teachings, and which could have had a more unstable text (this is of course not to mean that this should be posited).

The above observations bear on the overall stability or instability of a text. Assuming, for example, that *Amenemhat* or *Neferti* were composed in the Middle Kingdom, their textual history would have been of a substantially different sort than the one of *Ptahhotep*. Accordingly, the status of late features possibly to be detected in *Amenemhat* and *Neferti* must be appreciated differently than in e.g. *Ptahhotep* L2, a composition with a generally more unstable text. This is of course not to mean that such late features should necessarily be integral to the original composition; in all cases an individual discussion is required. In some cases, arguments can also be made

---

56 Hagen 2012a: 219-39; Vernus 2010²b: 103-6; Moers 2009; Heyne 2007; Burkard 1977; Stauder in press c.

57 Parkinson 2012a; 2009: 90-112, 119-25, 162-7.

58 Parkinson 2002: 126; Winand in press a.

59 An example is the 'narrative infinitives', which are prominent in the first part of B, partly replaced by (stylistically flatter) *sḏm.n=f*'s already in R, and further reduced in the course of the New Kingdom (Köhler 2009: 54-5; Kahl 1998; below, §4.1.3.B, §4.1.3.D.NB; disputed by Feder 2004).

60 Parkinson 2009: 164-5; for R 13-14, §4.5.5.1.B.

61 Parkinson 2009: 182; also 160-9; Kahl 1998: 399. A few changes are observed in G (Parkinson 2009: 184-6), most famously the rewriting Sinuhe's identity as a prince (Feder 2003). For stemmata proposed for *Sinuhe*, Winand in press a; Peust 2012; Kahl 1998.

62 Similarly Vernus 2010²b: 106 and n.22.

63 Lastly Gnirs 2013b: 134, 136-8.

64 Parkinson 2002: 193-200 (*Neferti*); 241-8 (*Amenemhat*).

on the compositional structure of the work to further assess whether an expression is part of the original composition or not (e.g. §5.2.3.3; §5.3.1.3).

2.3.2.2   Possible alterations of lexical expressions

Turning to individual expressions, lexical expressions are in general more loosely bound to their respective contexts than grammatical ones: with a lexical expression, it is often difficult to assess whether it belongs to the original text or not. Given that the issue does not lend itself to much further generalization, the following limits itself to a selective illustration of two different situations that can be encountered (many more will be discussed throughout the present study):

(i) *Sinuhe* G 15 (followed by AOS and C) *isḳ* 'wait for'

Middle Kingdom witnesses read differently: B 5 *irt*, R 28 *iw{t}*?*<d>*. *Neferti*, not documented before the early New Kingdom, also has an instance of *isḳ* (7g: §2.2.2, (i)), yet the cases of *Neferti* 7g and *Sinuhe* G 15 differ. If the B and R witnesses of *Sinuhe* had not survived, the secondariness of the reading in G (and later New Kingdom witnesses) would be recognized nonetheless based on the context, which is clearly garbled: G 15 [*rḏt(=i) wi*] *imytw b3ty r isḳ w3t šmw=sn* 'My placing myself between two bushes to wait for the road of their travellers.' 'Waiting for' (*isḳ*) a 'road' (*w3t*) yields little sense; in addition, the third person plural anaphoric pronoun (=*sn*) lacks an antecedent. In *Neferti* 7g, by contrast, *isḳ* coherently fits its context: 7g-h *tw r isḳ m3ḳt m grḥ tw r ʿḳ ḥnrwt tw r snbt ḳdd m irty* 'A ladder will be waited for at night! Strongholds will be entered! Slumber in the eyes will be swept away!' There is some likelihood therefore that *isḳ* in *Neferti* 7g is original, yet of course no way to prove this.

(ii) *Loyaliste* 2.2 (New Kingdom witnesses) *snsi* 'praise'

If the short version of *Loyaliste* inscribed on Sehetepibre's Stela had not survived—a statistically likely fate—there would be no way to assess the textual status of *snsi* in the New Kingdom copies *Loyaliste* 2.2: as it stands, the text makes good sense and the expression could well be original. Sehetepibre's Stela happened to survive, demonstrating that a different reading, *snsn* 'fraternize', is original; when the two versions are compared, this reading *snsn* appears superior to the one in New Kingdom witnesses.[65]

2.3.2.3   Possible alterations of grammatical expressions

Grammatical expressions tend to be more strongly bound to their respective contexts than lexical ones. Principled arguments are therefore often possible in assessing the textual status of a grammatical expression.

A. Textual secondariness can sometimes be established directly on internal grounds, when a construction is syntactically hybrid and/or implies tensions with its context. Different situations that can occur are preliminarily illustrated by two Gedanken-experimente with no bearing on dating.

---

65   Posener 1976: 20 (quoted below, §4.5.5.2, n.a to the relevant passage).

(i) *Sinuhe* AOS vso 42

ḥḏ-t3 iw r i3ꜥš n (...)

'At dawn, one came to call to (...)'

The construction in AOS is grammatically correct and fits the context semantically. It is only when B is drawn into the picture that the AOS reading appears secondary, effecting grammatical simplification. Compare B 248 *ḥḏ.n rf t3 iw iw i3š n=i* (...) 'When it dawned, one came and called to me (...)'. B has a complex serial construction[66] (*iw iw i3š n=i*) involving two subjectless passives (*iw*; *i3š*) with a shared argument (*n=i*). In AOS, a preposition is inserted to reduce the construction into a non-serial one with only one subjectless passive (*iw r i3ꜥš*). The resulting construction is much simpler and more easily processed.[67]

This account, however, is only possible in retrospect. If B had not survived, the secondariness of the text in AOS could not have been established based on grounds internal to AOS. Even less so could the original text, and subsequent processes of textual alteration, have been reconstructed.[68]

(ii) *Ptahhotep* 59 L2

iw gmm.tw=s m-ꜥ ḥmwt ḥr bnywt

'It (*scil*. fine speech) is found only with maidservants on the millstones.'

Ỉw gmm.tw=s in L2 is a hybrid construction, accommodating the conflicting semantics of the assertive *iw* with a form, the *mrr=f*, that expresses lesser informative salience of the verbal phrase.[69] Unlike in (i), the secondariness of L2 is therefore immediately hypothesized on purely internal grounds, without drawing any knowledge of the text in P into account.

It is then further hypothesized that the original construction, if not altogether different, would have been either *iw gm.tw=s* or *gmm.tw=s*. In a third step, it is observed that Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses of Middle Kingdom compositions, unlike Ramesside ones, do not display cases of intrusive *iw*'s. A reconstruction as *iw gm.tw=s* would therefore be hypothesized on purely text-internal grounds. As it turns out, this is just the original reading in P.

NB. The textual alteration in *Ptahhotep* 59 is in line with other cases in which a more explicit formal marking of information structure, such as by a *mrr=f*, is made in contexts in which an adverbial phrase has high informative salience. In *Ptahhotep* itself, compare:

---

66 In informal terms, a 'serial construction' is a construction that tightly links two verbal predicates, both semantically and syntactically. Semantically the events contribute to a joint meaning; syntactically, they are often in the same inflected form and/or share arguments. In the *Sinuhe* example, all of these apply.

67 On processing as a major parameter in textual histories, also below, §6.2.1.2.

68 Note that unlike most witnesses on which the present study is based, AOS is not from the Eighteenth Dynasty and has a more substantially altered text in general.

69 Occurrences of this combination are exceedingly rare. Another one is *Kemit* 8.C *iw rmm=s tw* 'she beweeps you.'

(α) in a general present tense context:

349 P *iw in.tw ꜥḳw wn ꜣḳ* 'Intimates are brought even though there is ruin.'

> → L2 *inn.tw m ꜥḳ wn ꜣhw* 'To an intimate recourse is made when there is trouble.' (Note the mediate object construction, only in L2.)

(β) in a future/modal context:

293 P *pr.tw ḥr irt=f ib ḥr win=f* 'One will emerge from doing it while the heart rejects it.'

> → L2 *prr.tw ḥr irt*[=*f*] *ib ḥr win=f* 'One will emerge from doing it precisely while the heart rejects it.'

This is more generally illustrative of how processes of textual alterations, although ultimately individual histories, tend to follow certain recurrent paths, rather than be fully random.

B. As these two Gedankenexperimente illustrate, a broad variety of situations can be encountered. In some cases, the secondariness of a reading can be established on internal grounds. Going further, the original reading can be reconstructed with some likelihood through a consideration of how the text in a given witness could have arisen (ii). In other cases, however, the secondariness of a reading can not be determined on similar internal grounds (i). Accordingly, the lack of an indication that a reading is secondary falls much short of what is required to declare it original. In establishing that a reading is original, additional arguments are required.

To these ends, a variety of strategies can be pursued, illustrated in individual details in the subsequent chapters. Among these, very general principles are the following. To begin with, not all grammatical constructions are equally likely to undergo alteration in the course of textual transmission. In addition, the ways a grammatical construction fits the surrounding segment of text, more or less tightly, can be indicative. An often useful strategy also consists in making the hypothesis that a reading is secondary and in examining the possible 'source constructions' from which this reading would have been altered, if indeed secondary. When no candidates can be named, the likelihood for a grammatical expression to be integral to the original text is high. Whenever possible, arguments are made along the above combined lines (e.g. §5.2.2; §6.2.1). In the most favorable cases, a grammatical expression can be directly proven to be original based on an analysis of the structural role it plays within the overall composition. The argument is then that the type of large-scale compositional patterning into which a construction fits and to which it contributes can not have arisen as a chance artifact in textual transmission nor through local rewriting (e.g. §5.2.3.3; §5.3.1.3).

In the following sections, I present three case studies which require more substantial developments. The first illustrates how an assessment of the textual status of an expression is impossible when only the individual clauses in which that expression occurs are considered, yet becomes possible when relevant aspects of the articulation of a composition as a whole are brought into consideration (§2.3.3). The second and third are complementary. In the former, I examine a verse in a composition known only through New Kingdom manuscripts, *Teaching of a Man to His Son*,

and discuss which among the readings that have been proposed is original (§2.3.4). In the latter, I consider a section of a composition of which both Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses survived, *Ptahhotep*, and discuss whether a linguistic dating based on the main Eighteenth Dynasty witness could have resulted in wrongly ascribing the composition to the early New Kingdom (§2.3.5).

2.3.3 Assessing the textual status of grammatical expressions:
    NP ḥr sḏm and *N(P) sḏm=f* in *Kheti*

Kheti has a great many occurrences of *NP ḥr sḏm* and a fair amount of *N(P) sḏm=f*'s. The composition thereby lends itself to a case study in how the two constructions—both expressing relative present tense yet with different aspect—can be affected, or not, in the case of textual transmission. The issue has broader relevance because these constructions are central to one major dating criterion (§2.6).

The following comments are not based on a stemmatological approach.[70] By definition, this provides no tool for going beyond the possibly earliest archetype, except by an additional examination of grammar on the clausal or sentential levels.[71] Yet, several grammatical constructions are often acceptable in one passage. In particular, both *NP ḥr sḏm* and *N(P) sḏm=f* are similarly correct in Middle Egyptian grammar. These differ in meaning, yet not in ways that one or the other could be declared more likely based on usual text-critical methods. In circumstantial clauses, the contrast between the two constructions can be neutralized to a large extent, as is demonstrated e.g. by *Sinuhe* B 2, where B has *iw=f ḥr mdt* 'as he was speaking', while R reads *iw=f mdw=f* 'as he spoke'. Although the contrast between the two Egyptian constructions can be aptly transposed into a similar contrast in English, the actual difference in meaning between the two constructions is minimal in both these languages. In main clauses, the issue is made even more complex by the issue of the date of composition of a text, in many cases itself an unknown. In texts composed from the late Middle Kingdom on, *NP ḥr sḏm* increasingly comes to be used in the same contexts as *N(P) sḏm=f* (§2.6.1-2). Moreover, *N(P) sḏm=f* can in all relevant periods be used where *NP ḥr sḏm* is (§5.3.5.2.A).

To circumvent these problems, the perspective is here set on the parameters by which the alternation between *NP ḥr sḏm* and *N(P) sḏm=f* is principled, or not, within the composition considered. The approach thereby targets aspects of the temporality of *Kheti* as a whole. On the other hand, the analysis to follow is specific to *Kheti* in particular: in other texts, different issues are relevant (thus, concerning the same alternation, §2.6.2.2-3 for *Eloquent Peasant*; §2.6.2.4 for *Ipuwer*; §2.6.2.5 for *Khakheperreseneb*). As illustrated throughout the present study, the interpretation of grammar and textual history often requires a consideration of the broader semantic, temporal, and/or formal articulation of a composition being examined (for other constructions, e.g. §5.2.2; §5.2.3.3; §5.3.1.3).

---

70 For such, Jäger 2004. Critically emphasizing how the stemmatological method when applied to literary texts relies on partly problematic assumptions made on the transmission of these, Fischer-Elfert 2007: 309.

71 E.g. Backes 2011; for a recent illustration, e.g. Werning 2011: I, 51-82.

A. In the text of *Kheti* as transmitted, *N(P) sḏm=f* is found in general maxims mostly in the final sections of the text (i). Yet, the construction recurs in a few other places including at the beginning of 'chapters' (ii). *NP ḥr sḏm*, for its part, is common at the beginning of individual 'chapters', more than anywhere else in the text (iii):

> (i) *Kheti* 27.2
>
> *iw ẖꜣẖ-ib ḏ=f mḥ ib* (...)
>
> '(If an official sends you in mission, speak according to what he has spoken, do not take from it, do not add to it!)
> The hasty-hearted one produces negligence (...)'
>
>> Sim. 25.2. Also 14.4, in continuation to a passive *sḏm.tw=f* (14.3) in the apodosis to a *ir*-introduced hypothetical clause (14.3): for this passage, see the analysis in §5.3.2.2.D.

> (ii) *Kheti* 8.1
>
> *bty ḫd=f r idḥw r iṯṯ n=f swnw*
>
> 'The reed-cutter fares downstream to the Delta to take away arrows for himself.'
>
>> Sim. 3.1.

> (iii) *Kheti* 12.1
>
> *kꜣri ḥr int mw m mꜣwḏ kꜥḥ=f nb ḥr tnw*
>
> 'The gardener is bringing water with a carrying bar; each of his shoulder suffers of old age.'
>
>> Sim. 6.1; 7.1; 13.1; 16.1; 19.1.

Uses as in (i) are unremarkable: *N(P) sḏm=f* is a regular expression of general or habitual events. More noteworthy are the occurrences of *NP ḥr sḏm* at the beginning of 'chapters' characterizing trades (iii): in almost no case is a temporal limitation readily implied by the immediate context.[72] As trades are characterized in general terms in *Kheti*, one then wonders why *N(P) sḏm=f* is not also used here. Moreover, *N(P) sḏm=f* is occasionally found at the beginning of 'chapters' (ii), in contexts apparently similar to the ones in (iii) that have *NP ḥr sḏm*.

When grammar is examined only locally, at the clausal or sentential levels, this would seem to suggest that *NP ḥr sḏm* in *Kheti* as transmitted can express habitual or general events, just like *N(P) sḏm=f* does. Two interpretive possibilities would then offer themselves. If original, the uses of *NP ḥr sḏm* as in (ii)-(iii) could reflect a later date of composition of the text (under application of Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* argument, §2.6.2—note that Vernus himself did *not* apply his criterion to *Kheti*, rightly so; see the discussion below). Alternatively, instances of *NP ḥr sḏm* could be

---

72 A possible exception is only 16.1 *sḫḫti ḥr prt r ḫꜣst swḏ.n=f ḥwt=f n msw=f* 'The courier is going to a foreign country having handed over its belongings to his children', where an initial limitation may be implied by the circumstantial clause. Perhaps also 7.1, depending on how this is read or emended.

secondary to original *N(P) sḏm=f*'s in these 'chapter'-initial positions in *Kheti*. As it turns out, both these interpretations are equally wrong.

B. The *NP ḥr sḏm*'s in (iii) are with events that characterize trades. Under a purely local examination of grammar, these could be viewed as expressing habitual or general aspect. When, however, the broader articulation of the text is taken into account, it appears that these characterizations of trades are set under the scope of a presentification to the addressee. In *Kheti*, a father tells his son (*ḏd=i n=k*: 10.1; 21.1; 23.1), speaking of what he has 'seen', i.e. experienced (*m33*: 2.1; 3.2; 4.1; 4.2).

   This compares with the speech situation in *Neferti*, a composition in which events are presented to the addressee (simultaneously Neferti's heart, the king, and the audience): 4a *ḫft-ḥr=k* 'in your presence'; 3f *m-bȝḥ=k* 'before you' (also *ḏ=i n=k* (...) 'I shall show you (...)', recurrently in the lament). In *Neferti*, present tense events in the *NP ḥr sḏm* fall under the scope of such presentification and thus express progressive aspect, e.g. (iv) (on presentification in *Neferti*, further §5.3.1.3.C). In *A Man to His Son* similarly, present tense events in the *NP ḥr sḏm* construction are mostly dependent on a presentification. The aspectual 'extension' expressed by the construction is thereby related to an act of 'seeing' (*m33*), e.g. (v):

   (iv) *Neferti* 9f

   ḏ=i n=k sȝ m ḫrwy sn m ḫft
   s ḥr smȝ it=f (...)

   'I shall show you the son an enemy, the brother an opponent,
   a man killing his father (...)'

   (v) *A Man* 8.1-6

   m33=n ḫȝst nbt ḥr ḥryt=f
   iw wrw=sn ḥr ḳnb n=f sn (...)
   pwnt idbw ḫȝw-nbwt iw nṯr ḥr nwḥ n=f st (...)

   'We see every foreign country dreading him:
   Their great ones are inclining themselves to him (...);[73]
   Punt and the shores of the Hau-Nebu, the god is binding them for him (...)'[74]

A similar type of analysis extends to *Kheti*: characterizations of trades as in *Kheti* 12.1 are not viewed under an habitual or general aspect, because they fall under the scope of a presentification (to the speaker's son, and thereby to the audience). In perhaps more intuitive terms, the aspectual perspective is not 'the X-er (habitually) does so and so', but 'I have seen and I am hereby presenting you with (an image of) the X-er do-*ing* so and so.'

   The analysis accords with the lack of *iw* in all these 'chapter'-initial constructions of *NP ḥr sḏm* in *Kheti*. In contexts where *iw* could have been present syntactically, the lack of the particle signals that the state-of-affairs in the clause is presented en bloc,

---

73 On the intertext of *A Man* 8.2 and Rekhmire 13-14 (*Urk.* IV 1075, 16), Fischer-Elfert 1999: 102 (interpreting this as a quotation from the former into the latter).

74 A similar formulation recurs in Thutmosis III's *Poetical Stela* 5 (*Urk.* IV 612, 14): see Fischer-Elfert 1999: 103.

rather than related to some preceding segment of discourse.[75] Events presented en bloc naturally come with a progressive view on the event. Significantly, the events under the scope of presentification in *Neferti*, both future and present tense ones, are also *iw*-less (§5.2.3.3; §5.3.1.3). Beyond literary texts, the analysis extends to *iw*-less *NP ḥr sḏm* in captions to images, e.g. *wḥꜥw ḥr ḥꜣm* [*rm*]*w* 'fishers are catching fish' (*Bersheh* II, pl.XVI). In *Kheti* and in *Neferti* similarly, the speaker presents its audience with images of what he has seen.

C. This leaves the two instances of *N(P) sḏm=f* in similar 'chapter'-initial positions (ii) to be explained. In 8.1 (quoted above), the use of *N(P) sḏm=f* relates to the Aktionsart of the event: the 'reed-cutter' 'fares downstream to the delta' (*ḥdi r idḥw*), and thereby a long way: the event can not easily be captured in a snapshot. In similar structural positions in the two preceding 'chapters', *wḥb mnḫwt* 'bore beads' (6.1) and *ḥꜥḳ* 'shave' (7.1) are both in the *NP ḥr sḏm* construction, just like other characterizations of trades (above, B).

In 3.1 *iw=f ir=f sꜣrt n ky* 'He fulfills somebody else's need', the referent of the subject is of direct relevance for interpretation. So is the position of the clause in the text. The statement is about the scribe, not about any of the other trades. The clause directly follows the quotation from *Kemit* (note the anaphoric subject pronoun) and has generalizing force. *Kheti* 3.1, in the introductory part of the composition, does not fall under the scope of presentification as the following characterizations of trades do.

D. The above analysis directly demonstrates that all instances of both *NP ḥr sḏm* and *N(P) sḏm=f* are integral to the original text of *Kheti*. It does so in ways that neither a study of textual variation in extant witnesses, nor an examination of grammar solely on the clausal or sentential levels, could. Observing that witnesses are remarkably consistent with each other in these passages only points to a common archetype, not necessarily to the original text. In the passages that have *NP ḥr sḏm*, *N(P) sḏm=f* would not have been ungrammatical or semantically inappropriate. Nor would *NP ḥr sḏm* have in the passage which have *N(P) sḏm=f*, depending on the time to which *Kheti* is dated.

The reader will notice that the result reached happens to be very similar to Jäger's. *As it turns out*, the tradition of *Kheti* is remarkably stable with respect to the two constructions considered. This, however, is the very research question here discussed ('how stable, or unstable, is the text with respect to the two constructions considered?'). No answer to this question can be presupposed: this must be independently established, as it was above.

E. Once the original readings are established, and only then, comments can be made on the textual tradition. In one place, P. Sallier II—which is Ramesside and not the best of witnesses in general—replaces *N(P) sḏm=f* with *NP ḥr sḏm*, yet does so only incompletely. The result is a hybrid formation:[76]

---

75 In more technical terms, such environments are analyzed as 'thetic' (Stauder & Uljas in prep.).

76 Noted by Vernus 1990a: 190-1, ex.412.

(vi) *Kheti* 3.1

P. Sallier II   *iw=f ḥr ir=f sꜣrt n ky*

Mult. mss.   *iw=f ir=f sꜣrt n ky*

'He fulfills somebody else's need.'

> For similar hybrid formations occasionally encountered elsewhere in Ramesside manuscripts, §2.3.4.1, (iv)-(v).

Most witnesses keep the original reading, as all do in other passages. While the text of *Kheti* is notoriously unstable, surprisingly little variation concerns cases where a *N(P) sḏm=f* construction would have been replaced by a *NP ḥr sḏm* one. The reverse alteration is to my knowledge undocumented in any text; it would also be unexpected as it would run counter to linguistic history (§2.6.1.1). These observations made on *Kheti*—in some respects a 'worst-case scenario text'—demonstrate that *NP ḥr sḏm* and *N(P) sḏm=f* tend to be stable in the course of textual tradition, particularly in Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts on which the present study is mainly based.

2.3.4 Identifying the original reading based on New Kingdom manuscripts: *A Man to His Son* 3.1

A Man 3.1 could afford an indication for dating the composition, depending on how the text originally read. In the context of the present chapter, a discussion of this verse is illustrative of how, when classical approaches to textual criticism fail to settle the issue, the original reading may nonetheless be accessible through a more thorough examination of grammar itself.

2.3.4.1 The competing readings

A. The traditional interpretation of this difficult and much discussed passage follows the extant manuscripts, reading as in (i). The editor of the text proposes to read differently, as in (ii):

(i) *A Man* 3.1, traditional reading[77]

in iw hrw n rnnt ḥr tht=f

'Does a day of Renenet contravene itself?'

(ii) *A Man* 3.1, alternative reading[78]

*in iw *hꜣw n rnnt th.tw=f*

'Wird etwa die *Angelegenheit (/das Ressort) der Renenet überteten (/verletzt)?'

The passage involves considerable semantic complexities.[79] Both readings seem equally acceptable at this level.[80] The following remarks therefore limit themselves to the more formal aspects, textual and grammatical, that are involved.[81]

---

77 E.g. Vernus 2010²b: 292, n.27; 1990a: 186-7, ex.401, and n.83 (references to the previous discussion); Quack 2000a: 538.

78 Fischer-Elfert 1999: 58-9, 66.

For the present purpose, the crucial issue resides in identifying the grammatical construction. Among witnesses sufficiently preserved, five out of six read *N ḥr tḥꜣ*(*.tw*)=*f*. One, IFAO 2359, has *N tḥꜣ.*[*tw*]=*f*:

Manuscript tradition of A Man 3.1

DeM 1665I+, OG 318, OG 317,   *in iw hrw* (*n*) *rnnt ḥr tḥꜣ*(*.tw*)=*f* [82]
DeM 1667, P. 14374

IFAO 2359   [...] *hrw rnnt tḥꜣ.*[*tw*]=*f.*

In the traditional interpretation (i), one witness, IFAO 2359, would present a minor alteration, the omission of *ḥr*. In the reading proposed by the editor of the text (ii), the other manuscripts would result from the insertion of *ḥr* into an original *N tḥ.tw*=*f*:

A Man 3.1, competing textual scenarios

- *Ḥr* omitted (*N ḥr tḥt*=*f* → *N tḥt*=*f*) in IFAO 2359;
- Constructional alteration (*N tḥ.tw*=*f* → *N ḥr tḥt*=*f*) in the other mss.

B. Under the traditional interpretation, the loss of *ḥr* in IFAO 2359 is unproblematic. In the early New Kingdom, the morpheme *ḥr* was much reduced in its phonetic substance in the grammaticalized construction *NP ḥr sḏm*. The omission of *ḥr* in this construction is otherwise documented, thus already in a very early Eighteenth Dynasty manuscript of another Middle Egyptian literary text:

(iii) *Loyaliste* 8.2

TC   *iw rꜣ sbꜣ ḏr rk nṯr*

PL (and later mss.)   *iw rꜣ ḥr sbꜣ ḏr rk nṯr*

'Speech is teaching since the time of god.'

> In view of the earlier date of TC, one may wonder whether *iw rꜣ sbꜣ* (...) could be
> faulty for an original *iw rꜣ sbꜣ*=*f* (...) rather than for *iw rꜣ ḥr sbꜣ* (...). The reading
> in PL and in other manuscripts, *iw rꜣ ḥr sbꜣ* (...), would then be yet a further
> reinterpretation, making the reading grammatical again, if in a different way.
> However, the presence of *ḏr rk nṯr* in the clause, which defines a left temporal

---

79 Lastly Vernus 2010[2]b: 289-90.

80 Compare Fischer-Elfert 1999: 58-9, advocating (ii); Quack 2000a: 538, advocating (i).

81 The alternative reading proposed by Fischer-Elfert (1999: 58) additionally implies an emendation of *hrw* (all mss.) into **hꜣw*. The emendation (originally proposed by Fecht 1978: 30-1) is not supported by external evidence (Quack 2000a: 538 and n.9). It may still be hypothesized that all extant witnesses derive from some common archetype. The issue has some bearing on the overall semantic interpretation of the passage but not on identifying the following verbal construction; it is therefore left open here.

82 DeM 1665I+ and OG 318 with a spelling *tw* for the ending of the infinitive; OG 317 and DeM 1667 with the ending of the infinitive dropped; P. 14374 with the ending of the infinitive corrupted into *pw*.

limit, implies that the event is viewed in its extension.[83] The progressive construction, *iw rꜣ ḥr sbꜣ*, is therefore original.

In the alternative interpretation proposed by Fischer-Elfert, the textual alteration would have been more substantial in nature. A secondary insertion of *ḥr* implies a constructional reinterpretation, from a synthetic construction, *N(P) sḏm=f*, into an analytic one, *NP ḥr sḏm*.[84] The process is uncommon (§2.3.3), but occasionally documented in Ramesside manuscripts. One example is from no other text than *A Man to His Son* itself (iv):

(iv) *A Man* 4.9

OL 23561   *iw=f ḥr sbꜣ=f* (...)   (OG 317 *iw=f ḥr sbꜣ* [...];
                                          IFAO unn. ro *iw=f* [...] *sbꜣ=f*)

Var. mss.   *iw=f sbꜣ=f* (...)

'He teaches (...)'

> Sim. *Kheti* 3.1 P. Sallier II (§2.3.3, (vi)). With a secondary alteration of the subject into a first person, also *Sinuhe* C 4 (Twentieth Dynasty; = B 2)[85] *iw=i*[sic] *ḥr mdt=f*; compare *iw=f mdw=f* 'as he spoke' in the R tradition (R, G, AOS; for the reading in B, §2.3.3, intro.).

In this, the result of the alteration is a hybrid between the original *iw=f sḏm=f* and *iw=f ḥr sḏm*. The former construction was obsolete in the Nineteenth Dynasty. The latter was as well in main clauses, but is morphologically close to the then regular *sw ḥr sḏm*. As such occasional hybrids document, some Ramesside scribes—probably not all—had problems with the old *N(P) sḏm=f*.

   Related is (v), also with an intrusive *ḥr*, but in the context of an original cleft-sentence with the old independent pronoun *twt*. The result is a hybrid as well:

(v) *Amenemhat* 15c

Var. mss. (incl. P. Sallier II)   *twt ḥr wꜣḥ ḥḏt* (...)

Var. other mss.   *twt wꜣḥ ḥḏt* (...)

'You wear the White Crown (...)'

> That the construction was not any more understood by some Ramesside scribes is also suggested by the spelling of *twt*, as if this were the word for 'statue'.[86] For a discussion of *Amenemhat* 15c in context, below §6.3.1.

---

83 Compare *Merikare* E 93 *iw=f ḥr ꜥhꜣ ḏr rk nṯr* 'He is fighting since the time of god.' For the role of the left temporal limit in the aspectual interpretation of this passage as progressive, Vernus 1990a: 165, ex.342.

84 In the present case, some semantic reinterpretation would have been involved as well, since the synthetic construction would have been passive while the secondary analytic one would have been active and reflexive.

85 Noted by Vernus 1990a: 182, n.66.

86 Burkard 1977: 43. For textual interferences with Ramesside witnesses of *Hymn* 5.5 (notably P. Sallier II), Fischer-Elfert 1992: 354-5.

The textual processes implied in either reading of *A Man* 3.1 are thereby documented. The traditional reading is the one in the majority of manuscripts, but this is not a strong argument since witnesses other than IFAO 2359 could derive from a common archetype or have altered the text in similar ways independently from each other. The textual alteration posited in the editor's reading is less commonly documented than the one in the traditional reading, but it is documented, and thereby possible. It is also more substantial as it involves a constructional reinterpretation, but this too can not serve as a reliable argument against it. In (iv) as in other cases presented above, the result of the textual alteration is a hybrid: under the hypothesis that *N th.tw=f* is original in *A Man* 3.1, *N ḥr th.tw=f* could be a hybrid as well, if *tw* is taken as an hangover of an original passive *N th.tw=f*. It could also be a spelling of the ending of the infinitive, if *N ḥr tht=f* is original. Witnesses without *tw* (OG 317, DeM 1667) could be secondary to either of the above.

In short, the traditional reading implies hardly any textual alteration, while the alternative reading comes with an uncommon and fairly thorough-going scenario of textual alteration. Yet, this does not suffice to declare the traditional reading original. Which of the two readings is original can not be decided solely at these levels.

2.3.4.2 Issues of grammar

The alternative reading proposed by the editor, with a passive construction, may at first seem to find some support in the immediately following verses. These also have passive constructions, not *NP ḥr sḏm*. The broader context is quoted here under inclusion of 3.1 read as the editor proposes:

> *A Man* 3.1-3
> *in iw *hꜣw n rnnt th.tw=f*
> *in iw wꜣḥ.tw hrw n ꜥḥꜥw*
> *in iw ḫbꜣ.tw im=f rꜣ-pw*
> '*Wird etwa die *Angelegenheit (/das Ressort) der Renenet überteten (/verletzt)?*
> Is a day added to the span of life?
> Or does one subtract from it?'

There is, however, a difference between the construction in 3.2 and the one hypothesized for 3.1. The second verse has a *sḏm.tw N* construction, with the full noun after the verb, not a *N sḏm.tw=f*, as 3.1 would have in this reading. (Verse 3.3 is from an intransitive verb, and therefore subjectless in the passive.)

Yet, the passive counterpart of the general present tense *N(P) sḏm=f* is *sḏm.tw NP* (as e.g. in *A Man* 3.2)—not **N(P) sḏm.tw=f*. Given that this formal dissymmetry between the active and passive paradigms is hardly discussed in grammatical studies,[87] a lengthy digression is required to establish the relevant facts.

---

87 A lone exception is a marginal note in Vernus 1986: 377 and n.10; the issue is also shimmering through in *EG* §462-3. A more detailed treatment will be given in Stauder in prep.

2.3.4.2.1 *N sḏm.tw* in *Ipuwer*

At first, the possibility of a construction *N sḏm.tw=f* functioning as a passive counterpart to *N(P) sḏm=f* would seem to be suggested by occasional occurrences of the former construction in two Middle Egyptian literary texts, *Sinuhe* and *Ipuwer*. The former has two occurrences of *N sḏm.tw=f* in parallel to each other, while the latter has several occurrences of a slightly different construction, *N sḏm.tw*. After briefly discussing the former construction, I examine the more complex problems posed by the latter.

A. The *Sinuhe* passage just alluded to reads:

> (i) *Sinuhe* B 233-234
> *mw m itrw swr.tw=f mr=k*
> *ṯꜣw m pt ḥnm.tw ḏd=k*
> 'The water in the river, it is drunk as you wish;
> The air in the sky, it is breathed as you say.'

As is implied by the balancing of the two verses,[88] the pre-verbal noun phrases (*mw m itrw*; *ṯꜣw m pt*) are topicalized. Syntactically, they stand outside the boundaries of their respective clauses.[89] The construction in *Sinuhe* is therefore a marked topic construction. In *A Man* 3.1, no contrastive topic is involved. A marked topic construction of another kind is also ruled out on formal grounds by the presence of *in iw* at the beginning of the sentence. In short, the construction in *Sinuhe* B 233-234 is different from the one that *A Man* 3.1 would have had under the reading here discussed.

B. The case of *Ipuwer* is more complex. A typical instance of a passive construction with pre-verbal subject is:[90]

> (ii) *Ipuwer* 5.6
> *iw ms msw srw ḥw.tw r sꜣwt*
> *ḥrdw nw nḥt ḏ.tw ḥr ḳꜣnr*
> 'But now, the children of officials are beaten against the wall,
> children of prayer are placed on the high ground.'

The constructions in *Ipuwer* have presentative force. This is implied by the overall presentative articulation of the lament, underscored by the recurrent use of *iw ms NP (...)* and *mṯn is NP (...)*.[91] The interpretation is confirmed by other constructions in similar environments, for which the written form is explicit in implying that the pre-verbal nouns must stand outside the boundaries of the clause:

---

88 The whole passage is balanced: B 232-234 *m wi m ḫnw m wi m st tn ntk ḥbs ꜣḫt tn wbn itn n mrt=k mw m itrw (...)* 'Whether I am in the Residence, or whether I am in this place: you are the one who veils this horizon, while the sun shines for love of you; the water in the river (...)'.

89 Technically, the segmentation is: [[*mw m itrw*]left-dislocated topic [*swr.tw im=f*]clause]sentence. In the spoken chain, this was probably marked by an intonational break, as is the case with similar constructions in other languages (notably all Egyptological translation languages).

90 Translations of *Ipuwer* in this section are taken over or adapted from Enmarch 2008.

91 For a semantic analysis of *iw ms* and *mṯn is* in *Ipuwer*, Oréal 2011: 274-5 and 138, respectively.

- In negative constructions:

(iii) *Ipuwer* 4.5-6

iw ms idḥw r-ḏr=f nn dgi.tw=f (...)

'But now, the whole Delta, it will not be concealed (...)'

> Sim. in the active 3.10-11[92] *iw ms ꜣbw ṯni* [*spꜣw*]*tʔ šmꜤw n bꜣk n* [*ḥꜣ*]*Ꜥyt* 'But now, Elephantine, Thinis, and the nomes(?) of Upper Egypt, they have not worked because of strife.'

- With extraposition of a constituent other than the subject:

(iv) *Ipuwer* 6.8-9

iw ms sšw nw tmꜣ dr sšw=sn (...)

'But now, the scribes of the field registers, their writings have been obliterated (...)'

> With a *sḏm(w)*-passive. Sim. in the active, 7.7 *mtn tꜣ ṯs.n=f ḥr smꜣy(t) ḳn ḥsi ḥr nḥm* [*ḫwt*]*=f* 'Look, the land, it has knotted together in gangs; the strong man, the vile man carries off his things.' Etc.

Significant is also the following passage, in which *N sḏm.tw* follows *sḏm.tw N*. The two constructions correlate with different types of subjects. In the first, the post-verbal subject (*ḫnmw*, 'dependents') is not further defined. In the second, the pre-verbal subject is locally defined (*ḥbsy p(ꜣ)ḳt*, 'those who used to wear fine linen'):

> (v) *Ipuwer* 4.8-9
> *iw ms ḏ.tw ḫnmw ḥr bnwt*
> *ḥbsy p(ꜣ)ḳt ḥw.tw m ḏꜣwt*
> 'But now, dependents are put to quernstones;
> Those who used to wear fine linen, they are beaten wrongly.'

C. Instances of *N sḏm.tw* in *Ipuwer* are often in parallel with other passive or related constructions: *sḏm N* (*sḏm(w)*-passive) and *N sḏm* (*subject – pseudoparticiple*). E.g.:

> (vi) *Ipuwer* 6.8
> *iw ms sšw smꜣ.tw*
> *šd sšw=sn*
> 'But now, scribes are being slain,
> their writings have been removed.'

In analyzing these alternations, aspect appears to be one relevant parameter. *N sḏm.tw* often seems to function as a present tense passive expressing ongoing action. The construction contrasts with perfective passives, implying or expressing a resultant state (*sḏm N* and *N sḏm*, respectively). This is reflected in the above, perhaps overly explicit, translation of 6.8. A perfective interpretation of the passive constructions other than *N sḏm.tw* is illustrated in the following contexts:

---

92 Restoration after Enmarch 2005: 29.

- *Sḏm N* (not uncommon):

(vii) *Ipuwer* 2.11

iw ms (...) *ḫbȝ niwt*
šmʿw ḫpr [*m kȝ*]*yw šwy*

'But now, (...) a town is hacked up,
Upper Egypt has become empty fields.'

> Sim. e.g. 6.7 *iw ms wn ḫȝ<w> šd wpwt=s<n>* 'But now, offices are opened and their inventories have been removed'; 3.4-5 *iw* [*ms*] *gmgm hnw nw hbni* 'But now, chests of ebony are smashed'; *passim*.

- *N sḏm*(*w*) (very common):

(viii) *Ipuwer* 2.6

iw ms mwtw ʿšȝw krsw m itrw

'But now, the many dead are buried in the river.'

> Sim. e.g. 2.2 *iw ms ḥr ʿȝdw pḏt*(*i*) *grg ʿdȝ m st nbt* 'But now, the face is pale, the bowman settled, falsehood everywhere'; 7.4 *mtn sštȝ n tȝ ḫmm ḏrw=f sḥȝw* 'Look, the secret of the land the boundaries of which are unknown is stripped bare'; *passim*.

D. Matters might be more complex, however, since the distribution of passive and related constructions in *Ipuwer* is principled along aspectual lines only in part. *N sḏm.tw* is comparatively less common in *Ipuwer* than other passive and related constructions (*sḏm N* and *N sḏm*). Most occurrences of the former cluster around recurrent formulations, mainly with two verbs (*ḥwi* and *rḏi*), and often in set phrases:

(ix) *N sḏm.tw* in set phrases:

- With *ḥwi*: 5.6 (above, (ii); identically 4.3-4); also 4.8-9 (above, (v));
- With *rḏi ḥr kȝnr*: 5.6 (above, (ii)); 4.4 (identically 6.14); with *rḏi* and another adverbial phrase, 3.14-4.1;
- An exception: 6.8 (above, (vi)).

Even formulations tightly similar to these set phrases with *N sḏm.tw* display some textual fluctuation in the nature of the construction:

(x) *N sḏm* (*subject – pseudoparticiple*) in contexts similar to *N sḏm.tw* in (ii):

- With *rḏi*: 6.9-10 *iw ms hpw nw ḫn*(*r*)*t ḏw r ḫnti* 'But now, the laws of the labor enclosure are cast out.'
- With *V ḥr kȝnr*: 7.8 *mtn nbw wʿbwt dr ḥr kȝnr* 'Look, the owner of sepulchers are repelled onto the high ground.'
- With *msw srw V*: 6.12-13 *iw ms msw srw ḫȝʿ m mrwt* 'But now, the children of officials are thrown into the street.'

The possibility of textual alterations must therefore be taken into account, all the more so for a text documented only in a single manuscript, P. Leiden I 344 ro, dating to the late Nineteenth Dynasty.[93] As (ix) and (x) suggest, at least some instances of *N sḏm.tw* may be secondary to an original *N sḏm*.

Rather than merely graphic,[94] the phenomenon would have been constructional, implying genuine reinterpretation on syntactic, morphological, and semantic levels. Morphologically, the pseudoparticiple would have been turned into a suffixal passive. Semantically, a perfective form of the verb would therbey have been made a present tense one. Syntactically, the pre-verbal subject would have become an extraposed one. The process of alteration could have been supported by the presence of other presentative topic constructions in the composition, also with extraposed subjects. Under such a scenario, it would not be surprising that events that naturally lend themselves to a dynamic interpretation—such as *ḥwi* 'beat' (4.3-4; 4.8-9; 5.6: above, (ii)) and *smꜣ* 'kill' (6.8: above, (vi))—would have been the ones primarily affected by a reinterpretation into a non-perfective construction.

E. The Ipuwerian construction *N sḏm.tw* remains to my knowledge unparalleled in Middle Egyptian, both in the literary corpus and elsewhere. Among other subjectless verbal constructions, only *N sḏm.n* is reasonably common (§1.2, (xi)). This, however, is a *Sonderfall*, since the conditioning possibility of the construction lies with the morphological specificities of the tense marker *-n-*.[95] Lacking the tense marker *-n-*, *N sḏm* is altogether exceptional: the construction is apparently documented only twice in the Middle Egyptian record and remains unclear in interpretation (§2.4.2, (vi)). Entirely unrelated is the only superficially similar construction in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 327-328, to be read as a relative form with *tw*:[96] *srw ir.n.tw r ḥsf r iit* (...) 'the officials who were appointed to outlaw evil (...)'.

There is serious doubt, therefore, that *N sḏm.tw* ever existed as a regular construction in Middle Egyptian. The construction no doubt made sense to the copyist of P. Leiden I 344 ro and to the readers of this stage in the tradition of *Ipuwer*. With a view on language as consisting in evolving repertoires rather than in a fully stable grammar, a description of the construction in this sense belongs to a comprehensive grammar of Middle Egyptian yet to be written. In the same perspective, the particular status of the construction, possibly limited to one text and arguably an artifact of the textual transmission of that text, must then also be emphasized.

2.3.4.2.2 The passive counterpart of *N(P) sḏm=f* in Middle Egyptian

N sḏm.tw in *Ipuwer* does not afford evidence in support of the existence of a construction *N sḏm.tw=f* as implied in Fischer-Elfert's reading of *A Man* 3.1. Nor does the contrastive topic construction in *Sinuhe* B 233-234. Another construction is always used as the passive counterpart of *N(P) sḏm=f*, namely *sḏm.tw NP*. Taking examples

---

93   For the date of P. Leiden I 344 ro, Enmarch 2005: 11.

94   As already observed by Enmarch (2008: 94), the later Nineteenth Dynasty is still too early for an interpretation of *<tw>* in *N sḏm.tw* as a written ending of the pseudoparticiple.

95   Edel 1959: 30-7; Stauder in press b: §10.

96   Parkinson 2012a: 263.

from Middle Kingdom literary texts, the counterpart relationship is illustrated in *Ptahhotep* (i)-(ii) and in the Fifth Petition of *Eloquent Peasant* (iii)-(iv).[97] The same counterpart relationship is also observed in *A Man to His Son* itself (v)-(vi):

(i) *Ptahhotep* 103 P

iw s ḏd=f (...)

'A man says (...)'

> Sim. 373 *iw štm ꜥḳ=f n iwt* 'The aggressive one ends in trouble'; 506 *iw wnft-ib sip=s ꜥḳꜣꜣ* 'A joyful woman checks the *aqaa*-water'; 574 *iw wḫꜣ mḏd=f* 'The fool presses(?)'; *passim.*

(ii) *Ptahhotep* 288 P

iw pḥ.tw mwt ḥr rḫ st

'Death is reached trying to know it.'

> Sim. 349 *iw in.tw ꜥḳw wn ꜣḳ* 'Intimates are brought when there is ruin'; 284 *iw ngb.tw s ḫꜣ r ꜣḫt n=f* 'A thousand men are tied against what is good for them'; with a pronominal subject, 59 *iw gm.tw=s m-ꜥ ḥmwt ḥr bnwt* 'It is found with maidservants on the millstones'; *passim.*

(iii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 261-262

iw wḫꜥ ḫbꜣ=f itrw

'The fisher ravages the river.'

(iv) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 267

iw mḥ.tw ib im=k

'You are trusted.'

(v) *A Man* 1.10

ḫn ḫwrw swḫꜣ=f ḏd sw

'Bad speech makes the one who says it a fool.'

> Sim. 4.1 *iw=f sḫpr=f ḥm r rḫ* 'he makes the ignorant one a wise one'; 4.3; 4.7; 4.9 (quoted §2.3.4.1, (iv)); 7.2; 11.1; *passim.*

(vi) *A Man* 9.3

iw ṯn.tw s ḥr sp ḫwrw

'A man is noticed (lit. distinguished) on a bad occasion.'[98]

> Sim. e.g. 3.2 (below); 10.7 *wšd.tw ḳbw r mdt[?]* 'The moderate (lit. the cool) is invited to talk(?)'.

---

97 The distribution still holds in post-classical times: thus, in Book of the Dead (quoted in *EG* §463) *iw=f wnm=f swr=f* (...) *iw stꜣ.tw=f* (...) 'He eats and drinks (...) he is made to enter (...)'.

98 Following Vernus' (2010²b: 284) interpretation. Another one is Fischer-Elfert's (1999: 117, 120-2): 'Man suspendiert eine Standesperson wegen eines erniedrigenden Vorfalles.'

The same distribution extends to sequences of sentence questions similar to the one in *A Man* 3.1-3 (vii)-(viii):

(vii) *Eloquent Peasant* B 1 179-181

in iw iwsw nnm=f (...)
in iw rf ḏḥwti sfn=f

'Do the scales wander? (...)
And is then Thot lenient?'[99]

(viii) *Amenemhat* 9b-d

in iw šd.tw ḫnnw m-ḫnw pr
in iw wb3.tw mw ꜥdd gbbw
swḫ3.tw nḏsw ḥr iryt=sn

'Are people of tumult ever brought up in the Palace?
Is water that destroys the fields ever let forth?
Are commoners ever made into fools by their own actions?'

A Man to His Son itself has *in iw sḏm.tw N* in the verse immediately following upon 3.1—not **in iw N sḏm.tw=f*. Had the construction in *A Man* 3.1 been a passive one, **in iw th.tw N* (with the full noun subject after the verb) would have been used—not **in iw N th.tw=f* as proposed by the editor of the text. Based on the grammatical grounds outlined in the above discussion, the original text of *A Man* 3.1 can not have been passive. Rather, the traditional reading must be upheld:

(ix) *A Man* 3.1-3

in iw hrw n rnnt ḥr tht=f
in iw w3ḥ.tw hrw n ꜥḥꜥw
in iw ḫb3.tw im=f r3-pw

'Does a day of Renenenet contravene itself?
Is a day added to the span of life?
Or does one subtract from it?'

2.3.5   Dating *Ptahhotep* 60-83 based on a late Eighteenth Dynasty manuscript

An essential issue in working with Middle Egyptian literary compositions documented only in Eighteenth Dynasty and later copies is whether a linguistic dating would target the original composition of a text or only the linguistic surface of the earliest manuscripts in which that composition happens to be documented. Under ideal conditions, this question would be discussed through a thorough examination of a great many texts documented in both Middle Kingdom and early New Kingdom copies: one would then date these texts based on their early New Kingdom copies and verify if any late datings are thereby erroneously obtained. In practice, the possibility for doing so is restricted to three compositions documented both in Middle Kingdom and in early New Kingdom copies, *Sinuhe*, *Loyaliste*, and *Ptahhotep*.

---

99   Transl. Parkinson 2002: 153.

With two of these compositions, the amount of text available for such experiment is very limited. The two main Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses of *Sinuhe*, S and G, preserve only a part of the text. In *Loyaliste*, the experiment must be restricted to the portion of the text effectively documented in the Twelfth Dynasty, on Sehetepibre's Stela: whether the long version existed in the Middle Kingdom already is at this stage an open question (discussion below, §4.5). Moreover, the three compositions have different textual histories, reducing the prospects for generalization. *Loyaliste* is the only Middle Egyptian literary composition documented in both a short and a long version. *Sinuhe*, a tale, is fairly stable as a composition. Middle Kingdom versions of *Ptahhotep* display substantial differences with each other, suggesting a more open type of textual status and early transmission than for *Sinuhe*, for which differences in Middle Kingdom versions are comparatively minor and possibly go back to different performance versions.

A. In the early New Kingdom witnesses of both *Sinuhe* and the portion of *Loyaliste* also on Sehetepibre's Stela, no element would support a dating to the Eighteenth Dynasty. When in a second step these early New Kingdom witnesses are compared with the documented Twelfth Dynasty witnesses, differences appear to be minor.

In *Loyaliste*, differences between the short and long versions concern one word (2.2 *snsn* 'fraternize' – *snsi* 'praise': §4.5.5.2, n.a to the relevant example) and a few formulations, reflecting different semantic emphases in the two versions (compare the two texts of *Loyaliste* 2-5, juxtaposed in §4.5.5.1-2). *Loyaliste* 6 is more substantially different in relation to the different functions it has in the two versions, conclusive in the short one, transitional in the long one. More major differences between the short and long version of *Loyaliste* are thereby directly related to the fact that this composition comes in two versions, uniquely in the Middle Egyptian literary corpus.

In *Sinuhe*, linguistic differences between the Middle Kingdom versions and the Eighteenth Dynasty ones concern mainly the lexicon (e.g. B 5 *iri* 'do' (R *iw*{*t*}[?]<*d*>) → G *isḳ* 'wait for': §2.3.2.2, (i); B 6 *kꜣi* 'devise' → G *nkꜣ* 'ponder': §2.7.3.3, (ii); R 6 *ꜥr* 'ascend' → G, S *ꜥḳ* 'enter'). Inasmuch as can be judged based on the surviving Eighteenth Dynasty text of *Sinuhe*, grammar remains largely unaffected (e.g. the 'narrative' infinitives in R 6, B 2-3, and B 4-6, preserved in Eighteenth Dynasty versions: §4.1.3.D.NB). More substantial grammatical changes are, on the other hand, observed in the Ramesside AOS, thus the serial construction in B 248, reduced in AOS vso 42 (§2.3.2.3, (i)); the new subject pronouns introduced in AOS vso 2-3 (= B 173-174), vso 45 (= B 254), and vso 50 (= B 263) (§3.4.1.1.B); and various other alterations, some resulting in incorrect constructions (for a selection, §4.1.3.D.NB). In many relevant passages, the Eighteenth Dynasty text is not preserved; however, the changes in AOS are in line with more general Ramesside tendencies and therefore probably Ramesside alterations of the text (e.g., for the new subject pronouns, §3.4.1.1.B).[100] Some of the differences between Eighteenth Dynasty versions and B

---

[100] On AOS—probably the work of an apprentice (Parkinson 2009: 200)—Parkinson (2009: 202) comments: 'Although the large ostracon copy is often not readable in details, it would have been an approximately legible text for someone who was familiar with the poem from other more precisely written and coherent versions.'

are changes already effected in R (e.g. B 3 *nfꜥ=i* – R 27 *nfꜥ.n=i*, G 14 *nf{t}<ꜥ>.n(=i)*; B 35 *ḥr m išst pw* – R 58 *ḥr si-išst*, B1, 3 *ḥr s(i)-(i)šst*: §4.3.2.B; §4.3.2.D). In other cases, early New Kingdom witnesses align with B against R (e.g. the interpolation in R 13-14: §4.5.5.1.B). Again with the caveat that not much of the Eighteenth Dynasty text of *Sinuhe* is preserved, it would seem that this does not differ from the two main Middle Kingdom versions substantially more than the latter already differed from one another.

B.   *Ptahhotep* is the only composition in which a more extensive comparison between Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses is possible. The composition is very long by Middle Egyptian standards and is substantially preserved both in a later Eighteenth Dynasty manuscript, L2 (P. BM EA 10509),[101] and in Twelfth Dynasty manuscripts, P (P BN Égyptien 183-194) and L1 (P. BM EA 10371 + 10435).[102] Accordingly, a Gedankenexperiment can be made on dating *Ptahhotep* based on L2 alone.

    Under the assumption that P and L1 had not survived, the set question is whether a dating based on L2 alone could have resulted in wrongly ascribing the composition of *Ptahhotep* to the early New Kingdom. The present Gedankenexperiment focuses on the triptych of the disputants, maxims §2-4 (Dévaud 60-83).[103] In comparison with other Middle Egyptian compositions, the text of *Ptahhotep* seems to have had a more open status and early transmission. Within *Ptahhotep* L2, the section considered has more linguistically innovative expressions than any other in the composition. Intentionally, the Gedankenexperiment is thus set on a worst-case situation for a linguistic dating based on Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts only.

    In dating *Ptahhotep*, maxims §2-4, based on L2, two verses are of primary interest:

(i) *Ptahhotep* 72 L2

tw r wfꜣ=f in sḏmyw

'He will be disapproved of by the hearers.'

> (P reads *wr wfꜣ in sḏmyw* 'Great will be the disapproval by the judges.' In the present Gedankenexperiment, this information is not accessible.)

(ii) *Ptahhotep* 82 L2

sw r irt ntt m ib=f

'He will do what is in his heart.'

> (P has *ib.tw r irt ntt m ib=k* 'One will want to do what is in your heart.'[104] This information is similarly inaccessible.)

Ptahhotep 72 L2 has a construction *tw r sḏm*. As discussed in a later chapter, this implies a terminus *ante quem non* by the late Twelfth Dynasty (§5.2). The dating can

---

101 Lastly Hagen 2012a: 179-82; a much earlier Eighteenth Dynasty witness is T. Carnarvon I (Hagen 2012a: 174-9).
102 Hagen 2012a: 131-42.
103 Studies of the triptych: Stauder in press c; Fecht 1981; Faulkner 1955b.
104 For this reading, which diverges from the traditional one, Stauder in press c; in the present study, also §5.2.1.

be narrowed down further by *Ptahhotep* 82 L2, which has an exploratory construction of the Future III. The construction—which accommodates the new subject pronoun onto the *NP r sḏm* pattern—is only scarcely attested, mainly in *Kamose Inscriptions* (§1.3.3.2, (vii)).[105] A dating to a time no earlier than the late Seventeenth Dynasty is secured by the presence of the new subject pronoun (§3.4.1.3). In addition, a lower chronological bound can be derived from the exploratory nature of the construction. In the written varieties of Egyptian documented in the record, *sw r sḏm* coexisted with *iw=f r sḏm* during a few generations only, rapidly to be superseded by the latter in relation to the overall stabilization of the paradigm of the Future III. This was achieved by the times of Thutmosis III – Amenhotep II (§1.1.2.B, (c)). Two verses in close proximity thus present late expressions. The section on disputants as in the L2 text is thereby dated to the late Seventeenth/early Eighteenth Dynasty.

C. If, however, the original composition of *Ptahhotep* is to be targeted, it must be established that the constructions in 72 and 82 are integral to the original text. In the present case, the reading in *Ptahhotep* 72 L2 is immediately identified as secondary based on the hybrid nature of the construction. On the one hand, *tw r wfꜣ=f* is an 'active impersonal' construction, with *tw* in the pre-verbal subject slot of a *NP r sḏm* constuction. On the other hand, *tw r wfꜣ=f* is followed by an agent phrase (*in sḏmyw*), otherwise restricted to genuine passive constructions. Less than a handful similar constructions are otherwise documented. Taking into account that the expression of passive voice in the future is not a marginal domain of linguistic function, such scarce attestation is in itself a strong indication of the non-regular status of such constructions in grammar. Actual instances known to me are from New Kingdom royal inscriptions, one from the time of Amenhotep II,[106] the other two from the time of Merenptah.[107] The former includes yet another very rare and syntactically hybrid feature, a doubling of *tw*,[108] while the latter are from a high variety that is itself partly heterogeneous and recomposed. In all cases, the agent is royal, probably motivating such altogether exceptional and strictly speaking ungrammatical constructions. In a Middle Egyptian literary composition such as *Ptahhotep*, this can not be integral to the original text, whatever the date of composition of that text may be. It must have arisen by some process in textual transmission.

Turning to *Ptahhotep* 82 L2, some suspicion on the immediate context of this verses is raised by the fact that the preceding verse ends in *ḥwrw-ib* (81), an expression that remains otherwise unattested.[109] In isolation, the argument is admittedly

---

105 Further occurrences are in *Heavenly Cow* 232 (as a secondary reading: §4.6.0, (iii)) and O. Cairo 25372, 1-2 (§5.2.4.1, (b)).

106 Amenhotep II's *Sphinx Stela* 19-20 (*Urk.* IV 1281, 14-15) *tw sḏm.tw m pr-nsw in it ḥr kꜣ-nḫt ḫꜥ-m-wꜣst* 'One heard in the palace by the father, Horus, the victorious bull, Khaemwaset.' (The English rendering is ungrammatical, no more, however, than the original Egyptian.)

107 K*RI* IV 19, 8; 155, 13.

108 Compare the other instances noted in §3, n.109.

109 The reading *ḥwrw-ib* in 81 P, proposed in Dévaud's (1916: 20) and Žába's (1956: 23) synoptic editions, followed in almost every subsequent translation, and registered in lexicographical works, is not an attestation, but an interpretation of P (Stauder in press c: §2.1; in the present study, also §5.2.1.B). Under the present Gedankenexperiment, P is inaccessible anyway, as are therefore lexicographical works that refer to this witness.

insufficient, as *hapax legomena* are otherwise encountered in literary compositions. Important is then the observation that maxim §4, to which verses 82-83 serve as a conclusion, itself introduces the petitioner as a *ḥwrw* (75), not as a **ḥwrw-ib*. Moreover, 82 L2 stands out as the sole instance of an exploratory construction of the Future III in *Ptahhotep*, a very long text by Middle Egyptian standards. Other constructions are used in roughly similar semantic environments throughout the composition.

A series of observations thereby converge in casting a very strong suspicion on the reading in 82 L2. It is then further observed that 82 L2 comes just a few verses after 72 L2. Both verses have constructions relating to the same broader pattern, *NP r sḏm*. In their particular form, both are found only here within the whole of *Ptahhotep* L2. Both are equally exceptional, as a syntactic hybrid in 72 L2, and as an exploratory construction in 82 L2. An immediate hypothesis is therefore that the two constructions influenced one another textually. This accords with the various suspicious elements in 81-82 L2 already independently observed. An influence of 72 on 82, rather than the other way around, is more likely because this reflects the sequential nature of writing. As the secondariness of 72 L2 is already directly established on internal syntactic grounds, the secondariness of 82 L2 follows.

D. Textual secondariness can thereby be directly established for both *Ptahhotep* 72 and 82 L2 on strictly text-internal grounds. Also with a possibly late construction, the L2 reading of *Ptahhotep* 78-79 can similarly be identified as secondary on internal grounds (§2.8.3.2.NB, (γ)). To be sure, L2 does not allow to reconstruct the original text of *Ptahhotep* 72 and 82 (nor in 78-79), as was possible for e.g. *Ptahhotep* 59 based on L2 (§2.3.2.3, (ii)).[110] This, however, is not required within the present Gedankenexperiment. For the specific purpose of this, enough information is to be found in L2 to determine that both 72 L2 and 82 L2 are secondary readings. Even if P and L1 had not survived, linguistic dating would therefore not have resulted in wrongly dating the original composition of the maxims on disputants to the late Seventeenth/early Eighteenth Dynasty.

2.4   Language in Middle Egyptian literature

Strategies for linguistic dating respond differently depending on types of written discourses, cultural contexts, and periods in Egyptian linguistic history. Dimensions already evoked include the specific linguistic situation in early/mid-second millennium BCE Egypt (§1) and the contingencies in working with early New Kingdom manuscripts (§2.3). The configuration of written language in Middle Egyptian literature is consequential as well.

---

110 In retrospect, i.e. when knowledge of the text as in P is taken into account, the relevant textual processes can of course be reconstructed and interpreted in details; see below, §5.2.1.C.

2.4.1   Different configurations of written language

Strategies for linguistic dating are strongly contingent upon time and types of written discourses in ancient Egypt. In very general terms, this is due to the high-cultural status, and thereby linguistic formality, of most written productions, compounded with the continued valuation of past cultural and textual, and thereby linguistic, tradition in several types of written discourses. A few cases other than Middle Egyptian literature are preliminarily evoked to illustrate contrasting configurations.

In documentary registers (epistolary, administrative, and legal), the evolution of written standards reflects the general evolution of language in a fairly straightforward manner. To be sure, language in documentary registers is often formal in its own ways and administrative and legal language can be technical or formulaic. Yet, a strong relative chronology is easily established and an absolute temporal anchoring is possible to a large extent. It is for example immediately obvious that the Thutmoside documentary corpus is linguistically more recent than the late Twelfth Dynasty corpus (Illahun), which is itself easily identified as more recent than e.g. the Heqanakht letters.[111] If these were not already dated on other grounds, even differences internal to Thutmoside documentary texts could be exploited for establishing a relative linguistic chronology of these.[112]

Different is the case of Late Egyptian literary texts. In the particular ways they accommodate both innovative and older expressions in various combinations, Late Egyptian literary registers differ linguistically from both documentary and inscriptional ones.[113] The Ramesside written record is the densest in the second millennium BCE, lending itself to a more detailed description of written language, including variation therein, than is possible for any preceding period in Egyptian language history. The Ramesside continuum of written registers has thus been and continues to be the object of extensive analysis, leading to an increasingly refined appreciation of its shifting configurations,[114] in literary[115] and non-literary texts alike.[116] A background is thereby given against which literary texts can be discussed as to heir relative

---

111 Compare the description by Kroeber 1970.

112 Compare the description by Kruchten 1999.

113 In general terms, Winand 1992: §2-50; Junge 2008³: 17-23.

114 Gohy 2012; Goldwasser 1999; 1991; Jansen-Winkeln 1995. The concept of 'dynamic canonicity' (Goldwasser 1991) remains central for appreciating the dynamically shifting configurations of Late Egyptian linguistic repertoires in various registers.

115 For different types of Late Egyptian literary texts, Ragazzoli 2008: 117-21 (praises of a city); Quack 2001: 168-72 (*Wermai*); 1994: 29-47 (*Ani*); Mathieu 1996: 189-201 (love poetry); Goldwasser 1990 (*Satirical Letter*); Polis in press (texts by or associated with Amunnakht); with a view on one specific item, Winand 2004: 105-6 (distribution of *mk* and *ptr* in narrative texts). A comprehensive analysis of the linguistic repertoires of the Miscellanies remains a desideratum.

116 E.g. Polis in press (Amunnakht, including non-literary texts); Winand & Gohy 2011 (Papyrus Harris Magical). For royal texts inscriptionally published, Nagai 2006; Spalinger 2002: 332-4 (*Qadesh*); Manassa 2003: 135-52 (Merenptah's *Karnak Inscription*); Sweeney 1985 (Ramses II's *Inscription Dédicatoire*). For biographies, Frood 2007: 23-4; Vernus 1978 (Samut son of Kyky). For Late Ramesside Letters, Sweeney 2006; 2001.

chronology—provided of course that the internal diversity of Late Egyptian literary registers is taken into due account.[117]

An altogether different situation is afforded by Netherworld books and cosmographic compositions documented from the early New Kingdom on. These make reference to a deep tradition, reflected in various elements of their linguistic repertoires. The partly esoteric character of such compositions also finds linguistic correlates. An example is the *sw*-headed constructions:[118] the particular distribution of these in the record strongly suggests that they belonged to very specific repertoires, probably hyper-restricted, and to be drawn upon only in some contexts of written performance. Reflecting their very contents, these compositions are further distinguished by their specific linguistic temporalities. The conspicuous rarity of *NP ḥr sḏm*,[119] for example, is primarily a matter of tensing—a progressive construction will hardly ever be called upon in such compositions[120]—not an indication for dating. These dimensions conspire in making an anchoring to the general linguistic history difficult or impossible. Alternative dating strategies must be pursued, analyzing phenomena of linguistic interference and form-function mismatches of various sorts.[121] Beyond individual expressions, relevant linguistic repertoires must be reconstructed as these may cohere reflecting the specific, culturally over-determined, written performance of language in these compositions.

In entirely different cultural and linguistic contexts, yet other approaches are required for dating texts composed in older varieties but not documented until the Late Period. In these, linguistic heterogeneity is not uncommon.[122] In some cases, this may reflect different compositional layers in a text,[123] while in others it may reflect the recomposed nature of Traditional Egyptian itself.[124] In distinguishing between genuinely old texts and recently composed ones, interference phenomena of various sorts are analyzed as to the shifting linguistic and cultural horizons in which these could have been possible. Integral to these dynamics are also phenomena of intentional dissimilation that result in constructions or repertoires different from both contemporaneous varieties and older ones.[125] The issue is complicated further by the fact that older texts kept being worked upon. In the process, they not only accommodated recent expressions but also older ones, not previously present in their tradition. In terms of the resulting linguistic phenomenology, continuous work on older

---

117 Teachings for example tend to be linguistically more conservative than other Late Egyptian types of literary discourses, e.g. Vernus 2013 (*Amenemope*); Quack 1994: 29-47, 61-2 (*Ani*). A discussion of register is also integral to a linguistic dating of *Wenamun* (Winand 2011: 564-9) and *Wermai* (provisionally Quack 2001: 168-72).

118 Preliminary comments below, §4.7.3, with references to previous studies.

119 E.g. Werning 2013: #31; Quack 2000b: 548; Zeidler 1999: I, 207-8; Baumann 1998: 447.

120 Also suggested by Zeidler 1999. Other elements that might be relevant here are discussed by Werning 2013: #31.

121 E.g. Werning 2013; Jansen-Winkeln 2012 (for *Amduat* specifically). Substantially different methodologies underlie the approaches by von Lieven 2007: 223-54; Quack 2000b; Baumann 1998.

122 E.g. Quack 2010a.

123 Proposed by Quack 2008 for P. Jumilhac.

124 E.g. Engsheden 2003; for Ptolemaic Egyptian, see also the debate conducted in Quack 2013; Kurth 2011; and Quack 2010b.

125 E.g. Engsheden 2003; Depuydt 1999; Vernus 1982; also Oréal 2011: *passim*.

texts can then come very close to texts newly composed, as both can harken back to older traditions in genuinely productive ways.[126] In some cases, one may find oneself staring at an abyss.

In much earlier times and as a different type of written discourse, Coffin Texts do not lend themselves to any of the above strategies. The analysis of the language of Coffin Texts involves multiple parameters such as textual layering, issues in textual transmission and monumental actualization, linguistic exchange with contemporaneous funerary self-presentations, and phenomena of linguistic dissimilation.[127] Middle Egyptian literary texts, for their part, afford a situation different from all the above. For each type of text and time period in Egyptian written history, specific dating strategies have to be pursued. In dating Egyptian texts, there is no linguistic method of general application, immune to the varying extra-linguistic determinations that preside over the shifting configurations of written language; there is, in other words, no escape from culture.

2.4.2 Middle Egyptian literature

A. The linguistic repertoires of Middle Egyptian literature are essentially similar to the ones documented in other types of higher written discourses in the early/mid-second millennium BCE, for example in inscriptionally published texts:[128] there is no specific linguistic register of 'literary Middle Egyptian'. The language of Middle Egyptian literature is part of what has been described as a 'Kultursprache',[129] arguably a defining element of early/mid-second millennium BCE high-culture as expressed and supported notably by Middle Egyptian itself. Against the substantial geographic, socio-linguistic, and diachronic variation that must have existed, this variety of Egyptian appears to have been very strongly standardized.

Literature is differentiated from contemporaneous types of written discourses because it is bound by partly different constraints of decorum.[130] Different themes than in other types of written discourses can thereby be addressed in literature, or similar themes form a different perspective. As a result, some expressions, or particular functions or meanings of expressions, are mainly or at times exclusively documented in literature. While there is no literary register of Middle Egyptian, there are therefore expressions that may be viewed as typical of literature because of their privileged association with literature in the record.

Middle Egyptian literature is strongly intertextual, as are contemporaneous written discourses with which literature communicates. Beyond intertext proper, there are certain culturally defined ways in which certain things can be said in the relevant registers. Expression is not free and both literary and non literary texts include

---

126 Vernus in prep.

127 Vernus 1996b.

128 From a different perspective, a similar general assessment now also by Díaz Hernández 2013 (differences noted mainly concern the graphic level or are diachronic internally to earlier Middle Egyptian).

129 Moers 2000: 59-80. Beyond grammar and lexicon, a major dimension of this 'Kultursprache' also lies in how texts are patterned and textured, see Collier 1996; Uljas 2007b.

130 Parkinson 2002: 91-8.

varying amounts of preconfigured formulations.[131] Literary texts themselves are closely similar to each other in language because they belong to the same, strongly intertextual, Middle Egyptian literary tradition. On a textual level, these determinations reflect some of the same cultural conditions of which the afore mentioned very strong degree of linguistic standardization is another token.

B. For dating, this has a series of practical implications, all with restrictive effect. The substantial linguistic continuity in literary and other relevant types of written discourses throughout the early/mid-second millennium BCE considerably reduces the prospects for identifying differences that could be interpreted diachronically. As linguistic form is more easily manipulated by users than linguistic function, such differences that can be identified mostly lie with rather subtle levels of linguistic function. The linguistic continuity in the relevant registers is also one of the reasons that conspire in making *post quem non* criteria pointing to a period in time prior to the first manuscript attestation of texts to be dated so difficult to devise at present.

Expressions that are mainly documented in literature, or even de facto literary, are difficult, or impossible, to anchor to the external record. Complementarily, formulations that are preconfigured in one way or another tend to be linguistically undistinctive. More generally, the strongly intertextual nature of Middle Egyptian literature has effects that hamper relative chronology. The phenomenon, which extends to all types of literary discourses, is strongest in the most topical of these, teachings; these are also often the least linguistically distinctive. In any Middle Egyptian literary composition, a varying quantity of text will therefore end up trapped in a dead angle as far as dating is concerned.

C. Issues resulting from the high degree of standardization of Middle Egyptian, the densely intertextual nature of Middle Egyptian literature, and the often observed preconfiguration of expression in relevant written registers are discussed in their various implications throughout the present study. Illustrating one particular issue mentioned above, a few examples of grammatical constructions that are exclusively found in literature may be given at this stage already:

(i) *Smwn – clause*

The construction[132] is found in *Sinuhe* B 157-158, *Eloquent Peasant* B1 75, *Cheops' Court* 4.1,[133] and, later, in P. Bulaq 13 frg. X.1.[134] At first, this pattern of attestation would suggest that the construction is a specifically literary one. Yet, the textual distribution could also be due to the type of meaning conveyed by the construction, expressing doubt or irony, and thereby primarily to be expected in literary contexts. The two options are not mutually exclusive: the meaning of *smwn* could have made the construction tightly associated, if secondarily only, with literary registers.

---

131 E.g. Junge 1982; Eyre 1990: 157-60; in the present study, §5.1.3.3.C.
132 Oréal 2011: 429-32.
133 These occurrences quoted below, §2.4.4.5, (vi).
134 Text: Haykal 1983. On paleographical grounds, the manuscript is early Ramesside or only slightly earlier (Haykal 1983: 216).

Independently from this, the textual distribution of *smwn – clause* also illustrates how a relatively uncommon construction can recur in different periods in literature.

(ii) *Kagemni* 1.6; *Loyaliste* 10.3: *N sḏm*

The construction, which is not described in any grammatical studies, is apparently found only in the two following texts, both literary:

> *Kagemni* 1.6
> *iw nfrt idn bw-nfr*
> *iw nh n ktt idn wr*
> 'A good thing deputizes for goodness;
> A little thing deputizes for much.'

> *Loyaliste* 10.3
> *iw ḫrw=sn smn inbw*
> 'Their voices establish the walls.'[135]

The construction could be tentatively described as a variation on the more common *N sḏm.n* (§1.2, (xi)), also limited as it seems to subjects of low individuation. The sheer rarity of *N sḏm* makes any further appreciation, syntactic, functional, or diachronic, difficult. By definition, the rise or obsolescence of the construction can not be related to changes observed in the external record, because it does not feature there.

(iii) Varia, discussed in the present study

- *Ḥꜣ ꜣ*: the construction is documented only a handful times. Heading a clause, it is found only in literary texts (*Ptahhotep*; *Eloquent Peasant*; *Fowler*; *Khakheperreseneb*): see §2.7.2.2.B;

- Past tense *rḏ.tw*: this has become a frozen formation in the Middle Kingdom, used only in literature (*Eloquent Peasant*; *Sinuhe*): see §2.4.3.2, (ii);

- *Tw sḏm*: the construction is limited to three texts, all literary (*Neferti*; *Hymn*; *Kheti*): see §5.3;

- *Tw r sḏm*: leaving aside instances that are textually secondary, the construction is documented in eight places. Seven of these are from one composition, *Neferti*, while the eighth is in a personal name: see §5.2;

- *N sḏm.tw*: the construction is found in one text only, *Ipuwer*: see §2.3.4.2.1.B-E.

2.4.3   The thickness of language in literature

Just as Middle Egyptian literature, linguistic registers of literature are variable and internally complex. As in other traditions and in other periods in Egyptian history itself, variation in linguistic registers of Middle Egyptian literature is expected in relation to different types of literary discourses, as well as within individual compositions.

---

135 *Loyaliste* 4.2 was tentatively suggested by Posener (1976: 25) as a further instance of the construction. However, the sorry state of preservation of the text prevents any secure reading.

Yet, a detailed study is made difficult by the still sketchy understanding of linguistic variation in Middle Egyptian in general. Pending a fuller study yet to be done, I first present a few easily identified cases of contrasting registers within one composition (§2.4.3.1). I go on discussing a phenomenon characteristic of Middle Egyptian literary texts, namely how these can accommodate expressions from different periods, and how in doing so they linguistically communicate with contemporaneous inscriptional texts (§2.4.3.2-3). A more in-depth study of register in one composition, *Cheops' Court*, is presented in turn (§2.4.4). This also provides an occasion for discussing possible linguistic correlates of what has been termed a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature, in this composition and in other ones.

2.4.3.1   Contrasting registers within a composition

Contrasting registers within a composition are most easily detected in the following cases, which involve direct speech:

> (i) *Neferti* 8c-d
>
> (...) *imn m ḏd*
> *ptr sḏm ḥr idw iw gr ḫft-ḥr*
>
> '(...) concealed in the saying:
> "Look, the one who should be hearing is deaf; the silent is in front." '

> Presentative *ptr*—as against the full verb *ptr*[136]—becomes common only in the early New Kingdom.[137] Middle Kingdom literary texts generally use presentative *mk*, as late Twelfth Dynasty as documentary texts still do as well.[138] Yet, instances of presentative *ptr* are found in one literary composition contemporaneous with the documentary texts just mentioned, *Sasobek*,[139] B1.10 *ptr n ḫpr.n* 'Look, it can not happen' (sim. B1.11; B4.1). This composition has at least one other element otherwise associated with a lower register (§2.4.4.4, (iv)). In *Neferti*, presentative *ptr* is used only in 8d, heading the saying introduced by *m ḏd*. It contrasts with *mk* used elsewhere in the same composition (3h; 3i; 4b).

> NB. At a much later time, a more sophisticated exploitation of the contrast *mk* vs. *ptr* is observed in *Wenamun*.[140] In Ramesside literary texts, *mk* and *ptr* are found side by side but no correlates in terms of register or expression have been detected (yet).[141]

---

136 Documented since the Pyramid Texts, see Winand 1986.
137 See *TLA* #62910.
138 Compare Collier & Quirke 2002: 189-190. Also in a magical text, P. Ramesseum IV, C29 (*TLA* #62910).
139 Terminus *post quem non* to the late Twelfth Dynasty on paleographic grounds (Parkinson 2009: 149-50).
140 Winand 2004.
141 Mathieu 1996: 192 (love poetry); Ragazzoli 2008: 119 (praises of cities); Winand 2004: 105-6 (narrative texts).

(ii) *Neferkare and Sisene* P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+4-5

(...) *ḥr mḥ ḥr ḏd ir is nt{y}-pw mꜢꜤ pw pꜢ ḏd*

sw (*ḥr*) *pr*(*t*) *m grḥ*

'(...) thinking and saying that since it was so, the word was true:
"he goes out at night!" '

> The new subject pronoun *sw* occurs only here in *Neferkare*, and recurs only in
> one other place in the preserved body of Middle Egyptian literature (§3.4.1). It is
> significant that this occurrence in *Neferkare* is in reported speech. On *pꜢ ḏd* as
> also indexical of register, below, §4.4.3.1.

Possible modulations of registers generally remain difficult to appreciate. In the
lexicon, recherché expressions can sometimes be identified based on their rarity and
distribution in the record. In other cases, interpretation remains ambiguous, as in the
lexicon of fishing in the Fifth Petition of *Eloquent Peasant*. In Parkinson's words:[142]
'For example, the fifth petition includes several words to do with fishing. Some of these
may have struck the original audience as unusual, but they could have been intended to
sound either like vulgar working language or like impressively recherché diction. We do
not know which: it is impossible to chart fully the differing registers or gauge an
individual word's resonances (...)'.

2.4.3.2   The diachronic breadth of Middle Egyptian in individual compositions

Middle Egyptian literary compositions can accommodate expressions that in an
historical grammar of Egyptian would be described as relating to different diachronic
layers. A similar phenomenon is observed notably in inscriptional texts, often with the
same expressions. Such diachronic breadth of individual compositions is another
token of the linguistic thickness here evoked: composers of Middle Egyptian literary
texts draw on various elements of language present in their textual, hence linguistic,
horizon. This constellation also provides an illustration of how literary and relevant
non-literary types of written discourses are allied with each other by common
linguistic repertoires.

Pending a fuller study yet to be made, I here present a selective exemplification of
the phenomenon in literary texts securely dated to the Twelfth Dynasty (for the dating
of *Ptahhotep*, §2.4.3.3). In the following, 'antiquated expressions' stands as a
convenient label for various expressions that were not any more part of general
written usage by the time of composition of a literary text considered. Not all these
'antiquated' expressions were of course 'antiquated' in the same ways.

(A) *Eloquent Peasant*

(a) *Antiquated expressions*

(i) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 219 *tnm.ḫr=f*

Diachronically, synthetic -*ḫr*-infixed forms are superseded by *wn*-auxiliated
constructions (*wn.ḫr=f ḥr sḏm*) before the Middle Kingdom; the process is begun

---

142 Parkinson 2012a: 3.

already in Coffin Texts.[143] By the time of composition of *Eloquent Peasant*, synthetic *sḏm.ḫr=f* had become antiquated. In the Twelfth Dynasty, it recurs only once, in the slightly later inscription of Herwerre (*temp*. Amenemhat III), 9 (discussion: §4.1.2, (iii)).

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 159 *rḏ.tw N* (passive past tense *sḏm=f*)

(Non-negative) past tense *sḏm=f* is antiquated in post-Old Kingdom times (below, (viii)). In the passive, only two secure instances are found in Middle Egyptian literary texts, the one in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 159 and one in *Sinuhe* B 238 (below, (viii)). A third, in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 11, is very uncertain (§2.7.2.2, (i)), and *Shipwrecked Sailor* 34 probably to be read differently.[144] The construction is literary: it is never found in the contemporary inscriptional record.[145] Significantly, both *Eloquent Peasant* B1 158 and the *Sinuhe* B 238 are with *rḏi*, a high-frequency verb (so is also the one in *Khakheperreseneb*, should it belong here). The form is not part of a productive paradigm any more but a frozen remnant, confined to literary usage.

(iii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 352-353 *gm.tw N sbw=s* (and *passim*): prospective *sḏm=f* (active and passive)

Outside Coffin Texts, the prospective is strongly obsolescent in the Twelfth Dynasty.[146] It is then preserved mainly in literary registers.[147]

(b) *Alongside recently innovated expressions*

(iv) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 115-116 *wn.in.tw ḥr sḏm*

The construction is otherwise first documented in the late Twelfth Dynasty. The higher-order construction to which it relates, *wn.(X.)tw ḥr sḏm*, is itself not documented before the early Twelfth Dynasty, in an expedition inscription (§3.1.2.A; §5.3.4.1).

---

143 Detailed study in Vernus 1990a: 63-5, 68-71.

144 See §4, n.24.

145 Borghouts (2010: I, §56.a.1, (1)) mentions CG 20140 (ANOC 1.3, Simpson 1974: pl.2; *temp*. Amenemhat III), b, 1-2 *rnpt 1 ḥr ḥm=f*[sic] *nsw bity n-mꜣꜥt-rꜥ ꜥnḫ ḏt sꜥḥꜥ tw*[sic] *wḏ pn* (...) 'Year 1 under His Majesty, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Nimaatre, living forever. Erecting this stela one did (...)'. This, however, is not an instance of the past tense *sḏm=f*, but a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive as is usual after a regnal year. The combination with *tw* is remarkable, yet not unparalleled: early in the same Dynasty, compare Wadi el-Hudi 10 (*temp*. Senwosret I), 1-4 *ḥsbt 22 prt tw*[sic] *r ḥsmn n ḥr ꜥnḫ-mswt* (...) 'Year 22. Going out for natron for the Horus Ankhmesut (...)'. The construction, accommodating what is originally an inflectional morpheme (*tw*) onto a non-finite form (the infinitive), is non-standard. A non-standard register is also demonstrated by various further details: both texts have the abnormal spelling *tw*, complemented by the plural strokes in the latter text (interpretation: Stauder in press b: §5.1.2); the former further has a non-standard formulation of the regnal year.

146 Classical discussion in Allen 2002a: 91-6. Among the Heqanakht cases discussed by the author, some are with *wnn* or after *ir*. These uses are either grammaticalized or bound to specific environments. They thereby differ from the more productive uses as in *Eloquent Peasant*. Further elements on the gradual obsolescence of the prospective after the Old Kingdom now in Díaz Hernández 2013: *passim*.

147 E.g., in *Debate of a Man and His Soul*, Allen 2011: 116-8.

(v) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 253, 254, 322: *tw* with events lacking an agent in their semantic representation

The construction is an innovation datable precisely to the the mid-Twelfth Dynasty (§3.1.2.C; §6.2.2.3).

(vi) *Eloquent Peasant*, *passim*: *Pȝ/tȝ/nȝ*[148]

Demonstratives of the *pȝ/tȝ/nȝ* series are in *Eloquent Peasant* comparatively more common than in any other Twelfth Dynasty literary text (§2.4.4.2.2). Their uneven presence over different parts of the composition is indexical of a modulation of register. *Eloquent Peasant* also includes an instance of the related possessive expression in B2 128 *nȝy=k*, strongly deictic in context (§2.4.4.2.2, (iii)). In documentary texts, these possessives are common in Illahun (late Twelfth Dynasty) but absent in Heqanakht (very early Twelfth Dynasty).

———

(B) *Sinuhe*

(a) *Antiquated expressions*

(vii) *Sinuhe* B 45, 114 *ḏd.k(w)* 'I said'

The active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple with events other than the lexical statives (*rḫ* and *ḫm* '(not) to know') is found in a small set of Sixth Dynasty so-called 'event biographies' (mainly in Weni and in Sabni son of Mekhu). In the Middle Kingdom, it recurs in a handful funerary self-presentations, as a purely textual revival. In literary texts, the construction is found only in *Sinuhe*, echoing these revived inscriptional uses (§4.1.3.A).

(viii) Past tense *sḏm=f*

Outside the bound negative construction *n-sḏm=f*, past tense *sḏm=f* shows signs of obsolescence as early as in the later Old Kingdom, as is evidenced by its restriction to a set of specific, textually determined, uses in Sixth Dynasty so-called 'event biographies'. In the Middle Kingdom, the form is antiquated: it is occasionally found in private inscriptions in direct phraseological inheritance to Old Kingdom models, and thereby as a textual revival.[149] In literary texts, passive *rd.tw=f* in *Sinuhe* B 238[150] and *Eloquent Peasant* B1 159 is a frozen form (above, (ii)). Active uses are less exceptional but remain very uncommon: several are in *Sinuhe*.[151] In *Sinuhe*, the construction is part

---

148 Occurrences in Allen 2009: 266.

149 For the latter, Vernus 1997: 70-7, especially 73-4; *pace* el-Hamrawi 2004 (who proposed a dialectal scenario).

150 This is from a passage for which a garbling of verses has often been hypothesized; in details and critically, now Schenkel in press b: §5. Unlike Schenkel, I do not interpret *rd.tw* as being in the textual background: rather, the selection of a (frozen form of the) past tense *sḏm=f* is here probably motivated by the royal agent of *rdi*, as is commonly the case in biographies where the same form is also associated with royal causation.

151 Discussed lastly by Schenkel in press a; Borghouts 2010: I, §56.a.1, (9)-(10). These forms have been disputed (e.g. Kammerzell 1988).

of a broader set of expressions by which the composition echoes funerary biographies, thereby indexing such relationship on a linguistic level (§4.1.3.A; §4.1.3.C).

(ix) *Sinuhe* B 281 *rd̠.t(w)=f* (prospective *sd̠m=f*)

Compare above, (iii).

(x) *Sinuhe* B 237 demonstrative *pw*

The form, which is antiquated in Middle Egyptian, is occasionally found in inscriptional texts of the Middle and early New Kingdom. In *Sinuhe* B 237, its occurrence is phraseologically bound (§4.1.2.B).

(xi) The lexicon, e.g. *Sinuhe* B 4 *nftft* 'twitch'

Nftft[152]—as against unprefixed *ftft* (§3.4.6, (iv))—is rare and recherché. So is the derivational pattern itself, *n-ABAB*, which is obsolescent in the Middle Kingdom.[153] In *Sinuhe* B 3-4, the selection of the *n*-prefixed variant simultaneously allows for an alliteration with the preceding verb, *nfꜥ*.

(b) *Alongside a recently innovated expression*

(xii) *Sinuhe* R 15 *ti sw* predicate[154]

Only one other instance of the construction has been noted in the Middle Kingdom, in an inscriptional text.[155] The construction recurs once in a literary text dating to the Second Intermediate Period, *Eulogistic Account of A King* X+7.x+3 (§3.3.2, (i)). It becomes more common only by the early New Kingdom.

———

(C) *Ptahhotep*

(a) *Antiquated expressions*[156]

(xiii) *Ptahhotep* 98 P *w* (enclitic negation)[157]

The majority of occurrences of negative *w* are from the Old Kingdom.[158] In post-Old Kingdom times, the negation is only found in two Coffin Text passages (CT VI 23j-l B1Bo; CT VII 115i-k B4Bo), in Moꜥalla III.5-7 (inscription #8: threats, and thereby possibly formulaic language), and in one early Twelfth Dynasty inscription, Mentuhotep (CG 20539; *temp.* Senwosret I), Ib 20.

---

152 Study: Vernus in press.
153 Study: Vernus 2009a.
154 *Ti sw ḥm ii=f*; R 13-14 *ti sw hꜣb* (...) is an interpolation (§4.5.5.1.B).
155 Deir Rifêh, tomb 7, col.17 (Griffith 1889: pl.18); noted by Oréal 2011: 246, n.158.
156 Possibly also the construction in 600-3, if to be analyzed as in Vernus 1996b: 180-1; different interpretation now by Oréal 2011: 140-1.
157 Similarly Vernus 2010²b: 154, n.76; Junge 2003: 215; Kammerzell 1993: 27. Quack's (2005: 14) reading, with positive polarity and -*w* the ending of a prospective, is impossible: this written ending is in the Middle Kingdom reserved to certain inflectional classes of which *2rad* (here *d̠d*) is not part (see Schenkel 2000, extending beyond Coffin Texts).
158 Study: Kammerzell 1993.

(xiv) *Ptahhotep* 398 L1 *swt* (old independent pronoun)

Beginning in the Old Kingdom, this is superseded by the new independent pronoun *ntf*. After the Old Kingdom, the old independent pronoun recurs in parts of Coffin Texts. Other Twelfth Dynasty occurrences are only in *Chapelle Blanche* (§6.3.1.1).

(b) *Alongside more recently innovated expressions*

(xv) *Ptahhotep* 71, 529, 631 (and *passim*): *iw* introducing a circumstantial clause with clause-initial pronominal subject (circumstantial *iw P predicate*)

The construction develops during the First Intermediate Period, gradually replacing old *sk P predicate*.[159]

(xvi) *Ptahhotep* 33, 39, 594, 600, 618-619, 625-626:[160] *iḫ sḏm=f*

Only one occurrence of the construction has been noted for the Old Kingdom.[161] *Iḫ sḏm=* is well documented in Twelfth Dynasty literary compositions and other texts.[162]

(xvii) *Ptahhotep* 482 *ir pr m mḫr n ꜥḳ.n* 'If something comes out of the storehouse, it does not enter (again)'; sim. 514

The constructions (*N*) *n sḏm.n* (negative, with full noun subject before the verb or dependent) and the related *N sḏm.n* (positive, with full noun subject before the verb: §1.2, (xi)) are undocumented before the early Middle Kingdom.[163] The negative variant here considered is not uncommon in Twelfth Dynasty literary texts.[164] The positive variant is found in contemporaneous and later private inscriptions.[165]

(xviii) *Ptahhotep* 343 P[166] *n rḫ.n.tw ḫprt siꜣ=f dwꜣ* 'One can not know what will happen to the point of perceiving tomorrow.'

The construction is innovative since the referent of the suffix pronoun in *siꜣ=f* is the same as the implied agent of the passive construction in the main clause.[167] In this particular form, the construction remains unparalleled. However, its syntax relates to broader changes affecting the morpheme *tw* beginning in the Twelfth Dynasty (§5.2; §5.3; §6.2).

---

159 Vernus 1987: 104-5 (with the first occurrences in Coffin Texts); Díaz Hernández 2013: *passim* (in First Intermediate Period biographies); also Oréal 2011: 218-9; Kruchten 1999: 71.
160 Vernus 1990a: 102.
161 Allen 1984: §420.
162 Extensive references in Vernus 1990a: 102-3.
163 Edel 1959: 30-7.
164 E.g. *Debate* 104 *ḫnmsw nw min n mr.ny* 'Friends of today do not love'; *Shipwrecked Sailor* 130-131 *ḫpr.n r=s nn wi ḥnꜥ ꜣm.ny* (...) 'It happened while I was not with them, they burnt (...)'.
165 A very early occurrence is Abkau x+3 (quoted above, §1.2, (xi.α)).
166 L1 and L2, both here preserved, phrase differently (see D 345).
167 Vernus 2006: 153.

2.4.3.3 Digression: A very brief note on dating *Ptahhotep*

A Middle Kingdom dating of *Ptahhotep* is most commonly accepted,[168] yet one to the Old Kingdom had been suggested as well.[169] Although arguments for an Old Kingdom dating have been rebutted,[170] concern has been raised that a Middle Kingdom dating is still not fully established.[171] Pending a fuller study of the language of *Ptahhotep*,[172] the following observations confirm a Middle Kingdom dating.

A. *Ꜣw* introducing a circumstantial clause with clause-initial pronominal subject (*iw P predicate*, 71 and *passim*: §2.4.3.2, (xv)) emerges during the First Intermediate Period, gradually superseding the older expression of the same function, *sk P predicate*. The process is not completed before the early Middle Kingdom. For example the Eleventh Dynasty *Deir el-Ballas Inscription* accommodates various innovative expressions[173] but still has *sk P predicate*: x+11 *ir.n(=i) nn sk w(i) m nsw* 'I did these things while I was a king.' In *Ptahhotep*, the recent construction is used multiple times, across the composition, and exclusively: whenever the linguistic function it performs comes to order, *iw P predicate* is always used. This further speaks against a scenario of textual modernization, which would have to have been systematic in a way not otherwise documented in any Earlier Egyptian text of any type. Similar comments extend to *iḫ sḏm=f* (33 and *passim*: §2.4.3.2, (xvi)). While documented once in the Old Kingdom, the construction becomes common only in Middle Egyptian. It is used multiple times in *Ptahhotep*, here as well strongly speaking against a scenario of textual modernization.

Negative *n sḏm.n* (482; 514: §2.4.3.2, (xvii)) is for its part entirely undocumented before the early Middle Kingdom. The pattern of attestation is reliable because of its consistency and density. This construction and the related positive one *N sḏm.n* are found more than a dozen times in the Middle Kingdom beginning in mid-Eleventh Dynasty inscriptions, then extending to literary texts in the Twelfth Dynasty (*Shipwrecked Sailor*, *Debate of a Man and His Soul*). When *n sḏm.n* was innovated in spoken interaction is unknown, and irrelevant. The construction emerges in the record with the onset of the Middle Kingdom, at a time when other elements of a linguistic discontinuity with preceding periods are observed.[174] The expression thus entered the written language when Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian was being defined as a written standard. In *Ptahhotep*, *n sḏm.n* occurs twice. I remain unaware of any

---

168 E.g. Hagen 2012a: 129-31; Vernus 2006: 153; Grajetzki 2005: 40-1; Junge 2003: 12-13; Parkinson 2002: 48; Eichler 2001.

169 E.g. Quack 1994: 20-1; Fecht 1986: 246-7. Full references in Hagen 2012a: 129-30.

170 Most directly Hagen 2012a: 130-1; Eichler 2001; also Junge 2003: 122-8 (for the objection raised by Quack 1994: 20-1 specifically).

171 Quack 2005: 8-10.

172 A more detailed study is currently under preparation by Roman Gundacker (Gerald Moers, p.c. 1/2013); *non vidi*.

173 X+3 *iḫr m-ḫt sḏm.n=f*; x+10 *ḏꜣḏꜣ*. In Middle Egyptian literature, these expressions would be associated with compositions such as *Tale of Hay* (both), *Cheops' Court* (both), *Fishing and Fowling* (the latter), and *Neferkare and Sisene* (the former)—not with the likes of *Sinuhe* or *Ptahhotep* (§2.4.4.4, (v)).

174 Another construction is discussed by Gundacker 2010.

instance in the Middle Egyptian written record where the construction would have been altered from a different source construction.

The construction in 343 P (§2.4.3.2, (xviii)), finally, is singular, and therefore not directly to be anchored to the external record. However, its conditioning possibility lies in broader changes affecting *tw*. These are themselves beginning only in the Twelfth Dynasty.[175]

B. While more elements would no doubt emerge upon a closer inspection, the above suffices to establish a terminus *ante quem non* for *Ptahhotep* to the late Eleventh Dynasty at the earliest, a dating to the early or mid-Twelfth Dynasty being more likely.[176] Such dating is consistent with the tight intertextual connections *Ptahhotep* displays with Middle Kingdom self-presentations and related types of written discourses[177]—not with Old Kingdom exponents of such.

Of major interest in the context of the present discussion of language in Middle Egyptian literature is that the two preserved Middle Kingdom versions of *Ptahhotep* each have one much older expression, antiquated by the time of composition: P has an instance of the enclitic negation *w* (§2.4.3.2, (xiii)) while L1 has one of the old independent pronoun *swt* (§2.4.3.2, (xiv)). Both expressions are sparsely documented in Middle Kingdom inscriptional texts, in Mentuhotep (CG 20539) and in *Chapelle Blanche* respectively (both *temp.* Senwosret I). Such occasional archaizing features on the linguistic level find a pendant in the archaizing script (and, according to some, meter) of P. Prisse.[178] They also illustrate how Middle Egyptian literature communicates with contemporaneous inscriptionally published written discourses: the communication is not only intertextual, it extends to common linguistic repertoires.

---

175 Similarly Vernus 2006: 153.

176 The terminus *post quem non* is given by the two Twelfth Dynasty manuscripts, L1 and P. For the dating of these, now Hagen 2012a: 134 and 142, respectively

177 Most famous is probably the intertext with Ameni's Wadi Hammamat Graffito (#3042; *temp.* Senwosret I), discussed by Vernus 1995b; now also Hagen 2012a: 156-8. Further intertext has been noted with Rediukhnum (*temp.* Wahankh Antef II), 4-5; with Mentuhotep son of Hapy (probably early D.12, see Schenkel 1964), 11-14; and with Senwosret III's *Semna Stela* 13-16. See the discussion in Hagen 2012a: 151-2, 161-4, and 159-61; for the second also Vernus 2010²b: 455-8; for the third also Eyre 1990. Not intertext in a narrow sense, yet no less significant, is a cluster of expressions in common between *Ptahhotep* §2-4 (D 60-83) and Antef (Louvre C167, Simpson 1974: pl.10; *temp.* Senwosret I), see Stauder in press c: n.82. The topical formulation of old age in *Ptahhotep* 8-9 recurs in *Sinuhe* B 168-9 where it implies that Sinuhe espouses the Egyptian cultural values he has fled during the first part of the tale (Moers 2001: 128-31). If interpreted as a direct allusion to *Ptahhotep*, this would imply that *Ptahhotep* is at least slightly earlier than *Sinuhe* (the precise dating of *Sinuhe* is uncertain: it is probably later than the reign of Senwosret I himself as some time is to be assumed for historical events to be turned into a fictionalized setting). Alternatively, *Sinuhe* and *Ptahhotep* could be independently drawing on a culturally given formulation: while the implications for interpretation would be similar, none could be derived for relative chronology (Moers 2001: 131, n.494).

178 Parkinson 2002: 49, 313.

2.4.4   Register in *Cheops' Court*

Cheops' Court is often mentioned as a text composed in an innovative linguistic register, sometimes described as 'Late Middle Egyptian'. I here propose some comments on the linguistic typology of the composition, which turns out to be complex in terms of register.

2.4.4.1   Preliminary: A very brief note on dating *Cheops' Court*

A. *Cheops' Court*[179] is preserved in a single manuscript, P. Westcar (P. Berlin 3033).[180] This is classically dated to the late Second Intermediate Period,[181] although the very early New Kingdom has occasionally been evoked as well;[182] a re-examination is a desideratum.

In dating the composition, its transitional character is often evoked. In its literary typology (formal articulation, subject matters, tone, etc.), *Cheops' Court* differs from e.g. *Sinuhe* and anticipates certain features of Late Egyptian narrative literature to come. It is likely, therefore, that the former was composed later than the latter. Yet, assessing how much later than the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty *Cheops' Court* should be remains difficult on such grounds, because developments in literary typology need not project linearly over time. Moreover, various traditions may have been in part contemporaneous with each other. It has thus been proposed that the 'low tradition' to which *Cheops' Court* relates begun developing while the 'high tradition' of Middle Egyptian was still very much productive.[183] A proposal to date *Cheops' Court* to the Seventeenth Dynasty based on its being 'Kunstprosa'[184] is problematic since *Cheops' Court* would itself be the earliest major fully preserved exponent of what under this hypothesis is defined as such. As fragmentarily preserved compositions such as *Tale of Hay* and others demonstrate, elements associated with this type of literary form are present in the late Twelfth Dynasty already.

The language of *Cheops' Court* has been described as 'Late Middle Egyptian' and it has been proposed to date the composition late in the Middle Kingdom.[185] However, what is said to be 'Late Middle Egyptian' remains in want of a more precise definition. As to be seen below, the label is misleading: many elements associated with the notion of 'Late Middle Egyptian' are present in the late Twelfth Dynasty already, if not before, and have primarily to do with register; they do not project over time in any straightforward manner. Just as with literary typology, therefore, no dating can be easily derived at this level.

On an altogether different level, it has been observed that the three kings announced in *Cheops' Court* may be in allusion to a sequence of three brothers of

---

179 Text: Blackman 1988.
180 Lastly, Lepper 2008: 15-21.
181 E.g. Lepper 2008: 21, 320; Burkard & Thissen 2012[4]: 203.
182 Compare the references in Parkinson 2002: 295.
183 Parkinson 2002: 138-46.
184 Burkard & Thissen 2012[4]: 201, 203, with references to various other proposals for a similarly late dating.
185 E.g. Lepper 2008: 291; Parkinson 2002: 296. Both authors favor a dating by the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (Lepper 2008: 319-20; Parkinson 2002: 141, 296).

non-royal origin who ascended the throne in the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty, Neferhotep I, Sahathor, Sobekhotep IV.[186] The comparatively longer reigns of the first and third of these kings mark the peak of the Dynasty and these kings explicitly pro-claimed their non-royal ascent (as other kings of the period also did).[187] An association of *Cheops' Court* with this historical constellation is possible, yet by nature speculative. In a less direct anchoring, it has also been proposed to read *Cheops' Court* as reflecting a broader (late?) Second Intermediate Period context.[188]

B. With a view on a subsequent appreciation of linguistic registers, I here present some preliminary comments on elements of language in *Cheops' Court* that contribute to a dating of the composition.[189]

The strongest element for dating is given by the functions of *p3*. As analyzed by Kroeber, *p3* is routinely used with participants and entities important in the tales, which the expression underscores and singles out from the set of all nominal expressions. In doing so, *p3* keeps some deictic force. However, it does not have what Krober termed 'anaphoric' functions any more. In most cases, the referents of the nouns preceded by *p3* can be immediately identified by the hearer in the context of a given story, without such reference being established in the preceding clause. In other words, *p3* points to the universe of referents in the mental representation of the hearer, but not to the immediately preceding clause any more.[190] On the other hand, nouns with referents that can be identified also outside the narrower context have *p3* only

---

186 Franke 1994: 69-70; Lepper 2008: 319, also suggesting that *Cheops' Court* may include an allusion to the throne name of the only slightly earlier ruler Khendjer (see however von Lieven 2012: 304). Lepper (2008: 320) further speculates on a final redaction by the Seventeenth Dynasty.

187 Ryholt 1997: 225-31, 298; Grajetzki 2006: 71-3.

188 Morenz 1996: 107-10.

189 Lepper (2008: 286-92) has recently proposed an internal chronology of the stories in *Cheops' Court*, based notably on grammar. I disagree with the criteria on which the analysis is based. For example, *p3*'s are relevant only if analyzed as to their function (strength of deictic force and type of such: see §2.4.4.2). Counting *iw*'s without reference to their functions (syntactic and semantic, changing over time) is similarly inconsequential (compare e.g. §2.4.4.5, (iii)). So is counting 'uneingeleitete *sḏm.n=f* Formen', which can only be appreciated within an overall analysis of clausal dependency and inter-clausal cohesion as a functional domain in a text being studied (see §2.4.4.5). The distribution of '*w*-Passiva' and '*tw*-Passiva' is a matter of aspect (the former are perfective, the latter aspectually unmarked) and therefore an effect of what is being said in individual stories, not of time during the period concerned. As regards 'Neuägyptizismen' (Lepper 2008: 291-2), *p3*'s (incidentally, not yet an 'Artikel' in *Cheops' Court*) are documented in Twelfth Dynasty literary registers (§2.4.4.2.2). '*Sḏm pw irj.n*' and '*ꜥḥꜥ.n*' are documented in First Intermediate Period inscriptions and in Twelfth Dynasty narrative literature (§2.4.4.3). Among 'alte Formen' (Lepper 2008: 292), (synthetic) 'causatives' are still productive in the early New Kingdom, not to speak of individual verbs based on this formation, which, as lexicalized items, were used centuries after they entered the lexicon. '*Pwy*' demonstratives, also mentioned as 'alte Formen', are first documented in the Twelfth Dynasty and were to become more common only later: while associated with a specific register (§2.4.4.6.B), these demonstratives are fairly recent expressions in pre-New Kingdom times.

190 Kroeber 1970: 22-4; these are in the author's terminology the 'relativ-realen Begriffe mit niedriger Assoziations-Intensität'.

occasionally.[191] Nouns with referents identified in a fully context-independent manner do not have *pꜣ* at all.[192]

In a Twelfth Dynasty literary text such as *Tale of Neferpesedjet*, *pꜣ* is still strictly 'anaphoric': x+2-3 [...] *kꜣwtiw ḏd.in n=f nꜣ n kꜣwtiw* [...] '[...] workers. The workers (*scil.* the afore mentioned workers, just introduced in discourse) said to him [...]'. The stage of development in *Tale of P. Lythgoe* (*pꜣ* in ro x+2; ro x+9; vso x+2) remains difficult to judge given the fragmentary state of the text, which prevents an analysis of referent activation. Documentary texts from the late Twelfth Dynasty are, on the other hand, preserved in numbers sufficiently high for a full-scale functional analysis to be carried out on these. The stage of development these bear witness to is less advanced than in *Cheops' Court*.[193]

While keeping some deictic force, *pꜣ*'s are thus used in *Cheops' Court* in ways that imply a composition later than the late Twelfth Dynasty. When more precisely after the Twelfth Dynasty the stage of functional development of *pꜣ* as used in *Cheops' Court* was reached is unknown. The next stage of development would be reached only in the early Eighteenth Dynasty.[194] Since the stage of development as in *Cheops' Court* is first documented within this composition itself, this could therefore have been reached at any time between the Thirteenth Dynasty and the early Eighteenth. Such temporal uncertainty, ultimately determined by the low density of the Second Intermediate Period record, directly bears on the terminus *ante quem non* that can be defined for the composition of *Cheops' Court*. This must then be a type-B terminus, set to the early Thirteenth Dynasty for methodological reasons. The early Thirteenth Dynasty is thereby the earliest period in time for which based on the evidence available it can not be ruled out that *pꜣ*'s could have been used in the functions in which they are in *Cheops' Court*. As with all type-B termini, this is a conservative assessment: the relevant linguistic change may in fact have occurred at any later time until the manuscript documentation of *Cheops' Court*.

C. Other than the functions of *pꜣ*, linguistic evidence for dating *Cheops' Court* appears to be extremely limited. Only one other element is readily identified, the negative construction *nfr pw N* (11.23). This is first found in later Twelfth Dynasty documentary texts in Illahun and was then used until the Eighteenth Dynasty.[195] In a literary text, the expression is found only once elsewhere, in *Ipuwer* (4.11-12), a composition dating no earlier than the early Thirteenth Dynasty (§6.2.2.5). In *Cheops' Court*, *nfr pw N* is in a maidservant's speech, and thereby associated with a lower register in that composition. Accordingly, *nfr pw N* in *Cheops' Court* can not be taken to define a terminus *ante quem non* later than to the first occurrences of the expression in late Twelfth Dynasty documentary texts. The resulting terminus *ante quem non* is therefore less precise than the one already defined based on the functions of *pꜣ*.

---

191 Kroeber 1970: 24; in the author's terminology, the 'relativ-realen Begriffe mit hoher Assoziations-Intensität'.
192 In Egyptian, these include encyclopedically given nouns such as 'Ausdrücke des Cultus, des Königthums, und Ähnliches' (Erman 1889: §109; Kroeber 1970: 24-5).
193 Kroeber 1970: 15-7, 19-21, 25.
194 Kroeber 1970: 25-8.
195 Brose 2009.

It may be worth emphasizing, finally, that the above terminus *ante quem non* to the early Thirteenth Dynasty is only just that, a terminus. Moreover, it is a type-B one: whether a dating to a time as early as the early Thirteenth Dynasty is actually possible is unknown. Nothing linguistically, nor as it seems on any other level, speaks against a dating of the composition close in time to its sole surviving manuscript. When after the Twelfth Dynasty—and probably not immediately in the early Thirteenth—*Cheops' Court* was composed is therefore here left open.

2.4.4.2 *P3*

The above terminus *ante quem non* for dating of *Cheops' Court* was based on an analysis of the functions of *p3*, not on the fact that the composition has *p3*'s. To be sure, a composition must have *p3*'s for an analysis of the functions of that word to be possible in the first place. Yet, this is only a conditioning possibility for analysis, not an argument in itself. In appreciating the presence, or conversely the absence, or the density or rarity, of *p3*'s within any given composition, the ways this morpheme often functions as a linguistic index, and thereby issues of register, must be taken into account.

2.4.4.2.1 A linguistic index

In Middle Egyptian, *p3* is commonly interpreted as a token of a relatively lower written register. This is based on the skewed distribution of the expression across the written record. *P3*, already documented in Old Kingdom proper names and 'Reden und Rufe', is commonly used in Twelfth Dynasty documentary texts, but much more sparsely in contemporaneous literary texts (§2.4.4.2.2) and inscriptional ones.[196] In the Thirteenth and Seventeenth Dynasties, *p3*'s are also found in inscriptionally published texts that in their linguisitic typology are similar to documentary registers,[197] in private inscriptions,[198] and in *Kamose Inscriptions*. All of these are also otherwise linguistically innovative (§1.3.3.1-2). In Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptions, *p3*'s are avoided almost entirely until the times of Amenhotep II and become more common only by Amarna and later. Meanwhile, they are common in documentary registers and in 'Reden und Rufe'.[199] In the former, the presence of *p3*'s is in continuation to similar selections already in the late Twelfth Dynasty; in the latter, they contribute to stylize the 'sermo quotidianus' evoked.

That a demonstrative expression may have been made an index of linguistic register by speakers is not surprising, in view of the high formal salience of the expression. For an expression to function as a linguistic index, it must be easy to

---

196 In a royal inscription, an altogether exceptional example is *Tod Inscription* 23 *n3* [...], if this text is to be dated to the Twelfth Dynasty (see Buchberger 2006). In an expedition inscription, and in a lesser register, e.g. Hammamat 19 (*temp*. Amenemhat III), 11 *n3 n mnw* 'these blocks'.

197 E.g. Sobekhotep IV's *Karnak Stela*, *passim*; Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree*, *passim*; *Stèle Juridique*, *passim*.

198 E.g. Ameniseneb, Louvre C12, 3; 5; 6; Louvre C11, 6; 7; 14; Sobekdedu-Bebi (Louvre C285), 15; Iymeru-Neferkare (Louvre A125), B.2; Minnakht (Zagreb 7), B.4; B.5.

199 E.g. *Paheri*, pl.3, in various places.

recognize for speakers.[200] In the present case, the contrast between *pꜣ* and e.g. *pn* is based on segmental morphology; moreover, it is with a linguistic function, and therefore with expressions, that have a high token frequency in (spoken and written) text.[201] The high salience of demonstratives is further illustrated by how these can be subjected to linguistic dissimilation in Middle Egyptian, thus: *ipf – nf* (*Tod Inscription* 29: §4.6.3.B, (a)); *ipn – nn* (Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela*; *Appointement of the Vizier*: §4.6.3.B, (b)); and, with *pꜣ* itself, Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree* 4-5 *pꜣ r-pr*, against 6 *r-pr pn*.

This analysis of *pꜣ* as a linguistic index, and as an expression accordingly to be avoided in certain registers, is not contradicted by the fact that the vizier Antefiqer freely uses *pꜣ*'s in a letter (P. Reisner II).[202] To be sure, a vizier sits at the top of the innermost circle of court officials, yet when writing a letter he selects a register that befits this type of linguistic performance. Conversely, Heqanakht extensively uses *pꜣ* when addressing his household, but avoids the expression when addressing a superior in the third letter.[203] In ways that are only rarely possible in the Middle Egyptian record, a linguistic index is here observed being manipulated by a single individual.

> NB. One famous early Twelfth Dynasty inscription has been interpreted as including an explicit meta-pragmatic statement on *pꜣ*: Mentuwoser 13 *ink mdw r rꜣ-ꜥ srw šwy m ḏd pꜣw* 'I spoke in the manner of the officials, free of saying *pꜣw*.' This is classically taken to be a reference to the avoidance of *pꜣ*'s in the language of officials and by extension, in higher registers.[204] Such interpretation has been challenged and Mentuwoser's statement read differently.[205] Be the reading as it may, this does not affect the present argument, since the indexical value of *pꜣ* is independently established based on its skewed distribution in the Middle Egyptian written record (above).

2.4.4.2.2 In Middle Egyptian literature

Twelfth Dynasty literary compositions are themselves not free of *pꜣ*'s. One instance is found in *Kagemni* (before a noun: below, (i)), one in *Sinuhe* (pronominal: (iv)),[206] and one in *Shipwrecked Sailor* (pronominal: (v)). *Eloquent Peasant*, for its part, has no less than ten occurrences of *pꜣ*'s (below),[207] while *Debate of a Man and His Soul* has

---

200 Incidentally, the recruitment of a demonstrative expression for meta-linguistic purposes is not unparalleled (Andersen & Keenan 1985: 276-7, as a designation of a whole language; I thank Pascal Vernus for having drawn this to my attention).

201 On an altogether different level, it is significant as well that the rise of the article *pꜣ* was identified as an important diachronic process in early Egyptology already. In a similar vein, it is significant that there is a general awareness of *pꜣ* as one item of linguistic form by which the register of *Cheops' Court* saliently differs from the register of other Middle Egyptian narrative compositions such as *Sinuhe*.

202 Allen 2009: 266-7, with an interpretation different than mine.

203 James 1962: 107-8; Allen 2002a: 88; Uljas 2013.

204 Initially Fecht 1960: 205, n.580; widely followed, e.g. by Kroeber 1970: 21; Allen 1994: 11; Loprieno 1996b: 519-20; Morenz 1996: 34-6; Parkinson 2002: 119-20; Uljas 2013.

205 Lastly by Díaz Hernández 2013: 119 and Allen 2009, with references to previous proposals.

206 *Sinuhe* B 217 is sometimes emended into *ḏ.tw <n>ꜣ* (...) (e.g. Feder, *TLA*). AOS, to be sure, reads with a demonstrative (*ḏ.tw nn* (...)), but this is a secondary reading. As emerges from the semantic analysis by Oréal (2011: 46), the reading in B (*ḏ.tw(=i) ꜣ* (...)) is rich.

207 See Allen 2009: 266.

four (two pronominal, two before a noun: below, D). Roughly from the same period, *Ptahhotep*, a very long composition, does not have a single *pꜣ* in P, and only one in L1 (below, (ii)). That *pꜣ*'s are found at all in Twelfth Dynasty literary texts may at first seem surprising in view of the above discussion on how the expression is indexical of register. Moreover, *pꜣ*'s are very scarce in those Twelfth Dynasty literary texts in which they occur and their distribution is very uneven over these: this as well merits comment.

A. The discussion is best begun with the Middle Egyptian literary composition that has the highest amount of *pꜣ*'s after *Cheops' Court*, *Eloquent Peasant*.[208] In this, eight of ten occurrences are from the narrative or dialogue situations, against only two from the much longer petitions themselves. To some extent, this reflects the fact that dialogue situations naturally afford deictic contexts in higher numbers than the petitions do. Yet, when a deictic context is given, a *pꜣ* or a *pn* could be used: that *pꜣ*'s are more common in the dialogues than in the petitions is therefore a composer's deliberate selection, exploiting the expression to index a different register. This accords with the studied simplicity of the framing narrative and dialogues of *Eloquent Peasant*, which contrastively highlights the petitions.[209]

In *Kagemni* similarly, a related morphological category, possessive *pꜣy=f*, is found once in the introduction to the framing epilogue: *Kagemni* 2.3 *nꜣy=f n ẖrdw* 'his children'. The expression is strongly deictic in the context of a teaching, a type of literary discourse defined by a speech situation of a father to his child(ren). The possessive is simultaneously indexical of register, according with how the framing epilogue is brief and direct in a highly stylized way on other levels as well (below, (i)).

B. In Middle Egyptian literary texts in which *pꜣ*'s appear only once, these singular selections are always significant. Deictic force is particularly strong in the following places, each time at salient junctures:

(i) *Kagemni* 2.4-5

ir ntt nbt m sš m pꜣ šfdw sḏm st mi ḏd=i st

'As to all there is in writing on this roll, hear it like I say it.'

(ii) *Ptahhotep* 507 L1

ir sḏm=k nꜣ ḏd [...]

(P *ir sḏm=k nn ḏd.n=i n=k*)

'If you listen to this that I have said to you (...)'

Kagemni 2.4-5 introduces the vizier's final speech in the epilogue: *pꜣ šfdw* reflexively points to the teaching itself now put in writing in a performative way. *Ptahhotep* 507 similarly introduces the epilogue, with *nꜣ* in L1 also pointing to the teaching. That P has *nn* illustrates the composer's role in selecting expressions.

---

208 Occurrences in Allen 2009: 266, with an analysis different from mine.
209 Parkinson 2002: 175-6; 2012: 4, both with an analysis of subtle differences in the narrative and the dialogues.

Directly comparable to these is the single occurrence of possessive *pȝy=f* in *Eloquent Peasant*, also reflexively pointing to the written textualization of the orally performed discourses:

(iii) *Eloquent Peasant* B2 126-129

ḏd.<i>n imi-rȝ pr wr mrw sȝ rnsi
sȝ grt ꜥȝ sḏm=k nȝy=k n sprwt
rḏ.in=f šd.t(w)[=s] ḥr ꜥrt mȝt sprt nbt r ḫr[t=s]

'The high steward Meru's son Rensi said:
"Now wait here and listen to these petitions of yours."
He caused them to be read out from a fresh roll, each petition according to its content.'

In these texts in which *pȝ* occurs only once, the expression is used not only for its intrinsic demonstrative force: the compositions otherwise have other demonstratives that are not any deictically weaker as far as grammar proper is concerned. Rather, *pȝ* is selected for the additional force that derives from its contrast with other demonstratives used elsewhere. The expression is salient inasmuch as it stands out of the ordinary in the overall register of these compositions. In being salient, the expression is deictic in yet an additional sense, intra-textually defined, beyond the deictic force it has as its conventionalized grammatical meaning.

C. Slightly different is the case of two Twelfth Dynasty narrative compositions, *Sinuhe* and *Shipwrecked Sailor* where *pȝ* occurs only once, but as a pronoun. This use is less innovative, and thereby less marked in terms of register, than before a noun. Some effect associated with the selection of the *pȝ* demonstrative is manifest nonetheless: both passages in which a pronominal *pȝ* occurs are from high points in the compositions and deixis is accordingly strong. *Sinuhe* B 198-199 introduces the conclusion to the king's decree urging Sinuhe to return (B 178-199): in using *nȝ*, the king points to the sum of Sinuhe's past tribulations, the occasion for the composition itself. In *Shipwrecked Sailor*, the expression is set in the serpent's mouth, deploring his dead children:

(iv) *Sinuhe* B 198-199

iw nȝ ȝw r ḥwt tȝ

'This is too long to be roaming the earth!'

(v) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 129-132

ꜥḥꜥ.n sbȝ hȝw pr.n nȝ m ḫt m-ꜥ=f
ḫpr.n r=s nn wi ḥnꜥ ȝm.ny nn wi m-ḫr-ib=sn
ꜥḥꜥ.n=i m(w)t.kw n=sn gm.n=i st m ḫȝyt wꜥt

'Then a star came down and these went up in fire through its action.
It happened while I was not with them, they burnt while I was not in their midst.
I died for them, having found them as a single heap of corpses.'

D. More substantially different, but not less remarkable, is the case of *Debate of a Man and His Soul*. The composition has four instances of *pȝ*'s (5 and 17, pronominal; 50 and 116, before a noun) alternating with four instances of *pfȝ*'s (34; 37; 77; 126). A *pn*-demonstrative is selected only once (149), rather remarkably in a vocative address. One further demonstrative expression in the text is *pf*, placed before the noun rather than after it (16 *pf gs* 'that side'), a construction that is reminiscent of early funerary texts. That eight out of ten demonstratives in *Debate* are from the *-ȝ* series (*pȝ*'s and *pfȝ*'s) is striking. This suggests that the *pȝ*'s in *Debate* must be interpreted in relation to the overall configuration of demonstratives in the composition. The recurrent selection of *-f-* demonstratives (five out of ten occurrences: four *pfȝ*'s, one *pf*) probably has to do with the distal semantics expressed by these, here in relation to the strong funerary overtones of *Debate*.[210] The interpretation naturally extends to the afore mentioned syntax of *pf gs*.

E. As the above demonstrates, *pȝ*'s are in no ways banned from Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian literary texts. Nor, conversely, do they ever relinquish their indexical force in these. In compositions where they occur multiple times, such as in *Eloquent Peasant* (and *Kagemni*, taking into account the brevity of the epilogue), an association with register is directly manifest. In compositions in which *pȝ* occurs only once, it does at salient junctures, often reflexively poiting to the textual status of the compositions themselves. The additional deictic force the expression carries there, going beyond the grammatically defined one, derives from its out of the ordinary character within the overall register of these compositions. In some places in *Eloquent Peasant* and in both instances in *Kagemni*, both analyses apply simultaneously.

In *Cheops' Court*, *pȝ* (and possessive *pȝy=f*) is overly common: the effect is not differential and additionally deictic (as in e.g. *Ptahhotep* L1 or *Sinuhe*), but direct and indexical, as in *Eloquent Peasant* and *Kagemni*. Unlike in these compositions, however, the register indexed extends over the whole composition. This accords with the register of *Cheops Court* as can defined in literary terms.[211] In the following, I examine other aspects of the linguistic register of *Cheops' Court* more closely.

2.4.4.3 *Cheops' Court – Kagemni, Eloquent Peasant*

A. Narrative structure in *Cheops' Court* is more episodic and repetitive than in concentrically patterned Middle Kingdom tales such as *Sinuhe* or *Shipwrecked Sailor*. This is reflected, for instance, in the common use of *ʿḥʿ.n sḏm.n=f* and *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm*, and of fronted temporal expressions such as *ḥr m-ḫt sḏm=f* and *ḥr m-ḫt NP pseudoparticiple* as recurrent articulating devices. The syntactic texture is also less densely-woven than in Twelfth Dynasty literary works: complex sequences of semantically dependent clauses tend to be avoided in favor of simpler modes of textual cohesion and articulation.

The broad use of *ʿḥʿ.n sḏm.n=f* and *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm* side by side has been interpreted as a transitional feature of *Cheops' Court*: the composition would thereby

---

210 A similar interpretation is reflected by Allen (2009) in his translation, where *-f-* demonstratives are often rendered by 'yon', 'yonder' (e.g. 'yon side' for *Debate* 16).

211 Analyzed by Parkinson (2002: 138-46).

occupy an intermediary position between e.g. *Sinuhe* and *Shipwrecked Sailor* (in which *ꜥḥꜥ.n sḏm.n=f* is said to be relatively more common than *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm*) and Late Egyptian Stories (in which *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm* is more common).[212] However, the presence and distribution of these constructions must be viewed in relation to other elements in the narrative texture of the compositions being compared. *Cheops' Court* favors more direct modes of clause linkage over complex sequences of asyndetically joined clauses as in e.g. *Sinuhe*. This naturally results in an overall much higher density of *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-headed constructions and *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm*'s. As is generally the case in Middle Egyptian, including in *Sinuhe*, *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm* is associated with paragraph-final functions in *Cheops' Court*.[213] At the levels considered, there are no differences in language between these compositions, only differences in what may be termed their 'narrative style', or better, their narrative texture.

B. Whenever multiple events in the main narrative chain directly follow each other, this results in sequences of *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-headed constructions, with no *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm*'s or other constructions intervening. Such sequences, which are conspicuous in *Cheops' Court*, are absent in *Sinuhe* and *Shipwrecked Sailor* because of the differently articulated narrative hierarchies in these compositions. A sequence of three *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-headed constructions is, on the other hand, found in a Twelfth Dynasty composition, in the framing epilogue of *Kagemni*. This has further elements in common with *Cheops' Court*:

(i) The framing epilogue of *Kagemni* and *Cheops' Court*:

- Sequences of *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-headed constructions: *Kagemni* 2.7-9 (3x) – *Cheops' Court* 8.23-9.1; 11.14-19 (6x each); 3.12-14; 3.23-25; 5.14-17; 6.7-10; 8.17-20; 10.7-8 (3-4x each). Such sequences recur in spectacular form in Ameniseneb's mid-Thirteenth Dynasty biography (particularly in Louvre C11), associated with other elements of a lesser register. Similarly in the late Twelfth Dynasty in a biography (Khusobek) and in a documentary register (Semna Dispatches) (§1.3.3.1.C);

- *ꜥḥꜥ.n N sḏm.n=f*: *Kagemni* 2.7-8 *ꜥḥꜥ.n ḥm n nsw bity ḥwni mni.n=f* 'Then the Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Huni went to harbor.' – *Cheops' Court*: 5.15-16 *ꜥḥꜥ.n wꜥt ntt r štiw ḫt.n=s m ḥnskt=s* 'Then the woman who was at the stroke oar got her braid entangled.'[214] The construction is very rare. That in both cases the construction is motivated by the length of the subject makes it no less noteworthy;

- Sequences of *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm* constructions: *Kagemni* 2.5-7 (4x) – *Cheops' Court* 12.2-3; 12.7 (2x each).

Such conjunction is noteworthy when the sheer brevity of the framing epilogue of *Kagemni* is taken into account.

---

212 Hintze 1950: 31-6, particularly 34-5; now also Jay 2008: 80-132.

213 Similarly Schenkel in press b; for *Cheops' Court* specifically, §2.1-2, §3.1, and §4.3. Schenkel identifies the function of *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm* as providing 'background information' in the contouring of a text: despite different terminologies, this is substantially the same analysis expressed here in more descriptive terms by 'paragraph-final position'.

214 Transl. Parkinson 1997a: 110.

Not a narrative construction, but significant of a similar constellation, is the use of *ḥnꜥ sḏm* in continuation to an imperative. In Middle Egyptian literature, this is found only in two texts, various times in *Cheops' Court* and once in the R version of *Eloquent Peasant*:[215]

(ii) *Cheops' Court* 5.9-12

im in.tw n=i st-ḥmt 20 (...)
ḥnꜥ rḏt nn iꜣdwt n nn ḥmwt (...)
'Have twenty women given to me (...)
and have these nets given to these women (...)'

> Sim. 4.13-14; 6.20; also 1.4 (restored). For the slightly different construction in 7.2-4, §2.4.4.7, (iv).

(iii) *Eloquent Peasant* R 18.1-5

[ir s]wt ꜥ n ꜥ[nḫ] ḥmt sḫti pn (...)
ḥnꜥ swt irt ꜥ n ꜥnḫ [sḫti] pn (...)
'But make a portion of sustenance for this peasant's wife (...)
And yet also make a portion of sustenance for this peasant (...)'[216]

> B1 phrases differently, with a second imperative: B1 112-114 *ir swt ꜥnḫ ḥmt=f* (...) *ir grt ꜥnḫ sḫty pn* (...). A subjunctive *sḏm=f* could not be used here because, as the presence of *grt* implies, the linkage between the two clauses is not merely continuative. Inasmuch as it implies an effect on register, the text in R bears witness to a rewriting.

The construction *imperative – ḥnꜥ sḏm* is not recent in itself, being found already in an Eighth Dynasty decree.[217] It recurs in documentary texts of the Twelfth and Thirteenth dynasties,[218] as well as in documentary texts monumentally published of the Seventeenth Dynasty (§1.3.3.1.C). The construction is, however, otherwise avoided in Middle Egyptian literary texts: these use another construction instead, *imperative – subjunctive sḏm=f*.

Significantly, (iii) is from a dialogue in the framing narrative, as are several of the *pꜣ*'s in this composition. In both *Cheops' Court* and *Eloquent Peasant*, the selection of *ḥnꜥ sḏm*—rather than a subjunctive *sḏm=f* (for the former) or an imperative (for the latter)—thereby appears as an index of register.[219] As noted, *Kagemni* also has an instance of *pꜣ* before a noun (§2.4.4.2.2, (i)) and one of a *pꜣy=f* possessive (§2.4.4.2.2.A). In the framing parts of both *Kagemni* and *Eloquent Peasant*, verbal

---

215 Kroeber 1970: 154-5.
216 Transl. Parkinson 2012a: 94.
217 *Urk.* I 296, 11-12; 306, 9-10 (the same text): see Kroeber 1970: 153-4, ex.1-2.
218 Heqanakht, P. Reisner II, and P. Bulaq 18; see Kroeber 1970: 154. Also in P. Berlin 10470 (Smither 1948; H*HBT* 50-4), *passim*.
219 Similar interpretation by Kroeber (1970: 155) and Parkinson (2012: 95).

constructions thereby appear to index register just like *p₃*'s do. A similar constellation is characteristic of *Cheops' Court* more generally.[220]

2.4.4.4 *Cheops' Court – Tale of P. Lythgoe, Sasobek, Tale of Hay*

Also relating to different types of narrative texture are different fronted temporal expressions. In *Cheops' Court*, a great many are introduced by *ḥr m-ḫt*, providing a common articulating device throughout the composition (for another fronted temporal expression, *wꜥ m nn hrw ḫpr* in 9.21, see §5.6.2). Roughly half of these are formulaic (i), foreshadowing similar techniques in Ramesside narrative literature.[221] Other than in *Cheops' Court*, formulaic temporal expression in *ḥr m-ḫt* are uncommon in pre-Ramesside times.[222] In Middle Egyptian literary texts such as *Sinuhe* or *Tale of a Herdsman*, different formulae, of a synthetic type, perform similar functions (ii). The contrast is of register, rather than diachronic: the construction as in *Cheops' Court* is documented in an Eighth Dynasty decree already.[223]

(i) Stock temporal expressions introduced by *ḥr m-ḫt* in *Cheops' Court*:[224]

Cheops' Court 3.10-11 *ḥr m-ḫt mšrw ḫpr iwt pw ir.n p₃ nḏs* (...) 'Now, after the evening had set, the commoner came (...)' (sim. 2.10-11); 12.8-9 *ḥr m-ḫt hrww sw₃ ḥr nn ꜥḥꜥ.n šnt*[sic] *rwd-ḏdt ḫt* (...) 'Now, after days had passed on this, Ruddjedet quarelled (...)' (sim. 2.3-5[225]); 2.15-16 [*ḥr m-ḫt*] *t₃ ḥḏ 2* [*n*] *h*[*rww ḫpr š₃*]*s pw* [*ir.n p₃ ḥr-pr*] (...) 'Now, after the land had brightened and two days had passed, the steward went (...)'.

(ii) Stock temporal expressions in e.g. *Sinuhe* and *Herdsman*:

Sinuhe B 11-12 *ḫpr.n tr n msyt s₃ḥ.n=i* (...) 'When the time of supper had come, I touched (...)'; *Herdsman* x+22-23 *ḥḏ.n rf t₃ dw₃ sp 2 iw ir mi ḏd=f* 'When the land had brightened early in the morning, it was done as he said' (with expressions of 'dawning', also *Sinuhe* B 20; B 129; B 248).[226]

---

220 At the level of a literary trope, another element allying *Cheops' Court* with the framing sections of *Eloquent Peasant* and *Kagemni* is the formula *wn.in nfr st ḥr ib=f* 'And they were perfect to his heart', *passim* in these three compositions. As always with literary tropes, this need not point to a close temporal horizon, but is significant as an element of a shared literary typology.

221 Detailed analysis by Hintze (1950: 14-31).

222 A much later, almost Ramesside, occurrence is Tutankhamun's *Restoration Stela* 10 (*Urk.* IV 2028, 2-3) *ḥr m-ḫt hrww sw₃ ḥr nn ḫꜥy*[*t ḥm=f* ...] 'Now, when days had passed on this, the rising of His Majesty (...)' (noted by Hintze 1950: 11, n.4).

223 Hintze 1950: 9, n.4.

224 Detailed analysis in Hintze 1950: 11-4.

225 [*ḥr m-ḫt*] *hrw* [*sw₃*] *ḥr* [*nn is*]*t rf wn šsp*[*t m š n w*]*b₃-inr ꜥḥꜥ.n ḏd.n* [*p*]*₃ nḏs* [...] 'Now, after days had passed on this—there was a pavilion in Ubainer's garden—the commoner said [...]', with a parenthetical clause between the fronted temporal expression and the event in the main narrative chain (sim. Parkinson 1997a: 106; Hintze 1950: 11, n.3). Lepper's (2008: 30) reading is ungrammatical (a *ḥr m-ḫt* introduced clause can not be circumstantial to a preceding clause). In filling the lacuna, Lepper (2008: 77) evokes the possibility of an alternative restoration, by analogy with 9.21 (*wꜥ m nn hrw ḫpr*): this is ruled out by the fact that the expression in 9.21 has a major articulating function in the overall composition (introducing the section on Ruddjedet's giving birth and the ensuing ramifications), while 2.3-5 lacks any such large-scale articulating function.

226 Closely comparing with *Sinuhe* B 248, also with a subjectless *sḏm(w)*-passive: *ḥḏ.n rf t₃ iw iw i₃š n=i* (...) 'When it dawned, one came and called to me (...)'. In what little text is preserved,

Tale of P. Lythgoe and *Discourse of Sasobek*—both documented in late Twelfth Dynasty manuscripts and therefore not much younger than *Sinuhe* or *Herdsman*—have fronted temporal expressions like *Cheops' Court* (iii)-(iv).[227] Both also include other expressions associated with a register different from the one of e.g. *Sinuhe*:

(iii) *Tale of P. Lythgoe* ro x+7-8

ḥr m-ḫt m[š]rw ḫpr ꜥḥꜥ.n rḏ.n=f [...]

'Now, after the evening had set, he gave [...]'

> Sim. vso x+9-10 *ḥr m-ḫt ꜣbdw ꜥšꜣ swꜣ ꜥḥꜥ.n nsw* [...] 'Now, after many months had passed, the king [...]'.[228]

> In the same composition, also *pꜣ*'s in series (ro x+2; ro x+9; vso x+2).

(iv) *Sasobek* A.11

ḥr m-ḫt kt pḥryt swꜣ[.ti ...]

'Now, after another long period had pass[ed ...]'

> In the same composition, also presentative *ptr* (B1.10; B1.11; B4.1: §2.4.3.1, (i)).

Further fronted temporal expressions introduced by *ḥr m-ḫt*, not formulaic, contribute to articulate the narrative in *Cheops' Court* (3.17; 7.11; 7.13; 8.5-6; 8.22). The same construction is avoided in other Middle Egyptian literary texts,[229] which for similar functions use the *sḏm.n=f* in setting function. Here as well, the contrast is of register, not linguistic: the construction as in *Cheops' Court* is found in early Middle Kingdom private and royal inscriptions[230] and even before.[231] In Middle Egyptian literature, non-formulaic *ḥr m-ḫt*-introduced clauses recur only in *Neferkare and Sisene* (§4.4.4.1) and in *Tale of Hay* (v). The latter is documented in a late Twelfth Dynasty manuscript. Like *Tale of P. Lythgoe* and *Sasobek* (iii)-(iv), *Tale of Hay* also includes at least one other expression significant of a register different than the one of e.g. *Sinuhe*:

Herdsman has another expression in common with *Sinuhe*, the transitive construction of *ḫpi* 'meet (someone)' (*Herdsman* x+23; *Sinuhe* B 10).

227 Similarly noted by Vernus 1981: 88, n.46; further comments by Spalinger 2006: 67.

228 Similarly noted by Parkinson 2002: 142.

229 Another instance, in *Sinuhe* B 135-136, has been proposed (Hintze 1950: 8, n.3; Feder, *TLA*). The reading, however, requires heavy emendation. The text, with *ḥr* a verb serving as the predicate to the preceding clause, is coherent as it stands (e.g. Parkinson 2009: 286).

230 As *ḥr m-ḫt sḏm=f* (with a subjunctive *sḏm=f*, as in *Cheops' Court* 7.13; 8.5-6; 8.22): Hammamat 114 (*temp.* Mentuhotep IV), 15 (noted by Hintze 1950: 9, n.4, also quoting an instance from an Eighth Dynasty decree). As *ḥr m-ḫt sḏm.n=f* (as in *Tale of Hay* X+1.3-4: below, (v)): Amenemhat (CG 20541; *temp.* Amenemhat II), 10 (*TLA* #119740). In Khety (UC 14430; D.11 or early D.12), A.x+2 (*TLA* #119740), the context is broken, making it impossible to identify which of the two constructions stood in this text.

231 E.g. *Deir el-Ballas Inscription* x+3 *iḥr m-ḫt ḥw.n=sn mnit snb* [...] 'Now, when they had moored successfully [...]'.

(v) *Tale of Hay* X+1.3-4

ḥr m-ḫt ḏd.n [...]

'Now, when [...] had said [...]'

> In the same composition, also *ḏ3ḏ3* 'head' (X+1.7; perhaps further in X+1.17?). While not entirely documented in earlier times,[232] *ḏ3ḏ3* 'head' is by and large avoided in Middle Egyptian literary texts, which use *tp* instead; the expression was to gain general acceptance in literary registers only in Ramesside times.[233] Yet, *ḏ3ḏ3* is found in *Tale of Hay*, in *Cheops' Court* (8.19; 8.21; compare also the personal name *ḏ3ḏ3-m-ꜥnḫ*), and in one other Middle Egyptian literary text, *Fishing and Fowling* (C2.x+11).

Such linguistic encounters are significant as *Tale of P. Lythgoe* and *Tale of Hay* are exponents of what on literary grounds has been described as a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature,[234] to which *Cheops' Court* would also relate.

2.4.4.5 *Cheops' Court – Sinuhe*, etc.

The above elements of a linguistic differentiation notwithstanding, the two traditions of Middle Egyptian literature, the 'low' and the 'high', are substantially in the same variety of Middle Egyptian. This is manifest for example in aspects of the syntax of clause combining, which makes full use of complex asyndetic dependency:[235]

(i) *Cheops' Court* 10.11-12

iꜥ.in=sn sw
šꜥd ḥp3=f
rḏ ḥr ifd m ḏbt

'They washed him,
his navel having been cut off,
and he was placed on a sheet in a brick.'

> Sim. 10.19-20; 11.23.

(ii) *Cheops' Court* 12.4-6

ꜥḥꜥ.n rḏ.n=s <sw> r pds
rḏ m-ḫnw ky ḫtm istn m dḥr
rḏ.n=s st r ꜥt wnnt ḥr ḫnw=s ḫtm.n=s ḥr=f

---

232 *Deir el-Ballas Inscription* x+10; Nesimontu A.13 (referring to the 'head' of a 'tribe' (*pdt*)). In PT 1064, P/V/E 45, *ḏ3ḏ3* is used with a more specific meaning, side by side with *tp*: (...) *ir tp=f r ḏ3ḏ3=f* '(...) to his head, to his skull'.

233 A pre-Ramesside instance is *Astarte* I.9.

234 Parkinson 2002: 142-3.

235 Beyond the examples quoted in the main text, also e.g. *Cheops' Court* 10.2 *gm.n=sn sw ꜥḥꜥ d3iw sḫd* 'They found him standing, the kilt upside down' (sim. 12.20); 11.26-12.1: *3s pw ir.n t3 wb3t wn.n=s t3 3t* 'The maidservant went and opened the door' (sim 12.4; 12.9-10; 12.12-13). The latter is also discussed by Uljas (2007a: 251, ex.2), significantly in a paper on texture with most examples drawn from highest written registers of Middle Egyptian.

'She put it in a box,
which was placed inside another sealed container, which was bound(?) with leather;
she put it into the room which had her belongings and sealed it.'

> In (i), the first passive event (*šʒd ḥpʒ=f*) is interpreted as providing a background to the main narrative chain[236] while the second (*rḏ ḥr* (...)) is interpreted as part of that chain. In (ii), by contrast, the passive events (*rḏ m-ẖnw* (...); *istn m dḥr*) are both interpreted as part of the main chain, expressing subsequent actions, like the following events (*rḏ.n=s* (...); *ḥtm.n=s* (...)). In either case, the linkage is asyndetic and hearer's inferals are called upon to complete the construal of meaning. Such texturing is typical of high registers of Middle Egyptian.[237]

The syntax of *iw* can be complex as well, as in the following passage, the grammar of which has merited a sizeable amount of successive interpretations:[238]

> (iii) *Cheops' Court* 5.3-7
>
> *ib n ḥm=k r ḳbb n mʒʒ ẖnn=sn ẖnt m-ẖd m-ẖnt*
> *iw=k ḥr mʒʒ sšw nfrw n š=k*
> *iw=k ḥr mʒʒ sẖwt=f ẖfʒʒwt=f nfrw*
> *iw ib=k r ḳbb ẖr=s*
>
> 'Your Majesty's heart will be cool at seeing how they row a rowing trip up and down!
> You will be seeing the beautiful pools of your lake;
> You will be seeing its fields and its beautiful banks.
> For your heart will be cool through it.'

> The second and third clauses (*iw=k ḥr mʒʒ* (...)) are semantically dependent on the first (*ib n ḥm=k* (...)), although not necessarily circumstantial in a strict syntactic sense. An effect of such dependency is the temporally future interpretation of the progressive construction. Also introduced by *iw*, the fourth clause (*iw ib=k r ḳbb* (...)) is not dependent in a similar way: the role of *iw* is here macro-syntactic, signaling that the clause relates to the preceding segment of discourse (compare also the anaphoric pronoun in *ẖr=s*), to which it provides a conclusion. The first clause is similar to the fourth but differs from it by lacking *iw*. As *iw* can serve to connect a segment of discourse to a preceding one, not using *iw* allows a speaker to present a state-of-affairs as set off from what precedes.[239] This gives the clause a thetic quality, presenting the state-of-affairs en bloc and probably with some

---

236 Similarly Uljas 2007a: 260-1.

237 E.g. Uljas 2007a; Collier 1996.

238 Various interpretations that have been expressed are conveniently summarized by el-Hamrawi (2000: 142-4); I disagree with these and with the author's.

239 An analysis of 5.3 *ib n ḥm=k r ḳbb* (...) with the lack of *iw* signalling dependency on the precedent segment has often been contemplated in approaches to Middle Egyptian grammar that viewed the functions of *iw* as merely syntactic. Such interpretation of 5.3 is not possible grammatically because a *NP r sḏm* can not be in continuation to a subjunctive (here 5.1-2 *ḥw ʒ wḏʒ ḥm=k* (...)), nor to an imperative (should 5.2 ʿ*pr* be interpreted as one rather than as a *sḏm(w)*-passive; the latter is more likely).

affective nuance.[240] The syntax of *iw* in the fourth clause is as in e.g. *Sinuhe* R 8, articulating the court's mourning (R 8-11) to Amenemhat's apotheosis (R 5-8) (§1.3.3.2.D). *Iw*-lessness in the first clause is as in e.g. *Sinuhe* B 269-70 ꜥ*wy=k r* {*r*} *nfrt nsw wꜣḥ ḫkryt nt nbt-pt* 'Your hands are upon the beauty, enduring king, the insignia of the Lady of heaven!'

On an altogether different level, the rare construction *NP r sḏm ḥr=s* in 5.6-7 (*iw ib=k r ḳbb ḥr=s*) is noteworthy as well. Only two other instances of the construction have been noted overall:[241] *Ptahhotep* 407 *iw sꜣ=k r ḥbs ḥr=s* 'Your back will be clothed through it'; *Merikare* E 49 *iw tꜣ pn r grg ḥr=s* 'This land will be founded through it.'

Cheops' Court has various instances of serial constructions other than ꜥ*ḥꜥ.n*-headed ones (*pr.n sḏm.n=f*, etc.). These recur in *Sinuhe* and *Debate of a Man and His Soul*; beyond literary texts, they are also found in Coffin Texts. Just as *Cheops' Court* accommodates them, so does the framing epilogue of *Kagemni*.

(iv) *Cheops' Court* 6.4

ii.n ḫḏ.n=s pꜣy=s rmn

'She came to disrupt her side.'

Sim. *Cheops' Court* 6.14 *pr.n fḳꜣ.n=f ḥri-ḥb ḥri-tp ḏꜣḏꜣ-m-ꜥnḫ m bw nb nfr* 'He finally rewarded the chief lector priest Djadjaemankh with every good thing.'

Sim. *Sinuhe* B 127 *sḏr.n ḳꜣs.n=i pḏt=i* (...) 'At night I strung my bow (...)'.

Sim. CT IV 278/279d BH1Br *pr.n ḥpt.n ky ky* 'They finally embraced each other' (other witness with ꜥ*ḥꜥ.n* in place of *pr.n*).[242]

Sim. *Kagemni* 2.4 *ḏr.n ḏd.n=f n=sn* (...) 'He ended up saying to them (...)'.

Related to these serial constructions are other constructions with the same verbs also in auxiliary function, but not themselves serial. These have a similar distribution in the record:

(v) *Cheops' Court* 6.11

ḏr.in=f mḥ [*2*]*4* (...)

'It (scil. the water) ended up as [2]4 cubits (...)'

Sim. *Shipwrecked Sailor* 130 (...) *pr.n nꜣ m ḫt m-ꜥ=f* '(...) and these (*scil.* the serpent's children) went up in fire through its (*scil.* the star's) action'; *Debate* 75-76 *ḏr.in=f ḥms psš=f m ḥrw ḥr ḏd* (...) 'He ended up seated, spreading out by voice saying (...)'.

---

[240] This analysis has its roots in Vernus' discussion of '*iw*-lessness' (1997: 45-61; not mentioning *Cheops' Court* 5.3-7); further analysis will be provided in Stauder & Uljas in prep. For *iw*-less *NP r sḏm*, see already in the present study §5.2.3.3.

[241] First by Kaplony-Heckel 1956: 80.

[242] Schenkel 2012[5]: 256.

Sim. CT IV 280/281a M1NY *ḏr.n ḫpr m bꜣwy=f* 'They ended up becoming The-one-with-two-*ba*'s' (other witnesses have *ꜥḥꜥ.n*); CT V 97g T1C *sḏr.n iḥw=s rḫs smn=s npd* 'At night her oxen were killed and her goose was slaughtered.'[243]

Illustrative is also e.g. *smwn – clause* (§2.4.2, (i)), which recurs in both *Sinuhe* and in a dialogue in *Eloquent Peasant*:

(vi) *Cheops' Court* 4.1

smwn msḥ p<w>[244] *nḥꜣ*

'No doubt this is a dangerous crocodile!'[245]

Sim. *Sinuhe* B 157-158 *smwn=k r rḏt* (...) 'Surely you will let (...)'.

Sim. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 75 (the officials speaking to Meru's son Rensi) *smwn sḫty=f pw* 'Surely it is but a peasant of his!'; later also in P. Bulaq 13 frg. X.1.

2.4.4.6   Further elements of linguistic inclusiveness

A. In accommodating the elements noted above, the linguistic register in *Cheops' Court* appears inclusive. Beyond these, old and new expressions of the same function can occur side by side, without any obvious correlate in terms of register to be detected. A clear case is with the syntax of *ib*:

(i) *Cheops' Court* 9.12

wn.in ḥm=f ib=f wꜣ r ḏwt ḥr=s

'His Majesty's heart fell into a bad mood about this.'

(ii) *Cheops' Court* 6.1-2

wn.in ib n ḥm=f ḳb n mꜣꜣ ẖnn=sn

'His Majesty's felt well at seeing them rowing.'

Sim. 5.14.

Both sentences have the same overall construction, *wn.in NP pseudoparticiple*, but differ in the syntax of *ib*. In 9.12, the old construction, with a *badal* apposition, is selected (*ḥm=f ib=f*). In 6.1-2 and 5.14, the innovative genitival construction is selected (*ib n ḥm=f*).

B. Linguistic inclusiveness in *Cheops' Court* extends to elements of a heightened register in relation to ritual. The relevant expressions are concentrated in the episode of the divine birth. The section is set off from the overall composition by an intro-ductory fronted temporal expression that occurs only here in the composition and is

---

243 Schenkel 2012[5]: 257.

244 Emendation after Lepper 2008: 84-5.

245 For a semantic analysis of *smwn* in this passage, Oréal 2011: 431-2, not emending the text and with a translation as 'Se peut-il que ce crocodile s'en retourne!'

otherwise associated with text-initial positions (§5.6.2): 9.21 *wꜥ m nn hrw ḫpr* (...) 'One of these days (...)'.[246]

The first of these expressions is *pwy* demonstratives. These occur in *Cheops' Court* in relation to two types of referents, the names given to the three kings to come and kingship itself:

(iii) *Pwy* demonstratives:

10.9   (...) *m rn=k pwy n wsr-r=f* '(...) in this your name of Userref!' (sim. 10.16-17; 10.24);

9.24-25   (...) *r irt iꜣt twy mnḫt m tꜣ pn r-ḏr=f* '(...) to perform this excellent function in this whole land' (sim. already 9.11).

The demonstratives are first documented, still sparsely, in the Twelfth Dynasty and become more common from the Thirteenth Dynasty on and in the early New Kingdom. They are found mostly in religious or magical texts. The specific associations as in *Cheops' Court* recur notably in some Thutmoside inscriptions to do with royal ideology, also with referents associated with kingship and names given to the king.

The same section is distinguished by a collection of synthetic *-in*-marked forms (*sḏm.in=f*). In Middle Egyptian literature, these—as opposed to analytic *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm*—are mostly restricted to a set of high-frequency verbs and to dialogal exchanges, often in contexts that evoke the format of the 'Royal Tale'.[247] High-frequency verbs found with synthetic *-in*-marked forms are *ḏd*, *rḏi*, and *iri*. Significantly, these are themselves mostly found in contexts of dialogal exchange (*ḏd*), including the acting related to such dialogues (*iri* and causative *rḏi*). Less common verbs also found in the synthetic form include *ini* or *stꜣ*, as a convention associated with the 'Royal Tale' (for *stꜣ*, e.g. *Neferti* 1h; 2g; *Cheops' Court* 8.10; for *ini*, e.g. *Cheops' Court* 4.24, by extension also *Eloquent Peasant* R 7.7[248]). Synthetic *sꜥk.in* in *Eloquent Peasant* B2 130 (on the petitions now entextualized being 'presented to' the king) has a similar meaning and relates to a similar convention, extended further. Among other uncommon verbs found in the *sḏm.in=f*, *dr.in=f* in *Cheops' Court* 6.11 is an auxiliary (§2.4.4.5, (v)): the analytic construction could not have been used (compare **wn.in=f ḥr dr mḥ 24*). *Ms.in=sn* in *Sinuhe* B 269 is discussed below. Further instances of *sḏm.in=f* with verbs other than the usual ones (e.g. *wšš.in=f* and *nḏm.in=f* in P. Ebers 52, 1-7;[249] *mꜣ.in=f* in CT II 334d[250]) are not from literature and therefore abide by different conventions.[251]

---

246 On 9.21-22 introducing a 'major shift' in 'time, place, and protagonists who suddenly include the court of the Sungod', further Parkinson 2002: 186-7.

247 I agree with Schenkel (in press b: §1) that the often repeated claim that synthetic *sḏm.in=f* forms are restricted to high-frequency verbs and/or correlate with high-status participants fails to describe the data adequately. However, I maintain that the distribution of these synthetic forms—as opposed to analytic ones—is in literature principled, according to conventions such as described in the main text. As elsewhere in the present study, I use 'Royal Tale' as a conventional label for a certain situation of exchange with the king, well aware of the fact that there may never have been such a fixed 'format', let alone a 'genre'.

248 In the interaction between Nemtinakht and his follower, as one among various ways by which Nemtinakht is presented as usurping prerogatives that are not his.

249 Schenkel in press b: §2.8.

Outside contexts falling under the scope of the above conventions, the analytic construction, *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm*, is regularly used in Middle Egyptian literature. Examples in *Eloquent Peasant* are with *rmi* 'cry' (B1 55-56) or *srḫ* 'denounce' (B1 73); in *Cheops' Court* with *ẖni* 'row' (5.13-14), *ḫbꜣbꜣ* 'waddle' (8.21), *šni* 'suffer' (9.22), *ms* 'bring, present' (10.3), *swḏꜣ* 'fortify' (10.21-22), *wḥm* 'repeat' (12.2; 12.7; 12.15), or *dbn* 'go around' (12.3).[252] Significantly, analytic *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm* can also be used with the afore mentioned high-frequency verbs when the contexts are other than dialogal exchange with the king and associated acting. For example in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 115-116, the verb is *rdi*, but the event a mere giving, not a causing (someone to do something): *wn.in.tw ḥr rdt n=f tꜣ 10 ḥnḳt ds 2 rꜥ nb* 'And one began giving him ten loaves of bread and two jars of beer daily'; contrast with B2 128-129 (Meru's son Rensi acting as a deputy to the king) *rḏ.in=f šd.t(w)[=s] ḥr ꜥrt mꜣt sprt nbt r ḫr[t=s]* 'And he caused them to be read out from a fresh roll, each petition according to its content.'[253]

Against the background just outlined, the following synthetic *-in*-forms in *Cheops' Court* are then very remarkable:

(iv) Synthetic *-in*-marked forms in the episode of divine birth:

10.9-10   *wꜥr.in ẖrd pn tp ꜥwy=sy m ẖrd n mḥ 1* (...) 'This child rushed out onto her arms as a child of one cubit (...)' (sim. 10.17; 10.24);

10.11   *iꜥ.in=sn sw* (...) 'They washed him (...)' (sim. 10.19; 11.2);

11.8-9   *iwḥ.in sw ẖnmw m pꜣ it* 'Khnum loaded himself with the grain.'

These forms are not with high-frequency verbs in the context of a dialogal exchange, nor are they more generally accounted for under the conventions discussed above. Their divine subjects play no role either: for the goddesses, compare the analytic construction in 10.3 *wn.in=sn ḥr ms n=f mniwt=sn sḫmw* 'They presented him with

---

250 Schenkel in press b: §3.6; witnesses alternate between *mꜣ.in=f* and *mꜣ.n=f*.

251 A similar comment extends to Eighteenth Dynasty royal inscriptions, e.g. Thutmosis II's *Aswan Inscription* 9 (*Urk.* IV 139, 9) *ḫꜥ<r>.in ḥm=f* (hardly a 'narrative' infinitive in view of the meaning of the verb). As often, such reconfigurations are at their densest in the *Royal Cycle*, e.g. *Urk.* IV 259, 4 *sn.in=sn*; 259, 7 *pr.in=sn*; 261, 1 *nḏm.in ib*; 261, 11 *mꜣt.in=sn*.

252 Sim. e.g. in a Twelfth Dynasty expedition inscription, Hammamat 19 (*temp.* Amenemhat III), with *ḥd* 'attack' (said of stones), *wꜣsi* 'be damaged', and *sfn* 'make smooth' (passage discussed by Schenkel in press b: §3.5).

253 In B1 115-116 (my translation), and similarly in B1 55-56 ('(...) began weeping', e.g. Parkinson 2012a: 54), the analytic construction often lends itself to an inchoative translation ('begin doing'). These inchoative semantics are not part of the grammatical meaning of the construction (if they were, *wn.in N ḥr rmyt* should be observed contrasting with **rm.in N*), but a side-effect of how the Aktionsart of the events interacts with the grammatical tense. *Rmi* in B1 55-56 is atelic, and *rdi* (...) in B1 115-116 is made atelic by the quantified temporal expression (*rꜥ nb*); when used in a construction with perfective aspect such as *-in*-marked constructions, this naturally yields a possibility for an inchoative reading (Winand 2006: 215-7). Accordingly, the selection of an analytic construction is not motivated by aspect, but by the principles outlined in the main text. Different is the case of *Neferti* 2q, where aspect could have been a factor in the selection of the analytic construction. This permits the expression of progressive aspect (the king will be continuously writing while Neferti speaks his lament): *wn.in{n}=f ḥr irt m sš ḏdt.n ẖri-ḥb nfrty* 'And he was writing down what the lector priest Nefert said.'

their necklaces and sistra'; for Khnum, 10.21-22 *wn.in ẖnmw ḥr swḏꜣ ꜥwt=f* 'Khnum fortified his limbs' (sim. 11.1-2). Rather, *wꜥr.in*, *iꜥ.in*, and *iwḥ.in* are associated with actions in the ritual, which they contribute to underscore within the overall composition. Their selection is therefore indexical. A similar effect is observed in *Sinuhe* B 269, introducing the cultic lyric performed by the royal children (B 269-279):[254] *ms.in=sn st n ḥm=f* 'They presented them to His Majesty.' In the parallel formulation, *Cheops' Court* for its part has the analytic construction (10.3, quoted above), demonstrating how such selections are ultimately a composer's choice: the composer of *Cheops' Court* chose to reserve the synthetic construction for the events in the ritual itself.

In these selections of *pwy* demonstratives and synthetic *-in*-marked forms, *Cheops' Court* goes beyond the regular linguistic repertoires of Middle Egyptian literature. This is not unparalleled. Reaching deeper yet, a similar phenomenon is observed in *Sinuhe*, with different expressions according with the different contents and semantics of this composition: in addition to B 269 *ms.in=sn* (above), compare e.g. *ḏd.k(w)* in B 45 and B 113 (§4.1.3.A), the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive (*passim* in the first section: §4.1.3.B), or the *pw* demonstrative in B 237 *fnḏ=k pw špss* (§4.1.2.B).

2.4.4.7   Dialogues, characterization, humor

The linguistic register of *Cheops' Court* also accommodates elements of language aimed at a characterization of protagonists and at humor.[255] While gauging the effects these expressions may have had on ancient audiences often remains difficult, some elements, possibly only the tip of the iceberg, seem fairly clear.

A. Dialogal exchanges are composed in ways to evoke the directness of spoken interaction. Cases in point include:

(i) *Cheops' Court* 9.8-9

mr=i is st nꜣ ḏdy=k pty sy tꜣ rd-ḏdt

'I want it, what you say! Who is she, this Ruddjedet?'

> Sim., in a question: 8.10-11 *pty st ḏdi tm rḏ mꜣn=i tw* 'What is it, Djedi, that you don't let me see?'[256]

> Constructions with subsequent cataphoric explicitation of a pronoun recur in dialogues in Coffin Texts. Both in these and in *Cheops' Court*, they alternate with non-cataphoric ones.[257] In extraposing a constituent from the clause, cataphoric

---

254 On this lyric and its intertext, Morenz 1997; Parkinson 2009: 177 and n.5.

255 For a proposal of a 'socio-linguistic' analysis, Lepper 2008: 273-85. I disagree with the criteria (expressions in text) on which this is based.

256 Vernus 2006: 162, ex.76, observing that the cataphoric construction may also be due to the intervening vocative.

257 In *Cheops' Court*, 11.10-11, contrasting with 8.10-11 (Vernus 2006: 162, ex.75); also 9.13 and 11.6. In Coffin Texts, Vernus 2006: 162-3.

constructions make that clause much shorter and evoke the vividness of speech.[258] A similar effect is found in *Kamose Inscriptions* (§1.3.3.2, (viii)-(ix)).[259]

(ii) *Cheops' Court* 9.14

k3 s3=k k3 s3=f k3 wꜥ im=s

'Then your son, then his son, then one of her.'

> The segments introduced by *k3* are very short, as in letters: P. UC 32200, 20-21 (*i*)*n iw.tw r gmt=i k3 nfr* 'If I am going to be found, then good!' Unlike the latter, which can still be analyzed syntactically as a full clause (subjectless: *k3 ø nfr* 'then *it* is good'), the segments introduced by *k3* in *Cheops' Court* 9.14 consist in a single noun phrase: they lack any predicative relation other than the one semantically implied. In addition, the condition against which the *k3*-headed segments in 9.14 are uttered is itself left implicit.
>
> Perhaps significant as well is the observation that in literary texts securely dated to the Middle Kingdom, *k3*-headed constructions recur only in *Kagemni* 1.10, and perhaps in *Sasobek* B2.7 (§2.8.3.2). Both these compositions have already been evoked above in relation to register (§2.4.4.3; §2.4.4.4, (iv)).

(iii) *Cheops' Court* 7.8-9

ḏs=k irf ḥr-ḏd=f s3=i int=k n=i sw

'Yourself then, Hordjedef my son, you shall bring him to me!'

> Initial *ḏs=k* is apparently unparalleled in the Middle Egyptian written record.[260] The construction could be interpreted as serving to characterize the king's recurrent impatience, here upon being told of Djedi's remarkable feats.

Characteristic of direct speech is further an instance of *tiw* 'yes' (8.14). The expression recurs in a saying in *Amenemhat* 14b and *Ipuwer* 6.14 (§6.1.2.B). In the final part, *nfr pw N* (11.23) is set in the mouth of a maidservant (*wb3t*) in a dialogue with Ruddjedet. As noted, the expression probably indexes a less formal register (§2.4.4.1.C). Also in a dialogue with Ruddjedet, her brother uses *ḥn* as—or as if?—a particle: 12.24 *ḥnwt=i ḥn s(i) iy.ti* (...) 'My lady, ...?, she has come (...)'. While the expression is possibly related to *ḥn* 'utterance', a usage as in *Cheops' Court* is as it seems unparalleled: some effect is intended, the nature of which, however, remains difficult to interpret.

---

258 Similarly Vernus 2006: 163.
259 Further examples and discussion, Vernus 2006: 173.
260 Gilula 1991.

B. Further elements contribute to a characterization of participants and lend themselves to an interpretation as tokens of verbal humor:

(iv) *Cheops' Court* 7.2-4

iw=f ḥr wnm tꜣ 500 rmn n iwꜣ m iwf
> *ḥnꜥ swr ḥnḳt ds 100 r-mn-m hrw pn*

'He has been eating 500 loaves of bread, a shoulder of an ox for meat,
> and also, drinking 100 jars of beer up to the present day.'

> Hordjedef speaks to the king, telling of Djedi's gargantuesque appetite. The use of *ḥnꜥ sḏm* in continuation to an infinitive is significant in terms of register: the construction is occasionally paralleled in Middle Kingdom documentary texts, later also in Eighteenth Dynasty royal inscriptions,[261] not, however, otherwise in Middle Egyptian literature. The particular construction as in *Cheops' Court*, with *ḥnꜥ sḏm* introducing a second event in continuation to a *NP ḥr sḏm* construction, is unparalleled altogether.

(v) *Cheops' Court* 8.11-12

nisw pw iy i (i)ty ꜥ.w.s.
nis r=i mk wi iy.kw

'The one come is one summoned, oh Sovereign L.P.H.
There has been summoning to me, and see, here I am.'

> Djedi's previous salutation, to Hordjedef, had been formal (7.23-8.21), in keeping with general patterns of such (compare Hordjedef's greeting Djedi: 7.17-20). Djedi's salutation to the king here raises formality to yet higher levels. A contrast is intended with the preceding casual, perhaps even abrupt, questioning by the king: 8.10-11 *pty st ḏdi tm rḏ mꜣn=i tw* 'What is it, Djedi, that you don't let me see you?' In his response (in the main text), Djedi uses a passive twice in reference to himself, the implied agent being the king. In ways similar to other honorific constructions in other languages, the high-status participant is here demoted to index such high status of his.[262] What is more, the first of these honorific passives is in a classifying pattern (*nisw pw iy*), which by its semantics induces additional distancing. The result is a formulation of such high-flown diction that it may easily be interpreted as reversing itself into irony.[263]

> In stark contrast to Djedi's baroque mode of salutation, the king's response uses very simple language: 8.12-13 *ḏd.in ḥm=f in-iw mꜣꜥt pw pꜣ ḏd* (...) 'His Majesty said: "Is it true, the word (...)".' This finds its closest parallel in a composition also associated with the 'low tradition' and in which parody plays a

---

[261] Kroeber 1970: 155-6.
[262] Honorific passives are not uncommon in second millennium Egypt. For another instance in *Cheops' Court*, 9.13-14 *pty irf pꜣ ib i (i)ty ꜥ.w.s. nb=i in ir.tw ḥr pꜣ ẖrdw 3 ḏd.n=i* 'What then is this mood, oh Sovereign L.P.H. my Lord? Is it being done on account of the three children I spoke about?'.
[263] Similarly Parkinson (1997a: 123, n.36): 'Djedi's answer is respectful, but almost impertinently polite (...) It is already clear that the king will not get what he wants, but that the commoner will get the better of him.'

major role, *Neferkare and Sisene*: P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+4 (...) *ḥr ḏd ir is nt{y}-
pw mꜣꜥ pw pꜣ ḏd* (...) '(...) saying that since it was so, the saying was true (...)'.

C. *Cheops' Court* variously alludes to esoteric knowledge, in ways that are subverted
by humor.[264] An instance where the phenomenon extends to language is in the
following famous passage:

(vi) *Cheops' Court* 8.21-22

wn.in pꜣ smn ꜥḥꜥ ḥr ḫbꜣbꜣ ḏꜣḏꜣ=f m mitt
ḫr m-ḫt spr=f wꜥ r wꜥ ꜥḥꜥ.n pꜣ smn ꜥḥꜥ ḥr gꜣgꜣ

'And the goose stood up and begun to waddle, its head likewise.
Now, when the one part had reached the other, the goose was standing,
gaggling.'

> A 'gaggling' 'goose' probably alludes to a motif otherwise known in Coffin Texts
> (and later, inheriting from this tradition, in Book of the Dead).[265] The scene to
> which the motif is adapted in *Cheops' Court* conveys a strong sense of parody in
> itself. This is here augmented by various verbal effects. Twice in close
> succession, the composer selects *ḏꜣḏꜣ* (8.19; 8.21), significantly in variation to *tp*
> with the same referent just ahead (8.18)—a selection strongly marked for register
> (§2.4.4.4, (v)). The combination of the auxiliary *ꜥḥꜥ.n* with the full lexical verb *ꜥḥꜥ*
> (*ꜥḥꜥ.n pꜣ smn ꜥḥꜥ* (...)) may be unique.[266] At the level of sound patterns, *ḏꜣḏꜣ*,
> *ḫbꜣbꜣ*, and *gꜣgꜣ* come in close succession[267]—the last an expression onomato-
> poetic in origin.[268]

2.4.4.8 Summary

Linguistic register in *Cheops' Court* is complex. The composition accommodates
fronted temporal expressions like e.g. *Tale of Hay* and *P. Lythgoe* (§2.4.4.4) or
(sequences of) verbal constructions similar to ones in the dialogues of *Eloquent
Peasant* and the framing epilogue of *Kagemni* (§2.4.4.3). According with these
selections, it also accommodates *pꜣ*'s (§2.4.4.2). Yet, the language of *Cheops' Court*
is on most accounts substantially the same Middle Egyptian as in e.g. *Sinuhe*
(§2.4.4.5). Linguistic inclusiveness extends to elements of a heightened register
associated with ritual (§2.4.4.6) or to expressions that must have conveyed some sense
of humor or parody (§2.4.4.7). As in its semantics and form,[269] the apparent simplicity
of the composition is deceiving.

The language of *Cheops' Court* has been described as 'Late Middle Egyptian'.
Accordingly, the position of the composition in the relative chronology of develop-

---

264 Parkinson 2002: 182-92 (with a comparison with *Shipwrecked Sailor*); Burkard & Thissen 2012[4]:
     207-8; Morenz 1996: 108-9, all with references to previous studies.
265 References in Stauder in press e: §1.8.A, §1.9.
266 Linguistically, this is a textbook example of grammaticalization (presented as such by Vernus
     1997: 12), with the semantically bleached and syntactically recategorialized auxiliary *ꜥḥꜥ.n*
     occurring side by side with the full lexical verb from which it historically derived.
267 Similarly Lepper 2008: 185.
268 Stauder in press e: §1.8.A.
269 Parkinson 2002: 182-92; Morenz 1996: 107. On rhetorical tropes, Lepper 2008: 152-219.

ment of Middle Egyptian has been suggested to be relatively late. Yet, *Cheops' Court* turns out to be linguistically closer to e.g. *Sinuhe* than are many texts generally described as composed in '(classical) Middle Egyptian', discussed in subsequent chapters of the present study. *Cheops' Court* is almost undatable linguistically: only the functions of *pꜣ* support a sound terminus *ante quem non* (§2.4.4.1). If the register of the composition had not been of a sort to accommodate *pꜣ*'s, not even this terminus could have been defined. As linguistic register is ultimately determined by literary register, it is therefore a literary aspect of *Cheops' Court* that provides the conditioning possibility for a linguistic dating. Further linguistic elements that have played a role in proposals that *Cheops' Court* should be viewed as later than other presently undated compositions in the Middle Egyptian literary corpus are yet more directly to do with register, and therefore ultimately with literary typology. One may of course suggest that an overall literary register such as in *Cheops' Court*, including some of the associated linguistic selections, could be viewed as indicative of a later dating, close in time to the sole manuscript of the composition. Nothing would speak against such hypothesis, yet this would remain an hypothesis only at this stage. Literary typology projects over time, but only to some extent; how it does more precisely is one of the very research questions asked in the present study.

The language of *Cheops' Court* is not 'Late Middle Egyptian'. As already noted, 'Late Middle Egyptian' is not a stage in linguistic history, but a collection of expressions to do with register (§1, introduction; §1.4.A). *Cheops' Court* accommodates some of these, yet only as one component within the overall register of the composition. As in its literary typology, *Cheops' Court* includes linguistic elements that associate it with what has been termed a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature. The linguistic correlates of such 'low tradition' lie on the level of individual expressions: most of these are not recent in themselves, but they are associated with literary register in recurrent ways so that they can function as markers, or indices, of such. As *Cheops' Court* (and beyond, e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* and *Kagemni*) demonstrate, the relationship between the 'high' and the 'low' tradition is fluid. There are no two distinct linguistic registers of 'Middle Egyptian' in literature, only elements of a differentiation, modulated differently in individual compositions.

2.4.5 Play with language

Composers of literary works not only draw on the thickness of the language of their times (§2.4.3-4), they can also on occasions go further, twisting the linguistic resources given to them to fit their semantic and expressive needs.

A. Lexical expressions can be invested with meanings extended from regular ones (e.g. *ḥwsi* in *Neferti* 3f: §5.8.1.4, (iii)). How this can be relevant for discussions on dating is illustrated by e.g. *ḳnḳnw* 'beatings' in *Kheti* 2.1 (§6.2.2.6.3, (i)). Composers can also create unique expressions, to evoke an image that suits the semantics of a particular composition (i), or through play with linguistic form (ii). By definition, such expressions can not be anchored to the external record. Their study is, however,

relevant to aspects of the literary interpretation of the compositions in which they occur.

(i) *Sinuhe* B 73, B 292 *nmiw-šꜥ* 'Sand-farer' (also R 43, as an interpolation)

The expression is unique to *Sinuhe*, except for one instance in a much later inscription of Amenhotep son of Hapu (*Urk.* IV 1821, 12), in allusion to *Sinuhe*, then in Osorkon II's Festival Hall in Bubastis.[270] The compound *nmiw-šꜥ* encapsulates one major semantic theme in the composition, Sinuhe's becoming an Asiatic, then throwing this identity away as far as this is still possible. With regard to the very expression discussed, this is formulated explicitly in the closing section of *Sinuhe*, where Sinuhe 'gives the sand back to the ones who fare it ({*imiw*}<*nmiw*>[271]=*f*).'[272] *Nmiw-šꜥ* was salient to ancient readers, as is demonstrated by its occurrence in the interpolation in R 43, which can be interpreted as a trace of such readers' engagement with the text. Serious consideration must therefore be given to the possibility that *nmiw-šꜥ* could have been an ad hoc creation by the composer of *Sinuhe*, taken up on a few subsequent occasions, in Amenhotep son of Hapu's inscription still as a conscious reference to the literary work,[273] in Osorkon II's inscription perhaps less consciously so. *Nmiw-šꜥ* is similar in form to expressions such as *ḥrw-šꜥ* (e.g. Weni 23 (*Urk.* I 103, 8; 103, 10)), on which it could have been modeled.

(ii) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 2

(...) *ḫnw ḫmmy*
ṯsw ḫppy
mdt mꜣt tmt swꜣ šwt m wḥmmyt (...)

'(...) unknown utterances,
extraordinary verses,
new words which have passed, free from repetition (...)'

Repetition, and the desire to escape it, are here famously addressed. *Ḫppy* 'extraordinary' is a rare word—one that was itself quite out of the ordinary. The word recurs once only,[274] in a place of wonders, Thutmosis III's *Jardin Botanique*: *Urk.* IV 775, 15 *smw nb ḫpp* (...) 'All extraordinary plants (...)'.[275] In *Jardin Botanique*, a sense of wonder is also otherwise linguistically conveyed, by the very much out of the ordinary construction *sw ḥm=f ḏd=f* 'His Majesty says' (*Urk.* IV 776, 5: §4.7.3, (v)). In *Khakheperreseneb*, the selection of *ḫppy* reflexively points to the statement being made—a rare illustration of the Jakobsonian 'poetic function' of language in Middle Egyptian literature.

---

270 *DZA* 25.119.280.
271 Emendation after Feder, *TLA*.
272 More fully: B 291-294 *iw rḏ sbt n ḫꜣst ḥbsw n nmiw-šꜥ sd.kw m pꜣḳt gs.kw m tpt sḏr.kw ḥr ḥnkyt ḏ.n=i šꜥ n {imiw}<nmiw>=f* (...) 'The load was given back to the foreign land, clothes to the sand-farers; I was clad in fine linen, I was anointed with fine oil, I slept on a bed, and I gave the sand back to the ones who fare it (...)'.
273 Discussed by Parkinson 2009: 52 and n.13.
274 Vernus 1995a: 8, n.c; Gardiner 1909: 97-8.
275 Beaux 1990: 42-3.

In the same sequence, *wḥmmyt* 'repetition' is unique.[276] It may or may not echo *wḥmyt* 'continued howling(?)',[277] itself as it seems unique to *Shipwrecked Sailor* (35; 104). While the latter, *wḥmyt*, is, as far as written form permits to judge, based on a regular morphological type, *Khakheperreseneb*'s *wḥmmyt* has a partly reduplicated form, a very rare pattern in nominal derivation. Reduplication is generally an expressive device in *Khakheperreseneb*.[278] As regards morphological reduplication specifically, *Khakheperreseneb* includes four instances of the otherwise fairly uncommon reduplicated formation of the passive participle of *2rad* (§2.7.2.1, (ii)): measured against the brevity of the composition, this is a higher concentration than in any other Middle Egyptian literary text. Two of these are in a passage that also speaks of repetition, ro 3 (...) *ḥr-ntt rf wḥmw ḏddt iw ḏddt ḏd* '(...) for what has been said can only be repeated: what has been said is said.' Another one is *ḥmmy* 'unknown', in the very sequence here discussed. In this, it resonates with two other reduplicated expressions, *wḥmmyt*, and *ḥppy*. The salient and highly iconic form of all these expressions[279] reflexively points to the object concerned by Khakheperreseneb, 'repetition'. In the present sequence, the first expression is regular if uncommon (*ḥmmy*, a perfective passive participle of a *2rad*), the next one very recherché and otherwise associated with wonders (*ḥppy*, above), and *wḥmmyt* unique, possibly even a creation by the composer.

B. As only to be expected, instances of extended meaning or outright creation are mostly to be found on the lexical level, which is by nature more plastic in this respect. In grammar, a case of a combination of two constructions that are otherwise semantically exclusive of each other can be identified in *Neferkare and Sisene* (§4.4.2). *Sinuhe* uses various expressions beyond what is otherwise regular in Middle Egyptian grammar, in a complex play with the indexical overtones of these expressions (§4.1.3.A-B).

2.5   Interim summary: Horizons of expectation

Prospects for a linguistic dating vary considerably depending on the nature of the texts to be dated and the period in the written history of Egyptian that is relevant for dating. In the case of Middle Egyptian literary texts, relevant contextual dimensions include the shortness of the time period considered for dating, roughly half a millennium

---

276 For an analysis of how *wḥmmyt* resonates semantically with other expressions in *Khakheperreseneb*, Moers 2002: 298-9.

277 F*CD* 67.

278 E.g., in a passage modulating the same theme further, ro 5 *n ḏd ḏd ḏd ḏd.t=fy* (...) 'The one who spoke has not spoken in order that the one who will speak now speaks (...)'.

279 While linguistic form is arbitrary, reduplication is distinguished by its strong propensity to correlate with a cross-linguistically recurrent set of meanings, such as intensity, plurality, imperfective aspect, more generally 'increased quantity' (e.g. Moravcsik 1978: 317; Mayerthaler 1981: 115). This recurrent relation is iconic and relates to the perceptual salience of reduplication, which is much higher than with other types of linguistic form (e.g. Kouwenberg 1997: 39; Jakobson & Waugh 2002[3]: 198-200).

(from ca. 1950 to 1450 BCE); the low density of the record in general, making the primary description of linguistic change more difficult; and the substantial linguistic continuity in relevant written registers during the period concerned. Relevant dimensions to do with the nature of the objects to be dated include issues of transmission in a manuscript culture; the configuration of language in literature and associated issues of register; the conciseness of most texts; and the densely intertextual nature of Middle Egyptian literature in general. In addition, morphological change is almost entirely trapped in a dead angle, so that primary arguments for dating must rely on grammar. Except in favorable cases, possible lexical indications have only a complementary status in the argument.

In approaching individual Middle Egyptian compositions for a linguistic dating, horizons of expectation must be set accordingly. That Middle Egyptian compositions of as yet insecure dating resemble other Middle Egyptian compositions documented in Twelfth Dynasty manuscripts by 'language and style' is not an argument for an early dating of the former. If the texts had been composed later, linguistic differences would not be readily apparent. As regards 'style' as a criterion for age, the notion is difficult when applied to Middle Egyptian literature, as it presupposes style-historical succession. In all cases therefore, a direct examination of individual texts is required. As already suggested in the present chapter, a view on the more subtle dimensions of linguistic function can often be of value. More generally, possible indications or arguments for dating will lie in details, not numerous but possibly converging, rather than in an immediately apparent late or early linguistic typology of a given composition.

The remainder of the present chapter consists in three additional case studies that flesh out some of the issues addressed so far in more general terms. The first discusses the one major dating criterion of broader application that has been proposed so far, Vernus' aspectual criterion. This demonstrates how working out a criterion requires taking into detailed account the particular semantics, temporality, and expression in individual texts. It is also illustrative of the uneasy, yet largely structural, imbalance between possible *ante quem non* and possible *post quem non* criteria. The second and third case studies are on two compositions, *Khakheperreseneb* and *Merikare*, for which a linguistic examination fails to provide a dating as precise, or as secure, respectively, as one may wish for. For *Khakheperreseneb*, this may have to do with the contents of the composition, which in a common interpretation makes Middle Egyptian literary tradition its object: this is reflected in much language shared with other literary texts; the conciseness of the composition is another limitative factor for dating. *Merikare*, for its part, is a teaching, the least linguistically distinctive among types of Middle Egyptian literary discourses. Indications for dating are found, but no expressions that would support a full-fledged linguistic argument.

2.6 Devising and applying a linguistic argument: Vernus' aspectual criteria

While a few isolated notes have been made on individual compositions,[280] the linguistic dating of Middle Egyptian literary texts has by and large relied on one single criterion of broader application, proposed by Vernus some two decades ago.[281] The criterion targets a change in a domain of meaning that is very common in language (compare condition (b) in §2.1.3.E): it would therefore apply to a large variety of Middle Egyptian literary texts even when these are concise and regardless of their subject matter or contents. Accordingly, the criterion has often been referred to subsequently, acquiring classical status.[282] In the present section, I critically discuss the validity of the criterion, as well as its applicability to individual texts. This provides a practical illustration of how a dating criterion can be devised, of what difficulties are encountered in so doing, and of how applying a criterion once this has been devised may require analyzing not only individual clauses but elements of the broader linguistic typology—in the present case, temporality—of a text to be dated.

2.6.1 Introduction

Vernus' criterion is based on a change in the expression of aspect whose very first traces are detected in the record of the late Twelfth Dynasty. For the purpose of the discussion to follow, a short reminder of how the criterion was originally formulated by the author is given.

2.6.1.1 Background: A change in the expression of aspect

In Middle Egyptian, mainly two formal categories are involved in the expression of relative present tense (/'inaccompli', 'unaccomplished'): *NP ḥr sḏm* and *N(P) sḏm=f*. Vernus' criterion targets a change in the functional distribution of these two formal categories during Middle Egyptian.

In earlier Middle Egyptian, *NP ḥr sḏm* is used with events that are viewed in their extension over a typically bounded stretch of time (in Vernus' original formulation: 'inaccompli extensif'). The construction thereby expresses progressive aspect. In a language such as English, where progressive aspect is fully grammaticalized as it is in earlier Middle Egyptian, *NP ḥr sḏm* thus roughly corresponds to continuous tenses: *he is listening* (or, as a relative present tense in the past, *he was listening*).

N(P) sḏm=f, by contrast, is unmarked for such 'extensive' or progressive semantics (in Vernus' original formulation: 'inaccompli non-extensif'). The event is not viewed under any specific perspective. *N(P) sḏm=f* thus roughly corresponds to English simple tenses: *he listens*. In text, *N(P) sḏm=f* is most commonly used with

---

280 See n.1 in the introduction to the present study.
281 Vernus 1990a: 185-90; 1990b.
282 E.g. Lorand 2011: 13, n.17 and Parkinson 2002: 316-7 (*Amenemhat*); Enmarch 2008: 21 and Parkinson 2002: 308 (*Ipuwer*); Parkinson 2002: 304 (*Khakheperreseneb*); 317 (*Kheti*); Verhoeven 2009: 97, n.72 and Parkinson 2002: 318 (*Loyaliste*); Parkinson 2002: 319 (*Merikare*); 319 (*A Man to His Son*).

general or habitual events: this is because the language has a dedicated progressive construction, the afore mentioned *NP ḥr sḏm*, which is generally selected for events that are neither general nor habitual.[283]

Beginning in the late Middle Kingdom, *NP ḥr sḏm* is observed spreading beyond its originally restricted domain of use. By a cross-linguistically well documented process of extension and semantic generalization, the construction is gradually extended to general and habitual events, which had previously been the exclusive domain of *N(P) sḏm=f*. Ultimately, *NP ḥr sḏm* would supersede *N(P) sḏm=f* altogether as the sole expression of relative present tense, resulting in a full neutralization of the original aspectual contrast. The change is completed in early Late Egyptian:

Expression of relative present tense ('inaccompli') in Middle Egyptian

		unmarked (*he listens*)	progressive (*he is listening*)
(I)	earlier MEg.:	*N(P) sḏm=f*	*NP ḥr sḏm*
(II)	later MEg.:	*N(P) sḏm=f/NP ḥr sḏm*	*NP ḥr sḏm*
(III)	early LEg.:	⟵———— *NP ḥr sḏm* ————⟶	

2.6.1.2 The double criterion as originally formulated

Vernus' aspectual criterion concerns the contrast between stage I to stage II. The earliest dated occurrence of an innovative use of *NP ḥr sḏm* beyond the progressive semantics to which the construction was originally restricted is from the beginning of the late Twelfth Dynasty:[284] *iw bꜣk im ḥr hꜣb ḥr=s spw ꜥšꜣw* 'This servant writes very often about this' (P. Berlin 10056 ro 4; *temp.* Amenemhat III, year 10). An habitual reading of *NP ḥr sḏm* is here implied by the quantified temporal expression (*spw ꜥšꜣw*). The earliest use of *NP ḥr sḏm* in a performative statement, also implying ongoing change, is from the very same period (Amenemhat III, year 39).[285] The earliest occurrences of *NP ḥr sḏm* in personal names point to the same period.[286] In similar registers, early Twelfth Dynasty texts (Heqanakht, Reisner papyri, Hapidjefai contracts) display no sign of any innovation having begun.[287]

In literary registers, *NP ḥr sḏm* is used with general/habitual events for example in *Khakheperreseneb*,[288] *Fishing and Fowling*,[289] and *Ipuwer*.[290] Taking only the most immediately obvious elements, the first of these texts has a terminus *ante quem non* to

---

283 Compare the more detailed presentation in Vernus 1990a: 163-91; Winand 2006: 263-312 (with a focus on the interaction between the two constructions and the Aktionsart of events).

284 Vernus 1990a: 186, ex.398; 1990b: 1038, ex.1.

285 Vernus 1990a: 186, ex.400, with the observation that in a performative statement the event is viewed as punctual and thereby not in its extension.

286 Vernus 1990a: 187, n.87, and ex.403. In personal names, an event can hardly be presented as 'extensive' or progressive. The earliest instance of a personal name with *NP ḥr sḏm* is perhaps slightly earlier than the two occurrences in continuous text mentioned above, but not by much.

287 Vernus 1990a: 185.

288 Vernus 1990a: 188, ex.405; see below, §2.6.2.5, (ii).

289 Vernus 1990a: 186, ex.398; see below, §2.6.2.6, (i).

290 Vernus 1990a: 188-90; see below, §2.6.2.4.

the reign of (Khakheperre) Senwosret II;[291] the second may be no earlier than the late Middle Kingdom as it 'reflects the increasing interest in the Fayum from the second half of Dynasty XII onward';[292] and the third can not be earlier than the late Middle Kingdom based on institutional evidence.[293] In Vernus' interpretation, an incipient stage of the change, transitional between stage I and stage II, is to be detected in *Eloquent Peasant*.[294] This would imply that the innovative uses of *NP ḥr sḏm* here concerned begun spreading to literary registers by the mid-Twelfth Dynasty precisely, then generalizing in the following decades or generations.

Based on the above elements for a temporal anchoring of the earliest textual manifestations of stage II, Vernus proposed that compositions that have *NP ḥr sḏm* with general/habitual events (stage II) receive a terminus *ante quem non* by the mid-/late Twelfth Dynasty. More precisely, according to Vernus, a text that has innovative uses of *NP ḥr sḏm* with transitive events may date as early as that period, while a text that has innovative uses of *NP ḥr sḏm* with all types of events, transitive and intransitive ones alike, would get a slightly later terminus *ante quem non*, to the early Thirteenth Dynasty,[295] or very late Twelfth at best.[296] Complementarily, Vernus derived a *post quem non* criterion based on the same change. Texts in which general/habitual events are still the exclusive domain of *N(P) sḏm=f* (stage I) could, according to the author, not have been composed later than the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty.

In its original formulation, Vernus' two-way aspectual criterion would apply to a great many Middle Egyptian literary texts, yielding the following upper and lower bounds for linguistic dating:

Vernus' aspectual criterion, as formulated and applied by the author

(a) Texts with uses of *NP ḥr sḏm* with habitual/general events: the *ante quem non criterion*:

  - Incipient: *Eloquent Peasant*

    – mid-Twelfth Dynasty;

  - With transitive events: *A Man to His Son*,[297] *Fishing and Fowling*

    – *ante quem non* to the later Twelfth Dynasty;

  - Regularly with all types of events: *Ipuwer*, *Khakheperreseneb*, *Neferkare and Sisene*[298]

    – *ante quem non* to the Thirteenth Dynasty, or very late Twelfth.

---

291 For 'Khakheperre-' defining a terminus *ante quem non* only, Vernus 1995a: 2-3; for the dating of *Khakheperreseneb*, below, §2.7.

292 Thus, Vernus 1990a: 186; for the dating of *Fishing and Fowling*, below, §3.2.

293 Vernus 1990a: 190, n.94, with reference to Quirke 1988; for the dating of *Ipuwer*, below, §6.2.2.5.

294 Dedicated study: Vernus 1990b. See below, §2.6.2.2-3.

295 Vernus 1990a: 188, #5: 'In a further stage, which may be located during Dynasty XIII and the onset of the Second Intermediate Period (...)'; sim. in the table on 191.

296 Vernus 1995a: 3 (discussing the date of *Khakheperreseneb*). On transitivity as a parameter in the change, below, §2.6.2.1.

297 Vernus 1990a: 186-7, ex.401; see below, §2.6.2.6, (ii).

298 The last not mentioned by Vernus 1990a and 1990b; see below, §2.6.2.6, (iii).

(b) Texts in which general/habitual events are still the exclusive domain of *N(P)* *sḏm=f*: the *post quem non* criterion:

> *Ptahhotep*, *Kagemni*, *Sinuhe*, *Shipwrecked Sailor*, *Hirtengeschichte*, *Debate of a Man and His Soul*, *Merikare*, *Neferti*, *Hymn to Hapi*, *Kheti*, *Loyaliste*, *Heavenly Cow*[299]
>
> > – *post quem non* to the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty.

(c) Texts in which the relevant domain of meaning is not featured:

> *Amenemhat*,[300] *Cheops' Court*[301]
>
> > – the criterion does not apply.

At first, the above tableau seems compelling, also because several compositions it associated with stage I are documented in Twelfth Dynasty manuscripts (e.g. *Ptahhotep*: (b)). For dating the compositions also associated with stage I but not documented in Twelfth Dynasty (e.g. *Neferti*), the criterion would then be extremely powerful. If it were correct, one could in fact dispense with a further examination of the linguistic typology of these compositions. Yet, as to be seen, both parts of the double criterion are in need of a revision. I first discuss the *ante quem non* criterion (§2.6.2), then turn to the *post quem non* criterion which raises different issues (§2.6.3).

2.6.2   The *ante quem non* criterion

In the elaboration of the *ante quem non* criterion, *Eloquent Peasant* played a central role. It was based on this text that issues of transitivity were proposed to have been a parameter in the change. It was also based on this text that a temporal anchoring of the earliest stage of the change, even prior to its first attestation in documentary texts, was defined. I accordingly begin the present discussion with *Eloquent Peasant* (§2.6.2.1-3), then turn to other compositions (§2.6.2.4-6).

2.6.2.1   Issues of transitivity?

Vernus suggested that in an early stage of the change, 'it (*scil.* innovative uses of *NP ḥr sḏm* beyond progressive events) obtained only with transitive verbs, while intransitive verbs resisted this evolution.'[302] The analysis was based on the following passage of *Eloquent Peasant*:[303]

---

299 Vernus 1990a: 185; 1990b: 1037.
300 *Pace* Vernus 1990a: 185; see below, §6.1.3.1, introduction.
301 In particular, *Cheops' Court* 7.2-4 is uncriterial (similarly Vernus 1990a: 167, ex.344, whose analysis is repeated here): *iw=f ḥr wnm tꜣ 500 rmn n iwꜣ m iwf ḥnꜥ swr ḥnḳt ds 100 r-mn-m hrw pn* 'He has been eating 500 loaves of bread, a shoulder of an ox for meat, and also, drinking 100 jars of beer up to the present day.' *NP ḥr sḏm* is used for describing a habit of Djedi's, but the event is temporally bounded by the expression *r-mn-m hrw pn*, and thereby viewed in its extension.
302 Vernus 1990a: 188; sim. 1990b: 1046.
303 Vernus 1990a: 188, ex.404; Vernus 1990b: 1043, ex.8.

Eloquent Peasant B1 179-181

in iw iwsw nnm=f

in iw mẖȝt ḥr rḏt ḥr gs

in iw rf ḏḥwti sfn=f iḫ{r} ir=k iyt

'Do the scales wander?

Is the balance partial?

And is then Toth lenient? If so, then you can do evil!'[304]

The first and third clauses have *N(P) sḏm=f* while the second has *NP ḥr sḏm*. The three clauses are in parallel to each other and all are analyzed by Vernus as having general aspect. The second clause would then document the innovative use of *NP ḥr sḏm*, extended beyond the progressive semantics to which the construction was initially restricted. The passage would further demonstrate how this extension affected transitive events first (*rḏi* 'give' in the second clause) while intransitive verbs 'resisted' it (*nnm* 'err' and *sfn* 'lenient' in the first and third clauses).

This analysis is made under the assumption that clauses in parallel to each other should have a similar aspectual profile. As to be discussed below, the underlying methodological principle is questionable, in general and in the present case (§2.6.2.2-3). Keeping provisionally to issues of transitivity itself, the following observations can be made. Under the same assumption of parallelism, a series of *NP ḥr sḏm* constructions in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 128-134 (below, §2.6.2.2, (i)) are analyzed by Vernus as habitual events because they stand in parallel with an initial *N(P) sḏm=f*.[305] Among the events in B1 128-134 is *rḏ ṯȝw ḥr gȝt ḥr tȝ* (B1 131); *gȝw* 'to lack', however, is an *in*-transitive. In B1 179-181 quoted above itself, *rḏi ḥr gs* can hardly be described as transitive. While *rḏi* is transitive in many of its uses, it is not when part of the idiom *rḏi ḥr gs* 'lean on the side'.[306]

Rḏi ḥr gs recurs in B1 129, also in the *NP ḥr sḏm* construction, here as well with habitual/general aspect according to Vernus. In a subsequent passage (B1 135-136; below, §2.6.2.2, (ii)), also consisting in habitual/general events according to Vernus' analysis,[307] *siȝt* is found in the *NP ḥr sḏm*. This verb, morphologically a causative, can be used transitively ('encroach upon'), but also intransitively ('cheat'), as is indeed the case here. In short, intransitives and transitives do not behave any differently in *Eloquent Peasant* with respect to their distribution over the constructions *NP ḥr sḏm* and *N(P) sḏm=f*.

Transitivity is therefore not a parameter in the change under consideration and the *ante quem non* criterion must be recast in ways that do not make reference to transitivity. Before doing so, however, alternations between *N(P) sḏm=f* and *NP ḥr sḏm* as in B1 179-181 quoted above must be accounted for, in some other way. This implies reexamining all occurrences of *NP ḥr sḏm* that according to Vernus' original analysis would be witness to incipient change in *Eloquent Peasant*.

---

304 Transl. Parkinson 2012a: 153.

305 Vernus 1990b: 1044-5, ex.10.

306 On this idiom more generally, Parkinson 2012a: 107-8; Fischer-Elfert 1999: 168.

307 Vernus 1990b: 1045-6, ex.11.

2.6.2.2 *Eloquent Peasant* B1 128-134 and B1 135-138

Uses of *NP ḥr sḏm* in *Eloquent Peasant* that in Vernus' analysis are described as innovative are from four passages. The following two, already grouped by Vernus, must be discussed together. The other two raise different issues and are discussed in turn (§2.6.2.3).

(i) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 128-134

mk mȝꜥt {t}w<t>ẖ=s ẖr=k nš.t(i) m st=s

srw ḥr irt iyt

tp-ḥsb n mdt ḥr rḏt ḥr gs

sḏmyw ḥr ẖnp it=f

siȝti pw n mdt m ꜥkȝ=s ḥr irt r=f nwdw im=s

rḏ tȝw ḥr gȝt ḥr tȝ

srfw ḥr rḏt nšp.tw

psšw m ꜥwnw

dr sȝir {r} m wḏ irt=f

dmi m wḏnw=f

ẖsfw iw ḥr irt iyt

'Look, Truth flees from under you, exiled from its palace;

the officials are doing evil;

the standard of speech is being partial,

and the judges are snatching what it takes—

this means that he who twists speech from its rightness is making things go wrong to it thereby;

the breath-giver is now at a loss on the ground;

he who breathes calmly is making people pant;

the approportioner is a grasper,

the dispeller of need is the commander of its making,

and the harbor is its own flood;

the punisher of wrong is doing evil.'[308]

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 135-138

ḏd.in sẖty pn

ẖȝw n ꜥḥꜥw ḥr siȝt n=f

mḥ n ky ḥr ḥḳs ẖȝw=f

sšm r ḥpw ḥr wḏ ꜥwȝt

(i)n-m irf ẖsf=f bw ḥwrw

dr nw ḥr irt nwdw (...)

'And this peasant said:

---

308 Transl. Parkinson 2012a: 106-12.

"The measure of heaps now defrauds for himself;
the filler for another now despoils his surroundings;
he who leads lawfully now commands theft—

who then will beat off wretchedness?
when the dispeller of infirmity is going wrong; (...)" '[309]

In Vernus' argument, the interpretation of (ii)[310] is dependent on the one of (i);[311] I thus begin with (i). Based on the parallel with the opening *N(P) sḏm=f* (*mk mꜣꜥt wtḫ=s*), the following sequence of *NP ḥr sḏm* constructions (*srw ḥr irt iyt*, etc.) are interpreted by Vernus as 'actions vues commme de purs faits généraux (inaccompli non extensif)'.[312] The argument presupposes that the parallel use of different constructions implies that these have a similar meaning—a tempting, yet questionable, principle of method.[313] *N(P) sḏm=f* is the unmarked term in the opposition with *NP ḥr sḏm* ('unextensive' vs. 'extensive'): the opposition is privative, not equipollent.[314] In practice, *N(P) sḏm=f* can also be used for an action that is in progress, rather than habitual or general: the difference with *NP ḥr sḏm* lies in the fact that only the latter construction expresses this linguistically, as a marked progressive aspect. In the former construction, such interpretation is left to the reader/hearer.[315] The parallelism with *mk mꜣꜥt wtḫ=s* does not, therefore, imply that the events expressed by the following *N ḥr sḏm* must be viewed 'comme de purs faits généraux'.

The passage under discussion is from a context that makes reference to the *Sonst-Jetzt* type of articulation.[316] The events are thereby set in relation to the present speech situation, 'with a strong sense of "here and now" '.[317] This was, in fact, noted by Vernus himself as a possibility ('des actions étroitement liées au moment de l'énonciation'),[318] yet dismissed in view of the parallel with the opening *N(P) sḏm=f* construction. As just seen, such argument does not hold. The *NP ḥr sḏm* constructions in (i) express progressive aspect, with the 'extension' of the event-perspective being defined in relation to the *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation of the passage. The correlation between *Sonst-Jetzt* and progressive aspect is recurrent, e.g. *Neferti* 9f *ḏ=i n=k sꜣ m ḫrwy sn m ḫft s ḥr smꜣ it=f* 'I will show you the son an enemy, the brother an opponent, a man killing his father.' That the temporality in B1 128-134 implies progressive, not general/habitual, aspect is also made clear by the nature of the non-verbal constructions: the sequence has three *A m B* constructions (*psšw m ꜥwnw*, etc.),

---

309 Transl. Parkinson 2012a: 113-5, slightly adapted.

310 Vernus 1990b: 1045-6, ex.11.

311 Vernus 1990b: 1044-5, ex.10

312 Vernus 1990b: 1044-5.

313 E.g. Oréal 2011: 17, writing about her own topic of investigation (particles), but with general relevance: 'Il faut au moins souligner que la commutabilité apparente entre deux ou plusieurs particules n'est nullement l'indication d'une signification commune.'

314 Similarly Vernus 1986.

315 For examples of *N(P) sḏm=f* used with events that are not habitual or general, in contexts, therefore, in which *NP ḥr sḏm* could have been used as well, below, §5.3.5.2.

316 Similarly Parkinson 2012a: 106; Vernus 1990b: 1044. On the *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation generally, Schenkel 1984.

317 Parkinson 2012a: 107.

318 Vernus 1990a: 1044 and n.25.

not *A pw B*. The former also otherwise correlates with the *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation (e.g. *Neferti* 9f, above), because it expresses a temporally contingent relationship between A and B, in contrast with the generalizing semantics expressed by *A pw B*.

As regards the opening *mꜣꜥt wtḫ=s*, this is the aspectually unmarked category. The statement is related to the speaker's here and now not through grammatical tense, but through an indexation on the addressee's sphere by the speech situation, by phatic *mk*, and by the second person pronoun (*ḥr=k*). The selection of *N(P) sḏm=f* rather than *NP ḥr sḏm* may have been motivated by the opening position of the clause in the sequence, possibly also by its subject, *mꜣꜥt*, which has general reference, particularly in the context of the petitions of *Eloquent Peasant*.

In *Eloquent Peasant* B1 135-138 (ii), the articulation is similarly along the lines of *Sonst-Jetzt*. The *NP ḥr sḏm* constructions then express progressive aspect here as well. This is independently confirmed by the *iw*-less construction opening the discourse (*ḫꜣw n ꜥḥꜥw ḥr siꜣt n=f*). The construction is thetic, presenting the event en bloc (§1.2, (vi)); a thetic event naturally has a progressive interpretation (§2.3.3.B, *fine*).

2.6.2.3 *Eloquent Peasant* B1 257-262 and B1 179-181

Unlike B1 128-134 and B1 135-138 just discussed, the two other passages adduced by Vernus in support of his analysis are not from *Sonst-Jetzt* contexts. In both of these, *NP ḥr sḏm* constructions are used in parallel to *N(P) sḏm=f*. As already discussed, this is not in itself a sufficient argument to imply that *NP ḥr sḏm* can be associated with general or habitual events (compare B1 128-134, where it is not: §2.6.2.2). Yet, some positive account must be given for the alternation between the two constructions in both these passages. As long as none is given, Vernus' original interpretation that these could here be expressing similar semantics, and thereby *NP ḥr sḏm* stand as a token of an innovative usage, remains a valid option.

In one of the two passages,[319] a series of *NP ḥr sḏm* constructions is followed by a closing *N(P) sḏm=f*:

(i) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 257-262

iw ḫwdw ḥr [...]
[...]yw ḥr smꜣ iy
st rmw ḥr ḫꜣ{ḫ}ꜥ wbbw
ḏꜣbḥw r pꜣḳrw
iw wḥꜥ ḫbꜣ=f itrw

'The netter is [...]ing the [...-fishes],
[the ...]er is killing the comer-fish,
the fish-spearer harpooning the *ubebu*-fish
and the trawler is after the *paqeru*-fishes.
The fisher ravages the river.'[320]

---

319 Vernus 1990b: 1043, ex.9.
320 Transl. Parkinson 2012a: 211-3.

Assuming that parallelism implies similar value, all events would be viewed under general aspect. The formal contrast between the two constructions would then remain entirely unaccounted for. This is obviously not a satisfying description.

Remarkable, on the other hand, are the different types of subjects with which the *NP ḥr sḏm* constructions, respectively the closing *N(P) sḏm=f*, are associated. In the first four clauses, 'the vocabulary is unusual and apparently very specific, perhaps sometimes almost technical'[321]; in the fifth, by contrast, '*wḥꜥ* is a much more standard general term for fishers than the previous terminology.'[322] This principled correlation is strongly indicative that the contrast between verbal constructions is here a contrast of meaning, aspectually motivated in some way yet to be determined.

In Parkinson's analysis, 'the fivefold form alludes to the mock-titulary of B1 252-255, which is here debased into a series of derogatory statements. (...) Rensi was once a Nile-flood (B1 173), but he is *now* (emphasis AS) a petty destroyer of the river.'[323] The 'point de repère' is thereby 'le moment de l'énonciation', like in two other passages analyzed in these very terms by Vernus:[324] B2 113-114 *mk wi ḥr spr n=k n sḏm.n=k st* 'Look I am pleading to you but you do not hear it'; B1 332 *iw srw ḥr rḏt n=k* 'Officials are giving to you.' In B1 257-262 here under discussion similarly, the three *NP ḥr sḏm* clauses have progressive aspect, while the final clause with *N(P) sḏm=f* and a referentially much more general subject (*wḥꜥ*) 'prepares for the generalized comparison which follows. *ḥbꜣ* stresses the violent *implications* (emphasis AS) of the preceding verses (...)'.[325] With differences in details, a similar correlation was discussed in B1 128-134 (§2.6.2.6, (i)). In this passage, a *N(P) sḏm=f* construction with a referentially very general subject, *mꜣꜥt*, opens a sequence of *NP ḥr sḏm* constructions. In the present passage, B1 257-262, a *N(P) sḏm=f* construction with a referentially more general subject than in the preceding clauses, *wḥꜥ*, closes a sequence of *NP ḥr sḏm* constructions.

The other passage not from a *Sonst-Jetzt* context on which Vernus based his analysis is the following:[326]

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 179-181

in iw iwsw nnm=f
in iw mḫꜣt ḥr rḏt ḥr gs
in iw rf ḏḥwti sfn=f iḫ{r} ir=k iyt

'Do the scales wander?
Is the balance partial?
And is then Toth lenient? If so, then you can do evil!'[327]

For reasons exposed above (§2.6.2.1), the contrast between *N(P) sḏm=f* in the first and third clauses and *NP ḥr sḏm* in the second can not be accounted for in terms of

---

321 Parkinson 2012a: 211.
322 Parkinson 2012a: 213.
323 Parkinson 2012a: 211.
324 Vernus 1990b: 1041.
325 Parkinson 2012a: 214.
326 Vernus 1990b: 1043, ex.8; 1990a: 188, ex.404.
327 Transl. Parkinson 2012a: 153.

transitivity, as had originally been proposed by Vernus. If, based on parallelism, it is assumed that *NP ḥr sḏm* here expresses general aspect, the formal alternation between the verbal constructions in the three clauses remains unaccounted for.

The composition of this brief sequence is noteworthy. One level consists in a dynamic progression a – a' – b (*iwsw*; varied as *mḫꜣt*; then heightened by a reference to the divine, an intensification also marked formally by *rf*). Superimposed on this is a symmetrical arrangement of verbal constructions, α – β – α (*N(P) sḏm=f*; *NP ḥr sḏm*; *N(P) sḏm=f*). All three events could be read with general aspect as in Vernus' reading; the formal variation would then be just that, a formal effect. They need not, however: the second clause could be more closely indexed on the 'situation de l'énonciation', and thereby on the addressee, Rensi, than the two outer ones. The symmetrical arrangement of verbal constructions, immediately noted on the formal level, would correlate with a similar alternation in how the events are presented semantically. Set against the consistently progressive value of *NP ḥr sḏm* throughout *Eloquent Peasant*—the occurrences discussed in this and the preceding sub-sections as well as a great many other ones for which this had never been disputed[328]— interpreting *NP ḥr sḏm* only in B1 179-180 as expressing habitual aspect is unlikely. In the present passage, the alternation between *N(P) sḏm=f* and *NP ḥr sḏm* arguably correlates with alternations in meaning, themselves stylistically motivated in the symmetrical arrangement of these verses.

In sum, *Eloquent Peasant* does not offer evidence for the innovative uses of *NP ḥr sḏm* on which the aspectual *ante quem non* criterion here discussed is based. This does not affect the validity of the criterion itself, as this is independently established based on an analysis of linguistic change in non-literary texts. However, it implies recasting the criterion in slightly different ways, without reference to *Eloquent Peasant*. Before mapping these out (§2.6.2.7), I briefly examine other Middle Egyptian literary compositions for which the criterion has been proposed to apply, as well as one for which no such proposal has been made to date.

2.6.2.4 *Ipuwer*

In Vernus' analysis, *NP ḥr sḏm* has become the regular expression of general/habitual aspect in *Ipuwer*, implying that this text was not composed before stage II of the change here discussed had been reached: the *ante quem non* criterion would straightforwardly apply.[329] However, much of *Ipuwer* is cast in the *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation.[330] As discussed in relation to *Eloquent Peasant* (§2.6.2.2), *NP ḥr sḏm* has progressive aspect in such environments.[331] Further elements internal to *Ipuwer* support the same analysis. In addition to presentative *mk*, antithetic *A m B* formula-

---

328 Vernus 1990b: 1040-1, ex.3-7 and the examples in the associated footnotes.

329 Vernus 1990a: 188-90; subsequently Parkinson 2002: 308; Enmarch 2008: 21.

330 Generally on the *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation in laments and lamentations, lastly Enmarch 2012: 92-3, 96-7.

331 The possibility that *NP ḥr sḏm* in *Ipuwer* could be progressive is raised, only to be dismissed, by Vernus himself (1990b: 1044-5, n.25). That the author dismisses this interpretation is due to his interpretation of *NP ḥr sḏm* in *Eloquent Peasant*, not on grounds internal to *Ipuwer*. For the relevant passages in *Eloquent Peasant*, see §2.6.2.2.

tions (including with *A* negative: *tm sḏm n=f m B*), are recurrent (i)-(ii). So is the expression *wȝi r* (ii)-(iii). The latter is associated with resultative aspect, a temporality that is more broadly distinctive of the perspective under which events are presented in *Ipuwer* (iii). Similar comments extend to the *iw ms* section (e.g. (iv)), where antithetical formulations and resultative temporality are underscored further by *ḫpr m*):

(i) *Ipuwer* 7.13-14

mtn ḫm ḏȝḏȝt m nb bnt
tm ḥs n=f ḥr swhȝ mrt

'Look, he who knew not the arched harp is now the owner of a shovel-shaped harp;
he who could not sing for himself is vaunting Meret.'[332]

(ii) *Ipuwer* 8.11-9.1

mtn tm sft n=f ḥr sft wnḏw (...)
mtn nsyw^? ḥr wnm^a m rȝw (...)
mtn ḥmwt [...] *ḥr wdn ȝpḥw* (...)
*mtn špswt ḥr sḫs m *rwwt w*[t]* (...)
mtn špswt wȝw r ḥḳrw (...)

'Look, he who could not slaughter for himself is now slaughtering shorthorn cattle (...)
Look, the *nesyw*(?) are now eating greylag geese (...)
Look, maidservants [...] are offering pigs (...)
Look, noble ladies are now running in one rush(?) (...)
Look, noble ladies have come to hunger (...)'

a)   The verb is generally read *ḳnḳn*, but a reading *wnm* seems preferable.[333]

(iii) *Ipuwer* 7.4-6

mtn kmt wȝ.ti r stt mw r tȝ iṯ.n=f nḫt-ꜥ m mȝir
mtn šdw ḳrḥt m ṯpḥt=s sḫȝw sštȝw n nsyw bityw
mtn ḫnw ḥr snḏ m-ꜥ gȝwt (...)
mtn tȝ ṯs.n=f ḥr smȝy(t) ḳn ḥsy ḥr nḥm [ḫwt]*=f*

'Look, Egypt has come to pouring water on the ground; the strong-armed man seized from the miserable one;
Look, the Primordial Creature has been removed from its cavern; the secrets of the Kings of Upper and Lower Egypt have been bared.
Look, the Residence is now fearful because of want (...);
Look, the land, it has knotted together in gangs; the strong man, the vile man carries off his things.'

---

332 In this and the following examples, the translations are adapted from Enmarch 2008.

333 Jäger 2004: 131, n.2; originally Lichtheim 2006[2] (1973[1]): 162, n.12, who also observed that the mediate object construction in both *Ipuwer* instances fits *wnm*, not *ḳnḳn*.

(iv) *Ipuwer* 2.8-9

iw ms tꜣ ḥr msnḥ mi irr nḥpw

ꜥwꜣy m nb ꜥḥꜥw [ḫpr]w m ḥꜣḳw

'But now, the land is spinning round as does a potter's wheel;
the robber is now an owner of wealth, having become a plunderer.'

All the above instances of *NP ḥr sḏm*, and many more in the lament, are from contexts in which progressive aspect is implied: in this function, *NP ḥr sḏm* is expected at all times. One may therefore wonder whether the aspectual *ante quem non* criterion applies at all to *Ipuwer*.

In a final section of the composition (Enmarch's 'Meditation'), the composer strikes '(...) a more impersonal and generalizing tone than the preceding Reproach I, as well as most of the earlier strophic laments and injunctions.'[334] The construction *NP ḥr sḏm* is found here as well. Significantly, it alternates with *N(P) sḏm=f*, which is otherwise very rare throughout the composition:

(v) *Ipuwer* 13.9

[iw irf ḥm] nfr ꜥḥꜥw ḥr ḫnty (...)

'Indeed it is good when ships sail upstream (...)'

– With *N(P) sḏm=f*:

Ipuwer 13.12-13

iw irf ḥm nfr ꜥwy rmṯw sḫws=sn mrw (...)

'Indeed it is good when men's hands build pyramids (...)'

(vi) *Ipuwer* 13.11-12

iw i[r]f [ḥ]m nfr sr[w?...] sꜥḥw n=sn mtnw ḥr irt šmt

'Indeed it is good when offi[cials(?) ...] honor for themselves, when paths make way.'

– With *N(P) sḏm=f*:

Ipuwer 13.13

iw irf ḥm nfr rmṯw tḫw swr=sn *mint? ibw=sn nfr

'Indeed it is good when people are drunk, when they drink *mint*(?) and their hearts are happy.'

As it turns out, therefore, the *ante quem non* criterion applies to *Ipuwer*, if only in extremis. Had *Ipuwer* not included this final part with more generalizing tone, the composition would have been undistinctive as to whether the criterion applies. To be sure, *NP ḥr sḏm* is exceedingly common throughout the text and *N(P) sḏm=f* very rare.[335] Yet, this would support no conclusion, given the overall temporality of the lament: in this, progressive aspect is called for and *NP ḥr sḏm* therefore expected to

---

[334] Enmarch 2008: 196.
[335] Vernus 1990a: 189 and n.91; 1990b: 1044-5, n.25.

be common, regardless of when *Ipuwer* was composed. Establishing that the criterion applies requires exhibiting habitual/general contexts in which *N(P) sḏm=f* could have been used, yet *NP ḥr sḏm* happens to be (also) documented. These are given in only one small section of what is a very long composition by Middle Egyptian standards. In another sense as well, *Ipuwer* is illustrative of how contingent the possibility for a linguistic dating can be. Had P. Leiden I 344 ro, the single manuscript to preserve *Ipuwer*, been destroyed in its final parts only slightly more than it already is, the relevant passages may not have survived. Even though the bulk of the composition would have been preserved, the information that *Ipuwer* was composed at a time when stage II of the change here discussed had been reached would have been lost.

2.6.2.5 *Khakheperreseneb*

Khakheperreseneb has three instances of *NP ḥr sḏm* in its second part (beginning with ro 10). This is also a lament, largely cast in the *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation: compare e.g. vso 2-3 *ḏd ḥr m ḏḏw n=f ḥr* 'he who used to give orders is now one to whom orders are given'; vso 3 *ḥrt sf mi pꜣ hrw* 'yesterday's share is like today's.' Whether the aspectual *ante quem non* criterion applies to *Khakheperreseneb* must therefore be examined in individual details.

The first occurrence of *NP ḥr sḏm*, *ḥprw ḥr ḥpr* could be read with general aspect if standing in isolation (*'changes happen'). In context, however, the clause follows right after the statement introducing the lament (*ink pw ḥr nkꜣ* (...)), with several expressions typical of laments (*ḥprt*; *sḥrw ḥpr ḥt tꜣ*; *sḥꜣ tꜣ*: §5.1.3.3, (ii)-(iii); §5.1.3.3.B). Moreover, the event is set in relation to a temporal limit expressed in the two following clauses (*nn mi snf*; *dns rnpt r 2-nwt=s*): changes did not always happen and that they now do so is new and the object of the lament. Aspect is therefore progressive; the *ante quem non* criterion does not apply:

(i) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 10
ink pw ḥr nkꜣ{=i} m ḥprt sḥrw ḥpr ḥt tꜣ
ḥprw ḥr ḥpr
nn mi snf dns rnpt r 2-nwt=s
sḥꜣ tꜣ (...)

'I am pondering on what happens, on the state that is through the land.
Changes are happening:
it is not like the preceding year, a year is heavier than the other.
The land is in uproar (...)'

Different is the case of the next occurrence of *NP ḥr sḏm*.[336] The lexicon is again typical of laments in general (*ḥprt*; *tnbḥ*; see §5.1.3.3.B), but aspect is here not progressive. A first indication lies with the quantified temporal expression (*rꜥ nb*): technically, however, this is not yet a sufficient reason, since the repeated occurrence of the event could itself be viewed over a bounded temporal extension, thus fitting the

---

336 This and the next one (iii) are the ones quoted by Vernus 1990a: 188, ex.405; 1990b: 1038, ex.2.

definition of progressive aspect (in an intuitive paraphrase: *'(...) is now happening on a daily basis'). The full argument then implies interpretation based on world knowledge: 'dawn' is a natural phenomenon and its occurrence a quintessentially habitual event.

(ii) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 12

nhpw ḥr ḫpr rꜥ nb ḥr tnbẖ r ḫprt (...)

'Dawn happens every day, but the face swerves to what happens (...)'

A second instance of *NP ḥr sḏm* to which the criterion applies is *ḫsf ḫn ḥr sḫpr rḳw* in the following passage. The context consists in general maxims: these are not bound to the specific temporality of the lament and its *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation. Significant are the non-verbal *A pw B* construction (with classifying semantics, not temporally contingent). As discussed, another non-verbal construction, *A m B*, is found in *Sonst-Jetzt* contexts (compare *Eloquent Peasant* B1 128-134 and the discussion in §2.6.2.2; similarly in *Ipuwer*, §2.6.2.4, (i)-(ii); or, in *Khakheperreseneb* itself, vso 2-3 quoted above):

(iii) *Khakheperreseneb* vso 4-5

ḫꜣt pw gr r sḏmt
iḥ pw wšb n ḫm
ḫsf ḫn ḥr sḫpr rḳw
n šsp.n ib mꜣꜥt (...)

'Silence against what is heard is a disease,
but to answer the ignorant is a painful thing.

To oppose an utterance creates enmity:
the heart can not accept Truth.'

2.6.2.6 *Fishing and Fowling*, *A Man to His Son*, and *Neferkare and Sisene*

Two more compositions have been mentioned in relation to applying the aspectual *ante quem non* criterion, *Fishing and Fowling* and *A Man to His Son*. To these, a third, *Neferkare and Sisene*, can be added. None is a lament, and they are therefore free of the additional interpretive complexities associated with these.

A. *Fishing and Fowling* has one instance of *NP ḥr sḏm* in an environment that implies an interpretation of the event as habitual.[337] The quantified expression (*r-tnw sp*), here not in a lament, is strongly indicative. Significant is also the objectless construction of *ḫdb*, with the effect of generalizing the event ('kill' in general, not related to a specific object of the killing and therefore not an individual act of killing):

(i) *Fishing and Fowling* B2.7-8

iw=i ḥr ḫdb r-tnw-sp nn ꜣbw n mꜣ[wt=i]

'I kill at every occasion without my harpoon ever stopping.'

---

337 Vernus 1990a: 186, ex.399. On the passage in its broader context, lastly Widmaier 2009: 133-5.

B. *A Man to His Son* has various instances of *NP ḥr sḏm* expressing progressive aspect (e.g. 8.2 and 8.6, discussed above, §2.3.3, (v)) and regularly uses *N(P) sḏm=f* for general/habitual aspect (§2.3.4.2.2, (v)). In one place, however, the composition has *NP ḥr sḏm* in a context that implies general aspect.[338] Unlike the outwardly similar *in iw mḫȝt ḥr rḏt ḥr gs* in *Eloquent Peasant* (B1 179-180: §2.6.2.3, (ii)), to which this has been compared,[339] the event can not be related to the speech situation in any way. The aspectual *ante quem non* criterion therefore applies:

(ii) *A Man* 3.1 (as read in the present study[340])

in iw hrw n rnnt ḥr tht=f

'Does a day of Renenet contravene itself?'

C. *Neferkare and Sisene*, finally, has one instance of *NP ḥr sḏm* with an event that must be interpreted as habitual based on context (on this passage, further §4.4.3.1):

(iii) *Neferkare and Sisene* P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+4-5

(...) *ḥr mḥ ḥr ḏd ir is nt{y}-pw mȝꜥ pw pȝ ḏd*
sw (ḥr) pr(t) m grḥ

'(...) thinking and saying that since it was so, the word was true:
he goes out at night!" '

2.6.2.7 Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion recast

A. Based on the above discussion, Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion must be modified slightly. Issues of transitivity play no role in the linguistic change by which *NP ḥr sḏm* is gradually extended beyond the progressive domain (§2.6.2.1). No relative chronology of termini *ante quem non* based on transitivity, such as previously assumed (§2.6.1.2, (a)), can be maintained. When a given composition presents an innovative use of *NP ḥr sḏm*, the criterion applies, irrespective of whether the event is transitive or intransitive.

The composition which would have presented the earliest traces of the linguistic change here relevant, *Eloquent Peasant*, turns out to offer no evidence for that change (§2.6.2.2-3). This does not affect the dating of *Eloquent Peasant*, which can be established both by institutional analysis and by other elements of linguistic analysis (§3.1.2). However, it does affect the temporal resolution of the criterion itself. Once *Eloquent Peasant* is taken out of the picture, the earliest occurrences for *NP ḥr sḏm* with habitual/general events, still isolated, are in documentary texts from the time of Amenemhat III (§2.6.1.2). When this innovative usage first spread to higher written registers, such as literary ones, can not be determined because literary texts that present the innovative construction are presently insecurely dated. Some time for the spread must probably be assumed, but this need not have been long: the linguistic innovation here concerns the function of an expression, not its form. Accordingly, the

---

338 Vernus 1990a: 186-7, ex.401.
339 Vernus 1990b: 1043, n.19.
340 The editor of the text reads differently, with an altogether different construction; compare the above discussion, §2.3.4.

innovation may have been indexical of register, but probably not strongly so. Assuming, therefore, that the spread of the innovation from documentary to literary registers was indeed fairly rapid, the use of *NP ḥr sḏm* with habitual/general events in literary texts defines a terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty, or the late Twelfth at the very earliest.

B. Of the literary texts that use *NP ḥr sḏm* with habitual/general events (§2.6.2.4-6), *Ipuwer*, *Khakheperreseneb*, and *Fishing and Fowling* have a terminus *ante quem non* by the late Middle Kingdom based on various other linguistic and non-linguistic considerations (§6.2.2.5, §2.7, and §3.2, respectively); in the case of *Fishing and Fowling*, lexical evidence suggests an even later dating (§3.2). Linguistic analysis of *Neferkare and Sisene* suggests that this composition dates to the Eighteenth Dynasty (§4.4). With four out of five compositions to which the criterion applies, independent elements of linguistic and non-linguistic evidence are thereby consistent with the terminus *ante quem non* defined by the criterion.

Only *A Man to His Son* (§2.6.2.6.B) does not readily provide independent linguistic indications for dating. The manuscript tradition of the *Teaching*, which is dense, begins in the Eighteenth Dynasty.[341] The editor of the text pointed to strong intertextual connections and similarities in structure with *Loyaliste* and *Kheti*, and suggested that these texts were composed to form a tripartite curriculum; assuming that *Loyaliste* and *Kheti* date to the reign of Senwosret I, *A Man to His Son* would then as well.[342] However, these datings of *Kheti* and *Loyaliste* are themselves hypotheses only.[343] Loyalism, a core theme in *A Man*, was an issue textually thematized in the early Twelfth Dynasty, but also in the later part of that Dynasty, and later yet.[344]

Under the reading advocated in the present study (§2.3.4), *A Man* 3.1 provides a clear case to which the aspectual *ante quem non* criterion applies.[345] This defines a terminus *ante quem non* to the early Thirteenth, or late Twelfth, Dynasty for the composition. The use of *NP ḥr sḏm* for general/habitual aspect is by no means generalized in *A Man*: in places other than 3.1, events with a general or habitual interpretation are expressed by *N(P) sḏm=f* (§2.3.4.2.2, (v)). This need not imply a transitional stage in the change, as *N(P) sḏm=f* could always be used with such events even when *NP ḥr sḏm* had begun spreading beyond its original semantic domain (§2.6.3). Other than by the construction in 3.1, *A Man to His Son* is extremely difficult to date linguistically. The often unusual philological difficulties of the text hamper linguistic analysis in substantial ways. In addition, the linguistic typology of *A Man to His Son* is by and large undistinctive, as is generally the case with teachings, which have much precon-

---

341 Fischer-Elfert 1999: II, VIII-XXVI. The composition is now also documented in the Assiut graffiti (4a-d), see Verhoeven 2013, §4.
342 Fischer-Elfert 1999: 417-21; see the whole study for an extensive analysis of intertext, common loyalist motifs, and similar elements in composition of the relevant texts.
343 For a linguistic discussion of these texts, §6.2.2.6 and §4.5, respectively; for *Amenemhat*, which has played a role in the hypothesis associating the literary figure 'Kheti', and thereby the composition *Kheti*, with the early Twelfth Dynasty, §6.
344 Gnirs 2013b: 153-6, 159-66; Schipper 1998: 176-9.
345 Similarly Vernus 1990a: 186-7.

figured language, all the more so in one that is so densely intertextually allied with other texts.

2.6.3   The *post quem non* criterion

In Vernus' original discussion, a twofold criterion for dating was derived from changes affecting the functions of *NP ḥr sḏm* beginning in the late Middle Kingdom. A composition that has innovative usages of *NP ḥr sḏm* (stage II: §2.6.1.1) receives a terminus *ante quem non* by the time when this change is first documented (§2.6.1.2, (a); discussion above, §2.6.2). Complementarily, a composition that has the older distribution of *NP ḥr sḏm* and *N(P) sḏm=f* (stage I) receives a terminus *post quem non* to a period in time before stage II sets on (§2.6.1.2, (b); discussed in the present section). The linguistic change concerned would, in other words, support both an *ante quem non* criterion and a *post quem non* criterion set to the same time. If so, a terminus *post quem non* by the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty would apply to various literary texts of insecure dating, with significant consequences for dating Middle Egyptian literary texts such as e.g. *Merikare* or *Neferti*, which have stage I.

At first, the argument would seem commonsensical, given that linguistic change consists in obsolescence as much as it consists in innovation. For it to be valid, however, the argument would require a model of linguistic change whereby innovative usages neatly replace older ones. Going further, it would need to imply that *advanced* obsolescence (on which a *post quem non* criterion is to be based) is roughly simultaneous with *initial* stages in innovation (on which an *ante quem non* criterion is to be based). As already discussed in general terms, this is hardly ever the case: in linguistic change, innovative and older usages coexist over longer periods, resulting in an inherent thickness of language, particularly of written language, at any given moment in time (§2.1). In the particular case at hand, it can also be demonstrated on direct descriptive grounds that the older stage I and the innovative stage II coexisted for centuries.[346]

2.6.3.1   *N(P) sḏm=f* as a 'non-extensive' in post-Middle Kingdom times

A. *N(P) sḏm=f* is still used in all shades of 'non-extensive' meaning well after the mid-Twelfth Dynasty. Taking well dated examples where these are to be found, in inscriptionally published compositions, this is illustrated by the following selection:

---

[346] Upon discussion with the present author, Vernus (p.c. 5/2010) concedes that his *post quem non* criterion can not be upheld. The reasons for this are nonetheless developed below in explicit terms because of the importance the *post quem non* criterion has had in dating Middle Egyptian literary texts (§2.6.1.2, (b)). In addition, the discussion is illustrative of more general issues in devising dating criteria and thereby provides a case study to flesh out some of the introductory considerations of the present chapter.

(a) *With an habitual event*

(i) Sobekhotep IV's *Karnak Stela* 5

iw=i m3=i nfrw ḥm=f r-tnw ḥb nbw (...)

'I used to see the beauty of His Majesty at each and every festival (...)'

> The quantified adverbial expression (*r-tnw ḥb nbw*[347]) imposes an habitual reading.

> Sim. e.g. Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela* 5 (below, (iv)).

(b) *With a general event, in a gnomic context*

(ii) *Appointment of the Vizier* 8 (*Urk.* IV 1381, 2)

i3wt ip=s wnwt=s

'Old age counts its hour.'

> Sim. in the *Vizieral Cycle*, *Aametju* 13; 43 (§1.3.2.3, (i)); also e.g. Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* 20 (*Urk.* IV 19, 13 - 20, 3) (§2.8.2.3, (iv)).

(c) *As an unmarked synchronous tense ('unextensive' in the bare sense)*

(iii) Tutankhamun's *Restoration Stela* 7-8 (*Urk.* IV 2027, 11)

wnn t3 m sny-mnt ntrw mkḥ3=sn t3 pn (...)

'The land was in calamity, the gods were neglecting this land (...)'

> Sim. e.g. *Speos Artemidos* 24 (*Urk.* IV 387, 15-16) *dḥwty wr pr m rˁ swb3=f* [*ḥr* ...] 'Thoth the great, who came from Re, instruct[ed ...]'; 27 (*Urk.* IV 388, 7-8) *ḥr ḥm=i d=f spd-ḥr n rmnw ntr* 'My Majesty's face gives alertness to those who shoulder the god'; probably also 19-20 (*Urk.* IV 386, 15-16)[348] *p(3)ḥt wrt ḥnst inwt ḥr-ibt i3btt w*[*ḫ3=s*] *w3wt snm* (...) 'Great Pakhet who roams the wadis, presiding over the East, was looking for the roads of rain (...)'; Thutmosis III's *Poetical Stela* 9 (below, (v)); Amenhotep II's *Sphinx Stela* 26 (*Urk.* IV 1283, 5-6) *m-ḫt nn sḫˁw ḥm=f m nsw wrt ḥtp=s st=s m wpt=f* 'After this, His Majesty was made to appear as a king, while the Great One took his place on his forehead.'

If the *post quem non* criterion to date e.g. *Merikare* or *Neferti* to a time no later than the mid-Twelfth Dynasty were valid, all the above compositions would be subject to the same criterion.

B. Post-mid-Twelfth Dynasty compositions often have the two constructions in their old distribution, with *N(P) sdm=f* and *NP ḥr sdm* contrasting as an expression of 'non-extensive' aspect (habitual, general, or unmarked) with one of 'extensive' aspect (i.e. progressive) (stage I: §2.6.1.1). Again taking well dated examples where these are to be found, in inscriptionally published compositions:

---

347 For the rare *r-tnw NP*, e.g. Beni Hassan 2 (Ameny), 16-17 (*Urk.* VII 15, 18) *ḥs.kw ḥr=s m pr-nsw r-tnw rnpt nt irw* 'I was praised for it in the royal palace on every year of the cattle count.'

348 Restitution of the lacuna after Allen 2002b: 9.

(a) Mid-Thirteenth Dynasty:

(iv) Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela* 4-5

rḏ n<=i> iꜣwt=i m ḥri-tp tꜣ rḫ=f sꜣy[t]=i mtr iw=i [ḥr] irt mi nṯr
iw[=i] rḏy=i[a] *ḥꜣw-ḥr sipt n=i* (...)

'My office as head of the land was given to me, for he knows my wisdom precisely, as I was acting like a god.
I used to give more than what was entrusted to me (...)'

a)   Sic, for expected *iw=i ḏ=i*.

   Contrast *iw=i [ḥr] irt* with *iw[=i] rḏy=i*, the former expressing progressive aspect, the latter habitual aspect.

(b) Early NK, 16th century BCE:

N(P) sḏm=f: Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* 19-20 (§2.8.2.3, (iv))
NP ḥr sḏm: *Karnak Eulogy* 14-19 (§2.8.2.3, (iii)).

(c) Early NK, 15th century BCE:

(v) Thutmosis III's *Poetical Stela* 9 (*Urk.* IV 613, 14-15)

ḏ=i nrw nw ḥm=k ḫt ibw=sn
ꜣḫt=i imt tp=k sswn=s st

'I shall place dread of Your Majesty through their hearts;
the uraeus which is on my head will destroy them.'

(vi) *Poetical Stela* 23 (*Urk.* IV 618, 5-7)

snty=k ḏ.n=i sn m sꜣ ḥꜣ=k
ꜥwy ḥm=i ḥr ḥr ḥr sḥr ḏwt

'Your two sisters, I have placed them as protection around you,
while the arms of My Majesty are above, driving evil away.'

(d) Early NK, 14th century BCE:

(vii) Suti and Hor 6-7 (*Urk.* IV 1944, 17-20)

irt nb mꜣ=sn im=k (...)
ḫḏḏwt=k wbꜣ=s irty ꜥwt

'All eyes see through you (...)
Your light opens the eyes of the flock.'

(viii) Suti and Hor 4 (*Urk.* IV 1944, 7)

ḏꜣ=k ḥrt ḥr nb ḥr mꜣ=k

'When you cross the sky, all faces sees you.'

   Ḥr nb ḥr mꜣ=k is progressive, the temporal extension of the event being defined in relation to the setting clause (*ḏꜣ=k ḥrt*); for the general principle of such constructions, compare above, §1.2, (ii).

As the above examples document, the old distribution of *N(P) sḏm=f* and *NP ḥr sḏm*, in other words stage I, is still productive well into the early New Kingdom.

C. To conclude this illustration, a comparison between two accounts of returns from expeditions, one in a Twelfth Dynasty literary text, the other in a late Seventeenth Dynasty composition with literarizing tendencies, is enlightening. Both have the motif of people hugging each other upon successful return. In both cases, this is set after constructions with resultative aspect or interpretation (*rḏ ḥknw dwꜣ nṯr*; *ḥmwt ṯꜣw iww* (...)). These define a stretch in time with respect to which the event of 'hugging' is unfolding. *Shipwrecked Sailor* expresses the implied temporal relation by using the dedicated progressive pattern, *NP ḥr sḏm*, as is common. *Kamose Inscriptions*, on the other hand, uses the unmarked pattern, *N(P) sḏm=f*, a more recherché choice. If linguistic history is conceived of in terms of an orderly succession, the construction in *Kamose Inscriptions* would be described as older than the one in *Shipwrecked Sailor*:

(ix) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 2-6

mk pḥ.n=n ẖnw (...)
rḏ ḥknw dwꜣ nṯr
s nb ḥr ḥpt sn-nw=f (...)

'Look, we have reached the Residence (...)
praise has been given, the god has been thanked,
everybody is hugging their fellows; (...)'

(x) *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 32-33[349]

iw ḥr nb ḥḏ (...)
ḥmwt ṯꜣw iww r mꜣn=i
st nbt ḥpt=s 2-nw=s (...)

'Every face was illuminated (...)
women and men had come to see me;
every woman hugged her fellow (...)'

2.6.3.2 Dissociating the *ante quem non* and *post quem non* criteria

The above examples demonstrate the continued use of the old functional contrast (stage I) centuries after innovative usages of *NP ḥr sḏm* (stage II) had begun emerging in the late Middle Kingdom. In view of the general models of linguistic change discussed above (§2.1.1), this is hardly surprising: while innovative uses spread, older ones do not disappear, resulting in an overall thickness of language in use at any given time. The situation, descriptively documented above, may be schematically represented as follows:

---

349 On this passage in its broader context, §1.3.3.2, (xiv).

Thickness in ongoing linguistic change: not as in (a), but as in (b)

			innovation of B	(← *ante quem non*)
(a)	A	→	B	
			obsolescence of A??	(← *post quem non*??)

			innovation of B	(← *ante quem non*)
(b)	A	→	AB →	B	
			obsolescence of A	(← *post quem non*)

The two termini, the *ante quem non* and the *post quem non*, must be dissociated from each other. While initial stages in the change here concerned are observed in the late Middle Kingdom, the overall change took several centuries to complete. Meanwhile, texts were composed still presenting stage I, well into the early New Kingdom. While the terminus *ante quem non* based on the change here concerned can be set to the early Thirteenth, or perhaps late Twelfth, Dynasty, the terminus *post quem non* based on the same change can only be defined as pointing to the late Eighteenth Dynasty. For dating Middle Egyptian literary texts that have stage I, this is of no practical import, as these texts are documented in manuscripts from the early or mid-Eighteenth Dynasty.

Nor can the argument be recast differently, in terms of a relative chronology internal to literature. As repeatedly emphasized, there is no indication that Middle Egyptian was linguistically any distinct in literature from what it was in other types of higher written discourses. Accordingly, the thickness of language just described applies to literature as it does to other types of written discourses. Within this thickness, composers of various texts make different selections. The composer of e.g. *Khakheperreseneb* (or *Ipuwer*) thus accommodated the innovative usages of *NP ḥr sḏm*, while the one of *Neferti* or *Merikare*, for whatever reason, intentional or not, may not have. In other words, *Neferti* or *Merikare*, which display stage I, need not be relatively older than *Khakheperreseneb* or *Ipuwer*, which display stage II. Only two claims can be made based on the linguistic expressions here considered: (a) that *Khakheperreseneb* was not composed earlier than the early Thirteenth Dynasty, or late Twelfth at best (the *ante quem non* criterion, slightly modified: §2.6.2); (b) that *Neferti* was not composed later than the late Eighteenth Dynasty (the *post quem criterion*, redefined). Which of the two compositions is earlier can not be determined based on the aspectual criteria here discussed.

2.7 The limitations of linguistic dating 1: *Khakheperreseneb*

The constraints that bear on linguistic dating (§2.1-4) add up, sometimes in critical ways. This is illustrated by two additional case studies, now devoted to compositions considered as a whole (this section and the next). In keeping with the tenor of the present chapter, the presentation is focused on methodological issues that can be encountered in dating. Accordingly, several expressions that turn out to be uncriterial

are here included because discussing these is illustrative of broader methodological issues at stake. In subsequent sections of the present study, similar expressions will not be included any more.

2.7.1 Introduction

Khakheperreseneb is documented on a mid-Eighteenth Dynasty writing board, T. BM EA 5645 (the main witness),[350] and on a roughly contemporaneous ostracon, O. Cairo JE 50249 (paralleling T. BM EA 5645 ro 10-11).[351] An upper chronological bound is given by the name 'Khakheperreseneb' itself, which is based on the throne name of Senwosret II ($\underline{h}^c$-$\underline{h}pr$-r^c).

A. The name 'Khakheperreseneb' provides only a terminus *ante quem non*, and does not secure a dating into the reign of Senwosret II himself: the name may have been given to individuals at least as long as a cult of that king was active.[352] Independently from this, it is observed that the word *ḫpr* plays a distinguished role in the lament. This defines itself as a 'pondering on what *happens* (*ḫprt*), on the conditions that *happen* (*ḫpr*) through the land' (ro 10), and is introduced by the observation that '*changes are happening* (*ḫprw ḥr ḫpr*), it is not like last year' (ro 10). *Ḫpr* is prominent later on as well, as in the observation that 'dawn *happens* (*ḫpr*) daily, the face has swerved from *what happens* (*ḫprt*)' (ro 12). Alongside *ḫpr-k3-r^c* (Senwosret I), $\underline{h}^c$-$\underline{h}pr$-r^c is one of only two Twelfth Dynasty royal names that include the element *ḫpr*. A reference to this name would therefore have been appropriate at all later times in the Late Middle Kingdom; taken into account that *Khakheperreseneb* makes Middle Egyptian literary tradition one of its objects, such reference would also have been appropriate in yet later times.

   Khakheperreseneb has the old expression of filiation, by a *badal*-type apposition (*B s3 A* 'B's son, A', literally, 'B, the son: A'): ro 1 *sny s3 $\underline{h}^c$-$\underline{h}pr$-r^c-snb ḏdw n=f ^cnḫw* 'Seni's son Khakheperreseneb, called Ankhu'. This expression of filiation is typical of the Twelfth Dynasty, contrasting with the construction with direction annexation (*A s3 B* 'A, son of B) which developed after the Twelfth Dynasty;[353] the spread of the latter construction was gradual, and the earlier construction is still found in the Thirteenth Dynasty.[354] Taken at face value, this could imply a terminus *post quem non* at some time in the Thirteenth Dynasty. Making such an argument would be dangerous, however, since in general 'any aspect of a composition can be archaistic';[355] such possibility is all the more real in a composition, *Khakheperreseneb*, that thematizes tradition. The older expression of filiation recurs in *Neferkare and Sisene* (e.g.

---

350 Parkinson 1997b: 55-64 and pl.X-XI; for the dating of the manuscript, p.63.

351 Parkinson 1997b: 64-8 and pl.XII; for the dating of the manuscript, p.65 ('Thutmoside').

352 Vernus 1995a: 2-3, and n.15, 17.

353 E.g. *EG* §85; Borghouts 2010: I, §87.c, NB 3. In the mid-Twelfth Dynasty, *Eloquent Peasant* has yet another construction (*s3 B A* 'the son of B, A': *s3 mrw rnsi*): Parkinson 2012a: 40, with references to previous discussions.

354 E.g. Posener 1957: 131-2.

355 Parkinson 2002: 49, discussing meter in *Ptahhotep* P; similarly on script in literary compositions, Parkinson 2002: 313; on linguistic selections in Middle Egyptian literary texts, §2.4.3.2.

P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+3 *ḥn-tꜣ sꜣ ṯti* 'Hent's son Tjeti'); as discussed below, this composition probably dates to the Eighteenth Dynasty (§4.4). In *Khakheperreseneb*, the expression of filiation as *B sꜣ A* may point to an earlier period of composition, or it may be archaizing in later times: in order to decide between the two alternative interpretations, the dating of composition, early or late, would have to be established first, on independent grounds.

The title born by Khakheperreseneb, a '*ouab*-priest of Heliopolis' (*wꜥb n iwnw*, ro 1), is unparalleled. It has been observed that its form (*wꜥb + place*) is typical of the Late Middle Kingdom, and perhaps of the Thirteenth Dynasty specifically.[356] Whether this affords a reliable indication for dating remains unclear: the form of the title is not terribly distinctive; moreover, just as other discrete elements in a literary text, titles can be archaizing.

B. An upper bound is, on the other hand, given by Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion. As discussed, this applies to *Khakheperreseneb* ro 12 (*nhpw ḥr ḫpr rꜥ nb* 'dawn happens every day': §2.6.2.5, (ii)) and vso 5 (*ḥsf ḫn ḥr sḫpr rḳw* 'to oppose an utterance creates enmity: §2.6.2.5, (iii)), implying a terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty, or late Twelfth at the earliest.[357] The criterion does not narrow the range for possible dating by much. It is valuable, however, in defining an earliest possible dating that is later than the reign of Senwosret II himself.

In the present section, I discuss linguistic expressions that could be interpreted as suggestive of a narrower range for dating *Khakheperreseneb*. Possible indications for a terminus *post quem non* prior to the early Eighteenth Dynasty are examined first (§2.7.2). Possible indications for a terminus *ante quem non* later than the one just recalled, are presented in turn (§2.7.3).

2.7.2   A terminus *post quem non* earlier than the Eighteenth Dynasty?

2.7.2.1   Middle Egyptian language

Khakheperreseneb is composed in a linguistic register similar to the one of Middle Egyptian literary texts securely dated to the Twelfth Dynasty. Yet, expressions that are characteristic of such a register are also documented in productive use down to the Eighteenth Dynasty, making these expressions uncriterial for establishing a terminus *post quem non* earlier than this period. A selective illustration is the following:

(i) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 10

nn mi snf

'It is not like last year.'

> The subjectless situational construction is common in Middle Kingdom Middle
> Egyptian literature, as it is in higher written registers in the early New Kingdom.
> E.g. *Sinuhe* B 224-225 *iw mi sšm rswt* 'It was like the nature of a dream';

---

356 Grajetzki 2005: 45-6.
357 Similarly Vernus 1995a: 3; 1990a: 188, ex.405. Barbotin's (2012) argument that the criterion does not apply misunderstands the aspectual contrast that underlies the criterion.

Chapelle Rouge, p.137: IX.19 (H*HBT* II 27, 14) *nn m gnwt imiw-ḫȝt* 'It is not in the annals of the predecessors.'

(ii) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 2 *ḫmmy* 'unknown'

Sim. ro 3 *ḏddt* 'said' (twice), ro 7 *tmmt* (negation)

While the finite reduplicated passive formation (*sḏmm=f*) was obsolescent by the turn of the third to the second millennium, loss of productivity of the same morphological formation was more protracted with participles, and gradual over the lexicon. These differential rates of obsolescence reflect the fact that participial formations are naturally prone to undergo lexicalization, and the general tendency for frequent items to retain older formations longer. In *Khakheperreseneb*, reduplicated passive participles are with common verbs, for which similar formations are well documented in the early Eighteenth Dynasty:[358] (a) for the general principle, compare with a common verb: *wddt* 'ordered' (*Urk.* IV 325, 17; 397, 2); also with a less common one: *ṯsst* 'knotted' (*Urk.* IV 47, 12); (b) with the same verbs as in *Khakheperreseneb*: *ḏddt* 'said' (*Urk.* IV 194, 1; 500, 12); *rḫḫy* 'known' (as the positive pendant to *ḫmmy*) (*Urk.* IV 119, 3); negative *tmm*(*t*) (*Urk.* IV 331, 12; 344, 7; 500, 8; 780, 13; 1097, 12; H*HBT* 109, 3-4). In *Khakheperreseneb*, the presence of no less than four instances of reduplicated passive participles—a density higher than in any other Middle Egyptian literary text—may well relate to 'repetition' (*wḥmmyt*, ro 2), a major theme of the text (§2.4.5, (ii)).

(iii) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 3

(...) *ḥr-ntt rf wḥmw ḏddt iw ḏddt ḏd*

'(...) for what has been said can only be repeated:[359] what has been said is said.'

Sim. ro 13 *snni wi ḥr ib=i wḏd sw ḫȝp ḥt=i ḥr=f* 'I am in distress because of my heart; it suffers, my body is concealed because of it.'

The *nfr sw* construction with a passive participle as predicate (here *wḥmw*) is common in Middle Kingdom literary registers; it is also productively used in the early New Kingdom. E.g. *Shipwrecked Sailor* 66 *ʿrḳ sw r ḫnt* 'He was bent to the front'; Thutmosis I's *Abydos Stela* 12 (*Urk.* IV 99, 15-17) *ḏsr st r ḫprt m pt ḫȝp st r sḫrw dwȝt* [*wȝš*] *st r imiw-nnw* 'They are more recondite than what has come to existence in the sky, more concealed than the conditions of the lower world, more exalted than those who are in the Nun.' In *Khakheperreseneb* ro 3, the specific type of *nfr sw* construction here discussed is followed by a *iw NP PsP* (*iw ḏddt ḏd*) construction, with subtle semantic effect.[360] The sequence is documented in the early New Kingdom, with a similar semantic contrast: *Chapelle Rouge*, p.310[361] *wʿb.wy ʿȝbt=t iw=sn nfr* 'How pure is your offering! It is excellent.'

---

358 Most references drawn from *EG* §360.
359 Identification of the construction and discussion of its semantics, Vernus 1995a: 9-11. On *ḥr-ntt rf*, below (§2.7.3.2.A).
360 Semantic analysis in Vernus 1995a: 10.
361 Noted by Vernus 1995a: 10.

(iv) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 10 (= O. Cairo JE 50249, 1)

ink pw ḥr nk3y{=i}[362] *m ḫprt sḥrw ḫpr ḥr t3*

'(The situation is that) I am pondering on what happens, on the conditions that happen through the land.'

> Sim. vso 1.

> As the somewhat pedantic English rendering attempts to express, the lament proper is introduced by a thetic construction *ink pw ḥr sḏm* /pseudoparticiple /*sḏm.n=f* /*sḏm=f*.[363] The construction is productively documented in the Middle Kingdom and in the early New Kingdom alike. E.g. *Shipwrecked Sailor* 89-91 *ink pw h3.kw r bi3 m wpwt ity* (...) '(What happened is that) I had gone to the mine in a mission of the Sovereign (...)'; Ahmose's *Abydos Stela for Tetisheri* 7-8 (*Urk. IV* 27, 14-15; quoted below, §5.1.4.2, (v)); Hatshepsut's Northern Obelisk, Basis D 14 (*Urk. IV* 364, 16-17; quoted below, §5.1.4.2, (vi)).

2.7.2.2   Rare literary expressions, unparalleled after the Twelfth Dynasty

Very few expressions in *Khakheperreseneb* are not paralleled in higher written registers of the early Eighteenth Dynasty. These deserve a more detailed discussion.

A. *Khakheperreseneb* has a form that based on written morphology (*rḏ-*, not *ḏ-*) would seem to qualify as an instance of a past tense *sḏm=f*:

> (i) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 11
>
> *rḏ.tw m3ʿt <r->rwti isft m ẖn sḥ*
>
> 'Maat is put outside, Isfet is within the council.'

If this is indeed a past tense *sḏm=f* (see below, NB), *Khakheperreseneb* would have a form that is otherwise documented only in Twelfth Dynasty literary registers. This would not, however, afford a reliable argument for dating. Passive past tense *sḏm=f* is exceedingly rare in Middle Egyptian literary registers: only two other secure instances can be quoted (*Eloquent Peasant* B1 159; *Sinuhe* B 238): these are frozen remnants, not elements of a productive paradigm any more (§2.4.3.2, (ii), (viii)). As a frozen remant, past tense *rḏ.tw* is bound to the Middle Egyptian literary tradition, but not to any specific period in time within that tradition. Whatever its date of composition, *Khakheperreseneb* is itself part of that tradition. What is more, the composition makes this tradition its object; the selection of *rḏ.tw* would therefore have been appropriate as a linguistic index of this very tradition.

> NB. In addition, the identification of ro 11 *rḏ.tw* as an instance of passive past tense *sḏm=f* is itself altogether uncertain as this is based on written morphology only. The

---

362 The superfluous suffix pronoun is now also documented in O. Cairo JE 50249, suggesting that the traditions represented by the two witnesses of *Khakheperreseneb* are closely related (Parkinson 1997b: 66, and n.39).

363 In *Khakheperreseneb*, the thetic nature of the construction is manifest in that it opens a new section in the text, the lament. That this was a significant articulation is also nicely evidenced by this being the beginning of the section excerpted on O. Cairo JE 50249.

text goes on with what is clearly present tense: ro 11 *ḫnn.tw sḫrw nṯrw wn{t}.tw mḫrw=sn* 'The counsels of the gods are thrown into tumult, their directives are neglected.' Semantically, both readings of *rḏ.tw* are defensible: as a past tense, providing the setting to the non-past tense description that follows,[364] or as a present tense, with the neglect of Maat being presented as an ongoing state-of-affairs.[365] As regards written morphology itself, the stem *rḏ-* is generally characteristing of the past tense *sḏm=f* as opposed to the present tense *sḏm=f*; it is also characteristic, however, of a prosodically initial position more generally.[366] In *Khakheperreseneb* ro 11, *rḏ.tw* is itself verse-initial and the form of the stem may reflect this position: *rḏ.tw* may then be a present tense form just as well. Alternatively, or complementarily, the *written* form *rḏ.tw* may be literary in the sense defined above, even if a present tense *sḏm=f*: if so, this would be motivated by the same indexical dimensions attached to the form discussed above.

B. *Khakheperreseneb* has an instance of the expression *ḥꜣ ꜣ*, that is of *ḥꜣ* (< *ḥw-ꜣ*) itself reinforced by *ꜣ*:

(ii) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 7

ḥꜣ ꜣ rḫ=i ḫm.n{y} kywy (...)

'If only I knew what others ignore (...)'

Introducing a clause as in *Khakheperreseneb*, *ḥꜣ ꜣ* recurs in *Ptahhotep* 387 L1, *Eloquent Peasant* B1 142, and *Fowler* 12,[367] all of which are securely dated to the Twelfth Dynasty. In later times, *ḥꜣ ꜣ* recurs as a lexicalized noun (*ḥꜣ-ꜣ* 'would that!'), in Thutmosis I's *Abydos Stela* 5 (*Urk.* IV 96, 13)[368] and in the High Steward Amenhotep's statue (*temp.* Amenhotep III), 10 (*Urk.* IV 1794, 19).[369] This distribution would at first suggest that with *ḥꜣ ꜣ* one piece of evidence for a dating of *Khakheperreseneb* not much later than its terminus *ante quem non* may finally be given.

Taking this step would be dangerous, however, since a pattern of attestation is itself in need of interpretation. As its textual distribution suggests, *ḥꜣ ꜣ* introducing a clause is strongly associated with, and possibly specific to, literary registers—an association that may relate to the formal expressiveness of an expression consisting in *ḥꜣ*

---

364 E.g. Moers 2001: 146 in his discussion of the passage.

365 E.g. Parkinson 1997a: 147.

366 Without going into the details of a notoriously complex issue, compare the case of the *sḏm.n=f*, which tends to display a stem *rḏ-* in the 'emphatic construction' (where the verb is in sentence-initial position) and after negation, while it tends to display a stem *ḏ-* after *iw* or a preceding clause to which it relates. In the domain of the non-future and non-modal *sḏm=f* formations similarly, past tense *sḏm=f* (used in sentence-initial position or in the bound negative construction) has the stem *rḏ-*, while the basic (/'aorist') *sḏm=f* (after *iw*, a noun phrase, or a preceding clause to which it relates) has the stem *ḏ-*.

367 Oréal 2011: 55; el-Hamrawi 2003: 131-2. In *Fowler* 12, *ꜣ* is in lacuna (*ḥꜣ* [*ꜣ*]).

368 *Nn ḥꜣ-ꜣ m-ḫt=k* 'There is no "Would that!" after you.' The lexicalized noun *ḥꜣ-ꜣ* is documented in earlier times already (*Ptahhotep* 387 L1; P has the related *ḥn-ꜣ*) (Vernus 2003a: 263).

369 *Nn wn ḏdt ḥꜣ-ꜣ r=s* 'There is nothing about which "*ḥꜣ(-)ꜣ*" was said.' Unlike the passage quoted in the previous footnote, this one has a verb *ḏd* 'say', and *ḥꜣ-ꜣ* may therefore be either a quotation, or the lexicalized expression. (For a similar ambiguity in the interpretation of the related expression *ḥꜣ-n=i* in *Merikare* E 44, Vernus 2003a: 272; sim. e.g. *Urk.* IV 61, 1; 506, 8)

(< *ḥw ꜣ*) further reinforced by *ꜣ* itself. Middle Egyptian literature, on the other hand, is highly intertextual, and two out of three other occurrences of *ḥꜣ ꜣ* are from texts, *Eloquent Peasant* and *Fowler*, that are intertextually allied with *Khakheperreseneb*; the temporal depth of such intertextuality is presently itself an unknown. The issue becomes acute in the case of *Khakheperreseneb*, a composition that, whatever its date of composition may have been, targets the very literary tradition in which *ḥꜣ ꜣ* introducing a clause is used.

In addition, both *ḥꜣ* and *ꜣ* are individually documented in the early New Kingdom,[370] and only their combination could therefore be relevant for dating. The attestation of *ḥꜣ ꜣ* heading a verbal clause, although cohesive, remains scarce (perhaps no more than the four instances mentioned above). Although *ḥꜣ ꜣ* has grammatical functions, its obsolescence can not be related to a broader process of linguistic change: the pattern of attestation of the expression is thereby exposed to the very same uncertainties as is the case with mid-/low-frequency lexical expressions. These combined uncertainties are critical, as can be illustrated by comparison with another expression, *wn.k(w) rf predicate* (§1.2, (v); §4.1.3, (v)-(vi)). Just as *ḥꜣ ꜣ*, this expression is documented only a handful times, solely in higher written registers, and may be specific to these. Leaving aside the instance in *Tod Inscription* 26-27 (of unclear dating), only four other instances are known. Of these, three cluster in the Twelfth Dynasty (*Shipwrecked Sailor* 136-137; *Sinuhe* B 252-253; Khentemsemti 4), just as three out of four occurrences of *ḥꜣ ꜣ* do. If the apparently consistent distribution of *ḥꜣ ꜣ* were taken as an argument for a terminus *post quem non* prior to the New Kingdom for *Khakheperreseneb*, then, based on the similar distribution of *wn.k(w) rf predicate*, a terminus *post quem non* prior to the New Kingdom could result for *Speos Artemidos*, which also has the expression (9-10; *Urk.* IV 385, 3).

2.7.2.3 *Khakheperreseneb* and *Eloquent Peasant*: A common literary tradition

Khakheperreseneb shares some of its lexicon with *Eloquent Peasant*, a text dating to the mid-Twelfth Dynasty, e.g. ro 12 *iꜥnw* 'woe' (also *Eloquent Peasant* R 16.6; 26.5); ro 12 *tnbḫ* 'turn aside, swerve' (also *Eloquent Peasant* B1 128; 192); vso 5 *ḥꜣbb* 'crookedness' (also *Eloquent Peasant* B1 138 *ḥꜣbb*). Among the above expressions, *tnbḫ* and *iꜥnw* are individually documented in later times as well.[371] *Ḥꜣbb* is not, but is an exceedingly rare word:[372] its pattern of attestation is therefore unreliable.

Shared lexicon between *Khakheperreseneb* and *Eloquent Peasant* may be relevant nonetheless, if considered not in terms of individual words but in terms of a set of words common to both compositions. Also shared between the two compositions are the two expressions just discussed, *rḏ.tw* and *ḥꜣ ꜣ* (*Kh.* ro 11; ro 7: §2.7.2.2). This overall constellation is noteworthy given the relative brevity of *Khakheperreseneb*

---

370 For the former, e.g. *Urk.* IV 658, 8; for the latter, §1.2, (viii.β); §6.1.3.1, (ii).

371 For *tnbḫ*, e.g. *TLA* #172520; for *iꜥnw*, below, §5.1.3.3.B.

372 Otherwise perhaps only in P. Turin 54003 ro, §1.2 (*TLA* #122520). The verb *ḥꜣb* 'be bent, crooked', another uncommon word, is also documented in *Debate* 2 (in the reading of Allen 2011: 24), yet recurs much later as well, both in a literary register (P. Anastasi III ro V.11 (*ḥꜣb*)) and in a magical one (P. Chester Beatty VIII ro 5). On the root *ḥꜣb*, Coulon 1999: 111, n.41, with further references.

and the rarity of some of these expressions (*ḫꜣbb*, *rḏ.tw*, and *ḫꜣ ꜣ*). The constellation is clearly consistent with *Khakheperreseneb* belonging to the same literary tradition as *Eloquent Peasant*, providing a tangible illustration of this on a linguistic level. It is also significant in relation to *Khakheperreseneb*'s thematizing aspects of that very tradition.

The issue then boils down to whether this literary tradition is to be conceived of as fairly concentrated in time (in which case an early dating could result for *Khakheperreseneb*), or not (in which case no such implication could be derived). This is presently itself an open question (further discussion below, §5.1.3).

2.7.3 A terminus *ante quem non* lower than by Vernus' criterion?

I now examine *Khakheperreseneb* for linguistic expressions that may suggest a terminus *ante quem non* later than the one based on Vernus' argument, to the early Thirteenth Dynasty or late Twelfth at the very earliest. Grammatical expressions are discussed first (§2.7.3.1-2) and lexical ones in turn (§2.7.3.3).[373]

2.7.3.1 Two fallacious 'arguments'

I first present two fallacious arguments: these hold only as long as the specific contents of the text to be dated are not taken into account. They are thereby illustrative of one major tenet of the present study, namely that linguistic selections are often themselves in need of interpretation, just as the contents of a text are. (Similarly fallacious arguments will not be included in subsequent chapters of the present study.)

A. The following has an instance of a *-ꜣ* demonstrative that would superficially seem to afford an indication for dating:

> (i) *Khakheperreseneb* vso 1
>
> *wḥꜥ=k n=i nꜣ nty ḫt tꜣ ntyw ḥḏ ptḫ*
>
> 'You shall explain to me those things that are through the land, the ones that were bright cast down!'

Pronominal *nꜣ* is well attested in the Middle Kingdom, both in documentary and literary registers. Only in documentary texts, however, does *nꜣ* seem to be freely used in all sorts of positions, including as antecedent to a relative clause (e.g. Illahun, P. Berlin 10038A vso 14 *nꜣ nty ḥnꜥ=f* 'those who are with him').[374] In literary

---

373 The two Eighteenth Dynasty copies of *Khakheperreseneb* include several elements of late orthography. As for other texts, these are entirely unreliable for dating. E.g. (a) verbal morphology: ro 5 *ḏd.ti=f* 'what he will say' (more typical of, although not exclusive to, the early New Kingdom: §2.3.1.1, (v)); (b) ro 6 *kt-ḫy* 'other ones, other people' (more typical of, although not specific to, the early New Kingdom: *Urk.* IV 20, 11; 736, 13; 1089, 11; see *EG* §98); note the alternation in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 77 *kt-ḫt* = R 13.7 *kt-ḫy* (Borghouts 2010: I, §24.b.1); ro 7 *kywy* (more typical of the early New Kingdom: *Urk.* IV 331, 12 *kwy*; 780, 13 *kwy*; see *EG* §98), yet already in a Middle Kingdom manuscript: P. Butler vso (*Fowler*) 14 *kiwy* (Borghouts 2010: I, §24.b.1); (c) lexical morphology: vso 1, vso 4 *iḥ* 'misery' (the New Kingdom form, common e.g. in Book of the Dead; the older form is *ꜣhw*, e.g. Mentuwoser 9; *Ptahhotep* 171 P; see *TLA* #174).

374 Kroeber 1970: 17-20.

registers, the construction is found in *Cheops' Court* (6.1; 11.10-11), which has a type-B terminus *ante quem non* to the Thirteenth Dynasty and includes elements of a lower linguistic register (§2.4.4). In a Twelfth Dynasty literary register, only one occurrence of *nꜣ* before a relative clause can be quoted, in the L1 version of *Ptahhotep* 507 *ir sḏm=k nꜣ ḏd*[...] 'if you hear these things which [I have] said.' (P, which is otherwise identical, has *nn*, as is usual in higher registers of Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian.) With the caveat resulting from the last mentioned passage, one may thus be tempted to cautiously speculate on a possible difference between documentary and literary registers, partly projecting over time; accordingly, one may be tempted to derive a weak indication for a terminus *post quem non* for *Khakheperreseneb* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty.

The argument is fallacious. As a consideration of the context implies, *nꜣ* in *Khakheperreseneb* vso 1 has strong deictic force, pointing to what the lament itself is about, the events 'through the land'. Broadly similar is *Ptahhotep* 507 itself: at the opening of the epilogue, the demonstrative points to the whole teaching, and the selection of *nꜣ* in L1 does so even more strongly (§2.4.4.2.2, (ii)). Also in the Twelfth Dynasty, a similar analysis applies to *Kagemni* 2.5 *pꜣ šfdw* 'this roll' and *Eloquent Peasant* B2 128 *nꜣy=k n sprwt* 'these petitions of yours' (§2.4.4.2.2, (i) and (iii), respectively). These are not before relative clauses, but the very selection of a demonstrative of the -*ꜣ* series is yet again at a salient junction in the overall articulation of the text, reflexive with respect to the text in which they occur. Accordingly, the use of *nꜣ* as in *Khakheperreseneb* vso 1 is fully consistent with what is otherwise observed in at least some Middle Kingdom literary registers, including Twelfth Dynasty ones.

B. *Khakheperreseneb* has another instance of *pꜣ* which may at first seem to provide an indication for dating:

(ii) *Khakheperreseneb* vso 3

ḫrt sf im mi pꜣ hrw

'Yesterday's share of it is like today's.'

In Twelfth Dynasty literary registers, nominal 'today' appears as *min* or *hrw pn*: e.g. *Debate* 104 *ḫnmsw nw min* 'the friends of today'. Similarly after the Twelfth Dynasty, in a text that is otherwise replete with *pꜣ*'s, 'today' is still *hrw pn*: *Cheops' Court* 7.3-4 *r-mn-m hrw pn* 'up to the present day'. *Pꜣ hrw* 'today', on the other hand, is documented only twice in pre-New Kingdom texts, in Heqanakht II ro 5[375] and in P. Berlin 10063.[376] In the early New Kingdom, the expression is still confined to registers that otherwise accommodate innovative expressions.[377] Of the two older expressions, *min* and *hrw pn*, the latter is here relevant, since *Khakheperreseneb* vso 3 alludes to a common formula contrasting 'yesterday' with 'today': this is realized by a

---

375 Kroeber 1970: 57, ex.1.
376 Hann*Lex* 5: 1577b.
377 Kroeber 1970: 58, ex.2-5.

demonstrative pronoun, thus *hrw pn* ('*this* day', as opposed to the days before).[378] In the Middle Kingdom, the formula invariably appears as *hrw pn*, not *pꜣ hrw*, e.g. (iii). In the early New Kingdom, on the other hand, the formulation *pꜣ hrw* is occasionally documented, e.g. (iv):

> (iii) Khentemsemti (*temp.* Amenemhat II), 4-5
>
> *ḥs wi m hrw pn r sf*
>
> 'I am more praised on this day than yesterday.'

> (iv) *Urk.* IV 1618, 14 (Nebamun's installation, *temp.* Thutmosis IV):
>
> (...) *iw nfr sw m pꜣ hrw r sf*
>
> '(...) while it is better today than yesterday.'

In terms of register, Khentemsemti's biographical inscription has various elements in common with Middle Kingdom literature (§4.1.3.C): this text would therefore seem relevant to assessing how the phrase may have been if *Khakheperreseneb* had been composed at this period in time. As to the more modern formulation in Nebamun, this is in a profane context, and contrasts with the older formulation *nfr sw m hrw pn r sf* in a funerary context in the same tomb (*Urk.* IV 1622, 13). The contrast, initially a diachronic one, has become one of registers, associated with different functions (profane vs. funerary) in the context of an early New Kingdom tomb.[379] In the tableau sketched above, *Khakheperreseb* vso 3 aligns with *m pꜣ hrw* as in the profance, more innovative, version of Nebamun. Bare attestation is thereby substantiated by a coherent distribution of registers: an indication for a late dating of *Khakheperreseneb* would seem to be given.

The above reasoning is fallacious because it fails to take into account how expression and content may relate to each other in specific ways within a given composition. *Khakheperreseneb* is about 'what happens' (ro 10), about the fact that 'changes are happening' (ro 10), about the fact that 'it is not like last year' (ro 10). An allusion to the formula contrasting 'yesterday' with 'today' is therefore generally appropriate. The deixis in *Khakheperreseneb*'s 'today', however, is much stronger than in the formula alluded to, since 'today' points to nothing less than the 'changes' 'happening', the very object of the composition. Such enhanced deixis is realized in *Khakheperreseneb* by *pꜣ*, rather than by the regular and unremarkable *pn*. Similar

---

378 *Min* is used in *Khakheperreseneb* as well, in the adverbial expression *m-min* (vso 2). Unlike the expression discussed in the main text, this is not contrastive. The expression *m-min* itself is paralleled twice in Middle Kingdom literary registers (*Debate* 5; *Sinuhe* B 186). In the New Kingdom, it recurs in Book of the Dead (*TLA* #64840). Unlike (adverbial) *min*, *m-min* is uncommon at all times.

379 The differentiation in registers extends to other expressions, e.g. circumstantial *iw* before a quality predication (*nfr sw*) in the profane context. As to the older formulation, this need not be a back-translation, as was suggested by Kroeber 1977: 58 and n.5 ('Es fällt immerhin auf, daß der Übersetzer (*scil.* translating back into Middle Egyptian, AS) nicht das alte Adverb *mjn* gebrauchte! War es ihm nicht mehr bekannt?'). Since the formulation is contrastive between 'yesterday' and 'today', *hrw pn*, not *min*, is the correct older expression. Accordingly, no deduction on the direction of translation can be made. More likely is that both formulations would have been made simultaneously, in different registers.

correlations have been discussed in Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian literary compostions (§2.4.4.2.2, (i)-(v)).

2.7.3.2 Problematic, uncertain, or insufficiently consolidated indications

I go on presenting three expressions that based on their patterns of attestation in the external record would seem to afford indications for dating, yet do not, or only limitedly. The first is problematic because differences between various types of written discourses must be taken into account. The second is uncertain because it may ultimately be on patterning, rather than on grammar proper. The third remains brittle because the current understanding of Middle Egyptian grammar is too sketchy in the relevant domain to permit consolidating (or invalidating) the argument.

A. *Khakheperreseneb* has a combination of *ḥr-ntt* with *rf*, which deserves some discussion:

> (i) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 3
>
> (...) *ḥr-ntt rf wḥmw ḏddt*
>
> '(...) for what has been said can only be repeated.'

In Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian, *ḥr-ntt* is not documented in combination with *rf*, neither in literature nor in documentary texts. Thus, in a literary register, with *ḥr-ntt* followed by the very same *nfr sw* construction as in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 3:

> (ii) *Horus and Seth* (Middle Kingdom), X+2.5
>
> (...) *ḥr-ntt dns tw r=i*
>
> '(...) for you are too heavy for me.'

Ḥr-ntt rf is, on the other hand, found in the early New Kingdom: the combination is found both in documentary texts (iii)-(iv) and in a literary one (v):

> (iii) P. Louvre 3230B (Tay to Ahmes Peniati; *temp.* Hatshepsut), 4-5
>
> (...) *ḥr-nt[t] rf šrit pw n rḫ=s b3k*
>
> '(...) for she is only a girl that does not know to work.'
>
>> Sim. 6-7 (...) *ḥr-ntt rf t3y=s mwt ḥr h3b n=i ḥr-ḏd* '(...) for your mother writes to me in these words:'
>
> (iv) P. MMA 27.3.560 (Tit to Djehuti; *temp.* Hatshepsut), 2-3
>
> (...) *ḥr-ntt rf twt th r=f m n3 n rmṯ iwnw*
>
> '(This is a message to let my lord know the matter about Ptahsokary),
> for it is correct that you have done damage to him with the people of Heliopolis.
> (Speak with the herald Geregmennefer and you both write a letter about him to the Great-of-Seers.)'

In this letter, *twt* has often been interpreted as the antiquated independent pronoun, here in an address to a superior, and *twt th* a cleft-sentence.[380] Quack[381] proposes to read differently, with *twt* a participle and *twt th* a *nfr sw* construction, as in the above tentative translation. This may perhaps be supported by *Eloquent Peasant* B1 153 *t(w)t t3wt n iwtw ḫwt=f* 'Theft suits one without belongings.' Under this interpretation, this would be the exact same construction as in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 3.

(v) Neferhotep (TT 50; *temp.* Horemheb), pl.IV, third song, 1-2

(…) *ḥr-ntt rf nn wn wny sw*

'(…) for there is none who may avoid it (*scil*. the day of death)'

And further:

- Sethi I's Year 9 *Kanais Inscription* C 4 (K*RI* I 68, 4) (…) *ḥr-nty rf st mi dpiw* '(…) for they are like crocodiles';

- *Sinuhe* AOS 64-65 (…) *ḥr-ntt rf iw i3wt h3w* '(…) for old age has descended' (the original reading of B 168 is unclear, but traditionally restored to *<n->ntt <r>f*, see below).

It is observed further that *ḥr-ntt* is not rare in the Middle Kingdom, and documented in a variety of texts, registers, and discourse situations, consistently without *rf*. Among these are letters (Heqanakht, Illahun), permitting direct comparison with early New Kingdom letters (iii)-(iv). The contrast is not easily accounted for in terms of different semantics in early New Kingdom (which routinely have *ḥr-ntt rf*) and Middle Kingdom letters (which never have it). Accordingly, *ḥr-ntt rf* in early New Kingdom letters seems to have developed into a semi-bound combination. One may be tempted, then, to relate the presence of *ḥr-ntt rf* in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 3 to a similar early New Kingdom horizon.

The argument remains problematic, however. *Ḥr-ntt rf*, as documented in early New Kingdom letters, necessarily had its origins in discourse, i.e. in freer and more strongly semantically determined uses. If the semantic analysis of *Khakheperreseneb* ro 3 proposed by Oréal[382] is to be followed, this may be just one such case. Be this as it may (I remain agnostic), the possibility itself has to be taken into account, all the more so in a text, *Khakheperreseneb*, that deploys a complexly articulated argument. In this context, *Sinuhe* B 168, if indeed to be restored as *<n->ntt <r>f*, is noteworthy as well, since this may be providing one early instance of another *X-ntt* conjunction followed by *rf*.

B. *Khakheperreseneb* ro 6-7 has a construction that may be broadly described as the use of a prepositional phrase expressing temporal extension in a nominal slot (more precise description below):

---

380 Brunner 1986[2]: 175, n.3, followed by Vernus 1990a: 65, n.33, Stauder 2013: §6.4.
381 P.c. 6/2010.
382 Oréal 2011: 88-9.

(vi) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 6-7

š3ˁ-r ḫt tpt nfryt-r iww ḥr-s3 sny=sn r sw3t

'From the first generation to the ones that come afterward, they imitate what has passed.'[383]

The construction is not paralleled in any Twelfth Dynasty register, literary or otherwise. It is, on the other hand, paralleled to varying degrees in the following passages:[384]

(vii) *Ipuwer* 3.8

r-mn-m kftiw n ii.n=sn

'From as far as Crete(?) they (*scil.* pine and oil) do not come.'[385]

(viii) Thutmosis III's *Poetical Stela* 22 (*Urk.* IV 618, 1)

r-mn-m šˁt m 3mmt=k

'As far as *Shat* is in your grasp.'

(ix) *Urk.* IV 649, 9 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*)

(...) *ḥnˁ š3ˁ-r nhrn m* [...]

'(...) and until Naharina in [...]'

(x) *Duties of the Vizier* R 9-10 (*Urk.* IV 1107, 11-12)

ir wpwty nb h(3)bw t3ti m wpwt n sr
m š3ˁ-m sr tp(y) nfryt-r sr n nfryt

'As for any messenger whom the vizier sends with a message to an official—beginning with the first official down to the last official—(...)'

> Sim. Akhenaten's *Second Proclamation* A 12-13
>
> *ḥr ir 3ḫt-itn*
> *m š3ˁ-m p3 wḏ rsy n 3ḫt-itn nfryt-r p3 wḏ mḥty m ḫ3yt r-iwd wḏ r wḏ ḥr p3 ḏw*
> *imnt[y n] 3ḫt-itn* (...)
>
> 'Now as for Akhetaten—
> starting from the southern stela of Akhetaten to the northern stela, measured between stela and stela on the western mountain of Akhetaten—(...)'.

In these passages and in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 6-7 alike, a prepositional phrase with a preposition expressing extension functions syntactically as a noun. In (vii) and (viii), this prepositional phrase is in the subject position, as in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 6-7. In (vii), this prepositional phrase in subject position is antecedent to a following anaphoric *=sn*, as in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 6-7. Of the above, three occurrences are from the early Eighteenth Dynasty, while one is from a composition, *Ipuwer*, that

---

383 Interpretation after Vernus 1995a: 14, n.q.
384 The first three were already noted by Vernus 1995a: 14, n.q.
385 Reading after Enmarch 2008: 88-9; also below, §6.2.2.5, (iv).

itself remains insecurely dated, beyond a firmly established *terminus ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty (§6.2.2.5).

Caution is here recommended in view of the overall low frequency of the construction. That the construction is not documented in Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian literary texts may have to do with a different patterning of these. Phrased with this caveat, the distribution of the construction in the record remains noteworthy and may be interpreted as weakly indicative of a post-Twelfth Dynasty dating of *Khakheperreseneb*.

C. The following construction is illustrative, finally, of how the currently still limited understanding of vast portions of Middle Egyptian grammar may hamper dating:

(xi) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 5

nn mdt ntt k3=s ḏd=s

'There is no discourse that plans how it is said(?)'

While the overall meaning, which hinges on the interpretation of *ḏd=s*, remains debated,[386] one element is clear, namely that *k3* is the full lexical verb *k3i* 'devise, plan, plot'.[387] The construction in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 5 is therefore an instance of the rare *nty sḏm=f*.

In Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian, finite forms after *nty* are by and large limited to negative constructions, mostly passive ones.[388] Among non-negative *nty*-headed relative clauses with finite verbs, a single instance of *nty sḏm.n=f* has been quoted for Middle Egyptian: this is from an extremely specific context, which accounts for the selection of an analytical strategy in this particular case.[389] No

---

386 In the above tentative translation, I interpret *ḏd* as an infinitive. Similarly for grammar, but with a different overall interpretation, e.g. Dils, *TLA*: 'Es gibt (bisher?) keine Rede, die ihr Zitiert-Werden beabsichtigt(?).' Not to be ruled out is an interpretation of *ḏd=s* as a finite form in circumstantial function, as favored by Vernus (1995a: 4): 'Il n'y a pas de parole qui envisage l'avenir en faisant sens.' A full summary of the various translations, and associating interpretations, to which this difficult verse has been subjected is given in Dils, *TLA*.

387 Vernus 1995a: 13.

388 *EG* §201. E.g. *Shipwrecked Sailor* 73 (...) *nty n m3.t(w)=f* '(...) one who has not been seen'; *Eloquent Peasant* B1 347 (...) *nty n pḥ.n.tw=f* '(...) that can not be reached'. That negative constructions can display analytic relativization strategies (i.e. *nty*-headed ones, as opposed to synthetic ones, with participles and relative forms) has a straightforward rationale in processing, since negative clauses are inherently more difficult to process than positive ones. An account in terms of processing is further confirmed by the propensity of negative *nty*-headed clauses to be more often than not in the passive, itself more difficult to process than the active.

389 Siut I 295 (...) *p3 t3 ḥnḳt irrw* (or *irw: <iw r w>*) *n=i t3 ḳnbt nt ḥwt-nṯr nty rd.n=i n=ṯn sw* '(...) this bread and beer which this council of the temple 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 ḥnḳt*), from which it is separated by another relative construction (*ir(r)w n=i t3 ḳnbt nt ḥwt-nṯr*): the selection of a *nty*-headed clause is probably a strategy to ease processing. Alternative accounts that have been proposed are in semantic terms: specific expression of perfect aspect, with current relevance (Allen 2013: 197, ex.12.176), or underlining of a pivotal element (here the destinee, *n=ṯn*) (Borghouts 2010: I, §109.d). In any event, the construction in Siut I 295, which remains unparalleled in Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian, relates to the specific determinations of this passage.

Middle Egyptian instance of *nty sḏm=f* is known.[390] In Old Egyptian, two occurrences have been noted:[391] the construction then remains exceptional and may have served to 'specifiy a temporal relationship between the antecedent and the action of the relative clauses', thus 'denoting a situation of limited validity'.[392] Any such nuance seems to be absent in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 5, which has general validity.

The construction is, on the other hand, occasionally documented in post-classical times (a), in Late Egyptian (b), and in Traditional Egyptian (c):[393]

(a) *Early New Kingdom varieties of Middle Egyptian*[394]

(xii) *Installation of the Vizier* 11

(...) *wḏꜥ-mdw nty kꜣ=f ir n=f* (...)

'(...) a judgment which he plans to do to him (*scil.* the appealing petitioner) (...)'

(xiii) *Litany of the Sun*, 6th Invocation[395]

(...) *nty ḏwi=f nṯrw=f* (...)

'(...) who calls to his gods (...)'

---

390 At first, CT II 375c-376a (all variants: two from Saqqara, eleven from Bersheh) could be read as (...) *ḏw pf n bꜣḫw nty pt tn rhn=s ḥr=f* '(...) this mountain of Bakhu on which the sky leans'. This would then be an instance of *nty NP sḏm=f*, itself entirely unparalleled. A parallel passage has *ḏw pf bꜣḫw nty pt tn rhn.ti ḥr=f* (quoted in *EG* §328): as noted by Winand & Gohy (2011: 215, n.109), this strongly suggests that CT II 376a is itself to be read as *nty pt tn rhn s(i) ḥr=f*. While a construction *nty NP nfr sw* would be odd in general, the present case, in the third person feminine singular, is merely an instance of *nfr s(i)* as the morphological alternant to the third person feminine singular pseudoparticiple.

391 Edel 1955-1964: §1058.

392 Allen 2013: 197, ex.12.173, 12.174.

393 Lastly, Winand & Gohy 2011: 213-5, with references to previous discussions (n.99-102).

394 These two parallels are already drawn by Vernus 1995a: 13, n.m. Possibly different is the case of the following passage, which may involve a *mrr=f* form (although it need not: the long written stem *m*ꜣꜣ- can in post-classical times stand for other forms than the *mrr=f*): Book of the Dead 90 Nu, 2-3 (quoted after *EG* §201) (...) *irty=k ipn nty m*ꜣꜣ*=k im=sn m mꜣswt.k(i)* '(...) these two eyes of yours by which you see on your knees'. Unclear in interpretation is *Heavenly Cow* 8-9 (R.II+R.III) *wn.in ḥm=f ḥr siꜣ mdt nt kꜣt* (or: *kꜣ.t(w)*, or *kꜣ.t(i)*) *r=f in rmt* 'His Majesty recognized the matter that was being devised against him by the people' (on the dating of *Heavenly Cow*, below, §4.6). If the spelling of *nt* is followed, this may be a case of *n + infinitive*. This construction, however, seems to be preferred with non-referential antecedents (this is an impression based on text-reading, a dedicated study remains to be done)—unlike what is the case here. This then leaves two options: either as the construction here discussed, in the passive (*nt(t) kꜣ.t(w)*), or as an analytical relative construction with a pseudoparticiple (*nt(t) kꜣ.t(i)*). I fail to find a way to decide between these options.

395 Text: Hornung 1975: 11. As regards the dating, the composition includes various Old Egyptian expressions and a dating to the Old Kingdom has been proposed (Quack 2000b: 559). However, these expressions could all be accounted for in later periods as well (in relevant details, Werning 2013). Moreover, the composition includes various features that upon closer analysis turn out not to be Old Egyptian at all, but only Old Egyptian-looking; these are identified as such by an analysis of form-function mismatches of various sorts (similarly for *Amduat*, Jansen-Winkeln 2012). In the case of *Litany*, the following have been noted: postposed *ist* coordinating clauses, not nouns (Werning 2013: #26); *pn N* outside balanced contexts (#27; further Werning 2011: I, 190-1; 259); *sw*-headed constructions (Werning 2013: #33; §4.7.3 in the present study); *swt is* constructions (Werning 2013: #34). These point to an early New Kindom dating of the composition, at least in its present wording (Werning 2013: §4).

(b) *Late Egyptian*

(xiv) *Wenamun* 2.27-28 (*LES* 69.13)[396]

(...) *pȝ nty wn=f*

'(...) the one who was there'

    Sim. P. BM EA 10375, 14-15; *LEM* 73, 7-8; Taharqa, 4.[397]

(c) *Traditional Egyptian*[398]

(xv) P. Harris Magical vso I.2-5[399]

ḫtm rȝ n mȝiw ḫtwt tp n iȝwt nb ḳȝ sḏ sp-sn
nty wnm=w m iwf swr=w m snf r stwhȝ=w nḥm msḏr=w (...)

'Seal the mouth of lions, hyenas, all type of long-tailed livestock
that eats meat and drinks blood, to bewitch them, to take their hearing (...)'

    Sim. *ibid*, vso II.3-5; P. Brooklyn 47.218.135, V.7-8.[400]

In interpreting the occurrence of the same construction in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 5, a first issue is whether the two isolated Old Kingdom instances of *nty sḏm=f* are to be related to the later occurrences of *nty sḏm=f*, and if so, how. As mentioned above, the former may have different semantics than the latter; the mere fact of a formal commonality between the two need not imply continuity over time, since an analytical construction may have emerged at two different periods independently. Alternatively, continuity in language use could be posited: even so, however, this need not imply that the construction was part of the written standards that defined Middle Egyptian.

A second interpretive issue lies with the pattern of attestation of the construction. In the New Kingdom itself, the construction remains uncommon, and this although relativization itself is an important functional domain in language. The non-occurrence of the construction in earlier times must then be interprteted against such general rarity. In the Middle Kingdom, the record is perhaps dense enough for this to be significant; in the Second Intermediate Period, it is certainly not. Moreover, diachronic studies in the domain of relativization remain a desideratum as of 2013: the change that could here be relevant can therefore not be related to broader processes of change affecting the domain. The overall assessment must therefore be barely descriptive: the construction *nty sḏm=f* in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 5 is not documented with such semantics before the New Kingdom. This is noteworthy, since the

---

396 Dedicated discussion of the grammar of this passage: Winand 2007; for an analysis of the complex literary implications, notably for Wenamun's very name, Moers 2001: 92-4.
397 Winand & Gohy 2011: 214, ex.281-3.
398 Also Vernus 1982: 83, n.15.
399 Winand & Gohy 2011: 213, ex.279. As discussed by the authors, *wnm* and *swr* can not be (old) *mrr=f* or (recent) *i.mr=f* for the morphological, respectively semantic, reasons discussed by the authors. As also discussed by the authors, the context makes a general present tense translation vastly preferable over a past tense one. Accordingly, this is a genuine instance of *nty sḏm=f* with general present tense, as in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 5.
400 Winand & Gohy 2011: 213, ex.280; 214, ex.284.

construction also remains undocumented in other Middle Egyptian literary registers. How relevant this is for dating remains unclear.

2.7.3.3   The lexicon

Among lexical expressions in *Khakheperreseneb*, the following two are most note-worthy:

(i) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 6-7 *š3ꜥ-r* (...) *nfryt-r* (...) 'from (...) until (...)'

The expression is not otherwise attested in this particular form. In a slightly different form, as *š3ꜥ-n* (...) *nfryt-r* (...), it is found twice in Illahun (P. Berlin 10074 vso 4; P. Berlin 10225 vso 2).[401] It recurs as *š3ꜥ-m* (...) *nfryt-r* (...) in the Eighteenth Dynasty, when it is not uncommon, e.g. *Urk.* IV 38, 12; 125, 12; 648, 6; 776, 4; 895, 16; *Duties of the Vizier* R 10 (*Urk.* IV 1107, 12);[402] later in the Dynasty also e.g. Akhenaton's *Second Proclamation* A 12; A 13; A 24; Tutankhamun's *Restoration Stela* 6 (*Urk.* IV 2027, 4); Neferhotep (TT 50), pl.LX, 238. The expression in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 6-7 differs from these only by the first part, *š3ꜥ-r*.

   As regards *š3ꜥ-r*, this has a fairly limited distribution which is itself not without interest: the expression occurs once in the Thirteenth Dynasty P. Bulaq 18,[403] several times in *Kamose Inscriptions* (T. Carn. 4 and *passim*), then in Thutmosis III's *Annals* (*Urk.* IV 649, 9).[404] *Š3ꜥ-r* thus appears limited to a period stretching from the Thirteenth to the early Eighteenth Dynasty; in this period, it remains confined to texts that are otherwise fairly innovative linguistically.

   Weaving the above together, *š3ꜥ-r* (...) *nfryt-r* (...) is indicative of a terminus *ante quem non* by the Thirteenth Dynasty for *Khakheperreseneb*. Whether this can be narrowed down further is uncertain: one may observe that early occurrences (of *š3ꜥ-n* (...) *nfryt-r* (...) in Illahun, and of *š3ꜥ-r* in P. Bulaq 18) are from documentary registers, and that the expression may have spread only later to literary registers such as in *Khakheperreseneb*. This remains impossible to confirm.

(ii) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 10 (= O. Cairo JE 50249 1) and vso 1 *nk3* 'think about, meditate on'

In a literary register, the expression recurs only in *Fishing and Fowling* A2.8.[405] The word is perhaps once attested in the pre-New Kingdom record, in an isolated and possibly problematic Coffin Text instance.[406] *Nk3* is, on the other hand, found in

---

401 *TLA* #550077.

402 On the dating of *Duties*, §2.8.3.5.

403 *DZA* 29.946.600.

404 Later also *r-š3ꜥ-r*: P. Mook II.1 (*temp.* Thutmosis IV; quoted in *EG* §180); *Chonsemhab* O. Louvre N667+N700 IV.x+8 (*TLA* #854087).

405 Parkinson 2002: 110, 229, with a discussion of the different overtones of *nk3* in *Fishing and Fowling* and *Khakheperreseneb*.

406 CT VI 251b (see Faulkner 1973-1978: II, 213 and 214, n. 2). The passage is preserved only in two witnesses, one of which (Sq6C) is presumably faulty (*sk3*). The other one (Sq3C) has *nk3*, but with a semogram (Z9) different from the expected one (A2). The other instance quoted in Hann*Lex* 5: 1351c (*Sinuhe* B 72 = R 96) is to be read otherwise, as *nn k3=f* (*nn sḏm=f*, after a *iw=f r sḏm* construction), see already *DZA* 25.315.040.

various places in the early New Kingdom:[407] *Urk*. IV 46, 16; 138, 14; 434, 8; 1381, 8; Book of the Dead, *passim*.[408] Literary texts securely dated to the Middle Kingdom, for their part, consistently use (etymologically related) *kꜣi* 'think about' with roughly similar semantic extension,[409] as do contemporaneous inscriptional texts.[410] Given this pattern of attestation, the single (problematic) Coffin Text example evoked above does not stand in the way of an assessment of *nkꜣ* as typical of the early New Kingdom. Taking into account the low density of the Second Intermediate Period record, the expression is indicative of a post-Middle Kingdom language in the literary sphere.

There can be no guarantee, however, that *nkꜣ* is original in the two instances in which it occurs in *Khakheperreseneb* (a similar comment extends to the instance in *Fishing and Fowling*). *Sinuhe* G once has *nkꜣ* where B and R have *kꜣi* (B 6 = R 30),[411] and *Ptahhotep* L2 similarly once has *nkꜣ* where P has *kꜣi* (117). In the same texts, *kꜣi* is just as often, if not slightly more often, left standing: *Ptahhotep* 345 L2 has *kꜣi* as in L1, and *Sinuhe* AOS preserves *kꜣi* in all other places (B 72, B 112, B 131; also B 144, preserved only in P4). In *Khakheperreseneb* (and/or *Fishing and Fowling*), *nkꜣ* may thus well be original, or it may not be.

2.7.3.4   Expressions recurring combined

Several of the expressions discussed above as possibly indicative for dating recur combined in some texts.

Kares (*Urk*. IV 45-9; *temp*. Amenhotep I)[412] has *nkꜣ* constructed indirectly (*nkꜣ m*: *Urk*. IV 46, 16; also *Kh*. ro 10, §2.7.3.3, (ii)).[413] Just a few lines below, the same text has the uncommon idiom *ḥꜣp ḫt ḥr* 'to keep silent about' (*Urk*. IV 47, 10; also *Kh*. ro 13).[414]

Nkꜣ recurs in the *Vizieral Cycle* (*Appointment of the Vizier* 11). In the same group of texts tightly related to each other, an instance of *nty sḏm=f* is found in a formulation that closely compares with the one in *Khakheperreseneb* (*Installation of the Vizier* 11; also *Kh*. ro 5, §2.7.3.2.C). The *Cycle* also has *šꜣꜥ-m* (...) *nfryt-r* (...) (*Duties of the Vizier* R 10;[415] also *Kh*. ro 6-7, §2.7.3.3, (i)). In both texts, the prepositional phrase expresses extension is used as if a noun phrase (§2.7.3.2.B). Of the above, the second and fourth constructions are rare, and therefore remarkable.

Šꜣꜥ-m (...) *nfryt-r* (...) recurs in Thutmosis III's *Jardin Botanique* (*Urk*. IV 776, 4). The same short text also has the very rare, and therefore remarkable, expression *ḥppy* 'extraordinary' (*Urk*. IV 775, 15; also *Kh*. ro 2, §2.4.5, (ii)). Related to *Jardin Botanique* both by contents and in space, Thutmosis III's *Annals*, provides one of very

---

407 *DZA* 25.315.010: 'nur Dyn. 18' (NB: before de Buck's edition of Coffin Texts).
408 *TLA* #89260 and the associated *DZA* files.
409 *Sinuhe* B 6; B 72; B 112; B 131; B 144 (and the equivalent passages in R); *Ptahhotep* 117 P; 255 P; 267 P; 345 L1; *Sasobek* B1 7 (references from *TLA* #163220).
410 E.g. *Semna Stela* 3. Further Hann*Lex* 5: 2541b-c.
411 G is followed by AOS, while C preserves *kꜣi*.
412 On Kares and this text, now Gnirs 2013b: 156-9.
413 Already Gardiner 1909: 101.
414 Already Gardiner 1909: 104.
415 On the dating of *Duties*, §2.8.3.5.

few instances of *šꜥ-r* (*Urk.* IV 649, 9; §2.7.3.3, (i)), again in the construction as if a noun phrase.

2.7.4   Dating *Khakheperreseneb*

In dating *Khakheperreseneb*, only one full-fledged linguistic argument is given, Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion (§2.6.2.5; §2.7.1.B). This implies a terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty, or perhaps late Twelfth. By any event, the composition is later than the reign of Senwosret II, by a few decades or by much more.

Khakhaperreseneb includes two rare expressions that are only documented in the Middle Kingdom (*rd.tw*; *ḥꜣ ꜣ clause*: §2.7.2.2). Both are sparsely attested and in literature only: they therefore only demonstrate that *Khakheperreseneb* belongs to a common Middle Egyptian literary tradition, which according to a common interpretation the composition refers to and emulates. Unless an independent hypothesis is made to imply that such literary tradition was fairly concentrated in time, these expressions do not afford an indication for dating.

Khakhaperreseneb also includes a series of expressions not documented in the Middle Kingdom, and for several of these not before the early New Kingdom (§2.7.3.2-3); in all cases, bare patterns of attestation are in need of interpretation. One grammatical expression could very well have existed earlier than its first secure attestation (*ḥr-ntt rf*: §2.7.3.2.A) and does not, therefore, provide a reliable indication. One lexical expression points to a post-Twelfth Dynasty dating, but it can not be determined that this is original in the text (*nkꜣ*: §2.7.3.3, (ii)). Another grammatical expression is uncertain because of the low numbers involved, but would seem to point to a Late Middle Kingdom terminus *ante quem non* (a prepositional phrase expressing extension used as if a noun phrase: §2.7.3.2.B). Another one may point to a post-Twelfth Dynasty dating, but the relevant chapter of Middle Egyptian grammar still needs to be written for any argument to be consolidated (*nty sḏm=f*: §2.7.3.2.C). A stronger indication for a dating no earlier than the Thirteenth Dynasty is given by one prepositional expression (*šꜥ-r* (...) *nfryt-r* (...): §2.7.3.3, (i)). Some indications thus converge in confirming a dating no earlier than to the early Thirteenth Dynasty, but none implies a more precise dating.

Going beyond individual linguistic items, *Khakheperreseneb* shares a series of expressions, grammatical and lexical, with *Eloquent Peasant*, some rare and therefore noteworthy (§2.7.3). Conversely, other similarly rare and remarkable expressions in *Khakheperreseneb* recur, grouped, in a set of early Eighteenth Dynasty texts (§2.7.3.4). As these conflicting groupings imply, no definite argument can be derived in either direction. One could for example speculate that elements shared with *Eloquent Peasant* reflect the common Middle Egyptian literary tradition to which both compositions relate, while elements in common with certain early Eighteenth Dynasty texts would reflect the horizon in which *Khakheperreseneb* was composed: this is possible, but would be purely an hypothesis, not any more backed up by independent linguistic argument.

Linguistically, *Khakheperreseneb* could therefore have been composed at any moment in time between the early Thirteenth and the early Eighteenth Dynasty. In dating the composition further, one major issue would be until when the type of literary discourse *Khakheperreseneb* is an exponent of—what has been termed 'discourses'—remained productive. Answering this question is in no small part dependent on the dating of *Ipuwer*, which remains unclear beyond a similar terminus *ante quem non* to the early Thirteenth Dynasty (§6.2.2.5), and of *Khakheperreseneb* itself.

2.8 The limitations of linguistic dating 2: The *Teaching for Merikare*

2.8.1 Introduction

The *Teaching for Merikare*[416] is first documented in early New Kingdom manuscripts: P. Petersburg 1116 A vso (= E), P. Moscow 4658 (= M), and P. Carlsberg VI (= C).[417] Of these, the first has accounts on its recto dating to Amenhotep II; the copy of the literary text could date to a slightly later period, from Thutmosis IV to Amenhotep III.[418] P. Moscow 4658 dates to the late Eighteenth Dynasty and P. Carlsberg VI probably to the same period, although a later dating has been proposed. In terms of circulation, P. Petersburg 1116 A is broadly Memphite (Perunefer) and associates the composition with *Neferti*, documented on P. Petersburg 1116 B vso. P. Moscow 4658 was bought in Thebes and probably derives from a single find that includes other Middle Egyptian literary texts;[419] of these, two were composed in the Twelfth Dynasty (*Sinuhe* and *Ptahhotep*), while for two other ones (*Fishing and Fowling* and *Sporting King*) a later date of composition deserves serious consideration (§3.2; §4.3). P. Carlsberg VI is of unknown provenience. Unlike various other Middle Egyptian compositions of as yet insecure dating, *Merikare* does not feature among the early New Kingdom Assiut graffiti.

The dating of the composition to the time of its Herakleopolitan setting, once contemplated, has been shown to be baseless.[420] At a time when the model of an early Twelfth Dynasty political literature was dominant, a detailed argument has been put forward to date *Merikare* to the reign of Senwosret I.[421] Focusing on the closing

---

416 Text: Quack 1992.
417 Quack 1992: 10-2.
418 Lastly Gnirs 2006: 254-5.
419 On this find, lastly Hagen 2012a: 179-80.
420 In decisive terms, Björkman 1964 and Quack 1992: 114-20. For a history of early research, also Burkard & Thissen 2012⁴: 111-3.
421 Quack 1992: 120-36. The argument is to be read in relation to the particular interpretive frame it makes reference to, and upon which it is therefore contingent. Also to be taken into account is that a series of texts adduced by the author to outline an early Twelfth Dynasty context for *Merikare* are themselves of as yet insecure dating: these include *Neferti* (Quack 1992: 121), *Amenemhat* (123), *Loyaliste* (124-5), *Tod Inscription* (128-30), and *Berlin Leather Roll* (131-2); for linguistic perspectives on these texts, below (*Neferti*: §5; *Amenemhat*: §6; *Loyaliste* §4.5; *Berlin Leather Roll*: §4.2). The remaining texts considered by Quack are firmly dated: whether these suffice to

hymn, a dating to the early Eighteenth Dynasty has been suggested by another author.[422] With a view on the whole composition, a detailed argument for a dating to the same period has been proposed more recently.[423] A preference for a late, rather than early, Twelfth Dynasty dating has also been expressed,[424] as has one for a dating to the Middle Kingdom more generally;[425] another author suspends his judgement altogether.[426] The text in its present shape is difficult both philologically and semantically, making attempts at a linguistic dating no easier.

2.8.2   A terminus *post quem non* earlier than the Eighteenth Dynasty?

In attempting to define a linguistic terminus *post quem non* pointing to a period earlier than the first manuscript attestation, the grammar of *Merikare* is considered on various levels: first as a literary token of Middle Egyptian in general (§2.8.2.1), then with a view on expressions that are less accesible because they are uncommon in text (§2.8.2.2) or because they involve a subtle contrast in function (§2.8.2.3).

---

outline a context specific enough for dating *Merikare* is unclear, however. I do not agree with the interpretation that Mentuwoser (*temp.* Senwosret I), 14 should be viewed as quoting *Merikare* E 43-44 (Quack 1992: 134; originally Kees 1928: 76-8), thereby providing a terminus *post quem non* for the literary text (Quack 1992: 135-6). While Quack rightly observes that the formulation is not common (134), this need not imply a direct dependency: Middle Egyptian written culture is generally intertextual to a high degree. Moreover, suggesting that the literary text must have been the 'Vorbild' (Quack 1992: 134) makes significant assumptions on the relationship between various types of written discourses. More likely is a scenario by which both texts, the biographical and the literary one, would have drawn on a similar motif (for which see also *Aametju* 16 (below, n.527) and Rekhmire 37 (*Urk.* IV 1082, 14: Fischer-Elfert 1999: 144-5). Noteworthy is also the encounter between *Merikare* E 44 and *Ptahhotep* L2 418-419 (Fischer-Elfert 1988: 184; 1999: 168, interpreted by the author as a quotation from the former in the latter): this further documents the motif in an Eighteenth Dynasty horizon. Quack (1992: 12, with reference to an observation originally made by Posener) further mentioned that some hieratic sign forms in witness E may suggest a Middle Kingdom Vorlage. This is discussed critically by Giewekemeyer 2013: n.7; for issues relating to the form of script in literary manuscripts and in documentary texts, further Gnirs 2013b: 128, n.4; also Parkinson 2002: 313.

422 Bickel 1994: 178-9, 214-9, based on the anthropocentristic orientation of the closing hymn and differences in cosmology with Coffin Texts. The first of these elements was noted as innovative by Blumenthal (1980) already, who suggested that the hymn may have originally stood as an independent piece. Yet, as Parkinson's (2002: 254-7) reading implies, the hymn is integral to the overall composition, of which it is a 'culmination', 'with universalized assertions' (254). Stadler (2009: 375) comments that the characterization of the creator god in the hymn is in fact documented in the Middle Kingdom. This is based on BD 175a and *Heavenly Cow*. Yet, the dating of the former text to the Middle Kingdom remains itself an hypothesis only, if one argued for by the author. As regards *Heavenly Cow*, linguistic analysis (called for by Stadler 2009: 375, n.115) demonstrates that this text was composed in the Eighteenth Dynasty (§4.6). More consequential is the caveat expressed by Parkinson (2002: 254, 316), that the differences observed by Bickel could be 'of discourses rather than chronology'.

423 Gnirs 2006. Skepticism has been voiced on various sides (e.g. Hagen 2012a: 155, n.23; Burkard & Thissen 2012[4]: 112-3; Stadler 2009: 375), yet no author has so far engaged with the argument any further.

424 Parkinson 2002: 248-9, 316 (in cautious terms).

425 Quirke 2004a: 112: 'probably of Middle Kingdom date'.

426 Vernus 2010[2]b: 206, upon reception of Gnirs' (2006) proposal.

2.8.2.1   Middle Egyptian language

As far as the present author was able to determine, the Middle Egyptian of *Merikare* would be generally consistent both with a Middle Kingdom and an early Eighteenth Dynasty dating. Pars pro toto, this is illustrated by two expressions:

(i) *Merikare* E 128-129

šsp bit nt ꜥk̠-ib r iwꜣ n ir isft

'The character of the right-hearted one is more acceptable[427] than the ox of the evil-doer.'

> Sim. E 91; E 102; E 130.[428]
>
> The construction, a *nfr sw* pattern with a passive participle as predicate is common in Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian literature; it is similarly productive in higher written registers of the early New Kingdom (§2.7.2.1, (iii)).

(ii) *Merikare* E 120-121

ḫpr.n is m irt.n=i
rḫ.n(=i) st r-sꜣ ir.tw{=i}

'It happened through my own doing,
although I learnt about it only after it had been done.'

> This would fit a Middle Kingdom dating. It would fit a later one just as well: for discourse-connective *is* in the early New Kingdom, §1.2, (ix) and §5.1.4.2, (viii)-(ix); for subjectless clauses, in the active with *ḫpr* and in the passive (here *ir.tw*), e.g. Thutmosis I's *Abydos Stela* 5 (*Urk*. IV 96, 14-15) *šꜣ ḫrp wḏ ir.tw* 'Command, and it will occur; order and it will be done.'
>
> Only *r-sꜣ* followed by a verbal form warrants some discussion. The construction is well documented in literary texts securely dated to the Middle Kingdom (*Debate* 153; *Shipwrecked Sailor* 179-180; 180-181). In *Merikare*, *r-sꜣ* + *verb* recurs, fronted, in E 7 *ir r-sꜣ ḫpr mdt=k r b*[...] 'When your discourse has taken place about [...]'. The fronted construction is found in two Middle Kingdom documentary texts (P. Reisner II, pl.5, 13; P. Berlin 10025 vso 9). Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptional texts generally use another construction with similar functions, *m-ḫt sḏm=f* (e.g. *Urk*. IV 139, 10); also in fronted position, *ir m-ḫt sḏm=f* (e.g. *Urk*. IV 768, 11-13). Yet, *r-sꜣ* + *verb* is documented in a literary composition later than the Twelfth Dynasty (*Cheops' Court* 6.11) and recurs in medical texts (e.g. P. Ebers 21.13; 41.16; also, fronted, in 44.2),[429] in Book of the Dead,[430] and in *Duties of the Vizier* R 21 (*Urk*. IV 1112, 4).[431] Under the

---

427 Following Vernus' (1995a: 10) semantic analysis.

428 Quack 1992: 55, n.a.

429 Medical texts display various antiquated expressions and may well harken back to a tradition reaching deep in time, yet are not necessarily much earlier in their present form than their first manuscript attestation at the turn of the early New Kingdom. A linguistic dating of medical texts remains to be attempted.

430 See *TLA* #80017.

431 For the dating of *Duties of the Vizier*, below, §2.8.3.5.

hypothesis of a later date of composition of *Merikare*, *r-sꜣ* + *verb* could have been selected in a literary register for its slightly antiquated quality, instead of *m-ḫt* + *verb* favored in inscriptional texts. This possibility is directly documented by *Neferkare and Sisene*, a composition which is argued below to date to the Eighteenth Dynasty (§4.4): P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+14 *ir-sꜣ ꜥk=f ḥm=f* [...] 'After His Majesty entered [...]'. The same composition also has *m-ḫt* + *verb*, what is more in the form *ḫr m-ḫt* (P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+9: §4.4.4.1).

2.8.2.2   Rare expressions

Expressions that are uncommon in text have a specific status. While their patterns of attestation are comparatively less reliable, they also stand a better chance of providing a terminus *post quem non* inasmuch as rarity translates into lesser exposure (compare §1.2.A). Conversely, documenting that even rare expressions were cultivated in relevant registers in post-Middle Kingdom times can contribute further characterizing the grammar of *Merikare* as not specifically related to the Middle Kingdom.

(i) *Merikare* E 91

is ꜥꜣmw ḥs[a] *ḳsn pw n bw nt=f im*

'Behold, the vile[432] Asiatic, he is a painful thing for the place where he is.'

The sentence-initial particle *isw* is very rare and remains poorly understood in its functions.[433] In the Middle Kingdom, *isw* is famously attested, no less than nine times, in one text, the Illahun Hymns to Senwosret III,[434] while it apparently remains undocumented otherwise in this period. The particle recurs in the main Eighteenth Dynasty witness of another Middle Egyptian literary composition of as yet insecure dating, *Amenemhat* (6e P. Millingen; the other early witness here preserved, T. Carnarvon 5, probably had *ist*: §6.1.3.2). The expression also recurs in *Mutter und Kind* VIII.4 (Spruch M), a text documented in an Eighteenth Dynasty witness (P. Berlin 3027) and arguably a post-Middle Kingdom composition (§5.3.4.2, (iii)). In addition, *isw* is found inserted in an Eighteenth Dynasty witness of *Sinuhe*, S 4 (followed by G and Ramesside witnesses; R 7-8 without the particle) *is ḥꜥw nṯr ꜣbḫ m ir sw*.[435] While the reading is here secondary, it contributes demonstrating that *isw* was part of early New Kingdom littérateurs' Middle Egyptian repertoires. The expression, which apparently was never a common one, recurs in yet later times.[436]

---

432 It has been proposed to emend *ḥs* away (Quack 1992: 55, n.b.). However, the translation associated with this proposal ('Wahrlich, der Asiat ist übel dran (...)') does not fit the classifying semantics of the *ḳsn pw* construction (similarly Vernus 2010²b: 208-9).

433 Oréal 2011: 253.

434 Different interpretation by Oréal 2011: 253.

435 Discussed by Parkinson 2009: 182, n.16; Gnirs 2013a: 379.

436 *TLA* #851437: in Book of the Dead, *passim*; in *Two Brothers*, *passim* (several instances are interrogative, as noted in *TLA*); perhaps in Traditional Egyptian (where the possibility that *is* stands as a spelling for *ist* must be discussed in each case individually). In addition, *isw* may be related to Coptic ⲉⲓⲥ, which would imply a continuous use well after the early New Kingdom, although not necessarily in those written standards that were committed to writing.

(ii) *Merikare* E 87-88

nn mn n=k ḥˁpi tm=f iw
b3k<t> m-ˁ=k nt t3-mḥw

'The Nileflood will not be painful to you if it fails to come:
For the labor-dues of the Delta are in your hand.'

As is reflected in various translations, different grammatical analyses have been contemplated:

(α) It has been proposed to view *ḥˁpi tm=f iw* as a noun clause forming the subject to *mn*, with a translation as 'Nicht wird für dich schlimm sein, daß eine Überschwemmung nicht kommt.'[437] This implies a left-extraposition of a nominal constituent (*ḥˁpi*) within a noun clause embedded into a higher syntactic node. Left-extraposition, however, is strictly limited to main clauses in Middle Egyptian.[438]

(β) It has been proposed that *nn* would have scope over both *mn n=k ḥˁpi* and *tm=f iw*, for a translation as 'The Nileflood will not be sick for you and fail to come.'[439] The construction *nn tm=f sḏm* is otherwise documented,[440] but no case is known in which *nn* has scope over two successive clauses as would here be the case.[441]

(γ) It has finally been proposed that *tm=f iw* may relate to the *following* clause to which it would provide a setting, for a translation along the lines of: 'The Nileflood will not be sick to you: (Even) when it fails to come, the labor duties of the Delta belong to you.'[442] This is possible grammatically and would yield a meaning similar to the one in the reading here advocated. It is less likely than the latter, however, because of the markedly irregular verse lengths that would result.

Accordingly, *ḥˁpi* is the subject of *mn* and *tm=f iw* a circumstantial clause, expressing a condition to the main clause *nn mn n=k ḥˁpi*.[443]

Tm=f sḏm after the main clause generally seems to express a condition.[444] It is only sparsely documented, in the Old Kingdom (iii) and in the Middle Kingdom (iv) alike, yet recurs later as well, if with what seems to be a somewhat different meaning,

---

437 Quack 1992: 53, n.b.
438 Left-extraposition is never documented in the Middle Egyptian record in any environments other than main clauses. The functional rationale is that left-extraposition, a marked-topic construction, has to do with topic-focus articulation, and thereby with inter-sentential cohesion; the construction can not, therefore, occur in a clause that is embedded into a higher syntactic node. That interpretation (α) is impossible is also noted by Vernus 1997: 7, n.17.
439 Parkinson 1997a: 223.
440 E.g. *Sinuhe* B 74-75 *nn tm=f ir bw nfr* 'He will not fail to do good.'
441 In similar environments, *nn* is repeated, e.g. with full noun subjects, *Eloquent Peasant* B1 151-152 *nn n=k nn n=s nn <r>=s nn r=k n irr=k* (or *ir=k*) *st n irr=<s>* (or *ir=<s>*) *st* 'what is not for you is not for her; what not against her, not against you; you will(?) not do it, she will(?) not do it!' (transl. Parkinson 2012a: 128-9).
442 Dils, *TLA*.
443 Similarly Allen 2013: 130, ex.9.114; Vernus 1997: 7, n.17; *EG*, p.265, n.4.
444 The listing below is by no means exhaustive, nor is the semantic description of the construction fully clear: a dedicated study of *tm=f sḏm* after a main clause remains a desideratum.

possibly contextual (v). In view of the low density of attestation of the construction at all times, no argument can be made that it had become obsolete by the early Eighteenth Dynasty, a few generations only after Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree*:

(iii) Pyr. §499c[W]

n id=f tm=f sḏm ḫrw=k

'He will not be deaf if he does not hear your voice.'[445]

(iv) P. Ramesseum III B 10-11

rḏt šsp ḫrd tm=f snkw

'Making a child take (milk) when it does not suck.'[446]

And elsewhere in medical texts, e.g. P. Ebers 49.8.[447]

(v) Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree* 5-6

imi ḫsf.tw n=f m iȝt=f nṯ[sic] *ḥwt-nṯr m sȝ n sȝ iwꜥ n iwꜥ*
ptḫ ḥr tȝ
nḥmw ꜥkw=f ḏrf<=f> wꜥbwt=f
tm sḫȝt rn=f m rȝ-pr pn mi irrt r mity=f sbi ḥr ḫftiw nṯr=f
dr sšw=f m ḥwt-nṯr nṯ[sic] *mnw m pr-ḫḏ ḥr šfdw nb r-mitt*

'Cause him to be punished in his office of the temple, from son to son, from heir to heir,
being cast on the ground,
his food rations, title-deeds(?), and joints being taken away,
his name not being remembered in this temple, as is done against his like who rebelled against the enemies of his god,
his writings being removed from the temple of Min, from the treasury and on every roll likewise.'

2.8.2.3   Subtle contrasts in meaning: *N(P) sḏm=f* and *NP ḥr sḏm*

In attempting to define a terminus *post quem non* earlier than the first manuscript attestation of a composition to be dated, another strategy consists in looking for contrasts in meaning of a subtle nature. These are less easily manipulated by composers and may thus provide better indications than the more immediately salient dimensions of e.g. linguistic form (compare §1.2.A). An example of such subtle contrasts in meaning is the aspectual contrast between *N(P) sḏm=f* and *NP ḥr sḏm*. In *Merikare*, the contrast is fully productive. It has therefore been proposed that *Merikare* should pre-date the time when *NP ḥr sḏm* begun being used as a general relative present tense, invading the domain once reserved to *N(P) sḏm=f*. *Merikare* would thereby get a linguistic terminus *post quem non* by the mid-Twelfth Dynasty.[448]

---

445 Allen 1984: §283; related is also the construction discussed in Allen 1984: §352.
446 Borghouts 2010: I, §59.d.
447 *EG* §347.3.
448 Vernus 1990a: 185.

As discussed, the *post quem non* part of the aspectual criterion can not be upheld (§2.6.3). By way of a further illustration, relevant constructions in *Merikare* are here set against similar ones in post-Middle Kingdom times. In *Merikare*, both *N(P) sḏm=f* and *NP ḥr sḏm* are used in general characterizations, of the king and of the Sungod. The contrast in meaning is of a subtle nature. With *NP ḥr sḏm* (i), the characterization is related to, and thus temporally bounded by, some preceding segment of discourse (in the example quoted, *rmm=sn*). With *N(P) sḏm=f* (ii), by contrast, the characterization is not related to any other segment of discourse and remains temporally unbounded; the preceding *A pw B* construction is diagnostic of such temporality as well:

(i) *Merikare* E 135

rmm=sn
iw=f ḥr sḏm

'Whenever they cry,
he is listening.'

(ii) *Merikare* E 24-25

sh[ꜣ] pw n niwt ẖnn[-ib]
iw=f sḫpr=f mrw 2 m ḏꜣmw

'The tumultuous man is a factor of disturbance for the town;
He raises two parties among the youth.'

The exact same subtle contrast can be found in early Eighteenth Dynasty royal compositions, for instance in Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* (iii)-(iv):

(iii) Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* 14-19 (*Urk.* IV 18, 10 - 19, 12)

prr=f (...)
ḫꜣtiw ḥr ftft n=f
dgg.tw=f mi rꜥ (...)
niꜣw ḥr ibꜣ m inwt

'Whenever he comes forth (...),
the hearts are shuddering for him.

Whenever he is seen like Re,
ibexes are dancing in the wadis (...)'

(iv) Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* 19-20 (*Urk.* IV 19, 13 - 20, 3)

nsw wꜥ sbꜣ.n spdt ḥsy n sšꜣt (...)
iw=f šsm=f sšw r tp-ḥsb
wr ḥkꜣw pw nb mrwt r nsw nb (...)

'A unique king, taught by Sothis, praised by Seshat (...)
He leads the scribes to rectitude;
He is a great of magic, a lord of love more than any king (...)'

2.8.3   A terminus *ante quem non*?

Possible indications for a terminus *ante quem non* are considered in turn. Elements of late orthography in the early New Kingdom witnesses in which *Merikare* is first documented are entirely inconsequential for assessing the date of composition.[449] Elements of late lexical morphology go beyond the graphic level as they involve genuinely younger forms, yet remain similarly unreliable when it comes to dating.[450] Various other elements are noteworthy, however, either descriptively or as providing possible indications.

2.8.3.1   *Merikare* E 67-68

This following much disputed passage[451] is probably best understood by relating the *iwty*-headed clause to the immediately preceding noun phrase (*ḫꜣst wꜣyt*).[452] The construction is an instance of circumstantial *iwty mrr=f*:[453]

(i) *Merikare* E 67-68

sb twtw=k r ḫꜣst wꜣyt iwty ḏd=sn sḥwy iry

'Send your statues to a far away country of which a summary is not given.'

A. Circumstantial *iwty mrr=f*, a fairly rare construction,[454] is more common in the early New Kingdom than in any other times and may thus be described as 'typical' of that horizon (ii)-(iii) (some cases may involve either *iwty mrr=f* or *iwty* with a suffixed infinitive: (iv)):

(ii) Thutmosis I's *Abydos Stela* 6 (*Urk.* IV 97, 7-8)

(...) *šsꜣ m rḫt.n=f iwty thh=f rdyt m ḥr=f*

'(...) one experienced through what he has learnt, who does not transgress what has been assigned to him'

---

449 E.g. (a) pronominal morphology: *st* for *sn* (suffix pronoun): E 56 *tst=st*; E 85 *ḥḏ.n=st* (Quack 1992: 37, n.b); (b) verbal morphology: E 90 subjunctive *mꜣꜣ=i* (for classical *mꜣ=i* or *mꜣn=i*); (c) *n* for *m*: perhaps in E 71 *n-mitt* (§2.3.1.1, (vii)).

450 E.g. (a) *snk* 'be greedy' for *skn* (Quack 1992: 79, n.b. with further references on *snk* as the younger form); the older form, *skn*, is found in Middle Kingdom literary texts (e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 210; *Ptahhotep* 296); the history of the latter text illustrates the possibility of an alteration of *skn* (P) into *snk* (L2); (b) *m-mr(y)t* for *n-mrwt*: E 118 *m-mryt* (C *m-mr[y]t*); E 114 *m-mrt* (C *m-mryt*); for *m-mryt* as an Eighteenth Dynasty written form, compare Book of the Dead *passim* (*TLA* #79190) or, in an inscriptional register, *Urk.* IV 1796, 8.

451 Besides the *iwty*-headed clause, interpretive issues concern the referent of the pronoun *=sn*. Compare the proposals collected in Dils, *TLA*; Werning 2013: #9.

452 Lastly Werning 2013: #9; Allen 2013: 128, ex.9.102; Vernus 2010²b: 188; also e.g. Quack 1992: 41; *EG* §443.

453 The construction remains the same if the *iwty*-headed clause is related to *twtw=k*, as in Parkinson's (1997a: 221) interpretation.

454 Pending a study yet to done, compare Werning 2013: #9; *EG* §443.

Sim. *Urk.* IV 410, 5-6 (Senenmut)[455] (...) *sḫm-ib iwty b(ꜣ)gg=f ḥr mnw n nb nṯrw* '(...) one strong of heart, who is not negligent over the monuments of the lord of the gods' (a formula;[456] see below, (vi)).

(iii) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.150: XV.8-9 (H*ḤBT* II 33, 9)

(...) *iṯ grt iwty nḥm.tw m-ꜥ=f*

'(...) one who seizes, moreover, from whom it can not be taken away'

(iv) *Urk.* IV 959, 14-15 (Iamunedjeh)[457]

(...) *tm b(ꜣ)g ḥr rdyt m ḥr=f iwty ḳdd=f m grḥ*

'(...) one not weary about what has been assigned to him, who does not sleep at night'

> With *ḳdd=f* possibly a suffixed infinitive. Other morphologically ambiguous cases: *Urk.* IV 971, 14 (Great Royal Herald Antef) *iwty nmꜥ=f* (...) 'who is not partial (...)'; *DZA* 24.589.140, l.9 (Thutmosis, TT 110) *mdw r wšb iwty wꜥr=f* 'one who answers to a question, who does not flee'. In one case at least, a non-finite construction is more likely: *DZA* 24.591.350 (Book of the Dead) *iꜣty ḫsf=f im=sn (/=s)* 'without getting refused from them/it(?)'.[458]

Middle Kingdom literary texts display another construction in similar functions. Contrast *Merikare* E 67-68 with e.g.:

(v) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 148

(...) *tꜣ wꜣ n rḫ sw rmṯ*

'(...) a far land, which people do not know.'

Yet, circumstantial *iwty mrr=f* is also, if only occasionally, documented in earlier times. The association with the early New Kingdom is not exclusive:

(vi) Ini (D.13), b, col.3-4[459]

mnḫ-ib iwty bꜣgg=f r=s

'(...) one excellent of heart, who does not become negligent about it'

> The same formula as in (v). With another verbal form, also with general imperfective aspect, Rudjahau (later D.11), 11-12[460] (...) *iwt sḏr.n rmṯ špt r=f* '(...) one on account of whom no men (ever) went to sleep angry'; in a construction with passive meaning, either with a suffixed infinitive or a *sḏm(w)*-passive, Hatnub 25, 3 (...) *iwt rḫ=f in rmṯ* '(...) one who is not known by anybody.'[461]

---

455 Noted in *EG* §443.
456 Also e.g. *DZA* 24.589.770 (BM EA 160); noted by Werning 2013: #9.
457 Noted in *EG* §443.
458 Also from Book of the Dead, *DZA* 24.590.900; these examples noted by Werning 2013: #9.
459 Noted by Borghouts 2010: I, §109.d.(i).
460 Noted by Borghouts 2010: I, §27.c.
461 Noted by Werning 2013: #9 *fine*; Borghouts 2010: I, §40.g NB 4. Perhaps also to be mentioned is the following instance of a construction *iwty + suffixed noun*: Nesimontu 11-12 *wꜣst iw sḫrwyw*

B. *Merikare* E 67-68 must also be appreciated with a view on a textual alternation in a Middle Egyptian literary text securely dated to the Middle Kingdom:[462]

> (vii) *Ptahhotep* 350-351
>
> P   *im=k wḥm mski n mdt n sḏm=k sw*
>
> 'You shall not repeat a gossipy affair(?): you have not experienced it!'
>
> L2[463] *im=k wḥm ms[ki] n mdt iwty sḏm=k sw*
>
> 'You shall not repeat a gossipy affair(?) that you have not experienced.'

For the present purpose, the implication is twofold. The direct contrast between *iwty sḏm=k sw* (L2) and *n sḏm=k* (P) is exactly similar to the one between *ḫꜣst wꜣyt iwty ḏd=sn sḫwy iry* (*Merikare* E 67-68: (i)) and *tꜣ wꜣ n rḫ sw rmṯ* (*Shipwrecked Sailor* 148: (v)). This strengthens what was said on the construction in *Merikare* E 67-68 being 'typical' of an early New Kingdom horizon as opposed to a Middle Kingdom one. On the other hand, *Ptahhotep* 350-351 also directly illustrates how the construction in *Merikare* E 67-68 could well have come about secondarily in textual transmission. While the construction in *Merikare* E 67-68 is worth noting as a token of an early New Kingdom phenomenology of the text as transmitted, it does not provide a reliable criterion for dating the composition itself.

2.8.3.2 *Merikare* E 14

Although damaged, the following passage is one of the most consequential for dating *Merikare*:

> *Merikare* E 14
>
> *ḥn n=k sw kꜣ tm{=k}*[a] [...]
>
> 'Order him to you and then [...] will not [...]'
>
> a)   The suffix has been stricken through in red.[464]

A. *Kꜣ tm=f sḏm* (early occurrences: *Urk.* IV 655, 4; P. Hearst XI.14; O. Berlin 1269 vso 3)[465] is the diachronic successor of *tm.kꜣ=f sḏm* (e.g. CT II 174i). The lack of pre-New Kingdom attestations of *kꜣ tm=f sḏm* is an accidental gap: the negative construction was probably possible as early as *kꜣ*-headed ones themselves were (negative constructions are generally less common in text, and therefore in the record, than positive ones). Any argument possibly to be made on *kꜣ tm=f sḏm* in *Merikare* E 14 must therefore target the positive construction, *kꜣ sḏm=f*.

   Concerning *kꜣ sḏm=f*, 'the bulk of occurrences extends from late Dynasty XII to early Dynasty XVIII, a time when these constructions still belonged to the non-formal

---

iwtt mnt=s m šmꜥw (...) 'Thebes, the island of planners(?), which is without precedent in Upper Egypt (...)' (noted by Borghouts 2010: I, §109.d (i)). CT I 170g-j B13C remains unclear in interpretation (Werning 2013: #9), since this may also be a complement clause (Uljas 2007a: 208).

462 Noted by Werning 2013: #9, who also draws the parallel with *Merikare* E 67-68.
463 Caminos 1956: pl.28a.
464 Quack 1992: 165; Burkard 1977: 256.
465 Quack 1992: 17, n.b.

language since they were used in administrative letters.'[466] In literary registers, *k3*-headed constructions are found in *Cheops' Court* and in a series of texts not documented before the early New Kingdom, *Khakheperreseneb*, *Fishing and Fowling*, *Hymn to Hapi*, *Neferkare and Sisene*, and *Ipuwer*. In literary texts securely dated to the Twelfth Dynasty, *k3*-headed constructions recur only in *Kagemni* 1.10 and probably in *Sasobek* B2.7.[467] Outside literary texts, these constructions are common in administrative texts from the late Twelfth Dynasty on.[468] Another occurrence is in a late Middle Kingdom address to the living.[469] The possibly earliest instance is in a Twelfth Dynasty letter to the dead.[470] Coffin Texts still have synthetic *sḏm.k3=f* exclusively, commonly so.[471] This implies that a dating of *Merikare* to its Herakleopolitan setting, already rebutted on other grounds, is certainly too early on linguistic grounds as well.

The distribution of the construction in the record further suggests that a dating to the early Twelfth Dynasty, as has also been contemplated, may itself be too early. It can not disprove such dating fully because securely dated early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary texts such as *Sinuhe* or *Ptahhotep* and others do not have any of the *k3*-marked constructions, neither synthetic (*sḏm.k3=f*) nor analytic ones (*k3*-initial). Register and, associated with this, issues to do with the spread of change, may provide an indication, however.

Among literary texts mentioned above, *Ipuwer*, *Khakheperreseneb*, and *Fishing and Fowling* all have a terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth, or perhaps late Twelfth, Dynasty by the aspectual *ante quem non* criterion (§2.6.2.4-6); further linguistic indications confirm a terminus *ante quem non* by the Thirteenth Dynasty for the first two (§6.2.2.5; §2.7) and suggest a yet later dating for the third (§3.2). *Cheops' Court*, where the constructions are common, has a type-B terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty (§2.4.4.1.B), while *Hymn to Hapi* and *Neferkare and Sisene* are linguistically later still (§3.4; §4.4). This leaves only two instances in the Twelfth Dynasty, one in *Kagemni* and one in *Sasobek*.

In Coffin Texts, only synthetic *sḏm.k3=f* is found, commonly so. As is generally the case and directly illustrated in earlier and later times by changes affecting the morphologically similar -*ḥr*-marked forms and constructions, the spread of innovations is very gradual.[472] With -*k3*-marked forms and constructions, change is

---

466 Vernus 1990a: 89. The following discussion is based on data from the detailed tableau in Vernus 1990a: 88-90.

467 *K3* itself is partly broken; the context, however, leaves little other possibility than reading with a *k3*-headed construction.

468 Compare *TLA* #162840.

469 Liverpool 13846, 3-7 (Vernus 1990a: 92, ex.164).

470 Cairo Bowl 6-7 *ir nfr.n m-ˁ=k k3 pr=k ḥb3* 'If there is nothing from you, then your house will be destroyed' (quoted by Vernus 1990a: 90, ex.160).

471 Vernus 1990a: 86-7.

472 For the replacement of synthetic *sḏm.ḥr=f* by analytic *wn.ḥr=f ḥr sḏm* in the First Intermediate Period and early Middle Kingdom, Vernus 1990a: 63-5, 68-71; in Coffin Texts for example, both constructions are used side by side. For the replacement of *ḥr NP sḏm=f* by the bound construction *ḥr-sḏm=f* during the Eighteenth Dynasty, resulting in a situation in which the two constructions were used side by side in the same texts, §3.4.2.2.C. For further well studied cases of gradualness

not even incipient in Coffin Texts. Only one text that has a *k3*-headed construction may possibly date to the early Twelfth Dynasty, the Cairo Bowl letter to the dead. As noted, the expression is common in documentary registers from the late Twelfth Dynasty on through the early New Kingdom.

In the literary composition in which it is most common, *Cheops' Court*, the abundance of *k3*-headed constructions, as well as possibly the configuration of individual instances thereof, may in part have to do with register (e.g. §2.4.4.7, (ii)). As regards *Sasobek* and *Kagemni*, these also include elements that are noteworthy in terms of register: presentative *ptr* and *ḥr m-ḫt* for the former (§2.4.4.4, (iv)), sequences of narrative constructions similar to ones in *Cheops' Court* and deictic expressions for the latter (§2.4.4.3). In *Kagemni*, *k3* heads a *A pw* construction, following imperatives: 1.10 *šsp ḏ=f n=k m win st k3 ssft pw* 'Take when he gives to you, do not reject it! Then it will be something that soothes.' In *Ptahhotep*, by contrast, generalizing maxims of the *A pw (B)* type follow imperatives directly, without *k3*: this is indicative of a difference in tone between the two compositions.

The above outlines a coherent background in terms of spread of change in time and across registers. That a *k3*-headed construction should be found in a register such as in *Merikare* would be surprising if this had indeed been composed as early as the early Twelfth Dynasty.

NB. Worth a merely descriptive note is also the broader construction of which *k3 sḏm=f* in *Merikare* E 14 is a part, a sequence of an imperative followed by a *k3*-headed verbal clause. In this precise form, the sequence remains unparalleled in any text securely dated to the Twelfth Dynasty, literary or documentary. It recurs, on the other hand, in the final stanza of *Hymn to Hapi*, repeatedly (14.5; 14.6; 14.10: §3.4.4.NB)—a composition for which a dating to the late Seventeenth/early Eighteenth Dynasty is argued below on linguistic grounds (§3.4). In non-literary texts, two further occurrences of the same sequence are from early Eighteenth Dynasty letters:

(α) P. BM EA 10107 ro (Ptahu to Ahmes Peniati; *temp.* Hatshepsut), 6-7

mi
k3 wp{t}=k [ḫ]nꜥ=f
'Come
and then dispute with him!'

(β) P. MMA 27.3.560 (Tit to Djehuti; *temp.* Hatshepsut), 3

mdw <ḥnꜥ> wḥmw grg-mn-nfr
k3 h3b=tn šꜥt ḥr=f n wr-m3
'Speak with the herald Geregmennefer
and then write a letter about it to the High-Priest of Heliopolis.'

In later times, a few instances of an apparently similar construction are also found in Ramesside Miscellanies; e.g., with slightly different semantics, P. Anastasi V, VIII.3-4

in the spread of innovations in second millennium Egyptian, all implying protracted periods in time during which the older and newer expressions coexisted, §2.1.1.B.

(*LEM* 59, 11-12)[473] *ir n=k t3 i3t sr k3 gm=k sw m-ḫt i3wt* 'Exercise the office of magistrate and then you will find it after old age.'[474]

This does not, however, afford reliable evidence in support of a very late dating of *Merikare*. In late Twelfth Dynasty letters, the sequence under consideration is not found, even though *k3*-headed clauses are not uncommon; in several cases, however, contexts are fragmentary. In securely dated Twelfth Dynasty literary texts, *k3*-headed constructions are very rare in general, but include one case where a (non-verbal) *k3 N pw* clause follows a negative imperative (*Kagemni* 1.10, quoted above).[475] Since verbal clauses in continuation to an imperative are generally in the subjunctive *sḏm=f* in Middle Egyptian, this can not be treated as the exact same construction as the verbal one in *Merikare*. It strongly suggests, however, that the sequence as in *Merikare* may have been acceptable stylistically in a literary register well before the early New Kingdom. (The issue must be phrased at this level, since on strict grammatical grounds the construction would have been possible as early as *k3*-headed clauses themselves were.) In sum, it is a worthwhile descriptive observation to note that exact parallels to the construction as in *Merikare* are in late Seventeenth/early Eighteenth Dynasty texts, not before; venturing beyond this bare statement would be very uncautious.

The following passage, from an Eighteenth Dynasty witness of a Twelfth Dynasty literary composition, must also be mentioned in the context of the present discussion. The construction is slightly different, since the *k3*-headed clause is here itself in the imperative—an apparently singular combination. Yet, it also includes the feature that is here of interest, namely the sequence *imperative – k3-headed clause*:

(γ) *Ptahhotep* 78-79

L2   *m wšb n=f*
        k3 m sisy=k
        k3 m iˁt ib n nty m ḫfty=k

'Do not reply to him,
and then do not relieve yourself,
and then do not please who happens to be your enemy!'

P   *m wšd sw r isy ib=k*
        m iˁ ib n nty ḫft=k
'Do not address him to lighten your heart!
Do not please who is facing you!'

Just as for the construction discussed above (*iwty mrr=f*: §2.8.3.1), the implication is twofold. *Ptahhotep* 78-79 L2 provides an additional element documenting the construction as in *Merikare* in an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon. Complementarily, it also demonstrates that such a construction can arise in the course of textual

---

473 Noted by Vernus 1990a: 91, n.51.

474 The construction alternates with the more common *ir n=k* (...) *gm=k* (*imperative – subjunctive*): Erman 1933²: §675.

475 After the Twelfth Dynasty also *Cheops' Court* 11.25 (a *k3*-headed *in*-cleft sentence, after an imperative).

transmission. In the case of *Ptahhotep*, the reading in L2 could probably be identified as secondary on internal grounds in view of the odd, otherwise undocumented, construction consisting in *k3* introducing an imperative. In *Merikare* E 14, by contrast, nothing on internal grounds suggests that the construction is secondary. In particular, the *k3* could not have been merely inserted: if it had, the following *tm* would remain unaccounted for.

2.8.3.3 *Merikare* E 30-31

Merikare has the following construction of indirectly reported speech that is clearly late:[476]

> *Merikare* E 30-31
>
> *sm3ꜥ-ḫrw=k r-gs nṯr*
> *iḫ ḏd rmṯ [m-ḫmt?]=k*
> *ḫsf=k r-ḏ3wt i[yt]=k*[a]
>
> 'You should justify yourself in presence of the god
> so that people even in your absence may say
> that you punish in accordance with their[b] offence.'
>
> a)   Thus E; M is entirely lost here except for the very end of this passage, [...]WALKING LEGS=*f*.
>
> b)   Sic, see below.

The text in E has two second person pronouns, obviously standing for different referents (the king, here the addressee, then the people). The structure of the Egyptian construction can not be rendered directly in any of the customary Egyptological translation languages because it involves a construction of indirectly reported speech that, although not unusual typologically, does not exist in these Egyptological languages. In Egyptian, indirectly reported speech can be realized through an adaptation of the pronoun of only one of various participants in the clause indirectly reported (Peust's rule of 'Einaktantenanpassung', (b)):[477]

> (a) *Directly reported speech*
>
> **iḫ ḏd rmṯ (...) ḫsf=f r-ḏ3wt iyt=k*
>
> 'so that people say (...): "He (*scil.* the king) punishes in accordance with your offence." '
>
> (b) *Indirectly reported speech, partial adaptation ('Einaktantenanpassung')*
>
> *iḫ ḏd rmṯ (...) ḫsf=k r-ḏ3wt iyt=k*
>
> (c) *Indirectly reported speech, full adaptation*
>
> **iḫ ḏd rmṯ (...) ḫsf=k r-ḏ3wt iyt=sn*
>
> 'so that people say (...) that you punish in accordance with their offence.'

---

476 Noted and discussed by Kammerzell 1997; subsequently also Peust 2005: 82, ex.14.
477 Peust 1996: 53-6; discussion of further aspects of the construction, Peust 2005.

(In rendering *Merikare* E 30-31 in Egyptological translation languages, either of strategies (a) or (c) can be chosen.[478])

The construction with partial adaptation (b) is common, if not exclusive, in Later Egyptian, and particularly in Late Egyptian itself.[479] In Old and Middle Egyptian only the construction with full adaptation of all pronouns, as in (c), is found.[480] *Merikare* E 30-31, with partial adaptation, has the innovative construction; in Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian, construction (c) would have been used. This could then be a very serious indication for dating, assuming that the text in E is original.

Whether this is the case remains slightly uncertain. What survives of the text of M, [...]^{D54}=*f*, has a third person pronoun after what based on the walking legs semogram seems to have been [... *iyt*]. One may then speculate that M had construction (c), with full adaptation of the pronouns. However, the reverse may well be true, with M being secondary to E: if the text originally had construction (c), a third person plural pronoun, not a singular one as in M, would probably have been expected. There is no positive indication, therefore, that the text in E should be viewed as secondary (unless of course a dating of *Merikare* to a period before the early New Kingdom is given first, on independent grounds). Still, this is not equivalent to saying that the text in E must be original. In short, textual uncertainties in *Merikare* E 30-31 prevent turning the in itself late construction into a fully reliable argument for dating.

2.8.3.4 The lexicon

Merikare includes several lexical expressions not documented before the early New Kingdom.

A. Some among these lexical expressions apparently first documented in the New Kingdom are rare or very rare, making their patterns of attestation unreliable. In appreciating the overall lexical typology of *Merikare*, these expressions will weigh very little:

    E 82   *pdswt* 'flatland/sand-dunes';[481]
    E 122 *sˁsˁ*[482] 'deface';[483]

---

478 Kammerzell 1997: 100. In emending E into *ḫsf=k r-dȝwt i*[*yt*]={*k*}<*f*>, Quack 1992: 23, n.f suggested that the pronoun =*k* in *i*[*yt*]=*k* could be due to an assimilation with the preceding pronoun =*k* in *ḫsf=k*, thereby assuming that *i*[*yt*]=*k* could not be correct as it stands. This line of reasoning would be impeccable in Egyptological translation languages; it also was for Egyptian itself by the time Quack wrote (1992), before Peust's (1996) study of the construction with 'Einaktantenanpassung'.

479 Peust 1996: 53-6; further Peust 2005.

480 Peust 2005: 94-6; Kammerzell 1997.

481 Also Ramses II's *Inscription Dédicatoire* 72 (K*RI* 330, 14) and *DZA* 23.543.870 (Medinet Habu); rare. Note that the verb *pds* 'stamp flat, flatten', from which *pdswt* is derived, is old (e.g. *Urk.* I 103, 10).

482 Thus M and C; E has *sˁn*.

483 Also *Ani* B 20.14 (Quack 1992: 75, n.a; 1993: 109, n.87); rare.

E 138   *shpw* 'regulations';[484]
E 139   *ṯs* 'rule'.[485]

In addition, E 107 has an instance of the rare *ꜥgsw* 'belt(?)', probably a loanword. The time of borrowing of *ꜥgsw*, however, turns out to be less clear than once assumed, making the word ultimately unreliable for dating (§6.2.2.6.3, (ii)).

B. Three other expressions in *Merikare*—one adverb, one preposition, and one compound—are considerably more common than the ones just enumerated. All three expressions remain undocumented before the early New Kingdom. Moreover, there are indications for each of these expressions that they may indeed be specific to that very period. These expressions therefore weigh more heavily in an appreciation of the lexical typology of *Merikare*, and all the more so cumulatively:

(i) *Merikare* E 87, E 137 *mm* in adverbial use ('there(in)'):

The expression is fairly common in the Eighteenth Dynasty (e.g. *Urk.* IV 157, 6; 501, 3; 776, 10; 835, 14). *Mm* is not documented in earlier times:[486] one dubious Coffin Text instance is probably to be read differently.[487] Pre-New Kingdom Middle Egyptian consistently uses another expression for similar meaning, *im* (among the various meanings *im* has). The pattern of attestation of *mm* therefore stands a reasonably good chance to be reliable.

This leaves the issue of whether *mm* in *Merikare* is integral to the original composition. As is almost invariably the case with lexical expressions, there is no way to prove this, nor can there be one: that the expression occurs twice in *Merikare* is only weakly indicative. Another strategy consists in considering (the) putative source expression(s) from which *mm*, if indeed a secondary reading, could have arisen, namely *im*. Whenever an observation can be made, with literary compositions documented in both the Middle and the New Kingdom, *im* stays stable in textual transmission. This is no formal proof for *mm* being original in *Merikare*, only an indication that this as well stands a good chance to be the case.

(ii) *Merikare* E 31 *r-ḏꜣwt* 'in return for, in accordance with'

The expression remains undocumented in any securely dated pre-New Kingdom text. It is, on the other hand, fairly common in the Eighteenth Dynasty: *Urk.* IV 66, 15 (from the tomb of Ineni); Thutmosis I's *Abydos Stela* 17 (*Urk.* IV 101, 10: spelled *r-*

---

484 Also *Oxford Wisdom Text* B.x+3 (Blumenthal 1980: 20-1, n.173; Quack 1992: 83, n.a); rare.
485 For the reading, Quack 1992: 83, n.b; 'belegt seit D.18' according to *DZA* 31.294.650; rare.
486 'Seit D.18' according to *Wb.* II 2.17; 'apparently a mere Dyn. XVIII variant of *im*' according to *EG* §205.1.
487 Hann*Lex* 5: 982a. CT VII 53b *iw N pn grt rḫ rn n ꜥnḫt=k im mm sp-2* 'This N knows the name of what you live from *among them*(?) TWICE(?).' Faulkner (1973-1978: III, 34, n.13) comments: 'The frequent changes of person from 52u onward make it impossible to extract a coherent sense from the text, which appears much garbled. *Mm sp 2* at the end of 53b probably represents an adverbial use of the preposition.' Wolfgang Schenkel (p.c. 8/2012) also emphasizes the difficulty of understanding the passages, and prefers other possibilities: '(...) In der digitalen Version der Sargtexte habe ich *mm* als Präposition notiert, nach der ein substantivischer Ausdruck ausgefallen wäre. Ich könnte mir auch vorstellen, daß im folgenden *sp-2* der verlesene substantivische Ausdruck steckt: "(...) der Name dessen, wovon du lebst unter (...)".'

dꜣty); *Urk.* 439, 8 (Djehuty); *Urk.* 752, 17 and 754, 1 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*); *Duties of the Vizier* R 9 (*Urk.* IV 1107, 6) and R 11 (*Urk.* IV 1109, 8);[488] Thutmosis III's *Gebel Barkal Stela* 12 (*Urk.* IV 1232, 7); Amenhotep II's *Amada Stela* 6 (*Urk.* IV 1291, 13); *DZA* 31.542.770 (Memnon colossi); 31.542.780 (Luxor, Amenhotep III: *r-dꜣty*); 31.542.700 (Ramose: *r-dꜣw*). Other than in *Merikare*, the preposition recurs in only one Middle Egyptian literary text, *Loyaliste* (long version) 12.1.[489] As discussed below, some sections of this composition are demonstrably later than the Middle Kingdom and at least one segment is as recent as the early Eighteenth Dynasty (§4.5); even if the section that has *r-dꜣwt* were earlier, the clustering of all other occurrences of the expression in the early New Kingdom remains no less remarkable. *R-dꜣwt* does not recur after the Eighteenth Dynasty in this form.[490] In the Middle Kingdom, another preposition, *ḥft*, is used in similar contexts. Compare *Merikare* E 31 *ḥsf=k r-dꜣwt i[yt]=k* '(...) that you punish in accordance with their[sic] offence'; *Ptahhotep* 180 *snd n=f ḥft ḥprt n=f* 'Respect him in accordance with what has happened to him.' Unless *r-dꜣwt* in *Merikare* E 31 is a textual alteration, the expression may provide an indication for a later dating of the composition. Note that *ḥft* in *Ptahhotep* 180 P is unaltered in L2.

(iii) *Merikare* E 33 *ḥmw-ib* 'with a skillful understanding'

The expression, which remains undocumented before the New Kingdom, is not uncommon in the early New Kingdom. It is apparently only documented in that period and may therefore be specific to it. *Ḥmw-ib* is often said of the king, compared with Ptah.[491] The expression recurs in a private tomb (TT 110; *temp.* Hatshepsut-Thutmosis III)[492] and in *Appointment of the Vizier* 25 (*Urk.* IV 1382, 15), both times in a series of eulogizing epithets.

2.8.3.5 Digression: A very brief note on dating *Duties of the Vizier*

One of the texts just mentioned as including two early occurrences of *r-dꜣwt* is *Duties of the Vizier*, the dating of which is controversial: a brief digression is therefore in order. The editor of the text proposed an Ahmoside dating based on institutional analysis, linguistic observations, and a modeling of a possible historical setting.[493] However, the last part of this argument remains speculative, so that a dating to an Ahmoside horizon specifically can not be substantiated. Further institutional analysis

---

488 On the dating of *Duties of the Vizier*, below, §2.8.3.5.

489 In *A Man* 14xy+10 [...] *r-dꜣ(n)r* (only one witness preserved, Ramesside), the reading is probably secondary to *r-dꜣr=f* 'relative to his need' (Fischer-Elfert 1999: 162, initially observed by Faulkner).

490 Sim. *DZA* 31.542.630: 'nur Dyn. 18'; *EG* §180: 'common in Dyn. XVIII'. *R-dꜣ(n)r*, with a similar meaning, and documented from the late Eighteenth Dynasty on, may be a more recent (written) form of the same preposition. E.g. *Teaching of Amunnakht* O. Lacau ro 11 (= O. KV 18/3.614+627 vso 5). Further, *DZA* 31.546.980-31.547.010.

491 In the common phrase *ḥmw-ib mi rsi-inb=f*: *Urk.* IV 555, 3; *DZA* 20.485.900 (Amenhotep II, Karnak); 20.485.870 (Thutmosis IV, Lateran Obelisk 36); 20.485.910 (a stela of Amenhotep III); 20.485.890 (Ramses II, Karnak Hypostyle Hall); perhaps also, in lacunous context [*ḥmw-ib mi*] *ptḥ* in Tutankhamun's *Restoration Stela* 29 (*Urk.* IV 2032, 6).

492 *DZA* 26.753.170.

493 Van den Boorn 1988: 333-71.

has also demonstrated significant parallels in documented Late Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period administrative practices (in several cases down to the late Seventeenth Dynasty); this has lead other authors to favor a dating to these earlier periods, notably to the Thirteenth Dynasty.[494]

I consider the *Duties of the Vizier* a Thutmoside composition on the following grounds. In content and form, the text is highly rhetorical and ideological. *Duties* need not, therefore, reflect the terminology of administrative practices of their own time faithfully. Put differently, institutions mentioned in the composition need not necessarily be read in a strictly referential sense; in some cases, the composers may also have drawn on (even only slightly) earlier materials for this. (The *Vizieral Cycle* is more generally replete with archaizing or recherché features on various levels, reaching from aspects of the titulary of the viziers[495] to orthography[496] and language, notably the lexicon.[497]) In the context of the funerary self-presentation of the Aametju-User-Rekhmire dynasty, *Duties* are complementary in function to other texts of the *Cycle*, such as *Appointment of the Vizier*, *Installation of the Vizier*, and *Teaching of Aametju*. Taking into account the afore mentioned ideological component of the text, such well designed functional complementarity makes a scenario by which *Duties* would have originally stood as an independent composition, only secondarily to be aggregated onto the later *Cycle* of which they are an integral component, unlikely on general grounds. The text also includes various linguistically innovative features, most notably:[498]

(i) *Ḥr-sḏm=f* (*passim*) used alongside older *ḥr NP sḏm=f* (*passim*)[499]

Duties document a transitional stage, exactly similar to the one observed in *Installation of the Vizier*, and more broadly typical of the early Eighteenth Dynasty: discussion below, §3.4.2.2.C.

---

494 Lastly, Quirke 2004b: 18-24, particularly 23-4.

495 Hagen 2012a: 223-6.

496 Van den Boorn 1988: 293-4.

497 Compare for example in *Aametju*, §1.3.2.3, (iii)-(v), or *imḏr* in (ix). In *Duties* themselves, e.g. R 1 (*Urk.* IV 1103, 17) *pḥḏw*, a type of chair (van den Boorn 1988: 25-26); further, van den Boorn 1988: 295-6.

498 The following notes are provisional: a more detailed study of the linguistic typology of *Duties of the Vizier* is in preparation. Various expressions were already noted by van den Boorn (1988: 299) as 'features of "NK signature" ', see below. I disagree with other observations by the author. As rightly noted by van den Boorn 1988 (23), the uses of *pꜣ* are functionally innovative and very much compatible with an early New Kingdom dating, yet they are not innovative enough to formally rule out an earlier dating, such as to the Thirteenth Dynasty. That they are found in a monumental context is no definite argument pro a late dating either, as such selection can be interpreted as indexical, just as occasional archaisms are, in a complementary way. Unlike van den Boorn (1988: 57-8), I do not see *iw* in R 5 (*Urk.* IV 1105, 13) *iw smi n=f ḥrt tꜣwy* as being circumstantial. As to R 10 (*Urk.* IV 1107, 12), this does not have a preposition *m-šꜣꜥ-m*, but a construction of *šꜣꜥ-m* after *m* (below, (iv) in the main text). Listed under 'special features' by van den Boorn (1988: 298) and therefore rightly not as an argument for dating is the construction of the prospective participle in *-ty* with a direct object in R 21-22 (*Urk.* IV 1112, 6). This finds an interesting parallel in the L2 version of *Ptahhotep* 49-50 (Gundacker 2012: 78, ex.10 and n.137), but recurs in *Shipwrecked Sailor* 184-185 (Gundacker 2012: 75-9).

499 References given below, §3.4.2.2.C.

(ii) *Ḥnꜥ sḏm* used in continuation to a construction other than the imperative, the subjunctive, or the infinitive[500]

R 5-6 (*Urk.* IV 1105, 17 - 1106, 1) *ḥr imi-rꜣ ḫtm ii=f m ḥs=f ḥnꜥ smit n=f r-ḏd* 'Then the overseer of the treasurer comes to meet him and reports to him saying:' (*ḥr NP sḏm=f ... ḥnꜥ sḏm ...*). Such extended uses of the conjunctive are a New Kingdom development.[501]

(iii) *Ḫr ir m-ḫt sḏm=f* (R 7 (*Urk.* IV 1106, 12) and R 16 (*Urk.* IV 1110, 2))[502]

The expression is only documented in the New Kingdom, and then densely so. Moreover, its rise can be traced in details in the record.[503]

(iv) *Šꜣꜥ-m ... nfryt-r ...* (R 10 (*Urk.* IV 1107, 12))

The expression is densely attested in the Eighteenth Dynasty, never before, and apparently not later either; see §2.7.3.3, (i). The construction in which it occurs in *Duties* is exactly paralleled in Akhenaten's *Second Proclamation* A 12-13, both with *ir NP m šꜣꜥ-m NP nfryt-r NP (...)*; see §2.7.3.2, (x).

(v) *R-ḏꜣwt* (R 9 (*Urk.* IV 1107, 6) and R 11 (*Urk.* IV 1109, 8))

This would remain typical of an Eighteenth Dynasty horizon even if *Merikare* and/or *Loyaliste* (long version) were earlier compositions: compare the pattern of attestation in §2.8.3.4, (ii).

(vi) *ꜥnꜥn* 'return' (verbally R 11 (*Urk.* IV 1108, 6); nominally R 27 (*Urk.* IV 1114, 3))[504]

An admittedly rare word; see §4.6.7.B.

(vii) Perhaps also *m-ḫꜣw-ḥr* 'in addition to' (R 13 (*Urk.* IV 1108, 14))[505]

The shorter form of this preposition, *m-ḫꜣw*, is used in the Middle Kingdom;[506] the longer one is apparently not documented before the early New Kingdom,[507] and may be an innovation of that period.

---

500 The other instance of *ḥnꜥ sḏm*, also noted by van den Boorn (1988: 299) as implying a late dating, does not: *ḥnꜥ sḏm=f* is in continuation to what is probably a subjunctive (*ḏd=f*), according with a usage already documented in much earlier times: R 10-11 *ḏd=f tꜣ wpwt nt tꜣty iw=f ꜥḥꜥ m-bꜣḥ pꜣ sr ḥr ḏd tꜣ(y)=f wpwt ḥnꜥ prt r ꜥḥꜥw=f* 'He shall tell the message of the vizier standing in front of the official while telling his message, and he shall go out (back) to his post.'

501 Compare Winand 2001, also including references to previous discussions of such uses.

502 Noted by van den Boorn 1988: 73.

503 Neveu 2001: 108-9, more broadly 107-11; Hintze 1950: 14-31. Quirke 1988: 98, n.48 notes an isolated instance of *kꜣ ir m-ḫt* in a letter from Illahun: this is remarkable indeed, and not easily paralleled in any variety of Middle Egyptian, early or late. However, this is different from *ḥr ir m-ḫt*, as *kꜣ*-headed clauses of various sorts are more broadly common in the Illahun letters, while connective *ḥr*, as in *ḥr ir m-ḫt*, is itself a later, early New Kingdom, development.

504 Noted by van den Boorn 1998: 111-2.

505 Noted by van den Boorn 1988: 117-8.

506 E.g. Rediukhnum A19; Mentuwoser 6; Beb (Leiden V 88), 11 (after *TLA* #65090). The short form of course continues to be used in the New Kingdom as well, e.g. *Urk.* IV 188, 2.

507 E.g. *Urk.* IV 843, 11.

2.8.3.6 Other elements of language

Although not to do with grammar or lexicon proper, two further elements of language in *Merikare* merit comment well.

A. One phrasing in *Merikare* is worth a note of its own:

> (i) *Merikare* E 91
>
> *ḏd swt nꜣ gr n pḏt* (...)
>
> 'Now, this is also said about (lit., to) the Bow-people: (...)'

From a strictly linguistic perspective, this is entirely undistinctive: all component parts, grammatical and lexical alike, can be paralleled in both the Middle Kingdom and the early New Kingdom.[508] What is remarkable, however, is that the exact same formulation recurs in the following inscription:[509]

> (ii) Statue of the High Steward Amenhotep (*temp.* Amenhotep III), 44 (*Urk*. IV 1799, 14)
>
> *ḏd=i swt nꜣ ḫrw*[a] (...)
>
> 'Now, I will say this as well: (...)'
>
> a)   Sic, for *gr* (confusion of signs).

Under the traditional hypothesis of a Middle Kingdom dating of *Merikare*, this has been interpreted as a 'cheville rhétorique', in echo to *Merikare*: 'Il s'agit bien, jusque dans la gratuité même d'une telle allusion, de faire valoir l'érudition d'un personnage, avec la légèreté d'une sorte de clin d'œil à ses pairs.'[510] To be sure, allusions to Middle Egyptian compositions are occasionally documented in the Eighteenth Dynasty,[511] as in the quotation of *Sinuhe* B 309 in another private inscription from the same reign, Amenhotep son of Hapu's statue (Back pillar 8; *Urk*. IV 1825, 11).[512] A closer look at the latter is instructive. The quotation is of one of the closing (and thereby most saliently exposed) verses in *Sinuhe*, encapsulating the protagonist's paradoxical fate: B 309 *nn šwꜣ iry n=f mitt* 'There is no vagabond for which the same (*scil.* the royal favors bestowed upon Sinuhe) has been done.' On the very same statue, the figure of Sinuhe is alluded to yet another time, through the expression *nmiw-šꜥ* 'sand-farer' (Base 12; *Urk*. IV 1821, 12):[513] in the second millennium, this is found only in *Sinuhe* itself, where it recurs no less than three times (§2.4.5, (i)), saliently expressing one aspect of the protagonist's problematic identity. In Amenhotep son of Hapu's statue, the allusion to a Middle Egyptian literary text is therefore specific, going well. In the High Steward Amenhotep's statue, the 'cheville rhétorique' here discussed is entirely unspecific. Rather than a 'sorte de clin d'œil'

---

508 Thus, for the grammatical expressions: qualifying predication (*nfr sw*) with a passive participle as predicate (§2.7.2.1, (iii)); *swt* (§5.1.4.2, (xi)); pronominal *nꜣ* (§2.4.4.2.2, (iv)-(v)).
509 Fischer-Elfert 2000: 264.
510 Oréal 2011: 408.
511 Thus, for *Sinuhe*, now Parkinson 2009: 176-80.
512 Parkinson 2009: 182, n.18; Gardiner 1916: 117.
513 Parkinson 2009: 52, n.13.

among Thutmoside littérateurs, this may well be a token of a shared horizon in language.[514]

Also to be noted in this context are instances of *ḏd swt* (in a different grammatical construction) introducing direct speech in Eighteenth Dynasty texts (iii)-(iv):[515]

(iii) *Teaching of the High-Priest Amenemhat* (*temp.* Amenhotep II),[516] 2 (*Urk*. IV 1408, 17 - 1409, 1)[517]

ḏd=f m sb3t ḥr msw=f
ḏd=i swt ḏ=i sḏm=tn ḫprt ḫr=i ḏr hrw tpy (...)

'He says as a teaching to his children:
"Now, I will speak to have you hear what has happened to me since the first day (...)" '

(iv) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.126: VI.15 (H*HBT* II 22, 3):

ḏd=i swt (...)

'Now, I will say: (...)'

    Sim. p.136: IX.11-12 (H*HBT* II 27, 3).

B. One expression, finally, deserves a mention of its own, since its extra-linguistic referent may itself relate to a certain horizon in time: *ꜥ-rsi* 'Southern Region'. The expression recurs no less than three times in *Merikare* (E 71; E 75; E 106). In the specific sense of a designation of the southern part of Egypt,[518] *ꜥ-rsi* is apparently not documented before the early New Kingdom. Early occurrences include *Urk*. IV 124, 9 and 125, 11 (Paheri); 362, 11 (Hatshepsut's Obelisks); *DZA* 21.541.340 (Nebamun, *temp.* Thutmosis IV); 21.541.320 (BM EA 1022; *HTBM* VIII pl.4). It has been proposed that the expression could have been coined not much earlier than the period of its first attestation, with an initial extension covering what had been the center of power of the later Seventeenth Dynasty.[519]

2.8.3.7 Groups of expressions

Up to the present point, only individual expressions, grammatical or lexical, were discussed. With the aim of reducing the uncertainties often attached to individual expressions, a complementary strategy could consist in considering sets of expressions recurring alongside each other in specific texts or groups of texts.

---

514 The Chief Steward Amenhotep's statue has another phrasing superficially reminiscent of a Middle Egyptian literary composition (46; *Urk*. IV 1800, 5), compare *Neferti* 10c-e: §5.3.1.2, n.d to the example): this as well is very unspecific, hardly an allusion.

515 Only formally similar is the collocation of *swt* with *ḏd* in *Sinuhe* B 37 (...) *ḏd.n=i swt m iw-ms* (...) '(...) But I spoke in untruth: (...)'. Unlike in the cases quoted in the main text, this does not serve to introduce direct speech: *Sinuhe* B 37 is only parenthetically inserted in already ongoing direct discourse. *Swt* is used for its regular adversative force.

516 Text: Gardiner 1910. Discussion: Gnirs 2013b: 136-8; Hagen 2012a: 187-9.

517 Also noted by Oréal 2011: 408.

518 The mere collocation of *ꜥ* 'region' with *rsi* 'southern' is of course found in earlier times, with a mythological referent (Hann*Lex* 5: 467b) or as the 'southern part/section' of a place (e.g. H*HBT* 18, 4).

519 Gnirs 2006: 213-4.

As discussed above, the preposition *r-ḏꜣwt* 'in return for, in accordance with' may be suggestive of a late dating of *Merikare* (§2.8.3.4, (ii)). Remarkably, this recurs in a series of texts or groups of texts that like *Merikare* also have *ꞽwty mrr=f* (§2.8.3.1) (a)-(b) or adverbial *mm* (§2.8.3.4, (i)) (c). *Ꞽwty mrr=f* itself recurs in a text that has an instance of the rare *ḏd swt* for introducing direct speech (§2.8.3.6.A) (d). To set observations on language into a slightly broader context, I add notes on similar formulations in smaller font; these are explicitly not meant to function as an argument for dating in themselves.

(a) Thutmosis I's *Abydos Stela*:

- *R-ḏꜣwt* (spelled *r-ḏꜣty*): 17 (*Urk.* IV 101, 10) – *Merikare* E 31
- *Ꞽwty mrr=f*: 6 (*Urk.* IV 97, 7-8) – *Merikare* E 67-68

The beginning of the inscription also has phraseological parallels with Merikare:

- (...) *m ꞽbw ꜥn* (...) *m ḥr*:

Thutmosis I's *Abydos Stela* 2 (*Urk.* IV 95, 8-9) *ḥr.wy nn m ꞽbw rmṯw ꜥn.wy nn m ḥrw nṯrw* 'How happy is this to the hearts of men, how beautiful is this to the faces of the gods';[520]

– *Merikare* E 22-23 *ꜥk m* [...] *m ꞽbw ꜥn sw m ḥr ḏt=f* 'Who enters the hearts as [...], he is beautiful to his people's face.'

- *Grg tꜣ pn*:[521]

Thutmosis I's *Abydos Stela* 3 (*Urk.* IV 95, 15-16) (...) *ḏr grg.tw tꜣ pn* '(...) since this land was founded.'

– *Merikare* E 49 *ꞽw tꜣ pn r grg ḫr=s* 'This land will be founded through it.'

(b) Royal inscriptions of Thutmosis III:

- *R-ḏꜣwt*: *Urk.* IV 752, 17; 754, 1; 1232, 7 – *Merikare* E 31
- *Mm*: *Urk.* IV 157, 6; 776, 10; 835, 14 – *Merikare* E 87; E 137

One of these texts has a formulation that recurs verbatim in Merikare:[522]

Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription* 21 (*Urk.* IV 164, 15) *nḥḥ pw grt wnn im* 'Now, being there is eternity.'

– *Merikare* E 56 *nḥḥ pw grt wn<n> im*.

---

520 This formulation, which recurs in contemporaneous inscriptions, is phraseologically bound. A variant is (...) *m ḥrw rmṯw* (...) *m ꞽbw nṯrw* in Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription* 8 (*Urk.* IV 159, 5-6), a text that also resonates with *Merikare* (below, (c)).

521 The collocation of *grg* with *tꜣ* in reference to Egypt recurs in Sethi I's *Nauri Decree* 6 (K*RI* I 47, 2) and in *Wenamun* 2.20. Slightly different in detail, but also in reference to Egypt, is *grg kmt* in Sethi I's *Alabaster Stela* 4 (K*RI* I 39, 5); also, partly broken, in Tutankhamun's *Restoration Stela* 27 (*Urk.* IV 2031, 13). With a broader reference than Egypt, further Sethi I's *Kanais Inscription* 11 (K*RI* I 67, 5) *grg pt tꜣ n ꞽb=sn* 'who founded heaven and earth for their sake', with a formulation similar to *Merikare* E 130 *ꞽr.n=f pt tꜣ n ꞽb=sn* 'for their sake he has made heaven and earth'; also P. Magical Harris 501 ro III.10 (all references drawn from *TLA* #168000).

522 Noted by Quack 1992: 37, n.a.

(c) *Chapelle Rouge*:

- *ʾIwty mrr=f*: *Chapelle Rouge*, p.150: XV.8-9 – *Merikare* E 67-68

- *Ḏd swt*: *Chapelle Rouge*, p.126: VI.15; p.136: IX.11-12 – *Merikare* E 91

> From the same reign, also in a royal inscription, is the earliest known instance of *ꜥ-rsi* as a geographical designation, in Hatshepsut's Northern Obelisk, Basis 6 (*Urk.* IV 362, 11: §2.8.3.6.B).

(d) The *Vizieral Cycle*:

- *R-ḏꜣwt*: *Duties of the Vizier* R 9 (*Urk.* IV 1107, 6); R 11 (*Urk.* IV 1109, 8) – *Merikare* E 31

- *Ḥmw-ib*: *Appointment* 25 (*Urk.* IV 1382, 15) – *Merikare* E 33

> The occurrences of *ḥmw-ib* in *Appointment* 25 and *Merikare* E 33 are significant are two of very few instances of the expression not in set phrases comparing the king with Ptah. In *Merikare*, *ḥmw-ib* and *r-ḏꜣwt* occur close to each other, in a passage that also includes a late construction of reported speech (E 31: §2.8.3.3):

>> *Merikare* E 31-33
>>
>> (...) *ḫsf=k r-ḏꜣwt i[yt]=k* (...)
>> *ḥmw m mdwt nḫt=k* [...] *ḫpš pw n nsw ns=f ḳn mdwt r ꜥḥꜣ nb*
>> *n ii.n.tw ḥꜣ ḥmw-ib*
>>
>> '(...) that you punish in accordance with their[sic] offence (...)
>> Be skillful with words, and you will be victorious [...] The strong arm of a king is his tongue, words are stronger than any fight;
>> There is no coming around a man with skillful understanding.'

> In terms of its contents and partly even formulation, the whole passage finds similarities in the *Vizieral Cycle*:[523]

>> *Duties of the Vizier* R 9[524] [*i*]*n tꜣty ḫsf n=f r-ḏꜣwt iw=f* 'It is the vizier who will punish him according to his offence.'

>> *Aametju* 20-21[525] *šsꜣ.ti m mdwt ꜥšꜣt ib n s tp ḏbꜥw=f* (...) [...] *psḥ n=f spty=f mdw* [...] 'Be experienced in many words, for every man's heart is on his fingers (...) [...] His lips bite for him;[526] speaks [...]'

> Other elements in *Merikare* and *Aametju* resonate which each other.[527] Most notable is what is presented as the respective objects of either text, the two highest political functions in Egypt:[528]

---

523 On the dating of *Duties of the Vizier*, §2.8.3.5.
524 Noted by Quack 1992: 23, n.f.
525 Noted by Dziobek 1998: 28 and 50. *Aametju* is intertextually allied with other Middle Egyptian teachings (Dziobek 1998: 49-52). One of these is *Ptahhotep*, which has paradigmatic value in the self-presentation of the Aametju-User-Rekhmire vizieral dynasty and arguably functions as an 'architext' (Moers 2001: 125, n.461) for subsequent teachings. Other teachings intertextually related to *Aametju* (most notably *A Man to His Son*) are of insecure dating.
526 I follow Vernus 2010²b: 61; different interpretation by Dziobek 1998: 28-9.

> *Aametju* 12 [...] *iȝwt* [*t*]*n mnḫt ḏ=i šsȝ=k m* [...] '[...] this excellent function; I shall make you wise in the [...]
>
> *Merikare* E 116 *iȝwt pw nfrt nsyt* (...) 'Kingship is a beautiful function (...)'

Both texts elaborate in terms of reciprocity:[529]

> *Aametju* 12 [...] *wˁ ir sn=f r* [...] '[... it is(?)] one who replaces(?) his second to [...]'[530]
>
> *Merikare* E 117-118 *in wˁ smnḫ ky ir s n nty ḫr-ḥȝt=f m-mryt smnḫ irt.n=f in ky iy ḫr-sȝ=f* 'It is one (king) who makes another one efficient, a man acting for the one who had been there before him in order that what he has done may be made efficient (in turn) by another coming after him.'

None of *r-ḏȝwt*, *ḥmw-ib*, and *ḏd swt* are paralleled in any text prior to the early New Kingdom, while circumstantial *iwty mrr=f* is itself strongly, although not exclusively, associated with the early New Kingdom. Given that these expressions are individually remarkable, their recurrence in the same texts and not in other ones could cautiously be interpreted as suggestive of an horizon in written language in common with *Merikare*.

2.8.4 Dating *Merikare*

A. A dating of *Merikare* to its Herakleopolitan setting can be ruled out by the *kȝ*-headed construction in E 14: this is the diachronic successor to synthetic *sḏm.kȝ=f* by a change that is well described and analyzed. When set against the background of the spread of this change in time and across registers during the Middle Kingdom, the same expression further suggests that a dating to a time as early as the earlier Twelfth Dynasty, although not to be ruled out fully, is unlikely (§2.8.3.2).

In attempting to restrict the range for dating further, the present author was not able to determine any distinctively early feature in *Merikare* that could lend itself to defining a terminus *post quem non* for the composition earlier than its first manuscript attestation (§2.8.2). This can of course not be an indication for a late dating in itself: the present author, necessarily limited in his understanding of Middle Egyptian and change therein, may have missed some relevant expression, or the composition may simply not include such expressions given the contents addressed and the form in

---

527 Thus *Aametju* 16 *m sfn n nb ḏbȝw* 'Do no be lenient on the one who can bribe'; *Merikare* E 44 *nmˁ=f n nb ḏbȝw=f* 'he is partial to the one who can bribe him' (Vernus 2010²b: 71, n.104; Fischer-Elfert 1999: 144-5; Dziobek 1998: 26). The motif is of course not specific to these two texts: it is for instance also found in Mentuwoser 14 (Kees 1928; Quack 1992: 134, 135-6: see above, n.421).

528 Noted by Vernus (2010²b: 60), who goes on: 'Le rapprochement est significatif. Ces mises en exergue de deux fonctions des plus importantes sont, dans une certaine mesure, les antécédents prestigieux de la bien moins étincelante apologie du métier de scribe, si fréquente dans la littérature "solaire", un peu plus tard; ce métier aura, lui aussi, droit à la même gratifiante qualification *jȝw.t tn mnḥ.t*, en l'occurrence à traduire plutôt par "profession excellente" (*Enseignement de Hori*, texte n°14) (...)'.

529 Vernus 2010²b: 71, n.101.

530 Following the interpretation cautiously proposed by Vernus 2010²b: 60.

which it addresses these. That *post quem non* criteria are inherently more difficult to devise than *ante quem non* ones should also be kept in mind as an important caveat in appreciating such descriptive result.

On the other hand, *Merikare* includes a series of expressions, grammatical and lexical, that are typical of, and for several even first documented in, the early New Kingdom. Of these, one grammatical construction has been well studied and is clearly late. There is no indication that the construction should not be integral to the original text of *Merikare*, in which case a valuable indication for dating the composition would be given; however, it can not be proven directly that the construction is indeed original (§2.8.3.3). Various lexical expressions are associated with the Eighteenth Dynasty specifically. Two of these, an adverb and a preposition, are not uncommon in those times and other expressions were demonstrably used in earlier times in similar contexts (§2.8.3.4.B). Other elements of language, although not to do with grammar or lexicon in a strict sense, may point to the same direction (§2.8.3.6).

B. A complementary approach, not exclusively focused on individual expressions, may also be pursued. Several of the expressions discussed turn out to recur combined in a series of early New Kingdom texts or groups of texts, such as Thutmosis I's *Abydos Stela*, inscriptions by Thutmosis III, *Chapelle Rouge*, or the *Vizieral Cycle* (§2.8.3.7). Except for the murky case of *iwty mrr=f*, no pre-New Kingdom text ever has any single one of these expressions. When the language of *Merikare* is considered not only as the sum of its individual expressions, but in terms of its linguistic typology, the composition relates to a coherent early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon.

As long as individual expressions are considered, alternative explanations such as textual alteration and/or coincidental gap in attestation remain of course possible, and must be considered. That such individual scenarios, all individually possible, should have applied simultaneously to all relevant expressions in *Merikare* is not the likeliest overall scenario, however. In particular, it would imply that the elements of a coherent linguistic typology discussed in *Merikare* would have arisen through the individual accidents of textual alteration—the results of which are usually of a different, more erratic, kind.[531]

In short, the scale tilts slightly toward a late dating of *Merikare*. A tilting scale and a definite linguistic argument are two different things, however. While the latter leaves little room for interpretation, the former is a matter of weighing the relative likelihood of competing options under the inclusion of complementary, non-linguistic, perspectives on the question.

---

531 This is illustrated by the case of *Ptahhotep* L2. As discussed, the two distinctively late constructions the L2 text includes could be immediately identified as secondary on internal grounds (§2.3.5). The L2 text further includes two less distinctively late grammatical expressions also found in *Merikare* (§2.8.3.1; 2.8.3.2.NB, (γ)). The second of these as well could be identified as secondary on internal grounds. In *Merikare*, by contrast, there are no text-internal indications for any of the expressions concerned that these should be secondary. Moreover, the mentioned expressions in *Ptahhotep* L2 relate to a certain horizon in time, but only when the whole of the written production of that time is considered. They do not, in other words, cohere in the ways the mostly different expressions described for *Merikare* do.

3   NARROW DATING 'BY SQUEEZING'

The most common strategy for dating a text linguistically consists in providing both a terminus *ante quem non* and a terminus *post quem non*. The text is then dated to a temporal range comprised between these and lower chronological bounds (for an altogether different strategy, §4). Ideally, these termini lie close to each other in time, defining a narrow range for dating (narrow dating 'by squeezing': this chapter). In other cases, upper and lower chronological bounds that can be defined remain centuries apart from each other: dating is then to a broader temporal range only (§2.7; §5-6).

3.1   Introduction

The conditions for a narrow dating 'by squeezing' are highly restrictive and it is a matter of favorable circumstances for them to be met in a particular composition to be dated. I first discuss these conditions in general terms (§3.1.1), then present a practical illustration in dating *Eloquent Peasant* (§3.1.2).

3.1.1   Conditions to be met

Defining termini *post quem non* based on linguistic evidence remains very difficult for the types of texts to which the present study is devoted. In general, *post quem non* criteria (based on advanced written obsolescence) are temporally more diffuse than *ante quem non* criteria (based on innovation in written registers). In the context of a substantial linguistic continuity in higher written registers during the early/mid-second millennium BCE (§1.2-3), literary compositions demonstrably draw on the thickness of language of their time (§2.4.3-4). Whatever termini *post quem non* can be defined linguistically are typically later, if often not by much, than the first manuscript attestation of a composition to be dated (case study: §2.6.3); they are then of no practical import. Unless some other element is given, a secure terminus *post quem non* will be provided by a text's first manuscript attestation only, to be interpreted in relation to what can be modeled of the composition's circulation. For texts that have been composed much earlier than their first manuscript attestation, a linguistically based narrow dating 'by squeezing' is then impossible for structural reasons.

Problems of a different sort affect texts that have been composed later in the time period considered for dating. By definition of a narrow dating 'by squeezing', a

linguistic innovation possibly relevant for dating must have occurred before, but not much before, the terminus *post quem non* provided by the first manuscript attestation. Moreover, this linguistic innovation must itself be datable with some precision. This results in the following set of conditions for a narrow dating 'by squeezing' to be possible.

(a) In the time periods here considered, ca. 2000-1450 BCE, only a limited number of linguistic dimensions underwent change in ways that could be exploited for dating (§2.2; also §1.1). When a narrow dating is aimed for, the time span relevant for dating a given composition becomes yet shorter and the number of individual linguistic changes potentially available for dating accordingly lower.

(b) The low density of the external record, compounded with its substantial linguistic continuity in relevant written registers, may make it difficult to describe potentially relevant innovations with sufficient temporal precision—a problem that can become acute when, as in narrow dating, temporal precision is aimed for. For a linguistic change to support a narrow dating, at least two of the three following conditions should ideally be met (compare the general discussion in §2.1.3):

(b.α) Expressions that perform common functions in language often provide better criteria because their frequency in language and in the record will make their patterns of attestation more reliable.

(b.β) For an expression documented from some point in time on, some other expression should, if possible, be exhibited in only slightly older texts performing the same, or a similar, function. Yet again, this condition is difficult to meet with linguistic functions other than common ones.

(b.γ) Whenever possible, an argument should be made on how the innovation considered fits into a broader process of linguistic change—a step that can prove essential in interpreting patterns of attestations as to the relative chronology and pace of developments. When no such argument is possible, a type-B *ante quem non* criterion may result (§2.1.3.D); by definition, this is always fairly broad temporally.

(c) A composition to be dated narrowly must happen to include one or several expressions that meet conditions (a) and (b) above. This comes with two additional requirements, seldom met in practice:

(c.α) A composition's contents must be of a sort that an expression in the process of being innovated in the time period considered may come to order. (This may seem obvious, but often turns out to be one of the most strongly limitative conditions of all.)

(c.β) In addition, the composition's register must be of a sort that it would include such innovative expression. (A similar comment applies.)

The above requirements are highly restrictive. That the present chapter devoted to narrow dating 'by squeezing' is the shortest of all is significant.

3.1.2   An illustration: Dating *Eloquent Peasant*

While a dating of *Eloquent Peasant* to its Herakleopolitan setting had once been contemplated as an option, a series of studies in the late 80's and early 90's independently suggested that the text was composed in the Twelfth Dynasty, and more precisely in the middle part of that Dynasty. One of these arguments was linguistic, Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion, which was developed largely for dating *Eloquent Peasant* itself.[1] This would have been a paradigmatic example of a narrow dating 'by squeezing'. *Eloquent Peasant* has a terminus *post quem non* in the late Twelfth Dynasty by its first manuscripts.[2] Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion in its original formulation (§2.6.1.2) would for its part have implied a terminus *ante quem non* no earlier than by the mid-Twelfth Dynasty: the composition of *Eloquent Peasant* would thus have been 'squeezed' to a relatively short period in time during the mid-Twelfth Dynasty.

A close examination of the occurrences and contexts that would document the innovative usage relevant for dating *Eloquent Peasant* by Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion reveals that the criterion does not apply to this text (§2.6.2.1-3). *Eloquent Peasant* must then be dated by other ways. Among these, institutional evidence plays a role: as pointed out by Berlev,[3] Rensi is a *imi-rꜣ pr wr* 'high steward' (R 6.6 and *passim*), a title first documented for Meketre at the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty; until then, only 'stewards' (*imi-rꜣ pr*) are attested in similar function (thus, Henenu, *temp.* Mentuhotep II-III; perhaps slightly later is Buau, with the title of 'steward in the entire land');[4] this strongly suggests that the lack of occurrences for a *imi-rꜣ pr wr* in that earlier period is not a gap in the record. Other elements of institutional evidence may be interpreted as confirmative evidence.[5] In addition, the composition may include an allusion to the titulary of Senwosret II, in which case a very precise dating to that short reign could follow.[6]

I here offer some linguistic arguments, other than the one originally submitted by Vernus, for dating *Eloquent Peasant*. Rather than a full study of the linguistic typology of that composition, one of the most complex in the preserved corpus of Middle Egyptian literature, these comments are aimed to provide a practical illustration of how the above conditions for narrow dating can be met, in full or only in part depending on various expressions considered: the discussion is therefore intentionally more explicit than for subsequent texts.

---

1   Vernus 1990b; 1990a: 185-8.
2   P. Berlin P 3023 ('B1') and P 3025 ('B2'), which form part of a collection of literary texts in a late Twelfth Dynasty Theban tomb (the so-called 'Berlin Library', probably Amenemhat III: Parkinson 2009: 77-90; Parkinson & Baylis 2012: 1-10); roughly contemporaneous with this is further P. Butler (P. BM EA 10274: 'Bt'), also from a Theban funerary context. See Parkinson 2012a: 2-3.
3   Berlev 1987a.
4   Grajetzki 2009: 69-80, particularly 71-3; 2005: 48.
5   Grajetzki 2005: 47-51.
6   Parkinson 1991b; 2012: 1.

A. In one place, *Eloquent Peasant* has a construction *wn.in.tw ḥr sḏm*: B1 115-116 *wn.in.tw ḥr rḏt n=f tȝ 10 ḥnḳt ds 2 rꜥ nb* 'And one began giving him ten loaves of bread and two jars of beer daily.' In this precise form, the construction is otherwise first documented in an expedition inscription of the reign of Amenemhat III (Hammamat 19, twice: §5.3.4.1, (iii)). The contents and register of the narrative parts of *Eloquent Peasant* are here of a sort as to include an expression that was apparently innovated only a relatively short time before the first manuscript attestation (compare §3.1.1, condition (c)). The pattern of early attestation of the construction is not dense: further occurrences of the *wn.in.tw ḥr sḏm* the present author is aware of are only from after the Middle Kingdom.[7] This accords with the fairly specific nature of the expression here considered, a passive construction of *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm*. Condition (b.α), stating that constructions common in language and text afford more reliable criteria for dating, fails to be met.

In assessing the early pattern of attestation of *wn.in.tw ḥr sḏm* as to its reliability, other types of *wn*-auxiliated analytic constructions with *tw* are then considered. These are themselves first documented by the Twelfth Dynasty, in each case as isolated 'firsts': *wn.ḥr.tw ḥr sḏm* (Kahun Veterinary Payrus, P. UC 32036, 20-21: §5.3.4.1, (iv)) and *wn.tw ḥr sḏm* (Antefiqer's *Girgawi Inscription* 6, *temp.* Amenemhat I: §5.3.4.1, (i)). Leaving aside the occurrence in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 115-116, the three other first occurrences of *wn*-auxiliated analytic constructions with *tw* are all from the Twelfth Dynasty: although attestation remains sparse, such clustering of first occurrences is relevant and suggests that *wn.in.tw ḥr sḏm* itself was not innovated before that time. In addition, the rise of these *wn.(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* constructions relates to broader processes of change affecting the functions and distribution of *tw* (aspects of which are discussed below: §5.2, §5.3, and §6.2; for *wn.(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* in this broader context, §5.3.4.1). Accordingly, these constructions did probably not emerge much earlier than their first actual documentation. Condition (b.γ) is met in substantial ways.

Independently of any of the non-linguistic elements for dating evoked above, the presence of *wn.in.tw ḥr sḏm* in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 115-116 thus provides strongly suggestive evidence for dating *Eloquent Peasant* no earlier than the Twelfth Dynasty, excluding the dating to the composition's Herakleopolitan setting once contemplated. The argument does not suffice to establish whether *Eloquent Peasant* was composed toward the beginning or the middle of the Dynasty: the expression targeted for dating does not relate to core functions in language and does not meet all the above conditions simultaneously.

B. In its closing section, *Eloquent Peasant* has one instance of a preposed possessive: B2 128 *nȝy=k n sprwt* 'these petitions of yours'. This still has strong deictic force in context (§2.4.4.2.2, (iii)), as is only to be expected in a composition that has a manuscript terminus *post quem non* still within the Twelfth Dynasty. The selection of the expression, innovative in itself, is noteworthy. Preposed possessives are common

---

7   E.g. Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* ro 14-15/vso 17 (H*HBT* 108, 15/16) *wn.in.tw ḥr sḫȝt* (...); Ahmes son of Abana 11 (*Urk.* IV 4, 3) *wn.in.tw ḥr ꜥḥȝ* (...); *Chapelle Rouge*, p.131: VII.12 (H*HBT* II 25, 5) *wn.in.tw ḥr irt* (...); Amenhotep II's *Amada Stela* 18 (*Urk.* IV 1297, 9/10) *wn.in.tw ḥr ꜥḥt* (...).

in late Twelfth Dynasty documentary texts from Illahun, but not in earlier documentary texts. Within Middle Egyptian literary registers, a preposed possessive recurs only once in a text securely dated to the Twelfth Dynasty, in *Kagemni* 2.3, also within a framing narrative, and also strongly deictic (§2.4.4.2.2.A). Later, it recurs in one other Middle Egyptian composition, *Cheops' Court*, several times and with already weakening deictic force. The expression used as in *Eloquent Peasant* can thereby be related to a broader change, which can be traced in the record, and of which it constitutes a fairly early stage (§3.1.1, condition (b.γ)); moreover, the linguistic function associated with the expression (a type of deixis) is very common in language (condition (b.α)). The pattern of attestation is therefore reliable, provided register is taken into due account. The presence of the preposed possessive in B2 128 implies a dating of *Eloquent Peasant* to the Twelfth Dynasty. It further suggests, but only suggests, that a dating to the middle of that Dynasty is more likely than one to its beginning.

C. In three places, *Eloquent Peasant* combines the 'passive' morpheme *tw* with events that lack an agent in their semantic representation: B1 252-254 *m(w)t.tw* 'one dies' and *ḥtm.tw* 'one perishes', B1 322 *ḫr.tw* 'one falls', and B1 131-132 *nšp.tw* 'one pants' (fuller quotations: §6.2.2.3, (i)-(iii)). As to be discussed in details in a later section (§6.2), this is an innovation occurring during the Twelfth Dynasty. In earlier Middle Egyptian, only events that have an agent in their semantic representation (such as *smꜣ* 'kill', *sḫtm* 'destroy', or *sḫr* 'bring to fall') can be made passive; other constructions are then used whenever the core participant of an event lacking an agent in semantic representation is to be left unspecified. Other than in *Eloquent Peasant*, the earliest occurrence of *tw* with an event lacking an agent in semantic representation is in a graffito dating to the time of Senwosret III (§6.2.2.3, (iv)). In a stela dated to the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty, on the other hand, an event of 'dying' still has the older construction, a subjectless active one: Antef (BM EA 1628), 8 *n rḏ=i m(w)t=ø* 'I did not let one die.' This contrasts with the innovative construction in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 253 *m rḏ m(w)t.tw* 'let not die!'

In terms of the conditions outlined above (§3.1.1), the construction here considered concerns a function that is relatively common in language (broadly: the expression of non-specified reference of the first participant), but not maximally common since the criterion is restricted to a specific subset of events (such that lack an agent in semantic representation): condition (b.α) is thereby met, but only in part. However, it can be demonstrated that for similar functions some other construction was used in only slightly earlier times: the all-important condition (b.β) is thereby met in full. Moreover, the innovative uses of *tw* in *Eloquent Peasant* can be related to a broader process of linguistic change, of which they constitute an early stage (§6.2.2.4): condition (b.γ), also contributing to an assessment of patterns of attestation as to their reliability, is thereby met as well. The construction of *tw* in B1 253, B1 254, and B1 322 therefore provides strong evidence for a terminus *ante quem non* to the mid-Twelfth Dynasty.

D. All three expressions discussed above imply a dating of *Eloquent Peasant* no earlier than the Twelfth Dynasty, thereby independently confirming the dating pro-

posed some while ago based on institutional analysis. Linguistic analysis also suggests a terminus *ante quem non* to the middle, rather than to the beginning, of that Dynasty: while individual expressions do so with varying degrees of force (compare the discussion above), their cumulative effect is here significant. *Eloquent Peasant* thus provides a textbook example of narrow dating 'by squeezing': the terminus *ante quem non*, linguistically defined, is only a few generations, or even decades, earlier than the terminus *post quem non*, defined by the first manuscript attestation. Taking into account that the presence of the composition in funerary contexts in Thebes may imply some time of previous circulation, a dating to the mid-Twelfth Dynasty is very likely. This is consistent with the possibility that the composition may date to the reign of Senwosret II specifically, if it indeed includes an allusion to the titulary of that king.

The above discussion has addressed technical aspects of how, depending on individual expressions, conditions (b.α), (b.β), and (b.γ) may be variously met, in full or in part. It is also illustrative of how the very possibility of one even getting to discuss such matters can be contingent upon the nature of the composition to be dated. Two out of three expressions considered (*wn.in.tw ḥr sḏm*; *nꜣy=f*) are from the narrative parts framing the Peasant's discourses, and could only have been from these. The first is related to the higher-order *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm*, intrinsically a narrative construction. The second is marked for register and its presence in the narrative frame accords with the also otherwise noticeable studied simplicity of this. The presence of the first of these expressions in *Eloquent Peasant* is thereby illustrative of condition (c.α), namely that the contents of a text to be dated narrowly must be of a sort to include certain expressions amenable to dating. The presence of the second expression is illustrative of condition (c.β), namely that for a text to be dated narrowly the selections it makes in terms of registers must be of a sort as to include certain expressions. In most texts in the preserved body of Middle Egyptian literature, neither of these two expressions features, nor would they be expected to feature.

As to the one construction that is from the petitions themselves (*tw* accommodated to events that lack an agent in semantic representation), its nature is also more broadly significant, on an altogether level. The innovative aspect of the expression lies in its function, not in its form: what is innovative is the extension of *tw* to events from which it was previously banned, not the morpheme *tw* itself, nor its use in post-thematic position of a synthetic form of the verb ('*sḏm.tw*', which is old). As current understanding goes, most registers of Middle Egyptian literature do not accommodate expressions whose innovative character is too clearly perceivable as such, as is the case, typically, with innovations in linguistic form. Accordingly, expressions whose innovative character lies with less tangible dimensions of linguistic function will often be the best, and at times the only, criteria for dating. (Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion, not applicable to *Eloquent Peasant*, but applicable to other compositions, is itself of that very sort.) In *Eloquent Peasant*, the petitions are currently datable linguistically only by one such criterion, targeting change in the function of an expression which as far as form is concerned has not undergone change.

3.2 *Fishing and Fowling*

The composition presently now referred to as *Fishing and Fowling* is documented in a single fragmentary manuscript (P. Moscow unnumbered) which paleographically dates to the late Eighteenth Dynasty.[8] The manuscript was purchased together with other manuscripts of Middle Egyptian literary texts that paleographically date to the same period. Some of these are Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses of compositions already documented in the Twelfth Dynasty (*Sinuhe* G, *Ptahhotep* L2), while other ones are witnesses of compositions of as yet insecure dating (*Merikare* M, *Sporting King*, and *Moscow Mythological Story*). Although there is no direct evidence for this, all these manuscripts arguably derive from a single find.[9]

Among these texts, *Fishing and Fowling* displays affinities with *Sporting King* (§4.3). It has been suggested that *Sporting King* and *Fishing and Fowling*, both fragmentary, could be parts of a single longer composition,[10] but this remains very uncertain;[11] for dating, *Sporting King* and *Fishing and Fowling* must therefore be discussed separately. The typologically transitional character of these two compositions has long been noted and they have been cautiously proposed as candidates for a possible Eighteenth Dynasty literature.[12] Parkinson subsequently established this transitional character in more precise terms[13] and suggested a more broadly later rather than earlier dating within the history of Middle Egyptian literature (full quotation, §4.3.1.C). Cautiously again, it has also been observed that, should *Fishing and Fowling* be late, the ideal image of life in the marshes projected in this composition could be viewed as a 'spezifische Reaktion auf die ausdifferenzierte Stadt- und Palastkultur des Neuen Reiches'.[14]

I here propose some linguistic perspectives on the issue, also with a view on discussing the general conditions for, and limitations of, 'narrow dating'. The reader may compare the present section with the one devoted to *Eloquent Peasant* (§3.1.2): the two texts afford different situations, complementary to each other in many ways.

3.2.1 Grammar: Broad dating

The fragmentary state of preservation of the composition severely restricts the prospects for discussing grammatical constructions possibly relevant for dating: to be identified and interpreted, grammatical constructions generally require continuous contexts. One feature of grammar relevant for dating is noted nonetheless, the use of *NP ḥr sḏm* for expressing habitual aspect in B2.7-8:[15] *iw=i ḥr ẖdb r-tnw-sp nn ꜣbw n mꜣ[wt=i]* 'I kill at every occasion without my harpoon ever stopping' (§2.6.2.6, (i)).

---

8   Text: Caminos 1956: 1-21 and pl.1-7.
9   Lastly, Hagen 2012a: 180.
10   Quirke 2004a: 206.
11   Parkinson 2002: 312, n.18.
12   Assmann 1985: 48-9; Baines 1996: 160-1.
13   Parkinson 2002: 226-34.
14   Widmaier 2009: 96-7.
15   Vernus 1990a: 186, ex.399.

The criterion here applied, Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion, is very strong (§2.6.1-2). It involves a core linguistic function, the expression of habitual aspect: this implies a high text frequency of the relevant expressions (compare §3.1.1: condition (b.α)). Moreover, the change can be firmly anchored in time not only through an exhibition of early similarly innovative uses in other texts, but also through the complementary exhibition of a different construction—in the present case, *N(P) sḏm=f*—expressing similar functions in only slightly earlier texts (condition (b.β)). Finally, the process of change to which the innovation relates has been studied in depth and is comparatively well-understood (condition (b.γ)). As also discussed, synthetic *N(P) sḏm=f* hardly ever undergoes alteration into analytic *NP ḥr sḏm* in the course of textual transmission; when it does, this concerns only lesser Ramesside witnesses, generally resulting in distinctively hybrid constructions that are easily identified as such (§2.3.3). This makes it extremely unlikely that the text in *Fishing and Fowling* B2.7-8 should be secondary. Based on B2.7-8, the composition of *Fishing and Fowling* therefore receives a strong terminus *ante quem non* to the early Thirteenth Dynasty, or the late Twelfth at the earliest.

This does not yield a narrow dating, because the terminus *ante quem non* linguistically defined still remains several centuries earlier than the terminus *post quem non* given by the first manuscript attestation of the composition. Under the hypothetical assumption that *Fishing and Fowling* was composed at some time in the late Middle Kingdom, a narrow dating 'by squeezing' could have resulted if some manuscript earlier than P. Moscow unn. had survived. Conversely, under the similarly hypothetical assumption that the text was composed in the Eighteenth Dynasty, a narrow dating 'by squeezing' could have resulted if in Egyptian language history the change in the expression of aspect here considered had happened some centuries later than it did happen. The change, however, happened at the time at which it happened, and no manuscript earlier than P. Moscow unn. has survived. Only a broad dating of *Fishing and Fowling* is therefore possible based on grammatical evidence.

3.2.2 Lexicon: Evidence for a narrow dating

Given the above limitations on analyzing grammar in *Fishing and Fowling*, the perspective may be broadened to include possible elements of lexical evidence. Lexical expressions tend to be individually less common than grammatical ones and their innovation is an individual history, not related to a broader process of change (§2.2.2). In general, these largely structural issues result in higher uncertainties in assessing patterns of attestation (§3.1.1: (b.α) and (b.γ)), compounded with difficulties in assessing whether a given lexical expression is integral to a composition to be dated. The latter issue specifically is illustrated in *Fishing and Fowling* by *nkꜣy m* 'ponder, think about' (A2.8), an expression that is strongly associated with the Eighteenth Dynasty, recurs in a literary composition of insecure dating, *Khakheperreseneb* (ro 10 and vso 1),[16] yet also in Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses of *Ptahhotep* and *Sinuhe*

---

16 Contrasting the object and mode of *nkꜣ*'ing in *Khakheperreseneb* and *Fishing and Fowling*, Parkinson 2002: 229.

(§2.7.3.3, (ii)). While *nk3y m* is probably a token of an Eighteenth Dynasty surface of *Fishing and Fowling* as transmitted in P. Moscow unn., the expression therefore fails to provide a reliable indication for dating.

A. Two other lexical expressions in *Fishing and Fowling* merit more substantial comments. The first is *bḫn* 'fortified house, country mansion' in B1.13 and B1.15.[17] The word[18] is common; it occurs in Ramesside miscellanies,[19] praises of the city,[20] narrative literature,[21] love poetry,[22] and further in Ramses II's *First Hittite Marriage*[23] and in *Onomasticon of Amenemope*.[24] In pre-Ramesside times, only two occurrences other than the ones in *Fishing and Fowling* have been noted: in an hieratic note added to EA 27[25] (a letter of Tushratta to Akhenaten: *Urk*. IV 1995, 17) and in a song from Rekhmire's tomb (*Urk*. IV 1164, 14; *temp*. Thutmosis III: below, B). From the same root, but a different word, is *bḫnt* 'pylon', documented since the Eighteenth Dynasty.[26]

Fishing and Fowling further has an occurrence of *h(3)nw* 'wave' (C1.x+7). Like *bḫn*, this remains undocumented in pre-New Kingdom times, while it is common in Ramesside literary texts of various sorts,[27] thus in a famous passage in *Wenamun* (1.49 = 1.x+14). Other occurrences are in Ramesside miscellanies,[28] literary letters,[29] in hymns to the king,[30] to the Nileflood,[31] and to a god,[32] in a teaching,[33] in *Onomasticon of Amenemope*,[34] in magical texts,[35] and in a letter to a coffin.[36] I am aware of only two pre-Ramesside occurrences of *h(3)nw* other than the one in *Fishing and Fowling*, one in *Great Hymn to Aton* 10, and one in *Pahu's Prayer* 2 (*temp*. Amenhotep II – Amenhotep III).

---

17 For the broader context, lastly Widmaier 2009: 133-5.
18 Noted as 'nur neuägyptisch' in *DZA* 22.918.110.
19 E.g. P. Anastasi IV ro III.7; VIII.9 (= P. Lansing ro XI.3); P. Lansing ro IX.1; XII.1; P. Chester Beatty IV vso III.4; P. Chester Beatty V ro VIII.11; these and the following references are drawn from *TLA* #57030 and *DZA* 22.918.110.
20 In a praise of Piramses (Ragazzoli 2008: 65-8): P. Anastasi II ro I.1 (= P. Anastasi IV ro VI.1); I.5 (= P. Anastasi IV ro VI.5); in another praise of Piramses (Ragazzoli 2008: 69): P. Anastasi II ro V.5.
21 *Two Brothers* 9.1, 9.2, 13.2.
22 P. Harris 500 ro II.11.
23 K*RI* II 255, 8 (Amara West x+29; not preserved in the duplicates).
24 P. Golenisheff V.13 (Gardiner 1947: II, 204-5 (#420)).
25 Sic, not '29' as wrongly in *Urk*. IV and *TLA*.
26 F*CD* 84; *DZA* 22.918.440.
27 References drawn from *TLA* #97670.
28 P. Anastasi IV Ib.2; II.8; P. Koller II.6; P. Turin Cat 1882 vso III.10; P. Lansing XII.2.
29 In one witness of *Satirical Letter*, O. Turin 57359, 9; in *Menna's Letter*, O. OIC 12074 + O. IFAO 2188 vso 5.
30 O. DeM 1222 ro 4 (to Ramses III); P. Turin 54031 ro 88.5 (to Ramses VI and VII); also in an inscriptionally published hymn to Ramses II in Abu Simbel (*DZA* 26.361.380; 26.361.430).
31 O. DeM 1675 ro 4.
32 *DZA* 26.361.420 (to Amun: Gurob, Nineteenth Dynasty).
33 *Amenemope* 7.2.
34 P. Golenisheff I.8 = P. Hood II.8 (Gardiner 1947: I, 77 (#26)).
35 P. Magical Harris 501 VII.9; P. Genève MAH 15274 ro VI.4.
36 Letter to Ikhtai's coffin, O. Louvre 689, 20.

Both *bẖn* and *h(ꜣ)nw* have highly cohesive patterns of attestation. In pre-Ramesside times, both recur only twice outside *Fishing and Fowling*, each expression once in an Amarna text and once in a slightly earlier one. Both are tightly associated with Ramesside literary registers: they do not occur often outside these in Ramesside times, and are hardly ever documented in later times. That *Fishing and Fowling* accommodates these two expressions in its lexicon is therefore consistent with other aspects by which the composition is a forerunner of Ramesside literature.

B. *Fishing and Fowling* is pre-Ramesside: independently from the date of P. Moscow unn. itself, this would be established by the general linguistic register, which is Middle Egyptian. The above strongly suggests that the composition is not pre-Ramesside by several centuries.

To be sure, what *bẖn* refers to is associated with a motif that is itself uncommon in Middle Kingdom literature, and one may therefore observe that the argument tends toward literary history just as much as it is a lexical one. Of singular interest is then the context of the single pre-Amarna occurrence of *bẖn*: this is from a song of a lyre-player in Rekhmire's tomb, a locus subject to conditions of decorum different from other textual productions. The song goes:

Urk. IV 1164, 13-14

tꜣ mḥyt my
mꜣ.n.tw iw=i m pꜣ(y)=i bẖn

'O North wind, come!
One has seen that I am in my mansion.'

The linguistic register in which *bẖn* is first found other than in *Fishing and Fowling* is innovative in several respects, including, in short sequence to each other: *tꜣ* introducing the address to the 'North wind'; a *iw*-headed construction after *mꜣꜣ*, a construction that would later develop into one type of complement clauses in Late Egyptian;[37] and the preposed possessive *pꜣ(y)=i*.

As to *h(ꜣ)nw* 'wave', its absence in earlier times can even less be a matter of motifs only marginally present in pre-New Kingdom literary texts. Twelfth Dynasty literary texts also tell of 'waves', famously *Shipwrecked Sailor* (40, 58, and 110) and, very significantly for the present discussion, *Fowler* (P. Butler vso 37). These Middle Kingdom texts all have another word for 'wave', *wꜣw*.[38] Significantly, the single pre-Amarna occurrence of *h(ꜣ)nw* other than in *Fishing and Fowling* is from a text of lesser formality, incised in hieratic outside the Valley, *Pahu's Prayer*. Among innovatives expressions, this also accommodates the new subject pronoun (5 *tw=i*).

---

37 With a view on another verb, *mri* 'wish', with different semantics, early instances of a similar construction are analyzed in Polis 2009: 223-4 (*Urk*. IV 890, 11, *temp*. Amenhotep II; P. Cairo 58053 ro 5-6, *temp*. Amenhotep III).

38 With a different semantic extension, and therefore not directly relevant to the above, is also *wḏnw* 'flood, torrent' (*Eloquent Peasant* B1 133; B1 175; B1 188; Hymns to Senwosret III ro II.12; *Ipuwer* 10.13; 13.4; further in a lamentation in the early New Kingdom tomb of Reneni of el-Kab (Enmarch 2012: 90)).

Both *h(3)nw* and *bḫn* are thus first documented in contexts that are also otherwise innovative.

If *Fishing and Fowling* is to be dated to a period before the Eighteenth Dynasty, it must be assumed that *bḫn* and *h(3)nw* are secondary readings in this text. Yet, *bḫn* is well integrated in its contexts in both its occurrences in *Fishing and Fowling* (the context of *h(3)nw* is fragmentary). Moreover, the presence of *bḫn* and *h(3)nw* in *Fishing and Fowling* is fully consistent with how in its broader literary typology the composition anticipates aspects of Ramesside literature to come.

3.2.3 Dating *Fishing and Fowling*

Grammar, on which the present study is mainly based, here supports only a broad dating: *Fishing and Fowling* was not composed before the late Middle Kingdom (§3.2.1). In the lexicon, the presence of *bḫn* 'fortified house, country mansion' and *h(3)nw* 'wave' is very remarkable (§3.2.2). For reasons specific both to the expressions considered and to the text under discussion, these strongly suggest that *Fishing and Fowling* was composed in the Eighteenth Dynasty.

Such a late dating would be consistent with the 'transitional' typology of the composition in literary terms (§3.2, introduction). It could also find some circumstantial support in a non-linguistic detail, the mention of *ḥwt-wˁrt* 'Avaris' (C3.14). While the site was occupied already in the Twelfth Dynasty and the city grew substantially from the Thirteenth Dynasty on, textual mentions of 'Avaris' are not found before the late Seventeenth Dynasty, always in directly referential contexts.[39] That a reference to 'Avaris' could have been included in a literary composition at any pre-Eighteenth Dynasty time is therefore very unlikely; for the same reason, the expression may even point to a period later than the beginning of that Dynasty.[40] (Under the hypothesis of an early dating, one could of course speculate that 'Avaris' was secondarily inserted in the list of Fayum and Delta toponyms of which it is part.)

A dating of *Fishing and Fowling* to the Eighteenth Dynasty, i.e. to a time fairly close to its sole surviving manuscript, is therefore the most likely option.

3.3 P. BM EA 10475 ro and vso

Two Middle Egyptian literary compositions are fragmentarily preserved on P. BM EA 10475 ro and vso, an *Eulogistic Account of a King* and a *Tale Involving the House of Life*.[41] Based on the paleography, comparable to P. Westcar, the manuscripts date to the late Second Intermediate Period.[42] As regards composition, the editor of these texts notes: '(...) presumably later Middle Egyptian rather than earlier'.[43] The follow-

---

39 Early occurrences are Tjau x+4 (Kubisch 2008: 232-4); *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 2 and *passim*; Emhab 14; Ahmes son of Abana 8 (*Urk.* IV 3, 7); *Speos Artemidos* 37 (*Urk.* IV 390, 7).
40 The next earliest literary reference to 'Avaris' is early Ramesside, in *Apophis and Seqenenre* 1.2.
41 Text: Parkinson 1999.
42 Parkinson 1999: 178-9.
43 Parkinson 1999: 193, n.107.

ing discussion, partly elaborating on observations made by Parkinson, confirms this assessment and provides further elements for dating. The preserved portions of text in either composition are not long and expectations for dating must be set accordingly.

3.3.1   *Tale Involving the House of Life* (P. BM EA 10475 vso)

The text has the following linguistically remarkable passage, which includes two late constructions, *iri ꜥḥꜥ* (...) *iw=f ḥr sḏm* and *iw.tw ḥr sḏm*:

> *Tale Involving the House of Life* X+5.2-4
>
> *ir.in.tw ꜥḥꜥw r hrw 40 m ḥb nfr n* [...]
> *iw.tw ḥr swr m* [...]
>
> 'And a period up to fourty days was spent in a beautiful festival of/for [...]
> drinking from/in [...]'

A. To my knowledge, this is the sole pre-New Kingdom instance of *iri ꜥḥꜥ* (or of some other expression of 'spending time' such as *wrš*, etc.) followed by *iw=f ḥr sḏm*. In the Middle Kingdom, the construction is always with the secondary predicate *ḥr sḏm* directly embedded (i.e. without *iw=f*), thus in a mid-Twelfth Dynasty composition, *Eloquent Peasant* (i). The construction with direct embedding is still the one found in *Cheops' Court* (type-B terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty: §2.4.4.1) (ii):

> (i) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 62-63
>
> *ir.in sḫty pn ꜥḥꜥ {10} r hrw 10*
> *ḥr spr n nmti-nḫt pn*
>
> 'Then this peasant spent a period of up to ten days
> petitioning this Nemtinakht.'

> > Sim., with another expression for spending time (*iri hrw* (...) *ḥr sḏm*), *Sinuhe* B 238-239; from an inscriptional register, e.g. Hammamat 199, 7.

> (ii) *Cheops' Court* 2.9
>
> *wrš.n=s im*
> *ḥr swr* [...]
>
> 'and she spent time there
> drinking [...]'

> > Sim. 7.6-7 *ist wrš ḥm n nsw bity ḫwfw mꜣꜥ-ḫrw ḥr ḥḥi n=f nꜣ n ipwt nt wnt nt ḏḥwti* (...) 'The Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Khufu, justified, used to spend time seeking for himself the chambers of the sanctuary of Thoth (...)'.

Of the conditions set out above (§3.1.1), (b.β) is met: some other construction (here: direct embedding) was used in similar functions (here: secondary predication after an expression of 'spending time') in only slightly earlier times than the expression under discussion (here: up to and including *Cheops' Court*). Condition (b.γ) is met as well

because the innovation under discussion relates to broader changes in the syntax of *iw*, increasingly used as an overt marker of subordination; major steps in the process are observed unfolding in texts of the later Seventeenth Dynasty.[44]

The analysis is confirmed by the fact that the second earliest occurrence of the construction with overt subordination of the secondary predication, later than the one in *Tale Involving the House of Life*, is in a text from the very eve of the Eighteenth Dynasty, Emhab. This is also otherwise innovative in its linguistic selections (§1.3.3.2.E):

(iii) Emhab 8-9

(...) *ir=i rnpt 3 iw=i ḥr sḫt m ḳmḳm rꜥ nb*

'(...) I spent three years playing the drum daily.'

B. The passage of *Tale Involving the House of Life* quoted above (X+5.2-4) also includes an early instance of *iw.tw ḥr sḏm*, i.e. of a use of *tw* in the subject slot of a *NP ḥr sḏm* construction not auxiliated by *wn*.[45] As to be discussed in details below (§5.3), the earliest securely dated occurrences of this construction are from the early Eighteenth Dynasty, typically in innovative registers. Moreover, securely dated Twelfth Dynasty compositions (*Sinuhe*, *Eloquent Peasant*), as well as other literary compositions that date to the late Middle Kingdom at the earliest (*Ipuwer*, *Khakheperreseneb*), demonstrably use another construction in similar functions (*sḏm.tw=f*). Condition (b.β) is thereby met.

Condition (b.γ) is met as well, yet not in full: upon further linguistic analysis, the innovation can be related to broader changes affecting the distribution of *tw* (detailed discussion below, §5.3), but not in ways that are as temporally precise as for the construction discussed first (above, A). The low density of the Second Intermediate Period record here leads to a reduced temporal resolution in anchoring the relevant linguistic change to time, with the effect that the resulting dating criterion is a type-B *ante quem non* criterion (§2.1.3.D): the construction *iw.tw ḥr sḏm* was innovated at some period in time not before the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty and could have been innovated only later; when more precisely it was innovated remains unclear. For methodological reasons, the construction must then be declared possible for the earliest period in time for which the available evidence does not permit to rule out that the construction could have been possible, the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty. (This does of course not mean that the construction was actually innovated by this early time already, only that such eventuality can not be ruled out.)

C. The second expression discussed provides a type-B terminus *ante quem non* to the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty; the first provides a terminus *ante quem non* to the Second Intermediate Period, and probably to the later part thereof. It is therefore submitted that *Tale Involving the House of Life* dates to the (later) Second Intermediate Period. A dating to the Seventeenth Dynasty, i.e. broadly to the time of its sole surviving manuscript, is linguistically the most likely option.

---

44 Provisionally Kruchten 1999.
45 Also noted by Parkinson 1999: 193, n.107.

3.3.2 *Eulogistic Account of a King* (P. BM EA 10475 ro)

A. The text has the following remarkable expression:

(i) *Eulogistic Account of a King* X+7.x+3

swꜣḏ.n=f tꜣ ti sw wšr.n=f

'He has made the land green when it had become dry.'

The subordinating particle *ti*[46] is commonly attested only from the early New Kingdom on,[47] but is also documented in at least two Middle Kingdom texts.[48] If a later dating of *Eulogistic Account of a King* is established first on independent grounds, the presence of *ti* would be relevant to an appreciation of the linguistic typology of the composition; for primary dating itself, it remains uncriterial.

Rather than *ti* itself, the main observation concerns the construction which *ti* here introduces, *ti sw sḏm.n=f*. *Ti* generally introduces subject-initial constructions with a pronominal subject (common patterns include *ti sw AP*, *ti sw ḥr sḏm*, *ti sw pseudoparticiple*, or *ti sw sḏm=f*). The specific combination in *Eulogistic Account of a King* X+7.x+3, however, which differs from all of the above, is exceedingly rare; this finds a direct parallel perhaps in one other text only:

(ii) Thutmosis I's *Tombos Inscription* 3 (*Urk*. IV 83, 1-3)

(...) *ti ḥm=f it.n=f iwꜤt=f ḥtp.n=f ṯnt(ꜣ)t ḥr r swsḫ tꜣšw wꜣst* (...)

'(...) when His Majesty had taken its heritage, when He had settled on the throne of Horus to widen the boundaries of Thebes (...)'

The pattern of attestation of *ti sw sḏm.n=f*, apparently limited to these two instances, is exceedingly slim and can not be assessed as to its reliability through any of the strategies presented above (§3.1.1). Rather than being based on ongoing language change, the argument here targets a specific type of formulation in written language. The general context for such is given in later Middle Egyptian times, when in some written registers *ti* and *ist* were developing various new uses.[49] This suggests a later, rather than earlier, date within the Second Intermediate Period. In terms of method, the argument comes close to 'direct dating', a strategy discussed in the next chapter.

B. Noteworthy in *Eulogistic Account of a King* is also *m-rꜣ-Ꜥ* 'likewise' (X+7.x+5). This is the earliest documented occurrence of the expression and the only in any pre-Eighteenth Dynasty text (§4.2.3). In the periods when it is attested, the expression is not uncommon, suggesting that its pattern of attestation is fairly reliable.

It may also be of some significance that one other very early occurrence of *m-rꜣ-Ꜥ* is in Thutmosis I's *Tombos Inscription* 2 (*Urk*. IV 82, 14), in the very same text therefore that has the single other occurrence of *ti sw sḏm.n=f* (ii).

---

46 Noted by Parkinson (1999: 193, n.107).

47 For various instances in early New Kingdom inscriptional registers, Oréal 2011: 247-8.

48 *Sinuhe* R 15 (§2.4.3.2, (xii)); Deir Rifêh, tomb 7, col.17 (Griffith 1889: pl.18; noted by Oréal 2011: 246, n.158).

49 See Oréal 2011: ch.4, the various sub-sections on 'égyptien de tradition'.

3.4 *Hymn to Hapi*

Hymn to Hapi[50] is first documented on T. Ashmolean 1948.91, which in all likelihood dates to the early Eighteenth Dynasty; the tablet gives two versions of the beginning (1.1-8), presumably by an apprentice and his teacher.[51] Another witness probably dating to the Eighteenth Dynasty is T. Louvre E 693, also with the beginning of the composition (1.1-2.6).[52] Other Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses now include the three graffiti in Assiut N13.1, spanning most of the text (graffito 2a: *Hymn* 1.1-5.8; graffito 2b: *Hymn* 8.1-8; graffito 2c: *Hymn* 9.1-14.7);[53] of these, the one with the beginning of the composition (2a) is paleographically dated to the early Eighteenth Dynasty.[54] The composition enjoyed a broad reception in the New Kingdom: copies are many, on diverse material supports, and found in various places in the country.[55]

Hymn to Hapi shares many motifs and elements in the articulation of the ideas exposed with texts from Amarna on.[56] The early Ramesside dating initially suggested by the editor of the text[57] is contradicted by its earliest manuscript attestation, in the early Eighteenth Dynasty; taking these into account, the author now argues in detail for a dating to the early Eighteenth Dynasty.[58] Based on language and the Middle Egyptian literary tradition *Hymn* is allied with, other authors have proposed a Middle Kingdom dating.[59]

3.4.1 *Hymn* 4.7: New subject pronoun

In one place, the composition has an instance of the new subject pronoun (*tw=i, tw=k,* etc.):[60]

> *Hymn* 4.7
> *sw*[a] *m dw3t pt t3 r-ẖt=f*[b]
> 'He (*scil.* the Nileflood) is in the underworld, while[c] earth and heaven are under its authority.'

---

50 Text: van der Plas 1986; three additional ostraca, all Ramesside, are mentioned in van der Plas 2013: §2, n.2-4. I follow the designation argued for by van der Plas 2013: §1.

51 Hagen in press, with a detailed discussion of the paleography; the early dating was already noted in *EG*, p.20, n.11; subsequently Quack 1992: 134.

52 Van der Plas 1986: I, 4. On the dating, see the references in van der Plas 1986: I, 11.

53 Verhoeven 2013: §4.

54 Verhoeven 2013: §5.b.

55 Van der Plas 1986: I, 4-16; discussion by Hagen in press.

56 Van der Plas 1986: I, 187-90, and the running commentary; van der Plas 2013. Similarly by an author who dates to the Middle Kingdom, Assmann (1999[2]: 547): 'In seiner Gedankenführung erinnert er oft an Amarnahymnen; geht es ihm doch, wie jenen, um die Deutung vielfältigster Phänomene als Manifestationen des „dem Angesicht verborgenen" lebenspendenden Wirkens der Gottheit.'

57 Van der Plas 1986: I, 187-90.

58 Van der Plas 2013.

59 E.g. Assmann 1999[2]: 547 (who duly acknowledges the shared ideas and motifs with later texts, see the preceding note).

60 Noted by van der Plas 1986: I, 28, 189.

a) A different reading in the Assiut witness that preserves this verse: §3.4.1.1.A. Corruption of the whole first part into *sntr* in P. Anastasi VII and P. Sallier II.

b) The second part of the verse displays some textual variation, mainly between *r-ḫt=f* 'under its authority' (e.g. O. DeM 1176 ro) and *ḥr sḫnwt=f* 'on its posts' (e.g. P. Turin ro);[61] this is inconsequential for the following discussion.

c) 'While' as a faute-de-mieux English rendering of the balanced patterning of the Egyptian verse (*sw m dw3t – pt t3 r-ḫt=f*). See below, §3.4.1.4.

The new subject pronoun is not documented before the late Seventeenth Dynasty (§3.4.1.3). Its occurrence in *Hymn* 4.7 would therefore imply a terminus *ante quem non* by the very late Second Intermediate Period. In order to strengthen the argument, a series of additional considerations are required.

3.4.1.1 The original reading?

A preliminary step consists in assessing whether the pronoun is integral to the original text of *Hymn*, thereby pointing to its actual date of composition, or a secondary reading, thereby pointing to some stage in textual transmission.

A. *Hymn* 4.7 was long documented in Ramesside witnesses only. The now earliest witness for this passage, from an Assiut graffito (2a), turns out to read differently, *m s dw3t/sb3t*[?].[62] However, the text in the Assiut graffito does not seem to make sense as it stands; the verse is also problematic on more than one level, as are other elements in the immediately surrounding context.[63] The reading in Assiut graffito 2a may be too corrupt to reconstruct the original text from it with any certainty, yet the most likely scenario at this stage of study remains an alteration from a reading such as now preserved in the Ramesside witnesses of *Hymn*, *sw m dw3t*. A more detailed picture is expected to emerge when the Assiut graffiti will be fully published and analyzed.

B. In six places in New Kingdom witnesses of other compositions, the new subject pronoun is demonstrably not original. Five of these cases, all from Ramesside witnesses, involve a first person pronoun *tw=i*, not a third person *sw* as in *Hymn to Hapi* (for the sixth case, below, C). In three cases, the pronoun is after *nty*/*ntt*:

Heavenly Cow 215[64] *rḫ=sn nty tw=i ꜥ3* 'May they know that I am here.'
        (in S and R.III; T preserves the original *rḫ=sn ntt wi ꜥ3*)

Heavenly Cow 232 *ḏr-nty tw=i r irt šsp* (...) 'for I am to make light (...)'
        (in S and R.II; T preserves the original (...) *ḏr-ntt wi* (*r*) *irt šsp* (...))

Sinuhe AOS vso 2-3 *sšmw pn nty tw=i im=f* 'these conditions I am in'
        (B 173-174 reads *sšm pn nty wi ḫr=f* 'this condition I am in (*lit.* under)')

---

61 See van der Plas 1986: I, 95-6; II, 40.
62 Provisionally Verhoeven 2013: §5.b, n.42 (without the broader context).
63 I thank Ursula Verhoeven (p.c. 10/2011) for having shared the broader context with me.
64 Numbering after Hornung 1982.

The process of textual alteration, recurrent across the traditions of two unrelated texts, is to be accounted for in relation to the specific constructional environment in which it occurs. This involves a strong formal similarity between the original and altered readings, on both the written and phonetic levels: *nty/ntt wi* (...) → *nty/ntt tw=i* (...). Ironically, this seems to mirror what in earlier times may have been one of the components of the linguistic process that contributed to the rise of the interlocutive (first and second person) forms of the new subject pronoun in the language itself.[65]

The other two instances are not in relative environments, but also involve first person singular pronouns:

Sinuhe AOS vso 45 (badly preserved) *tw=i mi s* (...) 'I was like a man (...)'
(B 254 reads *iw=i mi s* (...))

Sinuhe AOS vso 50 *mk tw=i m-bȝḥ* [...] 'See I am in front [...]'
(B 263 reads *mk wi m-bȝḥ=k*)

While not as strongly as in relative environments, these cases again involve at least some proximity, written or phonetic, between older and later forms (*wi* → *tw=i*; *=i* → *tw=i*). By contrast, the third person pronoun *sw*, as in *Hymn* 4.7, shows no point of similarity, neither in written nor in phonetic form, with whatever possible source construction may have originally stood in *Hymn* 4.7 if to be emended: **iw=f m dwȝt*, **wn=f m dwȝt*, or **wnn=f m dwȝt*. The chances that *sw* in *Hymn* 4.7 was altered from any of these are therefore minimal. Nor has this in fact ever been proposed.

C. Only one instance of a textually secondary third person form of the new subject pronoun (*sw*) is known to me. This is from a later Eighteenth Dynasty manuscript:

Ptahhotep 82 L2 *sw r irt ntt m ib=f* 'He will do what is in his heart.'

This passage differs textually from *Hymn* 4.7 in various respects. Even if no prior knowledge of P was given, a series of semantic and formal tensions in the immediate context of *Ptahhotep* 82 L2 would concur in strongly suggesting that the reading in L2 is not original (compare the Gedankenexperiment above, §2.3.5). By contrast, *Hymn* 4.7 is coherent as it stands, both in itself and within its broader context.

Once P is taken into account, the presence of *sw* in *Ptahhotep* 82 L2 appears as the outcome of a specific textual history, with two major steps: a resegmentation effecting the regularization of a rare construction, *ib.tw r sḏm*, and an adaptation in pronominal referents (§5.2.1):

P (...) *ḥwrw* [82]*ib.tw r irt ntt m ib=k*
   → *(...) *ḥwrw-ib* [82]*tw r irt ntt m ib=k*
      → L2 (...) *ḥwrw-ib* [82]*sw r irt ntt m ib=f.*

---

65 Already suggested in a slightly different form in *EG* §124.Obs. (unlike Gardiner, I take the origin of third person forms of the pronoun to be from an altogether different origin than first and second forms).

None of these two steps has to do with the form of the pronoun itself, and both steps are entirely conditioned by external factors. No similar process(es) can be posited for *Hymn* 4.7, where *sw*, if secondary, would have been so with respect to **iw=f*, **wn=f*, or **wnn=f* (above, B).

D. An entirely different scenario has been proposed by an earlier editor of *Hymn*, who suggested that *sw* should be emended into *swt, i.e. into the old independent pronoun.[66]

In itself a textual change *swt → sw* is possible.[67] In the present case however, the proposed emendation is impossible for the following reasons. To begin with, independent pronouns of the series *ṯwt*, *swt* (as opposed to *ntk*, *ntf*) are exceedingly rare in (post-Coffin Text) Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian (§6.3.1.1) and their occurrence is restricted to highly specific contexts, often with particular overtones (§6.3.1.2). *Hymn* 4.7 does not afford any comparable context.

Of decisive importance is a consideration of the broader constructional environment in which *swt would supposedly occur in *Hymn* 4.7. Instances of independent pronouns as subjects of situational predicate construction are strictly limited to the Pyramid Texts, where they remain extremely rare.[68] In short, the construction into which it has been proposed that *Hymn* 4.7 should be emended, *swt m dwꜣt, does not exist in Middle Egyptian.

E. In the lack of any scenario by which, nor source construction from which, *sw* might have plausibly been altered in the course of textual transmission, the transmitted text of *Hymn* 4.7—*sw m dwꜣt*—stands every chance to be original. An additional, yet more direct argument that *sw* is integral to the original text is given below (§3.4.1.4), taken into consideration the particular balancing context in which the new subject pronoun is used in the verse here under discussion.

3.4.1.2 Marginal instances of *sw*-headed clauses in Middle Egyptian

The new subject pronoun proper is not documented before the very late Seventeenth Dynasty (§3.4.1.3). There are, however, three instances of clause-initial *sw* from earlier times; these are discussed preliminarily.[69]

A. Two (possible) instances of clause-initial *sw* are from the Coffin Texts. The syntactic analysis of the second one remains an object of ongoing contention:

---

66 Helck 1972: 26, n.d. No argument is given: the posited emendation entirely relies on the implicit assumption that the text should display no late features such as the new subject pronoun, as it should date to the Middle Kingdom.

67 For examples and contexts of such change, e.g. el-Hawary 2010: 119, n.449; Schenkel 2008: 105.

68 Edel 1955-1964: §914. Occurrences are Pyr.1114b[P'] *ink ir pt* 'I am towards heaven'; Pyr.1093a[P', M] *ink/ṯwt m ḥmw* 'I am/you are the helm.' The former may perhaps be interpreted alternatively as *ink ir(i) pt* (Friedrich Junge, p.c. 6/2010), i.e. as an instance of a *ink nfr* construction (for which, e.g. Vernus 1994), with a *nisba*-derivate of *ir* as predicate. If so, the evidence for a construction *independent pronoun – situational predicate* becomes even slimmer.

69 An entirely different case is afforded by *sw*-headed constructions (*sw sḏm=f*, etc.) commonly found in some so-called 'Netherworld Books' and related compositions documented from the New Kingdom on (§4.7.3).

(i) CT VII 30j

ink ꜣs[t] s(i)[a] *m-ẖnw ꜣẖ-bit*

'I am Isis, as she was in Khemmis'

a)   The reading is epigraphically secure.[70]

(ii) CT VII 219f

wsir sw sꜥb=f s(i)

'As to Osiris, he cleanses her.' (α)
or: 'He is Osirian when he cleanses her.' (β)
or: 'As to Osiris, *he* cleanses her.' (γ)

> Three different analyses have been proposed:
>
> (α) As *fronted topic* (*wsir*) – N(P) *sḏm=f* (*sw sꜥb=f s(i)*).[71]
>
> (β) As a rare instance of the (disputed) pattern *NP sw*, with a (here non-referential) noun accommodated into a *nfr sw* pattern.[72]
>
> (γ) With slight emendation, and an analysis as *fronted topic* (*wsir*) – *cleft sentence* (*sw(t) sꜥb=f s(i)*).[73]

Of these two passages, the analysis of (ii) remains disputed. Analysis (α) is highly unlikely, since this would imply double fronting;[74] even if it did apply, the construction would be different from the one in *Hymn* 4.7.[75] If analyses (β) or (γ) apply, the passage does not have a clause-initial *sw*, and is therefore inconsequential to the present discussion.

  Only (i) is a case of clause-initial *sw*. Unlike in *Hymn* 4.7 however, clause-initial *sw* here occurs in a clause that is dependent on a preceding one (*ink ꜣst*). In general, dependent clauses are expected to be introduced by *iw=f* in Middle Egyptian; that this is not the case in CT VII 30j can possibly be accounted for along the following lines. In very broad terms, the morpheme *iw* signals that a clause is related to some point of reference, be this the speech situation, the speaker's world of experience, or unfolding discourse itself. As such, *iw* also signals that a state-of-affairs is presented as embedded in the temporal flux.[76] This is not the case in CT VII 30j, where the clause *s(i) m ꜣẖ-bit* is dependent on an identifying nominal predication (*ink ꜣst*), i.e. a pattern that expresses a state-of-affairs not contingent on time. That *sw* is here exceptionally

---

70 Roberson 2010: 186-7, *pace* Jansen-Winkeln 2004: 220-1.

71 E.g. Doret 1991: 59, n.22. Similarly Roberson 2010: 187-8, with additional discussion.

72 Uljas 2006a. Further discussion of the pattern *NP sw* in personal names and interrogative constructions by Gundacker 2010.

73 Schenkel 2008: 106-7, e (proposed as one possibility); followed by Gundacker 2010: 109.

74 Uljas 2006a: 246-7; Schenkel 2008: 106.

75 Although clause-initial, *sw* would not be initial within the broader segment of speech (here the sentence), as it is in *Hymn* 4.7; the use of a dependent pronoun could then be licensed prosodically by its leaning on a preceding element, the fronted topic.

76 Some well-known distributional restrictions of *iw* are illustrative: in non-verbal patterns, *iw* is reserved to situational (/'adverbial') predicate constructions, and near-universally banned from any qualifying (/'adjectival') or identifying and classifying (/'nominal') ones. This reflects the fact that the latter, in contrast to the former, are not embedded in the temporal flux (e.g. Vernus 1994; Winand 2006: 151-70).

licensed in clause-initial position then relates to the fact that *s(i) m-ḫnw ꜣḫ-bit* is dependent, semantically and prosodically, on some preceding segment of discourse, on which it leans. The altogether exceptional nature of the overall construction directly reflects its very low naturalness in communication, requiring a context as particular as can occasionally be found in Coffin Texts. Unlike the one in *Hymn* 4.7, the construction in CT VII 30j is thus explained within the ordinary rules of earlier Middle Egyptian grammar.

B. The other instance of a *sw*-headed clause prior to the late Seventeenth Dynasty is the following:

> (iii) P. UC 32201 ro 13-14
>
> (...) *rḏ.n*[a] *pꜣ imw hꜣ*[b] *in bꜣḳt sw ꜣtp*
>
> '(...) he had the ship sent off—Baqet had—once fully loaded.'

a) A construction *rḏ.n=ø* (...) *in N*, in which the agent (*bꜣḳt*) is not in the subject slot but only later introduced, by means of *in*. The construction is exceptional, with only one comparable instance known to the present author: CT V 27d-e Sq6C *smn ṯbwt nt N pn ḥr ꜣkr in ꜣst smn=s N pn in ꜣst ḥr ꜣkr m nṯr ꜥnḫ* '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.' Against otherwise documented standards of Middle Egyptian, the present construction is even more bizarre than the one in CT V 27e: unlike in CT V 27e, the subject slot is not filled by a cataphoric pronoun, and remains empty (*rḏ.n=ø*; contrast with CT V 27e *smn=s*). This is at odds with the semantic constraints that bear on zeroing in Middle Egyptian: with nouns that are singular, referential, and agentive (as here *bꜣḳt*), zeroing is generally not licensed.[77]

b) Resultative construction: *rḏi NP pseudoparticiple*. The construction is rare in pre-New Kingdom Middle Egyptian, and possibly confined to non-standard varieties.[78]

As in CT VII 30j (i), *sw* heads a circumstantial clause (*sw ꜣtp*). As such, the pronoun, although clause-initial, is not initial within the higher-order construal, the sentence: like CT VII 30j, P. UC 32201 ro 13-14 differs from *Hymn* 4.7, where clause-initial *sw* is in the first member of a balanced verse, a self-standing structure that does not depend syntactically on some preceding clause. Even if *Hymn* 4.7 were to be interpreted as textually parenthetical within the sequence of epithets (participles and relative forms) in stanza 4, this would still differ from syntactic dependency, as in P. UC 32201 ro 13-14 and CT VII 30j.

---

77 Stauder in prep.

78 The very existence of the construction has been debated for pre-New Kingdom Middle Egyptian (discussion by Schenkel 2007 and Peust 2006). P. UC 32201 ro 13-14 establishes the construction, at least for some (probably non-standard) variety of Middle Egyptian. In a literary text, a possible instance is *Sinuhe* B 201 *ḏ.n=i sw sn ḥr šnby*[sic, HAIR]*=i*. While this could be a secondary reading (Schenkel 2007: 111), it is no less interesting since the text as written by the B-scribe implies a reading *šny* 'hair', and therefore an overall resultative reading 'I placed it scattered on my hair.' At least to the B-scribe, therefore, a resultative construction was deemed acceptable: with all due caution, this may again be a token of some non-standard variety of Middle Egyptian.

In analyzing P. UC 32201 ro 13-14 further, differences with CT VII 30j itself are also relevant. While the construction in the latter text could be accounted for within the general frame of Middle Egyptian grammar, the one in the former text can not: no reason can be given for why a *iw*-introduced circumstantial construction is here avoided. To explain the *sw*-headed clause, register has to be taken into account. The passage under consideration is from a letter. In the present case, the narrow context of *sw ꜣtpw* features at least two other constructions (see textual notes a and b) that are exceptional in themselves. Regarding the first of these, it is further observed that the *in*-dislocated introduction of the agent is used rather differently in CT V 27d-e and in P. UC 32201 ro 13-14. In the former text, the construction makes for stylistic balancing (compare the full quotation above), while in the latter text, it serves to add an afterthought-like piece of information, in a way that typically tends to occur in more spontaneous modes of communication. Together, these features suggest that P. UC 32201 ro 13-14 is a rare case of a slip into a non-standard variety of Middle Egyptian. The construction *sw ꜣtpw* relates to such. Clause-initial *sw* in P. UC 32201 ro 13-14 thus differs from *Hymn* 4.7 both syntactically, and in terms of the variety of Middle Egyptian these two texts bear witness to.

3.4.1.3 Early attestations of the new subject pronoun

The new subject pronoun is not securely attested in any text prior to the very late Second Intermediate Period.[79] Early instances of the new subject pronoun up to the time of Amenhotep II are the following.

(a) In the late Seventeenth Dynasty 'military register' (§1.3.3.2.E):

- Antefnakht's Stela (later D.17), 3 (§1.3.3.1, (v));

- *Kamose Inscriptions*: T. Carn. 4 = St.I, 5; T. Carn. 5; T. Carn. 7 = St.I, 8 (twice); St.I, 10; St.II, 1; St.II, 5;

- Emhab 11 (§3.4.1.4, (iii));

- Similarly also later in Thutmosis III's *Annals*: *Urk*. IV 649, 7; 649, 15; 656, 5.

(b) Registers of lesser formality:

- Early New Kingdom 'Reden und Rufe': *Paheri* (*temp.* Thutmosis III), pl.3, *passim*;[80] *Intef* (TT 155; *temp.* Thutmosis III);[81] *Kenamun* (*temp.* Amenhotep II), pl.42;[82]

---

79 For one possible earlier instance, which however remains problematic in dating and in interpretation (O. Cairo 25372), see below in the main text (iii).

80 Pl.3, 3ᵈ register from top, central horizontal inscription: *hrw nfr tw.tw ḳb* (...) 'A good day: one is cool (...)'; 3ᵈ register from top, 3ᵈ vertical inscription to the right of the middle inscription, 5 (...) *sy nfr.ti wrt* '(...) it is very good'; 2ⁿᵈ register from bottom, 2ⁿᵈ inscription from the right, 10-11 (...) *ḥr tw.tw ḥr ꜣs=n m šmt* (...) '(...) and they are hurrying us in (our) going (...)'.

81 See Kroeber 1970: 90, ex.14.

82 Text: Davies 1930; quoted in *EG* §330 and n.6; Kroeber 1970: 90, ex.15

- In a direct discourse: *Deir el-Bahari*, VI, pl.155;[83]

- Tija's Sehel Graffito (*temp.* Hatshepsut), 7;[84] an early New Kingdom graffito in the temple of Sahure;[85]

- O. Cairo 25372 (*temp.*?),[86] 1-2.

(c) Documentary registers:

- O. Leipzig 13, 10 (a working report; *temp.* Hatshepsut);[87]

- P. BM EA 10103 ro 4 (Hori to Ahmes Peniati; *temp.* Hatshepsut/Thutmosis III); P. Louvre 3230A 5-6 (Teti to Ahmes Peniati; *temp.* Hatshepsut/Thutmosis III); P. Berlin 10463 vso 2 (Sennefer to Baki; *temp.* Amenhotep II).[88]

(d) Registers of higher formality:

- *Urk.* IV 181, 2 (*temp.* Thutmosis III); Thutmosis III's *Gebel Barkal Stela* 10 (*Urk.* IV 1231, 19);[89]

- *Appointment of the Vizier* 25 (§3.4.1.4, (ii));

- *Urk.* IV 1509, 5; 1509, 10 (inscription on Kha's golden cubit measure; *temp.* Amenhotep II).[90]

(e) In a literary text, in direct speech:

- *Neferkare and Sisene* P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+5 (§4.4.3.1; on the dating, §4.4).

The expression here discussed, a pronoun, performs a function common in language, thereby meeting the first of the conditions outlined above (§3.1.1; b.α). Other expressions, such as *iw=f, mk sw*, etc., consistently performed similar functions in older times, and still do regularly in most contemporaneous registers: the new subject pronoun thus also meets condition (b.β). The pattern of attestation is immediately fairly dense, suggesting that it is broadly reliable. It is also consistent in terms of registers: the new subject pronoun is attested since the late Seventeenth Dynasty, initially in less formal registers or such that more broadly accommodate innovative expressions (a)-(c); still on a sporadic basis, it is first included in more formal registers by the times of Thutmosis III (d). Even though the Second Intermediate Period record is sparse, it therefore appears that the new subject pronoun first gained access to written registers no earlier than the very end of that period.

---

83 *EG* §330.
84 Text: H*HBT* 121; reading disputed by Oréal 2011: 249.
85 *EG* §124, n.8.
86 The dating of the document, for which the Middle Kingdom has been proposed on paleographical grounds, remains unclear: see the discussion below, §5.2.4, (b).
87 Kroeber 1970: 89, ex.11.
88 Kroeber 1970: 91, ex.18, 19, and 21.
89 Kroeber 1970: 88, ex.7 and 6.
90 Kroeber 1970: 87, ex.4-5.

3.4.1.4 The broader construction

In *Hymn* 4.7, the pronoun is used in a balanced verse that interrupts a sequence of epithets:

(i) *Hymn* 4.5-9

(...) *sḫpr smw n mnmnt rḏw sftw n nṯr nb*
sw m dwȝt pt tȝ r-ḫt=f
iṯ tȝwy mḥ wḏȝw swsḫ šnwwt (...)

'(...) Who generates grass for the herds; who gives slaughtered animals to every god
—He is in the underworld, while earth and heaven are under its authority—
The seizer of the Dual Land; who fills storehouses and enlarges granaries (...)'

Such use of a *sw*-headed situational predicate clause interrupting a string of epithets is paralleled in the following passage:

(ii) *Appointment of the Vizier* 25

(...) *ḥmw-ib ḥtp ḳd nfr tw(t)*[a]
sw n= {nb}<k> (m)[b] *mdw iȝwt*

'(...) skilled of heart, calm of character, good and adequate(?)
—He is to you a staff of old age.'

a) Written *<t w* Y1*>*; interpretation unclear.[91]

b) Haplography before the following word beginning in *m*.

More remarkable yet is the following passage in which a *sw*-headed clause, also interrupting a descriptive sequence, is the first of two balanced clauses. The whole patterning is just as in *Hymn* 4.7:[92]

(iii) Emhab 8-12

(...) *ir=i rnpt 3 iw=i ḥr sḫt m ḳmḳm rꜥ nb*
stwt=i r pȝy=i nb m ḫn=f nb
sw m nṯr iw=i m ḥḳȝ
wnn=f ḥr ḫdb iw=i ḥr sꜥnḫ

'(...) I spent three years playing the drum daily,
I lived up to this my lord in his every speech
—He is a god, while I am a chief—
Whenever he kills, I sustain.'[93]

On grounds that are here ultimately stylistic in nature, these parallels in patterning point to the very same period in time that was already determined above by strict

---

91 I broadly follow Helck 1955a, against Dziobek 1998: 8.

92 The balanced formulation in *Kamose Inscriptions* T. Carn. 7 is of a different kind, not directly comparable to the one in *Hymn* 4.7: *sw ḥr tȝ [n] ꜥȝmw tw=n ḥr kmt* 'He owns the land of the Asiatics, we own Egypt.'

93 On the motif, Klotz 2010: 234-6, 241, n.254; Baines 1987.

linguistic analysis (§3.4.1.3). They also provide a further argument that *sw* is original in *Hymn* 4.7: the new subject pronoun is here part of a broader and highly elaborate patterning, documented elsewhere. The likelihood that this could have arisen as the effect of some textual alteration is accordingly minimal.

3.4.2   *Hymn* 2.5, 12.1-2: *Ḥr-sḏm=f* in the second part of a correlative system

Hymn has two probable instances of *ḥr-sḏm=f* in the second part of a correlative system:

(i) *Hymn* 2.5-8
wsf=f
ḥr ḏbb/ḏbw fndw ḥr ḥr-nb nmḥw
ḫbȝ.tw m pȝwt nṯrw
ḫr ḥḥw ꜥkw m rmṯ

'When he is sluggish,
noses get chocked up, everybody is orphaned;
When there is cutting off from divine loaves,
millions have perished among men.'

(ii) *Hymn* 12.1-2
wbn=f/k m niwt ḥkr
ḥr sȝȝ(=)sn/tw[a] *m inw nfr n šȝw*

'When he/you rise(s) in the city of hunger,
they/one become(s) satiated with all good produces of the fields.'

a)   The manuscript tradition is split.[94] Manuscripts that are traditionally considered better ones (P. Turin, O. Ashmolean) have *=sn*, but are themselves not immune to textual alteration in the very form under consideration.[95] Further discussion, §3.4.2.1.

For dating, two issues must be addressed: the identification of the constructions in *Hymn* (§3.4.2.1), and the diachronic status of *ḥr-sḏm=f* (§3.4.2.2).

3.4.2.1   *Ḥr-sḏm=f* or *ḥr nfr sw*?

At first sight, the *ḥr*-headed constructions quoted above could be instances of either of the two following constructions:

(a)   *ḥr-sḏm=f*   (the bound combination of *ḥr* with a subjunctive *sḏm=f*);

(b)   *ḥr nfr sw*   (a (free) combination of *ḥr* with the *nfr sw* pattern).

---

94   Mss. with *sn*: P. Turin ro III; O. Ashm. 313; P. ChB. V ro IV; O. DeM 1050 + O. Turin 57277. Mss. with *tw*: O. DeM 1176; O. Mich.; P. An. VIII ro XI; P. Sal. II ro XIV.

95   P. Turin ro III [...] *sm*[sic], implying *sn*; O. Ashm. 313 *ḥr **ss**ȝȝ sn*.

While the latter construction is well attested in the Middle Kingdom, the former, is not securely attested before the early New Kingdom, and may therefore be criterial for dating.

A. Formal arguments are inconclusive. In written form, the two constructions are non-distinct with full noun subjects (2.5 *fndw*). In 12.2, the reading *ḥr sꜣꜣ tw* in various other manuscripts would imply an interpretation as *ḥr-sḏm=f* (a). The manuscript tradition is split, however, and it remains unclear which of the two readings—*ḥr-sꜣꜣ.tw* or *ḥr(-)sꜣꜣ(=)sn*—is original; if the latter is original, the written form is non-distinct again. Determining which of these readings is original is itself no easy task: to my knowledge, only the alteration *tw → sn* is attested elsewhere[96], yet this does not suffice to rule out the possibility of a change *sn → tw*. As regards the written forms of the stem in 12.2, they would imply an understanding as *ḥr-sḏm=f* in several manuscripts (most clearly O. Michaelides *ḥr-sꜣy.tw*, with a written form of the subjunctive); yet the general degree of variation (*sꜣꜣ, sꜣy, sꜣ*), compounded with the overall post-classical orthography of the manuscripts, prevents any reliable argument on this level.

B. A look at the broader construction is therefore required. In *Hymn*, the *ḥr*-headed constructions are after a setting construction (*Hymn* 2.5 *wsf=f*; 12.1 *wbn=f/=k*), thus forming part of a correlative system (*setting sḏm=f – ḥr-headed construction*[97]). Among *ḥr*-headed constructions, *ḥr-sḏm=f*, as well as *ḥr NP sḏm=f*, are commonly used in such correlative systems following a setting, condition, or topic of some sort (§3.4.2.2). On the other hand, documented instances of *ḥr nfr sw* do not include uses in similar correlative systems.[98] If this is not a gap in the record, such lack of *ḥr nfr sw* in correlative systems would suggest an analysis of *Hymn* 2.5 and 12.2 as *ḥr-nfr=f*.

C. The argument is also a semantic one. A *nfr sw* pattern linguistically presents a state-of-affairs as not contingent upon time or any other circumstance. A correlative system, on the other hand, serves to express contingency of the second clause upon the first. When it comes to non-dynamic events, the second part of the correlative system is realized with a *subject – pseudoparticiple* construction, a pattern that, unlike *nfr sw*, presents a state-of-affairs as contingent. In *Hymn* itself: 2.5-6 *wsf=f* (...) *ḥr ḥr-*

---

96 *Ptahhotep* 33 P *ir.t(w)*; L2, C *ir=sn*. This change was probably induced by a reinterpretation of the passage, with an attraction to the plural referents in 30-32 (*sḏmyw*; *imiw-ḫꜣt*; *tpiw-ꜥ*). No plural antecedent is given in *Hymn* 12.1, but *niwt* is notionally plural (as is also underscored on the written level by the plural strokes); the attraction could have been ad sensum.

97 Morphologically, this could be a *mrr=f* or a subjunctive; this is left open since the issue is inconsequential for the following argument.

98 Compare: (a) Heqanakht I vso 1-2 (*in ir grt pꜣ rḏt iwt n=i sꜣ-ḥt-ḥr ḥr it-mḥ is n šwšyt wn m ḏd-swt n rḏt n=i pꜣ it-mḥ ḫꜣr 10 m mḥ mꜣ nfr*) *n ḥr nfr tw ḥr wnm it nfr iw=i r tꜣ* '(Now, what is this, having Sithathor come to me with old, dried-up full barley that was in Djedsut, without giving me those 10 sacks of full barley in new, fresh full barley?) Don't you have it good, eating fresh barley while I am outcast?' (Allen 2002a: 16, 30); (b) *Sinuhe* B 202-203 (*ir.tw nn mi-m n bꜣk th.n ib=f r ḫꜣswt ḏrḏryt*) *ḥr ḥm nfr wꜣḥ-ib nḥm wi m-ꜥ m(w)t* '(How is this done to a servant whose heart has led him astray to foreign lands?) The mercy is assuredly good that rescues me from death'; (c) *Ptahhotep* 407-410 (*iw sꜣ=k r ḥbs ḥr=s wn šsp=f ḥr=k r ꜥnḫ n pr=k*) *ḥr sꜥḥ.k mrr=k ꜥnḫ sw ḥr=s* '(Your back will be clothed by it, and his indulgence to you will be the life of your house.) Your noble one, the one you love, he is alive by it.'

nb nmḥw 'When he is sluggish, (...) everybody is orphaned'; 2.7-8 *ḫb3.tw* (...) *ḥr ḥḥw ʿkw m rmṯ* 'When there is cutting off (...), millions have perished among men.' The documentary lack of instances of *ḥr nfr sw* in the second part of a correlative system, noted above, is thus consistent with a semantic analysis of its constituent parts. The gap is unlikely, therefore, to be coincidental.

> NB. Mostly in order not to leave a possible devil's advocate's proposal unanswered, one may contemplate the possibility that *Hymn* 2.5 and 12.2 could be tokens of an extension of use, otherwise undocumented and semantically tense, yet possibly licensed in literary language and perhaps limited to *Hymn*. One could then posit a contrast between *ḥr nfr sw* and *ḥr NP PsP*, the former expressing essential semantics in the correlative systems of *Hymn*. This scenario, however, runs counter to the fact that in *Hymn* no meaningful contrast is observed along such lines: 2.5 *ḥr dbb fndw* and 12.2 *ḥr s33 sn/tw* are not associated with semantics that are any more essential than 2.6 *ḥr ḥr-nb nmḥw* and 2.8 *ḥr ḥḥw ʿkw*. Alternatively, and still as a devil's advocate's proposals, one may retreat into proposing that the contrast between the hypothetical *ḥr nfr sw* and *ḥr NP PsP*, apparently neutralized in meaning, was exploitation for rhythmical variation (as otherwise attested in Middle Egyptian literary texts, in non-*ḥr*-headed patterns). This interpretation however would be possible only in 2.5-6: *wsf=f – ḥr dbb fndw* (*ḥr nfr sw??) *ḥr ḥr-nb nmḥw* (*ḥr NP PsP*). It is impossible in 12.1-2, which has no similar balancing: *wbn=f – ḥr s33 sn/tw*. It is also made unlikely for 2.5-6 itself when the following sequence is taken into account: 2.7-8 *ḫb3.tw – ḥr ḥḥw ʿkw m rmṯ* (*NP PsP*).

The above considerations, based on actually documented constructions and semantic analysis, establish the analysis of *Hymn* 2.5 and 12.2 as instances of the bound construction *ḥr-sḏm=f*.[99]

3.4.2.2   The rise of *ḥr-sḏm=f*

As has been noted in a dedicated study of *ḥr*-headed patterns,[100] the bound pattern *ḥr-sḏm=f* is not securely documented before the early New Kingdom. Given the associated implications for dating *Hymn*, I here contribute some further remarks on the issue.

A. Only one instance of a sequence *ḥr sḏm=f* has been noted in a text earlier than the New Kingdom:[101]

---

99 For *Hymn* 12.2, this is also the interpretation selected by Vernus in his study of *ḥr*-headed constructions (1990a: 65, n.39).
100 Vernus 1990a: 66, n.41 and 65, n.39, respectively.
101 Borghouts 2010: I, §57b.

(i) CT IV 359c-e T1L

nis.k3 r=f nṯr pw r=k
ḫꜥꜥ rꜥ m b3=f
ḥr nis=k r=k r m3-ḥ3=f

'This god shall summon to you.
Whenever Re appears with his soul,
then you shall summon the Back-looker.'

> Spell 343, to which this passage belongs, is documented in many witnesses. CT
> IV 359c-e, however, is only in T1L. One other witness now also has CT IV 359e,
> in a slightly different reading: Sid2Sid[102] back 16-18 (...) *nis.k3=ṯ r=ṯ r m3-ḥ3=f.*
> CT IV 359d, with the first part of the correlative system to be discussed below, is
> only in T1L: in Sid2Sid, the construction is without a correlative system.

In written form, the correlative system in CT IV 359d-e T1L looks just like the ones
in *Hymn* here under discussion. These need not, however, imply that the construction
is identical, or has the same status in grammar. Given its isolated character in the
overall Middle Kingdom record, this is probably best interpreted as a free combina-
tion of the auxiliary *ḥr* with a *sḏm=f* of some sort (subjunctive or prospective), akin to
other Middle Kingdom constructions in which *ḥr* is freely combined with a variety of
different patterns, verbal and non-verbal alike.[103] It is of course from such free
combinations that the later bound construction would emerge, yet they have different
status. Also noteworthy is the future tensing in CT IV 359c-e, established by the *-k3-*
marked form in CT IV 359c; significantly, the partial parallel in Sid2Sid has a *k3-*
marked form in CT IV 359e itself. In this respect, the construction is certainly
different from the ones in *Hymn*.

B. In correlative systems, *ḥr-sḏm=f* is documented from the early New Kingdom on,
e.g.:[104]

(ii) *Urk.* IV 690, 4-5

ist ir p3 nty nb ḥr m(w)t m nn n wrw
ḥr-ḏ ḥm=f šm s3=f r ꜥḥꜥ ḥr st=f

'As to every one among these chiefs who is dying,
His Majesty has his son go to stand in his place.'

Ḥr-sḏm=f is a fairly common construction: the complete lack of pre-New Kingdom
attestation is therefore meaningful (§3.1.1, condition (b.α)). What is more, some other
construction is regularly used in all pre-New Kingdom times in environments similar
to the one under consideration (condition (b.β)). In the Middle Kingdom and Second
Intermediate Period, *ḥr*-headed constructions with dynamic events in correlative
systems are always based on the unmarked (/'unextensive') synchronous pattern *N(P)*

---

102 Text: Abd el-Fatah & Bickel 2000: 22.
103 References in Vernus 1990a: 65-6.
104 Further references: Vernus 1990a: 65, n.39; Depuydt 1993: 227-31. On the construction, also Polis
    2005, with reference to previous discussions.

sdm=f, not on the subjunctive (*hr-sdm=f*). Thus, following a textual setting (iii), a *ir*-marked condition (iv), and a *ir*-marked nominal topic (v) (for Second Intermediate Period examples, below, (vi)-(vii)):

(iii) Heqanakht II ro 40[105]

min3 n grt mr=k s(i)
hr=k d=k int n=i iwt-n-hb

'Now, if you don't want her,
you will have to have Iutenhab brought to me.'

> Sim. *Stèle Juridique* 25-26, quoted below, (vi).

(iv) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 193-194

ir gs3=f
hr=k gs3=k

'If it (*scil.* the scale) tilts,
you tilt.'

> Sim. *Eloquent Paesant* B1 182; Heqanakht I 8-9; Heqanakht II ro 35-36. In the
> Second Intemediate Period, *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep 5-6,
> quoted below, (vii). After a condition introduction by *ir + preposition*, P. Reisner
> II pl.5, 13-15 *ir grt r-s3 ʿ3=k p3 imw* (...) *hr=k stp=k šps 10* 'After you plane this
> *imu*-vessel, you have to select ten *shepes*-people.'[106]

(v) P. Berlin 10073[107]

ir nhw gmy=k hnt im
hr=k h3b=k hr=s n imi-r3 pr hr-m-s3=f

'As to the loss (of people) that you found there in front,
you will have to write concerning it to the overseer of the house Horemsaf.'

The construction *hr NP sdm=f* extends even to cases when the agent is non-specified: in the Second Intermediate Period, this leads to constructions with a doubling of *tw*. E.g. after a textual setting (vi) and after a *ir*-marked nominal topic (vii):

(vi) *Stèle Juridique* 25-26[108]

fdk wd3 m s3=i N nn hrdw=f
hr.tw d.tw p3y=i h3ti-ʿ 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 is to be given to his maternal brothers.'

---

105 For the interpretation of the first part as providing a textual setting, Allen 2002a: 45 (in details);
   similarly Vernus 1990a: 73, n.74.
106 Vernus 1990a: 79, ex.146.
107 Quoted after Green 1987: 54-5.
108 Discussion: Vernus 1990a: 98-9.

(vii) *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep (originally Ugaf?), 5-6
ir rf nty ṯw nb r gmt=f (...)
ḥr.t(w) wbd.t(w)=f

'As to anyone whosoever will find it (...),
he is to be burnt.'

Such constructions are remarkable, in general and in the present context, because *tw* is set twice despite the low topicality of the discourse referents *tw* stands for.[109] That *tw* is nonetheless regularly doubled in these *ḥr*-headed constructions demonstrates that no construction other than *ḥr NP sḏm=f*, and specifically not *ḥr sḏm=f*, had by then developed.

For assessing the rise of *ḥr-sḏm=f*, it is of further significance that both the above Second Intermediate Period instances are from monumentalized documentary registers, i.e. from written registers that in the Second Intermediate Period otherwise tend to accommodate linguistic innovations (illustration above, for these very same texts: §1.3.3.1, (ii) for *Abydos Boundary Stela*; §1.3.3.1, (iv) for *Stèle Juridique*; general discussion: §1.3.3.1). Yet, neither of these texts have *ḥr-sḏm=f*, not even in the passive. To be noted, finally, is that *Stèle Juridique* dates fairly late in the Second Intermediate Period (mid-Seventeenth Dynasty).

C. As just discussed, *ḥr-sḏm=f* is first documented by the early New Kingdom and is not uncommon in higher registers of Late Egypian.[110] A different construction was consistently used in earlier times performing similar functions, *ḥr NP sḏm=f*: this was used exclusively down to the late Second Intermediate Period, including in written registers that are otherwise open to innovations and in cases where this entails a doubling of the morpheme *tw*.

In the early New Kingdom, both *ḥr NP sḏm=f* and *ḥr-sḏm=f* are used, including in the same text. This transitional situation is here illustrated in the *Vizieral Cycle*,[111] where *ḥr-sḏm=f* is found alongside older *ḥr NP sḏm=f*, both in the active and the passive:

---

109 I am aware of only four cases of a doubling of *tw* in other constructions. All of these are syntactic hybrids and all are from Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptions: *Urk.* IV 344, 9 (*Punt Expedition*) *iw.tw sḏm.tw=f*; *Installation of the Vizier* 17 (*Urk.* IV 1090, 15) *mk tw ḏd.tw*; Amenhotep II's *Sphinx Stela* 19-20 (*Urk.* IV 1281, 14-15) *tw sḏm.tw* (...) *in* (...) (quoted above, §2, n.106); *Urk.* IV 1639, 8 (Djeserkareseneb) *iw.tw sḫȝ.tw nfrw* (...).

110 Neveu 2001: 219-28, particularly 225-6 for syntactic environments comparable to the ones in *Hymn*.

111 On the dating of *Duties*, §2.8.3.5. As regards the specific construction here under discussion, three out of four cases (a)-(c) are also documented in *Installation*, for which a dating to the early Eighteenth Dynasty is not disputed. As is apparent in the examples below, *Duties* presents the exact same transitional stage as *Installation*, which in itself provides a valuable linguistic indication for dating *Duties* to the same time as *Installation*.

(a) *Ḫr-sḏm=f*, active:

(viii) *Installation of the Vizier* 12-13

[*ir*] *sr irr mitt n*ꜣ
*ḫr rwd=f ꜥ*ꜣ *m t*ꜣ *st*

'As regards every official who acts like this,
he is successful here in this place.'

    Sim. *Duties* R 5 [*ḫ*]*r mnmn t*ꜣ*ti*.

(b) *Ḫr-sḏm=f*, passive:

(ix) *Installation of the Vizier* 6-7

ir ir=f nkt [...]*w r sp=f* (...)
ḫ[*r*] *rḫ.tw ḫr r*ꜣ *n wpy=f m ḏd 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 *ḫr wꜣḥ.t*(*w*); R 15 *ḫr it.t*(*w*) (twice); R 20 *ḫr m*ꜣ*.t*(*w*).

(c) *Ḫr NP sḏm=f*, active:

(x) *Installation of the Vizier* 21

*ir w*ꜣ*=k ḥr wḫꜥ*
*ḫr=k h*ꜣ*b=k r wḫꜥ imi-r*ꜣ ꜣ*ḥwt imi-r*ꜣ *šnwt wꜥrtw*
ir wnn wn wḫꜥ.t=f(*y*) *ḫr-ḥ*ꜣ*t=k*
ḫr=k šn=[*k*] *sw*

'If you are absent from(?) investigation,
you shall send the overseers of lands, chief of sheriffs(?), and *wꜥrtw* to investigate.
If there is anyone who shall have made investigation before you,
you shall question him;'[112]

    Sim. *Duties* R 9 *ḫr=f ḏ=f*; R 16 *ḫr=f pg*ꜣ*=f*; R 20 *ḫr=f šd=f*.

(d) *Ḫr NP sḏm=f*, passive:

(xi) *Duties of the Vizier* R 3 (*Urk.* IV 1104, 15-16)

ir ḏd ḥry nn sḏm nb r-ꜥ=i
ḫr.t(*w*) *nḏr.t*(*w*)*=f in wpwtyw n t*ꜣ*ty*

'If the higher official says "No one besides me is to be heard",
he shall be arrested by the messengers of the vizier.'

    Sim. *Duties* R 14 (*ḫr.t*(*w*) *smi.t*(*w*) *swḏ.t*(*w*)).

Such transitional situation is typical of ongoing change. This further confirms that *ḫr-sḏm=f* was a recently innovated construction in the early New Kingdom.

---

112 Translation Faulkner 1955a: 23. I am not certain that this is fully correct but fail to come up with a better interpretation.

3.4.2.3 *Setting sḏm=f – ḥr-headed construction*

The above discussion, and derived dating argument, was about *ḥr-sḏm=f* as a bound form. In order to contrast *ḥr-sḏm=f* with an older construction performing similar functions (*ḥr NP sḏm=f*), the correlative systems in *Hymn* 2.5 and 12.1-2 were considered only in general terms, irrespective of the nature of the first of the two clauses they consist in; this step was taken in order to make sure that relevant examples for comparison would be numerous enough (§3.4.2.2). I now consider the more specific type of *ḥr*-headed correlative systems in *Hymn*, which have a non-introduced *sḏm=f* of some sort (*mrr=f* or subjunctive) used in setting function in their first clause. Correlative systems of this sort are very rare, and apparently paralleled in the early New Kingdom only.[113] Perhaps significantly, the most direct parallel is from a hymn, although from slightly later times (i). Closer in time to the first manuscript attestation of *Hymn* are two Hatshepsutian instances (ii)-(iii). These examples display the exact same type of correlative system as *Hymn* 2.5 and 12.1-2, with a setting *sḏm=f* in the first clause and a -*ḥr*-marked form in the second:

(i) Suti & Hor 8 (*Urk*. IV 1945, 1)[114]

ḥtp=k m mꜣnw
ḥr-ḳd=sn mi sḥrw m(w)t

'When you set in the Western mountain,
they sleep in the manner of death.'

(ii) *Urk*. IV 245, 14-17

ḏd=s n rmṯ sḏmw
ḥr.ḥr [š]fšft im=[s]n
ḫpr.ḥr ḥmt=s ꜥꜣ.ti r ḫt nbt

'When she says to people "Listen!",
respect falls upon them
and Her Majesty becomes greater than anything.'

> Note the synthetic -*ḥr*-infixed construction, already obsolescent by the early Middle Kingdom,[115] here a token of Hatshepsut's archaizing selections.[116]

(iii) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.137: IX.22-23 (H*HBT* II 28, 8-10/11)

wp=i mi tm (...)
wn.ḥr=s m-ḫꜣt wiꜣ=f

'When I judge like Atum (...),
she is in front of her bark.'

---

113 Vernus 1990a: 73-4, from which the following examples are taken. In Herwerre 9 (*temp*. Amenemhat III), the *ḥr*-introduced clause is paratactically linked to the preceding one, but this linkage does not involve a correlative system (§4.1.2, (iii)). *Stèle Juridique* 25-26 (quoted above: §3.4.2.2, (vi)) has a passive *sḏm=f* in setting position; the construction may be related to, yet is also different from, the one here examined.

114 Quoted by Vernus 1990a: 137, n.74.

115 For the diachronics of synthetic -*ḥr*-infixed forms, Vernus 1990a: 63-5, 68-71.

116 Vernus 1990a: 65; for the dating of the *Royal Cycle*, §4.7.

3.4.3   *Hymn* 6.4: *Tw sḏm*

The composition has one instance of the construction *tw sḏm*:[117]

> *Hymn* 6.3-4
>
> *šms sw ḏȝmw ẖrdw tw nḏ ẖrt=f m nsw*
>
> 'When a group of children follows him, he is greeted as a king.'

These verses will be discussed in details below in relation to other instances of the same construction. As to be argued, the construction implies a type-B terminus *ante quem non* by the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (§5.3).

3.4.4   *Hymn* 3.7: Inchoative *šsp*

The composition has one instance of *šsp* used with inchoative force (*inchoari* 'begin to do sthg.').

> (i) *Hymn* 3.7
>
> *ṯst nbt šsp.n=s sbt*
>
> 'Every jawbone, it has begun to laugh.'

This remains undocumented in the Middle Kingdom. Examples have, on the other hand, been noted in literary Late Egyptian, e.g.:

> (ii) *Tale of Two Brothers* 18.5 (*LES* 28, 7)[118]
>
> (...) *iw=s ḥr šsp iwr m km n iȝt*
>
> '(...) and she became pregnant in one moment.'

More directly relevant to *Hymn* are two early examples from Hatshepsutian times, the two first occurrences of the construction known to me:

> (iii) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.98: I.2-3 (H*HBT* II 7, 11)
>
> *tȝ r-ḏr=f šsp.n sgri*
>
> 'The whole land, it became silent.'

> (iv) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.120: V.7-8 (H*HBT* II 19, 2)
>
> *wn.in nn smrw ibw=sn šsp.n mht*
>
> 'These companions' hearts, they begun to forget.'

These two Hatshepsutian instances are remarkable on yet another level: they use *šsp* with inchoative force in a *N sḏm.n* construction. The latter construction is documented in the Middle Kingdom and early New Kingdom alike (§1.2, (xi)); it remains fairly uncommon at all times. The combination of the two constructions in *Chapelle Rouge*

---

117 Noted by van der Plas 1986: I, 33, 189.
118 Quoted by Winand 2006: 335-6, ex.604.

is therefore noteworthy: this remains unparalleled, except in *Hymn* 3.7, which has an exactly similar formulation.

> NB. *Hymn to Hapi* has one more construction that deserves a brief descriptive note, even though it turns out not to provide any valuable indication for dating. In the final part of the composition, some manuscripts have the sequence *imperative – kȝ-sḏm=k*:
>
> > (v) *Hymn* 14.5, 6, 10
> >
> > (ḥˁpy) wȝḏ kȝ-iw(t)=k[a]
> >
> > '(Hapy), be verdant and then come!'
> >
> > a)   Thus in various manuscripts.[119] Other manuscripts[120] have (ḥˁpy) wȝḏ.t(i) kȝpw '(Hapy), be verdant, hidden one!' The former reading is preferred over the latter for the following reasons: it is found in P. Turin, which is generally superior to the manuscripts of the second group;[121] in having a *kȝ-sḏm=f* construction rather than a mere nominal phrase *kȝpw*, it is a *lectio difficilior* in the linguistic horizon of Ramesside times; finally, and perhaps more directly, the spelling of *kȝpw* as <k-ȝ-p-w-[A2]>, strongly suggests that the reading is secondary: the verb *kȝp* 'to cover, shelter, etc.' is otherwise written with the incense burner (R5) rather than phonographically[122] and never includes the A2 semogram.
>
> In Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian as documented in the record, an imperative is directly continued by a subjunctive *sḏm=k*, not by a *kȝ-sḏm=k* construction; the sequence *imperative – kȝ-sḏm=k* is, on the other hand, documented, if sparsely, in the New Kingdom (§2.8.3.2.NB). Yet, for various reasons discussed above, this fails to provide any reliable indication for dating. Still on a purely descriptive level, also note that *Merikare* has a similar construction (E 14).

3.4.5 Dating *Hymn to Hapi*

A. The primary evidence for dating *Hymn to Hapi* consists in the three expressions discussed first (§3.4.1-3). In two of three cases—the new subject pronoun and to a lesser extent *ḥr-sḏm=f*—the expression considered is common in text (§3.1.1, condition (b.α)); only *tw sḏm* is uncommon but relates to a high-order construction, (*X.)tw ḥr sḏm*, which is not rare (below, §5.3.4). In all three cases, some other expression can be documented to have been consistently used in similar contexts or functions in only slightly earlier times (condition (b.β); for *tw sḏm*, below, §5.3.5).

These expressions then provide the following individual termini *ante quem non* for dating *Hymn*:

---

119 See van der Plas 1986: II, 138ff: P. Turin ro IV (14.6; 14.10); O. IFAO 8332 (14.5 k[ȝ]-iwt=f; 14.7Ab); O. Var. Lit. B (14.5 kȝ-iwt; 14.7Ac kȝ-[iwt]); O. OI 25040 ro (14.9 kȝ-iwt).
120 P. ChB V ro V; P. An. VII ro XII; P. Sal. II ro XIV.
121 See van der Plas 1986: I, 16 and n.35.
122 Typical spellings are of the sort <kȝp-p-[SEMOGRAM, not A2]> (see *Wb*. V 104.14). Rarely, the body of the word is written phonographically but the spelling still includes the sign of incense burner (<k-ȝ-p-kȝp>: see Borghouts 2010: II, 117). Spellings without the incense burner sign are found only in nominal derivatives, e.g. in *kȝp* 'Schutzdach' (*Wb*. V 104.4).

(a) New pronoun *sw* (§3.4.1):   late D.17;

(b) *Ḥr-sḏm=f* (§3.4.2):   late D.17/early NK;

(c) *Tw sḏm* (§3.4.3; 5.3):   mid-D.13.

> (The last is a type-B *ante quem non*: the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty is the earliest moment in time for which based on the evidence available it can not be excluded that *tw sḏm* could have had currency in the relevant written registers, not necessarily the earliest moment in time when it actually had first gained currency. When the expression was innovated between the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty and late Second Intermediate Period remains unknown.)

The three arguments converge in ruling out a dating of *Hymn to Hapi* to the Middle Kingdom. Moreover, (a) and (b) concur in implying a more specific terminus *ante quem non* no earlier than the late Seventeenth Dynasty. The composition is thus 'squeezed' into a period in time close to its first manuscript attestation, in the early Eighteenth Dynasty.

Within this relatively short range for dating, the early Eighteenth Dynasty is slightly more likely. As an examination of the pattern of attestation of the new subject pronoun shows, this is first documented in innovative registers by the late Seventeenth Dynasty and seems to have gained acceptance in more formal ones only slightly later (§3.4.1.3).

B. Other elements in *Hymn to Hapi* do not lend themselves to full arguments such as the above but are indicative for dating nonetheless. With a view on describing the linguistic typology of the composition more fully, these are therefore worth summarizing as well. Inchoative *šsp* (§3.4.4) is not documented before the New Kingdom, but the observation can not be strengthened into a fully developed argument because of the generally low text frequency of the expression (conditions (b.α) and (b.β) in §3.1.1 thus fail to be met).

More remarkable is a set of specific formulations or constructions in *Hymn*, all of which are to my knowledge paralleled in the late Seventeenth and mostly early Eighteenth Dynasty specifically, and only then:

(a) *Sw m N*, as the first part of a balanced construction interrupting, or parenthetically inserted in, a descriptive sequence (§3.4.1.4):

> Paralleled only in Emhab and in *Appointment of the Vizier*;

(b) A *ḫr*-marked correlative system, the first clause of which consists in a setting *sḏm=f* (§3.4.2.3):

> Paralleled only in two Hatshepsutian compositions (*Youth Legend*, *Chapelle Rouge*) and in a later Eighteenth Dynasty hymn (Suti and Hor);

(c) Inchoative *šsp*, combined with the uncommon *N sḏm.n* (§3.4.4.1):

> Paralleled only in Hatshepsut's *Chapelle Rouge* (twice).

All these formulations in *Hymn to Hapi* are rare. All consistently point to the same fairly narrow period in time. This further allies the linguistic typology of *Hymn* with the early New Kingdom.

C. Based on the arguments recalled first, complemented by the additional indications summarized next, it is therefore submitted that *Hymn to Hapi* was composed in the late Seventeenth or early Eighteenth Dynasty.

The proposed dating confirms that *Hymn to Hapi* is not the work of a Middle Kingdom 'author' 'Kheti', if such ever existed.[123] More importantly, the proposed dating is close in time to the first witnesses of the composition, T. Ashmolean 1948.91 and Assiut Graffito 2a, both from the early Eighteenth Dynasty. This demonstrates that while some time for prior circulation must be posited, this need not have been long, even for texts documented in excerpts and in two different places.

Hymn to Hapi is composed in Middle Egyptian: the text includes a few innovative expressions—which permit dating—but is not couched in a 'transitional variety'—compare the fact that a dating to the Middle Kingdom was long deemed acceptable, or even preferable, on linguistic grounds. Without entering the discussion of whether *Hymn* had cultic functions or not,[124] the composition is allied with Middle Egyptian literature by its language, elements of a shared intertext, and its documented patterns of circulation. Under the proposed dating, *Hymn* thus provides a very clear case of a text allied with Middle Egyptian literature, composed in the late Seventeenth or early Eighteenth Dynasty, and for which the composers selected Middle Egyptian in a fairly pure form.

3.4.6 Appendix: Lexical notes

The dating of *Hymn to Hapi* here proposed was carried out on grammatical grounds. The following lexical notes are for the sake of a fuller description only:

---

123 The ascription of *Hymn to Hapi* to 'Kheti' (references in Simon 2013: 263, n.195) is based on occurrences of *Hymn* alongside *Teaching of Amenemhat* on the same manuscripts (e.g. P. Sallier II, P. Chester Beatty V, P. Anastasi II) with the latter composition being itself ascribed to 'Kheti' based on P. Chester Beatty IV vso 6.14. The hypothesis thus relies on further hypotheses. As Quack (2003: 184) already observed, such association of various compositions, however recurrent or even 'canonic' it may or may not have become in Ramesside times, may just as well be secondary, reflecting the importance of these works in Ramesside reception. From an entirely different perspective, Quirke (2004a: 32) demonstrates how the implied construction of 'Kheti' comes suspiciously close to modern concepts of authorship. Further critical discussion of 'Kheti' as associated with *Hymn* by Simon 2013: 263, 265; on 'Kheti' and other compositions with which this literary figure has been associated, §6.1.1.B; §6.2.2.6; on Ramesside literary figures, also §5.1.3.1.A.

124 Van der Plas (1986: I, 190) comments: '(...) un hymne proprement dit (...) Le contenu proprement littéraire n'exclut certainement pas une utilisation liturgique (...)'; further van der Plas 2013. Different is Assmann's (1999²: 546) assessment: 'Dieser Hymnus gehört unzweifelhaft zur Literatur. Sein manierierter Stil, die zuweilen spitzfindige (...), oft verblüffend luzide Argumentation (...)'. Further discussion now by Hagen in press.

(i) *Hymn* 12.7 *ḫnr* 'scatter, disperse'[125]

Ḫnr[126] recurs in Late Egyptian literary texts,[127] in a New Kingdom magical text,[128] and in Late Ramesside Letters.[129] Like in *Hymn* 12.7, the word comes in 'group writing' in all but two of these texts, suggesting that *ḫnr* was generally perceived by New Kingdom scribes as lacking an historically motivated spelling.

(ii) *Hymn* 14.1 *tmw* 'mankind'

The expression[130] recurs in Thutmoside inscriptions,[131] in Book of the Dead,[132] and in Ramesside texts.[133] The earliest occurrence known to me is in Sobekemsaf's *Medamud Endowment Inscription* 6.

(iii) *Hymn* 1.3 *sšmw* 'statue, portrait, image, counterpart'[134]

Before the New Kingdom, *sšmw*[135] is attested only twice, in Coffin Texts.[136] It is common in Thutmoside inscriptions,[137] Book of the Dead,[138] and Ramesside texts of various sorts. The phrase *imn sšmw(=f)* 'whose image is hidden' finds numerous parallels in New Kingdom hymns and compositions in royal tombs.[139]

(iv) *Hymn* 12.8 *ftft* 'leap, twitch'[140]

The word[141] is attested only once in the Middle Kingdom;[142] it is very common in the New Kingdom, particularly in hymnic literature.[143] Compare *Hymn* 12.8 *pꜣ tꜣ r-ꜣw ḥr ftft* 'the whole land is twitching' with e.g. Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* 17 (*Urk.* IV 19, 5) *ḥꜣtiw ḥr ftft n=f* 'the hearts are twitching for him'; etc.[144]

---

125 Noted by van der Plas 1986: I, 189; 2013: §6.
126 Noted as 'nur neuäg.' in *DZA* 27.878.870.
127 *Ani* B 18.9 = D X+1.1; *Wermai* 2.7.
128 Schlangenzauber Neues Reich, P. Vatikan, Spruch 1, X+1.8 (*TLA* #118390).
129 P. Berlin 10497, 21; P. Leiden I 370, 11 (*TLA* #118390).
130 Once noted as 'belegt seit Totb. und Dyn.18' in *DZA* 31.096.900.
131 *Urk.* IV 449, 14; 967, 16; 1817, 7.
132 See *TLA* #172070.
133 K*RI* I 38, 5; 61, 1; II 151, 7; 239, 1; 239, 3; further, *TLA* #172070.
134 Noted by van der Plas 1986: I, 189; 2013: §6.
135 Once noted as 'belegt seit D. 18' in *DZA* 29.606.570.
136 Hann*Lex* 5: 2357a: CT VII 496a; CT VI 2i.
137 E.g. *Urk.* IV 97, 13; 386, 12.
138 *Passim*, see *TLA* #145120.
139 Van der Plas 1986: I, 61-4.
140 Noted by van der Plas 1986: I, 189; 2013: §6.
141 Detailed lexical discussion by Vernus in press: §4 (list of attestations in §4.3.1).
142 Dramatic Ramesseum Papyrus 29 (Vernus in press: §4.3.1, ex.5).
143 Van der Plas 1986: I, 145-6. Further Assmann 1969: 249 '(...) *ftft*, eigentlich „hüpfen", bezeichnet in Hymnen des NR gern die freudige Bewegung des vom Sonnengott aus dem Todesschlaf erweckten Lebens (...)'.
144 Further e.g. in Tomb of Tutu (Amarna; see Vernus in press: §4.3.1, ex.4) *imyw mw ḥr ftft n ḫꜥꜥ=k* 'those in the water are twitching at your rising'; Tura Hymn to Amun-Re (Vernus in press: §4.3.1 ex.12) [*dwꜣ*] *tw pꜥt rḫyt ftft n=k* [...] 'May the patricians and the plebeians adore you; may [...] twitch for you'; P. Leyde I 350, II.7-8 (Vernus in press: §4.3.1, ex.3); Ritual of Amenhotep I (Vernus in press: §4.3.1, ex.10-11); etc.

4 DIRECT DATING: TARGETING SPECIFIC CONFIGURATIONS IN WRITTEN
   LANGUAGE

Classical strategies for linguistic dating are indexed on linguistic change. Phenomena of innovation and obsolescence in written registers are thereby examined in ways to derive *ante quem non* and *post quem non* criteria. Ideally combined, these criteria then define possible temporal ranges for a composition to which they can be applied (§3; §5-6). As illustrated throughout the present study, this approach is not without limitations of its own, both inherent and practical ones. I here present an altogether different strategy for dating, based on expressions that did not arise in the course of regular linguistic change as determined by linguistic interaction. Instead, specific configurations of written language are here targeted. As the approach is not indexed on linguistic change, implications for dating do not come in the form of upper or lower chronological bounds. Rather, linguistic expressions are related directly to a specific horizon in written language. When possible, direct dating thereby tends to be fairly precise temporally.

4.1 Introduction

Conditions for a direct dating are restrictive. A composition must include a criterial expression: many do not. In addition, the present-day philologist must be practically able to identify this expression and to determine that it relates to one specific horizon in written language excluding other ones. After briefly discussing these conditions in general terms (§4.1.1), I present two preliminary case studies with texts that happen to be well dated (§4.1.2-3). Stemming from different periods and standing for different types of written discourse, these two texts involve different phenomena and are thereby illustrative of some of the tenets involved in direct dating.

4.1.1 General conditions for a direct dating

In direct dating, expressions that stand outside regular usage are considered. Getting the sense that an expression or usage could be somehow odd falls much short of making it an indication for dating, however. An apparently odd expression may seem so only due to the incomplete documentation and/or insufficient modern description of the language. Moreover, language in use is defined by its plasticity: as they ultimately make language, users may always push it into forms other than the ones

more commonly encountered in text. If an apparently odd expression is to support a claim for dating, it must be demonstrated in explicit ways that this expression relates to a specific horizon in written language. To do so, it has to be shown that the expression could not have arisen, or did not arise, in linguistic change proper. It must then be shown that the expression has relevant and significant parallels in a certain horizon of written language, and only in this. By definition of the nature of the expressions considered for direct dating, direct parallels will typically be fewer than for other dating strategies; they may even not exist at all when an expression is a unique configuration. The relationship with a specific horizon in written language is then established through an examination of how the principle underlying the expression discussed and/or the component parts thereof relate to otherwise documented configurations of written language.

The possibility for a direct dating is contingent upon whether a full argument can be made along the lines sketched above. Quite literally, it is also contingent upon whether a given text happens to include (an) expression(s) that supports this type of argument. The two compositions selected below for a preliminary illustration are exceptional in the density of relevant phenomena they include. With Middle Egyptian literature, direct dating is generally a more marginal possibility than classical strategies based on linguistic change. With other types of texts, a different situation may obtain, in some cases even a reverse one. It is significant that several of the compositions included in the present chapter do not belong to a more narrowly defined corpus of Middle Egyptian literature.

4.1.2 A Gedankenexperiment: Dating *Chapelle Rouge* linguistically

A. In dating the composition inscribed on Hatshepsut's *Chapelle Rouge* (in a more damaged form also in Deir el-Bahari)[1] on purely linguistic grounds, classical strategies indexed on linguistic change fail. Only one expression, *wn.in.tw ḥr sḏm*, supports an argument for dating based on linguistic change:

(i) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.131: VII.12-13 (H*HBT* II 25, 5)

wn.in.tw ḥr irt snṯr ḥr smꜣꜥ ꜣbwt n imn m ipt-swt (...)

'The incensing was then done and the offering consecrated to Amun in Karnak (...)'

This construction implies that *Chapelle Rouge* was not composed before the early Twelfth Dynasty (see §3.1.2.A).

Conversely, the whole Middle Egyptian repertoire of *Chapelle Rouge* is documented in early Eighteenth Dynasty texts. Accordingly, no *post quem non* criteria are given: linguistically, the text may be as late as the early New Kingdom. Classical strategies therefore define a broad temporal range for dating *Chapelle Rouge*, extending from the early Twelfth to the early Eighteenth Dynasty.

---

1   Text: Lacau & Chevrier 1977-1979; H*HBT* II 7-33.

B. Direct dating, on the other hand, turns out to be an effective strategy with the composition considered. Only some expressions, however, lend themselves to this approach: this is preliminarily illustrated by the case of the old -*w* demonstratives, which do not. *Chapelle Rouge* has two instances of these, used with nouns broadly to do with kingship or rule, e.g. *Ch.R.*, p.130: VII.2 (H*HBT* II 23, 14) *nsw pw* 'this king' (the other occurrence is quoted below). Such association implies an indexical intent in the selection of the antiquated demonstrative. A similar association of antiquated demonstratives with things to do with kingship recurs in Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription* (§4.7.1.C). Yet, it is observed in the Middle Kingdom as well, e.g. *Chapelle Blanche* n°180 *šrt=k tw*[sic] *nfrt* 'this beautiful nose of yours', taken up in *Sinuhe* B 237 *fnd=k pw* 'this nose of yours'.[2] The association is therefore not specific to any horizon in particular.

The other occurrence of a -*w* demonstrative in *Chapelle Rouge* is in a clause that also has a remarkable instance of a *s-n-ABAB* derivational pattern, *Ch.R.*, p.107: III.6-7 (H*HBT* II 11, 14/15-16) *srwḏ=t ḥmw nṯrw snbꜣbꜣ=t tꜣ pw ḥr mḫrw=f* 'May you make the shrines of the gods strong, may you make this land take root on its foundations.'[3] If the dating of *Chapelle Rouge* to the early Eighteenth Dynasty were given first, this could be discussed further in terms of a linguistic recherche by Hatshepsutian composers.[4] If however, as in the present Gedankenexperiment, the composition is yet to be dated, such association remains too unspecific to support any conclusion.

C. Other expressions are criterial. *Chapelle Rouge* thus uses -*ḥr*-marked constructions in narrative function:

(ii) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.99: I.12-13 (H*HBT* II 9, 2-3)
iw.in r=s nbt tꜣwy m ḫnw ḏsrw nw ꜥḥ=s
wn.ḥr=s ḥr rdt iꜣw m ḫsfw nb nṯrw
'The lady of the Dual Land then came from the interior of the sacred place[5] of her palace.
And she begun giving praise at the approach of the lord of the gods.'

> Sim., after a *sḏm(w)*-passive, *Ch.R.*, p.141: X.1-3 (H*HBT* II 30, 2-4) *ḏw ḥms=i ḥr wtst-sḫmty-ḥr wn.ḥr r=s nbt tꜣwy ḥr biꜣt ꜥꜣt wrt ꜥšꜣ ꜥšꜣ wr wr ḥr ḥmt=i* 'I was made to sit down in the Wetjeset-Sekhemty-Her. The Lady of the Dual Land then begun giving very big oracle, numerous and important, about My Majesty.'
>
> Sim., after a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive, *Ch.R.*, p.107: III.14-15 (H*HBT* II 13, 5/6-7/8: quoted below, (vii)).

The linguistic form of the construction, -*ḥr*-infixation, is common at all times relevant for dating. The narrative function, on the other hand, remains entirely undocumented in the Middle Kingdom. This lack of attestation is significant, as *ḥr*-marked forms and

---

2   Stauder in press a: §1.
3   For a discussion of *snbꜣbꜣ* and for the translation, Vernus 2009a: 304-5.
4   Stauder 2013: §6.5.
5   On this phrase, Lacau & Chevrier 1977-1979: I, 104, n.w.

constructions are then not rare in general. In one Twelfth Dynasty segment that apparently comes close to a narrative usage, the -*ḫr*-infixed form is after an event with habitual aspect (*wn=i wšd=i ḥmwt*), marking a tight relationship between the two events: in a self-presentation, the speaker presents his 'saying' as if necessarily occurring when the craftsmen asked. Such semantics is in full compliance with non-narrative uses of -*ḫr*-infixed forms otherwise found in the Middle Kingdom:

(iii) Herwerre (*temp.* Amenemhat III), 9

wn=i wšd=i ḥmwt (...)
dd.ḫr=sn (...)

'I used to ask the craftsmen (...)
and they would (always) say (...)'

Forms and constructions with the -*ḫr*-infix in narrative function are found from the early Eighteenth Dynasty on, e.g.:

(iv) Ahmes son of Abana 6-9 (*Urk.* IV 3, 2-9)

ḫr m-ḫt grg.n=i pr ꜥḥꜥ.n=i iṯ.kwi r pꜣ imw mḥty ḥr ḳnn=i
wn.ḫr=i ḥr šms ity ꜥ.w.s. ḥr rdwy=i (...)
wn.ḫr=i ḥr ḳnt ḥr rdwy=i m-bꜣḥ ḥm=f
ꜥḥꜥ.n=i dhn.kwi r (...)

'After I founded a household, I was taken on the vessel "The Northern One" because of my bravery.
And I followed the Sovereign L.P.H. on my feet (...).
And I acted bravely on my feet in presence of His Majesty.
I was promoted to (...)'

(v) Rekhmire 7 (*Urk.* IV 1073, 11-13)

dhn.kw m ḥm-nṯr mꜣꜥt [...]
wn.ḫr ḥswt=i mn.ti m-ḥr-ib ḳꜣw ḥ(w)ꜥw

'I was promoted priest of Maat [...]
And praises of me were established among high and short alike.'

   Sim. Rekhmire 11-12 (*Urk.* IV 1075, 2-4); 29 (*Urk.* IV 1080, 9-11).

This extension of -*ḫr*-infixed constructions to narrative functions is a textual phenomenon: that the innovation did not arise in regular linguistic change is demonstrated by the textual distribution of the construction, strictly restricted to formal contexts. The twofold condition required for an argument per direct dating to be made is thereby met. The construction involves a form-function mismatch whereby: (a) this new function did not arise in regular linguistic change; (b) it can be related to a given horizon in the use of written language, the early New Kingdom.[6]

---

6   The construction recurs in earlier Ramesside inscriptions; within the present Gedankenexperiment, these are not relevant because they are later than *Chapelle Rouge* as a 'manuscript'.

D. In five places, *Chapelle Rouge* combines the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive with *m-ḫt nn*, a fronted temporal expression. As discussed below, this semantically unnatural combination lends itself to an argument by direct dating and implies an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon (§4.3.3). Beyond the ones quoted below as (vi)-(vii), occurrences are in *Ch.R.*, p.98: I.5-8 (H*HBT* II 8, 7/8-10); p.99: I.18 (H*HBT* II 9, 12); p.121: V.10-11 (H*HBT* II 19, 9) (all quoted below, §4.3.3, (ii)).

The following two passages go one step further, combining *-ḫr*-marked constructions used narratively and *m-ḫt nn + infinitive*.

(vi) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.99: I.13-15 (H*HBT* II 9, 3-4/5)

wn.ḫr=s ḥr rdt iꜣw m ḫsfw nb nṯrw
m-ḫt nn rḏt=s s(i) ḥr ḫt=s m-bꜣḥ-ꜥ ḥm=f m ḏd

'And she begun giving praise at the approach of the lord of the gods.
After this, her placing herself on her belly in front of His Majesty, saying:'

(vii) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.107: III.14-15 (H*HBT* II 13, 5/6-7/8)

m-ḫt nn wḏꜣ pw r ḥꜣ
wn.ḫr ḥmt=s ḫr-ḫꜣt it=s (...)

'After this, it is proceeding to the outside.
And Her Majesty was before her father (...)'

> Formally, this a variant construction: *m-ḫt nn A pw* (otherwise undocumented in this usage as well). Functionally, it compares with the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive as in (vi).

E. In three places, *Chapelle Rouge* has *-kꜣ*-marked constructions with the auxiliary *wn* (*wn.kꜣ=f – predicate*):

(viii) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.248

wn.kꜣ šfšft=t m nbwt snḏ=t m pḏt 9

'Awe you inspire then shall be in the *Nebut*, fear you inspire shall be in the Nine Bows.'

> Sim. p.107: III.9-11 (H*HBT* II 12, 5/6-9/19) *wn.kꜣ tꜣ pn m ḫfꜥ=t ḥnmmt ḥr st-ḥr=t rḫyt ḏ=sn n=t iꜣw* 'This land then shall be in your grasp, the *henmemet*-people under your authority, the *rekhyt* giving praise to you'; p.124: VI.1 (H*HBT* II 20, 5) *wn.k(ꜣ)=t n(=i) r mst iꜣwt* (...) 'You shall then be for me destined to fashion offices (...)'.

The construction is exceedingly rare: beside the three instances in *Chapelle Rouge*, only a single other one has been noted.[7] One more can be added, in the *Moscow Mythological Story* (§4.3.4.B.NB).

Unlike *-ḫr*-infixed constructions, which come both in synthetic (*sḏm.ḫr=f*) and in analytic (*wn.ḫr=f – predicate*) form, *-kꜣ*-infixed ones otherwise exist only in the synthetic form (*sḏm.kꜣ=f*). While *wn.ḫr=f – predicate* begun developing as early as

---

7   *Busirite Ritual* E V.20; see Vernus 1990a: 85-6, n.8-10.

the First Intermediate Period, becoming a regular construction in Middle Egyptian, *wn.kȝ=f – predicate* did not. As a detailed descriptive study of the history of forms and constructions with *ḥr* and *kȝ* more broadly demonstrates, these had different historical developments in the early/mid-second millennium, some functional similarity notwithstanding.[8] Analytic *wn.kȝ=f – predicate* constructions thereby appear as morphological reconfigurations, analogically modeled on the regular *-ḥr*-infixed constructions. That these constructions, which are a purely textual phenomenon, relate to the early New Kingdom is likely in view of the functional reconfigurations affecting *-ḥr*-infixed constructions, also purely textual phenomena, at that same time (above, C). With *-kȝ-*, near-exclusively in *Chapelle Rouge*, this results in a morphologically entirely new construction.

F. The above discussion is also illustrative of how the very possibility for a direct dating is contingent upon the linguistic selections a given text makes. Within the Hatshepsutian corpus itself, not all texts would similarly lend themselves to a direct dating. Of the various elements discussed above, only one for example applies to *Punt Expedition*, and only indirectly. In this composition, a *-ḥr*-infixed construction is found following a sequence of an infinitive and a *sḏm=f* (*Urk.* IV 324, 3-7: below, §4.2.1, (vi)): if not narrative, this is a functional extension similar to the one discussed above (§4.1.2.C). A *-ḥr*-infixed construction recurs a second time in this composition, with the subject anticipated. This is even further remote from any regular Middle Egyptian standards:

(ix) *Urk.* IV 332, 7-9 (*Punt Expedition*; beginning of a section)

wrw nw pwnt ḏd.ḥr=sn dbḥ=sn ḥtpw

'The great ones of Punt, they say asking for peace'

In *Speos Artemidos*, no direct dating could be performed at all. As classical strategies indexed on linguistic change also fail with this text, *Speos Artemidos* remains genuinely undatable linguistically (§1.2.C).

G. Turning back to *Chapelle Rouge*, this can be unambiguously related to an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon through the above observations. The text is datable only through direct dating: based on classical strategies indexed on linguistic change, only a terminus *ante quem non* by the early Twelfth Dynasty could be defined.

4.1.3 Another Gedankenexperiment: Dating *Sinuhe* (B) linguistically

As a complementary Gedankenexperiment, a text for which it is known that it was composed in the Twelfth Dynasty, *Sinuhe*, is examined in turn.

A. *Sinuhe* has two instances of the active-transitive construction of the pseudo-participle, B 45 and B 114 *ḏd.k(w)* 'I said.'[9] With events other than lexical statives (*rḫ* 'to know' and *ḫm* 'not to know'), the active-transitive construction of the pseudo-participle is exceedingly rare in the Middle Kingdom. The textual distribution of the

---

8   Vernus 1990a: 61-99.
9   Discussed in Stauder in press a: §3.

construction is revealing as to its status. Of the only four Middle Kingdom occurrences other than in *Sinuhe*, three are from funerary self-presentations;[10] a fourth is from a related type of written discourse, in an expedition account.[11] In the Old Kingdom, the construction is found in similar types of written discourses, in a subset of stylistically much elaborated Sixth Dynasty 'event-biographies'—three quarters of all occurrences are from only two texts, Weni and Sabni son of Mekhu—and, marginally, in expedition accounts. An argument can be made that this highly skewed textual distribution in the Old Kingdom is itself deeply significant: the expression developed in these types of texts, to which it is bound.[12] In the Middle Kingdom, the construction is textually revived in the very same types of texts, which it then contributes indexing as such.[13] A similar analysis extends to the sole literary composition in which the construction is found, *Sinuhe*, where it functions as one among several palimpsestic strategies by which the composition is framed as a fictional autobiography.[14] Except for one instance, which is different,[15] the construction is not documented in post-Middle Kingdom inscriptions any more. As the construction is bound to certain types of written discourses, and thereby to the associated horizons in written culture, this implies that *Sinuhe* dates either to the Sixth or to the Twelfth Dynasty.

In appreciating whether *Sinuhe* should be related to the Sixth Dynasty or to the Twelfth Dynasty contexts in which the active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple was cultivated, the following observations are relevant. In Sixth Dynasty so-called 'event biographies', the construction is used of the official acting for to the king and in response to the king's initiating agency. Typical events are *iri* 'act', *šꜥ* 'cut', *ini* 'get, bring', *shꜣ* 'bring down', etc. In *Sinuhe*, by contrast, the speaker merely 'says' things (*ḏd*). The construction thus appears to have lost some of the specific associations it had in Sixth Dynasty 'event biographies'. The Middle Kingdom funerary self-presentations that have the construction are not bound to these restrictions any more. Thus, Khentemsemti 14 *wḏ.k(w) rn=i* (...) 'I have place my name (...)'—alongside Iykhernefret 10 *ir.k(w) mi wḏt.n nbt ḥm=f* (...) 'I acted according to everything His Majesty had ordered (...)', continuing ancient phraseology. Moreover, the construction, which derives its salience from its rarity, is in these Middle Kingdom self-presentations reserved to major text-articulating junctures, more strongly so than used to be the case in the Sixth Dynasty (§6.1.3.2.B). A similar distribution is observed in the literary composition, where *ḏd.k(w)* both times introduces morceaux de bravoure spoken by Sinuhe, the encomium to Senwosret and the inner monologue before the fight with the strongman of Retenu.[16]

---

10 Khentemsemti (*temp.* Amenemhat II), 14; *Urk.* VII 47, 14 (Djehutyhotep; *temp.* Amenemhat II-Senwosret III); Iykhernefret (*temp.* Senwosret III), 10.

11 Wadi el-Hudi I, #14 (*temp.* Senwosret I), 10.

12 Stauder in prep.

13 Stauder in press a: §3.2.

14 Stauder in press a: §3.

15 *Mutter und Kind*, V.10-VI.1: discussed below, §5.3.4.2, (iii).NB; §6.1.3.2.NB. *Amenemhat* 6f *ir.kw*, sometimes interpreted as another instance of the construction, is to be read passively (§6.1.3.2).

16 Stauder in press a: §3.

In terms of method, it is emphasized that this is not a *post quem non* argument based on linguistic obsolescence. The active-transitive construction of the pseudo-participle with events other than lexical statives does not belong to the regular repertoire of Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian. Nor did it belong to the regular repertoire of Old Kingdom Egyptian: the construction was at all times a purely textual phenomenon. By definition, therefore, it could not be subject to obsolescence as happens in linguistic interaction. Rather cultural horizons in the configuration of written language are here targeted and contrasted with each other.

B. In the first of its five sections, *Sinuhe* has various instances of the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive (R 6; B 2-3; B 3-6; B 15; B 23-24: below, D.NB). The construction is found from the late First Intermediate Period on, yet no classical argument based on linguistic innovation can be made. When first documented, the construction is associated with a type of written discourse—expedition accounts—that is itself not documented in this developed narrative form in the Old Kingdom. Nor is any genuinely narrative type of written discourse.[17] If no further considerations are introduced, the lack of attestation of the construction before the late First Intermediate Period could be an effect of the nature of the written record itself.[18]

Yet, the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive provides an important argument for dating *Sinuhe*. The construction—consisting in the 'narrative' use of a form that is not even predicative—is a purely textual phenomenon: its innovation is therefore itself the result of a textual process. As can be traced in the record, the construction has a deep-reaching textual genealogy that harkens back ultimately to infinitives used in labeling functions from early Thinite times on. In continuous text, the construction develops in the late First Intermediate Period and does so in direct relation to how expedition accounts themselves develop. In *Sinuhe*, occurrences cluster in the narrative of the flight, echoing, and ironically subverting, expedition accounts. The 'narrative' infinitives in *Sinuhe* therefore presuppose the development of late First Intermediate/Middle Kingdom expedition accounts. They do so on two accounts simultaneously, quite literally for the construction to be possible as such, and for its indexical overtones to effectively function as they do in the literary work.

(At this point, the reader may wonder whether the argument has not moved from the linguistic to the literary or the cultural. It has not. For the flight episode to be recognized as evoking, and ironically subverting, expedition accounts, the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive—a linguistic expression therefore—is essential. If this was not present in such distinguished ways in the texture of the episode, this could be read as a mere account of the hero flying Egypt. The connection with expedition

---

17 'Ereignisbiographien' is a conventional label, expressing a contrast in form, contents, and function with 'Idealbiographien': the label does not imply a genuinely narrative type of discourse.

18 Similar comments extend to *ꜥḥꜥ.n sḏm.n=f* (*Sinuhe* B 26-27 and *passim*). The construction is intrinsically narrative, and no narrative texts in a strict sense are attested in the Old Kingdom. When the construction first appears in the record, in the First Intermediate Period, it is already fully grammaticalized (compare for example the fully bleached out lexical meaning of *ꜥḥꜥ* 'stand'). If things are viewed solely in terms of innovation in linguistic interaction, there is no way to exclude that the construction did not develop earlier already.

accounts, and the additional semantic complexities and faultlines springing from the subtext thus evoked, are established primarily on the linguistic level.)

C. Among other things a fictional autobiography, *Sinuhe* shares not only motifs and formulations, but also elements of its linguistic repertoires, with Twelfth Dynasty funerary self-presentations. The following comparison with Khentemsemti (*temp. Amenemhat II*)[19] is illustrative.

(a) *Active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple* (above, A)

(i) Khentemsemti 14

wd.k(w) rn=i r bw ẖr nṯr wsir ẖnti-imntiw (...)

'I have placed my name to the place where Osiris Khentamentiu (...) is.'

(ii) *Sinuhe* B 45

ḏd.k(w) r=i n=f wšb=i n=f (...)

'I for my part said to him, answering him: (...)'

> Sim. B 114.
>
> Only six occurrences, including the two in *Sinuhe*, are known in the Middle Kingdom. In inscriptional texts, notably in Khentemsemti 14, the expression is used to highlight salient textual articulations. Similarly in *Sinuhe*, *ḏd.k(w)* serves to highlight the two major speeches by Sinuhe it introduces.

(b) *Wn.in N sḏm=f*

(iii) Khentemsemti 3-4

wn.in ḥm=f wšd=f wi
ꜥd=f biꜣt(=i) nt rꜥ nb

'His Majesty used to address me,
observing my everyday's conduct.'

(iv) *Sinuhe* B 174-175

wn.in ḥm=f hꜣb=f n=i ẖr ꜣwt-ꜥ nt ẖr-nsw
sꜣw=f ib n bꜣk im (...)

'His Majesty sent to me with presents of royal giving,
gladdening the heart of this humble servant (...)'

> The construction is exceedingly rare (one further instance that comes to mind is *Kagemni* 2.7 *wn.in ꜥḥꜥ=sn ḥms=sn ẖft* 'Then they used to behave and live accordingly.'). In Khentemsemti and *Sinuhe*, the syntactic parallel extends further, with a sequence *wn.in=f sḏm=f sḏm=f*.

---

19   Text: *HTBM* II 8-9; Sethe 1928[2]b: 75.

(c) *Wn.k*(*w*) – *predicate, in setting function* (§1.2, (v))

(v) Khentemsemti 4-5

wn.k(*w*) *rf m iw=f-ˁꜣ=f*
ḥs wi m hrw pn r sf

'Being thus someone on the way up,
I am praised on this day more than yesterday.'

(vi) *Sinuhe* B 252-253

wn.k(*w*) *rf dwn.kw ḥr ẖt=i*
ẖm.n(=*i*) *wi m-bꜣḥ=f* (...)

'Being thus stretched out on my body,
I had lost myself in his presence (...)'

> Only three other instances are known (*Shipwrecked Sailor* 136-137; *Speos Artemidos* 9-10 (*Urk.* IV 385, 3-4); *Tod Inscription* 26-27: all quoted above, §1.2, (v)). In isolation, this would not be distinctive for dating (see the *Speos Artemidos* instance). It does, however, contribute to the general horizon here outlined.

All three constructions are highly uncommon. On the other hand, Khentemsemti is a fairly short text. The linguistic encounters between *Sinuhe* and Khentemsemti can therefore be assessed as significant enough to support a claim that the former text was probably composed in the same Dynasty as the latter.

D. When the above is woven together, a clear picture emerges. The active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple implies a composition of *Sinuhe* in the Sixth or the Twelfth Dynasty; of the two options, the latter is more likely (above, A). The 'narrative' construction of the infinitive, for its part, implies a dating no earlier than the late First Intermediate Period (above, B). This leaves the Twelfth Dynasty as the only option for dating *Sinuhe*.

Such dating is confirmed by the shared linguistic repertoires with Khentemsemti, which can be assessed as significant (above, C). If only these were given, a strong indication for dating would result, not a full argument. In the present case, this indication converges with the dating already established on the above strong arguments.

> NB. The above analysis of elements of the linguistic typology in *Sinuhe* was carried out based on the text as preserved in a late Twelfth Dynasty manuscript, B. Had *Sinuhe* survived only in the New Kingdom copies that did survive, the prospects for a direct dating could have been weaker, or not. With the constructions discussed, compare:
>
> (a) Active-transitive uses of the pseudoparticiple (above, A and C, (a)):
>
> | (α) B 45 | B | *ḏd.k*(*w*) |
> |---|---|---|
> | | R | *ḏd*[...] |
> | | [D.18] | (no witnesses) |
> | | [Ram.] | AOS *sḏd.n=f n=i* – DM4 *sḏd.n=f n=i* |

(β) B 114 B   *ḏd.k(w)*
        R   [...]
        [D.18] (no witnesses)
        [Ram.] AOS [...] – DM1 [...]

(b) 'Narrative' construction of the infinitive, in the first part of *Sinuhe* (above, B):[20]

   R 6   R   *ꜥr nṯr*
          [D.18] S *ꜥk nṯr* – G *ꜥk nṯr*
          [Ram.] AOS *nṯr ꜥk.n* – C *ꜥk nṯr* – Bdt *nṯr ꜥk*[...]

   B 2-3   B   *psḫ ib=i (sš ꜥwy=i [?])*[21]
         R   *psḫ ib=i (sš ꜥwy=i)*
         [D.18] G *psḫ ib=i [sš ꜥwy=i]*
         [Ram.] AOS *psḫ ib=i (sš ꜥwy=i)* – C *p{n}s{r}ḫ ib(=i) (sš ꜥwy=i)*

   B 3-6   B   *nfꜥ=i (...)*   *rḏt(=i) (...)* *irt(=i) (...)*
         R   *nfꜥ.n=i (...)*   *rḏt=i (...)* *irt=i (...)*
         [D.18] G *nf{t}<ꜥ>.n(=i) (...)* *rḏt=i (...)* *irt[=i] (...)*
         [Ram.] AOS *n{t}f<ꜥ>.n=i (...)* *rḏ.n(=i) (...)* *irr=i (...)*
                – C *{ntwiw}<nfꜥ>.n=i (...)* *rḏ(=i) (...)* *ir.n=i (...)*

   B 15   B   *rḏt=i*
         R   *rḏ.n=i*
         [D.18] G [...]
         [Ram.] AOS *rḏt(=i)* – C *rḏt(=i)* – B4 *rḏt(=i)*

   B 23-24 B   *ṯst=i (s3ḳ=i [?])*[22]
         R   [*ṯs*]*t=i*
         [D.18] (no witnesses)
         [Ram.] AOS *ṯs.n=i (s3ḳ.n=i)*
                – C, B4 *ṯs.n=i (s3ḳ=i)* – P1 *ṯs.n=i (s3ḳ[...])*

(c) *Wn.in N sḏm=f* (above, C, (b)):

   B 174-175 B   *wn.in ḥm=f h3b=f n=i (...)*
           R   (R stops before)
           [D.18] (no witnesses)
           [Ram.] AOS *wn.in ḥm=f ꜥ.w.s. h3b*[sic] *n=i (...)*

(d) *Wn.k(w) – predicate*, in setting function (above, C, (c)):

   B 252-253 B   *wn.k(w) rf dwn.kw (...)* – BA *wn.k(w) r=i dm3.kw (...)*
           R   (R stops before)
           [D.18] (no witnesses)
           [Ram.] AOS *wn.in=f ḥr dmi*[...] – P2, P3 [...]

In Ramesside times (in effect mostly in AOS), instance of the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive (b) are preserved in part, but passages relevant to (a) and (d) are

---

20 See also the discussion in Köhler 2009. Unlike Köhler 2009: 52, I take B 19 to be a basic *sḏm=f*, elaborating upon the preceding segment of discourse, not a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive (compare the immediately following temporal setting, *ḫd.n t3* (...)). *Irt* in R is secondary, probably a contamination from the preceding *rḏt* and *irt* (compare B 3-6).

21 These are generally not counted as 'narrative infinitives' (e.g. Köhler 2009: 51). I argue elsewhere that *psḫ* must be recognized as such (provisionally, 'The art of linguistic artificiality in Sinuhe', paper given at the Conference *The Alpha and Omega of Sinuhe*, Leiden, 11/27-29/2010; this part unpublished). *Sš* could be either a 'narrative infinitive' or a basic *sḏm=f* elaborating on *psḫ*.

22 *S3ḳ* could be either a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive or a basic *sḏm=f* elaboration on *ṯst*.

completely altered and the one relevant to (c) is in part. If *Sinuhe* had survived only in AOS, a direct dating as carried out above could not be done. More relevant to the present study is the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty text of *Sinuhe*. What this may have been like can only be assessed indirectly, as not much of *Sinuhe* survives in Eighteenth Dynasty copies.

In passages relevant to (a), (c), and (d), Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses are lacking or broken, as is R. The 'narrative' construction of the infinitive (b) shows both erosion and stability, depending on individual passages. In R 6 and B 2-3, the text is stable in R, Eighteenth Dynasty copies, and still in Ramesside times (except for AOS in R 6). In B 3-6, 'narrative' infinitives are kept in large part until the Eighteenth Dynasty (*rḏt*, *irt*), and altered only in Ramesside copies. For B 15 and B 23-24, Eighteenth Dynasty, witnesses are lacking; the 'narrative infinitive' is still found in Ramesside versions of B 15, while R has altered the text; in B 23-24 a roughly reverse situation is observed. The distribution of the construction in the Eighteenth Dynasty text of *Sinuhe* is therefore not as neatly patterned as it was in B. Yet, what remains would still be enough to elicit commentary, all the more so since a similarly dense use of the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive is unparalleled in any other Middle Egyptian literary texts (first documented in Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts or not).

The above argument for dating *Sinuhe* was based on the conjunction of various constructions. Of these, one can be shown to be preserved fairly well in the Eighteenth Dynasty text of the composition. That the other ones were as well, or not any more, can not be assessed on empirical grounds. Accordingly, it remains unclear whether *Sinuhe* could have been dated based on a full Eighteenth Dynasty witness, if such had survived.

E. As already noted in relation to *Chapelle Rouge*, the possibility for a direct dating is contingent upon a variety of factors to do with the linguistic selections and expressive strategies in a given composition. For example, the Middle Kingdom tale closest to *Sinuhe*, *Shipwrecked Sailor*, would not lend itself to a direct dating. Among the constructions discussed above, *wn.in N sḏm=f* does not feature in *Shipwrecked Sailor*, nor does the active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple. *Wn.k(w) predicate* is found in a formulation directly similar to, and possibly reminiscent of, one in *Sinuhe*,[23] but this is criterial in *Sinuhe* only in conjunction with other elements (above, C); these are lacking in *Shipwrecked Sailor*. The 'narrative' construction of the infinitive (above, B) is present once in *Shipwrecked Sailor*, significantly in a context evoking expedition accounts.[24] However, the use of the construction is by far

---

23 *Sinuhe* B 252-253; *Shipwrecked Sailor* 136-137. The contact is closest with the BA version of *Sinuhe*, with a rare verb *dmꜣ* in both texts (as against more common *dwn* in B): BA *wn.k(w) r=i dmꜣ.kw ḥr ẖt=i* (...); *Shipwrecked Sailor* 136-137 *wn.k(w) rf dmꜣ.kw ḥr ẖt=i* (...). Scenarios for modeling the contact between *Sinuhe* B, *Sinuhe* BA, and *Shipwrecked Sailor* are discussed by Winand in press a.

24 *Shipwrecked Sailor* 34 *ꜣt ṯꜣw* 'Rising of the wind (...)'. An alternative interpretation as *ꜣꜣ.t(w) ṯꜣw* (past tense *sḏm=f*: e.g. Borghouts 2010: I, §56.a.1, (3)) is unlikely because this form is in literary Middle Egyptian a frozen remnant, otherwise confined to *rḏi* (§2.4.3.2, (ii); §2.7.2.2.A). An interpretation as a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive is also supported by the textual locus of

not as pervasive, and complexly patterned, as in *Sinuhe*. That *Sinuhe* can be dated on the grounds outlined above has to do with how the linguistic typology of this composition reflects broader palimpsestic strategies in ways that distinguish it also on a literary level. The possibility of a dating such as can be done for *Sinuhe* does not extend to other literary texts of which it is known that they were composed in the Middle Kingdom: it does not to *Ptahhotep*, *Debate of a Man and His Soul*, or *Eloquent Peasant* either.

A final word on *Sinuhe* may be that the dating could be established almost entirely based on the active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple: on the fact that it is present in *Sinuhe* (excluding any period other than the Sixth or Twelfth Dynasty), and on how it is there reconfigured (making the latter option more likely). Perhaps paradoxically at first, it is then a construction generally deemed typical of Old Egyptian that affords the individually strongest argument for a dating to the Twelfth Dynasty. The difference emerges when the details of the Sinuhean reconfiguration are examined.

4.2   *Berlin Leather Roll*

The text referred to as *Berlin Leather Roll* is documented in a single manuscript (P. Berlin 3029 ro), from the reign of Amenhotep II.[25] The composition itself has often been dated to the reign of Senwosret I based on a mention of that king's name in association with a precise dating to Year 3 (1.1). This hypothesis was famously challenged by Derchain who suggested that the text was composed in the early New Kingdom, possibly drawing on earlier materials; the ascription to Senwosret I would then be a case of pseudepigraphy.[26]

While Derchain's argument included observations on orthography and the lexicon, its main thrust was on phraseological encounters with early Eighteenth Dynasty royal inscriptions, among which various elements that are unparalleled in earlier times. As has been noted in the subsequent discussion, several of Derchain's observations on orthography and lexicon could be interpreted as artifacts of textual transmission or redaction and are therefore inconclusive;[27] as regards phraseological similarities, these extend to inscriptions dating to the reign of Senwosret I.[28] This weakens the force of Derchain's argument, yet does not in itself disprove his hypothesis. Various other elements by which *Berlin Leather Roll* finds best parallels in the early Eighteenth

---

the construction, opening the shipwreck narrative proper. In addition to this articulative function, a 'narrative' infinitive would be appropriate in *Shipwrecked Sailor* as a composition evoking expedition accounts. Just such a linguistic palimpsest was observed in *Sinuhe* (§4.1.3.B). For *Shipwrecked Sailor* and expedition accounts more generally, Enmarch 2011; Blumenthal 1977.

25   Text: de Buck 1938; for studies, compare Hofmann 2004: 58; add Hirsch 2008: 52-78.
26   Derchain 1992.
27   Piccato 1997: 139-40; the author's discussion is directed mainly against Derchain's broader interpretation of the text as to the Egyptian sense of history, not as much against the dating itself.
28   Franke 1996: 294, n.59; Piccato 1997: 138-9; Hirsch 2008: 53, n.145.

Dynasty have been pointed out in more recent times.[29] At present, the dating of *Berlin Leather Roll* is therefore an open question.[30] To this the present section contributes some linguistic remarks.

Dating the composition is made difficult by the very nature of the competing options. Under one hypothesis, the text would date to Senwosret I, possibly with some subsequent 'redaction'. If, on the other hand, the text is an early New Kingdom pseudepigraphy, the composition of *Berlin Leather Roll* would have served to relate the present to the past, as other cultural productions of the time did. One major strategy for doing so would have consisted in drawing on older textual materials, be these actual 'sources' or some more diffuse stock of possibly deep-reaching phraseology. The two options for dating could then come fairly close to each other.[31] As regards language specifically, an additional factor of undistinctiveness lies with the largely phraseological tenor of the composition: whole swathes of the text consist in formulations that are preconfigured.[32] The horizon of expectations for dating *Berlin Leather Roll* on linguistic grounds must be set accordingly.[33]

4.2.1 *Berlin Leather Roll* 2.4: The syntax of *is*

The following construction is indicative for dating:

(i) *Berlin Leather Roll* 2.4

(...) *ḥm=k is irty bw-nb*

'(...) for Your Majesty is everybody's eyes.'

A. Discourse-connective *is* is well documented in the Middle Kingdom and in the early New Kingdom alike.[34] Remarkable in *Berlin Leather Roll* 2.4 is the use of *is* in a bipartite *A-B* pattern with two full nouns.[35] This contrasts with the regular Middle Egyptian construction *A is pw B* as e.g. in a Twelfth Dynasty literary composition (ii), in a Second Intermediate Period royal stela (iii), and in an insecurely dated literary composition (iv):

---

29 References in Gnirs 2013b: 146, n.148.

30 Even before Derchain's article, already Eyre 1990: 144-6.

31 Compare Baines' (1996: 162) formulation: '(...) Berlin Leather Roll (...) provides evidence either for the study of older texts, perhaps as models, or for the composition of attributed works that would have helped to *manufacture a tradition* (emphasis AS), for which genuine Dyn. XII exemplars did exist.'

32 On phraseological boundedness more generally, Junge 1982.

33 It has been suggested that different layers in the composition could be distinguished based on language (Hirsch 2008: 53, n.145): this is illusory.

34 Oréal 2011: 134-8, 143-5; in the present study, also §1.2, (ix).

35 As against *P is N*, which is regular in all relevant periods, e.g. *Sinuhe* B 232 (...) *ntk is ḥbs ꜣḫt tn* '(...) for it is you who veils this horizon.'

(ii) *Debate* 17

(...) *p3 is pw prr in=f sw r=f*

'(...) for that is the sort who goes forth and brings himself to it.'[36]

(iii) Rahotep's *Coptos Stela* (D.17), 3-4

(...) *ḥw is pw nty m r3=k*

si3 [*is p*]*w n*[*ty m ib=k*]

'(...) for the one in your mouth is Hu,

for the one in your heart is Sia.'

(iv) *Ipuwer* 5.9[37]

(...) *ind is pw dd=tn n=f*

'(...) for your giving to him is misery.'

B. The rise of the construction *A is B* can not be related to any other process of linguistic change that would have been ongoing during the here relevant times. In particular, nominal predicate constructions are stable throughout the Middle and early New Kingdom. The construction *A is B* is therefore best interpreted as a purely written phenomenon, restricted to higher written registers.

Other than in *Berlin Leather Roll* 2.4, the construction is documented in one early Eighteenth Dynasty composition:

(v) *Urk.* IV 324, 12-14 (*Punt Expedition*)

w3d-w(*y*) *t3 ḫnd.n=tn*

rᶜ is[a] *nsw t3-mri*

nn grt w3t r ḥm=f ᶜnḫ=n m t3w n dd=f

'How fortunate is the land you have set foot on!

For Re is the king of the Beloved Land.

But, is there no way to His Majesty that we may live from the air he gives?'

a)   The segmentation in *Urk.* IV, as (...) *rᶜ is* | *nsw t3 mri nn grt* (...), is erroneous. Compare the associated translation: 'Wie glücklich ist das Gottesland, das ihr betreten habt, als ob ihr Ra wäret! Der König von Ägypten aber, gibt es (denn) keinen Weg zu Seiner Majestät (...)'.[38]

The context displays considerable formal elaboration. Just ahead is a quotation from *Sinuhe* (*Urk.* IV 324, 8: discussed below, §4.3.2, (iii)). The immediately preceding sequence has a very rare instance of a synthetic -*ḫr*-infixed form, strongly archaizing on a morphological level (*dd.ḫr=sn*: *Urk.* IV 324, 6). What is more, the form is used in a function that implies a functional extension similar to the one in narrative uses of -*ḫr*-marked constructions observed in the early Eighteenth Dynasty (§4.1.2.C):

---

36 Translation Allen 2011: 35.
37 Discussed by Oréal 2011: 141.
38 Blumenthal et al. 1984: 16.

(vi) *Urk.* IV 324, 3-7 (*Punt Expedition*)

iit in wrw nw pwnt m ksw m wȝḥ-tp r šsp mšꜥ pn n nsw ḏ=sn iȝw n nb nṯrw
imn-rꜥ pȝwti tȝwy hb ḫȝswt
ḏd.ḥr=sn dbḥ=sn ḥtpw

'Coming by the great ones of Punt in bowing down and with their heads lowered to receive this expedition of the king, giving praise to the lord of the gods Amun-Re, the primordial of the Dual Land who travels through the foreign countries.
They say asking for peace:'

C. The particle *is* is more generally subject to reconfigurations of various sorts in the written language of some early Eighteenth Dynasty compositions. Compare:

(vii) Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription* 20 (*Urk.* IV 164, 5-6)

rḫ.n=i is nḥḥ pw wȝst ḏt pw imn

'I know that Thebes is an eternal place and that Amun is forever.'

> *Is* at the beginning of a complement clause, rather than in clause-second position; the regular construction would have been *nḥḥ is pw wȝst.[39] Slightly later, but still in the Eighteenth Dynasty, is Amenhotep son of Hapu, Back Pillar 5 (*Urk.* IV 1824, 10-11) *irw n=i ir.tw n=tn ḥr-ntt is ink iwꜥ grg niwt=f dr twȝ=s m st nbt* 'Act for me and they will act for you, because I am an heir who establishes his town and drives away its evil from every place.' In lieu of regular **ḥr-ntt ink is iwꜥ* (...).

(viii) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.125: VI.8-11 (H*HBT* II 21, 5-9/10)

stp=i ȝ is hpw=t ḫr=i
ḏ=i ȝ is wš drf n m-ḫt
ḫn=i ȝ is tp-rd šȝ.n=t
ḏ=i ȝ is ḥr=ṯ ḥr st=i

'May I only ruin your laws which come from me?
May I only make prophecies empty?
May I only disturb ordinances you have decreed?
May I only allow you away from my seat?'

> *Is* is in combination with *ȝ*: not otherwise paralleled.[40]

(ix) *Urk.* IV 257, 7-8 (*Proclamation as Regent*)

ḏ=i sy m st-ti=i tw
is ḥrt-nst=i pw

'I wish to place her as this my royal representative;
for(?) she is my successor on the throne.'

> As in (vii), *is* heads the clause, diverging from the otherwise regular clause-second position of the particle (compare (ii)-(iv)).

---

39 Uljas 2007a: 283 and n.51; for a semantic interpretation of the phenomenon, Oréal 2011: 165.
40 Semantic analysis by Oréal 2011: 42-3.

The unique combination of *is* with the etymologically related *isk* in a single sentence in *Urk.* IV 260, 6 (*Proclamation as Regent*; discussed below, §4.7.1, (iii)) is illustrative of the same horizon in written language.

D. The above adds up to suggest that *A is B*, a very rare construction, is amenable to an argument by 'direct dating'. The construction is not documented in any Middle Kingdom or Second Intermediate Period text: in all periods, Middle Egyptian regularly uses another construction, *A is pw B*, to perform similar functions (above, A). The rise of the construction *A is B* can not be accounted for in terms of regular linguistic change and is therefore best interpreted as a phenomenon in written language. The construction is once documented in an Hatshepsutian composition, *Punt Expedition*: significantly, the context displays further tokens of a high degree of formal elaboration, including another element of linguistic reconfiguration (above, B). The particle *is* is more broadly subject to reconfigurations of various sorts in the very same time, and only then during the centuries relevant for dating *Berlin Leather Roll* (above, C). It is therefore proposed that *A is B* relates to an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon in written language.

4.2.2   *Berlin Leather Roll* 1.12 *ḫpr=f-it̠=f* 'born-conqueror'

The expression *ḫpr=f-it̠=f* recurs in only two other texts. One occurrence has often been noted, *Speos Artemidos* 39 (*Urk.* IV 390, 3: as *ḫpr=s-it*).[41] The other one is Amenhotep II's *Amada Stela*, upper part 5 (*Urk.* IV 1287, 20-21).[42]

A. In general, patterns of attestation of rare expressions are the most unreliable of all. In the present case, however, a series of further observations can be made. Morphologically, the expression is of the type *iw=f-ꜥꜣ=f*.[43] Semantically, *ḫpr=f-it̠=f* 'born-conqueror' is to do with royal ideology. Together, this strongly suggests that the expression was coined specifically to express such meaning, rather than innovated in regular linguistic interaction. Of the two dated examples of *ḫpr=f-it̠=f*, none is earlier than the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty; nor is any later than that period. The two other occurrences of the expression thus cluster in a very short time span (Hatshepsut-Amenhotep II), which happens to include the date of P. Berlin 3029 ro. Rather than a rare word sparsely used throughout history, *ḫpr-it̠=f* could then be a short-lived neologistic expression specific to some written registers in the brief period in which it is documented. If so, a lexical argument for a 'direct dating' of *Berlin Leather Roll* would be given.

---

41 Initially perhaps de Buck 1938: 55, n.22; Gardiner 1946b: 55, n.v; a locus classicus ever since.
42 Initially Gruen 1973; subsequently Borghouts 1994: 25; Klug 2002: 287, n.2271.
43 *EG* §194; Vernus 1970; Borghouts 1994: 23-4.

B. In all three instances, the expression *ḫpr=f-it=f* is bound to similar phraseological contexts:

(i) *Berlin Leather Roll* 1.12-14

rnn.kw m ḫpr=f-it=f (…) *ii.kw m ḥr* (...)

'I have been raised as a born-conqueror (...) I am come as Horus (...)'

(ii) *Speos Artemidos* 39-40 (*Urk.* IV 390, 13-14)

sr.n.tw=i r ḫnty rnpwt m ḫpr=s-it i.kwi m ḥr wˁtt (...)

'I have been announced from the ends of years as a born-conqueror; I am now come as the unique Horus (...)'[44]

(iii) Amenhotep II's *Amada Stela*, upper part 3-5 (*Urk.* IV 1287, 20-21)

sḫpr.n(=i) tw r ndty=i rnn(=i) tw m ḫpr=f-it=f (...)

'I have brought you into existence to be my avenger, I have raised you as a born-conqueror.'

This could be interpreted as additional evidence for relating *Berlin Leather Roll* to an early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty horizon. There is, however, another possibility. If the text now documented on *Berlin Leather Roll* was composed in the Middle Kingdom, this could have served as a textual model, drawn upon in later times. That the sole manuscript of *Berlin Leather Roll* dates to the very period when *ḫpr=f-it=f* is otherwise attested could then be interpreted as documenting an horizon of precisely such reception, of the composition, of the expression, and of the phraseological context to which it is bound. In view of the above discussion of *ḫpr=f-it=f* as a lexical expression, the former scenario would seem more likely, but the latter can not be ruled out.

4.2.3 *Berlin Leather Roll* 1.19 *m-rȝ-ˁ* 'as well, likewise'

M-rȝ-ˁ in *Berlin Leather Roll* 1.19 is remarkable because of the dense and near-exclusive attestation of the expression in the New Kingdom.[45] Both *TLA*[46] and a dedicated study of *m-rȝ-ˁ*[47] mention a singular much earlier instance of the expression, in the Old Kingdom tomb inscription of Hezy. This would imply that any argument based on the occurrence of *m-rȝ-ˁ* in *Berlin Leather Roll* 1.19 could only be suggestive, not conclusive.[48] As it turns out, the alleged instance of *m-rȝ-ˁ* in Hezy, which goes back to the prime editors of the text,[49] is to be read differently.[50] *M rȝ-ˁ* is

---

44 Fuller quotation above, §1.2, (iii.β).
45 Observed by a proponent of an early dating: Osing 1992a: 117, n.o; by a proponent of a late dating: Derchain 1992: 39.
46 *TLA* #64970.
47 Winand 2009.
48 Thus Winand 2009: 527, n.1: 'peut-être un indice supplémentaire d'une datation basse'.
49 Kanawati & Abd er-Raziq 1999: 38: '*Likewise*, His Majesty was discussing matters with me amongst the noblemen (...)'.
50 Baud & Farout 2001: 51 (with a contribution by Laurent Coulon acknowledged by the authors).

a prepositional phrase, with *r3-ꜥ* a full noun[51] and the following prepositional phrase (*mm srw*) dependent on *r3-ꜥ* (i).[52] The construction is closely similar to the one in a famous passage of Mentuwoser's stela (ii):[53]

(i) Hezy, west thickness 4-5[54]

wn ḥm=f nḏ=f ḫt m-ꜥ(=i) m r3-ꜥ mm srw sk w(i) m s3b sḫd sš n rḫ ḥm=f rn(=i) ṯny r b3k nb

'His Majesty used to take counsel with me in the manner that is done among the officials even though I was only a state inspector of scribes, for His Majesty knew my name to be distinguished over any servant's.'

(ii) Mentuwoser 13

ink mdw r r3-ꜥ srw (...)

'I was one speaking in the manner of[55] the officials (...)'

The reinterpretation of Hezy, West thickness 4-5 invites reconsidering the pattern of attestation of *m-r3-ꜥ*. The expression is very common in Late Egyptian.[56] Besides two Amarna instances, *TLA* mentions only one pre-Amarna instance, in *Eulogistic Account of a King* X+7.x+5 (§3.3.2.B).[57] To these, two more early occurrences can be added, one in Thutmosis I's *Tombos Inscription* 2 (*Urk.* IV 82, 14),[58] and a slightly earlier one in a fragment of a stela from Karnak which 'seems to date to around the same period as the Third Stela of Kamose.'[59] The overall pattern of attestation of *m-r3-ꜥ* is very consistent: the expression is first documented in the late Second Intermediate Period, then a few times during the Eighteenth Dynasty, and becomes very common in Ramesside times.

In *Berlin Leather Roll* 1.19, *m-r3-ꜥ* is tightly integrated in its context, in which some expression for 'likewise, as well' is required: it can not, therefore, be an addition. If an early dating of this passage is to be upheld, it must then be hypothesized that *m-r3-ꜥ* was altered from some older expression standing in this place, most probably *m-mitt*. This is very unlikely in view of how productively *m-mitt* is still used in the early New Kingdom:[60] the expression was then not felt to be any obsolete or difficult.

---

51 On the risk of confusing the adverbial expression *m-r3-ꜥ* with the prepositional phrase *m r3-ꜥ N* more generally, Winand 2009: 528.
52 There is no need to read as *m r3-ꜥ(=i)* or to posit a 'zero' (*m r3-ꜥ ø*), *pace* Baud & Farout 2001: 51.
53 Parallel drawn by Laurent Coulon in Baud & Farout 2001: 51, n.44.
54 Kanawati & Abd er-Raziq 1999: pl.33b, 59b.
55 Thus the classical translation; F*CD* 146 suggests 'in the presence of'.
56 In his discussion, Winand 2009 adduces some forty examples (without laying any claim at completeness). The list in *TLA* #64970 is similarly impressive.
57 *TLA* #64970.
58 Noted in F*CD* 146.
59 Van Siclen III 2010: 358, x+8.
60 E.g. *TLA* #64830.

4.2.4 Varia in the lexicon

Various other lexical expressions in *Berlin Leather Roll* must be appreciated with the usual caveats.

(i) *Berlin Leather Roll* 2.9 *rꜣ-ḥry* 'master, chief'

The word is not documented before the early New Kingdom.[61] From the early Eighteenth Dynasty on, it is fairly common: *Urk.* IV 58, 6 (Ineni); 208, 9 (Nebwawi I); 405, 3 (Senenmut); 420, 17 (Djehuti); etc. Other expressions are documented in earlier times with similar meaning, chief among which *ḥr-tp* (*ḥr-tp* of course continues to be used in the New Kingdom as well). In *Berlin Leather Roll* 2.9, *rꜣ-ḥry* is in collocation with the old independent pronoun, *ṯwt rꜣ-ḥry n-s=imy* 'Thou are the chief thereof': see the discussion below, §6.3.1.2.C.

(ii) *Berlin Leather Roll* 2.5 *iwnn* 'sanctuary'

The word is not documented before the early New Kingdom.[62] Early occurrences[63] include Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* 6 (*Urk.* IV 16, 1); *Speos Artemidos* 4 (*Urk.* IV 384, 2; the same text also has *ḫpr=s-it*, discussed above: §4.2.2); Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription* 25 (*Urk.* IV 166, 8; the same text also has an experimental construction of *is*, discussed above: §4.2.1, (vii)); *Urk.* IV 834, 2 (another building inscription by Thutmosis III). One other occurrence is in *Loyaliste* 7.4; the dating of the long version of this composition is discussed below, §4.5.

(iii) *Berlin Leather Roll* 1.8 *bwꜣ* 'to be highly regarded'

While a noun *bwꜣ* 'magnate' is once found in a pre-New Kingdom text,[64] the verb formed on the same root, possibly a denominative formation, is apparently not documented before the early New Kingdom.[65]

In the above, the last is weak, as there is no way to exclude that the denominative formation on *bwꜣ*, if this is one, may not have existed in the Middle Kingdom already. Of the remaining two, (i) is strongest, because the pattern of attestation of a word meaning 'master, chief' is less sensitive to whatever subject matters (and therefore semantic fields in the lexicon) were committed to writing in different periods. The same dimension must, on the other hand, be taken into critical account in appreciating (ii).

---

61 *Wb* II 390.6-9 notes 'vereinzelt M.R.; oft seit D.18'; in *Belegstellen* II 577a-b, however, all instances quoted are from the New Kingdom. Could 'M.R.' be in reference to *Berlin Leather Roll* itself (see the next n.)?

62 *Iwnn* is absent from Hann*Lex* 4 and 5. *Wb* I 55.12 writes 'seit M.R.', but this is in reference to *Berlin Leather Roll* 2.5 itself.

63 After F*CD* 13.

64 F*CD* 82; Hann*Lex* 4: 420b.

65 *Wb*. I 454.10-14.

4.2.5 Assessing the evidence

As discussed, the construction *A is B* in *Berlin Leather Roll* 2.4—not a regular construction in Middle Egyptian of any times—is best interpreted as a phenomenon of written language (§4.2.1). The construction is paralleled in the early Eighteenth Dynasty both specifically and for its general principle, and only then. From this, a strong indication for dating can be derived. Another strong indication is given by *m-rꜣ-ꜥ* in 1.19 (§4.2.3), an expression that lies at the boundary between the grammatical and the lexical: *m-rꜣ-ꜥ* is common and its pattern of attestation consistent; moreover, the likelihood for the expression to be secondary in *Berlin Leather Roll* 1.19 can be assessed as minimal. To various degrees, ranging from high to low, three lexical expressions may also be suggestive of a later dating (§4.2.4). One other lexical expression, *ḫpr=f-it=f* in 1.12 (§4.2.2), a neologism, was discussed for 'direct dating': this could be suggestive as well, yet remains ambiguous in interpretation because of the phraseological context with which it is associated in all cases. As initially noted, *Berlin Leather Roll* is expected to be fairly undistinctive linguistically (§4.2, introduction, *fine*): against this background, the above collection is almost surprisingly dense. *A is B* and *m-rꜣ-ꜥ* in particular are strongly indicative of a late dating.

It is therefore submitted that *Berlin Leather Roll* is probably an early Eighteenth Dynasty production, not merely in a redactional sense, but in terms of actual composition. As initially discussed, this stands in no contradiction with the possibility that the composers may have drawn on earlier materials: such a scenario is in fact inherently plausible in view of the cultural functions the text may have had. On what type of material the composers drew—on actual 'sources' or more broadly on an historically deep-reaching phraseological tradition—and in what amounts and what ways would be of interest in better appreciating *Berlin Leather Roll*. This, however, remains beyond the scope of a linguistic analysis; it is perhaps more generally irrecoverable in the present case.

4.3 *Sporting King*

The composition now referred to as *Sporting King* is documented in a single fragmentary manuscript (P. Moscow unnumbered) which paleographically dates to the late Eighteenth Dynasty.[66] The papyrus was purchased alongside other literary papyri dating to the same period (*Ptahhotep* L2, *Sinuhe* G, *Merikare* M, *Fishing and Fowling*, and *Moscow Mythological Story*). All probably derive from a single find (§3.2, introduction).

---

66 Text: Caminos 1956: 22-39, pl.8-16.

4.3.1   Non-linguistic elements for dating

A. *Sporting King* mentions the throne name of Amenemhat II (*nwb-kȝw-rꜥ*, E2.11), plausibly the king to which the speeches are addressed. In addition, various elements in *Sporting King* recur in one passage in this king's *Annals* (M23-25).[67] These encounters are relevant for interpretation, demonstrating how *Sporting King* relates to royal ideology as expressed in other types of written discourses.[68] They need not, however, imply a dating of the composition to the reign of Amenemhat II himself: the literary composition could for example have drawn on a tradition associated with Amenemhat II at some later time.[69] The text of Amenemhat II's *Annals* could also have been on display for a longer while, or a non-inscriptional copy thereof could have been kept, later to serve as one source for a literary treatment of the subject. As institutional analysis suggests, the literary composition probably post-dates the reign of the king it mentions (below, B), the question being by how much.

More generally, elements of royal ritual in *Sporting King* are not bound to a specific period in Egyptian history. Expressed in non-textual ways, the motif of fishing and fowling as part of a royal ritual is documented in the First Dynasty already.[70] The title *nbty wḥꜥ* 'Two Ladies Fowler' (C1.12) recurs in Amenemhat II's *Annals* (M24), yet also on a block from the causeway of Sahure's pyramid complex (SC/north/2003/05),[71] with a text dealing with fishing and fowling as a royal activity.[72] The title also recurs in the much later statue of a 'Mayor of the Fayum' Sobekhotep (*Urk.* IV 1587-8; *temp.* Thutmosis IV).[73] In this, *nbty wḥꜥ* (*Urk.* IV 1588, 4) is said of the king in the context of a leisurely activity of fishing and fowling in the Fayum (*tȝ-š*: *Urk.* IV 1587, 17), including a reference to the Marsh-goddess (*sḫt*: *Urk.* IV 1588, 2).

B. The main speaker, Sehetepibreankh, is said to be a *sš iri ꜥ n nsw n ḫft-ḥr* 'personal scribe responsible of the king's document' (A2.1; A2.3; B2.5).[74] In this particular form, the title is not documented in any other place. It is, however, closely similar to a title *sš ꜥ n nsw n ḫft-ḥr* 'personal scribe of the king's document'. In the early Middle Kingdom, a shorter form, *sš ꜥ n nsw*, is consistently used. The long form, with the addition *n ḫft-ḥr*, is documented only in the Thirteenth Dynasty.[75] In general, titles can undergo alteration in textual history, a classical case in point being the titulary of Ptahhotep in Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses of the *Teaching*, expanded with respect to

---

67   Text: Altenmüller & Moussa 1991: 17-8, 36-7, and pl.1. Discussion of the elements in common with *Sporting King*: Quirke 2004a: 206-7. Among further studies: Altenmüller 2008 (on the motif of the king as a fisher and fowler); Enmarch 2007: 76-9 (on *sr*'ing notably).

68   Parkinson 2002: 231.

69   Various scenarios are outlined in Quirke 2004a: 206-7; Parkinson 2002: 311-2 and n.17.

70   Altenmüller 2008: 5-10.

71   El-Awadi 2009: 215-31 and pl.13.

72   On this text in relation to Amenemhat II's *Annals* and *Sporting King*, Spalinger 2011: 363-9.

73   Noted by Altenmüller 2008: 4, n.14.

74   Dils et al., *TLA*, read as *sš nsw iri ꜥ n ḫft-ḥr* 'the king's personal scribe, responsible of the document'.

75   Grajetzki 2000: 169-77.

the P version and echoing, or echoed in, early New Kingdom viziers' titles.[76] In *Sporting King*, the title comes in the long form in all three occurrences (A2.1; A2.3; B2.5), making it less likely that *n ḫft-ḥr* could have been just such a secondary expansion. Accordingly it has been proposed that this title may provide an indication for dating *Sporting King* to the late Middle Kingdom, as the name *sḥtp-ib-rꜥ-ꜥnḫ* (A2.1) may as well.[77]

Yet, titles in literary works need not point to the period in time in which they corresponded to actually operating offices or functions. In literary texts and elsewhere, they can also be used for archaizing effect. Classical examples include *sꜣb ꜥd-mr* (...) 'state official, governor (...)' in *Sinuhe* (R 1),[78] *sḏm ḥwt wrt 6* 'judge of the six great estates' in early New Kingdom versions of *Ptahhotep* (3 C, L2) and contemporaneous viziers' titularies,[79] or *sꜣ nsw smsw n ẖt=f* 'eldest royal son of his body' in the Middle Kingdom version of the same composition (44 P).[80] If, as argued below, *Neferkare and Sisene* dates to the Eighteenth Dynasty (§4.4), this is yet another case of a Middle Egyptian literary composition with archaizing titles, not functional any more at the time when the work was composed. Regarding the segment *n ḫft-ḥr* specifically, one instance of an archaizing usage is found in Mentuhotep (CG 20539; *temp.* Senwosret I): this has *imi-rꜣ sšw ꜥ n nsw n ḫft-ḥr* 'personal director of the scribes of the king's document' (II.6l), a title otherwise documented in the Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period, not in this form in the early Twelfth Dynasty.[81]

C. Discussing possible forerunners of Ramesside 'Unterhaltungsliteratur', Assmann proposed that *Sporting King* (and *Fishing and Fowling*) could 'vielleicht' date to the Eighteenth Dynasty.[82] The proposal is problematic in one part, as entertainment is arguably a function of Middle Kingdom literature as well, expressed in different forms.[83] On the other hand, as also evoked by Assmann, *Sporting King* and *Fishing and Fowling* display various elements of form, motifs, and intertext that make them typologically transitional compositions.[84] Other literary texts that have been discussed in relation to *Sporting King* and *Fishing and Fowling* are *Eulogistic Account of a King* and *Tale Involving the House of Life*,[85] *Neferkare and Sisene*,[86] and the Eighteenth Dynasty praise of a city on O. Nakhtmin 87/173.[87]

An appreciation of *Sporting King* and *Fishing and Fowling* as typologically transitional is also expressed by Parkinson in terms that are worth quoting in full: 'Both the compositions seem to belong to a leisured poetry, a playful adaptation of courtly liturgies, almost foreshadowing the ethos of the Ramesside love-songs. While

---

76 For the two interpretive options, Grajetzki 2005: 41-2; Hagen 2012a: 220-7.
77 Grajetzki 2005: 56.
78 Grajetzki 2005: 51-2.
79 Hagen 2012a: 223; Grajetzki 2005: 41-2.
80 Grajetzki 2005: 40-1.
81 Grajetzki 2000: 173 and n.5.
82 Assmann 1985: 48-9.
83 E.g. Parkinson 2002: 83-5.
84 Similarly e.g. Baines 1996: 160-1.
85 Parkinson 2002: 112.
86 Assmann 1985: 48.
87 Parkinson 2002: 230.

the language is courtly, the serious tone which is peculiar to much of the central canon is lacking, suggesting that these compositions *might lie in some sense on the periphery of the high literary tradition* (emphasis AS), and also exemplifying the versatile capacity of poetry to absorb other genres. This expansion of subject matter and tone, the length, and the presumed structure of the poems *all may suggest a late date and a transitional status* (emphasis AS) between the Middle Kingdom canon and later literature.'[88]

That *Sporting King* is later than e.g. *Sinuhe* is clear; the question is how late *Sporting King* is, and thereby how close in time to Ramesside literature to come. This has broader implications, as it may bear on one major issue, namely until when Middle Egyptian literature was a productive tradition.

4.3.2 *Sporting King* A2.2: *Mi sy-išst*

In the section introducing Sehetepibreankh's telling of 'what he has seen', the king asks a question that includes an extraordinary expression:

(i) *Sporting King* A2.2-3
mi sy-išst [*pw ḏd=k m₃₃*].*n=k st*
'What is it like, what you say you have seen?'[89]

Mi sy-išst is a *hapax legomenon*. As to be discussed in the present section, its lack of attestation in any other text is not a gap in the written record: rather, the expression is truly unique. That a unique expression should have implications for dating is at first paradoxical, as expressions uniquely attested are by definition the ones that can least be anchored to the external record. As it turns out, the expression can only be accounted for in terms of a textual genealogy, not of ongoing linguistic change. It is at this level that it becomes relevant for dating.

4.3.2.1 Analyzing a unique expression

A. Various other phrases for expressing 'like what, how' are commonly documented in Middle Egyptian literature and elsewhere:

- *mi m*: e.g. *Sinuhe* B 43; *Ipuwer* 5.2; 14.14; *Fishing and Fowling* A1.1;[90] *Heavenly Cow* 130;[91]

- less commonly also *m m* (literally 'as what' with often closely similar meaning): e.g. *Merikare* E 137; *Neferti* 5b Pet.

---

88 Parkinson 2002: 231-2.
89 The lacuna after the interrogative permits different interpretations of the sentence: see Caminos 1956: 27; Vernus 2006: 165, ex.96, n.153. This issue is here left open as it is not further relevant for the present section, which concerns the interrogative word itself.
90 Parkinson (2002: 229) observes that both *Fishing and Fowling* and the first speech in *Sporting King* are introduced by a similar type of question. If so, the contrast in the expressions selected in either text makes the peculiar interrogative construction in *Sporting King* all the more apparent.
91 *Mi m* is in Late Egyptian superseded by *mi iḫ* (as multiples times e.g. in *Satirical Letter*); an early instance of *mi iḫ* is in *Urk*. IV 649, 15 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*).

Against this background, the interrogative *mi sy-išst* in *Sporting King* must have sounded recherché.

B. This interpretation is confirmed by an examination of the pattern of attestation of the second part of *mi sy-išst*, namely the interrogative word itself, *sy-išst*. At first sight, this would seem fairly unremarkable: *sy-išst* is salient in any Egyptologist's representation of Middle Egyptian as an expression specifically discussed in the most commonly used reference grammar of the language.[92] Moreover, the expression is one that features prominently in the Middle Egyptian text most popular in modern reception, *Sinuhe*, where it occurs in a context that is itself salient in asking one of the central questions of the composition:

(ii) *Sinuhe* R 58

[*pḥ.n=k*] *nn ḥr si-išst*

'Why have you reached this place?'

> The question was probably salient to ancient readers already, as is suggested by its presence on B1 (Berlin P 12341), an ostracon probably deriving from Deir el-Ballas and dating to the end of the Hyksos period.[93] This has a very short excerpt of *Sinuhe*, beginning with the question only preceded by introductory *ꜥḥꜥ.n ḏd.n=f*.

This salience in modern representations of Middle Egyptian only obscures the extremely sparse effective attestation of the expression. Beyond the *Sinuhe* R instance just quoted and the one in *Sporting King* here discussed, only three other occurrences of *sy-išst* have been noted, twice as *ḥr sy-išst* 'why', once as *sy-išst* 'what' (quoted below, (iii)-(v)). Just like 'how' (above, A), 'why' is regularly expressed otherwise in Middle Egyptian, not with *sy-išst*:

- *ḥr m*: e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 211; *Cheops' Court* 6.5; 11.22; 12.22; *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 20;

- *ḥr iḫ*: e.g. Heqanakht I vso 15; Ahmose's *Abydos Stela for Tetisheri* 7 (*Urk.* IV 27, 11).

C. The three occurrences of *sy-išst* other than in *Sinuhe* and *Sporting King* are themselves worth a closer look at:

(iii) *Urk.* IV 324, 6-9 (*Punt Expedition*)

ḏd.ḥr=sn dbḥ=sn ḥtpw
pḥ.n=tn nn ḥr si-išst r[sic] *ḫꜣst tn ḫmt.n rmt*

'They say asking for peace:
"Why have you reached this place, to[sic] this country unknown of men?" '

---

92 *EG* §500.4.
93 For this witness in its context, Parkinson 2009: 174-5.

(iv) Ahmose's *Abydos Stela for Tetisheri* 6-7 (*Urk.* IV 27, 10-12)

sḫꜣ.tw nn ḥr sy-išst
sḏd.tw mdt tn ḥr iḫ
pty spr r ḫꜣty=k

'Why does One think of this?
Why does One tell this discourse?
What has reached Your heart?'

(v) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.98: I.2-5 (H*HBT* II 7, 11 - 8, 3/4)

(...) *tꜣ r-ḏr=f ššp.n sgri* (...) *wrw ꜥḥ wꜣḥ.n ḥr*
imiw-ḫt=f ḥr sy-išst
sꜣw-ib ḫpr m tp-šw (...)

'(...) the whole land, it became silent (...) the great ones of the palace, they bent their heads;
his followers (*scil.* the god's) were saying: "What?"
The ones with sated hearts(?) were destitute(?) (...)'

Pḥ.n=ṯn nn ḥr si-išst in *Punt Expedition* (iii) has long been identified as a quotation of *Sinuhe* R 58 (ii).[94] Beyond its identical phrasing and contextual appropriateness,[95] the question is followed by further *in iw*-introduced question(s) in both *Punt Expedition* (*Urk.* IV 324, 10-11) and in *Sinuhe* itself (R 59). Indicative of a quotation is also the slightly awkward syntax of *pḥ*, first constructed transitively (as in the *Sinuhe* original), then expanded further by an oblique phrase introduced by *r*. The allusion to *Sinuhe* is only one element of the considerable elaboration displayed by the surrounding context: the question is introduced by *ḏd.ḫr=sn*, a strongly archaizing synthetic -*ḫr*-infixed form,[96] here used in a functionally remarkable way (§4.2.1, (vi)). The segment of speech continues with a construction *A is B* (*Urk.* IV 324, 12-13), which is apparently paralleled only once otherwise (§4.2.1, (v)).

The two other passages that have *sy-išst* also display a considerable elaboration. In Ahmose's *Abydos Stela for Tetisheri* (iv), the threefold sequence of interrogative clauses comes with strong rhetorical effect. Both the first and second questions are 'why'-questions, with two different expressions for 'why'—a plain case of linguistic dissimilation. In *Chapelle Rouge* (v), a high linguistic register is manifest in the twofold use of the construction *N sḏm.n* (§1.2, (xi); also §3.4.4, (iii)-(iv)). In the lexicon, *tp-šw*, a rare expression (§5.1.3.3, (viii)), is noteworthy as well.

---

94 E.g. *EG*, p.408, n.3.
95 Parkinson (2009: 177) comments: 'The international context of these scenes also suggests that this allusion to a poem about foreign travel might be meaningful and not simply an accidental result of scribal training and linguistic antiquarianism. The meaning of the question, however, has been transformed: although it was an embarrassing question in the poem, here it is a conventional expression of wonder at a royal act (...)'.
96 Vernus 1990a: 65.

D. At this point, a closer examination of the relevant passage in *Sinuhe* itself is in order. The interrogative word under discussion, *si-išst*, is in R only. B reads differently:

(vi) *Sinuhe* B 34-35
pḥ.n=k nn ḥr m
išst pw
'Why have you reached this place?
What is it?'

> R 58
> [*pḥ.n=k*] *nn ḥr si-išst*
> 'Why have you reached this place?'
>
>> As often, the New Kingdom tradition—B1, B3, AOS, Cl—here follows R.

The B manuscript has *ḥr m*, the regular way for expressing 'why' in Middle Egyptian (above, B). *Išst pw* similarly is a regular expression (e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 160; *Ipuwer* 5.10; *Cheops' Court* 6.25).[97] R has conflated the two questions into only one, replacing the interrogative word *m* 'what' by *si*.[98] This results in an interrogative word with *two* WH-expressions: *si-išst* 'what/which-what'. This is analogical to the regular construction *si N* 'what/which N', except that a second interrogative word is inserted in the slot of what in Middle Egyptian can otherwise only be a full noun:

CT II 141e   *ḥr si w3t*   'on what/which road?'
Sinuhe R 58   *ḥr si-išst*   'on what/which *what*?'

Si-išst in *Sinuhe* R 58 thereby appears as the result of a purely textual process. The second WH-interrogative expression, *išst* was originally part of another interrogative clause entirely independent from the first.

E. The realization that *si-išst* in *Sinuhe* R 58 owes its existence to a textual process, not to a linguistic one, invites reconsidering the other instances of *si-išst*. The one in *Punt Expedition* (iii) is a direct quotation of *Sinuhe* R 58. In Ahmose's *Abydos Stela for Tetisheri* (iv), an allusion to *Sinuhe* is possible, in view of the linguistic dissimilation of *ḥr sy-išst* with *ḥr m*; perhaps relevant is also that *ḥr sy-išst* is preceded by *nn*, as in *Sinuhe* R 58. In *Chapelle Rouge*, an allusion is possible as well, but would have been subtle enough. Remarkably, all three occurrences of (*ḥr*) *sy-išst* other than in *Sinuhe* R stem from the same temporal horizon: *Punt Expedition* and *Chapelle Rouge* are Hatshepsutian, while Ahmose's *Abydos Stela for Tetisheri* is only slightly earlier. As is suggested by the apparently extremely limited distribution of the expression, only in very high registers, and further by its formal makeup, singling it out from all regular interrogatives in the language, (*ḥr*) *sy-išst* must have sounded

---

97 Beyond literary Middle Egyptian, also e.g. *Chapelle Rouge*, p.99: I.16 (H*HBT* II 9, 9); further Vernus 2006: 151, ex.25-6.

98 The interrogative *si* is common notably in funerary texts such as Coffin Texts and Book of the Dead. In a literary text, it recurs in *Cheops' Court* 9.15.

extremely recherché. This appreciation is independently confirmed by the textual surroundings in which the construction is found, in all three cases displaying further elements of a strong elaboration.

Based on the fact that the expression, a double WH-interrogative, is ungrammatical, its history can then be traced. *Sī-išst* arises through a purely textual process in the tradition of *Sinuhe* now documented by R. In the early Eighteenth Dynasty, it recurs in very few places, in all cases in highly elaborate contexts. The connection to *Sinuhe* R 58 is directly demonstrated in one of these occurrences, and an allusion is likely or possible in the other two. From uses as a conscious quotation or allusion, the expression could then have gained some autonomous life as an element of extremely recherché language. Even when possibly not any more an allusion, the very presence of *sy-išst* in the linguistic repertoires of some early Eighteenth Dynasty compositions is understandable only as a token of the reception of *Sinuhe* R 58: initially the result of a textual process, the expression owes its further existence to a textual genalogy.

F. *Mi sy-išst* in *Sporting King* A2.2 then itself appears to stand in the reception of *Sinuhe* R 58, be this as a conscious allusion, or more indirectly as an expression made possible by a textual genealogy ultimately harkening back to *Sinuhe* R 58. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that *mi sy-išst* in *Sporting King* should be a *hapax legomenon*.

That *Sporting King* A2.2 stands in the reception of the tradition of *Sinuhe* now represented by R does not in itself suffice to define a terminus *ante quem non* by the time of the manuscript R itself (probably mid-Thirteenth Dynasty[99]). When the textual alteration discussed above in *Sinuhe* took place is unknown: it could have occurred before R was copied.

It is tempting, on the other hand, to relate *mi sy-išst* in *Sporting King* to the effectively documented horizon of reception of the Sinuhean *ḥr si-išst*, in the early Eighteenth Dynasty. While gaps in the written record can hardly be over-emphasized, it must also be observed that the three documented instances of *sy-išst* other than the one in *Sporting King* cluster very closely in time. Moreover, the pattern of attestation is here of an entirely different nature than for expressions that have a regular existence in language. For these, their actual presence in the language would have been continuous over the time of their existence, however continuously or discontinuously they may be represented in the record. The case of *sy-išst* is altogether different, since the very conditioning possibility for this expression lies in reception and textual genealogy, thereby in cultural phenomenona, which are not continuous in nature. The kind of reception here observed is also of a specific kind, sited at the highest levels of composers' engagement with *Sinuhe*. The pattern of effective documentation of the productive reception of the Sinuhean *ḥr si-išst* therefore stands every chance to be significant. In all likelihood, *mi sy-išst* in *Sporting King* A2.2 therefore points to an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon.

4.3.2.2 An expression secondarily inserted in the text?

It remains to be assessed whether *mi sy-išst* is integral to the original text of *Sporting King* or not. If the expression were textually secondary in *Sporting King* A2.2, the

---

99 For the dating of R (P. Ramesseum A), Parkinson 2012a: 3; 2009: 150.

source construction *mi sy-išst* would in all likelihood have been altered from the regular construction *mi m*, with an exactly similar meaning. Unlike for many other constructions in other texts discussed in the present study, there are at this level no indications that speak directly against the hypothesis of such an alteration: if one had occurred, the text as now to be read in P. Moscow unnumbered would look just as it does. On the other hand, such textual alteration would not have been an instance of 'modernization', regularization, or smoothening of the text. Quite the contrary would be the case: an extraordinary expression would have been inserted to replace a very ordinary one. This is not entirely impossible, if one imagines an early Eighteenth Dynasty littérateur enhancing the text to his own taste. How likely such a scenario would be is another issue, however.

Further considerations confirm that *mi sy-išst* is most probably original in *Sporting King* A2.2. Both in this composition and in *Sinuhe* R, the *si-išst* question is asked by a higher-status participant (the king, respectively Amunenshi) to which a lower-status participant (Sehetepibreankh, respectively Sinuhe) responds by a longer speech. There is therefore a great deal of contextual appropriateness in the presence of *sy-išst* in *Sporting King* A2.2.

Noteworthy is also the mention of *itw* 'Lisht' in *Sporting King* B3.3. The place is commonly referred to as *ḫnw* 'Residence', its designation as (*imn-m-ḥȝt-*)*iṯ-tȝwy* being fairly rare.[100] *Itw* in *Sporting King* B3.3 is one of only two instances of the fully abbreviated form, the other one being *Sinuhe* B 247.[101] In *Sinuhe* B 247, the text has *iṯʷ*{*tȝ*}: the scribe had begun writing the *tȝ*-sign, then 'realized that he could fit another line onto the page below this and so he stopped and instead used a shorter form of the toponym *jṯw*—going back and squeezing in the *w* between the signs that he had already written.'[102] The status of *itw* is thus open to debate, as a short form that existed in the language or as one that the B-scribe coined possibly accidentally in the course of the process just described. Either way, the textual distribution of *itw* suggests that *Sporting King* may here as well lie in the reception of *Sinuhe*, directly alluding to that composition, or less consciously using a name form that had gained currency by its presence in *Sinuhe*. That the influence of *Sinuhe* is now to be detected probably twice in the same composition suggests that *Sporting King* more generally resonates with a Sinuhean background. This provides an additional indication that *sy-išst* in *Sporting King* A2.2 is not the result of a secondary insertion.

---

100 Simpson 1963: 53-5.
101 Neither R nor any Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses preserve the passage in question. AOS, for its part, has the fuller form, *iṯ-tȝwy*.
102 Parkinson 2009: 96-8.

4.3.3 *Sporting King* C1.11: *M-ḫt nn + 'narrative' infinitive*

The following passage has a remarkable use of a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive after a fronted temporal expression:

> (i) *Sporting King* C1.10-11
>
> *sḳdwt* [...] *t3 m ʿḥ t3-š*
> *m-ḫt nn snmt* [...]
>
> 'Sailing [...] the land in the palace of the Sea-land.
> After this, feeding/consuming(?) [...]'

A. In the Middle Kingdom, the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive is never found after a fronted temporal expression. That this lack of attestation is not a documentary gap is strongly suggested by the fact that the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive is fairly common in Middle Kingdom texts (thus in various types of texts, Hammamat inscriptions, Amenemhat II's *Annals*, Khusobek, *Sinuhe*, etc.).

More directly, there are semantic grounds for why the combination of a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive with a fronted temporal expression can not occur. In the Middle Kingdom, the construction is used in headings, related to these in absolute paragraph-initial position, or, when events are listed in a bare form, following another 'narrative infinitive'. Reflecting its origins in a textual genealogy ultimately harkening back to label statements and annalistic notices, the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive presents the event in a bare form. The defining function of the construction, its very raison d'être, lies in *not* expressing a temporal relation with some preceding event, more broadly in *not* relating the event to the temporal flow. Fronted temporal expressions, for their part, serve to express precisely such a relation. The combination as in (i) is ruled out, because it is semantically a contradiction.

B. The combination as in *Sporting King* C1.10-11 is amply paralleled in early New Kingdom royal (ii)-(iii) and private (iv) inscriptions. According with such contexts, the agent is a high-status participant, a king (often in progress), less commonly a god. E.g.:

> (ii) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.98: I.5-8 (H*HBT* II 8, 7/8-10)
>
> *spr ḥm=f r tp-itrw* (...)
> *m-ḫt nn rdt ḥr m ḫd*
>
> 'His Majesty's reaching to the Head-of-the-Canal (...)
> After this, giving the order to go downstream.'
>
> > Sim, p.99: I.14 (H*HBT* II 9, 4/5), quoted above (§4.1.2, (vi)); p.99: I.18 (H*HBT* II 9, 12) *m-ḫt nn rḏt=f s(i) ḫr-ḫ3t=f* 'After this, his placing her before him'; p.107: III.14-15 (H*HBT* II 13, 5/6), quoted above (§4.1.2, (vii)); p.121: V.10-11 (H*HBT* II 19, 9) *m-ḫt nn gmt ibw=sn* 'After this, finding their hearts.'

(iii) *Urk*. IV 836, 6-7 (a building inscription of Thutmosis III in Karnak)

m-ḫt nn wḏꜣ nb=i r sḫꜣ[t] it(=i) imn

wḏꜣ nṯr r nmtwt=f r irt ḥb=f pn nfr

'After this, proceeding of My Lordship to make my father Amun appear.
Proceeding of the god in his journeys to make this beautiful celebration.'

> A variant formulation with a finite construction is in Amenhotep II's *Sphinx Stela*
> 26 (*Urk*. IV 1283, 5) *m-ḫt nn sḫꜥw ḥm=f m nsw* (...) 'After this, His Majesty was
> made to appear as a king (...)'.

(iv) *Urk*. IV 951, 4-7 (Iamunedjeh)

ḫꜥt nsw m st wrt m ꜥḥ nw iwnw-šmꜥw (...)

m-ḫt nn int inw n bꜣw ḥm=f m ḫꜣswt rtnw ḫst (...)

'Appearing of the king on the great seat in the palace of the Southern
Heliopolis (...).
After this, bringing of the tribute to the power of His Majesty from the foreign
countries of the vile Retenu (...)'

> Sim. Ahmes son of Abana 36 (*Urk*. IV 9, 8) *m-ḫt nn wḏꜣ r rtnw* (...) 'After this,
> proceeding to Retenu (...)'.

This early New Kingdom usage implies a reinterpretation of the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive. Inheriting from Middle Kingdom usage, the construction keeps significant associations with certain types of texts, events, and agents, yet is also extended to uses which can not be reconduced any more to the very strict conditions to which the construction was subject in the Middle Kingdom (compare the above illustration, (ii)-(iv)). In the early New Kingdom, the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive often serves to introduce segments of text: while differing in articulative function from other more classically narrative constructions, the construction has thereby become an integral part of the narrative texture of the texts in which it can be used. Put differently the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive is increasingly treated as if this were, indeed, a narrative construction. Accordingly, a temporally sequential relation to what precedes can be made explicit, by a fronted temporal expression.

Such usage could not arise through a process of linguistic change, because the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive itself was a purely textual phenomenon all along, existing only in certain types of written discourse to which it was bound. The early Eighteenth Dynasty reconfiguration is therefore specific to written language.

C. The construction in *Sporting King* C1.10-11 is thereby an unambiguous token of an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon in written language. There remains the possibility, however, that the construction is not original in *Sporting King*. Assuming the fronted temporal construction was secondarily inserted before *snmt*, the original text would simply have consisted in two 'narrative' constructions of the infinitive directly following each other: *sḳdwt* (...) *snmt* (...). The textual alteration would have be undetectable in the text now preserved on P. Moscow unnumbered. Further considera-

tions, extending beyond C1.11 itself, are therefore required to assess whether the construction is original or not (§4.3.5.A).

4.3.4 Varia

A. The beginning of *Sporting King* has an instance of the old demonstrative *ipn*:

(i) *Sporting King* A2.1

[...] *in špsw=f ipn*

'[...] by these nobles of his.'

The context is a dialogue between the king and Sehetepibreankh, perhaps other courtiers as well. A similar association of *ipn* is common in other texts and constitutes a convention of certain types of written discourses, notably the 'Royal Tale' (further discussion below, §4.6.3.A). Most examples are from the Eighteenth Dynasty: *smrw ipn* 'these companions' (*Urk.* IV 165, 7; 182, 8; 1241, 2; 1380, 20; 1381, 3; 1381, 16); *rmṯw ipn* 'these men' (*Urk.* IV 257, 2; for the dating to the Eighteenth Dynasty, §4.7); sim. in *Heavenly Cow* 23, 64, 76 (for the dating to the Eighteenth Dynasty, §4.6). One earlier instance is in Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela* 12 *smrw ipn* 'these companions' (§1.3.3.1, (ix)).[103] The use of *ipn* as in *Sporting King* is therefore typical of an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon, although not entirely exclusive to this.

B. One element in the lexicon deserves a brief mention:

(ii) *Sporting King* B2.1 *ihhy* 'rejoice'

The word is common throughout the New Kingdom. *Ihhy*[104] is found in a text that probably derives from the same find as *Sporting King*, the *Moscow Mythological Story* (P. Moscow unn. B2.9 and frg. 25.1; see below, NB). It recurs in a Harpist's song in the early Nineteenth Dynasty tomb of Nefersekheru (5), in the Hymn to Aton in Pentu's tomb in Amarna (4), in the Hymn to Amun on P. Chester Beatty IV ro (IV.5; XI.3), in the Ritual for Amenhotep I (P. Chester Beatty IX vso IX.6; XIII.9), and in P. Harris Magical (II.1). The expression is not uncommon in Book of the Dead and in private tombs, in some cases in phraseological contexts.[105] It is also found in temple inscriptions (the earliest is *Urk.* IV 580, 6), in royal inscriptions (the earliest is Horemheb's *Decree* 8), or in P. Harris I (*passim*). The attestation of *ihhy* in the New Kingdom is thereby dense, yet one pre-New Kingdom occurrence of *ihhy* has been noted, as have a few cases of the shorter form *ih*(*y*) and two mentions of the *ihhy*-festival.[106] The presence of *ihhy* in *Sporting King* remains noteworthy as the expression is strongly associated with the New Kingdom.

---

103 Different is the association in a (late) Second Intermediate Period text, *Tale Involving the House of Life* X+2.1 *n rḫ=i niwtiw ipn* 'I do not know these citizens.' *Tod Inscription* also has an instance of the demonstrative (29 *ipf*): in this text, the use of *ipf* is a case of linguistic dissimilation (Vernus 1996b: 164). The dating of the *Inscription* remains unclear (Buchberger 2006).

104 The following references are drawn from *TLA* #30360 and the associated *DZA* files.

105 Early occurrences are *Urk.* IV 917, 5 (Amenemhab); 935, 6 (Menkheperreseneb); 978, 10 (Min); *DZA* 21.184.840 (Khaemhat); *DZA* 21.184.710 (also *temp.* Amenhotep III).

106 Hann*Lex* 5: 381c-382c.

NB. A reference was just made to the *Moscow Mythological Story* (P. Moscow unnumbered + P. Moscow 167).[107] The papyrus dates to the turn of the Eighteenth to the Nineteenth Dynasty[108] and the composition is one of those for which a late dating has been evoked.[109] The highly fragmentary text does not support much in ways of a linguistic analysis. Accordingly, no systematic inquiry was done in the present study and no definite dating is here proposed, but some observations made in passing suggest that the later dating is more likely.

One late feature is in P. Moscow 167 frg. II.11 *iw=w r* [...] 'they will [...]'.[110] It has been proposed that this could be secondary to an original *iw=ø r* [...] in view of the 'overwhelmingly classical Egyptian' language of the text.[111] Whether a construction *iw=ø r NP* would be here grammatically possible can not be assessed due to the fragmentary nature of the context.[112] That the text is 'overwhelmingly classical' in language is not an argument pro emendation: by the same token, *iw=w* could then be emended in *Speos Artemidos* 30 (*Urk.* IV 388, 16) and in *Urk.* IV 54, 10 (Ineni). As these demonstrate, *=w* was occasionally deemed acceptable in some Eighteenth Dynasty configurations of Middle Egyptian.[113]

Most remarkable is the *wn.k3*-headed construction in P. Moscow unn. A.3 *wn.k3 sb3w* [...] 'Then the door(?) will [...](?)'. *Wn.k3*-headed constructions are exceedingly rare: except for one case, all examples are from *Chapelle Rouge* (§4.1.2.E). In Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian, other *-k3*-marked constructions are always used: in earlier times *sḏm.k3=f*, in later ones *k3 sḏm=f* and *k3=f sḏm=f*. The diachronic change leading from the former to the latter is well studied and linguistically consistent.[114] *Wn.k3*-headed constructions, which did not arise in regular linguistic change, are a late development, restricted to some configurations of written Middle Egyptian only.

On a lexical level, one detail that has been mentioned as pointing to an Eighteenth Dynasty date of composition, feminine *ḥmt=s* 'Her Majesty' (P. Moscow unn. frg. 1+2.2),[115] is inconsequential.[116] The presence of *ihhy* in P. Moscow unn. B2.9 and frg. 25.1 was just discussed as suggestive of a late dating.

---

107 Text: Caminos 1956; Korostovtzev 1960.

108 Caminos 1956: 40; Korostovtzev 1960: 120-2.

109 Parkinson 2002: 294, n.2; Baines 1996: 160 ('likely'); Assmann 1985: 48 ('vielleicht').

110 E.g. Baines 1996: 160, n.20.

111 Quack 2004: 359.

112 A construction *iw=ø r NP* is possible in Middle Egyptian under certain conditions, depending on the type of referent implied in the subjectless construction, typically situational or otherwise low in individuation. The badly damaged context does not permit to assess whether such semantic conditions are here met.

113 That there is no reason to emend is of course not a proof that the text must be original; nor can there be one, given the nature of the expression considered and, yet again, the sorry state of preservation of the text.

114 Vernus 1990a: 85-90.

115 Korostovtzev 1960: 122, with a reference to *Wb*. III 92.12-93.8 where the word is said not to be documented before the early New Kingdom.

116 See *ḥmt=s* in Rediukhnum (*temp.* Wahankh Antef II), A10. That the expression is documented only once before the early New Kingdom reflects the fact that appropriate contexts are then hardly ever found in the preserved record. In Rediukhnum, such a context is exceptionally given, in the official presenting himself as having been raised and promoted by a feminine member of the royal family, the king's ornament, royal daughter, and royal wife Neferukayet. This provides a neat

4.3.5 Dating *Sporting King*

A. Of the expressions discussed above, one directly relates to an Eighteenth Dynasty horizon in written language, *m-ḫt nn* combined with a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive (§4.3.3). Another one arguably does as well, *sy-išst* in *mi sy-išst* (§4.3.2). A third, *ipn* used with the specific associations as in *Sporting King* is typical of, although not fully exclusive to, that period (§4.3.4.A).

As discussed, there are strong and converging indications that *mi sy-išst* is integral to the original text of *Sporting King* (§4.3.2.2). In addition, both this expression and *m-ḫt nn* combined with a 'narrative' infinitive are documented only in the (early) Eighteenth Dynasty horizon. So is, if not in similarly exclusive ways, *ipn* as used in *Sporting King*. The second and third expressions are typical of royal inscriptions: this may be significant in view of the royal dimension central in *Sporting King*. Two out of three post-Sinuhean instances of *sy-išst* other than in *Sporting King* are in Hatshepsutian compositions: one of these is *Chapelle Rouge*, a text that also prominently uses *m-ḫt nn* combined with the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive (§4.1.2.D). The part of the linguistic repertoire of *Sporting King* here discussed thereby appears to be strongly consistent. This makes it highly unlikely that the three expressions considered are textually secondary.

Based on the above, it is here submitted that *Sporting King* was probably composed in the Eighteenth Dynasty.

B. A title and a personal name in the composition are typical of the late Middle Kingdom (§4.3.1.B): if the dating proposed is correct, these may reflect an intent of evoking times past. Such intent could also be manifest in the selection of the royal name included in Sehetepibre-ankh: Amenemhat I is associated with a very major Middle Egyptian composition, *Sinuhe*, and thereby further with *itw*,[117] possibly itself Sinuhean. The parallels with Amenemhat II's *Annals* (§4.3.1.A) are important for interpretation and the composers of *Sporting King* may have known of this text or of an associated tradition: the relationship between the two texts must then be modeled in indirect ways, as has already been made likely by others on independent grounds; the royal rituals evoked in the literary composition are not specific to any period in particular. Most importantly, it is here proposed that the general typological assessment of *Sporting King* as transitional in form, motif, and intertext (§4.3.1.C) can probably be specified temporally, with *Sporting King* having been composed not in the late Middle Kingdom but in the Eighteenth Dynasty.

---

illustration of how with some words patterns of lexical attestation can be over-determined by subject matters in the preserved record of various periods.

117 For other aspects of the later historical memory of Lisht, e.g. Parkinson 2009: 17.

4.4 *Neferkare and Sisene*

4.4.1 Introduction

The *Tale of Neferkare and Sisene*[118] is fragmentarily documented in probably three witnesses. The bulk of the preserved text is from the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty P. Chassinat I.[119] One New Kingdom witness is T. OIC 13539 (late Eighteenth/early Nineteenth Dynasty),[120] another one is probably T. IFAO 1214 (early Twentieth Dynasty);[121] these give only scraps of the beginning. This documentary situation does not help analysis: the main witness is very late[122] and not much text is preserved overall.

Neferkare and Sisene has been dated to various periods: the editor of the text proposed a dating to the Second Intermediate Period or early New Kingdom, while also contemplating the possibility that the *Tale* may have existed in the Middle Kingdom already, perhaps in an oral form;[123] other authors have proposed the late Middle Kingdom,[124] the early Twelfth Dynasty,[125] or the Twelfth Dynasty more broadly.[126] *Neferkare* has also been evoked among possible candidates for an early New Kingdom date of composition.[127]

These diverging proposals reflect the different priorities given to diverse types of evidence by various authors. Among elements that have been considered for dating, onomastics would stand in the Middle Kingdom tradition;[128] an expression of filiation as *B s3 A*[129] is otherwise typical of the Eleventh through Thirteenth Dynasties;[130] titles find parallels in actual usage in the Middle Kingdom,[131] and more specifically in the early Twelfth Dynasty.[132] On the other hand, the literary typology of *Neferkare and Sisene* allies the composition with *Cheops' Court*,[133] which was certainly not composed before the early Thirteenth Dynasty and quite possibly later (the early Thirteenth Dynasty is only a type-B terminus *ante quem non*: §2.4.4.1.B). In attempting to reconcile all the above, a compromise would seem to be in positing a

---

118 Text: Posener 1957.
119 Posener 1957: 120-2; further Verhoeven 1999: 260-1. As observed by van Dijk (1994: 392-3), this context of reception of the *Tale* may not be entirely coincidental in view of the 'obsession' of Kushite kings with the Old Kingdom, illustrated among other things by Shabaka's throne name, Neferkare. Given the tone of *Neferkare*, some irony could have been implied for readers of this time.
120 Posener 1957: 119-20.
121 Posener 1957: 122; on this witness probably belonging to *Neferkare*, further 124.
122 Discussion of the methodological implications by Posener 1957: 132-3.
123 Posener 1957: 133-4.
124 Parkinson 2002: 297.
125 Grajetzki 2005: 58-9.
126 Quirke 2004a: 168.
127 Assmann 1985: 48, with a 'vielleicht'; with similar caution, Baines 1996: 169.
128 Posener 1957: 131 and n.8-10, 132.
129 P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+3; X+3.x+5; X+3.x+8; X+3.x+13.
130 Posener 1957: 131 and n.7, 132.
131 Posener 1957: 132 and n.10-11.
132 Grajetzki 2005: 58-9.
133 Jay 2008: 80-132; Parkinson 2002: 297; Baines 1996: 169; Posener 1957: 133.

late Middle Kingdom (early or mid-Thirteenth Dynasty) date of composition (assuming of course that *Cheops' Court* itself dates to such an early time).[134]

   Cheops' Court and *Neferkare and Sisene* belong to what has been described as a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature.[135] This is documented, but only as developing, by the late Twelfth Dynasty (§2.4.4.3-4). A dating of *Neferkare and Sisene* to a time earlier than the early Thirteenth Dynasty is therefore unlikely. Yet, institutional detail would imply a dating to the early Twelfth Dynasty, not to the Middle Kingdom more broadly. Unless the whole typological development of Middle Egyptian narrative literature is to be revised, this implies that institutional detail can not be taken in a directly referential sense, as strictly relating to actual usage. The observation then also casts doubt on how reliable indications possibly afforded by a name and an expression of filiation are. In general, 'any aspect of a composition can be archaistic';[136] in the case of *Neferkare and Sisene*, both details are in the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty P. Chassinat I, i.e. from a time when archaism was also otherwise cultivated. In well-balanced terms, Posener outlines the problem:[137] 'L'interprétation de ces faits est délicate (...) Le prototype a pu subir un rajeunissement partiel, comme il a pu être remanié dans le style archaïsant (...)'.[138]

   In the following, I contribute some comments on language.[139] As already mentioned, the particular documentary situation of the text implies that some additional caution is required (in context, Posener's comments just quoted also have scope over language). Posener observed that P. Chassinat I seems generally trustworthy.[140] For each construction possibly indicative for dating, this must of course be assessed individually; constructions that could be, or demonstrably are, secondary are not included in the discussion (e.g. instances of the past tense $sdm=f$).[141]

---

134 This was already one among various options contemplated by Posener (1957: 133); subsequently Parkinson 2002: 296-7 (despite different terminologies, Posener's 'Deuxième Période Inter-médiaire' and Parkinson's 'Late Middle Kingdom' both include the early/mid-Thirteenth Dynasty).

135 Parkinson 2002: 138-46.

136 Parkinson 2002: 49, discussing meter in *Ptahhotep* P.

137 Posener 1957: 132-3.

138 In the case of the expression of filiation, such 'remaniement (...) dans le style archaïsant', if there was one, would have been systematic: the old expression occurs four times.

139 Previous discussions: Oréal 2011: 234-5; Jay 2008: 80-132; Posener 1957: 132-3.

140 '(...) on doit reconnaître que le p. Chassinat I ne présente aucun cas flagrant de modification, en dehors de quelques détails graphiques; dans l'ensemble, le texte donne l'impression d'uniformité et ne paraît pas remanié' (Posener 1957: 133).

141 Discussed by Vernus 1997: 74-5, n.212; for graphic phenomena affecting the lexicon, Posener 1957: 133, n.1.

4.4.2   P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+11: A case of linguistic recomposition

In one place, *Neferkare and Sisene* has a truly extraordinary construction:[142]

> P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+11
>
> *isk*[a] *wḏꜣ*(.)*in*[b] *ḥm=f r pr n mr-mšꜥ sꜣ-snt* (...)
>
> 'Meanwhile, His Majesty's proceeding[c] / His Majesty then proceeded[c] to the house of general Sisene (...)'
>
> a) On the archaizing morphology of *isk*, see below, NB.
>
> b) A 'narrative' construction of the infinitive or a *sḏm.in=f*, see below.
>
> c) The intentionally awkward English renderings are to suggest some sense of the semantic tensions in the Egyptian original, be *wḏꜣ*(.)*in* a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive or be it a *sḏm.in=f*; see below.

4.4.2.1   Interpreting an apparently aberrant construction

The particle *isṯ* (here in its older form *isk*) heads a clause that introduces a segment of discourse backgrounded with respect to the main narrative chain.[143] Such usage is consistent with both a Middle Kingdom dating and an early New Kingdom one. In literary texts, it recurs notably in *Cheops' Court* (7.6) and in the beginning of the framing narrative of *Eloquent Peasant* (R 1.2).[144] While not for dating, such distribution could be significant for an appreciation of the literary register of *Neferkare and Sisene*.

Of particular interest for dating is what here follows *isṯ*. As far as written form goes, *wḏꜣ*(.)*in* could be either a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive or a *sḏm.in=f*.[145] Either way, the combination is extraordinary. The defining function of the 'narrative' infinitive, which licenses the construction in the first place, is to present the event in its bare form, as a heading, in a list, or at the beginning of a segment of discourse. By definition therefore, the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive is incompatible with a use in a textually backgrounded context, as is implied by the presence of *isṯ*. If *wḏꜣ.in*, i.e. a *sḏm.in=f*, is to be read, a similar comment applies: *in*-marked form are otherwise limited to events in the main narrative chain; they are, in other words, excluded from backgrounded environments, such as *isṯ*-headed clauses.[146] 'Regular' Middle Egyptian, i.e. Middle Egyptian as documented in all other texts, would have had a *subject – pseudoparticiple* construction (thus *isṯ ḥm=f wḏꜣ* (...), with the resultative semantics of the pseudoparticiple according with, and playing into, the backgrounding function of *isṯ*. As already observed by others,

---

142 Also noted by Oréal 2011: 234-5 and Jay 2008: 102, 125-6.

143 Similarly Oréal 2011: 234.

144 Oréal 2011: 233-4.

145 Oréal 2011: 234 and Jay 2008: 102 read with the latter interpretation.

146 This characterization of the *sḏm.in=f* as associated with events in the main narrative chain may at first seem to stand in contradiction with Schenkel's (in press b) recent description of the form as 'kontingenter Hintergrund'. It does not, as Schenkel and I use 'background' in a different sense (mine follows Winand 2000).

the construction in P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+11 is 'unexpected and ungrammatical',[147] 'une aberration syntaxique'.[148]

In accounting for the construction, the following observations are relevant. In itself, *isṯ* is used correctly, to signal that the following segment of discourse is backgrounded (above); the issue therefore lies with the verbal construction that follows, *wḏꜣ in ḥm=f* or *wḏꜣ.in ḥm=f*. If this is a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive, the selection of this construction must relate to the royal participant. If this is a *sḏm.in=f* form, a similar comment applies; this emerges from a comparison with the analytic -*in*-marked construction just a few clauses later, used with a non-royal subject: X+3.x+13-14 *wn.in ḥn-tꜣ sꜣ ṯti šm* (...) 'Hent's son Tjeti went (...)'.[149] Either way, the construction *wḏꜣ(.)in ḥm=f* must be analyzed in relation to the royal participant. The analysis finds independent support on the lexical level: *wḏꜣ* 'proceed' is reserved to the king throughout *Neferkare*, expressing solemn process; Tjeti, by contrast, does not 'proceed', but simply 'goes' (*šm*).[150] The construction in P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+11 overrules semantic and syntactic constraints in combining *isṯ* (used regularly) with *wḏꜣ(.)in ḥm=f*, a construction that is here indexically over-determined. There is probably some irony in selecting *wḏꜣ*, set in a 'narrative' infinitive or in a *sḏm.in=f* form, in a less than august context.[151]

NB 1. While semantically aberrant, the construction is therefore principled in its makeup and in how it relates to the place in *Neferkare* where it occurs. This also demonstrates that it is integral to the original composition, whenever this may have been composed.

NB 2. Some irony is perhaps also to be seen in the archaizing morphology of the backgrounding particle, *isk* rather than *isṯ*. At first one may wonder whether such morphology, here documented in a Twenty-Fifth Dynasty witness, could not be a token of Kushite 'archaism'. As observed by Posener already, this is unlikely to be the case, since *isk* recurs at the beginning of the same composition, documented in a late Eighteenth/early Nineteenth Dynasty witness, T. OIC 13539, 2.[152]

4.4.2.2 Dating an apparently aberrant construction

Semantically aberrant, the construction in P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+11 did not arise in the course of linguistic change. As discussed, the construction consists in the combination of two semantically incompatible elements, *isṯ* and *wḏꜣ(.)in*, composed with

---

147 Jay 2008: 10.

148 Oréal 2011: 234-5: 'La cooccurrence de la particule avec une forme verbale narrative *sḏm.jn*, qui sert normalement à faire avancer le récit, constitue une aberration syntaxique au regard de son fonctionnement normal en moyen égyptien littéraire. Elle témoigne du caractère linguistiquement artificiel et composite de la langue utilisée dans la rédaction de ce texte.' Note that Jay and Oréal did not have knowledge of each other's works by the time these assessments were written.

149 Similarly Jay 2008: 102.

150 P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+5, X+3.x+10, X+3.x+13; noted by Posener 1957: 130, n.8.

151 That the composer of *Neferkare* was more generally sensitive to, and playing with, indexical dimensions of language is also suggested by the following observation by Posener 157: 130, n.8: 'Si, à la l. x+2, l'auteur se sert de *šm* en parlant de la promenade nocturne du roi, il veut peut-être souligner que Néferkarê se comporte comme un simple mortel.'

152 Posener 1957: 133, n.2.

each other in written language. As regards *ist̠*, early Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptional texts present various elements of a functional extension of this particle, which can amout to cases of outright experimentation.[153] No earlier period in the written history of Egyptian does. The written morphology of the particle (*isk*) also points to the same horizon (compare below, §4.7.1).[154]

Assuming that the second part of the construction is with a -*in*-marked form, one similarly artificial case is:

(i) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.120: V.7-8 (H*HBT* II 19, 2)

wn.in nn smrw ibw=sn šsp.n mht

'These companions' hearts, they begun to forget.'

The unique combination of *wn.in* with another form also marked for past tense is semantically redundant (further discussion below, §4.6.2, (i)).

Assuming that the second part of the construction is a 'narrative' infinitive, the same construction with *wd̠ꜣ* has become a set phrase for royal progress in the Eighteenth Dynasty (discussed below, §4.6.1.2). Moreover, a configuration comparable in its principle to the one in *Neferkare* is found in the combination of *m-ḫt nn* with a 'narrative' infinitive (discussed above, §4.3.3). Also an innovation of some early Eighteenth Dynasty written registers, this combines two semantically incompatible elements: the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive has its defining function in presenting the event in its bare form, outside any temporal relation, while *m-ḫt nn* expresses just such a temporal relation, making the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive narrative (sic). *M-ḫt nn + 'narrative' infinitive* is used with a royal participant, the indexical over-determination of the construction thus over-ruling semantic constraints that otherwise obtain. The exact same phenomenon is observed in the construction in *Neferkare*.

A further illustration of the same general phenomenon consisting in combining two constructions that are mutually exclusive on functional grounds is the following (fuller quotation: §6.2.2.6.2, (i)):

(ii) Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* ro 1 (H*HBT* 104, 8)

s[t̠] rf iwt ḥm=f [...]

'Now His Majesty's coming [...]'

Both *ist̠ rf* and the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive are paragraph-initial constructions: they are therefore mutually exlusive. Moreover, *ist̠* has, roughly defined, a function in backgrounding, while the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive is, by definition, used only for non-backgrounded events: in addition to a semantic redundancy, there is also a semantic contradiction. What is more, the hybrid construction in Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* consists in just the same elements found in

---

153 Oréal 2011: 238-49. With respect to *Neferkare and Sisene*, Oréal 2011: 235.
154 Similarly Oréal 2011: 235: 'Le choix de la forme ancienne *jsk*, qui est absente dans les textes en moyen égyptien littéraire, va dans le même sens, et rappelle de manière intéressante les archaïsmes présents dans le récit du couronnement d'Hatchepsout ainsi que dans quelques témoins tardifs.'

P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+11: the particle *ist̲*, followed by a narrative construction of an event motion. It thereby comes with the exact same semantic tension.[155]

The early Eighteenth Dynasty thus provides an horizon in which a creative recombination such as the one in P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+11 finds parallels, for the general principle, for the specific components involved in the construction, and once for the overall combination itself. No other period in the early/mid-second millennium BCE does on any of these levels.

4.4.3 Innovative expressions

Neferkare and Sisene includes various innovative expressions. Some of these are only in the very late P. Chassinat I, implying additional discussion in assessing whether they are part of the original text or not.

4.4.3.1 P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+4-5: A segment of direct speech

The following passage is relevant for dating on two levels simultaneously:

> P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+4-5
>
> (...) *ḥr mḥ ḥr d̲d ir is nt{y}-pw m3ˁ pw p3 d̲d*
> *sw* (*ḥr*) *pr*(*t*)[a] *m grḥ*
>
> '(...) thinking and saying that since it was so, the word was true:
> "he goes out at night!" '
>
> a)   A reading as *sw pr* 'he has gone out' (*subject – pseudoparticiple*) is ruled out by context. The omission of *ḥr* is readily accounted for by the late date of P. Chassinat I.
>
> NB. The formulation introducing direct speech finds a parallel in *Cheops' Court* 8.12-13 *d̲d.in ḥm=f in-iw m3ˁt pw p3 d̲d* (...) 'His Majesty said: "Is it true, the word (...)".' This is probably significant of how both compositions relate to what has been described as a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature.

A. A construction *NP ḥr sd̲m* (*sw* (*ḥr*) *pr*(*t*)) is here used in a context that imposes an habitual reading (compare also the adverbial expression *m grḥ*). Vernus' *ante quem non* criterion therefore applies, defining an earliest possible dating by the early Thirteenth Dynasty, or late Twelfth at best (§2.6.2). In earlier times, the construction would have been *iw=f pr=f, *mk sw pr=f,* or the like.

More remarkable yet is the new subject pronoun *sw*.[156] This is undocumented before the very late Seventeenth Dynasty, a time from which on it is densely attested; as discussed, the pattern of attestation is reliable (§3.4.1.3).

B. Given the implications for dating, assessing whether *sw* (*ḥr*) *pr*(*t*) is original in *Neferkare* is of the essence. As regards the *NP ḥr sd̲m* construction, it was observed that textual alterations consisting in the replacement of a synthetic present tense construction with an analytical one are rare and usually leave traces in yielding hybrid

---

155 Note that this description remains unaffected if *wd̲3*(.)*in* is interpreted not as an infinitive but as a *sd̲m.in=f* form as both are similarly narrative and similarly reserved to the foreground.

156 Also observed by Posener 1957: 132.

constructions, at least in Ramesside manuscripts (§2.3.3). As P. Chassinat I is post-Ramesside, this is no sufficient argument.

More consequential is the observation that *sw* (*ḥr*) *pr*(*t*) is here used in a direct speech. The general principle of a targeted distribution of innovative expressions within a text finds parallels elsewhere: for example, *Neferti* has presentative *ptr* only once, in a direct speech (8d-e), while it has *mk* elsewhere in the text (§2.4.3.1, (i)). That *sw* (*ḥr*) *pr*(*t*) in *Neferkare* is precisely from such a context as well suggests that the construction is here integral to the original composition, not an artifact of textual transmission.

4.4.3.2 P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+11-14 and T. OIC 13539, 3-4: The syntax of *iw*

A. In two places, *Neferkare and Sisene* has innovative constructions of *iw*, introducing a circumstantial clause headed by a full noun (i), and with a clause of non-existence (ii):[157]

(i) P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+11-14

isk wḏȝ(.)*in ḥm=f r pr n mr-mšˁ sȝ-snt*
iw wnwt 4 pẖr m grḥ

ir.n=f kt wnwt 4 m pr n mr-mšˁ sȝ-snt ˁḳ=f r pr-ˁȝ
iw wnwt 4 wn r ḥḏ-tȝ

'Meanwhile, His Majesty's proceeding /His Majesty then proceeded to the house of general Sisene,
four hours having elapsed in the night.

He spent another four hours in the house of General Sisene entering into the palace,
four hours remaining until dawn.'

In dependent subject-initial clauses with full noun subjects, *iw* is used in the Middle Kingdom only when some contrastive force is implied.[158] Any contrastive force is lacking in *Neferkare*, where the *iw*-headed clauses simply provide indications of time. This construction is undocumented before the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty (§1.1.2.B, (b)). In pre-New Kingdom times, asyndetic embedding (without *iw*) is always used in similar function.

(ii) T. OIC 13539, 3-4

[...] *mr-mšˁ sȝ-snt iw nn wn st-ḥmt m*[-ˁ=f ? or *pr=f* ?...][159]

'[...] General Sisene, in [whose house(?)] there was no wife [...]'

Ỉw before a clause of non-existence is documented in the Middle Kingdom, but always with strong assertive or contrastive force.[160] In (ii), *iw nn wn* (...) is merely

---

157 Also observed by Jay 2008: 125-6.

158 Thus, highlighting royal succession (§6, n.219), *Sinuhe* B 50 *ntf dȝr ḫȝswt iw it=f m ẖnw ˁḥ=f* 'He (*scil.* S.I) was the one who subjugated foreign countries, while his father (*scil.* A.I) stayed within his palace' (with a stressed independent pronoun *ntf* (...) in balanced contrast to *iw it=f* (...)).

159 Possible restorations suggested by Posener 1957: 124, n.7 and Parkinson 1991c: 55, respectively.

descriptive, characterizing the general's situation:[161] no contrastive force is implied. Such construction remains undocumented until the turn of the Seventeenth to the Eighteenth Dynasties. The earliest instance could be in *Kamose Inscriptions* (iii); this remains slightly insecure however, since the context, which functionally comes close to an oath, could involve some assertoric force of *iw*. The earliest secure instance is slightly later (iv); the register of the text, modeled on administrative usage, is itself significant:

> (iii) *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 10-11
>
> *nn wȝḥ=i tw nn ḏ=i dgs=k ȝḥt*
> *iw nn wi ḥr=k*
>
> 'I won't let you, I won't allow you to walk the countryside
> without being on you!'

> (iv) Ahmes-Nefertari's *Donation Stela* 19-20
>
> *ḥbs=f wi*
> *iw nn wny*[sic]*=i*
> *rḏ=f wsr=i*
> *iw(=i) nmḥ.kw*
>
> 'He provides me with clothing when I did not exist;
> He makes me strong when I am deprived.'

In earlier times, asyndetic embedding (i.e. without *iw*) is always used, e.g. *Bersheh* II, pl.XXI, top, 14[162] (...) *smr wꜥ n-wnt sn-nw=f* '(...) a sole companion, who has no equal'; similarly (with an adverbial expansion) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 130-131 *ḫpr.n r=s nn wi m-ḥr-ib=sn* 'It happened while I was in their midst.'

B. In view of the date of P. Chassinat I, the two *iw*'s discussed first (i) could have been introduced in the course of textual transmission; they could also be original. The *iw* discussed in turn (ii) is in a much earlier manuscript, T. OIC 13539 (late Eighteenth or early Nineteenth Dynasty); in general, intrusive *iw*'s are not observed in manuscripts before a later date.[163] The *iw* in T. OIC 3-4 (ii) therefore stands a fair chance to be integral to the original text.

---

160 E.g., in the context of a self-presentation, emphasizing the uniqueness of the speaker's achievement: Hatnub 16, 5-6 *ink ir [...]s m šdyt-šȝ iw nn wn rmṯ ḥnꜥ=i wpw-ḥr šmsw=i* (...) 'It is I who acted [...] in *Shedyt-sha*, while there was absolutely nobody with me excepted my followers (...)'. Sim. *passim* in the Hatnub inscriptions: see Kruchten 1999: 58.

161 Further, Parkinson 1995: 73.

162 Quoted in Borghouts 2010: I, §92c (ii).

163 For a spectacular case, e.g. *Amenemhat* 5b (P. Millingen and almost every other manuscript) *ir n=i kȝmdt* (...) 'Perform for me a mourning (...)', but P. Sallier I, P. Sallier II, O. DeM 1320 *iw ir n=i kȝmdt* (*iw* before an imperative, as occasionally in Late Egyptian). Intrusive *iw*'s extend to yet more manuscripts in the next verse.

4.4.4   Varia

4.4.4.1   A fronted temporal expression

The following passage presents an alternation between *ḥr m-ḫt* and *ir m-ḫt* that is apparently unparalleled.[164]

> P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+9-11
>
> *ḥr m-ḫt ir{t} ḥm=f mr.n=f ḥr=f šm.n tti m-sȝ=f*
> *ir m-ḫt wḏȝ ḥm=f r pr-ꜥȝ ꜥ.w.s. šm.n tti r pr=f*
>
> 'When His Majesty had done with him what he wanted, Tjeti went behind him.
> When His Majesty proceeded to the Palace L.P.H., Tjeti went to his house.'
>
> NB. On *ḥr m-ḫt* as associated with the 'low tradition', §2.4.4.4.

In general, *ḥr m-ḫt* and *ir m-ḫt* seem to stand in complementary distribution, the former when the main clause is in the past tense, the latter when it is in the future tense.[165] In *Neferkare*, however, *ir m-ḫt* precedes a main clause that is in the past (*šm.n tti* (...)), just as *ḥr m-ḫt* does. Such deviation remains undocumented in the Middle Kingdom, while it finds at least one partial parallel in Amenhotep II's *Syrian Campaigns* (Memphis Stela) 25 (*Urk*. IV 1308, 2-3)[166] *ir m-ḫt tȝ ḥḏw n 2-nw hrw prt ḥm=f* (...) 'When it had dawned for a second day, going out by His Majesty (...)'.[167]

4.4.4.2   The lexicon

In the lexicon, two possibly late expressions have been noted:[168] *ṯȝi* in the sense of 'to blame' (P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+6; X+3.x+14) is 'belegt Nä' according to *Wb.*;[169] *mtmt* 'inquire' (P. Chassinat I, X+2.x+2), a very rare expression, apparently recurs only in one other place, in Hatshepsut's Northern Karnak Obelisk, Basis D 14 (*Urk*. IV 364, 14).[170] In addition, the beginning of the text has *sḏȝ* [...] (T. IFAO 1214 ro 2) / *sḏȝ ib* 'take pleasure' (T. OIC 13539, 4-5). *Sḏȝ-ib*, in this form uniquely here, is probably best interpreted as a contamination of *sḏȝ ḥr* by *sḫmḫ ib*.[171] The expression in *Neferkare* therefore presupposes *sḏȝ ḥr*, which as far as securely dated texts go is very strongly associated with an Eighteenth Dynasty horizon (discussed below, §5.8.1.3).

On the other hand, the use of *mȝȝ* (P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+3; X+3.x+6) rather than of *ptr*, which was valued by Posener as indicative of an earlier dating,[172] is

---

164 Observed by Posener 1957: 131, n.2.
165 *EG*, p.133 bottom.
166 Noted by *EG*, p.133, n.27a.
167 The past tense reading, although not morphologically marked in a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive, is here contextually implied.
168 Posener 1957: 132 with n.5-6. Posener (1957: 131, n.7; 132) also suggested that *ir-sȝ* (P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+14) could be late; however, this is the sentence-initial form of *r-sȝ*, which is not any specifically late (§2.8.2.1, (ii)).
169 *Wb.* V 348.12-5; the expression is not in Hann*Lex* 4 and Hann*Lex* 5.
170 *Wb*. II 170.8-9; the word is not in Hann*Lex* 4 and Hann*Lex* 5.
171 Proposed by Posener 1957: 124, n.4.
172 Posener 1957: 132.

inconsequential in the case of a composition documented already in the Eighteenth Dynasty. The replacement of *m33* by *ptr* was very gradual in literary registers: in Ramesside literary texts, the two words are still found side by side in varying relative proportions.[173]

4.4.4.3   Some formulations

A. Assuming that T. IFAO 1214 belongs to *Neferkare*, the incipit of the composition can be reconstructed as follows:[174]

> (i) T. IFAO 1214 ro 1 + T. OIC 13539, 1-2
>
> *ḫpr swt wn ḥm n nsw bity* [*nfr*]-*k3*-[*r*ꜥ] *s3-r*ꜥ [*pipi*] *m3*ꜥ-*ḫrw m nsw* [...]
>
> 'It occurred, then, that the Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Neferkare, the son of Re Pepi, justified, was a king [...]'

A similar incipit recurs in *Heavenly Cow* 1-2 (for the dating to the Eighteenth Dynasty, §4.6), in *Apophis and Seqenenre* 1.1 (*LES* 85, 4), and in a series of Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptions (*Urk.* IV 26, 12; 180, 15-17; *Appointment* 1). The closest parallel, however, is in *Neferti* 1a-b,[175] a composition of as yet insecure dating; the discussion of this type of incipit is accordingly postponed to a later section (§5.6.1). The text goes on:

> (ii) T. OIC 13539, 4-5
>
> [*šmt pw*][a] *ir.n mr-mš*ꜥ *s3-snt r s*<*mtt*> {*wt*}[b] *r sḏ3 ib* [...]
>
> 'General Sisene [went] to stroll and take a recreation [...]
>
> a)   Based on the association of *šm* and *swt(wt)* in T. IFAO 1214 vso x+6 *šmt r swt*[...][176]
>
> b)   Based on T. IFAO 1214 ro 2 *r swt r sḏ3*[...][177]

This finds a direct parallel in an early Eighteenth Dynasty inscription (iii), then in an early Ramesside tale (iv):[178]

> (iii) Prince Amenmes' stone vessel (*Urk.* IV 91, 12-14)
>
> *prt pw ir.n s3 nsw smsw mr-mš*ꜥ *wr n it=f imn-ms* ꜥ*nḫ ḏt r swtwt*[a] *ḥr sḏ3 ḥr* [*m stt* ...]
>
> 'The oldest royal son, the great general of his father Amenmes, living forever, went out to stroll taking a recreation [in shooting ...]
>
> a)   Written *s3-wt*[sp 2].
>
>   The association of *swtwt* 'strolling' and *sḏ3 ḥr* 'take a recreation' recurs in Thutmosis IV's *Sphinx Stela* 5 (*Urk.* IV 1541, 9-12) (...) *sḏ3 ḥr=f ḥr ḫ3st inb-ḥd*

---

173 E.g. Winand 1986; Mathieu 1996: 192-3; Ragazzoli 2008: 119.
174 Posener 1957: 123.
175 Posener 1957: 123, n.2; subsequently Morenz 1996: 111-2; Parkinson 1996: 303; Spalinger 2009: 12-5 and n.51 (with bibliography); 2010: 117-21.
176 Posener 1957: 124 and n.8.
177 Posener 1957: 124.
178 Posener 1957: 124.

(...) *swtwt ḥr wrrt=f* (...) '(...) take a recreation in the desert of Memphis (...) strolling on his charriot (...)' (*swtwt* again in l.8 (*Urk.* IV 1542, 11).

(iv) *Doomed Prince* 8.7 (*LES* 8, 8)

wn.in pꜣ šri ḥr pr r swtwt [*rꜣ*] *sḏꜣyt* (...)

'The boy went out to stroll and take a recreation (...)'

> In Ramesside times, a similar formulation also recurs in visitors' graffiti, e.g. Graffito M.2.3.P.19.3, 1 (Nineteenth Dynasty, probably Ramses II).[179]

B. Among various allusions to more restricted knowledge in *Neferkare*, the following is the most famous, with a near exact parallel in *Divine Birth*:[180]

(v) P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+9

ḥr m-ḫt ir{t} ḥm=f mr.n=f ḥr=f (...)

'When His Majesty had done with him what he wanted (...)'

(vi) *Urk.* IV 221, 5 (*Divine Birth*; the dating to Hatshepsut is secure, see §4.7)

ir.n ḥm n nṯr pn mrt.n=f nbt ḥnꜥ=s

'The Majesty of this god did all he wanted with her.'

The broader passage in *Neferkare* includes a fronted temporal expression paralleled apparently only once, in a Thutmoside inscription (§4.4.4.1). More significant is the presence of *isk*, twice in *Neferkare* (§4.4.2.1.NB 2): this is typical of, and almost specific to, some compositions of Hatshepsut and Thusmosis III, among which the *Royal Cycle* itself (§4.7.1).

C. The following passage, already discussed twice for its grammar, is noteworthy on yet another level:

(vii) P. Chassinat I, X+3.x+11-14

isk wḏꜣ(.)*in ḥm=f r pr n mr-mšꜥ sꜣ-snt iw wnwt 4 pḫr m grḥ*
ir.n=f kt wnwt 4 m pr n mr-mšꜥ sꜣ-snt ꜥḳ=f r pr-ꜥꜣ iw wnwt 4 wn r ḫd-tꜣ

'Meanwhile, His Majesty's proceeding / His Majesty then proceeded to the house of general Sisene, four hours having elapsed in the night.
He spent another four hours in the house of General Sisene entering into the palace, four hours remaining until dawn.'

As observed by Posener,[181] '(le) même genre de précisions chiffrées' (although not of time) recurs in *Cheops' Court* 6.10-12, yet another element by which the two compositions resemble each other in their typology. In *Neferkare*, this could also be one among various mythical elements which the composition, again like *Cheops' Court*,

---

179 Navrátilová 2007: 108-11, 133).
180 Originally Posener 1957: 130-1, n.9; subsequently van Dijk 1994: 391 (interpreting as a possible quotation from *Divine Birth* into *Neferkare*); also Parkinson 1995: 72 (with a discussion of the meaning of *mri* in *Neferkare*, 73).
181 Posener 1957: 131, n.5.

seems to allude to.[182] As regards the expression of time itself, this finds three parallels, all from the Eighteenth Dynasty:[183]

> (viii) *Urk*. IV 655, 12-14 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*)
>
> *spr.n ḥm=f r rs mkti ḥr spt ḫnw n ḳynꜣ iw wnwt 7 m pḫr m hrw*
>
> 'His Majesty reached the south of Megiddo on the bank of the brook Qina when seven hours had elapsed (lit. were an elapsed thing) in the day.'[184]

> > Sim. Book of the Dead 144 Nu 48-49 (*temp.* Hatshepsut-Amenhotep II) *ḏd-mdw ḥr=s sin wꜥt wꜥt m-ḫt ir.tw sšm pn iw wnwt 4 pḫr m hrw sꜣꜣ* (...) 'Recitation about it when each one has been rubbed off after this guidance has been carried out, while four hours have elapsed in the day: "Beware of (...)" '; Neferhotep (TT 50; *temp.* Horemheb), pl.XL, 238 (...) *iw wnwt {m} 8 <m> pḫr m hrw pn* (...) '(...) when eight hours have elapsed in this day (...)'.

The segment of *Neferkare* quoted above also includes two other expressions that have been discussed for their grammar: *isk wḏꜣ(.)in ḥm=f* (§4.4.2) and circumstantial *iw* (§4.4.3.2); incidentally, the latter is also in all three examples just quoted.

4.4.5 Dating *Neferkare and Sisene*

A. The evidence for dating *Neferkare* was presented above by decreasing order of weight. A strong—and in the present author's appreciation individually decisive—indication for dating the composition lies with the apparently aberrant construction analyzed first, *isk wḏꜣ(.)in ḥm=f* (§4.4.2). Early Eighteenth Dynasty texts afford parallels for the general principle of such recombination, for both component parts that are composed with each other in the *Neferkare* construction, and at least once for the peculiar recombination itself. Neither the general principle, nor any of the individual components involved, let alone the overall combination are paralleled in any other period in the early/mid-second millennium.

   Neferkare also includes a series of late constructions (§4.4.3): (a) *NP ḥr sḏm* with habitual aspect (*ante quem non*: early D.13 or late D.12); (b) the new subject pronoun *sw* (*ante quem non*: late D.17); (c) circumstantial *iw* and (d) *iw* before a dependent clause of non-existence (both early D.18 innovations). While the particular manuscript situation of *Neferkare* must be taken into account, it is also noted that (a) and (b) are from a directly reported speech: the presence of innovative expressions in precisely such a context is consistent with shifts in registers also observed elsewhere. As regards the innovative uses of *iw*, (c) is with an expression that is also otherwise documented with *iw* (§4.4.4.3.C), while (d) is from the earliest witness of the composition, T. OIC 13539. There is a good chance, therefore, that several of the above are integral to the original text; that all should be secondary is unlikely.

   Other expressions or formulations discussed have only a circumstantial status in the argument (§4.4.4): one fronted temporal expression, some elements in the lexicon,

---

182 Van Dijk 1994: 389-91.
183 *Wb*. I 546.5.
184 Passage discussed by Spalinger 1996, who also draws the parallel with *Neferkare* (74, n.37).

and a series of formulations. The last mentioned (§4.4.4.3) are suggestive because they all point to the same period, and because these formulations are from passages that also otherwise include some of the grammatical constructions discussed before. This constellation coherently points to a fairly narrow horizon in time, reinforcing the impression that the text as transmitted is not that unfaithful after all.

Based on the above, it is submitted that *Neferkare and Sisene* was composed in the Eighteenth Dynasty, and more probably in the earlier part thereof.

B. In its literary typology, *Neferkare and Sisene* has been likened to *Cheops' Court* and thereby described in relation to the 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature. Expressions associated with and contributing to mark such literary register are *ist rf* (§4.4.2.1), *nt-pw mꜣꜥ pw pꜣ ḏd* (§4.4.3.1), *ḥr m-ḫt* (§4.4.4.1), or *ḫpr swt wn* (...) (§4.4.4.3, (i)). Like *Cheops' Court*, *Neferkare* is also semantically complex, includes mythical allusions and possible echoes of compositions of esoteric diffusion, and sets these in a parodistic context.[185] The linguistic register of the composition is itself more complex that may seem at first. The straightforward and outwardly simple narrative style is matched by the various innovative expressions the composition accommodates, more than is usual in Middle Egyptian literature of any time. In comparison with *Cheops' Court*, this may reflect the later date of composition of *Neferkare*. In comparison with other Middle Egyptian texts possibly composed in the early Eighteenth Dynasty, this is in part to do with the type of literary discourse (tales tend to be more linguistically innovative than e.g. teachings), but also a deliberate selection of register. Indexical dimensions of language are pervasive in what is preserved of *Neferkare*, for example in the distribution of *wḏꜣ* and *šm*. The apparently aberrant construction discussed first, or *isk*, twice in the surviving text, provide a direct linguistic pendant to the allusion to *Divine Birth*. The composition of such high-flung expressions with the generally lower tone of *Neferkare* is studied: in language as on other levels, there is parody in *Neferkare*.

4.5 *Enseignement Loyaliste*

Enseignement Loyaliste[186] is the only text in the preserved corpus of Middle Egyptian literature to be documented in a short and in a much longer version. This raises issues, methodological and substantive, that are proper to this composition.

4.5.1 Introduction

A. The long text of *Loyaliste*, as documented in New Kingdom manuscripts, falls in two parts (1-7 and 8-14), distinguished by contents notably;[187] various witnesses also

---

185 For parodistic aspects in *Neferkare*, van Dijk 1994; Parkinson 1995: 72; 2002: 142.
186 Text: Posener 1976.
187 Posener 1976: 12-3, 34; the two parts are articulated so as to be tightly related to one another (Posener 1976: 34). This is further substantiated by Fischer-Elfert's (1999) discussion of *A Man to*

reflect such bipartite articulation of the composition.[188] The earliest witness of the long text is the early Eighteenth Dynasty T. Carnarvon II vso (TC: with the second part, 8-14),[189] which derives from the same find as T. Carnarvon I (*Ptahhotep* and *Kamose Inscriptions*).[190] Other early witnesses include the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty P. Louvre E 4864 ro (PL: beginning within the first part and running through the end, 3.6-14), the late Eighteenth Dynasty P. Amherst XII+XIII (PA: originally with the complete teaching), and the late Eighteenth Dynasty or early Nineteenth Dynasty P. Rifeh (PR: with much of the first part, 1-4.8).[191] *Loyaliste* is now also documented in the Eighteenth Dynasty Assiut graffiti, with two graffiti giving the beginning of the composition (graffito 5a, 1.1-3.11 (fragm.); graffito 5b, 1.1-4.9) and a third one a longer extract that spans over the two parts (graffito 5c, 5.1-10.9 (11.1?, fragm.)).[192] From the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty on at the latest, and possibly before, the long version of *Loyaliste* was therefore circulated as a unitary composition. That the earliest witness, T. Carnarvon II vso, has the second part only demonstrates that the bipartite articulation was perceived as such and reflected in ancient editorial practice, not that the second part ever stood as an original composition. One of the Assiut graffiti also gives the ancient title of the composition in this Eighteenth Dynasty stage, namely a *Teaching of Kairsu* (*sbꜣyt irt.n* (...) *kꜣ-[ir]-s* (or *kꜣ-[r]-s*)).[193] This Eighteenth Dynasty teaching authority is identified with *kꜣ-ir-s*, one of eight literary figures in the Nineteenth Dynasty *Eulogy of Dead Writters* (P. Chester Beatty IV vso III.5-7); the same figure recurs in the contemporaneous Daressy Fragment.[194]

A part of the first part of *Enseignement Loyaliste* is also documented in much earlier times, on a stela of the Royal Seal-Bearer and Deputy Chief Treasurer Sehetepibre (CG 20538, 'verso' 8-20; Abydos, *temp.* Amenemhat III).[195] This short version of *Enseignement Loyaliste*[196] is inserted between fairly standard autobiographical phrases (1-8) and an appeal to the living (20-27); the 'recto' of the same stela has the titles of Sehetepibre and eulogizing epithets, also followed by an appeal to the living.[197] In various parts, but not for the *Teaching*, Sehetepibre's Stela draws on an earlier stela belonging to the Treasurer and Vizier Mentuhotep (CG 20539; also Abydos, *temp.* Senwosret I),[198] a major early Twelfth Dynasty figure.[199] It has been

---

His Son, a composition with a similar bipartite articulation; as analyzed in details by the author, encounters between these two compositions are densest in their respective second parts.

188 Posener 1976: 34.
189 Posener 1976: 3-4. The recto has a hymnic composition, published in Posener 1976: 143; see also Gnirs 2013b: 152, n.195.
190 On the find, Hagen 2012a: 174-9.
191 Posener 1976: 4-7; further discussion by Gnirs 2013b: 152-3.
192 Verhoeven 2013: §4; 2012a: 55-7; 2010, 196-7; 2009.
193 Verhoeven 2009.
194 Verhoeven 2009: 91, 94.
195 Text: Lange & Schäfer 1908: 145-50; 1925: pl.40.
196 For studies devoted to this short version of *Loyaliste*, see the references in Posener 1976: 3 and Leprohon 2009: 277; add Schipper 1998: 162-71.
197 For a study of the texts on CG 20538, Leprohon 2009. 'Ro' and 'vso' are conventional designations which harken back to the prime editors of the stela; the 'vso' may actually be obverse and vice-versa, see Gnirs 2013b: 155, n.229.
198 Lange & Schäfer 1908: 150-8; 1925, pl.41-2. Obsomer 1995: 520-31.

proposed that for the *Teaching* as well, Sehetepibre could have been drawing on a monument by Mentuhotep, now lost:[200] this remains speculative.[201] The version of *Loyaliste* on the stela has what corresponds to 1-6 of the long version only, and these by far not in full. Following Posener, this short version documented in early times is generally considered an extract from the long version, documented from early New Kingdom times on.[202] Posener's hypothesis has won wide acceptance and dissenting voices have been very few.[203]

B. The arguments on which the common hypothesis is based are problematic. Posener, and others after him, rightly emphasized the balance and coherence of the long version. There is no doubt that *Loyaliste* in its long version forms a coherent whole, and must be read and interpreted as such. This, however, only implies that the long version did not arise by the cumulated vagaries of successive textual accretions, but was the result of a deliberate and concentrated effort to create a new text. Put differently, it only implies that the composer(s) who created the long version did so in skillful ways, not that they must have done it from scratch.

Posener also observed, again rightly, that a large-scale redactional history such as would be implied if the text on Sehetepibre's stela was primary is otherwise unknown for any Middle Egyptian literary text. More generally, redactionalist theses, once popular for e.g. *Ipuwer*, have proven a bad fit with Middle Egyptian literature,[204] notably because they tend to rely on anachronistic assumptions on the unity of 'genres'.[205] However, this can not be taken to imply that such large-scale redactional scenario must be excluded a priori for every text: the preserved corpus of Middle Egyptian is fairly small and individual histories must be reckoned with as possible unless demonstrated otherwise. In the case of *Loyaliste* specifically, the unity of 'genre' does not stand to question. Any redactionalist hypothesis for *Loyaliste* must of course be argued for in explicit details and with better arguments than the ones that have been voiced in the past for *Ipuwer*; it then becomes an empirical question whether such indications can be found in the particular case at hand, or not (§4.5.5).

In his argument, Posener further contrasted the opening in the long and the short versions. These read, respectively:

---

199 For a study of such borrowing as a process of creative adaptation, Leprohon 2009. On Mentuhotep as a major historical figure, Grajetzki 2009: 55-7 and *passim*; Obsomer 1995: 172-89, 225-9; Simpson 1991.

200 Berlev 1976: 325; subsequently Simpson 1991: 337; Obsomer 1995: 164, 177. Discussion by Fischer-Elfert 1999: 418-20.

201 Verhoeven 2009: 94-5; Grajetzki 2005: 44-5; Quirke 2004a: 108; Parkinson 2002: 318-9; Schipper 1998: 175-6, n.56.

202 Classically Posener 1976: 11-5.

203 Gnirs 2013b: 151-67; Oréal 2011: 222; Schipper 1998.

204 Enmarch 2008: 9-18.

205 Parkinson 2002: 16.

Loyaliste, the incipit:

Loyaliste (early NK) 1.1-2

ḥꜣti-ꜥ m sbꜣyt irt.n N ḏd=f m sbꜣyt ḥr msw=f

'The beginning of the teaching that NN has made, saying in a teaching to his children'

Sehetepibre 8-9

sbꜣyt irt.n=f ḥr msw=f

'The beginning of the teaching that he has made to his children'

Posener argued: 'La construction *irj* + *ḥr* de la stèle n'est *pas très heureuse* (emphasis AS), alors que *ḏd* + *ḥr* des copies cursives est *conforme au bon usage* (emphasis AS).'[206] Yet, the formulation in the short version is fully correct and not any lesser stylistically: compare e.g. *Urk*. I 128, 5-6 *mḏꜣt=k tn irt.n=k ḥr nsw* 'this letter of yours that you have made to the king' (alongside e.g. *Urk*. I 180, 2 *iw(=i) ḏd(=i) ḥr=k* 'I am saying to you'). That the short version has *iri*, not *ḏd*, is arguably to do with its inscription for monumental publication, emphasizing the act of 'doing' over the (fictional) act of 'speaking' as in *Ptahhotep* P.[207] Both versions of the opening are similarly coherent as they stand and no argument on relative anteriority can be derived in any direction.[208]

Other arguments have been voiced to anchor the long version of *Loyaliste* more directly into the early Twelfth Dynasty. In its intertext, broadly understood, *Loyaliste* resonates with early Middle Kingdom texts,[209] but also with texts of the later Twelfth Dynasty and of the early Eighteenth.[210] Similar comments extend to loyalism as a theme, which is present in the early Twelfth Dynasty, but also in the later part of that

---

206 Posener 1976: 18. Similarly Verhoeven 2009: 96.

207 On these issues as they relate to *ḏd* and *iri* in the incipits of Middle Egyptian teachings, Moers 2009. For *Loyaliste*, see Gnirs' (2013b: 147) analysis: '(...) eine bewusste Ausklammerung der Dimension des Sprechers der Lehre und damit ihrer originären Sprechsituation (...) Was in Sehetpibres Version der Lehre im Vordergund steht, ist hingegen deren monumentale Verschriftlichung (...)'.

208 Schipper 1998: 169 suggested that the presence of *ḏd=f* and the double occurrence of *sbꜣyt* in the long version would be indicative that this is secondary to the short version. The argument does not hold, since the very same formulation recurs in the opening of the *Teaching of the High-Priest Amenemhat* (mid-Eighteenth Dynasty), 1-2 (*Urk*. IV 1408, 8-17). Similarly Verhoeven 2009: 96; Schipper 1998: 173; Posener 1976: 18.

209 E.g. with an Eleventh Dynasty letter to the dead (Fischer-Elfert 1994: 41-4); see also Schipper 1998: 171-4.

210 See the detailed presentation in Posener 1976: *passim*. Among literary texts, *Loyaliste* is closest to *A Man to His Son*, particularly in the respective second parts of these compositions (in extensive details, Fischer-Elfert 1999). However, the dating of *A Man to His Son* is insecure: Fischer-Elfert's proposal of a composition in the reign of Senwosret I is part of a broader hypothesis by which *A Man*, *Loyaliste*, and *Kheti* would have formed a curriculum, and therefore contingent upon the dating of *Loyaliste* itself (Fischer-Elfert 1999: 417-21). As noted above, linguistic evidence suggests that *A Man to His Son* was not composed before the late Twelfth Dynasty (§2.6.2.6.B); also based on language, *Kheti* was arguably not composed before the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty and probably later yet (§6.2.2.6).

Dynasty,[211] and, in forms directly relevant for appreciating the long version of *Loyaliste*, in the early Eighteenth.[212] A linguistic argument that has been proposed to support an early Twelfth Dynasty dating of the long version[213] does not apply (§2.6.3).

Elaborating on the identification of the long version of *Loyaliste* as a *Teaching of Kairsu*, Verhoeven observed that the vizieral titles in the long version would be typical of the Middle Kingdom, that the name 'Kairsu' is documented, if rarely and not for viziers, in the Old Kingdom, and that 'Kairsu' is paired with 'Ptahhotep', another Old Kingdom vizier, in the *Eulogy of Dead Writers*.[214] Like *Ptahhotep* and *Kagemni*, two teachings indisputably dating to the Middle Kingdom, Verhoeven argues that *Kairsu* should as well.[215] However, the titulary of Kairsu is best paralleled in the early New Kingdom, not in the Middle Kingdom:[216] like the early New Kingdom versions of *Ptahhotep*, the long version of *Loyaliste* has vizieral titles broadly contemporaneous with its manuscripts.[217] The pairing of 'Kairsu' with 'Ptahhotep' in the *Eulogy of Dead Writers* could have been for various reasons, such as the contents of the compositions ascribed to them, which display closest affinities among the ones to be identified;[218] the Daressy Fragment, for its part, presents viziers of various periods, including from what in the Nineteenth Dynasty was a more recent past, the Eighteenth Dynasty.[219] As regards the name 'Kairsu', its documentation in the Old Kingdom remains very sparse, while there is, on the other hand, another 'Kares' (*k3-r-s, k-r-s, k-n-r-s*) in the early Eighteenth Dynasty.[220] Remarkably, Kares' Stela (CG 34003; *Urk.* IV 45-9) displays clear dependency on the much older stela of Mentuhotep (CG 20539), on which Sehetepibre (CG 20538) itself had already drawn in the late Twelfth Dynasty: this opens rather different possibilities.[221]

C. Methodologically, the long version of *Loyaliste* must therefore be treated separately from the short one for dating. As regards prospects for a linguistic dating, the particular nature of the text must be taken into account. If the long version was as old as the short one, the two would look alike linguistically (by definition). If the long version was later than the short one, the process of Fortschreibung, making a new text out of an older one, would naturally have been in the same register and with the same set of constructions already found in the short version. In addition, *Loyaliste* is an exponent of the type of literary discourse—teachings—which is most densely intertextual and least linguistically distinctive in general. Expectations for dating have to be set accordingly: assuming that the long version is secondary to the shorter one, it

---

211 Gnirs 2013b: 153-6.
212 Gnirs 2013b: 159-66; Schipper 1998: 176-9.
213 Vernus 1990a: 185; subsequently Verhoeven 2009: 97, n.72; Parkinson 2002: 318.
214 Verhoeven 2009: 90-4. On such pairings, also Fischer-Elfert 2003: 126-7.
215 Verhoeven 2009: 96.
216 Gnirs 2013b: 158 and n.257.
217 Lastly Hagen 2012a: 223-7, particularly 226-7.
218 Verhoeven 2009: 91-2.
219 In details, Gnirs 2013b: 158-9.
220 Gnirs 2013b: 156.
221 Gnirs 2013b: 156-8, 166-7, 172.

would not be expected to differ from it on a linguistic level other than in very few details, if in any at all.

The nature of a possible process of *Fortschreibung* carries one further methodological implication: if some verse or group of verses in the long version could be shown to be late, this observation could not simply be taken to carry over the whole of the long version, unless additional arguments are given to that effect.

4.5.2 *Loyaliste* 5.5-6: The syntax of *ist̠*

In the first part of *Loyaliste*, the following passage, only in the long version, is consequential:[222]

> (i) *Loyaliste* 5.3-6
>
> *iwʿ{t} pw n{t} n̠tr nb{t}*
> *nd̠ty n ḳmꜣ sw*
> *ḥww=sn n=f šntyw=f*
> *istw[a] ḥm=f ʿ.w.s. m ʿḥ=f ʿ.w.s.*
>
> 'He is the heir of every god,
> the avenger of the one who created him;
> They strike his enemies for him,
> while His Majesty L.P.H. is in His Palace L.P.H.'

> a) The complete text of 5.5-6 is only in O. Ashm. Most of 5.6 is lost in PL, where a new line
>   (1.8) begins after *istw*. However, the beginning of 5.6 as *istw*, as well 5.5 completely,
>   are preserved: the construction to be discussed consists in the articulation between the two
>   and is thereby documented in PL.

As an analysis of the semantic and argumentative structure of the passage imposes, *Loyaliste* 5.6 depends on the preceding verse, 5.5.[223] *Loyaliste* 5.5-6 thus has an instance of *ist̠* introducing a clause following the main clause it depends on.

In its older form *sk*, the particle introduced subject-initial subordinate clauses in the Old Kingdom, more commonly before, but also occasionally after, the main clause. As early as in the First Intermediate Period, the latter, more marginal usage was undergoing rapid obsolescence, being superseded by *iw*-headed subordinate clauses (in clauses with initial pronominal subjects) and asyndetically embedded ones (in clauses with initial full noun subjects).[224] In its more recent morphology as *ist̠*, the particle is not used to signal dependency after a main clause in any Middle Kingdom literary composition: the construction in *Loyaliste* 5.5-6 does not belong to Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian.

Ꜣst̠-marked clauses that follow the main clause they depend on are otherwise documented only in Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptions:[225]

---

222 Oréal 2011: 222.
223 Oréal 2011: 222 and n.119.
224 References and discussion of the diachronic process in Oréal 2011: 218-9.
225 References from Oréal 2011: 219, n.112 and 221-2. Further examples, in *Urk.* IV 219, 4 and
    Urk. IV 228, 4, are quoted below, §4.7.2, (i)-(ii) (for the dating of the *Royal Cycle*, §4.7).

(ii) *Urk*. IV 272, 9-11 (inscription on the Eighth Pylon; *temp.* Hatshepsut)

ḳm3.n=i [s]b3wt=k nbt
ist ib=k ḥꜥ ḫft ir=i
swḏ=k nsyt=i mi nb nḥḥ

'I have realized all your teachings,
while your heart was rejoiced in accordance with me doing it,
so that you may decree my kingship as the lord of eternity.'

(iii) Thutmosis II's *Aswan Inscription* 3 (*Urk*. IV 137, 14-17)[226]

ḥww=sn n=f šntyw=f
st ḥm=f ꜥ.w.s. m ꜥḥ=f ꜥ.w.s. b3w=f sḫm snḏ=f ḫt t3 (...)

'They strike his enemies for him,
while His Majesty L.P.H. is in His Palace L.P.H., his might strong, the fear of
Him through the land (...)'

   The near-exact phraseological parallel to *Loyaliste* 5.3-6 has often been noted.[227]

(iv) Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription* 1 (*Urk*. IV 157, 1-4)

ink s3=f wḏ.n=f wnn(=i) ḥr nst=f
isk wi m imi-sš=f
wtt.n=f wi m mtt nt ib (...)

'I am his son, he has decreed that I be on his seat,
while I was someone who is in his nest.
He begat me in rectitude of heart (...)'

The construction did not arise in regular linguistic change. In Middle Kingdom
Middle Egyptian, as well as still by and large in early New Kingdom Middle
Egyptian, subject-initial dependent clauses following the main clause they depend on
were introduced by *iw* (with a pronominal subject, or when some contrastive force is
involved) or asyndetic (with a full noun subject). Later phases of the language
generalize the overt strategy, marked by *iw*, to all cases. *Ꜣst*-marked clauses depending
on a preceding clause are a purely textual phenomenon, as is also suggested by their
documented textual distribution (compare the registers in which they occur). Such
constructions are therefore interpreted as tokens of the partly recomposed language
associated with some high-cultural textual productions of the Thutmoside era. More
specifically, the construction recruits a regular item of linguistic form, *isṯ*, and uses it
in a function that can be broadly defined as textual backgrounding. So far, both
dimensions are germane to genuine Middle Egyptian. *Ꜣsṯ* is then textually extended to
further usage, in ways that differ from genuine Middle Egyptian on two levels: *isṯ*
introduces a clause that follows, rather than precedes, the clause it depends upon; such
clause is dependent, rather than merely a textual background.

   In short, the construction in *Loyaliste* 5.5-6—and similar instances in Thutmoside
inscriptions—is not the outcome of linguistic change, as determined by, and emerging

---

226 The segmentation in *Urk*. IV is erroneous (Oréal 2011: 222-3).
227 Initially by Walter Reineke, p.c. to Georges Posener, see Posener 1976: 28.

out of, the conditions and dynamics of regular linguistic interaction. Rather, the construction—which probably does not represent any actual stage in language history—is a token of the linguistic recompositions carried out in written productions of one particular period. The construction thus points to a specific cultural horizon, the early Eighteenth Dynasty.

4.5.3   Varia

4.5.3.1   *Loyaliste* 9.9: *Gȝy.tw*

The following construction accommodates *tw* with a non-dynamic event, *gȝw* 'lack':

> *Loyaliste* 9.9
>
> *gȝy.tw*[a] *r=s sḫm {m} šwȝw*
>
> 'When there is lack thereof (*scil*. of mankind's produce), poverty holds sway.'
>
> a)   PL and ostraca; the beginning of the verse is lost in TC.

As discussed below, such construction is not possible before the late Twelfth Dynasty (§6.2). Regarding textual matters, *Loyaliste* 9.9 is tightly integrated into the immediate context: the verse is complementary to 9.8 (ꜥnḫ.tw (...)) and serves as a conclusion to 9.5-9 (TC, completed with PL and PA): *ḥn n rmṯ sȝḳ {n} wnḏwt tȝr tn ḥr ḥmw n iryw in rmṯ sḫpr nty ꜥnḫ.tw m imy ꜥwy=sn gȝy.tw r=s sḫm {m} šwȝw* 'Care for the men and bring people together, fasten yourselves to such servants that work. It is mankind who creates what exists; one lives on what is in their hands; when there is lack thereof, poverty holds sway.' This suggests that the section 9.5-9 is no earlier than the late Twelfth Dynasty.

4.5.3.2   *Loyaliste* 11.8: *Ir A, B*

Also noteworthy is the following instance of a *ir A, B* construction, i.e. of a nominal pattern with the subject anticipated (A), and no *pw* after the predicate (B):[228]

> *Loyaliste* 11.8
>
> *ir ꜥpr im=s{t} spd-ḥr*[a]
>
> 'As to the one who is provided with it, he is a clever man.'
>
> a)   The whole verse is preserved only in TC, which also happens to be the earliest witness. Other witnesses, notably PL and PA, preserve only the end of the verse, which is here most relevant: in no case does a *pw* follow *spd-ḥr*.

The construction *ir A, B* was to become fairly common in 'literary' Late Egyptian,[229] with early instances e.g. in Sethi I's *Kanais Inscription* C 3 (K*RI* I 68, 1-2),[230] or, in a literary text, in *Ani* (B 20.1; B 20.16; B 23.8-9).[231] Earlier

---

228 Already noted by Posener 1976: 42.
229 Groll 1967: 12-5.
230 Sim. e.g. *Mes* N 34-35 *ir sš A šri n B* 'As regards scribe A, this is the son of B.' An early example of the broader construction *A ø* is *Urk.* IV 122, 15-16 (Paheri) *nn ꜥȝbt nt ḥwrw m ȝt=f mdwt nḏmt nt*

instances of the pattern are from medical texts,[232] which in the linguistic surface they present are probably not much earlier than their earliest manuscripts, by the eve of the New Kingdom. One other early case is from *Amduat*,[233] a text that is likely to date to the early Eighteenth Dynasty, at least in its final redaction.[234] A singular pre-New Kingdom instance of the construction is in Coffin Texts, in what turns out to be a secondary reading.[235] In the Middle Kingdom, a different pattern is used, consistently so: *ir A, B pw*. E.g. *Debate* 56-59 *ir sḫꜣ=k ḳrs nḫꜣt ib pw int rmyt pw m sind s šdt s pw m pr=f ḥꜣꜥ ḥr ḳꜣꜣ* 'As for your bringing to mind burial, it is heartache, it is bringing tears by saddening a man, it is taking a man from his house so that he is left on the hill.'[236]

4.5.3.3 Possible lexical indications

Among lexical expressions, the following may be mentioned. The usual caveats apply:

(i) *Loyaliste* 7.4 *iwnn* 'sanctuary'

Apparently not documented before the early New Kingdom; see §4.2.4, (ii).

(ii) *Loyaliste* 9.6 TC *tꜣr tn ḥr ḥmw n iryw* 'Fasten yourselves to servants that work.' (PL reads transitively: *tꜣr=tn ḥmw* (...) 'and fix the servants (...)'.)

While *tꜣr* itself is documented at least once in earlier times (CT VII 460e), the reflexive construction of *tꜣr* as in TC is not. Followed by a prepositional phrase introduced by *ḥr*, it finds a direct parallel[237] in Thutmosis I's *Tombos Inscription* 9

---

sḏꜣ-ḥr (...) 'There is no boasting of a humble man; these are sweet words providing pleasure (...)'. See Winand 2013: 87-8.

231 Quack 1994: 36.

232 Westendorf 1962: §401.1 bb.

233 Short *Amduat* 13-14 *ir rḫ nw n sšmw mity nṯr pn ꜥꜣ ḏs=f* 'As for the one who knows these representations, he is the likeness of the great god himself' (quoted after Wente 1982: 163).

234 The composition is first documented in blocks found in the tombs of Thutmosis I and Hatshepsut (discussion: Mauric-Barberio 2001). Datings both to this period and to various earlier periods have been contemplated (for a summary of proposals, see Jansen-Winkeln 2012: 87-8; Werning 2011: 2, n.9; Wiebach-Koepke 2003: 23-6). As regards language, Jansen-Winkeln (2012) observes that the Old Egyptian expressions in *Amduat* diverge, if at times subtly, from actual Old Egyptian and concludes that a dating to the Old Kingdom, an option contemplated e.g. by von Lieven (2007: 210, n.1145) and Quack (2000b: 552), must be renounced. Werning (2013: §4) identifies a series of linguistic features that are best accounted for under an early Eighteenth Dynasty (or possibly Second Intermediate Period) date of the composition, or at least of final redaction. In both Jansen-Winkeln's and Werning's analyses, form-function mismatches with respect to actual Old Egyptian play an important role.

235 CT VII 340c B1C, B1L, B2L *ir rḫ sn gmm wꜣt=sn* (noted by Borghouts 1986: 54; Wente 1982: 163, n.29; I thank Matthias Müller, p.c. 5/2012, for drawing this to my attention). The other witnesses, B3C, B4C, B2Bo, B4Bo, have *in rḫ sn gmm wꜣwt=sn* 'It is the one who knows them who finds their roads.' *Ir rḫ* in the former set of witnesses could easily have arisen through assimilation (*in rḫ → ir rḫ*), or simply as a Verlesung (*n → r*). Either textual process would have been facilitated by the fact that *ir rḫ sn* in itself is perfectly good Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian.

236 Translation Allen 2011: 62-3.

237 Posener 1976: 37.

(*Urk*. IV 84, 12) *ꜣr sw dpy ḥr wtḥw* 'The crocodile fastens himself to the fugitive.' A further parallel is *Chapelle Rouge*, p.108: III.22 (H*HBT* II 15, 1) *ꜣri.n=f ꜥwy=f ḥr swḥt=f* 'He fastened his arms on his egg' (with 'arms' an entity inalienably possessed by the subject, and therefore semantically reflexive as well).

(iii) *Loyaliste* 11.9 TC *sꜣt* 'soil, make wretched'

The word is apparently not attested before the New Kingdom, but common in the Book of the Dead;[238] it recurs in *Heavenly Cow* 270 (for the dating of this text to the Eighteenth Dynasty, §4.6).

(iv) *Loyaliste* 11.10 TC *nri* 'time, return of the year'

The word is apparently not documented before the New Kingdom.[239] One other occurrence in Middle Egyptian literature is *Sporting King* C1.18 (on the dating of *Sporting King*, probably to the Eighteenth Dynasty, §4.3).

(v) *Loyaliste* 12.1 TC *r-ḏꜣwt* 'in return for, in accordance with'

The preposition is common in the Eighteenth Dynasty specifically. It does not occur in any securely dated pre-Eighteenth Dynasty text, and does not recur in this form after the Eighteenth Dynasty (§2.8.3.4, (ii)). Other than in *Loyaliste*, only one occurrence is found in Middle Egyptian literature, *Merikare* E 31 (on the options for dating this composition, §2.8).

4.5.4 Dating *Loyaliste* linguistically

As observed first, a variety of factors conspire to the effect that, whatever its date of composition may have been, much of *Loyaliste* is expected to be linguistically indistinctive (§4.5.1.C). A few elements can be noted nonetheless.

In the first part of *Loyaliste*, the construction of *ist* in 5.5-6 strongly points to the early Eighteenth Dynasty. As noted by Posener, verses 5.5-6 form a 'quatrain' with 5.3-4.[240] Semantically, the 'quatrain' expresses reciprocity: in 5.3 the king is an heir to every god while in 5.5 the gods are striking for the king. The 'quatrain' as whole is probably from the early Eighteenth Dynasty.

In the second part of *Loyaliste*, 9.9 has a construction—*tw* with a non-dynamic event—that implies a terminus *ante quem non* by the late Twelfth Dynasty for that verse (§4.5.3.1). The terminus probably extends to the group 9.5-9 to which 9.9 serves as a conclusion. Also in the second part of *Loyaliste*, 11.8 has a yet later construction, *ir A, B* (§4.5.3.2). If original, as it seems to be, this construction implies that 11.8 is late; the argument here does not extend to the surrounding verses beyond 11.8 itself. Possible elements of lexical evidence (§4.5.3.3) must be appreciated with the usual caveats, particularly in a composition which appears to have had a complex textual history.

---

238 *Wb*. IV 27.8-11; *TLA* #127570; see also Posener 1976: 42, who notes that in Late Egyptian the word serves to translate *msḏi*.
239 *Wb*. II 279 ('belegt NR'); F*CD* 135; *TLA* 85100; see also Posener 1976: 42.
240 Posener 1976: 27.

Both in the first and in the second part, there are therefore strong indications that at least some verses or groups of verses are as late as the early Eighteenth Dynasty (5.3-6 and 11.8, respectively). Other ones in the second part could be as well, as is suggested by the lexicon. Determining how much more of the text of the long version of *Loyaliste* is late falls beyond the scope of linguistic analysis.

4.5.5 The long and short versions compared

Most expressions discussed above were from the second part of *Loyaliste* (§4.5.3) while the construction most strongly indicative for dating was from the first part (§4.5.2). This imposes reconsidering the relationship between the short and long versions for the part of the composition where both are documented.

4.5.5.1 *Loyaliste* 5.1-14

The discussion is best begun with *Loyaliste* 5.1-14, since this includes a double verse that is datable (5.5-6: §4.5.2). The short and long versions run:

5.1	*k3 pw nsw ḫ3w pw r3=f*	*nsw k3w pw ḥw pw r3=f*
5.2	*sḫpr pw wnnt=f*	*sḫpr.ty^? =f pw {m} wnn.ty=f^? ^a*
5.3		*iw^ʿ{t} pw n{t} nṯr nb{t}*
5.4		*nḏty n ḳm3 sw*
5.5		*ḥww=sn n=f šntyw=f*
5.6		*istw ḥm=f ^ʿ.w.s. m ^ʿḥ=f ^ʿ.w.s.*
5.7		*tmw pw n ṯs wsrwt^b*
5.8		*iw s3w=f r ḫ3 ḏd b3w=f*
5.9	*ḥnmw pw n ḥ^ʿw nb*	*ḥnmw pw n ḥr nb*
5.10	*wttw sḫpr rḫyt*	*wtt{y}w sḫpr rḫyt*
5.11	*b3stt pw ḥw t3wy*	*b3stt pw ḥw t3wy*
5.12	*iw dw3 sw r nhw ^ʿ=f*	*i{m}<w>^? [...]*
5.13	*sḫmt pw r tḫ wdt=f*	*smt pw thh m wḏt.n=f*
5.14	*iw sf3=f r ḥr šm3w*	*iw s{r}<f>3=f r ḥr šm3{yt}={f}*

a) Tentative, based on PL and O. Ashm.

b) Thus O. Ashm. And O. Gard. 373; PA apparently has a different reading with a suffix: [...]=f pw ṯs[...] wsr=f '[...] his [...] binding [...] his strength/that he be strong.'

A. *Loyaliste* 5.5-6 was argued above to be from the early Eighteenth Dynasty, and therefore by extension the 'quatrain' 5.3-6 as well (§4.5.2). The slightly broader group of six verses, 5.3-8 disrupts the thematic continuity between 5.1-2 and 5.9-10. In Posener's words:[241] 'Dans le premier (*scil.* quatrain) (vers 1-2 + 9-10), le roi est présenté comme le bienfaiteur de l'humanité; (...) Le deuxième et le troisième distiques des copies cursives (vers 3-6) forment un quatrain consacré au roi enfant des dieux, leur défenseur et leur protégé. Ce sujet n'a de lien direct ni avec ce qui précède,

___

241 Posener 1976: 26-7.

ni avec ce qui suit. Il en est de même pour les vers 7-8 (pharaon – Atoum).' To this, the presence of *sḫpr* in the second verses of both distichs 5.1-2 and 5.9-10 may be added. Schematically:

	CG 20538	long version	
king as benefactor	5.1-2	5.1-2	
protection		5.3-6	← linguistically early D.18
protection		5.7-8	
king as benefactor	5.9-10	5.9-10	

B. Verses 5.3-4, the first half of the inserted 'quatrain' 5.3-6, are patterned like 5.9-10 in the short version. In a similar fashion, 5.7-8 are patterned like 5.11-12 and 5.13-14 in the short version:

5.9-10	*DN pw n NP*	→	5.3-4 (-5-6)
	epithet in apposition		
5.11-12 / 13-14	*DN pw*, expanded	→	5.7-8
	iw NP[3ms, 242] *r NP*		

The interpolation, taking up constructions in what comes next in the pre-existing text (here 5.9-14) is similar in its principle to what is observed in the following sequence in *Sinuhe*:

Sinuhe R 12-16:

An	[...] *iry nṯr nfr* [...]
R	*s3=f smsw m ḥry iry nṯr nfr s-n-wsrt*
AOS	*s3=f sms{m} <m> ḥry iry nṯr=nfr s-n-wsrt*
R	*ti sw h3b r ḥwt ḫ3swt r skr imiw ṯḥnw*
An	[...] *in.n=f skrw-ˁnḫ* [...]
R	*ti sw ḥm iy=f in.n=f skrw-ˁnḫ n ṯḥnw*
AOS	*ti sw ḥm iy=f in.n=f s{g3b}<krw>-ˁnḫ m timḥw*

Enough of An is preserved to demonstrate that the Twelfth Dynasty tradition, like the much later Ramesside one here exemplified by AOS, did not have the first of the two verses beginning in *ti sw*, which is therefore additional in the tradition represented by R. Significantly, R displays elements of duplication (*skr*; *ṯḥnw*), which are bizarre in the otherwise densely textured *Sinuhe*. The interpolation of R 13-14 (*ti sw h3b*) is in line with R's broader tendency, otherwise documented, to include 'explanatory' phrases.[243] The interpolated line in R takes over a grammatical construction (*ti sw predicate*) already present in the then available tradition (*ti sw ḥm iy=f* (...) → *ti sw h3b* (...) *ti sw ḥm iy=f* (...)).

---

242 *Loyaliste* 5.12 *iw dw3* **sw** *r nhw* ˁ*=f*; 5.14 *iw sf3=f r ḥr šm3w*; then also 5.10 *iw s3w=f r ḥ3 ḏd b3w=f*.
243 Parkinson 2009: 164-5.

C. While based on, and taking up, constructions in the short version, the interpolation is no less artful. Just as the king is the maker of men (5.2, also in the short version), the king is himself related to 'the one who created him' (5.4, in the long version only). More subtly, 'the king at his most divine (in the *palace* [5.6, AS]) is again assimilated with the gods; as the heir [5.3, AS] of the ancient gods, he is the present people's god. Atum [5.7, AS] is the All-lord creator, who created people's bodies (*joining necks*, [5.7, AS]).[244]

> NB. Technically, only 5.5-6, and by extension the 'quatrain' 5.3-6, are linguistically datable. In view of the above discussion, 5.7-8 is naturally associated with 5.3-6 and thereby similarly late.[245] One formulation in 5.7, *ts wsrwt*, has been proposed to be in allusion to the name of Senwosret I and echoed in Hor's inscription (Wadi el-Hudi 143; *temp.* Senwosret I).[246] However, *ts*'ing 'necks' is fairly common in various contexts, expressing creation, revivification, and by extension beneficial activity more broadly.[247] Interpreting as an allusion therefore remains uncertain.

4.5.5.2 *Loyaliste* 2-5

In *Loyaliste* 5, the interpolation in 5.3-8 relates to themes already present in the short version, yet sets a different emphasis: the additional verses speak of the king as an 'avenger' of his creator (*ndty*, 5.4), of 'his ennemies' (*šntyw=f*) that are to be 'stricken' (*ḥwi*, 5.5), of 'his protection' (*sȝw=f*), and of 'his might' (*bȝw=f*, 5.8). A comparable shift in emphasis is also observed in other parts of *Loyaliste* 2-5, where segments of text only in the long version tell of the might and terror that emanate from the king, more broadly of his destructive powers; such aspects of kingship are not entirely absent in the short version, but less salient there. This observation could be interpreted in two ways. If the short version were the original one, the composers of the long version could have semantically enriched the text by emphasizing this

---

244 Parkinson 1997a: 243, n.11.

245 In 5.8, Poser 1976: 28 noted 'texte rajeuni par rallongement de la préposition *ḥȝ* qui devient *r-ḥȝ.*' *R-ḥȝ* is fully preserved in O. Ashm. only, yet is already implied in the late Eighteenth Dynasty PA (*iw sȝw=f r* [...] *bȝw=f*; O. Ashm. *iw sȝw=f r ḥȝ dd bȝw=f*). With the meaning 'behind', *r-ḥȝ* is apparently first documented in the tomb of Kheruef (*temp.* Akhenaton: *TLA* #600341). With the meaning 'to the outside', the first occurrence I know of is in Thutmosis III's *Gebel Barkal Stela* 15 (*Urk.* IV 1233, 4) and 21 (*Urk.* IV 1234, 19), later in Book of the Dead and the *Great Hymn to Aton* (*TLA* #500040). However, I strongly doubt that *r-ḥȝ* is here to be read at all: the construction in 5.8 is mirrored on the one in 5.10 and 5.12, also in the second of two verses, *iw NP* (with 3msg pron.) *r NP* (above, B). As such, the *r* is part of the construction, introducing the predicate in a situational predicate construction with semantics of necessity; *iw NP r ḥȝ NP* (sic, not '*r-ḥȝ*') is therefore to be read, just as in 5.12 *iw NP r ḥr NP* is, in both cases with a preposition introducing what is itself a prepositional phrase. The construction, which is not described in current grammars, is exceedingly rare in the preserved record: it must be posited, because there is no alternative interpretation for *r ḥr* in 5.12. The possibility of using a prepositional phrase in what is otherwise a noun phrase is also illustrated in the famous *r-sȝ msyt pw* (*Amenemhat* 6a; with the PP *r-sȝ msyt* in the NP slot of a *A pw* construction). In short, the text as it stands in 5.8 is original, reads as *r ḥȝ*, not '*r-ḥȝ*', and would be fully compatible with Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian (which of course need not imply that the verse was actually composed in the Middle Kingdom).

246 Originally Berlev 1981: 15; subsequently e.g. Fischer-Elfert 1999: 420. Further discussion of Wadi el-Hudi 143 in relation to *Loyaliste*: Fischer-Elfert 1999: 399-401, 420; Berlev 1987b: 157.

247 Poser 1976: 28.

complementary aspect of kingship more strongly, thereby making the text more polyphonic. If the long version were the original one, the composer of the short version could have cut these same dimensions out to adapt the text to the more private context of a stela. At this level, both scenarios are equally likely.

As discussed above, 5.3-8 is arguably secondary, notably on linguistic grounds. The possibility that the long version could also be secondary in *Loyaliste* 2-4 is here examined along similar principles as for *Loyaliste* 5. A great many relevant observations were already made by Posener himself, subsequently also by Schipper.

2.1	*dw3 nsw n-m3ˁt-rˁ ˁnḫ ḏt*	*dw3 nsw m-ḫnw ḥwt=tn*
	m ḫnw n ḥwt=tn	
2.2	*snsn ḥm=f m ibw=tn*	*sns*[a] *ḥm=f m ibw=tn*
2.3		*imy nrw=f m ḥrt-hrw*
2.4		*ḳm3 n=f hnw r tr nb*
2.5	*si3 pw imi-ḫ3t ibw*	*si3 pw*[b] *n imi-ḫ3t ibw*
2.6	*iw irty=f ḏˁr=sn ḫt nbt*	*iw irty=f ḏˁr=sn ḫt nb*

a) On *snsi* (long version; later also in 6.7), §2.2.2, (vi). On the alternation with *snsn* (Sehetepibre), Posener's extremely perceptive analysis, extending to graphic aspects, is worth quoting in full:[248] 'On donnera la préférence à la leçon de la stèle car *snsn* dans ce contexte est original et fort. Il a gêné les copistes qui ont remplacé « fraterniser » par un banal « prier, vénérer ». Si la lecture *snsj* dans 1235 est exacte alors que 1228 contient *snmḫ*, il y aurait eu flottement dans le choix du terme de remplacement. *snsj*, proche de *snsn*, lui emprunte le déterminatif du « nez » (D 19) ici et infra, §6, 7, graphie que *Wb* IV, 171 ignore. Pour *snsj ḥm=f*, cf. *Urk.* IV 1818, 12.'

b) PA has *si3 sw* [...], under attraction to the construction in 2.10 and 3.2-3.[249]

As has long been observed,[250] the short version (2.1-2 – 2.5-6) is chiastically articulated (*ḥwt*, *ibw* – *ibw*, *ḫt*). In the long version, the chiasm is stretched over a longer period, and thereby less salient (*ḫt-ib* – (...) – *ib-ḫt*). This may suggest that 2.3-4 could be secondary.[251] If so, the verses would have been embedded into the pre-existing text through a continuation of the imperatives in 2.1-2. Verses 2.3-4 first introduce the motif of the awe that emanates from the king, making the text semantically more complex by introducing another level of meaning right from the beginning.[252]

---

248 Posener 1976: 20.
249 Posener 1976: 20.
250 First by Grapow 1954: 23; subsequently Posener 1976: 19; Schipper 1998: 165.
251 Schipper 1998: 165; further 169.
252 'La version longue offre une gamme plus complète de ces devoirs (...)' (Posener 1976: 20).

2.5	*siꜣ pw imi-ḫꜣt ibw*	*siꜣ pw n imi-ḫꜣt ibw*
2.6	*iw irty=f ḏꜥr=sn ḫt nbt*	*iw irty=f ḏꜥr=sn ḫt nb*
2.7		*rꜥ pw ꜥnḫ ḥr sšmw=f*
2.8		*iw nty ḥr šwt r wr ḥrw=f*
2.9	*rꜥ pw mꜣꜣw m stwt=f*	*rꜥ pw mꜣꜣ <m>? stwt=f*
2.10	*sḥḏ-w(i) sw tꜣwy r itn*	*sḥḏ-wy sw tꜣwy r itn*

In *Loyaliste*, *A pw* constructions with *A* a god recur in various places (the ones only in the short version italicized: 2.5; *2.7*; 2.9; *5.7*; 5.9; 5.11; 5.13). Of these, 2.7 and 2.9, both *rꜥ pw* (...), are the only where a divine name is duplicated. This may be taken to suggest that 2.7-8 could be secondary.[253] If so, the two new verses would have been embedded by the same process described above for 5.3-4 and 5.7-8 (§4.5.5.1.B): verse 2.7 would be taking up the construction that comes next in the pre-existing text, *rꜥ pw* expanded by a construction of the passive participle with indirect coreference (2.9 *mꜣꜣw m stwt=f* → 2.7 *ꜥnḫ ḥr sšmw=f*). Semantically, 2.7-8 relate most directly to 2.3-4 (also in the long version only),[254] but the verses are well integrated into the context, with *stwt*, *sḥḏ* and *itn* (2.9-10, in both versions) being made to resonate with *šwt* (2.8, long version).

2.9	*rꜥ pw mꜣꜣw m stwt=f*	*rꜥ pw mꜣꜣ <m>? stwt=f*
2.10	*sḥḏ-w(i) sw tꜣwy r itn*	*sḥḏ-wy sw tꜣwy r itn*
3.1		*wbd hh=f r ns n sḏt*
3.2		*snw(ḫ) sw <m>ᵃ ꜣt=f r ḫt*
3.3	*swꜣḏ sw r ḥꜥp ꜥꜣ*	*sḥḏ-wy swᵇ r ḥꜥpy ꜥꜣ*
3.4	*mḥ.n=f tꜣwy m nḫt ꜥnḫ*	*mḥ.n=f tꜣwy m ḫtwᶜ n ꜥnḫ*

a) As subtly analyzed by Posener,[255] various witnesses may have understood differently.

b) Clearly only in 1056+CG347, lost in PR and PA; under attraction to 2.10.

c) The readings in both the short and the long version are equally coherent: 'Having filled the Dual Land with the strength of life (or: with strength and life)'; 'Having filled the Dual Land with the trees of life.'

In the short version, 2.9-10 and 3.3-4 chiastically relate to each other by the *nfr sw* constructions with participles of active-transitive events as their predicate (*sḥḏ tꜣwy*; *swꜣḏ sw*), further expanded by a comparative expression (*r itn*; *r ḥꜥp ꜥꜣ*). These verses thus form a 'quatrain', as 2.9-*10* – 3.*3*-4. In the long version, the same construction is also in 3.1 and in 3.2: the patterning is thereby chiastic as well, yet stretched over a 'sizain', as 2.9-*10* – 3.*1-2* – 3.*3*-4. The relationship between the short and the long version is similar to the one observed above in 2.1-6, where a chiastically articulated 'quatrain' (2.1-2 – 2.5-6) is stretched, and thereby less salient, in the 'sizain' of the long version. This could suggest that 3.1-2 are secondary.[256] If so, they would have been embedded by taking up the construction that comes before and after in the pre-

---

253 Schipper 1998: 169.
254 Posener 1976: 20 top.
255 Posener 1976: 22-3.
256 Schipper 1998: 165.

existing text, *nfr sw* followed by a comparative expression (2.10, 3.3 → 3.1, 3.2). Semantically, 3.1-2 tell of the destructive power of the king, making the text more complex by developing a thread already introduced in 2.3-4 (also in the long version only).

3.5	*ḳbb fndw wꜣ=f r nšn*	*ḏbb fndw wꜣf r nšny*
3.6	*ḥtp=f r tpr ṯꜣw*	*ḥtp=f tpi.tw*[a] *ṯꜣw=f*
3.7	*ḏd=f kꜣw n ntiw m šms=f*	*ḏd=f ḏfꜣw n nty m šmsw=f*
3.8	*sḏfꜣ=f m mḏd mtn=f*	*...*[?] *mḏd mtnw=f*
3.9-12		(...)
4.1-9		(...)
5.1	*kꜣ pw nsw ḥꜣw pw rꜣ=f*	*nsw kꜣw pw ḥw pw rꜣ=f*
5.2	*sḫpr pw wnnt=f*	*sḫpr.ty*[?]*=f pw {m} wnn.ty=f*[?]

a)   On the alteration in 3.6, §6.2.1.2, (ii).

Verses 3.7-8 and 5.1-2 are linked to each other by motif and lexicon (3.7 and 5.1 *kꜣw* 'sustenance'; 3.8 *sḏfꜣ* 'nourish', 5.1 *ḥꜣw* 'abundance').[257] In the long version, 3.9-12 continue the loyalist motif of 3.7-8, but also develop the king's power of death over 'his adversaries' (3.10 *rḳyw=f*) and 'his opponents' (3.12 *šntyw=f*). A similar development of these complementary aspects of the king's power, of life and death, juxtaposed, is given in 4.1-9 (long version).[258] In broader terms, this was touched upon before, in 3.1-2 (long version),[259] itself introduced in 2.3-4 (long version). Overall, the presentation of kingship is more complex in the long version. Concerning the thematic and lexical link between 3.7-8 and 5.1-2, Posener comments:[260] 'La version courte de la stèle est la plus cohérente. Par delà le §4 qu'elle ignore, son début s'enchaîne aux vers qui le précèdent directement et où il est aussi question du roi dispensateur de biens (...). On a le choix d'y voir soit le texte original bien charpenté, soit le résultat d'un habile découpage.'

4.5.5.3 *Loyaliste* 1-6: Compositional perspectives

A. The short version is semantically more focused, while the long one is more pholyphonic.[261] As long as only semantic dimensions are considered, two interpretations are possible: the long version could be an artful expansion of the short one; alternatively, the short version could be a similarly artful extract of the long one. The perspective is altered when formal matters are drawn into account.

    The text on Sehetepibre's Stela consists in an introduction (1), a main part (2-5), and a conclusion (6). The framing introduction and conclusion contrast with the main part in being patterned by threefold sequences. In the introduction,[262] the title (*ḥꜣty-ꜥ*

---

257 Initially Grapow 1954: 25-6; subsequently Posener 1976: 27; Schipper 1998: 165-6.
258 Similarly Schipper 1998: 169.
259 Parkinson 1997a: 242, n.6.
260 Posener's 1976: 27.
261 See the running commentaries in Posener 1976 and Parkinson 1997a: 242-5; also Schipper 1998, particularly 170-1.
262 This is identical in the short and long version except for the title, for which see §4.5.1.B.

m sbꜣyt (...)) is followed by a threefold injunction to the addressees (a), then by a sequence of three noun phrases characterizing the teaching, all beginning in *s-* (b). Echoing this threefold injunction and describing the expected response to it, the conclusion[263] begins with a series of three imperatives (c). These are followed by a sequence of three clauses with general value, justifying the above (d). A final injunction, itself threefold, follows (e):

(a) 1.3-5   *ḏd=i wrt*   *ḏ=i sḏm=tn*   *ḏ=i rḫ=tn*

(b) 1.6-8   *sḫr nḥḥ*   *sšr ꜥnḫ m3ꜥw*   *sbt ꜥḥꜥw m ḥtp*[264]

    'I shall speak a great matter, I shall have you hear, I shall have you learn the counsel of eternity, the condition of living truly, the passing of a lifetime in peace.'

(c) 6.1-2   *ꜥḥꜣw ḥr rn=f*   *twr ḥr ꜥnḫ=f*   *šw tn m sp n bgsw*

(d) 6.3-5   *iw mr n nsw r imꜣḫy*   *nn is n sbi ḥr ḥm=f*   *iw ḫꜣt=f m ḳmꜣ n mw*

(e) 6.9-10   *ir=tn nn*   *wḏꜣ ḥꜥw=tn*   *gm=tn st n ḏt*

    'Fight for his name, respect his oath, be free of an occasion of wrongdoing!

    The servant of the king will be a revered on, there is no tomb for the one who rebels against His Majesty, his body is a thing trown into the water.

    Do this, your bodies will be prosperous, you will find it good forever.'

By contrast, the body of the teaching (2-5) entirely consists in five 'quatrains' (on the left side in the synopsis below). These are linked to one another sequentially by a series of common elements that have a binding function (noted on the right side in the synopsis below). The inner articulation of the 'quatrains' is itself principled. While the first two are chiastically articulated, the fourth and fifth are sequentially articulated. The middle 'quatrain' (3.5-8) is neutral in this respect, neither chiastic nor sequential, consisting in a sequence of four verses all headed by a *mrr=f*. This provides the high point in the symmetrical arc-form that spans the compositions.

    2.1-2 – 2.5.6   aBBa
    2.9-10 – 3.3-4   aBBa

    3.5-8   abba

    5.1-2 – 5.9-10   aBaB
    5.11-12 – 5.13-14   aBaB

When the above observations are drawn together, the composition of the short version of *Loyaliste* may be represented as follows:

---

263 *Loyaliste* 6 is substantially different in the long version, where it does not function as a conclusion but leads over to the following parts of the text.

264 The syntax is elaborate: the three objects are simultaneously in apposition to *wrt* and supply the withheld objects of *sḏm=tn* and *rḫ=tn*.

1	introduction:	title
		opening injunctions 1sg (3)
		objects (3)

2.1	*ẖt*
2.2	*ib*
2.5	*ib*	(*si3 pw*)
2.6	*ẖt*

2.9		(*rꜥ pw*)
2.10	*sḥḏ sw t3wy r NP*
3.3	*sw3ḏ sw r NP*	(Nileflood)
3.4	

3.5	*mrr=f*	(2 clauses[265])	(*ḳbb fnḏw*)[266]
3.6	*mrr=f*
3.7	*mrr=f*		(*k3w*)
3.8	*mrr=f*		(*sdf3*)

5.1	A *pw*	(2 clauses[267])	(*k3, ḥ3w*)
5.2	*sẖpr*
5.9	A *pw*		(*ẖnmw pw*)
5.10	*sẖpr*

5.11	A *pw*		(*b3stt pw*)
5.12	*iw NP*[3msg pron.] *r NP*
5.13	A *pw*		(*sẖmt pw*)
5.14	*iw NP*[3msg pron.] *r NP*

6	conclusion:	imperatives 2pl (3)
		iw – nn – iw (3)
		final injunctions 2pl (3)

The short version of *Loyaliste* is a thoroughly composed text, symmetrically patterned on all levels. Much of this is obscured in the long version, which has its own qualities, of a different sort. If the long version were original, a higher degree of texturing could be achieved by processes of textual subtraction in individual loci—compare Posener's comments on 3.7-8 and 5.1-2, quoted above (§4.5.5.2, *fine*). However, no process of

---

[265] *Ḳbb fnḏw w3=f r nšn.* That 3.5 and 5.1 consist in two clauses, while 3.6 – 3.7-8 and 5.2 – 5.9-10 do not, independently confirms the proposed segmentation by which these verses head their respective 'quatrains'.

[266] On the 'blocking' of 'noses' in relation to the Nileflood, compare *Hymn* 2.5; on the motif more broadly (also in *Ptahhotep* 22 and *Eloquent Peasant* B1 264), lastly Parkinson 2012a: 215.

[267] *K3 pw nsw ḥ3w pw r3=f.*

textual subtraction could have led to the overall degree of symmetrical patterning presented by the short version on all levels and throughout the text.

This implies that the long version was composed by expansion of the short one, not the other way around. As the coherent and artful nature of the long version further implies, the process must have been one of actual composition, not the result of the vagaries of successive textual accretion. As described, the composition was careful, taking up constructions in the pre-existing text, and weaving new semantic threads into the ones already present in the short version. Far from being any mechanical, such modes of Fortschreibung made for a smooth integration of additional segments into the pre-existing text and contributed much to its final cohesion. The long version of *Loyaliste* is semantically rich and more deeply polyphonic than the short one; for interpretation, it must be read as such, as it stands, just as the short version must be for its part.

B. The above discussion of compositional aspects only bears on the relative chronology of the short and long versions in the first part of *Loyaliste*: in itself, it has no implications on the absolute dating of the long version. In the first part, only one segment of text, 5.5-6 and by extension 5.3-6, could be dated on linguistic grounds, to the early Eighteenth Dynasty. As discussed, other segments found only in the long version relate to the text of the short version in ways exactly similar to how 5.3-8 does to 5.1-2 – 5.9-14. As also noted, the long version is coherent, speaking against haphazarded accretion over time. Together, these observations make it likely that the long version of the first part of *Loyaliste*, probably the result of a careful compositional effort, is a product of the early Eighteenth Dynasty.

The second part of *Loyaliste* may also afford some linguistic indications for a dating to this period (most notably in 11.8, §4.5.3.2; with the usual caveats, perhaps also some elements in the lexicon, §4.5.3.3). Taking into account the coherence of the long version in this second part as well, this could be taken to suggest that the whole of the long version, or at least a substantial part of it, was composed in the early Eighteenth Dynasty.

4.6 *Heavenly Cow*

As is implied by its mixed contents and places of inscription, the text referred to as *Heavenly Cow* or *Destruction of Mankind*[268] is not a literary composition on a par with other compositions discussed in the present study, significant literarizing ten-

---

268 Text: Hornung 1982 (additional fragment: Guilhou 1998). The main versions are inscribed in the tombs of Sethi I, Ramses II, and Ramses III; the final sections of the text are on the inner part of the outer golden shrine of Tutankhamun and in the tomb of Ramses VI (Hornung 1982: 33-6). Sigla used are 'S', 'R.II', 'R.III', and 'T'. I quote following the verse numbering in Hornung 1982 (based on Fecht's metrical analysis in Hornung 1982: 109-27). I take the option of referring to the text as *Heavenly Cow* because the fabrication of the image of the cow is integral to the overall composition, as are the etiologies mainly in the second part; a title as *Destruction of Mankind* too narrowly focuses on the first, narrative, part of the composition.

dencies.[269] The composition is nonetheless included here, since, depending on its dating, it may bear on an issue that is of broader relevance to the present study, namely the configuration of higher written registers after the Middle Kingdom. Based on its contents mainly, *Heavenly Cow* has been dated by its editor to a time not much earlier than the first documentation of its final sections on Tutankhamun's outer shrine.[270] This dating has not found universal acceptance, however, and a dating to the Middle Kingdom has often been evoked as well.[271]

The overall composition is diverse, including narrative parts, etiologies, instructions for the fabrication of the image of a cow, and further textual material. The text inscriptionally presents itself as a unity, and ought therefore to be treated as such in overall interpretation. As to its composition, unity is possible as well, and may find some circumstantial support in the patterning uncovered by Fecht's metrical analysis,[272] if this is to be followed. The main focus is here on the first half (verses 1-165), i.e. the narrative proper: this is more clearly cohesive, and unity of composition is therefore probable. References to the second part of the overall composition are made on a more occasional basis only. As always in the present study, linguistic dating bears on the text, and therefore on the documented textualization of ideas, not on these ideas themselves, nor on hypothetical sources that may, or may not, have existed in some other form.

4.6.0 Inconclusive expressions

Heavenly Cow displays a series of late features in orthography:[273] as elsewhere, these do not provide any indication for dating.

A. Although inconclusive as well, a series of other superficially late features, in syntax and morphology, are worth a brief mention. Of the following, (i) and (ii) may well have resulted from textual alteration, as (iii) demonstrably did.

---

269 For these, Spalinger 2000.

270 Hornung 1982: 79-81. A few notes on language are already made in Hornung 1982: 80 (with cross-references to individual notes) and in Spalinger 2000. These, to be mentioned below have in part to do with orthography and/or narrative style (§4.6.0) and are therefore insufficient to date the composition. I disagree with the approach to grammar, and derived redactional thesis, in Guilhou 1989: 135-7; see the discussion below.

271 For a summary of opinions, Stadler 2009: 374-5, who calls for a linguistic analyis of the issue.

272 In Hornung 1982: 109-27, specifically 109-10.

273 E.g. (a) *Heavenly Cow* 91 *ii.n=s tḥ.ti nn siꜣ.n=s rmṯ* 'She came back drunk and could not recognize men' (note that *nn sḏm.n=f* is possible in the Middle Kingdom already, if with apparently slightly different semantics: Gunn 2012²: 127-30); (b) *Heavenly Cow* 126 *ꜥḥꜥ<.n> mꜣꜣ.n=sn* (long stem of *mꜣꜣ* in the *sḏm.n=f*: §2.3.1.1, (i)); (c) *Heavenly Cow* S 2 *m-ḫt wnn=f* (§4.6.4.2 with n.b); (d) *st* for *sn* (e.g. 42; 79) or for *=s* (e.g. 89; 90-91; 97; 98) (for the former, §2.3.1.1, (viii)); (e) in the lexicon, e.g. *iḫḫw* 'twilight' (162) (common in Book of the Dead and contrasting with the older form *ꜥḫḫw*).

(a) *Syntax*

(i) *Heavenly Cow* 97-98

ir n=s{t} sḏrt m trw (n) rnpt ip{n}=st[a] *r mwt{=i}*

'Sleep-drinks shall be made for her at the periods of the yearly festivals and counted to the servants.'

a) Thus S; *ip st* in R.II and R.III.

> *ʾIp st* (...), with an anaphoric subject pronoun, is post-classical. In regular Middle Egyptian, the construction would have been *ip r ḥmwt* (with *ip* a pseudoparticiple). No indication for dating can be derived, however, since *st* may easily have been secondarily inserted.

(b) *Lexical morphology*

(ii) *Heavenly Cow* 240-241 *r(-)ḫft-ḥr(-)n* 'in the presence of'

> In this form, the expression is probably late. It need not be original, however.

(c) *Pronominal morphology*

(iii) *Heavenly Cow* 215 S, R.III *ntt tw=i ꜥꜣ* 'that I am here'; 232 S, R.II *ḏr-nty tw=i r irt* (...) 'for I will make (...)' (new subject pronouns)[274]

> As the only slightly earlier T version demonstrates, both these instances of the 'new subject pronoun' are products of textual alteration: compare 215 T *ntt wi ꜥꜣ*; 232 T *ḏr-ntt wi (r) irt* (...). For similar instances of textually secondary new subject pronouns in Ramesside witnesses of *Sinuhe*, §3.4.1.1.B.

B. Late features in the Handlungsanweisungen deserve a note of their own:

(iv) *Heavenly Cow* 186 *sn m šꜣi* 'These (*scil.* words, inscriptions) are in retrograde script' (new subject pronoun)
> Sim. 191.[275]

(v) *Heavenly Cow* 175 *r-imitw* 'between' (as different from classical *imitw*);[276]
> Sim. 200.

These can be interpreted in two ways, either as a secondary insertion of such Handlungsanweisungen into an older text, or as a deliberate differentiation of linguistic registers in relation to different textual loci. Only in the second interpretation would these expressions be criterial for dating.

---

274 Noted by Spalinger 2000: 258, n.6; Hornung 1982: 66, n.154; Kroeber 1970: 96.

275 A third instance may be in 171, depending on how this difficult passage is interpreted (see Popko, *TLA*).

276 *EG* §177.

4.6.1 Narrative constructions

Heavenly Cow makes a fairly abundant use of *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm* constructions (4; 8; 85; 147-148; 155),[277] while both *ꜥḥꜥ.n sḏm.n=f* and *iwt pw ir.n=f* are only sparsely found (*ꜥḥꜥ.n sḏm.n=f* only in 126, also *ꜥḥꜥ.in* in 132 (§4.6.2); *ꜥk pw ir.n=f* only in 124; the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive only in 130 (§4.6.1.2)). All these constructions are documented in the Twelfth Dynasty and before, but Middle Kingdom narrative texts use *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-headed constructions alongside -*in*-marked ones in complementary functions.[278] The skewed relative frequency in *Heavenly Cow* is also observed in Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptions, then in Late Egyptian narrative literature. This is suggestive of a late dating of *Heavenly Cow*.[279]

Some other more specific elements in the configuration of narrative constructions in *Heavenly Cow* provide further indications for dating, to different degrees; the indication provided by the construction discussed last (§4.6.1.2) is the strongest.

4.6.1.1 *Heavenly Cow* 133-134 and 77-79: Two expressions for 'dawning'

Two expressions for 'dawning' are noteworthy in *Heavenly Cow*, for different reasons each.

> (i) *Heavenly Cow* 133-134 (preserved only in S)
>
> *ḥḏ rf tꜣ dwꜣwy iw nn n rmṯw pr ḥr pḏwt* [...]
>
> 'When it (had) dawned, very early in the morning, these men went out with their bows [...]'

> > In similar contexts, Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian has *ḥḏ.n rf tꜣ dwꜣ sp 2*.[280] Only one text dating to Middle Kingdom, Nesimontu has *ḥḏ tꜣ*, but arguably in a different context and with a different construction.[281] In the form as in *Heavenly*

---

277 Synthetic *sḏm.in=f*'s (such as *ḏd.in* and *in.in.tw*) are not relevant to the issue, as their occurrence, notably in dialogues, is bound by conventions associated with the format of the 'Royal Tale', evoked in *Heavenly Cow*. Among formulations typical of the 'Royal Tale', e.g. 10-23 *ḏd.in ḥm=f ꜥ.w.s. n ntyw m-ḫt=f nis m n=i r irt(=i)* (...) *in.in.tw nn n nṯrw* [... *wn.*]*i*[*n*] *nn n nṯr ipn ḥr gs=fy ḥr dhn tꜣ m-bꜣḥ ḥm=f* 'His Majesty L.P.H. then said to those who were in his following: "Call to my eye for me, if you please (...)" These gods were then fetched [...] these gods were then on his two sides, touching the ground in presence of His Majesty.' In the second part of the composition, e.g. 226-229 *ḏd.in ḥm n nṯr pn nis m n=i ḏḥwty in.in.tw=f ḥr-ꜥwy ḏd.in ḥm n nṯr pn n ḏḥwty* 'The Majesty of this god then said: "Summon Thot to me, if you please!" He was then fetched immediately. The Majesty of this god then said to Thot: (...)'.

278 Lastly Schenkel in press b.

279 Similarly Spalinger 2000: 258-9.

280 E.g. *Sinuhe* B 248; *Hirtengeschichte* 22-23; Hammamat 199; CT VII 3r T9C; similarly in a (here possibly literarizing) Eighteenth Dynasty inscription, *Urk.* IV 896, 4 (Amenemhab). All references drawn from Spalinger 2006: 51-85.

281 Nesimontu A.13 *ḥḏ tꜣ ḥtp.n dmi nḏr.n=i ḏꜣḏꜣ n pḏt sšm.n=i ꜥḥꜣ n tꜣwy* (...) 'When it dawned, the town surrendered after I had captured the head of the tribe and conducted the fight for the Dual Land (...)'. This differs from the narrative formula here discussed in various ways. Unlike in the mentioned Middle Kingdom occurrences and in *Heavenly Cow*, Nesimontu A.13 is not internal to a narrative sequence: the preceding section consists in self-eulogizing formulations, to which the immediately preceding clause relates as a circumstance (A.13 (...) *tsm.t(w) n=i mšꜥ m sḫt* '(...) the army being made loyal(?) to me through beating'); the clause just quoted provides a thematic

Cow 133, the stock phrase for 'dawning' recurs in Traditional Egyptian.[282] Altogether, this may be an indication for a later dating, but remains uncertain: in particular, the possibility can not be ruled out that the tense morpheme -*n*- may have simply been dropped in the course of textual transmission.[283]

(ii) *Heavenly Cow* 77-79

ist ḥḏ t3 n sm3 rmṯw in nṯrt m sww=sn nw ḫntyt ḏd.in ḥm n rˁ (...)

'Meanwhile, it dawned for the killing of men by the goddess on their days of sailing upstream. The Majesty of Re then said: (...)'

> In an initial setting, the expansion of *ḥḏ t3* by a *n* + *infinitive* phrase is apparently paralleled only once, in a New Kingdom text, Merenptah's *Karnak Inscription* 31 (K*RI* IV 5, 15-16) *ḥḏ t3 n ṯhn ḥnˁ=w iw pw ir.n p3 wr ḥsy ḥrw n rbw* (...) 'When it dawned to engage combat with them, there was coming by the wretched enemy chief of Libu (...)'.[284] The same expansion of *ḥḏ t3* recurs in earlier times in other grammatical contexts,[285] weakening much force the above parallel may have had.
>
>   What is more remarkable, however, is that *ḥḏ t3*, expressing a setting, is here preceded by *ist*, itself marking a setting function on a textual level. The combination, which remains otherwise undocumented, seems redundant; it is best related to an early New Kingdom horizon when the conditions of uses of *ist* were undergoing relaxation and the morpheme's function redefinition in higher written registers.[286]

---

bridge between the preceding self-eulogizing formulations and the narrative part that follows, introduced by *ḥḏ t3*. Significantly, the lack of narrative continuity in Nesimontu A.13 is also reflected in the absence of the particle *rf* after the expression for 'dawning': the expression introduces the narrative section itself, not a new episode within a narrative section. This suggests that *ḥḏ t3* in Nesimontu is in fact not the formulatic expression for 'dawning', but a free use of the regular lexical expression for 'dawning' (this may also be reflected in the fact that Nesimontu lacks the expansion *dw3wy* 'very early in the morning', which is, on the other hand, integral to the stock formula). In the grammar of Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian, *ḥḏ t3* in Nesimontu is therefore best interpreted as a relative present tense setting (with a *mrr=f*), 'when it dawned' (i.e. 'when it was dawning'). *Ḥḏ t3* in *Heavenly Cow*, on the other hand, is a recent form of the classical formula, the -*n*- of the *sḏm.n=f* having been dropped, perhaps all the more easily in the context of a set formula (technically, therefore, *ḥḏ* in *Heavenly Cow* is neither a *sḏm.n=f*, as in the Middle Kingdom, nor a Late Egyptian past tense *sḏm=f*, but an instance of 'formulaic language', not further to be analyzed morphologically).

282 E.g. Piye's *Victory Stela* 20; 89; 100; 106; 147 (Spalinger 2006: 79, ex.51).

283 For the general phenomenon, compare, within *Heavenly Cow* itself, 126 (preserved only in S) *ˁḥˁ<.n> m33=sn* (...). With the formula for 'dawning' specifically, compare *Sinuhe* B 248 *ḥḏ.n rf t3 dw3 sp 2*, but AOS and P2 *ḥḏ t3* (noted by Spalinger 2006: 64, n.37).

284 Manassa 2003: 42; 44-5; Spalinger 2006: 78.

285 *Shipwrecked Sailor* 185-186; later also, in yet another grammatical environment, *Urk*. IV 1860, 13. See Gilula 1976.

286 For the general constellation, Oréal 2011: 238-46.

4.6.1.2 *Heavenly Cow* 130: A 'narrative' construction of the infinitive fully integrated with the narrative texture

Heavenly Cow has one instance of a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive (for the fuller context, §4.6.2, (ii)):[287]

> *Heavenly Cow* 130
>
> *wḏꜣ ḥm=f r ꜥḥ* [*ḥr psd*] *n idt tn* [...]
>
> 'His Majesty's proceeding to the palace on the back of this cow [...]'

The 'narrative' construction of the infinitive is of course well documented in the Middle Kingdom with a royal subject. E.g., also with *wḏꜣ*: Khusobek (*temp.* Senwosret III), D.10-11 *wḏꜣ ḥm=f m ḫnt*[*yt*] *r sḫr mntiw-stiw* 'His Majesty's proceeding in sailing upstream to overthrow the Nubians.' A difference becomes apparent, however, when broader contexts, and thereby textual conditions of use, are drawn into the picture. In Middle Kingdom instances, the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive, including multiple ones in sequence to each other, directly harkens back to the annalistic format from which this 'construction' textually derives. This is immediately evident in Amenemhat II's *Annals*, itself an annalistic text; similar comments extend to other textual loci in which the construction developed early, in expedition accounts. In a private inscription such as Khusobek's, royal actions are in the infinitive, while actions by other participants, including the speaker, follow, juxtaposed, in *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-headed constructions: the texture remains additive and binary, rather than integrated.[288] In the more complex case afforded by *Sinuhe*, a literary composition, infinitives used 'narratively' have articulating and indexical functions: they serve to underscore specific junctures in the first narrative section, and simultaneously evoke the annalistic format of expedition accounts, one of the subtexts of the composition (§4.1.3.B). In the Middle Kingdom, the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive thus remains bound to its textual loci of origin.

In the early New Kingdom, uses in private and royal narratives of military campaigns stand in the same tradition, which they continue. In other texts, however, the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive has relinquished any such textual associations: the construction simply serves to underscore events with a royal subject (further discussion and examples: §4.1.2.D; §4.3.3, (ii)-(iii)). In the context of a relaxation, or broadening, of the conditions of use of the 'narrative' infinitive, the combination with *wḏꜣ* specifically has become a set phrase for royal progress, including for instance in a

---

287 In 69, the text is to be emended as *rḏ*{*t*}.*in ḥm=f* (compare 74 *ir*{*t*}.*in.tw*, where a similar emendation is imposed by the presence of *tw*). In the case of the 'narrative' infinitive in 130, the construction is with *wḏꜣ*, an event of motion; by contrast, *rdi* in 69 is an event for which the *sḏm.in=f* is routinely used in *Heavenly Cow* and in the 'Royal Tale'. See also Fecht, in Hornung 1982: 124, n.i.

288 Section C (horizontally): *wḏꜣ ḥm=f* (...) *spr ḥm=f* (...) *rḏt ḥm=f* (...) *ꜥḥꜥ.n skmm ḥr s*(*i*) (...) *ꜥḥꜥ.n ꜣbḫ.n ꜥnḫw* (...) *ꜥḥꜥ.n sḫ.n=i* (...) *ꜥḥꜥ.n rḏ.n=i* (...) *ꜥḥꜥ.n <r>ḏ.n=f n=i* (...) (although the last event is with a royal subject, it is oriented on the speaker, in the dative). Section D (vertically): (...) *ḫꜥt ḥm n nsw bity* (...) *rḏt ḥm=f* (...) *ꜥḥꜥ.n sspd.n=i* (...) – *rḏt ḥm=f* (...) – *wḏꜣ ḥm=f* (...) *ꜥḥꜥ.n sḫ.n=i* (...) *ꜥḥꜥ.n=i ḥḏ.kw* (...) *ꜥḥꜥ.n rḏ.n=f* (*wi*) (...) *rḏ n*(=*i*) (...) (although the penultimate event is with a royal subject, it is here as well oriented on the speaker).

building inscription (*Urk.* IV 836, 6: §4.3.3, (iii)). The construction is then used alongside other narrative constructions (*wn.in=f*-headed ones, etc.) and is tightly integrated into the overall narrative texture. The use in *Heavenly Cow* 130, also fully integrated into the narrative (compare the analysis of the broader context below, §4.6.2.C), relates to this same horizon: in the Middle Kingdom, this would not have been possible.

4.6.2 *Heavenly Cow* 132: A hybrid narrative construction

The following construction is remarkable on several accounts simultaneously. As to be discussed, this is best described as a case of creative reconfiguration.

> *Heavenly Cow* 132
> (...) *ꜥḥꜥ.in rf tꜣ m kk*
> '(...) and the land then was in obscurity.'

A. In *Heavenly Cow* 132, a past tense form of the auxiliary *ꜥḥꜥ* (for which see below, B) is combined with a situational predicate construction, *tꜣ m kk*. The construction is very rare,[289] and for good reasons. Historically, *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-headed constructions grammaticalized out of a serial construction (*ꜥḥꜥ.n sḏm.n=f*),[290] with an auxiliary derived from a verb that expresses a dynamic event when used as a full lexical verb in the suffix conjugation (*ꜥḥꜥ* 'stand up').[291] In keeping with this source construction, the auxiliary *ꜥḥꜥ.n* is almost universally followed by a verbal event of some sort (*sḏm.n=f*, *NP ḥr sḏm*, *NP PsP*, *sḏm(w) N*, perhaps rarely also *sḏm=f*). On a functional level, the distribution reflects how the semantics of a situational predicate construction conflicts with the narrative auxiliary *ꜥḥꜥ*: just as non-dynamic constructions more generally, situational predicate constructions contribute to provide the background to an unfolding narrative;[292] constructions headed by *ꜥḥꜥ.n*, for their part, serve to express events that push the narrative forward and therefore belong to the main chain of that narrative. In this, *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-headed constructions also differ from *wn.in*-headed ones, which often have paragraph-conclusive function and are therefore expected to accommodate situational predicate constructions on a fully regular basis, as they do.

B. Most remarkable, however, is the form of the auxiliary in *Heavenly Cow* 132, *ꜥḥꜥ.in*. When used as an auxiliary, *ꜥḥꜥ* always comes as *ꜥḥꜥ.n*:[293] *ꜥḥꜥ.in* in *Heavenly*

---

289 Only two instances had been noted, one in the Old Kingdom (Henqu 21-22 (*Urk.* I 78, 13)) and one in the Middle Kingdom (Hatnub 20, 5), see Winand 2006: 166. Beyond *Heavenly Cow* 132, a fourth can be added, Moꜥalla II.β.2: this is slightly different, because *ꜥḥꜥ*, also functioning as an auxiliary, is uniquely not in a past tense.

290 For related serial constructions, less grammaticalized than *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-headed ones, §2.4.4.5, (iv).

291 On the bleaching of the lexical meaning of *ꜥḥꜥ* in *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-auxiliated patterns, Vernus 2003a: 238-40.

292 E.g. Winand 2000.

293 With the lone exception of present tense *ꜥḥꜥ* in Moꜥalla II.β.2. This is not from a narrative context, uniquely so and may therefore be tentatively interpreted either as an exploratory construction or as representing a variety or register of Egyptian otherwise undocumented in the written record (the two accounts are not exclusive of each other).

Cow 132 is unique in the Middle Egyptian record.[294] Morphologically, *ꜥḥꜥ.in* is a *sḏm.in=f*, otherwise common in *Heavenly Cow* and elsewhere. The hybrid nature of the form becomes apparent, however, in view of the nature of *ꜥḥꜥ* in *Heavenly Cow* 132, an auxiliary, not the full lexical verb.[295] Hybridity is also manifest in the fact that *ꜥḥꜥ.in* is followed by *rf*, a particle that commonly follows *-in*-marked forms, but never co-occurs with the auxiliary *ꜥḥꜥ* anywhere else.

The auxiliary *ꜥḥꜥ*, otherwise always in the form *ꜥḥꜥ.n*, serves with past tense events in narrative chains; *-in*-marked forms and constructions themselves serve in narrative chains, if for functions that are different on other levels: an *ꜥḥꜥ.in* auxiliated construction may then be described as an instance of redundant marking of past narrative function. On general grounds, this strongly suggests a post-classical horizon in written language, when auxiliaries are occasionally amenable to reconfigurations of various sorts. A more specific parallel to the phenomenon here discussed is afforded by a case of redundant past tense marking, also involving *-in-*, in the artificially recomposed repertoire of one Eighteenth Dynasty text:

(i) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.120: V.7-8 (H*HBT* II 19, 2)

wn.in nn smrw ibw=sn šsp.n mht

'These officials' hearts, they begun to forget.'

The construction *N sḏm.n* (§1.2, (xi)) in itself marks past tense. It is here combined with the auxiliary *wn.in*: the result, apparently unique, is a redundant marking of past tense, first by *-in-*, then by *-n-*.[296] Provided the text is correct, a similar type of redundant marking, this time of future tense, could be in another construction in the same text, also unique: *Chapelle Rouge*, p.124: VI.1 (H*HBT* II 20, 5)[297] *wn.k(ꜣ)=t*

---

294 In filling the lacuna in 23, Hornung (1982: 53, n.19) evokes both [*ꜥḥꜥ.*]*i*[*n*] and [*wn*]*.i*[*n*]. Of these, the latter is vastly more likely after an event of 'bringing/introducing' in 22 (similarly alluding to the 'Royal Tale', compare e.g. the sequence in *Neferti* 1h-i). Even if the former possibility were to be preferred, this would simply be an instance of the full lexical verb *ꜥḥꜥ* 'to stand (up)', not of the auxiliary, and would therefore not compare with *ꜥḥꜥ.in* here under discussion. The auxiliary *ꜥḥꜥ.in* in 132 thus remains unique, in *Heavenly Cow* and in general.

295 Compare the blatantly absurd translation [?!]'The land then stood up in obscurity.'

296 Rare *wn.in*-headed constructions are also found in Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian. These include *wn.in N sḏm=f* (Khentemsemti 3-4; *Sinuhe* B 174-175; *Kagemni* 2.7: discussed above, §4.1.3.C, (iii)-(iv)); *wn.in nfr sw* (in the literary topos *wn.in nfr st ḥr ib=f* 'And they were perfect to his heart', e.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B2 131 and *passim* in *Eloquent Peasant*, *Kagemni*, and *Cheops' Court*); and *wn.in mrr=f*. The latter, as it seems uniquely in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 30-31, is a *wn.in*-prefixed emphatic construction: *wn.in ḫnn* [*sḏb=f ḥr*] *mw npnpt=f ḥr šmꜥ* 'And its fringe rested on the water, with its hem on the barley' (transl. Parkinson 2012a: 44; sim Bt; R has the emphatic construction without the auxiliary). In these, as in *wn.in sḏm.n* discussed in the main text, *wn.in* has developed into an auxiliary in ways that are not reconductible any more to its historical origin in constructions such as *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm*, *wn.in=f pseudoparticiple*, or *wn.in=f AP*. This development, completed in the Twelfth Dynasty, is a conditioning possibility for *wn.in sḏm.n* itself, yet this differs from all the above in one point, the double marking of tense. In *wn.in N sḏm=f*, *wn.in nfr sw*, and *wn.in mrr=f*, constructions with their own specific semantics are accommodated into a *wn.in*-headed construction, resulting in semantically complex overall constructions, but never in a double marking of the same category.

297 Lacau & Chevrier 1977: 127 with n.b; noted by Vernus 1990a: 86; further Stauder 2013: §9.3, and above, §4.1.2.E.

n(=i) r mst iȝwt (...) 'You shall then be for me destined to fashion offices (...)'. These unique doubly marked constructions in *Chapelle Rouge* are directly comparable in its (/their) underlying principle to *ꜥḥꜥ.in rf* (...) here under discussion. They lend further support to the above appreciation that the construction in *Heavenly Cow* 132 also relates to a post-classical, and probably early New Kingdom, horizon.

C. A further step in analysis is to account for how, and to serve what purposes, the construction in *Heavenly Cow* 132 may have been coined in the particular composition in which it uniquely occurs. To these ends, the broader context is considered (the typographical disposition reflects the proposed articulation as discussed below):

(ii) *Heavenly Cow* 123-134

(...) [...].*in swt ḥm n rꜥ ḥr psd=s*

[*iwt*] *pw ir.n nn n rmṯ* [...]
ꜥḥꜥ<.n> mȝȝ.n=sn sw ḥr psd n iḥt
dd.n n=f nn n rmṯw [...]*b*[...] *n=n sḫr=n ḫftiw=k wȝw mdwt r irw st*

wdȝ ḥm=f r ꜥḥ [*ḥr psd*] *n iḥt tn* [...]*wi=f ḥnꜥ=sn*
ꜥḥꜥ.in rf tȝ m kk

ḥd rf tȝ dwȝwy iw nn n rmṯ pr ḥr pdwt [...]

'(...) the Majesty of Re then [mounted?] on her back.

There was coming by these men [...];
and they saw him on the back of the cow.
These men said to him: "[...] to us, that we may fell your enemies who plotted against their creator."

His Majesty's proceeding to the palace on the back of this cow [...] his with them;
and the earth then was in obscurity.

When it (had) dawned, very early in the morning, these men went out with their bows [...]'

The artificial construction in *Heavenly Cow* 132 is one of only two instances of *ꜥḥꜥ*-auxiliated constructions in the overall composition. These occur close to each other in the text, suggesting that they should be interpreted alongside each other. In both cases, *ꜥḥꜥ*-auxiliated constructions follow an event of motion in an infinitive-based construction: *iwt pw ir.n=f* (124) and the narratively used infinitive *wdȝ* (130: §4.6.1.2). As elsewhere, the use of an infinitive-based construction with events of motion results in such events being presented 'en bloc'; these thereby opening a new shorter segment of discourse:

124-126   [*iwt*] *pw ir.n* (...)   – *ꜥḥꜥ.n mȝȝ.n=sn* (...)   – (...)
130-132   *wdȝ* (...)   – *ꜥḥꜥ.in rf tȝ* (...)

ʾIn-marked forms and constructions, on the other hand, are overly common throughout *Heavenly Cow* (§4.6.1). In the extract quoted above, they appear twice, in both cases in clauses that relate to a preceding shorter segment of discourse. This articulation is further underscored by discourse-connective particles:

123   [...].*in swt*

132   *ꜥḥꜥ.n rf* (...)

Moreover, both clauses that here have -*in*-marked constructions are just before clauses that begin with paragraph-initial constructions. As the latter open a new segment of discourse, -*in*-marked constructions are therefore in the present section associated with signaling the end of a shorter segment of discourse:

123   [...].*in* (...), just before the infinitive-based, paragraph-initial [*iwt*] *pw ir.n* (...) in 124

132   *ꜥḥꜥ.in* (...), just before the setting, paragraph-initial *ḥḏ rf tꜣ* (...) in 133

The hybrid auxiliary *ꜥḥꜥ.in* combines the functions, locally identified, of both the *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-headed and the -*in*-marked constructions. It directly follows a paragraph-initial (here infinitive-based) construction (130 *wḏꜣ ḥm=f* (...)), as *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-marked do in the present section. As a -*in*-marked construction, it simultaneously signals the end of this same paragraph, just before a new paragraph begins with a setting expression (133 *ḥḏ rf tꜣ* (...)).

As described above (B), the resulting construction in 132 is unique and hybrid. In the context of a composition in which *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-auxiliated constructions are largely disaffected in favor of -*in*-marked forms and constructions, the former are open to being reconfigured; this here happens through attraction to, or modelling on, the latter.

D. The descriptive account of *Heavenly Cow* 132 given above (A-B) establishes the uniqueness and hybridity of the construction. In *Heavenly Cow*, the construction is interpreted as a reconfiguration of narrative functions in the local context (C). Such construction implies a relaxation of the conditions bearing on *ꜥḥꜥ.n*-headed constructions, relating it to a post-classical horizon in written language when such phenomena, which do not arise in regular linguistic interaction, are occasionally found. What is more, directly comparable cases of reconfiguration are documented for either type of hybridity involved, in both cases in Hatshepsutian creative experimentations with written language. The likelihood that a construction such as in *Heavenly Cow* 132 could have been coined at a time before the early New Kingdom is extraordinarily low.

4.6.3   *ʾIpn* demonstratives in context

Heavenly Cow makes a fair use of the antiquated demonstrative *ipn*, also subjecting this to linguistic dissimilation; going yet further, two instances of double demonstrative marking are found.

A. *Ipn* demonstratives occur five times in the first part of *Heavenly Cow* (23; 64; 70; 72; 76).[298] In post-Old Kingdom times, these demonstratives are limited in their textual distribution, mainly to the following places (selective illustration):

- In one inscription of unclear dating (*Tod Inscription* 29);[299]

- Recurrently *smrw ipn* in the 'Royal Tale', as a convention—and thus, indirectly, an index—of this type of written discourse, from Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela* 12 through early Ramesside times (e.g. *Kuban Stela* 23 (K*RI* 357, 9));

- Recurrently in Thutmoside royal inscriptions: (a) in relation to the 'Royal Tale', *smrw ipn* 'these companions' (*Urk*. IV 165, 7; sim. 182, 8; 1241, 2; *Appointment* 7; 8); *rmtw ipn* 'these men (*scil.* present at the royal audience)' (257, 2); (b) with distinguished referents, *ḥꜥw=f ipn* 'these crowns of his' (161, 4); *sbꜣw ipn* 'these doorways' (168, 12); *mnw=t ipn* 'these monuments of yours' (237, 5);[300]

- In medical texts transmitted in early New Kingdom manuscripts,[301] as an index of (purported) old age, thereby also connoting scientific authority;

- Not uncommonly in Book of the Dead,[302] as a token of antiquated language and possibly as an index of an embedding into an age-old tradition, rather than as genuine textual inheritance (contrast with the relative rarity of *ipn* demonstratives in Coffin Texts);

- In three Middle Egyptian literary texts: *Tale Involving the House of Life* X+2.1, *Sporting King* A2.1, and *Teaching of Aametju* 42 (on the first two, §4.3.4.A with n.103). The first was argued to date to the (later) Second Intermediate Period (§3.3.1) and the second to the Eighteenth Dynasty (§4.3); the third is Thutmoside. *Ipn* demonstratives do not appear to have been part of the regular repertoires of these. In particular they remain undocumented in any literary text dating to the Middle Kingdom.

In *Heavenly Cow*, *ipn* demonstratives are found with participants interacting with the (here divine) king, in an association typical of the format of the 'Royal Tale': 23 *nn n nṯrw ipn* 'these gods';[303] 64 S+R.III *nn n wpwtiw ipn* 'these messengers'; 76 *nṯrw ipn* 'these gods'. In addition, *ipn* demonstratives are used twice with an entity that plays a distinguished role in the narrative, 'this ochre' (70 and 72 *ddty ipn*). Other participants that do not directly interact with the king are followed by regular Middle Egyptian

---

298 Also in the additional portion in T (col.31; Hornung 1982: 30) and in one caption (only S; see *TLA*).

299 On this text, further §5.1.3.3.C.

300 Discussion in Stauder 2013: §6.3.

301 E.g. P. Smith 15, 11; P. Ebers 1, 5 (after Lefebvre 1940: §102).

302 See *TLA* #24430.

303 This and the following example also involve double demonstrative, marking a phenomenon discussed below, B.

demonstratives (134 *nn n rmṯ* 'these men'),[304] as are entities that play a less salient role in the narrative (76 *nn n ḥnḳt* 'this beer'; 84 *nn n sḏrt* 'this sleep-drink'). The selection of an *ipn* demonstrative thus stands in a principled contrast to regular *nn n*, from which they are dissimilated. Incidentally this also implies that both types of demonstratives alike are integral to the original composition in the form in which they are transmitted.

As the above table demonstrates, *ipn* demonstratives are extremely rare in any type of Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian, while they are typical of the repertoires of some post-Middle Kingdom types of written discourses. That *ipn* demonstratives are used in *Heavenly Cow*, and that they are distributed there in the ways just described, is suggestive of a post-Middle Kingdom composition date of composition.

B. In addition, *ipn* demonstratives are subjected in *Heavenly Cow* to what may be described as linguistic play. Two types of phenomena are to be distinguished. The first is worth mentioning with a view on the overall linguistic typology of *Heavenly Cow*, but does not result in a reliable indication for dating. A case of linguistic dissimilation is observed with occurrences of the same referent in tight sequence: *nn n ddty* 'this ochre' (68), then *ddty ipn* (70, 72). Although not overly common, linguistic dissimilation is a phenomenon found in various places in Earlier Egyptian higher registers:[305]

(a) *Tod Inscription* 29[306] *šwȝw ipf* 'these miserable ones', alongside *nf n rstw* 'these prisoners';

(b) in the context of the 'Royal Tale':
- Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela* 12[307] *ḏd.in smrw ipn* 'Then these companions said', alongside 6 and 14 *ḏd.in nn n smrw*;
- *Appointment of the Vizier* 8 (*Urk.* IV 1381, 3) *smrw ipn ḏd=sn* 'These companions say' and 6-7 (*Urk.* IV 1380, 20) [... *smrw i*]*pn*; alongside 16 (*Urk.* IV 1381, 16) *nn n smrw*;

(c) *Book of the Dead* 102 (e.g. Nu 7; Iuia 827-828),[308] possibly with a threefold dissimilation of the demonstratives *pwy, nw, ipn*: *nḥm.n=i nṯr pwy m-ꜥ nw n iri mn=f mr ipn* 'I have saved this god from these ones who cause this difficult pain of his.'[309]

In lacking an association with a specific period in time, this offers no sound evidence for dating.

---

304 Perhaps also 124 *nn n rmṯ* [...] (unclear, since double demonstrative marking (below, B) can not be ruled out given the following lacuna).
305 On linguistic dissimilation in general, Vernus 1996b: 164-8.
306 Vernus 1996b: 164, ex.21a-b.
307 Vernus 1996b: 164, ex.20a-b.
308 Quoted after *TLA* # 24430.
309 Different interpretation by Gunn 2012²: 232, who views this as an instance of double demonstrative marking: '(...) these same(?) inflictors of his grievous hurt'.

More consequential for dating are two instances of double demonstrative marking in *Heavenly Cow*: 23 *nn n nṯrw ipn* 'these gods'; 64 S+R.III *nn n wpwtiw ipn* 'these messengers'. One is at first tempted to emend these as the results of some textual accident (such as the insertion a more recent demonstrative without suppression of the older one).[310] Yet, the double marking occurs twice, in non-contiguous passages of the text, and a plausible textual scenario can be devised only for the first of these instances.[311] Moreover, *ipn* demonstratives are in *Heavenly Cow* subjected to deliberate manipulation (above), further suggesting that the construction is here original. Double demonstrative marking—of which only one other instance has been noted, in a New Kingdom text[312]—is quite possibly ungrammatical in Egyptian. In *Heavenly Cow*, it is interpreted in the context of the afore mentioned broader manipulation of demonstrative expressions. The construction, in which syntactic rules are relaxed and overruled by non-syntactic parameters such as linguistic indexicality and dissimilation, is again suggestive of a post-classical horizon.[313]

4.6.4 Further elements for a direct dating

Heavenly Cow includes further expressions that lend themselves to a discussion in terms of direct dating.

4.6.4.1 *Heavenly Cow* 15: The syntax of *ist*

The following passage has an instance of an already discussed construction of *ist* that is relevant for dating:

---

310 Thus Hornung 1982: 53, n.19 ('... wobei wohl die jüngere Form automatisch eingefügt wurde').

311 With the first instance, one may be tempted to suppose that an original 22-23 *(...) *nn n nṯrw* (...) *nṯrw ipn* (with linguistic dissimilation) could have been altered into the extant text through extending *nn* from 22 to 23. No similar scenario is possible for the other instance (64).

312 P. Leiden I 348, XII.6 *pꜣ ẖrd pn n mwt≡f* 'this afore mentioned child of his mother', quoted by Popko, *TLA*, comment ad *Heavenly Cow* 23 (originally Katharina Stegbauer, p.c. to Lutz Popko).

313 Superficially similar is another case of a threefold formal alternation in the expression of a functional category, in one Coffin Text spell (Spell 720, CT VI 348-349; analyzed by Vernus 1996b: 153-4, ex.11a-e): this has object clauses marked by *is*, by *ntt*, and also doubly marked by *ntt* and *is* simultaneously. The double demonstrative marking in *Heavenly Cow* also results in a threefold alternation (*nn n N ipn*, alongside *N ipn* and *nn n N*), but differs from the Coffin Text case on two levels. (a) It remains unclear whether in CT 720 double marking is originally intended or not, see Vernus' (1996b: 154) open assessment: '(...) dans cette formule, la variation entre ces trois sous-types relève soit d'un souci de dissimilation grammaticale, soit d'une modernisation insuffisamment généralisée comme est insuffisamment généralisée dans cette même formule la substitution de *N tn* à la première personne (...)'. (b) In CT 720, no correlates of any sort can be identified to the use of *is* and *ntt*; in *Heavenly Cow*, on the other hand, the distribution of *ipn* and *nn n* is principled (above, A). Only in the latter composition, therefore, are the different expressions of a same category subject to deliberate linguistic manipulation, overruling the ordinary constraints of Egyptian syntax.

Heavenly Cow 11-16

nis mi n=i r irt=i r šw tfnwt gb nwt ḥnꜥ itw mwwt wnnyw ḥnꜥ=i
        ist wi m nnw
    ḥnꜥ gr nt̲r=i nnw (...)

'Call to my eye for me, if you please, and to Shu, Tefnut, Geb, and Nut,
together with the fathers and mothers who were with me,
        while I was in the Nun,
    and also my god, Nun (...)'

As the subsequent segment *ḥnꜥ gr nt̲r=i nnw* (16), yet another object of the act of
'calling' (*nis*, 11), implies, *ist wi m nnw* does not relate to a following clause. Seman-
tically, *ist wi m nnw* is dependent upon *itw mwwt wnnyw ḥnꜥ=i* (14-15), rather than
providing a mere background.[314] Accordingly, *Heavenly Cow* 14-15 is a case of *ist*
introducing a clause depending on a preceding main clause. As discussed above, this
construction remains undocumented until the Eighteenth Dynasty, did not arise
through regular linguistic change, and can be interpreted as a token of the written
language of the early New Kingdom (§4.5.2).

    The construction in *Heavenly Cow* 15 is in all likelihood integral to the original
text. If not, textual alteration would have had to be from a putative Middle Kingdom
(...) wnnyw ḥnꜥ=i iw=i m nnw (...). In the early New Kingdom, the *iw*-marked
construction was the one in regular use in all registers, while the *ist*-marked
construction is to be found in some higher written registers only. Positing the
secondariness of the transmitted text would then imply a textual alteration from a
construction that was regular in the early New Kingdom into a rare one that was then
associated with a strong recherché effect.

4.6.4.2 *Heavenly Cow* 2: *M-ḫt* expressing simultaneity

The incipit of *Heavenly Cow* reads:

Heavenly Cow 1-3

ḫpr [s]w[tꜣ w]bn rꜥ nt̲r ḫpr ds=f
m-ḫt wnn=fᵇ m nsyt
rmt̲w nt̲rw m ḫt wꜥty

'It occurred, then, that Re, the god who created himself, rose,
*when*ᶜ he was holding kingship,
men and gods being a single thing.'

a)   On text-initial *ḫpr swt* (...), §5.6.1.

---

314 Not entirely clear is *Heavenly Cow* 4-8 *wn.in rmt̲w ḥr kꜣt mdwt r ḫftyw rꜥ ist rf ḥm=f ꜥ.w.s. iꜣww
ḳsw=f m ḥd h3w=f m nbw šny=f m ḥsbd mꜣꜥ wn.in ḥm=f ḥr siꜣ mdt* (...) 'Men begun conceiving
plot against the enemies of Re (*scil.* Re himself), when His Majesty L.P.H. had become old, his
bones being of silver, his body of gold, his hair of true lapis-lazuli. His Majesty recognized the
matter (...)'. As in the passage discussed in the main text, the *ist*-headed clause also relates to
preceding, rather than to the following, clause. What remains unclear is whether such relation
involves outright dependency, or mere backgrounding; the presence of *rf* after *ist* may also be
relevant to the issue, although in ways that I am not fully capable of appreciating.

b)   Thus S; R.II has [*m-ḫt*] *wn=f*. The written morphology in S ist post-classical;[315] this of course remains entirely uncriterial for dating.[316]

c)   On the interpretation as a simultaneous, rather than anterior, temporal relation, compare the discussion below.

A. In Middle Egyptian, *m-ḫt* introducing a clause expresses anteriority.[317] Accordingly, an anterior meaning has been proposed for *Heavenly Cow* 2 as well.[318] This, however, is very unlikely. To begin with, *wn(n)* is hardly ever documented after *m-ḫt*, perhaps only once, in *Fowler*, P. Moscow 1695 vso 1-2[319] *ḫ3ti-ꜥ m mdt ḏdt.n s3 ḥri ḥ3m pw nt niwt rsi iwrw rn=f i3š m-ḫt wn=f m ḫnti n* [...] 'Beginning of the discourse spoken by Hori's son—he is a fisherman in the Southern City, Iuru by name, who had been called after he had been in the Palace[320] of(?) [...]'. This extremely scarce documentation is no accident, since it directly reflects the semantic tension between a preposition/conjunction expressing an anterior temporal relation (*m-ḫt*) and an event that is as non-transformative as one can be, *wn(n)*.

The unique instance in *Fowler* also differs from the one *Heavenly Cow* 2 in one important semantic respect. In *Fowler*, the anterior situation, a location of the subject, is presented as being over at the time of the main event. In *Heavenly Cow* 2, by contrast, the clause introduced by *m-ḫt* would express the *coming about* of a situation ('after he had taken hold of kingship(?)', i.e. after he had become king), with continuing validity in the present. Had this been the intended meaning, a verb expressing a transformative event, not *wn(n)*, would in all likelihood have been made recourse to: the construction would have been something along the lines of *ḫpr m nsyt, **m-ḫt sw ḫpr m nsyt*, **m-ḫt ḫpr=f m nsyt*, or the like.

B. The above establishes that *m-ḫt* in *Heavenly Cow* 2 expresses a simultaneous tense relation. As already mentioned, this meaning is never documented in Middle Egyptian 'proper', nor is it expected to be. It is, however, occasionally documented in literary registers of the New Kingdom, and, among texts that have been investigated in this respect, no less than six times in *Ani* (B 16.5; 16.12; 16.16; 20.13; 20.20; 21.18).[321]

---

315 In Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian, *m-ḫt* is usually followed by a form with the short stem, most probably the subjunctive; with *wnn* itself (a very rare combination), compare *Fowler*, P. Moscow 1695 vso 1-2 *m-ḫt wn=f* (...) (quoted in the main text). *M-ḫt wnn=f*, for its part, is paralleled in the Book of the Dead (*EG* §157.1; below, n.321).

316 In an only slightly different syntactic environment, compare the similar alternation in written forms in the incipit of *Neferti*: 1a-b Pet. *ḫpr.n swt wnn* (...), while other mss. have *ḫpr.n swt wn* (...). In the present case, the possibility of textual alteration is made even stronger by the fact that R.II actually has the correct form (*wn*).

317 Lastly Uljas 2007a: 260-3.

318 E.g. Hornung (1982: 37, 51, n.3), who translates: '(...) nachdem er das Königtum bekleidet hatte'.

319 Parkinson 2004: 88-9.

320 Parkinson 2004: 88, n.b.

321 After Quack 1994: 41, who qualifies such interpretation as secure ('zweifelsfrei'). A similar simultaneous meaning is also found in Book of the Dead, e.g. *m-ḫt wnn=f m nḫn=f* 'while Horus was in his youth', quoted in *EG* §157.1. NB: For various reasons, I take the *sḏm=f* in this construction to be a subjunctive functioning as a mode of syntactic dependency, unlike Quack who takes it to be a 'Perfekt'. This secondary issue is inconsequential to the present discussion and can therefore be left open here.

The change consisting in the rise of a simultaneous meaning of *m-ḫt* in the New Kingdom was presumably not the product of linguistic interaction, but a redefinition of functions in written language itself. This is best viewed in the broader context of the demise of the construction *preposition + finite form*, which during the transition to Late Egyptian was rapidly reduced to a limited set of bound and increasingly grammaticalized collocations. In this context, the semantics of *m-ḫt* before a finite form may have become less tightly defined than was the case when the overall system of combinations *preposition + finite form* was fully productive.[322]

Be the details as they may, the construction in *Heavenly Cow* 2 is post-classical and points to the early New Kingdom. It possibly even places the composition of *Heavenly Cow* in the later, rather than earlier, part of the Eighteenth Dynasty.

4.6.5 Varia

4.6.5.1 Two more cases of possible linguistic hybridity

Two further cases of possibly hybrid expressions, both from the second part of the overall text, are to be mentioned. Both these expressions seem to consist in a dissimilation vis-à-vis fairly recent expressions. The development of the latter would thereby be presupposed, as would a context in which such dissimilation could have been of interest to the composer.

A. *Heavenly Cow* has a remarkable construction that *resembles* the precursor construction of the conjunctive:[323]

(i) *Heavenly Cow* 211-213 (T, S, R.III; R.II not preserved)

s3w imit-t3-mw
ḥnꜥ grt irt sšw ntk r i3t nbt n ḥf3wt=k ntt im r-ḏd (...)

'Beware of the-snakes-in-the-earth-and-water,
and also make a piece of writing, you, about every hill, for your snakes which are there, saying: (...)'

The rise of the conjunctive is classically described along a path [D8-D18]*ḥnꜥ sḏm* (rarely *ḥnꜥ sḏm ntk*) > [D18]*ḥnꜥ-ntk sḏm* > [D19-...]*mtw=k sḏm*.[324] The construction in *Heavenly Cow* 212 obviously differs from the New Kingdom form of the construction, with mandatory expression of the agent before the verb. It comes close to the first stage of the path recalled above, yet in its particular form has two details of singular interest.[325]

To begin with, the mention of the agent (*ntk*), which is co-referential with the manipulee of the preceding imperative, is here redundant. The First Intermediate Period, Middle Kingdom, and Second Intermediate Period precursor construction *ḥnꜥ*

---

322 This account is essentially compatible with Quack's (1994: 41, 'Vielleicht spielt hier der Wechsel bzw. die Kombinierbarkeit mit *ḫft* eine Rolle'), only setting the author's more particularized approach into a broader context of ongoing linguistic change.

323 Kroeber 1970: 160, ex.20; Hornung 1982: 64, n.140; Spalinger 2000: 260.

324 Gardiner 1928; Kroeber 1970: 140-70; Winand 1992: §709-23.

325 The following only expands on Kroeber's (1970: 160, ex.20) insightful analysis.

sḏm is infinitival: it serves in cases when the event has the same agent as a preceding clause. Only exceptionally is an agent specified, and only when this is different from the subject of the preceding clause.

In addition, the expression of this agent (*ntk*) is in *Heavenly Cow* 211-213 placed after the direct object (*sšw*), rather than before it as seems to have been the rule in actual instances of stage one.[326] Compare, with a pronominal agent: Siut I 313[327] (...) *ḥnꜥ rḏt ntsn tꜣ gmḥt 2* '(...) and that they should give these two tapers.' More significant yet is the following, where the agent, even though a full noun, stays in close contact to the verb and before the object: Siut I 308[328] (...) *ḥnꜥ rḏt in wꜥb imi ꜣbd=f pꜣḳ* (...) '(...) and that the *wab*-priest who is in his month gives him the *paq*-bread (...)'.

These combined observations have led Kroeber to describing the 'ein wenig monströs anmutende Konstruktion' in *Heavenly Cow* as an 'etwas ungeschickter Klassizismus'.[329] As observed, the expression of the agent is at odds with the pre-New Kingdom construction, both functionally and formally. The construction in *Heavenly Cow* 211-213 therefore presupposes the early New Kingdom construction with mandatory expression of the agent. In placing the agent in the wrong place, the composer secondarily dissimilates the construction from the actual early New Kingdom one, possibly to make it look older. The result, however, is not the original construction, from which it differs on the two accounts discussed, the presence of the agent and its placement. This may be interpreted as a case of failed imitation of the old construction; more likely, however, is an interpretation in which the composer's intent lay with dissimilation itself. Be this as it may, the construction in *Heavenly Cow* 211-213, unique as it is, presupposes the early New Kingdom construction.

NB. *Grt*, inserted between *ḥnꜥ* and the infinitive, has been noted as well.[330] Syntactically, this poses no problem, compare *Eloquent Peasant* R 18.4 (...) *ḥnꜥ swt irt* (...) (§2.4.4.3, (iii)). On a semantic level, one may wonder whether *grt*, which lacks the adversative force of *swt*, is not here slightly redundant in view of the continuative force inherent to the conjunctive itself.[331] I remain agnostic and renounce interpreting further.

---

326 The two examples quoted in the main text are in continuation of another infinitive, and do not therefore qualify as precursor constructions of the conjunctive in a strict functional sense. Actual instances of the precursor construction of the conjunctive with the agent expressed remain undocumented, and for a very good reason: the conjunctive originated in, and further developed as, a *same*-agent construction. As regards the specific point here of interest, namely the formal aspect of how the agent after *ḥnꜥ* + *infinitive* is introduced, the examples quoted are no less directly relevant.

327 Gardiner 1928: 88, ex.12.

328 Kroeber 1970: 159, ex.18.

329 Kroeber 1970: 160.

330 Kroeber 1970: 160.

331 Kroeber 1970: 160. The combination *ḥnꜥ gr(t)* recurs in *Heavenly Cow* 16, in an altogether different syntactic environment, before a full noun. In this passage, the combination is motivated by the sheer length of the phrase of which it is part, interrupted by an intervening dependent clause: *r irt=i r šw* (...) *ḥnꜥ itiw* (...) – *ist* (...) – *ḥnꜥ gr* (...) (full quotation: §4.6.4.1).

B. *Heavenly Cow* 234 (fully preserved only in S) reads (...) *nt imiw=sn* '(...) who are in them'. Fecht[332] has proposed that this be interpreted as a hybrid ('Kreuzung') between recent *nti-im*(*w*) (> Coptic ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲀⲨ) and old *imiw=sn*. As Fecht further observes, 'proper' Middle Egyptian would have had either *imiw=sn*, or *ntiw im*, not *ntiw im=sn*.

4.6.5.2   Late features

Heavenly Cow accommodates a few recent expressions that unlike the ones initially mentioned (§4.6.0) could provide some further indications for dating.

A. *Heavenly Cow* has an instance of a causative construction *rḏi NP ḥr sḏm*:[333]

> (i) *Heavenly Cow* 69-70
>
> *rḏ{t}.in ḥm n nṯr pn ꜥꜣ ḥnsktt nty m iwnw ḥr nḏ ddty ipn*
>
> 'The Majesty of this great god then caused the Curled one who is Heliopolis to grind this ochre.'

In Middle Egyptian, syntactic causatives are with a (subjunctive) *sḏm=f* (*rḏi sḏm=f*); the construction is extraordinarily common. The construction *rḏi NP ḥr sḏm*, for its part, is documented in Ramesside times, if rarely.[334]

B. *Heavenly Cow* has an instance of a construction *ib n N r sḏm* that upon closer inspection may be indicative for dating:

> (ii) *Heavenly Cow* 261-262
>
> *ir wnn ib n ḏḥwti r šd st ḥr rꜥ* (...)
>
> 'If Thot wants to recite this about Re (...)'

The construction *ib=f r sḏm*[335] is documented since the Middle Kingdom.[336] What is noteworthy in *Heavenly Cow* 261-262 is the syntax of the full noun *ḏḥwty*, introduced as a complement to *ib* (*ib n ḏḥwty*). In the Middle Kingdom, a different syntax is observed, with the full noun agent anticipated before *ib*:

> (iii) P. UC 32205, 9-10
>
> *iw ꜣ bꜣk im* [*ib*]=*f r rḫ sḥr nb n nb ꜥ.w.s* (...)
>
> 'This humble servant wants to know every condition of the lord, L.P.H. (...)'

> In the Middle Kingdom, this is the only case of a construction *ib=f r sḏm* with full noun agent that I am aware of. The construction, however, is consistent with aspects of the broader syntax of inalienable entities: in the Middle Kingdom and

---

332 In Hornung 1982: 126, n.kk.
333 Noted by Popko, *TLA*.
334 Wente 1967: 27, n.s; 1962: 126, n.b; Erman 1933[2]: 210, §435.
335 Polis & Stauder in prep.
336 E.g. also in an hypothetical clause, *Sinuhe* B 125 *ir wnn ib=f r ꜥḥꜣ* (...) 'If he wants to fight (...)'.

later still, the possessor of an inalienable entity (such as a body port) is always anticipated before that entity in subject-initial patterns.[337]

The genitival construction, as in *Heavenly Cow* 261-262 is common in the New Kingdom.[338] To my knowledge, its first occurrence is in a Second Intermediate Period inscription:[339]

(iv) Seneferibre Senwosret IV's *Karnak Stela* (late D.16?[340]), 1-2

[...] *wnt*[?] *ib n ḥm=f ꜥ.w.s. r irt mnw n imn rꜥ* [...]

'[...] that(?) His Majesty L.P.H. wanted to make a monument for Amun-Re [...]'

C. The beginning of *Heavenly Cow* 236 is corrupt, in some way or another. Of the two scenarios sketched by Fecht,[341] the first implies a recent *Lautstand*, while the latter implies a hypercorrection. Either way, so argues Fecht, the implied underlying original reading would be post-classical. I remain agnostic as to whether an indication for dating can be here derived, or not.

4.6.6 Dating *Heavenly Cow*

A. *Heavenly Cow* includes a set of linguistic expressions that all convergently point to an Eighteenth Dynasty date of composition. Among these, the use of a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive fully integrated into the narrative frame (130: §4.6.1.2) is a very strong indication; so is the hybrid construction *ꜥḥꜥ.in rf tꜣ m kkw* (132: §4.6.2). Weighty indications for the same dating are afforded by the distribution of *ipn* demonstratives in context (*passim*: §4.6.3), a construction of *ist* (15: §4.6.4.1), and *m-ḫt* introducing a simultaneous tense clause (2: §4.6.4.2). More weakly indicative, yet significant as part of an overall tableau, are the distribution of narrative constructions (§4.6.1, introduction), the hybrid construction of the conjunctive (211-213: §4.6.5.1.A), one expression for 'dawning' (77-79: §4.6.1.1, (ii)), and some late features (69-70 *rḏi NP ḥr sḏm*: §4.6.5.2.A; 261-262 *ib n N r sḏm*: §4.6.5.2.B).

Based on the above, *Heavenly Cow* can be declared an Eighteenth Dynasty composition. A finer dating within the Eighteenth Dynasty is near impossible on linguistic grounds.[342] With due caution, simultaneous *m-ḫt* (§4.6.4.2) may suggest a later rather than earlier period in the Eighteenth Dynasty.

B. A few closing remarks are due on the specific linguistic typology of *Heavenly Cow*. The above dating was not based on late expressions: very few of these are found

---

337 E.g., among many other possible examples, *Cheops' Court* 9.12 *wn.in ḥm=f ib=f wꜣw r ḏwt ḥr=s* 'His Majesty's heart fell into a bad mood about it' (also §2.4.4.6, (i)).

338 E.g. *Urk.* IV 181, 11; 181, 17; etc. Further references to be given in Polis & Stauder in prep.

339 *Cheops' Court* 5.3-4 *ib n ḥm=k r ḳbb* (...) 'The heart of your Majesty will be cool (...)' is a different construction: (a) *ib* has full lexical value; (b) *ib* is clause-initial (see §2.4.4.5, (iii)).

340 According to Ryholt 1997: 157, 306.

341 In Hornung 1982: 126, n.ll.

342 Based on non-linguistic considerations, a dating to the reigns of Amenhotep III or Tutankhamun is contemplated by Hornung 1982: 80-1.

in *Heavenly Cow* (§4.6.5.2.A-B) and none in isolation would have afforded an indica-
tion dense enough to support a claim on dating. Well into the Eighteenth Dynasty,
Heavenly Cow is still fully oriented on Middle Egyptian. Pars pro toto, the productive
use of *N(P) sḏm=f* may be mentioned, expressing habitual aspect[343] and as an
unmarked relative present tense.[344] By classical strategies indexed on linguistic
change, the composition would be undatable.

Rather, the expressions discussed above have to do with written repertoires,
creative recompositions, functional redefinitions, and/or hybridity (§4.6.1.2; §4.6.2-4;
§4.6.5.1.A). That a great many such phenomena are observed in *Heavenly Cow* relates
to the particular contents and cultural siting of the composition. Literary texts proper
will not display similarly dense phenomena, nor are they therefore as easily datable as
Heavenly Cow is. In its linguistic typology, *Heavenly Cow* differs from all types of
texts discussed so far, literary and non-literary ones alike: the composition documents
yet another configuration of Middle Egyptian in the early New Kingdom.

4.6.7 Appendix: Lexical notes

Various lexical expressions in *Heavenly Cow* seem to be of late attestation only; some
of these carry more weight than others. These are noted here for the sake of a fuller
description of the linguistic typology of the composition: the actual dating was carried
out in the previous discussion on non-lexical grounds.

A. One word in *Heavenly Cow* deserves a special mention, because this is well
documented throughout Egyptian history, changed form over time, and has merited a
detailed lexicographical study:[345]

(i) *Heavenly Cow* 155 *sdȝdȝ* 'tremble'

In its original, shorter form, *sdȝ* 'tremble' is common since Pyramid Texts and
throughout the second millennium. The reduplicated form is first securely attested in
the Nineteenth Dynasty;[346] in Ramesside times and all the more so in later ones, the
reduplicated form is increasingly the regular one (> ⲥⲧⲱⲧ[347]). (Only one pre-New
Kingdom instance of a reduplicated form has been noted, as a textual variant in one
Coffin Text passage:[348] the form, *sȝdd*, is unlike later *sdȝdȝ* of which it is hardly a
forerunner; the construction is also unexpectedly transitive[349] and the reading

---

343 *Heavenly Cow* 192 *ꜥk=sn iw=i ḥm(=i) rꜥ nb* 'When they come in, I retreat daily' (note the initial
     setting and the quantifier); sim. 215 *mk wi wbn=i n=sn* 'Behold, I rise for them.'
344 *Heavenly Cow* 34 *mtn wi ḥḥy=i n smȝ.n=i st r sḏm.t{w}=i ḏd.ti=tn r=s* 'Behold, I try, but I can
     not kill them until I have heard what you are going to say about it.'
345 Jambon 2005: 34-58.
346 Jambon 2005: 41, table 1. One possible Eighteenth Dynasty instance (*sdd*, without semogram) is
     uncertain: Jambon 2005: 41, n.a. For the singular *sȝdd* in Coffin Texts, below.
347 Jambon 2005: 35.
348 Jambon 2005: 49, n.95; 50 and n.98. CT I 205f *sȝdd=k ȝḫt mi rꜥ* 'may you make the Akhet tremble
     like Re' (B12C, B17C, B16C; probably also B13C *sȝdd* [...] and B14, without reduplication, *sȝd=k
     ȝḫt mi rꜥ*).
349 In itself, the causative meaning would not pose a problem as causatives of verbs with a first root
     consonant *s* often have only one *s* in written representation (Schenkel 1999). See however the next
     note.

probably secondary.[350]) The rise of the reduplicated form in the New Kingdom is analyzed as a process of refection on both the morphological and the graphic levels.[351] The lack of pre-New Kingdom occurrences of *sdꜣdꜣ* is therefore hardly a gap in the record.

B. Among possible lexical indications, the following is noteworthy, since it involves a word-play that is possible only under the more recent morphology of the two words involved:[352]

(ii) *Heavenly Cow* 246-247
iw=i grt r rdt ꜥnꜥn=k ḥꜣw-nbw
ḫpr ꜥnꜥn pw n ḏḥwti
' "I will also have you drive back (*ꜥnꜥn*) the *Hau-nebu*."
This is how the baboon (*ꜥnꜥn*) of Thot came into being.'

> Fully reduplicated *ꜥnꜥn* 'drive back' is apparently attested only in the New Kingdom,[353] and contrasts with older *ꜥn* and *ꜥnn*. The second term of the word-play, *ꜥnꜥn* 'baboon', is very rare, and also contrasts with a shorter form, *iꜥn*, consistently used in older texts.[354] Although the pattern of attestation of *ꜥnꜥn* 'drive back' can not be fully assessed as to its reliability, it may therefore be observed that *ꜥnꜥn* is similar in meaning to another word from the same root, well documented in earlier times. That *ꜥnꜥn* in *Heavenly Cow* is part of a word-play further implies that the recent morphology of the word (*ꜥnꜥn* rather than *ꜥn* or *ꜥnn*) is not be the product of some process of textual alteration. If the pattern of attestation of *ꜥnꜥn* 'drive back' is reliable, this implies that at least this etiology is late, either as an addition to, or as an integral part of, the original composition. The first possibility can not be excluded, since the etiology is here from the second part of the overall text.

C. No similarly developed arguments can be made on the following expressions. Among these, (iii) and (iv) are not entirely uncommon in general; (v) and (vi) are very rare and their patterns of attestation are therefore impossible to assess as to their reliability.

---

350 Similar assessment by Wolfgang Schenkel (p.c. 8/2013); the original reading seems to have been the one documented in B10Cb and B10Cc *sdꜣ n=k ꜣḫt mi rꜥ* 'may the Akhet tremble for you like Re', a common formulation. In accounting for how the reading in B12C, etc., may have arisen, the *n* in the dative *n=k* could have been misread into a *d* in the hieratic; this *d* would then have been secondarily placed before the semogram. This still leaves *sꜣd* (<*s sꜣ ꜣ d*>) unaccounted for. (I thank Wolfgang Schenkel for discussion of this passage.)

351 Jambon 2005: 46, 57.

352 On the etiology itself, Hornung 1982: 67, n.168.

353 The expression, noted as 'nur nR' in *DZA* 21.733.350, recurs in *Duties of the Vizier* R 11 and R 27 (discussion by van den Boorn 1998: 111-2; on the dating of *Duties*, §2.8.3.5), in *Satirical Letter* 13.2 (*TLA* #38290), in *LEM* 123.1 (*DZA* 21.733.410; interpreted differently in *Wb.* I 191.11; see Dils, *TLA*, comment on *Satirical Letter* 13.2), and in Medinet Habu (*DZA* 21.733.380).

354 For Pyr. §1304a (PT 539), *DZA* 21.733.340 notes [ꜥ]*nꜥnw* under 'baboon'; this is to be read differently, as [ḥ]*nꜥ nw* 'and Nu' (Allen 2005: 169).

(iii) *Heavenly Cow* 19 *ḏri* 'firm, strong'

This word, which is not uncommon,[355] is first securely attested in the New Kingdom.[356]

(iv) *Heavenly Cow* 60 (...) *šꜥ-m nni-nsw* '(...) from (as far as) Herakleopolis'

As *šꜥ-n*, the preposition occurs twice in late Twelfth Dynasty documentary registers (Illahun); as *šꜥ-r*, it is found first in a Thirteenth Dynasty documentary register (P. Bulaq XVIII) and remains limited in its distribution. As *šꜥ-m*, the preposition is documented first in Thutmoside times, then in Amarna, post-Amarna, and early Ramesside times;[357] *šꜥ-m* is fairly common throughout the earlier half of the New Kingdom (§2.7.3.3, (i)).

(v) *Heavenly Cow* 83 *<n>hp* 'get up early in the morning'

The verb, which is rare at all times, may not be documented before the New Kingdom,[358] at least not with the meaning here relevant.[359]

(vi) *Heavenly Cow* 84 *nfrw grḥ* 'the deep of the night'

The expression is apparently documented only in the New Kingdom.[360]

4.7   The *Royal Cycle*

The *Royal Cycle*, consisting in the *Divine Birth*, the *Royal Youth*, and the *Proclamation as Regent*, is first documented in Deir el-Bahari (Hatshepsut), then in Luxor (Amenhotep III).[361] The *Cycle* is often viewed as an Hatshepsutian composition, yet dissenting opinions have been voiced.[362]

The motif of the divine birth recurs in *Cheops' Court*, documented in a manuscript that probably dates to the late Second Intermediate Period; linguistically, the composition could be as early as the Thirteenth Dynasty (§2.4.4.1). In a visual mode of expression, the motif is now documented in the causeway of Senwosret III's

---

355 See *TLA* #184860.
356 'Belegt seit D.18' according to *DZA* 31.678.260. A possibly earlier occurrence in *Khakheperreseneb* vso 3 is subject to debate (see Dils, *TLA*), as is the dating of that composition itself (not before the early Thirteenth Dynasty: §2.7).
357 See *TLA* #550077.
358 According to *DZA* 25.178.760, the word is 'belegt D.18 bis Griech.' An early occurrence is Rekhmire 13 (*Urk*. IV 1075, 11).
359 *TLA* #85470 proposes to relate the word to *nhp* 'lebensvoll sein', which is of older attestation (once in CT I 228d).
360 *Wb*. II 260.17; noted by Hornung 1982: 57, n.58.
361 Text: *Urk*. IV 215-62; for the Luxor version (Amenhotep III), Brunner 1986². The composition on *Chapelle Rouge*, paralleled in Deir el-Bahari, is arguably part of the overall cycle; it was extraposed for discussion above (§4.1.2).
362 E.g. Brunner 1986²: 187, who favors a dating to a period before the Fourth Dynasty. According to von Lieven 2007: 240, a dating to the time of Hatshepsut is 'hinfällig' and *Divine Birth* and *Royal Youth* should be dated to the Old Kingdom.

pyramid complex in Dahshur.[363] That the motif is older than Hatshepsut is thereby well established. Dating its textualization in the specific form first documented in Deir el-Bahari is an altogether different issue, however: the composition may have drawn on older motifs. The proclamation of royal names in *Proclamation as Regent* has also been noted to find parallels in the fragmentary Late Twelfth Dynasty blocks Berlin 15801-15804. How specific these parallels are is disputed;[364] no conclusions are supported by what could well be a formulary.

4.7.1   Old Egyptian expressions

A. The *Cycle* includes a great many Old Egyptian expressions. When simply taken note of, without further study, these expressions can be interpreted in two ways, either as pointing to a genuinely old composition, or as reflecting archaizing practices:[365]

(a) *Older form of a category*

- *ꞽsk* for *ꞽst̲*:   *Urk*. IV 219, 4; 228, 4; 260, 6; 260, 17; 261, 12.

(b) *Older morphological categories*

- *Pw* demonstratives: *Urk*. IV 221, 9; 257, 7-8; 257, 9;

- *ꞽpn* demonstratives: *Urk*. IV 237, 5; 257, 1;

- *T̲wt/swt*:   *Urk*. IV 222, 10; 228, 9; 229, 12 (*twt*); *Urk*. IV 221, 14; 257, 9; 257, 11; 257, 14; 257, 15; 257, 17; 258, 2 (*swt*).

(c) *Syntax*

- *ꞽs* in a complement clause: *Urk*. IV 260, 6;

- *S̲dm.ḥr=f*:   *Urk*. IV 245, 16; 245, 17;

- *N swt NP*:   *Urk*. IV 258, 2 (...) *n swt nt̲r(t)=t̲n s3t nt̲r* '(...) for she is your goddess, the daughter of a god';

- *NP s̲dm.t=f(y)*:[366]   *Urk*. IV 221, 14 (quoted below, C); 257, 17 (...) *swt ḥm ꞽw.t=f(y) ḥr-ꜥ(wꞽ)* (...) '(...) he will come back at once (...)'.

---

363 Oppenheim 2011.

364 Müller 2013 argues that the parallels are not as strong as sometimes assumed and mostly phraseological in nature. Biston-Moulin 2012 (*non vidi*), on the other hand, finds at least one specific detail in common between the Berlin blocks and the Deir el-Bahari text (Dimitri Laboury, p.c. 1/2013).

365 Thus Brunner 1986²: 175-6 ('... ist methodisch ungewöhnlich schwierig'), and *passim* (for each scene sub 'Alterskriterien'). Von Lieven 2007: 240 refers to Brunner, but does not take up the author's methodological caveat and declares the composition 'sprachlich altägyptisch' without further comment.

366 A very rare construction, see Gundacker 2012: 75-9; Doret 1989: 61; Edel 1955-1964: §950; Gunn 2012²: 58-9.

All these expressions are paralleled, mostly directly, rarely indirectly, in later times, in the Middle Kingdom or in the early Thutmoside period (below, B). More importantly, the Old Egyptian expressions in the *Cycle* are only a selection of Old Egyptian, strongly skewed toward such expressions that based on their outward form are saliently old, i.e. easily recognized as such. Syntactic constructions in the *Cycle* (c) all come with some distinctive element of form, immediately noted as such: there is no case of an expression that would involve a matching of form and function specific to Old Egyptian. All other Old Egyptian expressions in the *Cycle* have to do with morphology (a)-(b): for these, their formal distinctiveness is quite literally immediate. Such skewed selection does not define a cohesive Old Egyptian layer: the *Cycle* is composed in Middle Egyptian, interspersed with high quantities of older expressions. (Unsurprisingly, archaizing practices in the *Cycle* extend beyond grammar, to two other dimensions in which the associated effects are naturally salient, the lexicon[367] and orthography.[368])

B. Identifying an archaizing intent does not in itself suffice for dating: without further analysis, a text with archaizing features could have been composed at various post-Old Kingdom times, such as in the Middle Kingdom or in the early New Kingdom. As it turns out, some of the above expressions are documented in archaizing use in the Middle Kingdom:

- *Pw* demonstratives: *Chapelle Blanche* n°180 *šrt=k tw*[sic] *nfrt* 'this beautiful nose of yours'; alluding to such formulations, *Sinuhe* B 237 *fnd=k pw* 'this nose of yours': see §4.1.2.B;

- *Ipn* demonstratives: Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela* 12; also in *Tod Inscription* 29, possibly dating to the Middle Kingdom: see §4.6.3.A;

- *Twt*/*swt*:   *Chapelle Blanche* n°170; 253; 259; *Ptahhotep* 398 L1: see §6.3.1.1 and §6.3.1.2.A;

- *Sdm.ḥr=f*:   *Eloquent Peasant* B1 219; Herwerre (*temp.* Amenemhat III), 9: see §2.4.3.2, (i).

Only a subset of the Old Egyptian expressions in the *Cycle* can thus be paralleled as archaizing features in Middle Kingdom texts. In addition, these parallels are dispersed over a great variety of places: only one text, *Chapelle Blanche*, has two of the archaizing expressions here relevant; in all other cases, the archaizing expression remains isolated. No preserved Middle Kingdom text has anything that comes close to the broad repertoire of Old Egyptian expressions in the *Cycle*.

---

367 For old expressions in the lexicon, Brunner 1986[2]: *passim*, in each scene sub 'Alterskriterien'.

368 Most remarkable is a singular spelling of the preposition *mi* with phonetic complementation by *m* (*Urk.* IV 258, 1), typical of the Old Kingdom. Typical features of Old Egyptian orthography further include the plural by triplication (e.g. *Urk.* IV 261, 3; 261, 13 *rnw* as <*r n r n r n*>), the full complementation of *ḫpr* as <*ḫ p r ḫpr*> (*Urk.* IV 245, 17; 261, 12) or the spelling of *in* complemented by A27 (e.g. *Urk.* IV 245, 13; 260, 14; 261, 1). Also Brunner 1986[2]: *passim*, in each scene sub 'Alterskriterien'.

A rather different situation is observed in inscriptions for which a dating to Hatshepsut is undisputed and in some related inscriptions of Thutmosis III:

- *Ꜣsk* for *ist*:

Hatshepsut: *Urk.* IV 346, 9; 347, 11 (*Punt Expedition*);

Thutmosis III: *Karnak Building Inscription* 1 (*Urk.* IV 157, 3); *Urk.* IV 564, 2 (from a discourse by Amun about his relationship to the king; Karnak);

- *Pw* demonstratives:

Hatshepsut: *Chapelle Rouge*, p.107: III.7 (H*HBT* II 11, 16); p.130: VII.2 (H*HBT* II 23, 14);

- *Ꜣpn* demonstratives:

Thutmosis III: *Karnak Building Inscription* 13 (*Urk.* IV 161, 4); 22 (*Urk.* IV 165, 7); 30 (*Urk.* IV 168, 12); *Urk.* IV 182, 8 (in another inscription by Thutmosis III in Karnak);

- *Ṯwt/swt*:

Hatshepsut: *Urk.* IV 343, 10 (*Punt Expedition*) *twt*;

also in Senemiah 18 (*Urk.* IV 503, 17: *swt*), a contemporaneous private inscription that, incidentally, explicitly alludes to *Punt Expedition* (§6.3.1.1, and NB);

- *Ꜣs* in complement clauses:

Thutmosis III: *Karnak Building Inscription* 20 (*Urk.* IV 164, 5);

Ꜣs in complement clauses is not otherwise directly documented in Hatshepsutian compositions; see however various other constructions with *is* in the Hatshepsutian corpus, among which the strongly archaizing *NP is* in similes: Northern Obelisk, Basis D 25 (*Urk.* IV 367, 6-7);[369]

- *Sḏm.ḫr=f*:

Hatshepsut: *Urk.* IV 324, 6 (*Punt Expedition*: §4.2.1, (vi));

On *wn.ḫr=f*-headed constructions, common in texts of the times of Hatshepsut and Thutmosis III: §4.1.2.C-D.

Further compare *sḏm.kꜣ=f* in *Urk.* IV 346, 16 *Punt Expedition* 18) and *Urk.* IV 569, 10; 569, 12 (in a divine discourse; *temp.* Thutmosis III). On *wn.kꜣ=f*-headed constructions in *Chapelle Rouge*: §4.1.2.E.

---

369 Other constructions with *is* are also regularly used in the Middle Kingdom and therefore not directly relevant to the present discussion. These include subordinating *is* as in *Urk.* IV 324, 12-14 (*Punt Expedition*: §4.2.1, (v)); Northern Obelisk, Basis D 9 (*Urk.* IV 363, 7). For *is* with modal value in a main clause (also regularly in the Middle Kingdom), *Chapelle Rouge*, p.125: VI.8-11 (§4.2.1, (viii)).

The set of Old Egyptian expressions featured in the *Cycle* can thus be fully paralleled[370] as recurrently associated with each other in three texts that are very concentrated in time: *Chapelle Rouge*, *Punt Expedition*, and Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription*. These expressions are not a general feature of Thutmoside Middle Egyptian: except for *ipn* (a Sonderfall, for which see below, C), they are mainly, or exclusively, found in the texts mentioned above in the Eighteenth Dynasty. The selection of Old Egyptian expressions in the *Cycle* thereby appears as a coherent repertoire, shared with other compositions contemporaneous with the inscription of the *Cycle* in Deir el-Bahari. Of these, two are themselves inscribed in Deir el-Bahari (*Punt Expedition*, as well as the D-version of the composition here referred to as *Chapelle Rouge*). The cohesive nature of this repertoire is a strong argument to date the *Cycle* to the specific horizon in written culture just evoked.

C. The analysis is confirmed when, beyond mere listing, the particular ways these expressions are used in text are drawn into account. As it turns out, the Old Egyptian expressions in the *Cycle* are used in specific ways, rather than on a general or regular basis as would be the case in Old Egyptian itself. Moreover, the specific ways in which they are used are directly paralleled in *Punt Expedition*, *Chapelle Rouge*, and Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription*. This is consistent with an analysis of such uses as indexically over-determined:

- *Ꞽsk* for *ist̠*:

The construction in *Urk.* IV 219, 4 (§4.7.2, (i)) and 228, 4 (§4.7.2, (ii))—which does not fit Middle Egyptian, nor Old Egyptian, syntax (§4.5.2; §4.7.2.A)—is itself paralleled in Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription* (*Urk.* IV 157, 3: §4.5.2, (iv)).

- *Pw* demonstratives:

Pw demonstratives are used in the *Cycle* with nouns to do with kingship: *Urk.* IV 221, 9 [*ns*]*yt tw* 'this kingship'; *Urk.* IV 257, 9 *ḫnd=i pw bꜣ* 'this my precious throne'; probably also *Urk.* IV 257, 7-8 *st-ti=i tw* 'this my royal representative'. The same correlation is observed in *Chapelle Rouge*, p.107: III.7 *tꜣ pw* 'this land'; p.130: VII.2 *nsw pw* 'this king'.

In *Urk.* IV 257, 9, the *pw* demonstrative is associated with an antiquated word, *ḫnd*. In a similar fashion, the *pw* phrase is in *Chapelle Rouge*, p.107: III.7 associated with an extremely recherché verb, *snbꜣbꜣ* (discussed above, §4.1.2.B).

---

370 Only *n swt NP* and *NP sḏm.t=f(y)* are not directly paralleled. The first is common while the second is rare; both are associated with early funerary corpora (Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts). These were demonstrably cultivated by Hatshesput's and Thutmosis III's times (e.g. Dorman 1991) Significantly, the association with funerary literature goes on in the early New Kingdom, with occurrences of *n swt NP* in the Book of the Dead.

- *Ipn* demonstratives:

Of the two instances of *ipn* demonstratives in the *Cycle*, one is *Urk.* IV 237, 5 *mnw=t ipn* 'these monuments of yours'. This very same association recurs in Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription* 30 (*Urk.* IV 168, 12) *sbꜣw ipn* 'these doors'. This is specific to the Hatshepsut/Thutmosis III horizon here discussed.

> NB 1. The other occurrence of *ipn* in the *Cycle* is according to a convention that relates to the 'Royal Tale': *Urk.* IV 256, 17 - 257, 5 *ḫpr* [*ḥm*]*st nsw ḏs=f m ḏꜣdw n imi-wrt iw rmṯw ipn ḥr ẖwt=sn m stp-sꜣ sw ḏd ḥm=f ḫft=sn* 'Occurrence of a throne session of the king himself in the audience hall of the *Imi-weret*-phyle. These people were on their bellies in the palace. His Majesty speaks before them.' Compare Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription* 22 (*Urk.* IV 165, 7) *smrw ipn ḏd=sn* 'These companions say' (sim. *Urk.* IV 182, 8 *smrw ipn* [*w*]*š*[*b=sn ḥr ḥm=f*] 'These companions answer to His Majesty'). This correlation with the *Royal Tale* is not specific to the Hatshepsut/Thutmosis III horizon here discussed: it recurs in earlier and in later times as well, from Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela* 12 (mid-Thirteenth Dynasty) to *Kuban Stela* 23 (early Ramesside), including in two other texts of the times of Thutmosis III, *Gebel Barkal Stela* 42 (*Urk.* IV 1241, 2) and *Appointment of the Vizier* 7; 8 (§4.6.3.B, (b)).

> NB 2. A more general association with items of kingship is in *Karnak Building Inscription* 13 (*Urk.* IV 161, 4) *ḥꜥw=f ipn* 'these crowns of his'. One therefore wonders whether the *ipn* demonstrative could here be functioning in a suppletive paradigm with the *pw* demonstrative (above), as is also suggested by the fact that *pw* demonstratives are only documented in singular forms. If this were the case, such paradigm would readily be accounted for in terms of formal distinctiveness: by definition, *ipn* demonstratives are formally distinct from Middle Egyptian forms of the same series (*pn*, *tn*) only in the plural.

- *Ṯwt/swt*:

Except for three cases in immediate succession to each other (*Urk.* IV 257, 14; 257, 15; 257, 17), *ṯwt* and *swt* are used in the *Cycle* in statements about Hatshepsut claiming kingship, e.g. *Urk.* IV 221, 12 *swt ḥḳꜣ.t=s(y) tꜣwy* 'She is the one who will rule the Dual Land'; 229, 12 *ṯwt nsw itt ḫꜥ ḥr st ḥr n ꜥnḫw ḏt* 'Thou are a king who seizes having risen on the seat of Horus of the living, eternally.' This directly compares with the one occurrence in *Punt Expedition*, *Urk.* IV 343, 10 *ṯwt nsw itt tꜣwy ḫt-špswt-ẖnm-imn* 'Thou are the king who seizes the Dual Land, Hatshepsut-Khenemamun.'

D. The composed nature of the language in the *Cycle*[371] is also manifest in how salient effects accumulate in some places, stretching grammar to its outmost, and in some cases possibly beyond.[372]

---

371 In different terms, similar assessments on Hatshepsutian language more broadly are by Vernus 1990a: 65 (speaking of *-ḥr*-infixed constructions); Uljas 2007a: 283 (speaking of the uses of *is* in the Hatshepsut/Thutmosis III horizon): '(...) it experienced a brief revival (...) it appears to have

(i) *Urk*. IV 257, 5-9 (*Proclamation as Regent*)

sw ḏd ḥm=f (...)

swt ḥm pw ḥms=s ḥr ḫnd=i pw bi3

'His Majesty says: "(...)

It is however so that she is the one who will sit down on this precious throne." '

> *Sw sḏm N*—whatever its status (§4.7.3)—is a construction that is saliently different from regular Thutmoside inscriptional Middle Egyptian. The following clause combines two Old Egyptian morphological categories (*swt*; *pw*) and one antiquated word (*ḫnd*). Beyond archaizing effects, the thoroughly recherché nature of the formulation is also manifest in the contorted construction: a cleft-sentence is here combined with *ḥm* and additionally made thetic by another *pw* (*swt ḥm pw* (...)).

(ii) *Urk*. IV 243, 7 (*Royal Youth*)

sw swt rḏ m3 s(i) nṯrw nbw šm˓w mḥw

'He makes the gods, the lords of Upper and Lower Egypt, see her.'

> Apparently a combination of a *sw sḏm* construction with the Old Egyptian pronoun *swt* (adversative *swt* is unlikely in context); alternatively, a cleft-sentence with *swt* as its subject and preceded by *sw* functioning as a particle. Either way, a *sw*-headed construction of some sort is involved, which—again, independently of however this is to be analyzed—is in itself remarkable and this *sw*-headed construction is, somehow, combined with *swt*, in what is almost a grammatical pun.

(iii) *Urk*. IV 260, 6 (*Proclamation as Regent*)

isk sn rḫw i[...][a] *s3t nṯr is pw*

'For they knew it was a divine daughter.'

a) The interpretation of the read-leaf before the lacuna is unclear. Sethe's suggestion to read as *i*[*w*] is ungrammatical, as noted by Sethe himself. Oréal suggested to read *i*[*s*], and provided a semantic analysis under which this could be possible.[373] Whether this would fit the length of the lacuna can not be assessed further based on the text in *Urkunden*.

---

been employed as a conscious archaism with a particularly elevated flavour, and it seems, not always correctly'; Oréal 2011: *passim* (in the sections devoted to developments in early Égyptien de tradition).

372 The phenomenon extends to orthography, where an eloquent illustration is afforded by spellings of *in* complemented by A27. These are documented in the Old Kingdom, then occasionally as archaisms in the Middle Kingdom (e.g. on the pyramidion of Amenemhat III), then fairly commonly in Thutmoside times. Remarkably, this type of spelling is then extended to forms of the *sḏm.in=f*, with which it was never found in the Old Kingdom itself; e.g. (only examples that can not be interpreted as infinitives followed by *in* are given): *Urk*. IV 255, 11 (*ḏd.in n=s ḥm=f*); 256, 9 (*ḏ.in ḥm=i*); 259, 4 (*sn.in=sn*); 259, 7 (*pr.in=sn*); 259, 12 (*iw.in=sn*); 261, 1 (*nḏm.in ib*); 261, 11 (*m3t.in=sn*). The phenomenon recurs e.g. in *Chapelle Rouge*, p.141: X.1 (*wn.in=s*).

373 Oréal 2011: 164.

The combination of *isk* (in its archaizing form) with the etymologically related *is* in the same sentence is remarkable.[374] If Oréal's reading is correct, the passage would be even more virtuosic, with yet another instance of *is* (*isk* – *is*? – *is*).

4.7.2   Further elements of Thutmoside Middle Egyptian

A. In two places, *Divine Birth* has *ist*-introduced clauses depending on a preceding clause. As discussed, the construction is an innovation of the written language of the early Eighteenth Dynasty (§4.5.2):

(i) *Urk*. IV 218, 17 - 219, 5 (Thot's response to Amun)
ḥwnt tn[a] (...) *iꜥḥ-ms rn=s nfr s(i) r ḥmt nbt ntt m tꜣ pn r-ḏr=f*
ḥmt ity pw nsw bity ꜥꜣ-ḫpr-kꜣ-rꜥ ḏ-ꜥnḫ ḏt
isk ḥm=f m inpw
ḥw sḏꜣ[...] *rn=s*

'This young lady (...), Iahmes by name, she is more beautiful than any woman in this whole land.
She is the wife of the sovereign, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Aakheperkare, given-life forever,
while His Majesty is still a royal child.
May [...] proceed [...] her name.'

a) Sic. The hypercorrection recurs elsewhere in the early Eighteenth Dynasty,[375] and at other periods.

The *ist*-headed clause can not be related to the following clause (introduced by *ḥw*), and must therefore depend on the preceding one.

(ii) *Urk*. IV 228, 1-4 (Hathor presents Amun with the child)
ii.n nṯr pn šps r mꜣꜣ sꜣt=f mrt=f nsw bity mꜣꜥt-kꜣ-rꜥ ꜥnḫ.ti m-ḫt ms=s
isk ib=f nḏm r ꜥꜣt wrt

'This august god has come to see his beloved daughter, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Maatkare, may she live, after she was born,
his heart being extraordinarily delighted.'

The *ist*-headed clause, at the end of a caption, can not relate to a following segment of discourse, because there is none.

B. *Divine Birth* has one instance of fronted *m-ḫt nn*:

(iii) *Urk*. IV 221, 5 (*Divine Birth*)
m-ḫt nn ir.n ḥm n nṯr pn mrt.n=f nbt ḥnꜥ=s
'After this, the Majesty of this god did all he desired with her.'

---

374 Noted by Oréal 2011: 164.
375 Examples: Stauder 2013: §9.4, n.290.

Although this was no doubt grammatically possible in earlier times, the expression is not attested as such before the early New Kingdom, when it is fairly common in inscriptional texts (§4.1.2.D and §4.3.3, where fronted *m-ḫt nn* was discussed in the more specific combination with a 'narrative' infinitive). This seems to be a distinctive feature of Thutmoside Middle Egyptian in some, mostly inscriptional, written registers.

C. The *Cycle* has one instance of the rare construction *m-ḫt + sḏm(w)-passive*:

(iv) *Urk.* IV 228, 3 (*Divine Birth*)

(...) *m-ḫt ms=s*

'(...) after she was born'

The construction is not documented before the New Kingdom.[376] In earlier times, *m-ḫt NP pseudoparticiple* is consistently used instead.[377] That *subject – pseudoparticiple* should follow *m-ḫt*, and among all prepositions only *m-ḫt*, is accounted for in relation to the resultative semantics of the pseudoparticiple, as these accord with the meaning of *m-ḫt*. As to *m-ḫt + sḏm(w)-passive*, this is paralleled in three places: *Urk.* IV 978, 15 (from the tomb of Min of This; *temp.* Thutmosis III/Amenhotep II); Amenhotep II's *Sphinx Stela* 23 (*Urk.* IV 1282, 13); Statue of the High Steward Amenhotep (*temp.* Amenhotep III), 18 (*Urk.* IV 1795, 18).[378] Taking into account the fact that another construction was consistently used for the same function in earlier times and that the *sḏm(w)-passive* was gradually losing in productivity in the early New Kingdom, this textual distribution of *m-ḫt + sḏm(w)-passive* suggests that the construction is a Thutmoside reconfiguration.

NB. In one place, *Divine Birth* has what superficially looks like a cleft-sentence with a relative form: *Urk.* IV 228, 9[379] *twt (w)d.n=i s3t(=i) ꜥš3w rnpwt* (...) 'You are the one I have placed, my daughter with abundant years (...)' Such construction is not otherwise documented in Old or Middle Egyptian.[380] This falls much short, however, of what would be required for declaring it an Hatshepsutian innovation.[381]

---

376 *EG* §423.3; Edel 1955-1964: §566.

377 Lastly Uljas 2007a: 261-2.

378 The first two of these have been noted by Uljas 2007a: 261, n.115, the last in *EG* §423.3.

379 Noted by Brunner 1986²: 110.

380 *Ptahhotep* 173 and 483, mentioned by Gunn 2012²: 59.6 as instances of this construction, are to be intepreted differently (Junge 2003: 220-1, 255). So is *Urk.* IV 1111, 4-6, also mentioned by Gunn. The only parallel left to stand is then *Urk.* IV 446, 1 (from a prayer by Djehuti) *ink mr.n=k* 'I am one whom you loved.' This may or may not relate grammatically to the construction *ink mr=f* on which it is modelled phraseologically (on *ink mr=f*, Borghouts 1994).

381 Certainly *not* indications for dating are the following two constructions, contra Stauder 2013: §4.2 (written in 2009). (a) *Urk.* IV 259, 14-15 *sḏr sḏr im wp m rn=f mnf3t mnf3t ḥr* [...] 'Each chamber therein was divided according to its name, every troop was [...]'. Iteration for expressing distributivity (Daumas 1975-1976; Erman 1928⁴: §502) is in fact documented in early times, in Pyr. §25c^(Na,Nb) *ip tw ḥr rnp rnp* (...) 'May Horus count you year after year (...)' (Pyr. §991c^(PN), noted by Edel 1955-1964: §991, is different, see Allen 2005: 126). (b) *iw* in *Urk.* IV 257, 2, erroneously analyzed as signaling dependency in Stauder 2013: §4.2, only serves to connect the clause it introduces to the preceding infinitive construction (*ḫpr ḥmst nsw* (...)); once correctly analyzed this

4.7.3   *Sw*-headed constructions in the *Royal Cycle*

A. The *Cycle* includes various instances of the notoriously controversial *sw*-headed constructions:[382]

(i) *Urk.* IV 218, 15 (*Divine Birth*)

sw šm ḏḥwti [...] *n* [...]

'Thot goes [...] to(?) [...]'

(ii) *Urk.* IV 219, 13 - 220, 1 (*Divine Birth*)

(...) *rs.n=s ḥr sti nṯr sbt*[*=s*] *ḫft ḥm=f*

sw šm=f [a] *ḫr=s ḥr-ꜥ*
sw ḫȝd=f [b] *r=s*
sw rḏ ib=f r=s
sw rḏ mȝ=s sw [*m*] *irw=f n nṯr* (...)

'(...) She (*scil.* queen Ahmes) woke up to the scent of the god, laughing before His Majesty.

He goes to her at once,
he becomes inflamed at her.

He sets his heart against her,
he causes her to see him in his divine form (...)'

a)   The Luxor version (Amenhotep III) has *sw šm*.

b)   The Luxor version has *ḫȝd=f*, without *sw*.

(iii) *Urk.* IV 243, 7 (*Royal Youth*)

sw swt rḏ mȝ s(*i*) *nṯrw nbw šmꜥw mḥw*

'He makes the gods, the lords of Upper and Lower Egypt, see her.'

(iv) *Urk.* IV 257, 5 (*Proclamation as Regent*)

sw ḏd ḥm=f ḫft=sn

'His Majesty says before them:'

Not from the *Cycle*, but related to it by time of inscription, the following instance—the only other one in any inscriptionally published text in the New Kingdom—is worth quoting as well:

---

way, the construction is not any distinctive (compare e.g. *Sinuhe* R 8 and in *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 32: §1.3.3.2, (xiv)).

382 Main discussions of these constructions: Werning 2013: #33; Roberson 2010; Jansen-Winkeln 2004: 219-23. Further comments notably by Roberson 2013: 124; 2012: 105-11; von Lieven 2007: 276-8; Manassa 2007: 49, 307; Darnell 2004: 464; Quack 2000b: 548-9; Zeidler 1999: I, 151-2, 201-4; Baumann 1998: 158-9. Previous discussions: Barta 1985: 101-3; Brunner 1986[2] (1964[1]): 171-3; Grapow 1935: 48-52; *EG* §424. On the early history of the discussion, Brunner 1986[2]: 174.

(v) *Urk*. IV 776, 5 (Thutmosis III's *Jardin Botanique*)

sw[a] *ḥm=f ḏd=f*

'His Majesty says:'

a)   The editors of *Urk*. IV mark this with a 'so', probably to suggest that this may have been
      verlesen from a *iw*. In view of the above collection of contemporaneous instances of the
      construction, there is no reason that *sw* should not be original. Compare in particular (iv).

Unlike for other expressions discussed in the present study, the following comments
are presented as provisional only, pending a fuller study of what remains an
insufficiently understood matter.

B. *Sw*-headed constructions recur in various forms and in varying frequencies in texts
such as *Amduat*, *Book of Gates*, *Book of Caverns*, *Litany of the Sun*, *Book of the
Earth*, *Grundriss des Laufes der Sterne* (/*Book of Nut*), *Treatise of Memphite
Theology* (incomplete listing).[383] As this textual distribution implies, the constructions
had a restricted currency: they did not belong to regular written registers, lower or
higher ones, of any time. Moreover, *sw*-headed constructions are a phenomenon of
written language only, necessarily to be analyzed at this level.

   Sw-headed constructions come in diverse variants (some of which illustrated
above in the small Hatshepsutian subset thereof), a variety that points to successive
stages of 'reanalysis'. In view of the above, 'reanalysis' is here understood on the sole
level of written language itself. That *sw*-headed constructions underwent various
processes of reanalysis does not afford an indication for dating: such processes could
have occurred at various moments in time, early or late. As the processes did not
occur in ongoing language change as determined by social interaction, they need not
imply any duration over time: various stages of written reanalysis, in text, may or may
not have been simultaneous with each other.

   Sw-headed constructions are documented in fairly high numbers (more than
hundred and fifty occurrences have been noted), but never in any copy of any text
before the New Kingdom.[384] The dating of the original composition of several of the
texts in which they are found itself remains a matter of continued contention.[385] Low
datings are increasingly favored in recent studies, notably in linguistically oriented
ones,[386] but the question—in fact a series of individual questions—is not settled yet.

---

383 For a full table of occurrences, Roberson 2010: 187, with adjustments by Werning 2013: #33.

384 The two alleged Coffin Text instances occasionally mentioned in discussions of *sw*-headed
     constructions (e.g. Roberson 2010: 186-8) are to be interpreted differently: §3.4.1.2.A.

385 According to Quack (2000b: 552, 558-9) and von Lieven (2007: 278), several of these texts would
     date to the Old Kingdom on linguistic grounds. That no such conclusions can be derived is
     discussed by Werning 2013 (all texts) and Jansen-Winkeln 2012 (for *Amduat* specifically, but with
     wider relevance for method); see also Klotz 2010: 489-90 (for *Grundriss des Laufes der Sterne*)
     and above, §4.7.1 (for the *Royal Cycle*). For an introduction, lastly Roberson 2013: 122-4, with
     references to the main positions and approaches in contention.

386 *Book of Caverns*, early Ramesside according to Werning 2011; *Book of the Earth*, New Kingdom
     according to Roberson 2012; *Book of Gates*, New Kingdom according to Zeidler 1999 (disputed by
     Quack 2000b, on grounds, however, that have now themselves been disputed: see the previous
     note); *Amduat* and *Litany of the Sun*, early New Kingdom at least in their final wording according
     to Werning 2013; *Treatise of Memphite Theology*, Ethiopian according to el-Hawary 2010 (based

In addition, the restricted nature of the construction is of importance, because it could be one reason for the lack of any pre-New Kingdom occurrences in the now preserved record. In short, the effective documentation of the construction—from the early New Kingdom on, then in high numbers—is an element in the discussion,[387] not to be looked away from, but does not in itself afford a sufficient indication for dating the rise of the construction.

C. The lever for a possible interpretation then lies in the observation that *sw*-headed constructions can not be explained in Earlier Egyptian grammar of any period. Some of the *sw*-headed constructions involve what seems to be an initial subject pronoun *sw*, which does not otherwise exist in Earlier Egyptian. Other ones involve what seems to be based on an initial 'particle' *sw*, which does not exist in Earlier Egyptian either. A 'particle' *sw* can not be derived from the Earlier Egyptian particle *swt*: the latter has adversative and/or argumentative force and comes in second position in the clause; the former lacks any trace of such semantics and comes in first position in the clause. An initial subject pronoun *sw* can not be derived internally to Earlier Egyptian either: the Old Egyptian independent pronoun *swt* would at first seem to lend itself to such a derivation, but this scenario would pose various problems, semantic and formal.[388]

In the relevant periods of Egyptian language history, there seems to be only one expression that could be underlying the initial development of *sw*-headed constructions, the new subject pronoun *sw*. A construction such as *sw sḏm=f* would then be described as *N(P) sḏm=f* with a subject pronoun *sw* (in lieu of *iw=f*). Alternatively, but equivalently, *sw sḏm=f* could be described as a formal hybrid, conflating two types of present tense constructions, *sw ḥr sḏm*, a late construction, and *N(P) sḏm=f*, a much earlier one. That *N(P) sḏm=f* should be involved would not be surprising in the case of so-called 'Netherworld Books' at least, as these generally avoid *NP ḥr sḏm*.[389] In text, *sw sḏm=f* often seems to be tenseless, deriving its temporal interpretation from the context (thus in *Urk.* IV 219, 15-16: (ii)): this is consistent with the analysis

---

on grounds other than linguistic; also including a full history of the past discussions which have been intense with this particular text: 92-111). A useful entry to the the discussion is to be found in Werning 2013 and Jansen-Winkeln 2012, both with extensive references also to contrary opinions.

387 See also Roberson's (2010) presentation.

388 One could thus speculate on a scenario such as *swt sḏm > sw sḏm > sw sḏm=f*, where the point of departure would be a regular cleft-sentence, the second stage the same construction with *swt* shortened to *sw*, and the third stage a reanalysis, once a clause-initial pronoun *sw* had developed in the second stage. The scenario is highly unlikely, however, because there is no reason why *swt* should be shortened in the first place: the process is documented, but only as an occasional textual slip, not in a way that could provide a basis for an entirely new construction to emerge. In addition, *sw sḏm* does not seem to ever have focal semantics, as would be expected under such scenario. A further problem is how the second stage would lead to the third: *sw sḏm* does hardly have any formal features in common with *iw=f sḏm=f* that could have triggered a reanalysis along such lines. An altogether different scenario could consist in viewing the origin of *sw* in a *Verlesung* from *iw*, which may have happened at any time; that a scribal slip, occasional and singular, could have led to the rise of a new construction is very unlikely, however.

389 An often-noted phenomenon: Werning 2013: #31; Quack 2000b: 548; Zeidler 1999: I, 207-8; Baumann 1998: 447. This is probably best interpreted in relation to the tensing of these compositions, in which progressive aspect is hardly ever expected to be called for.

here developed. Formal hybrids of the type hypothesized are otherwise documented in some of the very same texts that have *sw*-headed constructions.[390]

A construction [*sw sḏm=f*] (*subject – sḏm=f*) could then have been reanalyzed as [*sw*] [*sḏm=f*] (*sw – sḏm – subject*), thereby leading to the rise of a 'particle' *sw*. This type of reanalysis is made likely by alternations such as between *sw sḏm N* (as in *Urk.* IV 218, 15; 257, 5: (i) and (iv)) and *sw N sḏm=f* (as in *Urk.* IV 776, 5: (v)), apparently with similar function. From a construction *sw sḏm=f*, a construction *sw sḏm* (*Urk.* IV 219, 17; 220, 1; 243, 7: (ii) and (iii)) could also have be derived, with *sw* the subject of a structure formally analogous to—although functionally disimilar from[391]—a cleft-sentence. Alternatively, or complementarily, *sw sḏm* could have been derived by (improper) extension of a *subject – pseudoparticiple* construction (as in *sw šm* in the Luxor version of *Urk.* IV 219, 17: (ii)). Such possible pathways are here only meant to suggest the kind of processes of constructional reinterpretation that may have been at play in written language: pending a fuller study, any details presently remain hypothetical.

D. It has been claimed that a scenario including the new subject pronoun *sw* is unlikely a priori, because *sw*-headed constructions are found only in very specific and invariably high written registers, while the new subject pronoun was still an innovative expression by the Hatshepsutian times when *sw*-headed constructions are first documented in the record.[392] This, however, implies a narrowly morphological view, concerned with individual items, not with how these may have been perceived in their constructional contexts. The new subject pronoun *sw* is a distinctively innovative feature only when used in the constructional environments that are proper to it in regular performance, *NP ḥr sḏm*, *subject – pseudoparticiple*, and situational predicate constructions. As an element of form, *sw* is not any distinctively late, since Earlier Egyptian also has a pronoun *sw* (the dependent pronoun). When *sw* is combined with *N(P) sḏm=f* into a *sw sḏm=f* construction, the resulting construction is not any 'recent-looking'.[393] The construction does not exist other than in specific,

---

390 An eloquent case in point is afforded by *pn NP* (Werning 2013: #27, from whom I take the following analysis). *Pn NP* is documented in Pyramid Texts, but is there balanced with *pf NP*. In non-balanced *pn NP*, as in some of the 'Netherworld Books' and related compositions, the preposed demonstrative has deicitic functions similar to *pꜣ*; the construction is therefore best analyzed as a linguistic dissimilation (or incomplete 'back-translation') from an underlying *pꜣ NP*. The result is a hybrid.

391 The cleft-*like* constructions both in *Urk.* IV 219, 17 - 220, 1 and in *Urk.* IV 243, 7 do not seem to have any particular constituant focusing semantics. Nor do they seem to be specifically marked for past tense, the outward written morphology of *rḏ* in all three cases notwithstanding.

392 Brunner 1986²: 175. (The author's assessment of *sw* as belonging to the 'noch nicht einmal schriftfähige Umgangssprache' is contradicted by the effective attestation of the new subject pronoun in written registers since the late Seventeenth Dynasty, and, if still on an occasionnal basis only, in higher written registers no later than by the times of Thutmosis III: §3.4.1.3).

393 Incidentally, such scenario could also account for why the construction is limited to the third person (singular and plural): the first and second person forms of the new subject pronoun are highly distinctive in form (*tw=i*, etc.). Different, but not entirely unrelated and possibly compatible, is the scenario proposed by Werning 2013: #33. (Both types of accounts would be complementary to another reason for the observed distribution, which is obviously to do with the fact that in the types of texts here considered the construction will naturally come to order with third person subjects in most cases).

highly restricted, written registers. Moreover, the construction to which *sw sḏm=f* comes closest, *N(P) sḏm=f*, has itself become a token of high registers in the early New Kingdom (§2.6.3).

Rather, the resulting *sw sḏm=f*—which has no kin in any early Eighteenth Dynasty innovative registers, nor in regular higher ones of the same time, nor in any Middle Kingdom ones documented for that period—seems to have had much of its value in its formal 'otherness'. Similar phenomena are documented in other languages with long and complex written traditions.[394] The analysis is consistent with the highly restricted nature of the construction initially observed, mostly confined to compositions of esoteric circulation.

4.7.4 Dating the *Royal Cycle*

A. The expressions discussed last, *sw*-headed constructions (§4.7.3), remain incompletely analyzed. Pending further study, I therefore renounce basing a dating of the *Cycle* on these constructions. Other constructions, however, are sufficiently clear in interpretation for doing so.

Three constructions in the *Cycle*—*ist*-headed clause after the clause it depends on; fronted *m-ḫt nn*; *m-ḫt sḏm(w)-passive*—are distinctive of Thutmoside Middle Egyptian (§4.7.2). Each of these individually affords a strong indication for dating the *Cycle* to Thutmoside times. Their joint occurrence in the *Cycle* is all the more eloquent.

The great many Old Egyptian expressions in the *Cycle* (§4.7.1) are a selection of mostly formally salient expressions, not a cohesive Old Egyptian layer. While some are paralleled individually in the Twelfth Dynasty, the same set of expression recurs grouped only in *Chapelle Rouge*, *Punt Expedition*, and Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscription*. The Old Egyptian expressions in the *Cycle* thereby appear to form a specific repertoire, otherwise documented by the very time when the *Cycle* was inscribed in Deir el-Bahari, and only then as a repertoire. As further analysis demonstrates, these expressions are subjected to specific uses, indexically determined; the very same associations are observed in the three other texts that share the repertoire with the *Cycle*, and, again, only in these. This configuration provides a direct argument to rule out a dating to the Old Kingdom, one to the Middle Kingdom, and one to any period other than the times of Hatshepsut/Thutmosis III themselves.

B. In its linguistic typology, the *Royal Cycle* is based on Middle Egyptian, the high variety of the early Eighteenth Dynasty. The Middle Egyptian in the *Cycle* includes a few expressions that are typical of Thutmoside Middle Egyptian, none of which to do with innovations that were ocurring in lower registers by the same time (§4.7.2). As for the Old Egyptian expressions that abound in the composition (§4.7.1), the intent is not to imitate Old Egyptian in such ways that the resulting phenomenology could be mistaken for a genuinely old one. Rather, a claimed relationship with an age-old tradition is indexed on the level of a set of individual expressions. The repertoire these

---

394 The Standard Babylonian variety of Akkadian, for instance, has some purely textual forms which also derived much of their value from their sheer formal 'otherness' (Kouwenberg 2005).

expressions form is recomposed, unique to a certain cultural constellation, and a genuinely innovative experiment.

Alongside other compositions discussed in the present chapter, the *Royal Cycle* is yet another token of the richly varied configurations of Middle Egyptian in the early New Kingdom. In the reign of Hatshepsut herself, the composed language of the *Cycle* differs for example from the very pure Middle Egyptian cultivated in *Speos Artemidos*.

5 *Neferti*

For a narrow dating 'by squeezing' to be possible, a composition must happen to in-
clude expressions that have demonstrably been innovated in relevant written registers
at a time shortly prior to the first manuscript documentation of that composition. As
discussed, this requires very favorable circumstances, some to do with the conditions
under which the primary study of linguistic change can be conducted, some to do with
the contents and register of the composition to be dated; these conditions are only
seldom met simultaneously (§3). For a narrow dating 'by direct dating' to be possible,
a composition must include expressions that can be related to a definite cultural
horizon in the configuration of written language. As also discussed, this is contingent
upon highly specific contents and modes of expression of individual compositions,
and is only limitedly possible in literary registers (§4). In either case, therefore, the
possibility for a narrow dating remains a matter of favorable circumstances. When
these are not given, only a broader chronological range for dating can be defined on
strong linguistic grounds. Technically, the strategy is the same as for a narrow dating
'by squeezing' except that reliable upper and lower chronological bounds can not be
made to come as close to each other as under more favorable circumstances; an
illustration of this situation was provided above (*Khakheperreseneb*: §2.7).

The present chapter is devoted to a discussion of the linguistic typology of one
major composition for which only a broader range for dating can be defined on strong
linguistic grounds, *Neferti*. In the course of the discussion, I also introduce two
important dating criteria, the first concerning *Neferti* specifically (§5.2), the second of
broader application (§5.3). Various indications possibly supporting a narrower dating
of *Neferti* are discussed in turn (§5.5-6).

5.1   The early dating: A distinguished option?

Neferti is first documented by the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty.[1] The main witness,
P. Petersburg 1116 B vso (= Pet.), which preserves the complete composition, has
accounts dating to the reign of Amenhotep II on its recto; the copy of the literary
composition on the verso may have been slightly later, but not much.[2] From roughly
the same period are two writing boards: T. Cairo 25224 (= C25224), which preserves

---

1   Text: Helck 1992[2]; additional witnesses mentioned by Mathieu 1993: 343, n.43.
2   Gnirs 2006: 254 and n.262, with references.

the second half of the text (8a-15g),[3] and T. BM EA 5647, with an excerpt of the prologue (2a-h).[4] Early witnesses of *Neferti* now also include three graffiti inscribed in the tomb Assiut N13.1 (graffito 6a: 1a-3i (fragm.); graffito 6b: 6a-7a (fragm.); graffito 6c: ?-?).[5] The presence of the composition on excerpts implies some time for prior circulation.[6] As *Hymn to Hapi* demonstrates, this need not have been long.

5.1.1 Introduction

Neferti, a much discussed text,[7] has commonly been dated to the early Twelfth Dynasty,[8] with only very few dissenting voices suggesting later periods, the Second Intermediate Period[9] and the early Eighteenth Dynasty.[10] The early Twelfth Dynasty dating is thereby distinguished in the modern tradition of interpretation and a preliminary discussion of the possible evidence for this early dating is required. The aim of the present section is not to argue for, or against, one dating or another, but only to assess whether one option is distinguished as inherently more likely than other ones.

The classical dating of *Neferti* to the early Twelfth Dynasty is based on a set of observations that can be summarized as follows:

(a) 'Ameny' (*imny*, 13a) is interpreted as referring to Amenemhat I, the found of a new dynasty. This interpretation is considered to find strong support in a mention of the 'Walls of the Ruler' (*inbw ḥḳꜣ*, 15a), which recurs only in *Sinuhe* (B 17).

(b) *Neferti*, telling of the advent of a new king, could have been intended to eulogize Amenemhat I, and thereby the Dynasty newly founded, for broadly contemporaneous audiences.

(c) In Ramesside times, *Neferti* was cultivated as a Middle Egyptian classic alongside other works, some of which demonstrably date to the Twelfth Dynasty (e.g., again, *Sinuhe* itself). 'Neferti' was then paired with 'Kheti' in the *Eulogy of Dead Writers* (P. Chester Beatty IV vso). Earlier in the New Kingdom, *Neferti* features in Assiut alongside other Middle Egyptian literary compositions, also documented as classics in Ramesside times.

(d) In its intertext and expression, *Neferti* belongs to a Middle Egyptian literary tradition that includes *Eloquent Peasant*, *Khakheperreseneb*, and *Ipuwer*, notably. Some stock formulations and motifs in the prologue recur in

---

3   'Mitte 18. Dyn.' according to Helck 1992[2]: 3.
4   '18. Dyn.' according to Helck 1992[2]: 3.
5   Verhoeven 2013: §4; 2010: 196.
6   The problem is outlined in Parkinson 2002: 46 (addressing a different issue, the presence of literary texts in Lahun, but with broader relevance); similarly Verhoeven 2013: §5, *fine*.
7   For studies of *Neferti*, see Parkinson 2002: 304; among major studies that have appeared since: Gnirs 2006; Pérez-Accino 2008; Giewekemeyer 2013.
8   Posener 1956: 21-60, defining a tradition of interpretation subsequently embraced by many.
9   Morenz 1996: 109-10 (Second Intermediate Period); Ryholt 1990: 109 (early Thirteenth Dynasty, cautiously); Raue 2010 (mid-Thirteenth – early Eighteenth Dynasty).
10 Gnirs 2006: 243-53.

Eloquent Peasant, in *Kagemni*, and in *Cheops' Court*. The reference to 'perfect words' (*mdwt nfrt*) recurs in *Ptahhotep*, notably, and a thematization of the en-textualization of the work as found in *Neferti* is also central to *Eloquent Peasant*.

(e) *Neferti* is composed in Middle Egyptian, as are other works belonging to the Middle Egyptian literary tradition. In addition, a narrow dating to the early Twelfth Dynasty specifically has been proposed to find linguistic support.[11]

5.1.2 A dating to the early Twelfth Dynasty? Possible historical references and interpretive frames

Possible historical references in *Neferti*—'Ameny' (*imny*, 13a) and the 'Walls of the Ruler' (*inbw ḥḳȝ*, 15a)—have been interpreted as convergently pointing to an early Twelfth Dynasty horizon. Such dating is also considered supported by what would have been one function of *Neferti*, as a piece of advocacy for the kings of the newly founded Dynasty.

5.1.2.1 'Ameny' (13a)

The reference in 'Ameny' is multi-layered, as is the whole composition. The name *imny* allies the king with the creator god (the 'hidden one'), as do various mythical aspects alluded to in the composition.[12] In addition, the name *imny* probably alludes to Menes (*mni*), the founder of Egyptian monarchy itself, and thereby to the culturally constructed time of chaos before the institution of the unified monarchy.[13] The advent of a new king and the restoration of order after chaos are major cultural themes, here addressed in paradigmatic terms.

It remains possible, of course, that referents of 'Ameny' simultaneously included an historically specific one. Even if this were the case, the identification of that possible historical referent as Amenemhat I is altogether uncertain, both at the level of the originally intended reference, and of how (groups of) ancient readers may have read the text;[14] in particular, various later Amenemhat's could then be candidates.[15] Even if it is additionally hypothesized that 'Ameny' included Amenemhat I among its intended referents, this need not imply a dating into, or close to, that reign itself: the eulogy may just as well have 'glorified [Amenemhat] as a dynastic ancestor rather than as a contemporaneous ruler.'[16] A reference to Amenemhat I as a founding figure

---

11 Vernus 1990a: 185; 1990b: 1037.

12 E.g. Parkinson 2002: 196-8; Gnirs 2006: 252-3.

13 Originally Assmann 1991: 275 (paper written in 1983); subsequently Franke 1994: 8; Pérez-Accino 2008; Giewekemeyer 2013: §5.1.

14 Giewekemeyer 2013: §3.4, §5.1. Although identifying Ameny with Amenemhat I, Parkinson (2002: 197-8) phrases in ways that are significant as well: '(...) the naming (...) also blurs his historical identity. The obliqueness of the naming is striking in a context that generates expectations of a direct eulogy.'

15 Ryholt (1990: 109) cautiously suggests an identification with Amenemhat V, or possibly Amenemhat IV or III. See also Quirke (2004a: 135): 'king Ameny, possibly one or all of the four kings of the Twelfth Dynasty named Amenemhat, or a king of the Thirteenth Dynasty'.

16 Parkinson 2002: 304.

would have been relevant in the later Twelfth and Thirteenth Dynasties,[17] as it could have been, in different ways, in the early New Kingdom.[18]

5.1.2.2   The 'Walls of the Ruler' (15a)

Among the above options, an interpretation of 'Ameny' as a reference to Amenemhat I made during or in a time close to that king's reign is classically considered to find strong independent support in the mention of the 'Walls of the Ruler' (15a).[19] *Ỉnbw ḥḳꜣ* is documented only once elsewhere, in a literary text that evokes the early Twelfth Dynasty and is documented in manuscripts from that Dynasty, *Sinuhe* (B 17). The pattern on which *inbw ḥḳꜣ* is formed, *inb + royal name*, is very rare and itself documented only in the Twelfth Dynasty.[20] In addition, *Sinuhe* B 17 was read in the early New Kingdom as referring to Amenemhat I, as is evidenced by its rewriting as *inbw it=i* 'the Walls of my father' (G, AOS, C; with Sinuhe being then understood as Amenemhat's son).[21]

In the above, the last dimension is a New Kingdom reading of *Sinuhe* and does not therefore bear on *inbw ḥḳꜣ* in *Neferti* 15a, except in indirect ways (below, B).[22] The textual distribution of *inbw ḥḳꜣ* and the pattern on which it is formed merit discussion.

A. To begin with, *inbw ḥḳꜣ* could be fictionalizing in *Sinuhe*.[23] The formation *inb-X* comes with a specific royal name in both non-literary instances in which it is documented: *inbw imn-m-ḥꜣt mꜣꜥ-ḥrw* (Boston MFA 13.3967; *temp.* Amenemhat III)[24] and *inbw sšmw-tꜣwy mꜣꜥ-ḥrw* (in a royal stela from el-Kab; *temp.* Amenemhat III).[25] Contrasting with these, the compounding of *inbw* with a generic expression (*ḥḳꜣ* 'Ruler') in the two literary instances (*Sinuhe* B 17; *Neferti* 15a), and only in these, is noteworthy. One not unsimilar expression is documented in Archaic and Old Kingdom times, *inb-ity* (var. *ḥwt-ity*) 'Wall (/Palace) of the Sovereign'.[26] The toponym at least initially had a real-world referent, probably (a part of) the royal Residence in

---

17 For Amenemhat I as a founding figure, epitomizing the dynasty he inaugurated, compare 'the kings [who followed(?)] after the [house of Sehet]epibre' as a designation of the Thirteenth Dynasty in later historiography (Ryholt 1997: 69).

18 For various aspects of the reference to the early Twelfth Dynasty in the early New Kingdom, see the studies gathered in Bickel 2013b; Parkinson 2009: 175-6; with reference to *Neferti* in particular, Gnirs 2006: 255-63. As noted by Giewekemeyer 2013: §5.1 (the final sub-section), there are in the early New Kingdom no direct traces of a distinguished memory of Amenemhat I himself, unlike for Senwosret I; the reference could then have been more generally to the early Twelfth Dynasty, founded by Amenemhat I (see the preceding note).

19 E.g. Posener 1956: 22-8; Parkinson 2002: 197.

20 Vogel 2004: 159-60, 163-4; Posener 1956: 26.

21 Feder 2003; further Parkinson 2009: 185.

22 Further discussion, Giewekemeyer 2013: §5.1, *fine*.

23 The following comments are strictly about the expression itself and therefore independent of the question of the historical reality of fortification works in the Eastern Delta in the early Twelfth Dynasty (for which e.g. Vogel 2004: 92-6; Monnier 2010: 71-91; Kemp 2006²: 25 and n.15).

24 Vogel 2004: 159-60.

25 Vogel 2004: 163-4.

26 Vogel 2004: 160-1.

Memphis:[27] this location, altogether different from the one of the literary instances here discussed, probably accounts for the generic designation 'Sovereign' selected in this particular case.

Noteworthy in the present context are also other geographical or ethnonymic designations in *Sinuhe* that could be fictionalizing, *iꜣꜣ* (B 81; B 238)[28] and *nmi(w)-šꜥ* 'Land-farer(s)' (R 43; B 73; B 292: §2.4.5, (i)). If fictionalizing, an expression *inbw ḥḳꜣ* would have been effective in expressing an important semantic dimension in the composition, 'borders' defined by the reach of the 'Ruler'[29] and crossed by Sinuhe (itself a fictionalizing dimension);[30] perhaps significantly, when Sinuhe later crosses the same border in opposite direction to be reintegrated into the Egyptian world and his normative values, he would be called upon Senwosret, the ruler, to do so.

The two competing alternatives are equally likely. *Ꞽnbw ḥḳꜣ* could have had a real-world referent, presently not otherwise documented. Yet it need not: the initially presented distribution of types of *inb-X* expressions in the record remains noteworthy and *Sinuhe*, a piece of narrative literature, is strongly fictional in various respects arguably including expressions directly comparable to *inbw ḥḳꜣ*.

B. Be the referential status of *inbw ḥḳꜣ* in *Sinuhe* as it may, the recurrence of the same expression in *Neferti* is to be discussed. That *inbw ḥḳꜣ* occurs only in these two texts, both literary, naturally raises the question of a possible relationship between these. In *Sinuhe* B 17, *inbw ḥḳꜣ* is textually salient. The expression is associated with border crossing, one central dimension in the composition. Among many toponyms evoked in Sinuhe's flight, it is significantly the only one to receive additional textual elaboration (*inbw ḥḳꜣ iry r ḫsf stiw* 'the Walls of the Ruler, *made to repel the Asiatics*').[31] This elaboration is further amplified in R (as (...) *r ptpt nmiw-šꜥ* '(...) and to trample the Sand-farers')[32] and the passage is partly rewritten in G (as *inbw it=i*: above), demonstrating continued active engagement with *inbw ḥḳꜣ* by later readers.

Given this salience of *inbw ḥḳꜣ* both in the Twelfth Dynasty text of *Sinuhe* and in subsequent readings thereof documented in later manuscripts, the possibility that *Neferti* 15a could be echoing a Sinuhean expression must be considered. If so, one intent of such an allusion to *Sinuhe* could have been to evoke the early Twelfth

---

27 The toponym is common in religious contexts, but not limited to these (it also occurs on archaic seals). Vogel (2004: 160) interprets: 'vermutlich (...) die Königsresidenz innerhalb der Mauern von *inbw-ḥḏ*, d.h. der ersten befestigten Siedlung von Memphis'.

28 While a geographical localization of *iꜣꜣ* has been attempted (Görg 1987), the possibility that this land could be fictional is raised by Parkinson (1997a: 46, n.25): the author observes that *iꜣꜣ* is described in paradisiac terms similar to the island in *Shipwrecked* Sailor and that it is stylized as a substitute for Egypt (Parkinson 2002: 157); the name could mean 'Rushy place' (also Parkinson 2012a: 179-80). Moreover, *iꜣꜣ*, sitting at the heart of *Sinuhe* like the island does in *Shipwrecked Sailor*, textually functions an image of Egypt also in terms of its foreign relations (Moers 2011). The presence of *iꜣꜣ* in New Kingdom lists of foreign lands could be part of a later imagined geography, possibly shaped by *Sinuhe* (Parkinson 2009: 179-80).

29 E.g. Pérez-Accino 2011.

30 Moers 2001: 253-61.

31 Noted by Posener 1956: 25-6.

32 E.g. Parkinson 2009: 164.

Dynasty, an era that is arguably evoked in *Neferti* as well;[33] alternatively, the allusion could have been more broadly to *Sinuhe* as a major literary work. The posterity of Sinuhean expressions is otherwise documented, notably in the case of two afore mentioned expressions, also salient in *Sinuhe*, *i33*[34] and *nmiw-š*ꜥ.[35] The inclusion of *inbw ḥḳ3* in *Neferti* would have been meaningful, as a 'royal rampart against chaos (15a) which reverses the earlier image in the lament that likened society to a defenceless fortress (7f-i)'.[36]

Various options therefore present themselves. If *Neferti* was composed in the early Twelfth Dynasty, *inbw ḥḳ3* could have been directly referential, or not (A); either way, it could have been resonating with a roughly contemporaneous composition, *Sinuhe*, or not. If *Neferti* was composed later, *inbw ḥḳ3* in *Neferti* 15a could still have been intended as an element of historical detail, through an evocation of *Sinuhe*. As the rewriting of *Sinuhe* B 17 in the New Kingdom tradition demonstrates, the expression was then associated with an early Twelfth Dynasty horizon; as its salience in *Sinuhe* implies, it would have had the same potential in earlier times already. In view of the textual distribution of *inbw ḥḳ3* and of its distinguished functions in the two literary texts in which it occurs, a directly referential interpretation of the 'historical detail' under discussion is not intrinsically more likely than an interpretation as a more indirect type of reference, mediated by literature itself. In the latter alternative, the reference could have been made at any time, simultaneously to *Sinuhe*, somewhat later, or much later.

> NB. Two other elements of possible historical detail in *Neferti* deserve to be mentioned. The first is *ḥnrt* 'enclosure, fortress' (7h),[37] used in a military sense.[38] This meaning is common in the Middle Kingdom,[39] yet also documented down to the early New Kingdom (e.g. *Urk.* IV 184, 15; 758, 16).[40] Whatever the historical evolution of the term's real-world referents may have been, such continued use in text makes it impossible to turn *ḥnrt* into a criterion for an earlier dating of *Neferti*.
>
> The second is *ḥn-nḥn* (13b), a very rare designation of the southern part of Upper Egypt. This is found once in an earlier Eleventh Dynasty private stela (Hetepi 4; *temp.* Wahankh Antef II),[41] as a designation of the seven first nomes of Upper Egypt.

---

33 'Arguably evoked' (rather than just 'evoked') may seem a pedantic precaution, yet is one now made necessary by the discussion in Giewekemeyer 2013: §5.1.

34 Parkinson 2009: 179-80, observing in reference to the occurrence of *i33* in encyclopedic lists of conquered lands: 'Iaa may even have been a land that the 12th-Dynasty poet imagined (...), and that subsequently became so familiar to composers of inscriptions that they cited it as a historical reality in their compendious lists. (...) The poem (*scil. Sinuhe*) may have contributed to fashioning the views of the literate officials and scribes (...)'.

35 *Urk.* IV 1821, 12 (Amenhotep son of Hapu); see Parkinson 2009: 52 and n.13 and §2.4.5, (i) in the present study.

36 Parkinson 2002: 198.

37 Study: Quirke 1988.

38 In Middle Egyptian literary texts also in *Merikare* E 102. In the sense of 'labour enclosure', *Sasobek* B2.13; *Cheops' Court* 8.14; *Ipuwer* 6.10.

39 On the historically shifting extension of the expression *ḥnrt*, see the detailed study by Quirke 1988.

40 Quirke 1988: 95; also van den Boorn 1988: 126-7.

41 Text: Gabra 1976; also Quack 1992: 99-100.

The expression recurs in a Ramesside papyrus from the Ramesseum.[42] (A further occurrence in Piankhi's *Victory Stela* 6 does not provide independent evidence as this text is more generally replete with echoes of Middle Egyptian literature.[43]) Given such exceedingly sparse pattern of attestation, any conclusions for dating must be withheld.

5.1.2.3 Interpretive frames

In the above, no argument was made directly against interpreting 'Ameny' as a reference to Amenemhat I roughly at the time of that king himself: that the reference is rich and complex does not in itself imply that it did not also have an historical component, nor does it imply that this possible historical reference did not include Amenemhat I, nor that such possible historical reference to Amenemhat I specifically was not made close in time to this king's reign. Nor was an argument made against interpreting the 'Walls of the Ruler' in relation to a Twelfth Dynasty horizon: the expression could have had a real-world referent, or be fictionalizing, and its presence in *Neferti*, possibly for evoking an early Twelfth Dynasty historical horizon, could have been directly referential or mediated by *Sinuhe*, still within the Twelfth Dynasty, or later. What emerges, however, is that strictly referential interpretations of 'Ameny' and of the 'Walls of the Ruler' do not have any distinguished status: several other options are available. That these alternative interpretations are less direct does not make them any less likely, as complexity in human behavior, particularly when it comes to literary matters, is expected.

Nor do 'Ameny' and 'Walls of the Ruler' provide a cumulative argument for placing *Neferti* in an early Twefth Dynasty horizon. If 'Ameny' is read in a directly referential manner, then 'Walls of the Ruler' is as well, and the two elements support each other. If, on the other hand, a dating of *Neferti* for instance to the early Thirteenth Dynasty is contemplated, then the allusion in 'Ameny' could have been along several of the lines sketched above, for instance as including a reference to a dynastic ancestor or more broadly to the 'House of Sehetepibre'; 'Walls of the Ruler', echoing a textual salient passage in *Sinuhe*, would then have been an effective strategy to evoke just that horizon. Based on the above, further scenarios, similarly cohesive, can be envisioned for other datings possibly to be complentated, such as the late Twelfth Dynasty or the early Eighteenth.

A directly referential interpretation of 'Ameny' and 'Walls of the Ruler' must then rely on a broader interpretive frame for reading *Neferti*, namely what is generally labeled the 'propaganda' model of Middle Egyptian 'political' literature.[44] This model is an hypothesis only, and one that was in no small part based on a certain reading of *Neferti* itself (*Amenemhat*, another text that played a major role in the elaboration of the model, is discussed below: 6). In the past decade, the model has been subjected to criticism on various fronts. Shortcomings in its accounting for the cultural functions and contexts of Middle Egyptian literature have been emphasized.[45] Its insufficient

---

42 *DZA* 28.219.570.
43 Grimal 1981: 284-6; Parkinson 2009: 212.
44 Classically Posener 1956.
45 Parkinson 2002: 13-6.

addressing of the actual semantic complexity of individual texts has been pointed out.[46] Thorough-going problems associated with an historically referential reading of Middle Egyptian literary texts have been discussed.[47] The model's relation to a specific and therefore contingent horizon in modern *Wissenschaftsgeschichte* has also been underscored.[48] The model has thereby lost the character of evidence it long held: at best, it stands as one interpretive option among several.

5.1.3   A dating to the Middle Kingdom more broadly? A common Middle Egyptian literary tradition

Based on language, common motifs and formulations, intertext, and reception, *Neferti* belongs to a common Middle Egyptian literary tradition, as was and is rightly recognized by ancient and modern readers alike. This has been interpreted as suggesting a dating of the composition to the Middle Kingdom.

5.1.3.1   Transmission and reception

A. 'Neferti' is included among literary figures of the past in the Ramesside *Eulogy of Dead Writers* (P. Chester Beatty IV vso) and probably recurs in P. Athens 1826 (if 'Nefer<ti>' is to be read, as is likely).[49] As the impressive number of manuscripts of *Amenemhat* suggests, works with historical subject matters were popular in Ramesside Deir el-Medineh.[50] In such context, some readers may have read *Neferti* for what in their view were the historical contents in the composition. This is also suggested by the pairing of 'Neferti' with 'Kheti' in the *Eulogy*: the latter is in Ramesside times associated with *Amenemhat*, a composition set in the times of Amenemhat I possibly evoked in *Neferti* itself.[51] These Ramesside readers may then even have conceived of *Neferti* as broadly associated with another composition set in the early Twelfth Dynasty, *Sinuhe*, depending on how they interpreted the reference to 'Ameny' in *Neferti* and/or based on the mention of the 'Walls of the Ruler' in both these works.

Knowledge of actual dates of composition, however, was probably fairly 'impressionistic'.[52] Dating also seems to have been less of a pressing concern to ancient readers than it has become to modern ones in the context of an altogether different, more strongly author-centered literary culture.[53] The literary figures in *Eulogy of Dead Writers* are presented as 'masters of truth' (as an admittedly loose evocation of the Egyptian *rḫ-ḫt*), enacting 'prospective repetition' (*sr*), whereby truth,

---

46   For *Neferti*, compare for instance Parkinson 2002: 193-200, whose rich reading effectively does without 'propaganda', even if this historical context is still mentioned.

47   Moers 2001: 38-79, particularly 38-54; Parkinson 2002: 9-10.

48   Giewekemeyer 2013: §3.2-3.

49   Lastly Simon 2013: 266-71, with references to previous discussions.

50   E.g. Parkinson 2009: 192.

51   For the grouping of 'Neferti' and 'Kheti' possibly based on their common association with Amenemhat I, e.g. Parkinson 2002: 45.

52   Parkinson 2009: 188-9.

53   E.g. Simon 2013: 265 (with reference to 'Kheti' and *Amenemhat*), stressing that actual authorship would have been irrelevant in the Ramesside context of the *Eulogy*.

which comes from the gods, is not bound to history.[54] In addition, traditions can be invented, in Egypt[55] and elsewhere:[56] '(tradition) is subject to modification as time passes, which sometimes amounts to invention. Traditions can thus obscure the past as well as illuminate it. *They answer current needs and are the products of ingenuous minds* (emphasis AS).'[57] The conceptions underlying the literary figures documented in the Ramesside *Eulogy* were arguably fairly late to emerge and probably did so in relation to broader cultural changes in the New Kingdom.[58] Incidentally, the figure with which 'Neferti' is paired in the *Eulogy*, 'Kheti', was subject to associations with works, *Kheti* and *Hymn*, that are in the present study argued to have been composed after Middle Kingdom (§6.2.2.6 and §3.4, respectively).

B. *Neferti* was transmitted alongside other Middle Egyptian literary texts, in Ramesside times and before, notably in the Assiut graffiti. Common transmission need not imply a common temporal horizon in composition. Paradigmatically, this is illustrated by the Chester Beatty Library (which includes *Kheti* and *Hymn*, yet also *Tale of Horus and Seth*, *Tale of Truth and Falsehood*, or *Satirical Letter*); in the early Eighteenth Dynasty similarly, the same document, T. Carnarvon 1, has a securely dated Middle Kingdom composition (*Ptahhotep*) and a securely dated much later one (*Kamose Inscriptions*, First Stela).[59]

In Ramesside times, common transmission reflects the common literary tradition, rightly recognized, to which works composed in Middle Egyptian belong. Much in terms of common themes, motifs, and tropes was probably sensed in reading, even without academic study of such. Common historical subject matters may also have played a role in some cases. Most important was arguably language itself. While Middle Egyptian as used in literary texts had been a high variety at all times, the later Eighteenth and early Nineteenth Dynasty witnessed major cultural changes that led to a reconfiguration of higher written registers and more broadly to a 'bifurcation' in written culture.[60] In the process, Middle Egyptian *became* 'classical', contributing to make works composed in that idiom themselves classical.[61] In addition, Middle Egyptian as used in literarture is highly homogeneous, reflecting the high-cultural functions of texts that were couched in this variety: possible diachronic differences, so difficult to pinpoint even for the present-day Egyptologist specifically targeting such matters, would have been entirely invisible to ancient readers. In terms of language, literature

---

54 Moers 2002 (I thank Gerald Moers, p.c. 5/2013, for further discussion of this issue); complementary interpretation by Simon 2013: 266-71, including references to previous debates.

55 For Egyptian examples of invented traditions, in domains entirely unrelated to the present one, e.g. Kemp 2006[2]: 140, 143.

56 The present author may be forgiven a reference to the diverse layers of invented tradition that coalesced into the founding myths of his native country in the process of becoming one. Sited at their proper level and in relation to the in part fairly recent needs they served, these are fascinating objects of study (see Maissen 2012[4]).

57 Kemp 2006[2]: 160.

58 Moers 2009; 2008; now also Gnirs 2013b: 130-2; Widmaier 2013: §1.1.

59 Also note O. BM 5632, with an excerpt of *Loyaliste* on the recto and one of *Sinuhe* on the verso (Posener 1976: 8).

60 Baines 1996: 173, also 158-9.

61 E.g. Loprieno 1996b.

composed in Middle Egyptian, an idiom secondarily made classical, may then have appeared as an homogeneous body to Ramesside readers.

In the (early/mid-)Eighteenth Dynasty, the nature of the collection of Middle Egyptian works excerpted on the walls of the tomb Assiut N13.1 (*Amenemhat*, *Hymn*, *Kheti*, *Loyaliste*, *Neferti*, *A Man to His Son*)[62] remains unclear. As the great many manuscripts of the same works in Ramesside times implies, all were then to be popular. The three works to be associated in Ramesside times with the literary figure 'Kheti' or with each other through common manuscript transmission are all present in Assiut (*Amenemhat*, *Kheti*, *Hymn*). If to this the long version of *Loyaliste*, now identified as a *Teaching of Kairsu*,[63] and *Neferti* are added, five out of six works in Assiut are associated with literary figures in the *Eulogy of Dead Writers*. In interpreting the selection of compositions featured in Assiut, one dimension is probably types of literary discourses: narrative literature is conspicuously absent in Assiut, even for compositions demonstrably cultivated in the New Kingdom (e.g. *Sinuhe*); it is similarly absent in the *Eulogy*. Also absent in Assiut are laments such as *Ipuwer* and *Khakheperreseneb*, documented in New Kingdom manuscripts; the latter is included in the *Eulogy*. More remarkable is the absence of *Ptahhotep*, a teaching that enjoyed reception in the New Kingdom and features in the *Eulogy*: why this is lacking, while teachings are generally prominent in the Assiut selection, is unclear. In part at least, associations based on contents seem to have played a role, as is suggested by the fact that three compositions which display a dense intertext (*A Man to His Son*, the long version of *Loyaliste*, and *Kheti*)[64] are all present in Assiut. Resonances with elements of the pictorial decoration of the tomb may also have played some role, as is suggested by the placement of individual texts.[65] To be noted, finally, is that some of the works copied in Assiut are in the present study argued to be linguistically later than then Middle Kingdom (*Hymn*: §3.4; *Kheti*: §6.2.2.6; parts of the long version of *Loyaliste*: §4.5). This is of course not to mean that the other compositions in Assiut must also be later than the Middle Kingdom: the processes by which works came to be variously grouped with each other, in Assiut and in later times, were certainly complex.

5.1.3.2   Motifs in common with *Eloquent Peasant* and *Kagemni*: The prologue

A. Like *Eloquent Peasant*, *Neferti* contrasts a fairly straightforward narrative introduction with the more tightly patterned main part of the composition, the lament spoken by Neferti and the Peasant's petitions, respectively. A similar stylistic contrast is also found in *Kagemni* between the end of the instructions and the brief narrative epilogue.[66] Both in *Neferti* (q) and in *Eloquent Peasant*, the framing narrative reflexively tells of the written textualization of the work;[67] so does *Kagemni* in more

---

62   For an overview, lastly Verhoeven 2013.
63   Verhoeven 2009.
64   Fischer-Elfert 1999: 383-99.
65   Verhoeven 2008: 202-4.
66   For elements in language supporting this contrast in register, §2.4.4.3.
67   Often commented upon, e.g. Hagen 2012b: 186-9; Parkinson 2002: 174-5.

succinct terms.[68] The words spoken by Neferti, respectively by the Peasant, are said to be *mdt nfrt* 'perfect speech' (*Neferti* 1l; *Eloquent Peasant* B1 106), a formulation that recurs elsewhere in Middle Kingdom literature (famously, *Ptahhotep* 58-59).[69]

Twice in the prologue, *Neferti* has a characteristic formulation for a high-status participant (here the king) asking subordinates to summon people (the Council of the Residence, then Neferti) to him: 1f-h *ḏd.in ḥm=f* (...) *i.sy in n=i* (...) *stȝ.in.tw=f* (*n=f*) *ḥr-ʿ* 'His Majesty said (...): "Go and bring me (...)!" It (*scil.* the Council) was introduced at once' (sim. 2f-g). The same formulation, a literary trope, recurs in *Eloquent Peasant* (B1 27-28: for fetching a thing, a 'sheet' (*ifd*)). Another stock formula in *Neferti* expresses the courtiers' response to a royal utterance: 1i *wn.in=sn ḥr ḫt=sn* (...) 'Then they were on their bellies (...)' (sim. 1n, 2h). A closely similar formulation recurs in *Kagemni* in the children's response to the closing words of the vizier's speech (2.5-6 *wn.in=sn ḥr rḏt st ḥr ẖwt=sn*).

B. Commonalities are also with *Cheops' Court*. This composition is later than *Eloquent Peasant* by at least a century, and possibly by much more (type-B terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty: §2.4.4.1.B).

The formulation expressing the courtiers' response recurs in *Cheops' Court* 4.23-25 and 8.9-10.[70] More important are parallels in the introduction of Neferti and Djedi.[71] In either text, the existence of a 'commoner' (*nḏs*), not living in the Residence and to say things about the future, is brought to the attention of a king, Snofru.[72] That commoner's distinguished qualities are given ample textual elaboration: *Neferti* 2b-d *i*[*w*] *ẖri-ḥb ʿȝ n bȝstt ity nb=n nfrty rn=f nḏs pw ḳn gȝb=f sš pw iḳr n ḏbȝw=f* (...) 'Bastet has a chief lector priest, Sovereign our lord, Neferty by name; he is a commoner valiant of his arm, he is an excellent scribe of his fingers (...)'; *Cheops' Court* 6.26-7.6 *iw wn nḏ*[*s*] *ḏdi rn=f ḥms=f m ḏd-snfrw mȝʿ-ḥrw iw=f m nḏs n rnpt 110 iw=f ḥr wnm tȝ 500* (...) *r-mn-m hrw pn* (...) 'There is a commoner, Djedi by name, dwelling in Djedsnefru; he is a commoner a 110 years old; he has been eating 500 breads (...) until the present day (...)'.

C. While reminiscent of a similar articulation in *Eloquent Peasant*, the contrast between a framing narrative and the main body of the composition is a general compositional device, made possible by the inclusiveness of Middle Egyptian literature, more broadly of early/mid-second millennium written productions, in the types of written discourses they can accommodate and combine with each other. In the case of *Neferti*, the contrast relates to the 'Royal Tale', a major subtext of the composition.[73] This is integral to the overall structure of the composition, creating horizons of expec-

---

68 In both *Eloquent Peasant* and *Kagemni*, this is also signalled linguistically by the strongly deictic use of *pȝ* demonstratives, reflexively pointing to the written textualization; see §2.4.4.2.2.B.

69 E.g. Moers 2002: 296-8; 2001: 174-81; Parkinson 2012a: 87.

70 Often noted, lastly by Parkinson 2012a: 43.

71 Morenz 1996: 109-10; Blumenthal 1982: 19-21.

72 On a possible origin of such tradition of Snofru in late Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period Dahshur, Raue 2010: 89-90. If correct, this would of course only suggest a terminus *ante quem non*, not implying that the literary texts must have been composed at the earliest moment when this tradition itself first originated.

73 E.g. Gnirs 2006: 243-8.

tation that are then to be decieved and foreshadowing the final restorative section (13-15).[74] While gradually developing in earlier times, the 'Royal Tale' in the particular format in which it is evoked in *Neferti* is first documented from the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty on (Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela*) and more densely so in the early New Kingdom (further discussion, §5.8.1.1).

Stock phrases are by their very nature fairly indistinctive as to time. This is illustrated here with *wn.in=sn ḥr ḫwt=sn* (...) (and the like), as in *Neferti* (1i, 1n, 2h) and *Kagemni* (2.5-6). The expression recurs in early Eighteenth Dynasty texts, in *Appointment of the Vizier* 16 (*Urk.* IV 1381, 15), in *Chapelle Rouge*, p.130: VII.1 (H*HBT* 23, 12), and, later yet, e.g. in Ramses II's *Inscription Dédicatoire* 40 (K*RI* II 326, 10-11); in detail, the formulation in *Neferti* finds its closest parallel not in *Kagemni*, but in *Chapelle Rouge* (§5.8.1.4, (ii)). Significantly, some of these texts are themselves modeled on the 'Royal Tale' and display further elements in common with *Neferti* (§5.8.1.2; §5.8.2.1).

In sum, the commonalities between the framing narrative in *Neferti* and *Eloquent Peasant* are significant, yet commonalities with later texts, themselves significant, are observed as well (see further below, §5.8). For dating, any indication afforded by the former remains uncertain, if not compounded with other elements.

NB. In *Eloquent Peasant*, *ʿḥʿ.n sḏm.n=f* is routinely used to introduce new episodes. In *Neferti*, on the other hand, -*in*-marked constructions (and *prt pw ir.n=f* for events of motion) are used throughout the prologue, while *ʿḥʿ.n sḏm.n=f* is used only twice, in two clauses in immediate succesion to each other.[75] These provide a reflexive description of the written textualization of Neferti's discourse: 2o-q *ʿḥʿ.n dwn.n=f ḏrt=f r hn n ḫrt-ʿ ʿḥʿ.n šd.n=f n=f šfdw ḥnʿ gsti wn.in{n}=f ḥr irt m sš ḏdt.n ḫri-ḥb nfrty* 'Then he stretched his hand out to a box of writing equipment. Then he took for himself a roll and palette. And he was writing down what the lector priest Nefert said.'[76] A similar distribution is in Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* where -*in*-marked constructions are used throughout the composition except in two places: the gods' intervention, causing the tempest (ro 6-7/vso 7-8; H*HBT* 106, 1/2-3/4; restored[77]), and the king's response, setting up an *wḏ* (ro 16/vso 18; H*HBT* 109, 5/6). The first is the occasion for the text, the second the text itself. This distribution would at first seem to associate *Neferti* with *Tempest Stela* against *Eloquent Peasant*. Yet, things might be more complex. Among the great many -*in*-marked verbal constructions in *Neferti*, all but the last (2q) are of the synthetic type, in the dialogue of the king with his courtiers and Neferti, and limited to a few verbs (*ḏd*, *rḏi*, *stȝ*).[78] That -*in*-marked constructions, rather than *ʿḥʿ.n*-headed ones, are here selected is primarily a convention of the type of written discourse to which the prologue, evoking the format of the 'Royal Tale', relates (§2.4.4.6.B). No reliable indication for a late dating can therefore be derived at this level.

---

74 See the analyses in Parkinson 2002: 195, 198.
75 From a different perspective, the distribution of narrative forms in the prologue of *Neferti* is also discussed by Schenkel in press b: §3.4.
76 Translation Parkinson 1997a: 135.
77 The restoration is near certain, see Wiener & Allen 1998: 10.
78 *Ḏd.in* (1f; 1j; 2a; 2f; 2i; 2l; 2n); *stȝ.in* (1h; 2g); *rḏ.in* (1n).

5.1.3.3 Motifs in common with *Eloquent Peasant*: The lament

A. Reflecting the literary tradition it belongs to, the lament in *Neferti* shares motifs and lexical selections with other Middle Egyptian discourses that are, or include, laments. This is nowhere more evident than in a comparison with the beginning of the *Eloquent Peasant*'s Fourth Petition:[79]

(i) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 228-231[80]

ḥḏ bw-nfr (...) 'Destroyed is goodness (...)'

— *Neferti* 7a *ḥḏ ḥm nf3y n bw-nfr* (...) 'For destroyed are these things of goodness (...)'[81]

ptḫ s3 n grg r t3 'and falsehood is hurled to the ground.'

— *Neferti* 3i *mk rf wn sr m ptḫ* {*š3ˤ.n=k im*} <*r*> *t3*[82] 'Look, moreover, the official is in a state of being cast down to the ground'; 7c *bw-nfr nb rwwi ptḫ* {*m*} *t3 n ḳsnt* (...) 'All goodness is gone away, the land is cast down through pain (...)'

(...) *sḫpr sp m msdd* '(...) when the deed has been made hateful?'

— *Neferti* 10h *tw r rḏt ḫwt m msdd* (...) 'Goods will be given with hatred (...)'

ḏ3t itrw m s3 tbwty (...) 'Crossing the river on foot (...)'

— *Neferti* 6a *iwtrw šw nw kmt ḏ3.tw mw ḥr rdwy* 'The river of Egypt is dry so that one will cross water on foot.'

Common motifs and lexical selections extend to *Khakheperreseneb* and *Ipuwer*, as is selectively illustrated below:

(ii) *Neferti* and *Khakheperreseneb*:[83]

- The lexicon of laments: e.g. *ḫprt m t3* 'what happens in the land' (*Neferti* 3a; *Khakh.* ro 10 (*ḫprt ḫt t3*); also *Ipuwer* 1.8 (*ḫprt m t3*)); *sny-mnt* 'calamity', said of the 'land' (*t3*) (*Neferti* 8e; 12a; *Khakh.* ro 11); *sh3* 'be in uproar' (*Neferti* 8f; *Khakh.* ro 10; also *Ipuwer*, *passim*[84]); *ptḫ* 'downcast' (*Neferti* 3i; *Khakh.* vso 1; also *El. Peas.* B1 228);

- Themes and motifs: *Neferti* 11a Pet. (...) *nn wḏd.n.tw pr n r3* '(...) what comes from the mouth can not be endured'; *Khakheperreseneb* vso 5 *n wḏd.tw smi n mdt* 'They have had no patience with the reply to a speech.' *Neferti* 11a begins with *ḥn* 'utterance', a word prominent throughout *Khakheperreseneb* (ro 1; ro 2; ro 8; vso 5). The characterization of Neferti's speech to come as 'some perfect words, choice verses (...)' (*Neferti* 1l-m) is matched by the self-characterization of Khakheperreseneb's

---

79 Parallels noted by Parkinson 2012a: 190-3.

80 Translation slightly adapted from Parkinson 2012a: 190-3.

81 For *ḥḏ* in a *nfr sw* construction, also 5a *ḥḏ t3 pn* (...) 'Destroyed is this land (...)'.

82 This verse, surely to be emended in some way, poses various philological difficulties; see the proposals gathered in Dils et al., *TLA*.

83 On other aspects of the relationship between *Neferti* and *Khakheperreseneb*, Moers 2002.

84 Enmarch 2008: 68.

speech as '(...) unknown utterances, extraordinary verses, new words which have passed, free from repetition (...)' (*Khakh.* ro 2).[85]

(iii) *Neferti* and *Ipuwer*:

- The lexicon of laments: beyond *ḫprt m tȝ* and *sḥȝ* (above), also e.g. *sḥrw nw tȝ* 'the conditions of the land' (*Neferti* 4b; *Ipuwer* 2.4; 5.5); predicative *ḥḏ* 'Destroyed is (...)' (*Neferti* 5a; 7a; *Ipuwer, passim*;[86] also *El. Peas.* B1 228);

- Motifs, e.g. the river being not as it should be (*Neferti* 6a; *Ipuwer* 2.10); strife in the nuclear family (*Neferti* 9f; *Ipuwer* 1.5; 5.10).

Formulations in common between *Neferti* and other Middle Egyptian literary compositions also concern the ways by which Neferti characterizes his speech to come:

(iv) *Neferti* 4a *mk st ḫft-ḥr=k* 'look, it is in front of you'

Compare *Fowler* P. Butler vso 17 *mk sḥr=n ḫft-ḥr=k* 'Look, our condition is in front of you.'[87]

(v) *Neferti* 5b *wnn tȝ pn m m* 'As what will this land to be?'

Thus Pet.; O. DeM 1074 *mi? m.* Compare *Sinuhe* B 43-44 *wnn irf tȝ pf mi m* 'How then will this land be?'

(vi) *Neferti* 5f *n sr.n=i ntt n iy* 'I do not announce what does not come.'

Compare *Shipwrecked Sailor* 30-31 and 97-98.[88]

B. Common lexical selections are largely determined by subject matter and by conventions associated with certain types of written discourses. Literary laments are allied with each other lexically, thus, with expressions not found in *Neferti*, e.g. *iꜥnw* 'woe' (*Khakh.* ro 12; *El. Peas.* R 16.6; 26.5); *tnbḫ* 'turn aside, swerve' (*Khakh.* ro 12; *El. Peas.* B1 128; B1 192); *ḫȝbb* 'crookedness' (*Khakh.* vso 5; *El. Peas.* B1 138). As the pattern of attestation of e.g. *iꜥnw* demonstrates, these expressions are more generally associated with certain types of texts, across time.[89] The case of *irtiw* 'mourning, lament' (*Khakh.* ro 11; *Ipuwer* 1.8; 4.13) is illustrative: this, a rare word, recurs in the First Intermediate Period Moꜥalla inscriptions, then again in funerary lamentations in the early New Kingdom tomb of Reneni of el-Kab.[90] In their imagery and lexically, the latter have significant elements in common with the much earlier *Eloquent Peasant*.[91]

Among significant expressions in *Neferti*, *ḫprt* 'what happens' (*Neferti* 3a; also *Khakh.* ro 10 and *Ipuwer* 1.8) recurs in a Seventeenth Dynasty inscription with

---

85 Discussion by Moers 2002.

86 Enmarch 2008: 89.

87 See Widmaier 2009: 82-3.

88 Another element in common between these two texts is the address by *ḫnms* 'Friend!' (*Neferti* 2i; *Shipwrecked Sailor* 184), lastly Gundacker 2012: 81-2.

89 Donnat 2012: 31; TLA #21750.

90 For the former, Vandier 1950: 183-4; for the latter, Enmarch 2012: 89.

91 Enmarch 2012: 90-1.

literarizing qualities, Wadi el-Hôl #8, 4;[92] this possibly includes a series of further elements in common with *Neferti*.[93] *Sny-mnt* 'calamity' (*Neferti* 8e; 12a; also *Khakh.* ro 11) recurs in two other second millennium texts, and as it seems only in these: *Mutter und Kind* IX.8 (arguably a post-Middle Kingdom composition: §5.3.4.2, (iii)) and Tutankhamun's *Restoration Stela* 8 (*Urk.* IV 2027, 11). The former is illustrative of how lexical expressions come in clusters: in *Mutter und Kind* IX.7-8, *sny-mnt* is closely associated with another word typical of literary laments, *i⸢nw* 'woe' (above).[94] The presence of *sny-mnt* in Tutankhamun's *Restoration Stela* is significant as well, as restoration inscriptions provide one major inscriptional subtext on which *Neferti* draws (§5.8.3.3).

C. As to common motifs, expression in formal registers is subject to strong conventions: there are certain culturally established ways of saying certain things, to be varied upon in individual texts; expression is (phraseologically) bound.[95] Commenting upon parallels between *Eloquent Peasant* and the stela of the Eighteenth Dynasty Great Royal Herald Antef (*Urk.* IV 963-75), Parkinson defines the problem:[96] 'These parallels may be due to a direct knowledge of the poem, or they may suggest that these various texts were all drawing on traditional clusters of language and imagery to express central concerns of elite culture.'

   In the context of a significant cultural continuity (of which linguistic continuity is itself one aspect), such 'clusters of language and imagery' extend over time. This can be illustrated through a parallel reading of two major restoration inscriptions, *Tod Inscription* and *Speos Artemidos*. Across time, restoration inscriptions share general motifs of things 'having fallen in ruin/dissolution' (*w3i r w3st/fḫ*, etc.) and now being 'build/fortified/etc.' (*ḳd, srwd*, etc.) 'anew' (*m-m3wt*).[97] More specific than these are the following, the first a motif, the second a lexical selection, the third a grammatical construction, all individually remarkable:

> (vii) *Tod Inscription* 27 (...) *m sẖnw n iryt im* '(...) from the destruction of what had been made there'

> – *Speos Artemidos* 37-38 (*Urk.* IV 390, 8-9) *šm3w m-ḳ(3)b=sn ḥr sẖn iryt* 'with vagrants in their midst toppling what had been made'

>> Further, in an insecurely dated literary text making reference to such formulations: *Merikare* E 78-79 *m ḳd isy=k m sẖnyt iryt r irt=sy* 'Do not build your tomb out of the destruction of what had been made for what will be made.'[98]

(viii) *Tod Inscription* 28 *tp-šw m33t=i im=s* 'Destitution(?) is what I saw in it.'

– *Speos Artemidos* 26 (*Urk.* IV 388, 6) *itw-ntr m tp-šw* [...] 'The god's fathers were in destitution(?) [...]'

> Further, in a comparable context, yet later in time, Ramses II's *Inscription Dédicatoire* 34 (K*RI* II 325, 13-14) *gm.n=f ḥwt nw t3-dsr n nsywt imiw-ḫ3t m^cḥ^cw=sn imi*[*w*] *3bdw w3w r ḫpr m tp-šw* 'He has found that the temple of the Sacred Land of the former kings and their tombs which are in Abydos had fallen into becoming destitute.'

> The presence of *tp-šw* in both texts is noteworthy in view of the rarity of the word: I am aware of only one other second millennium instance of *tp-šw*, in *Chapelle Rouge*, p.98: I.5 (H*HBT* II 8, 3/4: quoted in context above, §4.3.2.1, (v)).

(ix) *Tod Inscription* 26-27 *wn.k(w) r=i ḥr m33* (...)

– *Speos Artemidos* 9-10 (*Urk.* IV 385, 3) *wn.kw* [*r*]*f m ḫ^cw w^c* (...)

> The construction with an initial pseudoparticiple of *wnn* is very rare (§1.2, (v)): only three other instances of the construction are known, all from the Twelfth Dynasty (*Sinuhe* B 252-253; *Shipwrecked Sailor* 136-137; Khentemsemti 4-5).

If *Tod Inscription* is dated to the early Twelfth Dynasty, as it generally is, the above directly illustrates temporal depth at the level of three specific elements: a motif, a lexical selection, and a grammatical construction, all individually remarkable. If *Tod Inscription* dates to a later period, as has recently been argued,[99] the above is no less illustrative of how strongly bound expression can be, notably by the type of written discourse.

In literary texts, expression is similarly expected to be more or less tightly bound: while early/mid-second millennium literature affords some space for play (e.g. §2.4.5; also §2.4.3-4), it is not a space for the free play of composers, just as contemporaneous inscriptions as the products of the same culture are not. Significant is for example how expression in *A Man to His Son* is tightly related to both Middle Kingdom and early New Kingdom texts, inscriptional and non-inscriptional ones.[100] At the level of individual motif, an illustration is the 'blocking' (*d/ḳbb*) of the 'noses' (*fnḏw*), 'a common image for utter helpness':[101] this is recurrent in Twelfth Dynasty literary texts (*Ptahhotep* 22; *Eloquent Peasant* B1 264; *Loyaliste* 3.5 (short and long versions)), yet also in *Hymn* 2.5-6, a Middle Egyptian compostion for which a dating to the late Seventeenth or early Eighteenth Dynasty was argued in the present study (§3.4). How far 'clusters of language and imagery' in Middle Egyptian literature extend over time is more generally demonstrated by late compositions such as *Aametju* (§1.3.2.3) or *Hymn* (§3.4.5.C).

---

99 Buchberger 2006.
100 Detailed presentation in Fischer-Elfert 1999.
101 Parkinson 2012a: 215.

D. In *Neferti*, the motif of 'giving with hatred' (10h) finds a parallel in *Eloquent Peasant* (B1 230: compare (i) for the whole sequence B1 228-231), yet also in a much later composition, *Ani* (D 8.2).[102] A motif relating to the river drying out (6a) is paralleled in *Eloquent Peasant* (B1 230-231), but another one relating to the same theme (6f) is again in *Ani* (B 21.8-9).[103] *Ptḥ r tꜣ* in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 228-229 is similar to *Neferti* 3i, yet the expression also recurs in Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* ro 17-18/vso 19-20 (H*HBT* 109, 13/14) (...) *sꜥkt sšmw r kꜣrw=sn wnw m ptḥ r tꜣ* '(...) and reintroduce the statues to their shrines which were in a state of being cast down[104] to the ground'.[105] Like *Eloquent Peasant*, Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* shares other motifs with *Neferti* (§5.8.3.3). Said of (an) official(s), as in *Neferti* 3i, *ptḥ r/ḥr tꜣ* is best paralleled in Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree* 6 (quoted above: §2.8.2.2, (v)). A temporal depth of motifs and expression is directly manifest on another level: beyond the motifs it shares with literary laments and *Eloquent Peasant*, the lament of *Neferti* strongly resonates with hymns to the Nileflood documented in the New Kingdom (§5.8.3.2).

Similar comments extend to the formulations by which Neferti introduces his speech. The question about how the land will be in *Neferti* 5b is like a similar question in *Sinuhe* (B 43-44), but this is probably just the ordinary way of expressing such content. '(Not) announcing' (*sr*) situations 'that are (not) to come' is found in both *Neferti* 5f (vi) and in a Twelfth Dynasty composition, *Shipwrecked Sailor* (30-31; 97-98), but the phrasing is preconfigured, compare e.g. TT 110 (Djehuti; *temp.* Hatshepsut/Thutmosis III) *sr.n(=i) iyt* 'I announced what came.'[106] Possibly more significant is an occurrence associating *sr* with *ḫpr.t=sy* 'what will happen' (Hatshepsut's Southern Obelisk, Basis 3 (*Urk.* IV 370, 1-2), quoted below, §5.8.2.1).

5.1.4 Middle Egyptian language

A dating of *Neferti* to the early Twelfth Dynasty has been argued for on linguistic grounds. More generally, the Middle Egyptian language of the composition may have played a role in the hypothesis that *Neferti* should date to the Middle Kingdom.

---

102 Fischer-Elfert 1992: 355-6; the reading in the B version of *Ani* is different, see the discussion in Quack 1994: 197.

103 Discussion in Quack 1994: 197-8.

104 A different interpretation is in Malaise & Winand 1999: 478, ex.1236: '(...) réintroduire dans leurs chapelles les statues qui étaient sur le point de se précipiter par terre'. This is unlikely on semantic grounds, since this reading—technically with 'mellic' aspect—would imply that statues that were only about to fall down, and therefore had not yet changed position, should be 'reintroduced' to their shrines.

105 In details the formulation in *Neferti* is in fact slightly closer to the one in Ahmose's *Tempest Stela*, with *ptḥ* a passive participle as part of the predicate in a situational predicate construction, itself headed by *wnn*.

106 *DZA* 25.169.890; the same formula already in the Middle Kingdom (*DZA* 29.385.060). A more developed elaboration is in *Urk.* IV 481, 15-16 (Hapuseneb; *temp.* Hatshepsut).

5.1.4.1 A linguistic dating to the early Twelfth Dynasty?

The linguistic evidence for dating *Neferti* into the early Twelfth Dynasty specifically rests upon Vernus' *post quem non* criterion, here applied to two passages, 3a-b and 11d.[107] As discussed, the aspectual change on which Vernus' criterion is based only permits to define an *ante quem non* criterion, and no correlative *post quem non* criterion for the time period concerned (§2.6.3). With a view on *Neferti* specifically, this can be illustrated further by the following examples:

(A) *In a characterization of general validity (after a A pw clause)*

(i) *Neferti* 2r-3b

rḫ-ḫt pw n iȝbt ni-sw bȝstt m wbn=s
msw pw n ḥkȝ-ꜥnḏ
iw=f mḥy[sic]*=f ḥr ḫprt m tȝ*
iw=f sḫȝ=f kni n iȝbtt (...)

'He was a sage of the East, he belonged to Bastet in her rising,
he was a child of the Heliopolitan nome;

He ponders what happens in the land,
he recalls the sorry state of the East (...)'

(ii) Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* 19-20 (*Urk.* IV 19, 13 - 20, 3)

nsw wꜥ sbȝ.n spdt ḥsy n sšȝt (...)
iw=f šsm=f sšw r tp-ḥsb
wr-ḥkȝw pw nb mrwt r nsw nb (...)

'A unique king, taught by Sothis, praised by Seshat (...)
He leads the scribes to the right standard;
He is a great of magic, lord of love more than any king (...)'

(B) *Sim., with contextually derived future time reference*

(iii) *Neferti* 11d

iw rꜥ iwd=f sw <r> rmṯ

'Re will remove himself from men.'

> Future time reference is established by context,[108] at the beginning of the stanza in 11a *nn wḫd.n.tw (...)*, then confirmed in the elaboration of 11d, in 11e-h *nn rḫ.tw (...) nn tn.tw (...)*

(iv) Thutmosis' III *Poetical Stela* 9 (*Urk.* IV 613, 14-15)

ḏ=i nrw n ḥm=k ḫt ibw=sn
ȝḫt=i imt tp=k sswn=s st

'I shall place dread of Your Majesty through their hearts;
My uraeus which is on your head will destroy them.'

---

107 Vernus 1990a: 185; 1990b: 1037.
108 Similarly Vernus 1990a: 2.

5.1.4.2   A linguistic dating to the Middle Kingdom more broadly?

Neferti is composed in Middle Egyptian. Yet, all expressions in *Neferti* can individually be documented in higher written registers in later times, down to the time of the first manuscript attestation of the compostion. A selective illustration, focusing on the more subtle dimensions of syntax and/or linguistic function and meaning, is the following (the list could easily be expanded to cover the whole grammar of *Neferti*):

(A) *ꜣw-less subject-first construction in discourse-initial position, with thetic force* (see also §1.2, (vi))

(i) *Neferti* 8a (stanza-initial)

ꜥwt ḫꜣst r swr ḥr itrw nw kmt

'Foreign flock will drink at the river of Egypt'

> Very common throughout *Neferti* (§5.2.3.3).

(ii) Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree* (D.17), 4-5

(...) r-ḏd
ḫn bin wꜣ r ḫpr m pꜣ r-pr (...)

'(...) thus:
"A bad matter has come to occur in this temple (...)" '[109]

(iii) *Urk*. IV 656, 14-16 (from Thutmosis III's *Annals*)

iit tw[sic] r ḏd n ḥm=f
mrw snb iwꜥyt rst mḥtt r-mitt

'Coming one did to tell His Majesty:
"The coast is clear, the southern and northern garrisons likewise." '

(B) *Pw-marked thetic constructions* (see also §2.7.2.1, (iv))

(iv) *Neferti* 13a

nsw pw r iyt n rsy imny mꜣꜥ-ḫrw rn=f

'(This, the chaos described in the lament, means:) A king from the south is to come, Ameny, justified, by name.'

> Introducing the final affirmative part of the composition (13-15): the resolution is presented as an interpretive gloss to the preceding lament.[110]

---

109 Vernus 1997: 54, n.163 placed both this and the next examples in a footnote, for methodological reasons: being concerned with establishing the very existence of this construction in Middle Egyptian, the author refrained from taking argument on post-Middle Kingdom texts. Once the existence of the construction is securely established (by Vernus' 1997 overall argument; also Stauder & Uljas in prep.), these examples, similar to older ones both formally and functionally, can be safely adduced in present presentation.

110 Parkinson 2002: 198.

(v) Ahmose's *Abydos Stela for Tetisheri* 7-8 (*Urk*. IV 27, 14-15)

ink pw sḫꜣ.n=i mwt mwt=i mwt it(=i) ḥmt-nsw wrt mwt-nsw tti-šri mꜣꜥt-ḫrw

'(The fact is:) I thought of the mother of my mother and the mother of my father, the great royal wife, the royal mother, Tetisheri, justified.'

(vi) Hatshepsut's Northern Obelisk, Basis D 14 (*Urk*. IV 364, 16-17)

ink pw snḏm.n=i m ꜥḥ sḫꜣ.n=i ḳmꜣ wi

'(The situation was:) I relaxed in the palace and I thought of the one who created me.'

    Beginning of Hatshepsut's narrative of the construction of the obelisks.

(C) *Discourse-connective is* (see also §1.2, (ix))[111]

(vii) *Neferti* 2n

m ḫpr.t=s{t}(y) swt
min is ḫpr
swꜣ ḥr=f

'But from what will happen;
for today has happened,
forget about it!'

       Sim. 5e;[112] 11i.

(viii) Rahotep's *Coptos Stela* (D.17), 3-4

w[ḏ]t kꜣ=k ḫpr.t=sn ity nb=n
ḥw is pw nty m rꜣ=k
siꜣ [is p]w n[ty m ib=k]

'What your Ka orders is what will happen, Sovereign our lord;
for the one in your mouth is Hu,
for the one in your heart is Sia.'

(ix) *Chapelle Rouge*, p.99: I.16-17 (H*HBT* II 9, 9-10)

išst pw mrt.n=k ḫpr
iry=i is ḫft wḏ

'What do you wish to happen?
For I will act according to the decree.'

(D) *Polemic swt, i.e. swt expressing divergence in dialogue*[113]

(x) *Neferti* 2n

ḏd.in ḥm=f ꜥ.w.s. m ḫpr.t=s{t}(y) swt (...)

'And His Majesty L.P.H. said: "But from what will happen (...)!" '

---

111 Further, Oréal 2011: 134-8, 143-5.

112 Emendation into *wnn is ḥr-nb id n gꜣ=f*, following Quack 1993a: 77.

113 Further, Oréal 2011: 423-5.

(xi) *Deir el-Bahari* IV, pl.107, bottom left

mk w(*i*) *swt rḫ.kw st*

'But don't you see that I know that!'

5.1.5 Interim summary

In the above, no argument was made against the commonly accepted dating of *Neferti* to the early Twelfth Dynasty. Nor was any argument made in favor, or against, any other dating. Rather, some dimensions that have played a role in previous hypotheses were discussed, all individually. It remains to be seen whether the conjunction of these could suggest one horizon as being more likely than other ones. According with the elements evoked so far, the issue falls in two parts: is a very early dating, to the early Twelfth Dynasty, more likely than later datings, to the late Middle Kingdom or later still? Is a dating more broadly to the Middle Kingdom more likely than a very late dating, to the early Eighteenth Dynasty?

A dating to the early Twelfth Dynasty would have to rely on a specific reading of 'Ameny' and on an interpretation of *Neferti* as a piece of advocacy for the kings of that period. A directly referential reading of 'Ameny', itself an interpretation, is only one among several possibilities, not inherently any more likely than any other one (§5.1.2.1). A reading of the composition in 'propagandistic' terms is contingent upon a broader interpretive model, also an hypothesis only, not without problems of its own, and derived notably from precisely such reading of *Neferti* (§5.1.2.3). A linguistic argument that has been proposed for a very early dating does not hold (§5.1.4.1).

A dating to the Middle Kingdom more broadly would have to be based on a directly referential interpretation of the 'Walls of the Ruler' and/or on the literary tradition to which *Neferti* belongs. The referential status of the former is entirely unclear, as is the relation of *Neferti* to the only other text, itself literary, that includes the expression, *Sinuhe*. Alternative scenarios by which the expression would be fictionalizing in *Sinuhe* and/or would in *Neferti* be in echo to *Sinuhe* are not inherently any less likely than a directly referential interpretation (§5.1.2.2).

As regards the literary tradition to which *Neferti* belongs, this is defined by reception, language, and common themes and motifs. Of these, patterns of transmission in the New Kingdom and Ramesside construals of Middle Egyptian 'literary history' (an anachronistic term) are inherently neutral to the issue (§5.1.3.1). Linguistically, no expression in *Neferti* implies a Middle Kingdom dating (§5.1.4.2), nor does the overall register of the composition: Middle Egyptian was not a 'classical' language in the early Eighteenth Dynasty and was made one only subsequently (§5.1.3.1.B). Of possible consequence are only the significant commonalities observed between *Neferti* and other Middle Egyptian literary texts, first among which *Eloquent Peasant*. As far as this can be assessed on direct empirical grounds, and taking into account that several other Middle Egyptian literary texts are themselves not precisely dated, motifs and lexical selections—'clusters of language and imagery'—display significant continuity over time in the early/mid-second millennium (§5.1.3.2-3).

The question then comes down to whether production in the Middle Egyptian literary tradition to which *Neferti* belongs is viewed as fairly compact or more extended in time. If the former hypothesis were made, an early Eighteenth Dynasty dating of *Neferti* could be declared unlikely, yet this would then rely on an assumption that is itself hypothetical only. Assessing the temporal depth of the common literary tradition of which *Neferti* is an exponent is one of the very research questions the present study aims to address.

5.2 *Neferti*, *passim*: *Tw r sḏm*

The single most salient grammatical construction in *Neferti* is bare *tw r sḏm*. The construction occurs no less than seven times (6b; 7g; 7h (twice); 8f; 10h; 15a), to which one instance of the related *iw.tw r sḏm* (9a) is to be added. Moreover, the construction functions as a major articulating device throughout the main body of the composition after the framing prologue (§5.2.3.3).

The present section analyzes the diachronic status of bare *tw r sḏm* and its textual status in *Neferti*. A preliminary sub-section is devoted to discussing one apparent Middle Kingdom instance of the construction (§5.2.1). A second step lies with demonstrating that bare *tw r sḏm* is integral to the original text of *Neferti* (§5.2.2). The status of bare *tw r sḏm* as a construction by and large limited to the literary sphere is discussed in turn, at first restricting the prospects to directly anchor the construction to the external record (§5.2.3). The distribution of the broader constructional scheme (*X.*)*tw r sḏm* (i.e. with or without supporting morphological host) is then presented, with more easily derived implications for dating (§5.2.4). Finally, the expression of main future passive events in securely dated Middle Kingdom literary texts is described, with yet more consequential implications for dating (§5.2.5).

5.2.1 *Ptahhotep* 82 P: An instance of *tw r sḏm* in a Middle Kingdom literary text?

Considering bare *tw r sḏm* for dating *Neferti* would at first seem nonsensical given one apparently secure instance of just that construction in an early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary text:

(i) *Ptahhotep* 81-82 P, traditional reading
ḳsn pw ḥḏḏw ḥwrw-ib
tw r irt ntt m ib=k
'The one who destroys the poor-hearted is a difficult person;
What is in your mind will be done.'

This is quoted in the major reference grammar[114] and in all subsequent grammars[115] and grammatical discussions.[116] It has thereby acquired canonical status in the

---

114 *EG* p.254, n.4.

Egyptological description of Middle Egyptian and always stood as a proof that bare *tw r sḏm* is possible in Twelfth Dynasty literary registers. Consequently, the presence of (*X.*)*tw r sḏm* in *Neferti* is considered not to contradict an early Twelfth Dynasty dating of this composition.

A. A preliminary observation is that the classical reading of *Ptahhotep* 81-82 P (i) rests on two elements: (a) that no other grammatical construction seems readily available for reading *Ptahhotep* 82 P; and (b) that a similar segmentation is present in the later manuscript L2:

> (ii) *Ptahhotep* 81-82 L2
> *ḫsn pw ḫdd ḥwrw-ib* °
> *sw r irt ntt m ib=f*
>
> 'The one who destroys the poor-hearted is a difficult person;
> He will do what is in his heart.'

Upon closer study of Middle Egyptian grammar, however, another grammatical construction is possible in *Ptahhotep* 82 P, namely *ib.tw r sḏm*, the rare passive counterpart to *ib=f r sḏm*.[117] As to the segmentation in L2, this need not be original: internally to P, nothing supports such segmentation. Ink-dippings in P, which can in some manuscripts be analyzed as traces of a scribe's engagement with a text,[118] do not afford information in this respect.[119] In addition, 81-82 L2 has various traces of secondariness in other respects (notably the persons of pronouns: compare (i) and (ii)). Just a few verses ahead in L2, the other instance of bare *tw r sḏm* in the text (72), also a *NP r sḏm* construction, is itself demonstrably secondary (P reads differently: §2.3.5). Consequently, what is presented as a secure instance of bare *tw r sḏm* in a Middle Kingdom literary text, *Ptahhotep* 81-82 P, is not a positive fact, but itself an interpretation only.

B. Going beyond the above, a series of logically independent arguments, all internal to the text of *Ptahhotep* P and thereby independent of *Neferti*, impose that *Ptahhotep* 81-82 P must be segmented differently than in the traditional reading.[120]

> - The right part of the traditional segmentation *(...) | tw r irt* is problematic for various reasons, most notably because future passive events in exactly similar environments are expressed differently throughout *Ptahhotep* itself, as *ir.tw=f* (prospective or subjunctive), not as **tw r irt*. For instance, locally within the triptych of maxims §2-4 (D 60-83), and within maxim §2 in a structural position exactly similar to the one of 82 in §4, *Ptahhotep* 66 reads *nis.t(w)=f*, not **tw r nis=f*.

---

115 Lastly Borghouts 2010: I, §99.g, (37) and II, 467.
116 E.g. Vernus 1997: 26, n.78.
117 Stauder in press c: §1.
118 E.g. for *Sinuhe* B, Parkinson 2009: 90-112.
119 I am indebted to Chloé Ragazzoli (p.c. 1/2011) for checking this on the original.
120 In details, Stauder in press c: §2-3.

- The left part of the segmentation *ḫwrw-ib* | (...) is just as problematic, for a variety of further reasons. Among these, the heading of maxim §4, to which *Ptahhotep* 82 belongs, reads *ḫwrw* (75), not *ḫwrw-ib*. The latter expression itself is not attested anywhere else—except in the L2 reading of the very same verse.

- In addition, constructions in bare *tw*—both bare *tw r sḏm* (below, this section) and bare *tw sḏm* (§5.3)—are found in specific syntactic environments only: in paragraph-initial position or following a preceding setting clause (§5.2.3.3; §5.3.3.A). As discussed below, both environments relate to broader aspects of the syntax of *iw*, more precisely of *iw*-lessness. None of these apply to the posited *tw r irt* in *Ptahhotep* 82 P. If the traditional reading were correct, this would stand out syntactically isolated in the whole Middle Egyptian record; a new chapter of the syntax of *iw* would also have to be written.

In view of the above, *Ptahhotep* 81-82 P must be segmented differently:

(iii) *Ptahhotep* 81-82 P, as read in the present study:

ḳsn pw ḥḏḏw ḫwrw
ib.tw r irt ntt m ib=k

'The one who destroys a wretch is a difficult person;
One wishes to do what is in your heart.'

C. Textual processes that led to the reinterpretation of 81-82 P into the differently segmented reading in L2 can be described along various parameters, such as the differential salience of competing grammatical expressions (*ib.tw r sḏm* vs. bare *tw r sḏm*) in scribes' representations of Middle Egyptian grammar, phenomena of local attraction, and semantic reinterpretation.[121]

Also a textual process, of a different sort, is how the modern reading of *Ptahhotep* 81-82 'P' (i) came about. Descriptively, this modern reading (i) appears as a back-projection of the segmentation in L2 (ii), going back to the early synoptic editions of the text.[122] Its near-universal acceptance[123] may have been favored by the following set of circumstances:

(a) The typographical disposition of synoptic text editions, which favors conflating readings;

(b) The fact that the reading of L2 in 82 (*sw r irt*) in effect presupposes a reading **tw r irt* at some point during textual transmission;

(c) The local salience of bare *tw r sḏm* construction, which is found just a few lines ahead, in the L2 version (!) of *Ptahhotep* 72;

---

121 In details, Stauder in press c: §4.2.
122 Dévaud 1916: 20; Žába 1956: 23.
123 A lone exception is Lichtheim 2006² (1975¹): 64, 77, who reads as the present author, without however justifying her interpretation.

(d) The general salience of bare *tw r sḏm* in present-day philologists' grammatical awareness (not least due to the conspicuous presence of the expression in *Neferti*), contrasting with the textual rarity of *ib.tw r sḏm*, a construction until now never described.[124]

Of these, only (b) is of some consequence: a reading **tw r irt* is indeed to be assumed at some stage of textual transmission prior to L2 (§5.2.2, introduction). This stage is already posterior to P and can be dated to a period no earlier than the late Seventeenth/early Eighteenth Dynasty.[125]

5.2.2 Bare *tw r sḏm* as integral to the original text of *Neferti*

As *Ptahhotep* 72 L2 and 82 L2 demonstrate, bare *tw r sḏm* can arise in the course of textual transmission:

Ptahhotep 72 (§2.3.5):   P *wr wfȝ* (...) *in* (...)

→ L2 *tw r wfȝ=f* (...) *in* (...)

Ptahhotep 82 (§5.2.1):   P (...) *ḥwrw* | *ib.tw r irt* (...)

→ 'proto-L2' *(...) *ḥwrw-ib* | *tw r irt* (...)

→ L2 *(...) *ḥwrw-ib* | *sw r irt* (...)

A few more instances of secondary bare *tw r sḏm* are encountered in other texts (below, B). If *tw r sḏm* is to made an argument for dating *Neferti*, it must preliminarily be established that the construction is integral to the original text of that composition.

A. As discussed above (§2.3.5), the readings in *Ptahhotep* 72 L2 and 82 L2 can be identified as secondary on purely text-internal grounds, i.e. without taking any external knowledge of the text in P into account. By contrast, none of the instances of bare *tw r sḏm* in *Neferti* displays any traces of secondariness, neither in itself, nor in how it relates to its immediate textual surroundings. This makes a claim that the *Neferti* instances are original the null-hypothesis.

B. In going beyond this general appreciation, the 'source constructions' from which bare *tw r sḏm*, if secondary, could have arisen are considered. In *Ptahhotep*, these source constructions are very rare ones and the processes of textual change accordingly specific ones:

---

124 *Tw r sḏm* is near-universally mentioned in reference grammars and often given some special attention (e.g. a dedicated section in *EG* §333), reflecting the remarkable fact of a clause-initial *tw*. By contrast, *ib.tw r sḏm* is not referenced in any grammar nor in any grammatical study (Stauder in press c is yet to appear).

125 Stauder in press c: §4.2.

72 P *wr wfꜣ in sḏmyw*:   *nfr sw* with a subject elaborated by *in N*

The elaboration by *in N* probably helped support the alteration of the P construction into a morphologically overt passive one in L2.

82 P *ib.tw r irt*:   *ib.tw r sḏm*

The construction is very rare in itself; more importantly, it is much rarer than *tw r sḏm* in post-Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian. This practically results in a significantly differential salience of both constructions in ancient (and modern) readers' implicit representations of grammar, contributing to the alteration of the less common into the more common construction.

The textual processes leading to the rise of secondary bare *tw r sḏm* in *Ptahhotep* L2 are individual histories. In *Neferti*, none of these source constructions is possible. Nor is any other scenario based on individual histories of a similar sort: occurrences of bare *tw r sḏm* are too many in *Neferti*.

Other documented instances of secondary bare *tw r sḏm* are from a source construction *tw sḏm* (§5.3):

Tw sḏm → tw r sḏm:

- *Kheti* 3.5-6 (ca. 1/2 of mss.): see §5.3.2.2;
- *Hymn* 6.4 (1 ms.: O. Var.Lit.A): see §5.3.2.1;
- *Neferti* 10e (1 ms.: O. GC 90): see §5.3.1.2.

In all seven instances of *tw r sḏm* in *Neferti*, future contexts are firmly established by active *NP r sḏm* constructions and (subjunctive or prospective) *sḏm.tw=f*. A source construction *tw sḏm*, which has present progressive tense, is not possible for any of these.

Beyond documented cases, another source construction one may think of is (prospective or subjunctive) *sḏm.tw=f*. This is very common in general, yet never documented as undergoing textual alteration into (bare) *tw r sḏm*. Compare for instance the forms in the king's evocation of the promised burial in *Sinuhe* B 191 (*wḏꜥ.tw*), B 192 (*ir.tw*), B 195 (*nis.tw*), B 195-196 (*sft.tw*), all of which are still fully preserved in the post-Eighteenth Dynasty AOS version. More generally, synthetic forms hardly ever undergo textual alteration into a morphologically unrelated analytic category. (Rare cases of *N(P) sḏm=f → NP ḥr sḏm* are not before Ramesside manuscripts and tend to leave traces in the form of hybrids (§2.3.3); in addition, this is an alteration of a subject-initial category into another subject-initial one, unlike what would be the case if *tw r sḏm* were secondary to *sḏm.tw=f*.)

Not a possibility either is an alteration from a source construction *N_O r sḏm* ('N is to be heard': thus e.g. 15a **inbw ḥḳꜣ r ḳd → P. Pet tw r ḳd inbw ḥḳꜣ*). The construction *N_O r sḏm* is reserved to events in which the agent is minimally salient semantically (e.g. *Ptahhotep* 407 P; *Merikare* E 49: §5.2.5.C). This does not fit the semantics of any of the instances of *tw r sḏm* in *Neferti*, where the agent, although implicit, always remains salient (thus, with a rendering glossing the semantics, the meaning in 15a is not 'The Walls of the Ruler are to be built' (by some inner necessity), but 'One (*scil.*

the king himself) will build the Walls of the Ruler'). Formally, an alteration N_O *r sḏm* → *tw r sḏm=f* would also imply a movement of constituents in the clause (notably the patient moving after the verb), which is highly unlikely in itself.

As it turns out, there is no source construction, documented or undocumented, from which bare *tw r sḏm* in *Neferti* could have arisen. Bare *tw r sḏm* is therefore integral to the original text of *Neferti*.

C. Additional confirmation is found with the distribution of the construction in *Neferti*. Bare *tw r sḏm* occurs no less than seven times across the composition. Had it been adapted from some other construction, a scenario of fully systematic redaction would be implied, at complete variance with what is otherwise observed in the textual history of all other Middle Egyptian literary texts.[126]

More directly, the distribution of bare *tw r sḏm* in *Neferti* is itself eloquent. In *Neferti*, two constructions are mainly used with future passive events, *tw r sḏm* and *sḏm.tw=f*. The former is regularly used with main events, presented for themselves, while the latter is used with events that are subject to some further elaboration and/or dependent on other events (in details below, §5.2.3.3, (ii)). The contrast between bare *tw r sḏm* and *iw.tw r sḏm* (once, in 9a) is similarly explained within the broader textual articulation of *Neferti* (§5.2.3.3, (v)). The exact same contrasts extend to active constructions (§5.2.3.3, (i) and §5.2.3.3, (iii)-(iv), respectively). Bare *tw r sḏm* thereby appears to be fully integrated within the overall macro-syntactic articulation of the lament. Such a complex, multi-dimensional distribution does not arise as the accidental result of textual alteration.

5.2.3   Bare *tw r sḏm*

Bare *tw r sḏm* is a highly uncommon construction (§5.2.3.1). It is also formally distinguished by the bareness of *tw* itself: this is remarkable, because *tw*—be it as an inflectional morpheme, e.g. in *sḏm.tw=f*, or a pronoun-like clitic, e.g. in *iw.tw r sḏm*— otherwise leans on some preceding element. The only two exceptions to this rule are bare *tw r sḏm* itself and the even rarer bare *tw sḏm*, examined in the next section (§5.3). In discussing bare *tw r sḏm* in *Neferti* for dating, the status of the construction in grammar must therefore be addressed.

In the following, a few labeling conventions are adopted: (a) 'bare *tw r sḏm*' is self-explanatory; (b) '*X.tw r sḏm*' refers to a similar construction, but preceded by some segment, either *iw* or relative *nty/ntt*; (c) '*(X).tw r sḏm*' refers to (a) and (b) collectively, i.e. to the higher-order construction consisting in future *NP r sḏm* with *tw* in the subject slot, bare or not.

5.2.3.1   Attestation

The textual distribution of the construction is considered first. The full tableau of attestation is the following:

---

126 Compare e.g. the Ramesside *Sinuhe* (Parkinson 2009: 201; Köhler 2009: 55). As a case study on the lexical level, compare *nkꜣ* and *kꜣi* occurring side by side in Eighteenth Dynasty versions of *Ptahhotep* and *Sinuhe* (§2.7.3.3, (ii)).

(a) In one Middle Egyptian literary composition, integral to the original text (§5.2.2):

Neferti: 6b; 7g; 7h (twice); 8f; 10h; 15a;

(b) In New Kingdom manuscripts of Middle Egyptian literary compositions, as a secondary reading:

- altered from bare *tw sḏm*:

Kheti: 3.5-6 (ca. 1/2 of mss.): see §5.3.2.2;
Hymn: 6.4 (1 ms.: O. Var.Lit.A): see §5.3.2.1;
Neferti: 10e (1 ms.: O. GC 90): see §5.3.1.2;

- altered from other constructions:

Ptahhotep: 72 L2: see §2.3.5; also implicit in 82 L2: see §5.2.1.C;

> NB. Although secondary, these readings all make sense in their respective contexts. They thereby contribute to the overall pattern of attestation of the construction, documenting its full acceptability to early New Kingdom scribes.

(c) In one personal name, documented from D.13 to D.18:

PN: *tw*(*-r*)*-mrt=s* 'She-will-be-loved'.[127]

The overall pattern of attestation is very limited. Bare uses of *tw* are documented in Middle Egyptian, but do not constitute a regular phenomenon (compare further below, §5.3, for the even rarer bare *tw sḏm*). I go on to examine the specific conditions licensing and/or triggering the construction.

5.2.3.2   In a personal name

Personal names have a special status in language: even when consisting in a meaning-ful segment of speech (a phrase or a clause), they do not relate to the speech situation in which they are uttered nor to unfolding discourse. *Ỉw* on the other hand, when not used as a default morphological host, has functions precisely in the domains of enunciation and discourse-connectivity. Very roughly, these consist in relating an utterance to the speech situation and/or to a preceding segment of discourse, and in allowing the speaker to express his commitment to the truth or informativeness of the utterance. Such functions only very limitedly come to use in personal names, the only case of a semantically motivated use of *iw* in these being apparently when the state-of-affairs expressed by a clausal name is to be limited temporally. In all other cases, the presence or absence of *iw* in personal names is determined by its function as a morphological host. Compare:

---

127 References gathered by Vernus 1990a: 7, n.16: (a) Alwyn Castle 1950 (Vernus 1990a: 7, ex.9) *tw-r-mrt=s* (early D.13); (b) CG 20695a (Lange & Schäfer 1908: 322-3; Ranke 1935: 379.3) *tw-mrt=s, tw mr.tw*[sic]*=s* (D.13, cf. *www.griffith.ox.ac.uk/gri/8ste250.pdf*); (c) Vernus 1986: 88 and n.44 (Gitton 1984: 16-7, n. 37) *i'ḥ-ms tw-*(*m*)*r=s* (early D.18).

(a) Subject a suffix pronoun (*iw* required as a default morphological host):

E.g. *iw=f/s-r-ꜥnḫ* 'He/she-will-live'; *iw=f/s-r-snb* 'He/She-will-be-healthy'; *iw=s-r-prt* 'She-will-come-forth';[128]

(b) Subject not a suffix pronoun (no default morphological host required):

- Subject a full noun: e.g. *msḥ-r-m(w)t=f/=s* 'He/She-will-die-by-the-crocodile' (lit. 'The-crocodile-will-be-his/her-death');[129] uncommonly with *iw*, e.g. *iw ib(=i) mn* 'My heart is enduring' (Old Kingdom);[130]

- Subject *tw*: *tw(-r)-mr(t)=s* 'She-will-be-loved'.

5.2.3.3   In *Neferti*: Textual hierarchies and macro-syntax

In *Neferti*, the use of bare *tw r sḏm* relates to issues in the broader textual organization of the composition, in which various hierarchical levels are interwoven. The following major levels of organization are here relevant.

A. Among constructions with future time reference, (*iw*) *NP r sḏm* (i.e. *NP r sḏm*, with or without *iw*) contrasts with a *sḏm=f* of some sort. The former expresses main events in the text, while the latter provides some further elaboration to these.

Active – active

(i) *Neferti* 8a-b

ꜥwt ḫꜣst r swr ḥr itrw nw kmt
ḳbb=sn ḥr wḏbw=sn[a] *n-gꜣw stri st*

'The flock of foreign countries will drink at the river of Egypt,
they will cool themselves on their banks for lack of someone to make them fearful.'

a)   Sic. It has been proposed that this is in reference to *itrw nw kmt* in the preceding verse, then to be read as a plural[131] (meaning the branches of the Nile in the Delta?). This is possible, but remains insecure since *nw* in 8a may also have been through attraction to the ending -*w* of *itrw*.

Passive – active; then *passive – passive*

(ii) *Neferti* 8f-9a

tw r šsp ḫꜥw nw ꜥḥꜣ
ꜥnḫ tꜣ m shꜣ
iw[a]*.tw r irt ꜥḥꜣw m biꜣ*
dbḥ.tw {m} tꜣ <m> snfw

'Weapons of combat will be taken up,
the land will live in uproar.

---

128 Ranke 1935: 14.20, 15.10, 14.22, 15.12, 15.11, respectively.
129 For this name, Collombert 2006.
130 Ranke 1935: 414.17.
131 Dils et al., *TLA*.

(And) arms/arrows will be made of copper,
bread will be asked with blood.'

a) On *iw* in 9a, below, B.

B. On a higher-order hierarchical level, bare subject-initial constructions contrast with *iw*-headed ones. In conformity with the general anchoring functions of *iw*, *iw*-headed clauses are thereby related to some preceding segment of discourse. By contrast, bare constructions, which occur in paragraph-initial position, are not.[132]

Active – active

(iii) *Neferti* 14a-e

s3 n s r irt rn=f (...)
iw ᶜ3mw r ḫr n šᶜt=f (...)

'The son of a man will make his name (...);
(And) the Asiatics will fall to his slaughtering (...)'

Passive – active

(iv) *Neferti* 15a-e

tw r ḳd inbw ḥḳ3 ᶜ.w.s. (...)
iw m3ᶜt r iit r st=s (...)

'The Walls of the Ruler L.P.H. will be built (...);
(And) Maat will return to its place (...)'

Passive – passive

(v) *Neferti* 8f-9a[133]

tw r šsp ḫᶜw nw ᶜh3 (...)
iw.tw r irt ᶜh3w m bi3 (...)

'Weapons of combat will be taken up (...);
(And) arms/arrows will be made of copper (...)'

C. In one passage, finally, bare *tw r sḏm* constructions occur in direct succession to each other. The construction presents events 'en bloc' without any intervening elaboration of these. Contrasting with the layered texture found elsewhere, this brings about a *stringendo* effect, which can be interpreted as expressing a heightened expressive urgency:

---

132 On the general correlation between *iw*-lessness in subject-initial constructions and paragraph-initiality, provisionally Vernus 1997: 45-61; further Stauder & Uljas in prep.

133 As the semantic continuity between 8f and 9a demonstrates, these verses go together on the level of their macro-syntactic articulation. The placement of the rubrum in Pet. 9a reflects editorial practices.

(vi) *Neferti* 7g-h

tw r isḳ mꜣḫt m grḥ
tw r ꜥḳ ḫnrwt
tw r snbt ḳdd m irty

'A ladder will be waited for at night!
Strongholds will be entered!
Slumber in the eyes will be swept away!'

5.2.3.4   A de facto literary construction in *Neferti*

As emerges from the above, the bareness of *tw* in bare *tw r sḏm* in *Neferti* directly relates to broader macro-syntactic issues in that composition, which concern active and passive constructions alike. Rather than having to do with bare *tw r sḏm* itself, the bareness of *tw* is to do with more general phenomena in Middle Egyptian grammar, and ultimately with aspects of the syntax of *iw* itself.

Although bare *tw r sḏm* is almost exclusively documented in literature, the bareness of *tw* in *tw r sḏm* is therefore not a literary feature in itself—as is also independently confirmed by the personal name *tw-(r-)mr(t)=s*, in which the lack of *iw* similarly relates to Middle Egyptian grammar more broadly. In another sense, however, bare *tw r sḏm* may nonetheless be appreciated as a literary construction in *Neferti*. In unfolding discourse, conditions that can trigger bareness will typically be met in texts that have a complexly articulated macro-syntax such as *Neferti* (documentary texts, for example, only have *iw.tw r sḏm*: §5.2.4). This could have resulted in a strong, if by no means inherent, association of bare *tw r sḏm* with literary registers. Based on this de facto privileged association, the construction would have secondarily gained a literary flavor, as is suggested by manuscripts of literary texts in which the construction is textually secondary to some other construction (§5.2.3.1, (b)). Significantly, these include contexts in which the macro-syntactic conditions triggering, or licensing, bareness are not met any more (*Ptahhotep* 72 L2, 82 'proto-L2'), demonstrating that the construction had become part of a repertoire regardless of the syntactic conditions under which it was initially possible.

For the overall argument developed in the present section, the implication is twofold. The subtle multi-layered textual articulation of *Neferti*, to which bare *tw r sḏm* is integral, provides a decisive argument for declaring the construction part of the original text of *Neferti* (for other arguments, §5.2.2). The analysis also implies that bare *tw r sḏm* can not be anchored to the external record directly as such: for dating, the higher-order construction *(X.)tw r sḏm*, also documented outside literature, must be considered.

5.2.4   (*X.*)*tw r sḏm*

A. Early occurrences of (*X.*)*tw r sḏm* are the following:

(a) Documentary registers:

- Letters:	- P. UC 32200, 20-21 (*i*)*n iw.tw r gmt=i k3 nfr* 'If I am going to be found, then good!';
	- P. UC 32287, 2-3 (...) *ntt tw r irt* '(...) what is to be done';

    Regularly from the early D.18 on, e.g. P. Berlin 10463 ro (*temp*. Amenhotep II), 1-2 (...) *iw iw=tw r mni r ḥwt-sḫm* '(...) when one will moor in Hutsekhem.'

- Accounts:	- P. UC 32190, A, III.5 (...) *ntt tw r wḏ* '(...) what is to be decreed'.
- Legal texts:	- P. UC 32055 ro 9 *iw.tw r rḏt ʿrḳ p3 s 2* (...) 'The two men will be made to swear (...)';
	- *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep (early D.13, originally Ugaf?), 5 *ir rf nty ṯw*[sic] *nb r gmt=f* (...) 'As regards, however, whosoever will be found (...)';
	- *Stèle Juridique* (Nebirierau, D.17), 21 *iw.tw r rḏt ʿrḳ=sn* (...) 'They will be made to swear (...)'.

(b) Non literary, varia:[134]

- A graffito:	Uronarti Quay Inscription (*temp.* Senwosret III)[135] *iw.tw r gmt mw* (...) 'One had to find water (...)'.
- A personal name:	*tw*(*-r*)*-mrt=s* 'She-will-be-loved' (documented in the period D.13-18) (§5.2.3.1, (c)).
- An ostracon:	O. Cairo 25372,[136] 1-2 [...] *tw.tw r mst* [...].*tw r irt mw nw* (...) '[...] one will give birth; [...] one will do water of(?) (...)'.

NB. Based on its disposition in columns and the forms of some signs, O. Cairo 25372, a very short document, has been tentatively dated to the Twelfth Dynasty.[137] This is problematic in view of the presence of the new subject pronoun in col.1 (*tw.tw*), which would be earlier than the second earliest documented instance of such, in the late Seventeenth Dynasty, by several centuries (§3.4.1.3). As discussed, the pattern of early attestations of the new subject pronoun is dense in the late Seventeenth and early Eighteenth Dynasty and very

---

134 In later times, increasingly commonly, e.g. *Urk.* IV 656, 3 and 694, 7 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*); 1023, 15 (in a caption in the Theban Tomb of Amenmes, *temp.* Amenhotep III).
135 Noted by Vernus 1990a: 14, ex.29.
136 Text: Kroeber 1970: 95-6.
137 Georges Posener, p.c. to Burkard Kroeber (Kroeber 1970: 95, n.4).

consistent in terms of registers. Pending further paleographic examination, the dating of O. Cairo 25372 must be left open: paleography may be archaistic. Alternatively, a Middle Kingdom dating may turn out to be correct after all; the fact that O. Cairo 25372 has a new subject pronoun, at complete odds with the overall pattern of attestation of such, would then imply that the document reflects a hitherto undocumented variety, register and/or dialect, of Egyptian, different from the ones based on which the written standards documented in the record were based. If so, O. Cairo 25372 would be inconsequential for appreciating literary registers of Middle Egyptian, which relate to the otherwise documented written registers of the language.

(c) Literary:

- Original:	- *Neferti*, *passim*: *tw r sḏm* (7x), *iw.tw r sḏm* (1x);
	- *Ipuwer* 4.6 *ptr nt‹t› tw r irt* 'What shall one do?' (§6.2.2.5, (iii));
- Secondary:	- *Kheti* 3.5-6 (2x, about half of mss.) (§5.3.2.2); *Hymn* 6.4 (one ms.) (§5.3.2.1); *Neferti* 10e (§5.3.1.2); *Ptahhotep* 72 L2 (§2.3.5); also implied in *Ptahhotep* 82 L2 (§5.2.1.C).

B. The above list of earliest occurrences leads to two observations. The first is straightforward: (*X.*)*tw r sḏm* is entirely undocumented in any written register, literary or otherwise, prior to the late Twelfth Dynasty. This strongly suggests that a dating of *Neferti* to the early Twelfth Dynasty is probably too early.

The second observation concerns written registers: all securely dated early occurrences of (*X.*)*tw r sḏm*, from the late Twelfth Dynasty on, are from documentary registers (a) or informal registers (b). Meanwhile, the construction remains undocumented in any literary text securely dated to the Twelfth Dynasty: leaving *Neferti* provisionally aside, the construction recurs only in one other literary text, *Ipuwer*, for which a post-Twelfth Dynasty dating can be established on independent grounds (§6.2.2.5). In later times, the construction was demonstrably part of an Eighteenth Dynasty repertoire of literary Middle Egyptian (c, sub 'secondary').

The spread of innovations is generally gradual across written registers (§2.1). For example, preposed possessives (*pꜣy=f*), which are common in Illahun, remain limited in Twelfth Dynasty literary texts to only two occurrences (*Kagemni* 2.3; *Eloquent Peasant* B2 128: §2.4.4.2.2.A; §2.4.4.2.2, (iii)), in both cases as elements of a studied simplicity of the framing narratives. A more widespread use of the same expression is only in *Cheops' Court* (type-B terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty: §2.4.4.1.B), where the expression is again indexical of register. Against the background of such and similar constellations, a regular use of an expression as saliently innovative as (*X.*)*tw r sḏm* in *Neferti*—where it is not in any way interpretable as indexical of register—is remarkable. This suggests that *Neferti* is likely to have been composed somewhat later than the first absolute attestations of the

construction in documentary and informal registers, in the late Twelfth Dynasty. How much later can not be assessed further on the above grounds.

5.2.5   The expression of future passive events in early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary texts

In order to make sure that the lack of (*X.)tw r sḏm* in literary texts securely dated to the Twelfth Dynasty is not a mere accident of preservation, one additional step is taken. This consists in showing that literary texts securely dated to the Twelfth Dynasty use some expression other than *(X.)tw r sḏm* in similar function, for expressing the passive of future events.

A. To put the following discussion into perspective, some background on functional counterpart relationships in earlier Middle Egyptian verbal paradigms is primarily recalled. In general, functional counterparts need not be isomorphic (i.e. morphologically symmetrical). This is illustrated for Middle Egyptian by well-known cases throughout negative paradigms: for example, the negative counterpart of *iw sḏm.n=f* is provided by an altogether different morphological category, *n sḏm=f*. As to *n sḏm.n=f*, formally the pendant of positive *sḏm.n=f*, this provides the negative counterpart of yet another morphological category *N(P) sḏm=f*. In addition, counterpart relationships are complex in that they are often not defined on a one-to-one basis. Turning to voice, passive counterparts to active *iw sḏm.n=f* are two, *iw P sḏm* (with the pseudoparticiple) and *iw sḏm N* (with the *sḏm(w)*-passive): only in the passive, a distinction is made depending on the nature of the subject, a pronoun or a full noun, and neither passive category is the morphological pendant to the common active one. In addition, the anterior passive paradigm has yet a third category, the *sḏm.n.tw=f*, which provides the functional counterpart to a subset only of the uses of active *sḏm.n=f*. In the anterior domain, three entirely distinct morphological categories in the passive are thus opposed to only one in the active.[138]

The formal category here relevant, *NP r sḏm*, itself has a non-isomorphic negative counterpart in pre-Eigtheenth Dynasty Egyptian, *nn sḏm=f*, not **nn sw r sḏm*. An isomorphic counterpart develops only in the New Kingdom:[139]

Middle Egyptian

(i) P. UC 32057 vso III.16   *iw=s r mst*   'She will give birth'

(ii) P. UC 32057 vso III.17   *nn ms=s*   'She will not give birth'

---

138 These non-isomorphic counterpart relationships reflect what intuitively may be conceived of as the semantic and communicative autonomy of the 'weaker poles of communication' (negative polarity, passive voice) vis-à-vis positive active events. To give but a hint of what can be at play, the higher resolution of the passive in the anterior domain has to do with the Endpoint-orientation of the passive, interacting with perfective aspect, itself Endpoint-oriented. The issue will be developed in adequate details in Stauder in prep.

139 See Vernus 1990a: 126-7.

Late Egyptian

(iii) *Paheri* (*temp*. Thutmosis III), pl.7, 2nd register from bottom, to the right

nn iw=i r wȝḥ=t

'I won't abandon you.'

> The first known instance;[140] less than a century earlier, *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 10 still have (in an oath) *nn wȝḥ=i tw* (...) 'I will not let you be (...)'.

The reason for this non-isomorphic counterpart relationship in pre-New Kingdom times is in part historical. When they first grammaticalize, new analytic patterns do so for expressing specific domains of meaning, initially typically with positive and active events only. In Earlier Egyptian, this was precisely the case of *NP r sḏm*, as well as of *NP ḥr sḏm* (for which counterpart relationships are discussed below: §5.3.5). In an early stage, negative and passive counterparts to these newly grammaticalizing patterns were then provided by other formal means available in the language: in the present case the suffix conjugation (*nn sḏm=f*). Full formal alignment of negative patterns on positive ones is realized only much later; as the example illustrates, non-isomorphic counterpart relationships can be stable for a long time, here close to a millennium.

The lack of any instances of *(X.)tw r sḏm* before the late Twelfth Dynasty (§5.2.4) suggests that the passive counterpart of active *NP r sḏm* was provided by some other formal means until then in all written registers, and possibly later still in higher registers such as in literature. In the following, actual instances of such counterpart relationship are exhibited, first in non-literary texts then in literary ones.

B. One environment in which active *NP r sḏm* is regularly used is the apodosis of threat formulae.[141] These therefore provide a favorable locus for observing counterpart relationships with the passive. (Active constructions other than *NP r sḏm* are also regularly found in the same environment, notably (prospective and/or subjunctive) *sḏm=f*, e.g. Siut I 224 (*Urk*. VII 53, 13) (...) *ḥr=s[n] n dnd n ḏḥwty* '(...) they will fall to the fury of Thoth.'[142] The argument will therefore not be that an individual instance does not have *(X.)tw r sḏm*, but that no single instance ever has *(X.)tw r sḏm*, even though active *NP r sḏm* is common in the exact same environment.)

In apodoses of threat formulae, *(X.)tw r sḏm* is never documented. Constructions used instead include the (prospective or subjunctive) *sḏm=f* marked for passive voice

---

140 A singular pre-New Kingdom instance of a possible isomorphic negation of *NP r sḏm* has been proposed to lie in the much-discussed Moᶜalla II.α.1 (Ankhtifi, First Intermediate Period) *ḏr-ntt nn ḫpr mit*(=*i*) *nn sw r ḫpr n ms mit*(=*i*) *n ms.*[*t(w)*]=*f*. This is far from secure: see the different analyses (and associated translations) by Vernus (1990a: 130-1), Allen (p.c. to Pascal Vernus, quoted in Vernus 1990a: 130-1, n.57), and Loprieno (2003: 87). Even if Moᶜalla II.α.1 were to be a negation to *NP r sḏm* (which the present author doubts), the construction would be of an exploratory nature, as follows from the temporal distance with the first secure example in the New Kingdom, compounded with the morphological naturalness in developing isomorphic negative counterparts (I thank Jean Winand for discussion on the issue). For the present purpose, it therefore suffices to observe that Moᶜalla II.α.1 would be genetically disjunct from the regular isomorphic negative paradigm emerging by the early New Kingdom.

141 Morschauser 1991: 26; Edel 1943: §13ff. (for the Old Kingdom).

142 Sim. Siut III 71 (Edel 1984: 39) (...) *bwy sw tknw=f* '(...) his relatives will abhore him'; further Morschauser 1991: 20-37, specifically 21-5.

(iv) and *NP*$_O$ *r sḏm* (i.e. *NP r sḏm* interpreted passively, without overt marking of voice) (v).[143] The first (iv) defines a counterpart relationship similar in principle to the one in negative events (*NP r sḏm* – *sḏm.tw=f*; compare *NP r sḏm* – *nn sḏm=f*). The second (v) demonstrates how even when the passive construction is based on a *NP r sḏm* pattern, the use of *tw* in this pattern is avoided.

(iv) Sarenput, Stela Aswan Museum #1373, x+21-23

ir ḫꜣti-ꜥ nb (...)
sḫ.tw ḫpš=f mi iwꜣ pn
mn.t(w) ṯsw=f mi ꜣpd (...)

'As to any governor (...),
his arm will be cut off like this bull's,
his neck severed like this bird's (...)'

> In the same formula, also Moꜥalla II.θ.3 - III.1[144] *ir ḥkꜣ nb* (...) *sḫ.t(w) ḫpš=f* (...) 'As to any ruler (...), his arm will be cut off (...)'. In a different context, also *Abydos Boundary Stela* usurped by Neferhotep 6-7 *ir grt sr nb* (...) *smi.t(w)=f* (...) 'As regards, however, any official (...), he will be reported (...)'.

(v) Siut IV 79-80[145]

ir swt sbi nb (...)
iw=f r p[s]t (...)

'As to any rebel however (...),
he will be cooked (...)'

> Sim. Siut III 64[146] (...) [ḥꜥ]w=[s]n r tk[ꜣ] '(...) their bodies will be burnt.'[147]

> Compare the formally identical construction in the active, e.g. Cairo 1651[148] *iw(=i)* <*r*> *sḫt ṯs=f mi ꜣpd* 'I will strike his neck like a bird's.'[149]

The above establishes two counterpart relationships: active *NP r sḏm* – (passively interpreted) *NP r sḏm*, and *NP r sḏm* – *sḏm.tw=f*. (That passive counterparts can be more than one is almost a consequence of the notion of counterpart relationship itself.) For the present discussion, this is suggestive, yet remains insufficient because threat formulae can be formulaic: there is a possibility therefore that the linguistic age of some of the above formulations may be somewhat divorced from the time of their inscription.

C. In identifying functional counterparts in Twelfth Dynasty literary registers, only a small subset of all future passive events will be here relevant—namely the ones in environments in which *NP r sḏm* would necessarily have been used in the active, to

---

143 Yet another construction, possibly limited to the Old Kingdom, is *wnn + sḏm(w)-passive / wnn NP pseudoparticiple* (Edel 1943: §12.A.1, B; §20). This may impart some more specific meaning, in relation to the perfective semantics of the forms employed.

144 On Inscription #8 more generally, Willems 1990.

145 Edel 1984: 120-7 and fig.15.

146 Edel 1984: 124-5.

147 For the fairly common Old Kingdom instances of the construction, further Edel 1943: §12.A.2.

148 Morschauser 1991: 26.

149 For Old Kingdom instances of the formula, Edel 1943: §13.

the exclusion of any other active form. Accordingly, all future passive forms in any of the following environments are to be excluded from discussion:

(a) Events that carry modality—for which subjunctive *sḏm=f*, not *NP r sḏm*, would have been used in the active:

E.g. *Ptahhotep* 28 *wḏ.t(w) n bȝk im irt mdw iȝw* 'Let it be decreed to this servant that a staff of old age be made';

(b) Events that are semantically dependent upon some preceding segment of discourse—for which subjunctive *sḏm=f*, not *NP r sḏm*, would have been used in the active:

E.g. *Shipwrecked Sailor* 142-144 *sḏd<=i> rf (...) dwȝ.tw n=k nṯr (...)* 'I shall tell (...), and god will be thanked for you (...)';

(c) Events that provide a textual setting to a following segment of discourse—for which prospective *sḏm=f*, not *NP r sḏm*, would have been used in the active:

E.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 352-353 *gmw.tw kft=s sbw=s r imȝḫ* 'When its (scil. Truth's) revelation is found, it will conduct to blessedness!'[150];

(d) Events that mutually depend upon each—for which prospective *sḏm=f*, not a *NP r sḏm*, would have been used in the active:

E.g. *Eloquent Peasant* B1 213-214 *gm.tw imnw mȝʿt rd.t(w) sȝ grg r tȝ* 'The mystery of Truth will be found, and Falsehood cast down on the ground!';[151]

(e) Events that relinquish some of their rhematic load to an adverbial or circumstantial elaboration of some sort—for which prospective *sḏm=f*, not *NP r sḏm*, would have been used in the active:

E.g. *Eloquent Peasant* R 10.5[152] *in ʿwȝw.tw=i rf m ḏȝtt=f* 'Will I be robbed in *his* estate?'[153]

Given such highly restrictive conditions, the harvest will necessarily be limited. In *Eloquent Peasant* for instance (a fairly long composition by Middle Egyptian standards), all instances of future passive events fall under one of the above types.

Not directly relevant for different reasons is also the construction NP_O *r sḏm* (i.e. *NP r sḏm* passively interpreted), observed above in the apodoses of threats (above, B, (v)). This recurs in two Middle Egyptian literary texts, one dated to the Twelfth Dynasty: *Ptahhotep* 407 P *iw sȝ=k r ḥbs ḥr=s* 'Your back will be clothed through it' (sim. *Merikare* E 49: §2.4.4.5, (iii)). In both cases, NP_O *r sḏm* is followed by an expression *ḥr=s*, not an agent. The selection of a semantically oriented passive construction (as opposed to a syntactically one, with overt marking of voice such as by *tw*) correlates with a strong semantic backgrounding of the agent: the event is

---

150 Similar analysis in Vernus 1990a: 34, ex.69.

151 Similar analysis in Vernus 1990a: 34, n.27.

152 B1 49 has a spelling <ʿwȝ> of the stem: this may be either the same form (prospective with the ending -*w* left unwritten), or a genuine variant (with a subjunctive, modally colored).

153 Sim. *Sinuhe* B 280-281 *iw=f r smr mm srw rd.t(w)=f m-ḳȝb šnyt* 'He will be a Companion among the officials, he will be placed right within the court.'

presented as if it had no agent at all, while the phrase *ḥr=s* expresses the means or ways by which such non-agentive events unfold. In *tw r sḏm* as in *Neferti*, the implied agent is left unexpressed and is not always specific, yet remains fully salient in the semantic representation of the event. Accordingly, *NP$_O$ r sḏm*, although a genuine passive counterpart to active *NP r sḏm*, is not one that could have been used in *Neferti*, whatever the date of the composition of this text.

D. The other construction observed in apodoses of threats, *sḏm.tw=f*, also recurs in Middle Kingdom literary registers. As an examination of each of the examples below shows, the unexpressed and mostly unspecific agent is here fully part of the semantic representation of the event. The following examples, unlike the ones just presented, are therefore relevant for comparison with *tw r sḏm* in *Neferti*.

In examples from *Ptahhotep*, there is a theoretical possibility to interpret the use of a prospective *sḏm=f* as determined by the circumstantial expression that follows (above, C, (e)); this is fairly unlikely on semantic and contextual grounds:

(vi) *Ptahhotep* 292-293 P

ṯs pw ḫs stt ḫft
pr.tw ḥr irt=f ib ḥr win=f

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

> The clause *ib ḥr win=f* merely elaborates on *pr.tw ḥr irt=f*; it is not placed under focus.[154] L2 reinterpreted the passage, turning *pr.tw* into *prr.tw*; this is consistent with a general tendency of L2, also observed elsewhere in *Ptahhotep*, to read emphatic constructions where P has none (2.3.2.3, (ii).NB).

(vii) *Ptahhotep* 64-67 P

sꜥnd=k ḏd bin m tm ḫsf sw m ꜣt=f
nis.t(w)=f m ḥm-ḫt pw rmn.n ḏꜣir-ib=k ꜥḥꜥ=f

'It is by not opposing him in his moment that you will make little the one who speaks badly;
He will be called "This is an ignoramus", your self-restraint having matched his riches.'

> While the preceding sentence (*sꜥnd=k* (...)) is a clear case of a narrow-focus construction, *nis.t(w)=f*, the conclusion of maxim §2, is fully asserted, with *rmn.n ḏꜣir=k* (...) merely providing some background.

In similar environments, *Ptahhotep* has *NP r sḏm* in the active. Compare for instance (vi) with (viii):

---

154 Pace Vernus 2010²b: 126 and n.152, who translates 'On évitera de la mettre en œuvre, et ce même si le jugement s'égare.'

(viii) *Ptahhotep* 135-137

ir sr wnn=f ḥ3 t3 sḫr ḫft wḏ k3=f
iw=f r rḏt n ḥssy=f

'As to any official who will be after food, his decision is according to his *ka*:
he will give to the one who praises him.'[155]

In *Sinuhe*, the following passage is entirely beyond doubt. Adverbial elements can not
be under focus if a reasonable meaning is to be preserved. The first of the series of
passives (*wḏꜥ.tw*) can not be in continuation of the preceding imperative (*sḫ3*)
(compare the change in agents), and is therefore initial. Finally, any optative modality
is here absent, the king speaking.

(ix) *Sinuhe* B 189-196

iw min is š3ꜥ.n=k tni fḫ.n=k b33t sḫ3 n=k hrw n ḳrs sbt r im3ḫ
wḏꜥ.tw n=k ḫ3wy m sft wt3w m ꜥwy t3yt
ir.tw n=k šms-wḏ3 hrw sm3-t3 (...)

ir.tw ḫbb nnyw r r3 is=k
nis.tw n=k dbḥt-ḥtpw
sft.tw r r3 ꜥbw=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 similar textual environments, *Sinuhe* has *NP r sḏm* in the active. Thus, in Sinuhe's
response to the above royal pronouncement (x), and in another solemn pronouncement
by the king (xi), comparable to the one just quoted (ix):

(x) *Sinuhe* B 203-204

iw k3=k r rḏt iry=i pḥwy ḥꜥw=i m ẖnw

'Your *ka* will let me make an end with my body in the Residence.'[156]

(xi) *Sinuhe* B 280-281

iw=f r smr mm srw (...)
'He will be a companion among the officials (...)'[157]

---

155 Sim. 129-130 P *mdw=k ḫft wšd=f tw iw ḏdt=k r nfr ḥr ib* 'You must speak only according to him
 asking you: what you will say will be good on the heart.'
156 Sim. *Sinuhe* B 234-235 *iw b3k im r swdt 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.'

In a previous section (§5.2.4), the lack of any attestation of the isomorphic construction *(X.)tw r sḏm* before the late Twelfth Dynasty was noted and interpreted in terms of written registers. The present sub-section now establishes the counterpart relationship between active *NP r sḏm* and passive *sḏm.tw=f* in early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary Middle Egyptian: *(X.)tw r sḏm* is a later development.

5.3   *Neferti* 12b, 10e: *Tw sḏm*

In two places, *Neferti* has a construction *tw sḏm*. The construction is not mentioned in any grammars nor grammatical discussion and only recognized, occasionally and mostly implicitly, by translators.[158] A first step therefore consists in establishing the existence of the construction in Middle Egyptian, in *Neferti* (§5.3.1) and in two other compositions that have it, *Hymn* and *Kheti* (§5.3.2). The function of the construction, semantic and syntactic, as well as its status in Middle Egyptian grammar, are analyzed in turn (§5.3.3). As with *tw r sḏm*, the construction is de facto limited to literary registers; accordingly, the higher-order construction *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm*, to which *tw sḏm* relates, must be considered for dating (§5.3.4). The argument is completed by a discussion of the passive counterpart of *NP ḥr sḏm* in securely dated Twelfth Dynasty literary texts (§5.3.5).

5.3.1   *Tw sḏm* in *Neferti*

One instance of *tw sḏm* in *Neferti* is generally accepted by translators (§5.3.1.1). Another one has so far escaped notice and therefore requires more extensive discussion (§5.3.1.2).

5.3.1.1   *Neferti* 12b

The one undisputed instance of *tw sḏm* in *Neferti* is the following:

> *Neferti* 12a-c
> ḏ=i n=k   tꜣ m sny-mny
>   sꜣ-ꜥ m nb ꜥ
>   tw nḏ-ḥrt nḏ-ḥrt
> ḏ=i n=k (...)
> 'I shall show you the land in calamity,
>   the weak of hand now a lord of force,
>   the one who did the greeting being greeted.
> I shall show you (...)'

---

157 Technically an instance of *NP r N*; *NP r sḏm* itself is featured in *Sinuhe* only in Sinuhe's mouth ((x) in the main text, and the associated note), not the king's. The semantic conditions, however, are directly comparable.

158 E.g. Parkinson 1997a: 138 and Kammerzell 1986: 109 (for *Neferti* 12b); van der Plas 1986: I, 33 (for *Hymn* 6.4; with an explicit note in van der Plas 1986: I, 189).

As the context and the *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation[159] imply, the semantics are progressive (here reflected in English rendering by a continuous tense). This is further confirmed by an examination of parallel passages in *Neferti*. Compare:

(i)   12a-b   *ḏ=i n=k   tꜣ m sny-mny*
                        sꜣ-ꜥ m nb-ꜥ
                        tw nḏ-ḥrt nḏ-ḥrt

(ii) 9f   *ḏ=i n=k   sꜣ m ẖrwy*
                        sn m ẖft
                        s ḥr smꜣ it=f

               'I shall show you the son as an enemy,
                        the brother as an opponent,
                        a man killing his father.'

In *Neferti* 12b, the construction *tw sḏm* therefore provides the passive counterpart to progressive *NP ḥr sḏm*.

5.3.1.2   *Neferti* 10e

It is here proposed that another instance of *tw sḏm* in *Neferti* is to be recognized in *Neferti* 10e:

Neferti 10c-e
ḥḏd[a] *m iryt*
wš[t]{w}[b] *m gmyt*
iryt m tmmt ir[c]
tw nḥm ẖt s r=f rḏw n nty m rwty[d]

'Destruction is in what had[e] been done,
what is lost is what had been found,
what is done is what had not been done,
the property of a man is being taken from him to be given to the one who is outside.'

a)   Pet. and C25224 both have *ḥḏd*, which provides a coherent reading. Alternatively, the text could be emended to *ḥḏd<t>* 'What is being destroyed is what had been done', based on the two following clauses, which have a *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation (participle *m* participle). Both readings are coherent and which is original undecidable.

b)   Pet. *wš.[t]w*; C25224 *wš.tw*. Both Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses read with a 'passive' relative form, reflecting an understanding as 'what is being lost' (present tense). This is a semantically possible interpretation within the clause, yet appears to be secondary when the broader context, particularly *iryt* in the next clause, is taken into account.[160]

159 E.g. Schenkel 1984.
160 Further discussion below, §6.2.1.1, (i); similarly Quack 1993a: 78.

c) In *Neferti* echoing 4c *iryt m tm(m)t ir*; compare also Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* ro 15-16/vso 18 (H*HBT* 109, 3/4) *iryt tmmt ir*.[161]

d) For the sequence of passive events *nḥm – rḏi* (the latter in the pseudoparticiple), compare the Chief Steward Amenhotep's statue (*temp.* Amenhotep III) 46 (*Urk.* IV 1800, 5)[162] *nḥm.tw i3t=f ḫft-ḥr ḏw n s nty m ḫrw=f* 'His office shall be taken from before him to be given to someone who is his enemy.'

e) The pluperfect to reflect the *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation of the overall passage (here *Jetzt-Einst*), in the second and third clauses (not emending *ḫḏḏ*) or in all three clauses (emending *ḫḏḏ* into *ḫḏḏ<t>*); either way, the relative anterior tensing carries over to *iryt* in the first clause as well.

The passage is generally read otherwise, with two different traditions in interpretation.

A. A different segmentation of 10d-e has been proposed, associating *tw* with *ir* in the preceding verse, 10d. *Nḥm*, now initial in 10e, would then be a *sḏm(w)*-passive. This segmentation, adopted in the text edition in which *Neferti* is commonly read,[163] and reified in the typographical disposition of that text edition,[164] has been influential in subsequent interpretation.[165]

(...) *tmmt irt{w}*
nḥm ḫt s r=f (...)
'(...) what had not been done.
The property of a man has been taken from him (...)'

Helck's segmentation is not supported by any positive argument in favor of it.[166] It may have been favored by the fact that the construction *tw sḏm* is nowhere described in any grammars or grammatical studies; yet, the construction exists, as is demonstrated in *Neferti* itself by 12b (§5.3.1.1). The interpretation of *nḥm* as a perfective form may also have been inspired by the presence of another perfective form just a few words later in 10e, *rḏw* (a pseudoparticiple): this is inconsequential, compare e.g. *Urk.* IV 1800, 5 (n.d to the main example above). Remarkably, Helck himself translates *nḥm* with a present tense,[167] in contradiction to its own segmentation. In addition, an analysis of the overall temporal articulation of the lament speaks

---

161 E.g. Parkinson 2002: 196; more generally on Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* in relation to *Neferti*, Gnirs 2006: 228ff; below, §5.8.3.3.

162 Parallel noted in *EG*, p.341, n.1.

163 Helck 1992² (1970¹): 40, 42, n.d.

164 For the influence of the visual disposition of modern text editions on interpretation, compare e.g. the modern history of *Ptahhotep* 81-82 (§5.2.1.C); in more details, Stauder in press c: §4.3.

165 E.g. Quirke 2004a: 137; Parkinson 1997a: 137.

166 Helck's segmentation is also problematic in view of the supposed *ir.tw* after *tm*. The replacement of a negatival complement by an infinitive after *tm* is documented, thus in *Neferti* itself in the parallel passage, 4c, where Pet. has *iryt m tmt ir* and O. DeM 1188 [...] *m tmmt irt*; sim. e.g. *Ipuwer* 2.4-5: §2.3.1.1, (vi)). In both cases, however, the infinitive is spelled *irt*, not *ir.tw*. Moreover, both O. DeM 1188 and P. Leiden I 344 ro are Ramesside, unlike Pet. and C25224; Pet. clearly has the negatival complement in 4c, unaltered.

167 Helck 1992²: 43: '(...) wird ihm geraubt (...)'.

decisively against the posited perfective form *nḥm* (below, §5.3.1.3). Accordingly, the element *tw* belongs to 10e.[168]

B. Once the element *tw* is recognized to open 10e, two possibilities remain:

(a) *tw <r> nḥm*:   future *tw r sḏm* construction with *r* omitted in spelling, as is common throughout *Neferti* (§5.2);

(b) *tw nḥm*:   progressive *tw sḏm* construction, as in 12b (§5.3.1.1).

Among authors who segment the text with *tw* opening 10e, universal preference is given to emending into *tw <r> nḥm*.[169] Such reading apparently finds some support just a few verses below, where *tw r sḏm* is used with an event of 'giving things', resonating with 'taking things' in 10e: 10h *tw r rḏt ḥwt m msdd r sgr rꜣ mdw* 'Goods will be given with hatred to silence a speaking mouth.' Interpretation (a) may also have been inspired by the high-frequency (and resulting salience) of *tw r sḏm* in *Neferti*, compounded with the fact that *tw sḏm* has no status in any current description of Middle Egyptian grammar.

Yet, *tw sḏm* is a possible construction in *Neferti* (12b: §5.3.1.1), demonstrating that in this text a sequence introduced by *ḏ=i n=k* can be followed by either a progressive *tw sḏm* (12a-b) and or a future *tw r sḏm* construction (10f-h; 7e-f); consequently, no emendation can be justified a priori in 10e. An omission of the morpheme *r* is documented in Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses of *Neferti*, but remains very uncommon, being limited to two cases in Pet. (8c; 13d) and one in C25224 (14e), against a total of twenty-five occurrences of *NP r sḏm* (active or passive) throughout the text.[170] Just as in 12b, Pet. and C25224 concur in having *tw sḏm* in 10e: while a common archetype, already faulty, can be posited, emendation should be carried out only if positive arguments are given to that effect. The reading is coherent as the text stands: just as in 12b, *tw sḏm* in 10e follows a sequence of *A m B* constructions in the *Jetzt-Einst* articulation (12a, 10c-d, respectively).

5.3.1.3 *Neferti* 10e and 12b in the broader temporal articulation of the composition

A decisive argument pro the here advocated reading of 10e as *tw nḥm* is derived from a consideration of large-scale compositional patterns and the interweaving of temporalities in *Neferti*.

A. In sequences introduced by *ḏ=i n=k* (...), a perfective tense (the pseudoparticiple in most cases) is followed by *tw r sḏm* (i)-(ii). On the other hand, 12b, a secure instance of *tw sḏm*, follows a *NP m NP* construction (iii). This is just the construction that is found to precede the verse here under discussion, 10e (iv). Compare:

---

168 Also recognized by Dils et al., *TLA*: 'Die Satztrennung bei Helck ist irreführend! (...)'.
169 E.g. Kammerzell 1986: 108; Dils et al., *TLA*.
170 To the passive instances discussed above (§5.2), add the active ones in 5f; 6c; 6d; 6e; 6f; 8a; 12e (twice); 13a; 13c (twice); 13d (twice); 14a; 14f; 15e.

(a) *NP pseudoparticiple – tw r sḏm*:

(i) *Neferti* 8e-f

ḏ=i n=k   tꜣ m sny-mn
            tm ḫpr ḫpr
            tw r šsp ḫꜥw nw ꜥḥꜣ (...)

'I shall show you the land in calamity,
what should not happen having happened.
Weapons of combat will be taken up (...)'

(ii) *Neferti* 10f-h

ḏ=i n=k   nb m nhpw
            rwty ḥtp
            tm ir mḥ.n=f
            ir šw
            tw r rḏt ḫt m msdd (...)

'I shall show you the lord in sorrow,
the outsider satisfied,
the one who did nothing having filled,
the one who did in want.
Goods will be given with hatred (...)'

(b) *NP m NP – tw sḏm*:

(iii) *Neferti* 12a-b

ḏ=i n=k   tꜣ m sny-mny
            sꜣ-ꜥ m nb ꜥ
            tw nḏ-ḫrt nḏ-ḫrt

'I shall show you the land in calamity,
the weak of hand now a lord of force,
the one who did the greeting being greeted.'

(iv) *Neferti* 10c-e

(...) *ḥḏd m iryt*
wš[t]{w} m gmyt
iryt m tmmt ir
tw nḥm ḫt s r=f (...)

'(...) destruction is in what had been done,
what is lost is what had been found,
what is done is what had not been done,
the property of a man is being taken from him (...)'

B. A similar type of observation extends to the segments of text that follow the respective constructions, *tw r sḏm* and *tw sḏm*. In both 8f and 10h, the events expressed by a *tw r sḏm* construction are elaborated further by subsequent *sḏm.tw=f*'s (v)-(vi). The pattern is the one described above (§5.2.3.3.A-B), with the *tw r sḏm* con-

structions opening a new segment of text. In 12b, by contrast, the *tw sḏm* construction is subject to no further elaboration (vii). The passage here under discussion, 10e (viii), similarly lacks any further elaboration (other than the one provided by the embedded pseudoparticiple, *rḏw* (...), which is not on the same level as the *sḏm*(.*tw*)=*f*'s in (v) and (vi)). Compare:

(c) *Tw r sḏm* – elaboration with *sḏm*(.*tw*)=*f* (§5.2.3.3.A):

(v) *Neferti* 8f

tw r šsp ḫˁw nw ˁḥȝ
ˁnḫ tȝ m shȝ

'Weapons of combat will be taken up,
the land will live in uproar.'

(vi) *Neferti* 10h-i

tw r rḏt ḫt m msdd r sgr rȝ mdw
wšb.tw ˁ pr ḥr ḫt
mdw.tw m smȝ sw

'Goods will be given with hatred to silence a speaking mouth,
one will answer only with the arm stretched out with a stick,
one will speak only by: "kill him!" '

(d) *Tw sḏm* – no further elaboration:

(vii) *Neferti* 12b-c

(...) *tw nḏ-ḫrt nḏ-ḫrt*
ḏ=i n=k (...)

'(...) the one who did the greeting being greeted.
I shall show you (...)'

(viii) *Neferti* 10e-f

(...) *tw nḥm ḫt s r=f rḏ n nty m rwty*
ḏ=i n=k (...)

'(...) the property of a man being taken from him, to be given to the one who is outside.
I shall show you (...)'

C. The distribution of *tw r sḏm* and *tw sḏm* in *Neferti* is therefore principled, correlating in consistent ways with the construction types found in both the preceding and the following segments of texts:

8e-f	*ḏ=i n=k*		
	(...) NP PsP	*tw r sḏm*	elaboration (*sḏm=f*)
		(future)	
10d-e	(*ḏ=i n=k* (9f))		
	(...) NP m NP	*tw sḏm*	no elaboration
		(present progressive)	
10f-i	*ḏ=i n=k*		
	NP PsP	*tw r sḏm*	elaboration (*sḏm.tw=f*)
		(future)	
12a-b	*ḏ=i n=k*		
	(...) NP m NP	*tw sḏm*	no elaboration
		(present progressive)	
12c-f	*ḏ=i n=k*		
	NP PsP[171] (...)	*iw NP r sḏm*	elaboration (*in*-cleft)
		(future)	

Neferti is distinguished by its complex temporality, explicitly thematized in the opening parts of the lament: a presentification (4a *ḫft-ḥr=k* 'in your presence'; 3f *m-bꜣḥ=k* 'before you') of 'future events' (2m, 2n *ḫpr.t=sy*) to the addressee (simultaneously Neferti's own heart, Snefru, the audience).[172] The large-scale compositional articulation sketched above, extending over most of the second half of the lament, expresses just such an oscillation between future and present progressive tense. The temporalities of prophesy and of presentification, both conjured up by the recurrent *ḏ=i n=k* (...) 'I shall show you: (...)',[173] are interwoven.

D. For the purpose of the present argument, the implication is twofold. To begin with, 10e, compositionally parallel to *tw nḏ-ḫrt* in 12b in all respects, is to be read as the text stands, *tw nḥm*; 10e thus provides a second instance of the construction *tw sḏm* in *Neferti*. Moreover, both instances of the *tw sḏm* construction in 10e and 12b are integral to the original text of *Neferti*: this is because a complex and thoroughly structured large-scale compositional articulation such as the one just sketched can not have arisen as a chance artifact of textual transmission, nor through *ré-écriture*, however extensive.

---

171 *Pḫr.ti* in 12c is a classical crux (see the various interpretations gathered in Dils et al., *TLA*). The interpretation adopted here is based on the fact that neither *ḥry* nor *ẖry* in the first part of 12c have the semogram of the seated man (A1). In the second part of 12c, *pẖr.ti* is interpreted as a pseudo-participle, hooked on *n=k* in the first part. The 1sg pronoun after *ẖt* (only in Pet., not in C25224) is then emended. The proposed overall translation is thus as: *ḏ=i n=k ẖry r ḥry pẖr.ti m-sꜣ pẖr ẖt* 'I will show you the lower part being up, to you who are reversed after a reversal of the body.'

172 Also Widmaier 2009: 81-2; Parkinson 2002: 196.

173 Possbly in allusion to performative *ḏ.n=i n=k* (...) as in temple scenes (Parkinson 2002: 196).

5.3.2 *Tw sḏm* outside *Neferti*: *Hymn* 6.4 and *Kheti* 3.5-6

Besides *Neferti*, only two other texts, *Hymn* and *Kheti*, have the construction *tw sḏm*. In *Hymn*, the construction is immediately identified (§5.3.2.1). In *Kheti*, the manuscript tradition is split and some additional discussion is therefore required (§5.3.2.2).

5.3.2.1 *Hymn* 6.3-4

Hymn has one instance of the construction *tw sḏm*:

> *Hymn* 6.3-4
>
> *šms sw ḏꜣmw ḫrdw tw nḏ ḫrt=f* [a] *m nsw*
>
> 'When a troop of children follows him, he is greeted as a king.'
>
> a) All witnesses, except O. Var.Lit. A, which has adapted to *tw r nḏ-ḫrt=f.*

In identifying the grammatical function of *tw nḏ ḫrt=f,* the overall context of 6.3-4 is considered: 6.4 is linked to the preceding clause (*šms sw ḏꜣmw ḫrdw*) both through pronominal cohesion (*sw – ḫrt=f*) and through the double verse structure of the overall passage. In the lack of any other possible alternative interpretation,[174] the clause in 6.3 provides a setting to the following main clause in 6.4 (with *šms* a *mrr=f*; a subjunctive is unlikely).

This is confirmed by an analysis of the structure of strophe 6. Verses 6.1-2 and 6.5-6 are a series of epithets, while 6.7-8 is a setting construction followed by a main clause. As discussed, this is just the syntax of 6.3-4. The overall structure of strophe 6 is therefore alternating:

6.1-2	(epithets)	
6.3-4	*šms sw ḏꜣmw ḫrdw*	*tw nḏ ḫrt=f m nsw*
6.5-6	(epithets)	
6.7-8	*swr.tw mw*	*irt nbt im=f rḏw ḥꜣw ḥr nfrw=f*
		('When water is drunk, every eye is on him, who gives an excess on his good things.')

The construction in 6.3-4 is thereby identified as a variation on the construction *setting mrr=f – NP ḥr sḏm* (§1.2, (ii)), with the second clause passive. Consequently, *tw nḏ ḫrt* in 6.4 is the passive counterpart to *NP ḥr sḏm*. This value of *tw sḏm* in *Hymn* is just the one identified for the same construction in *Neferti*.

---

174 An alternative interpretation of *šms* as a subjunctive form with 'jussive' meaning is ruled out by the context: within strophe 6, 6.3-4 interrupts a series of epithets (6.1-2; 6.5-6). This contrasts with stanza 13, which consists in a whole sequence of 'jussive' clauses.

5.3.2.2 *Kheti* 3.5-6

As argued below, another instance of *tw sḏm* is to be recognized in *Kheti* 3.5-6:[175]

Kheti 3.5-6

šꜣꜥ.n=f[a] *wꜣḏ iw=f m ẖrd*
tw (r)[b] *nḏ ẖrt=f*
tw (r)[b] *hꜣb=f r irt wpt*
n iy=f sw[c] *sḏ=f sw m dꜣiw*

'When he has, still a child, begun to flourish[d],
he is greeted;[e]

He is sent to carry out missions:
before he has returned, he clads himself in a kilt.'

a) All witnesses have a *sḏm.n=f*. This is grammatical and rich in Middle Egyptian, and paralleled in 6.2 and 8.2. Jäger's emendation into a *sḏm=f*[176] is unjustified.

b) The manuscript tradition is split, roughly equally, between readings as *tw sḏm* and readings as *tw r sḏm*. See below, B.

c) Sic. The presence of *sw* before *sḏ=f* is at first unexpected. Formally, this looks like a *N(P) sḏm=f* construction (unmarked unaccomplished) with a pronominal subject realized by a dependent pronoun. *Sw* is here not the new subject pronoun (*tw=i*, etc.), which in the relevant register is not compatible with the *N(P) sḏm=f*.[177] The use of a dependent pronoun (rather than *iw=f*) seems motivated by the fact that the clause *sw sḏ=f sw m dꜣiw* leans on the preceding one, *n iy=f*. Although not referred to in modern grammars or studies, the construction is consistent with broader principles of Middle Egyptian grammar, and paralleled in P. UC 32201 ro 13-14 ((...) *sw ꜣtp*: §3.4.1.2, (iii)). The text is therefore coherent as it stands and no emendation is required a priori. The heavy emendation proposed by Jäger ('noch bevor es dazu kommt, daß er den Schurz anlegt')[178] is ungrammatical: a complement clause can not be governed by *iwi* in Egyptian. Seman-tically, the event *n iy=f* has not the following clause but the scribe to be as its subject: the return of the scribe in 3.6b echoes his being sent out in the first part of the same verse (*tw (r) hꜣb=f*).

d) Translating as the transmitted text reads. It has been proposed that *wꜣḏ* is here for an original *wḏ*, for a translation as 'When he has, still a child, begun to give orders (...)'. This is possible, but of no further consequence to the main argument below.

e) The translation reflects a syntactic interpretation of 3.5 with *iw=f m ẖrd* circumstantial to *šꜣꜥ.n=f wꜣḏ* and the whole of 3.5a a setting to the second part of the verse, *tw (r) nḏ ẖrt=f*. An alternative reading is often made, with the first half of 3.5 a whole sentence,

---

175 Some details are problematic due to an unstable text, most notably in the second part of 3.6. Focusing on what is relevant to the main discussion, some elements of textual variation are here omitted (details in Jäger 2004: XIX-XX).

176 Jäger 2004: 59.

177 The construction *sw sḏm=f* (§4.7.3), never found in any literary register, is not an option here.

178 Jäger 2004: 60, 133.

syntactically an emphatic construction, for a translation as: 'He has begun to flourish although still a child.' In favor of the former analysis, below, A.

In assessing the textual status of *tw* (*r*) *sḏm* in *Kheti* 3.5-6, two issues are at stake. The first is which of the two constructions, *tw sḏm* or *tw r sḏm*, is secondary to the other one (below, B). The second is whether the analytic construction in *tw* (be it *tw sḏm* or *tw r sḏm*) is original, or the product of an alteration from some altogether different construction (such as synthetic *sḏm.tw=f*) (below, C). A preliminary issue, relevant to both steps to be carried out subsequently, as well as to the interpretation and translation of the passage, consists in identifying the general syntax of 3.5-6 (below, A).

A. Considered in isolation, *Kheti* 3.5 would lend itself to two syntactic (and hence semantic) interpretations. *Kheti* 3.5a could be a whole sentence in itself, syntactically an emphatic construction placing *iw=f m ẖrd* under narrow focus; 3.5b would then be a new sentence. Alternatively, the whole of 3.5a (*šꜣꜥ.n=f wꜣḏ iw=f m ẖrd*, with *iw=f m ẖrd* a circumstance specifying *šꜣꜥ.n=f wꜣḏ* further) could be a setting to 3.5b (*tw nḏ ẖrt=f*); the whole of 3.5 would then be a single sentence, continued in 3.6.

   The latter interpretation (reflected in the above translation) is to be prefered in view of the overall chiastic articulation of 3.5-6: 3.5b is framed by the setting expressed in 3.5a, just as 3.6a is itself framed by the comment in 3.6b:

3.5	X, x' (setting)	–	*tw sḏm*
3.6	*tw sḏm*	–	Y, y' (comment)

The interpretation is also externally supported, within the same text. Differently tensed, a similar chiastic patterning with initial anterior setting recurs in 8.2-3:[179]

(i) *Kheti* 8.2-3

mḥ.n=f[a] *ꜥwy=f r irt   sm3.n*[a] *sw ẖnmsw*
ẖmiw sft.n[a,b] *sw   {ẖ}r*[c] *wnn=f ẖr wḏꜣw*

'As soon as he has set hands to work,[d] mosquitoes have killed him;
Sandflies have butchered him, so that he is in pieces (*lit.* cut).'

a) Consistently a *sḏm.n=f* in all manuscripts, here and in 8.2b and 8.3a similarly; the construction is grammatical and rich. Jäger's emendation into present tense forms[180] is unjustified; in addition, it fails to account why under such emendation the subject should be post-verbal in 8.2b and pre-verbal in 8.3.

b) Reading the text as it stands, with a *N sḏm.n* construction (§1.2, (xi)); alternatively, under emendation: *sft.n<=sn>*.

c) The transmitted text has *ẖr*. Based on the generally observed secondariness of *ẖr* before *wnn* throughout *Kheti*, *ẖr* is likely to be secondary here as well. Jäger[181] proposes *r*, which is semantically plausible. This would also account for how *ẖr* came about textually, as the

---

179 Further discussion of this philologically difficult passage by Widmaier 2009: 112-3.
180 Jäger 2004: 136.
181 Jäger 2004: 73.

two expressions are close formally and semantically (*r* 'so that (...)', *ḫr* 'consequently (...)').

d) *Mḥ ꜥwy* is possibly problematic; I follow Jäger's interpretation.[182]

B. The manuscript tradition is split roughly equally between readings as *tw nḏ ḫrt=f tw hꜣb=f* and *tw r nḏ ḫrt=f tw r hꜣb=f*. So are modern translations, although a slight preference for a present tense rendering is detectable.[183] In their own ways, both readings make sense, just as they already did to ancient readers. Yet, a series of arguments imply that *tw sḏm* is original relative to *tw r sḏm*.

In general terms, *Kheti* is about describing situations presentified to the audience, not about evoking future ones (further, §2.3.3.C). Significantly, *NP r sḏm* is never found otherwise in the whole work. It would therefore be fairly surprising if 3.5-6 was just one instance of that construction in *Kheti*.

Locally, the events *tw (r) nḏ ḫrt=f* and *tw (r) hꜣb=f* are after a setting construction in anterior tense (*šꜣꜥ.n=f wꜣḏ iw=f m ẖrd*: see A). Anterior setting constructions are followed by present tense constructions or past tense constructions. Within *Kheti* itself, the latter possibility illustrated by 8.2-3 (i); the former is illustrated by 6.2 *kn.n=f mḥ n iḫt ꜥwy=f ꜣk n wrḏt=f* 'When he has completed one cubit of work, his arms are perished because of his weariness(?)' (tentative translation). Setting constructions that are not themselves future are not followed by future events.

Semantically, the whole point of 3.5-6 is that the scribe-to-be is 'greeted' and 'sent out' in missions while still 'a child', when he has only 'begun' to 'flourish' (or 'give orders'). Even if 3.5a is not interpreted as a setting construction, a future reading of the events of 'being greeted' and 'being sent out' would trivialize the passage for 3.5b-6a: 'He has begun to flourish although still a child; he will be greeted and sent out(!?) (...)'. This is implicitly recognized by most modern translators when they favor a present tense reading.

Rather remarkably, both the two main editors of the text, although *transcribing* as *tw r sḏm*, nonetheless feel compelled to *translate* as a present tense.[184] This discrepancy between interpretation and transcription reflects the differential salience of *tw sḏm* and *tw r sḏm* in the present-day description of Middle Egyptian grammar, of which translations of 3.5b-6a as a future tense then appear to be a direct artifact. In ancient times similarly, such differential salience—to be viewed practically as ancient scribes' differential textual exposure to the two constructions—probably played a role in readings of 3.5b-6a with a future time reference: the change from *tw sḏm* to *tw r*

---

182 Jäger 2004: 71 and n.187; 137, n.16.

183 For present tense renderings, e.g. Jäger 2004: 133 and n.6; Simpson 2003: 433; Hoch 1992: 89; Helck 1970: 34; Lichtheim 2006²: 186. For future tense renderings, e.g. Vernus 2010²b: 244; Parkinson 1997a: 275; Dils et al., *TLA*.

184 Helck 1970: 34 translates '(...) grüßt man ihn schon. Er wird ausgesandt (...)', and yet assumes *tw r sḏm* to be original (33, n.e). Similarly Jäger 2004: 133 translates '(...) und man grüßt ihn schon. Man schickt ihn (....)', and yet gives *tw r sḏm* in the hypothesized original text (132). Jäger explicitly addresses the discrepancy between his transcription and translation (133, n.6): 'Mit vielen Bearbeitern muss diese Konstruktion wohl nicht futurisch, sondern im Sinne eines Generalis aufgefasst werden.' This would be the sole case of a *NP r sḏm* construction not expressing future tense or deontic modality in the Middle Egyptian record overall.

sḏm is an alteration of a very uncommon construction to a formally very similar, more common one. Yet, as the above discussion of *Neferti* 12b, 10e, and *Hymn* 6.4 establishes (§5.3.1; §5.3.2.1), *tw sḏm* is a possible, if marginal, construction in a certain variety of literary Middle Egyptian (further, §5.3.3). Once this possibility is recognized, the *tw*-headed constructions in *Kheti* 3.5b-6a are straightforwardly interpreted as present tenses on the above combined grounds.

C. Technically, the above only establishes that *tw sḏm* is prior relative to *tw r sḏm*. It does not establish that *tw sḏm* is itself original: a complex textual history along the lines of $X \rightarrow tw\ sḏm \rightarrow tw\ r\ sḏm$ (mult. mss.) would be conceivable in general terms. Some further discussion is therefore required.

The manuscript tradition is unanimous in having constructions in initial bare *tw* in both 3.5b and 3.6a (significantly, no author has so far come up with a proposal to emend the *tw*-headed constructions in 3.5-6 into altogether different ones). Assuming that *tw sḏm* is not original, possible source constructions which *tw sḏm* could have replaced ('X' in the above) are to be named. As discussed, 3.5-6 is chiastically patterned with an initial anterior setting. The patterning, which recurs in 8.2-3 (i) is complex, demonstrating that 3.5-6 is fairly well preserved as far as its general syntactic articulation goes. For semantic reasons, a present tense construction is then required in 3.5b-6a (above, B). Assuming that *tw sḏm* is not original, this leaves only one possible source construction, namely *sḏm.tw=f* (thus **nḏ.tw=f ḫrt*, **h3b.tw=f*). The textual alteration would then have consisted in the replacement of a synthetic construction (*sḏm.tw=f*) by an analytic one (*tw sḏm*). This is unlikely on general grounds, in view of the morphologically fairly heavy nature of the change then hypothesized. In the textual history of *Kheti* itself, synthetic constructions only marginally turn into analytic ones. In the active, present tense *N(P) sḏm=f* is very stable at this level and all instances of analytic *NP ḥr sḏm*, which are numerous, are demonstrably integral to the original text (in details, §2.3.3). In the passive, the two instances of the synthetic construction (*sḏm.tw=f*) are very stable as well. In 25.3 (discussed below, §6.2.2.4, (iv)), *iw ḥms.tw* is preserved in most witnesses, with changes only in O. Tur. 57082 (*tw=k m ḥms*) and O. DeM 1039 (*iw ḥms=k*). These reflect an altogether different issue, namely a reinterpretation of 25.3b (a general maxim, hence the passive) in an addressee-oriented fashion under local attraction to the imperative in 25.3a. In 14.3 *ḥw.tw=f* is preserved in all witnesses, except one which alters into *tw ḥw.tw*[*=f*] (O. BM EA 29550):

(ii) *Kheti* 14.3

O. DeM 1037; O. DeM 1539[185]	(...) *nn sḫt ° ḥw.tw=f* (...)
T. Louvre 693	(...) *nn sḫt{tw} ° ḥw.tw=f* (...)
O. BM EA 29550	(...) <*nn*> *sḫt ° tw ḥw.tw*[*=f*] (...)

This one case, in one witness, occurs under highly specific circumstances, either in relation to the final *-t* of the preceding *sḫt* or in relation to the reference implicit in the preceding *nn sḫt*, thus made explicit, in a wrong way and possibly under attraction to

---

185 Although Ramesside, these here preserve the original stage of the text.

the following passive construction. In 3.5-6, by contrast, all manuscripts consistently have a *tw*-headed analytic construction and no circumstance similar to any of the above is given.

D. Beyond issues of textual criticism, *Kheti* 14.3 is also relevant for grammar. The original text has a synthetic construction, *ḥw.tw=f*, in contrast to the analytic *tw sḏm* in 3.5-6. These different constructions correlate with different environments. In 14.3, the passive form is after a *ir*-introduced hypothetical clause; the main clause is accordingly in the general/habitual, or perhaps better here unextensive, aspect: in the active, the unmarked *sḏm=f* is used. In 3.5-6, by contrast, the passive forms are after a setting construction; this defines an extension to which the events in the main clauses are related: in the active, the progressive *NP ḥr sḏm* is used (§1.2, (ii); §2.8.2.3). Compare:

> *Hypothetical construction – unmarked aspect in the second clause (sḏm=f in the active)*

> (iii) *Kheti* 14.3 (T. Louvre 693)
> *ir ḫbꜣ=f hrw nn sḫt{tw}*
> *ḥw.tw=f m šsm 50*
> 'If he wastes a day without weaving,
> he is beaten with fifty whips.'

> *Setting construction – progressive aspect in the second clause (NP ḥr sḏm in the active)*

> (iv) *Kheti* 3.5-6
> *šꜣꜤ.n=f wꜣḏ iw=f m ḫrd*
> *tw nḏ ḫrt=f (...)*
> 'When he has, still a child, begun to flourish,
> he is greeted (...)'

The distribution of the two passive constructions, the synthetic and the analytic, is thereby principled on grammatical grounds. This affords yet another confirmation that *tw sḏm* is original in *Kheti* 3.5-6.

5.3.3   The construction *tw sḏm*: Functions and status in Middle Egyptian grammar

The above discussion establishes the existence of a construction *tw sḏm* in Middle Egyptian, perhaps limited to some variety thereof or even to a group of texts. With a view on how an argument for dating can be derived, the functions of the construction and its status in Middle Egyptian grammar are preliminarily reviewed.

A. In the extant Middle Egyptian record, the construction *tw sḏm* is documented five times and occurring in two environments:

   (a)   After presentifying *ḏ=i n=k* (...):   *Neferti* 10e, 12b (§5.3.1);

   (b)   After a setting construction: *Hymn* 6.4, *Kheti* 3.5-6 (§5.3.2).

In either environment, *tw sḏm* provides the passive counterpart to progressive *NP ḥr sḏm*. In *Neferti*, this is directly established by the observed parallelism with active *NP ḥr sḏm* in exactly similar structural position (for 12b, §5.3.1.1). Further confirmation is found with an analysis of the position and function of the construction in the large-scale compositional articulation expressing a temporality oscillating between the future tense of prophesy and the progressive tense of presentification (for both 10e and 12b, §5.3.1.3). In *Hymn* and *Kheti*, a progressive value is directly established by the use of the construction after a setting in the second part of a broader construction: *setting mrr=f/sḏm.n=f – NP ḥr sḏm*.

B. In *Neferti*, *Hymn*, and *Kheti*, and only in these texts, *tw sḏm* provides the regular passive counterpart to active *NP ḥr sḏm*. Such distribution suggests that the construction could be a literary one in some sense yet to be defined. In addition, *tw sḏm* displays two remarkable morphological properties, the bareness of *tw* (as in *tw r sḏm*) and the lack of the progressive marker *ḥr*.

   The bareness of *tw* is interpreted in relation to the environments in which the construction is used: continuing *NP m NP* patterns after presentifying *ḏ=i n=k* (in *Neferti*) or leaning on a preceding clausal setting (in *Hymn* and *Kheti*). In either case, the bareness of *tw* is therefore a literary feature inasmuch, and only inasmuch, as the environments triggering such bareness are themselves typically found in literary texts. Altough different in its specifics, a similar general analysis was made above for the bareness of *tw* in *tw r sḏm* (§5.2.3.3-4).

   As regards the omission of *ḥr*, this is specific to the construction: the active counterpart *NP ḥr sḏm* does not omit *ḥr* in the same texts and no case of a construction with a bare *tw*, yet with *ḥr* written out, is documented in the Middle Egyptian record. In the lack of any better explanation, the omission of *ḥr* in *tw sḏm* is tentatively interpreted as a token of literariness, perhaps aimed at making the construction different, and thereby distinguished, from the more ordinary *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* (§5.3.4).

C. Three out of five occurrences of *tw sḏm* are with an event of 'greeting' (*nḏ-ḥrt*: *Neferti* 12b; *Hymn* 6.4; *Kheti* 3.5); each of the three compositions that have *tw sḏm* thus has at least one instance with *nḏ-ḥrt*. In both *Hymn* and *Kheti*, instances of *tw nḏ-ḥrt* also have *ẖrd* 'child' in the immediately preceding context:

   Neferti: 10e   *tw nḥm*

                    12b   *tw nḏ-ḥrt*

   Kheti: 3.5-6   (... *ẖrdw*) *tw nḏ-ḥrt tw hȝb* (...)

   Hymn: 6.3-4   (... *ẖrdw*) *tw nḏ-ḥrt*

The possibility of a communication of some sort between these texts, at the level of textual transmission or of original composition, must therefore be examined.

In *Neferti* 10e and 12b, and in *Kheti* 3.5-6, the construction is demonstrably integral to the original composition (§5.3.1.3 and §5.3.2.2, respectively). In *Hymn* 6.3-4, *tw nḏ-ḫrt* semantically fits the context; it is syntactically coherent, with *tw sḏm* used after a setting construction, as in *Kheti* 3.5-6; moreover, the overall syntactic articulation of *Hymn* 6.3-4 is integral to the alternating structure of strophe 6 (§5.3.2.1). An hypothesis of textual contamination during transmission is therefore extremely unlikely for *Hymn* 6.3-4.[186]

A textual communication between *Neferti*, *Kheti*, and *Hymn*, if any, must then be viewed at the level of original composition. Recurring in all three compositions, *tw nḏ-ḫrt* was probably a literary trope. The construction itself, *tw sḏm*, is also found with other events: while in *Kheti* 3.5-6, *tw hꜣb* is in direct continuation of *tw nḏ-ḫrt*, *tw nḥm* in *Neferti* 10e is not (*tw nḏ-ḫrt* comes only later, in 12b). This demonstrates the existence of a construction *tw sḏm* beyond the trope *tw nḏ-ḫrt*. So does the fact that the construction is used in all three texts whenever the passive of a progressive event (*NP ḥr sḏm* in the active) is called for (that *tw nḏ-ḫrt* is over-represented is then due to its being a literary trope). *Neferti*, *Kheti*, and *Hymn*, and only these, thereby appear to share one highly specific element in their grammatical repertoires.

5.3.4   (*X.)tw ḥr sḏm*

The construction *tw sḏm* occurs in only three texts. One of these, *Hymn*, can be dated to the late Seventeenth or early Eighteenth Dynasty on independent grounds (§3.4), but the other two, *Neferti* and *Kheti*, are still undated at this point. In defining a terminus *ante quem non* for *tw sḏm*, this must be related to the more common *X.tw ḥr sḏm* of which it is a literary variant. A first step consists in reviewing the pattern of early attestation of the latter construction in the external record (this section); a second step will be to discuss the passive counterpart of *NP ḥr sḏm* in securely dated Twelfth Dynasty literary texts and in such that are at least somewhat later than the Twelfth Dynasty (§5.3.5).

5.3.4.1   A preliminary note on *wn.(X.)tw ḥr sḏm*

The earliest instances of an accommodation of *tw* into the subject slot of a *NP ḥr sḏm* construction all involve the auxiliary *wn*. Four instances of *wn.(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* are found in the Twelfth Dynasty record, including one from the early Twelfth Dynasty:

(i) Antefiqer's *Girgawi Inscription* (Amenemhat I, year 29), 6-7

wn.t(w) ḥr ḳd ḫnrt pn
ꜥḥꜥ.n smꜣ nḥsw spt nbt m wꜣwꜣt (...)

'While this enclosure was being built,
the Nubians, the whole remainder of Wawat, were killed (...)'

---

186 An altogether different issue is whether, internally to *Hymn*, 6.3-4 may have influenced 11.3-4 (Helck 1972: 37, n.b., and 69, n.b; the author's reconstruction, however, is speculative).

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 115-116 (mid-Twelfth Dynasty: §3.1.2)

wn.in.tw ḥr rḏt n=f t3 10 ḥnḳt ds 2 r⸢ nb

'And one began giving him ten loaves of bread and two jars of beer daily.'

(iii) Hammamat 19 (*temp.* Amenemhat III), 10-12

⸢ḥ⸣.n ir p3 sm3

wn.in.tw ḥr sfn n3 n mnw mi ḏd(t).n=f nbt

'The ramp was made

and (the way for) these blocks was made smooth according to all he had said.'

> Sim. Hammamat 19, 3-4 *wn.in={n}<t>(w) ḥr hd inrw* (...) 'And one began setting hand to the stones (...)'.[187]

(iv) P. UC 32036 (Kahun Veterinary Papyrus), 20-23

rḏ.ḥr.t(w)=f ḥr gs=f w⸢

wn.ḥr.t(w) ḥr ntš=f m mw ḳb

sin.ḥr.t(w) irty=f ḥn⸢ ḏrw=f ḥn⸢ ⸢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.'

Like (*X.)tw ḥr sḏm* to be discussed below (§5.3.4.2), these *wn.(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* constructions accommodate *tw* in the subject slot of a *NP ḥr sḏm* pattern. Yet, the commonality between the two construction types is only formal: long before being accommodated into any such patterns, the morpheme *tw* had always been maximally 'detachable' from its erstwhile exclusive inflectional position in synthetic verb-first forms such as *sḏm.tw=f*.[188] The actual extraction of *tw* must therefore be analyzed not in terms of a morphological possibility (which was given at all times), but in relation to the specific semantics of individual patterns to which *tw* was successively accommodated and to the ways innovations in such individual patterns relate to broader processes of ongoing change during Middle Egyptian.

In *wn*-auxiliated constructions, *wn* is variously inflected, as a past tense auxiliary in (i),[189] by *-in-* in (ii)-(iii), and by *-ḥr-* in (iv): in accommodating such inflection, it expresses specific semantics additional to the ones already expressed by the progressive *NP ḥr sḏm* itself. In the *Girgawi Inscription* (i), *wn NP ḥr sḏm* is at the

---

187 Emendation after Schenkel in press b: §3.5.

188 In slightly more technical terms, *tw* in the synthetic Verb-Subject conjugations was simultaneously characterized by the four following dimensions, partly related to each other: (a) its singular exponence: *tw* codes passive voice only without any other functions in voice (unlike e.g. the cognate Semitic {t}) and does not have any specific aspectual correlates (unlike e.g. *sḏm(w)*- morphology in Earlier Egyptian); (b) the morphological transparency of forms to which *tw* was accommodated: these are always analyzable componentially as *active stem + tw*; (c) the lack of fusion at morpheme boundaries in such forms (a very general property of Earlier Egyptian affixal morphology, as it seems); and (d) the position of *tw* at the outer edge of the inflected form, just before personal clitics. These dimensions conspire in making *tw* maximally 'detachable' at all times: in more details, Stauder in press b: §4.2.

189 On the past tense auxiliary *wn* as an inflected form (a *sḏm.n=f* of *wnn*), Stauder in press e: §3.

opening of the narrative part of the inscription and expresses an element of the textual background, setting the stage for the first event in the main chain of the narrative, the killing of the Nubians: this could not have been expressed by synthetic means. In (ii) and (iii), *wn.in.tw ḥr sḏm* is in contexts in which synthetic *sḏm.in.tw=f* could not be used under the conventions to which the types of written discourses exemplified abide in the Twelfth Dynasty (discussed above, §2.4.4.6.B). In (iv), three -*ḥr*-marked constructions follow each other, with synthetic and *wn*-auxiliated analytical ones alternating. Contrasting with the synthetic -*ḥr*-marked patterns, analytic *wn.ḥr NP ḥr sḏm* additionally expresses the continuous (i.e. 'extensive' in Vernus' terms) nature of the action to be performed.[190]

In all cases, therefore, early instances of *tw* in the preverbal slot of a *NP ḥr sḏm* pattern are from constructions that express specific semantics, associated with the inflectional marks on the auxiliary *wn*. Unauxiliated *NP ḥr sḏm*, by contrast, only expresses progressive aspect. While *wn.(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* patterns are documented in the Twelfth Dynasty already, the rise of *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* is an altogether different story, to be studied in its own terms.

5.3.4.2   *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm*: Early attestations

A. In the non-literary record, early attestations of unauxiliated *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* are the following:

(i) *Paheri* (*temp*. Thutmosis III), pl.3, 2nd register from bottom, 2nd inscription from the right, 10-11

ḥr tw.tw ḥr ꜣs=n m šmt

'And they are hurrying us in (our) going.'

(ii) *Urk*. IV 649, 15-17 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*)

sw mi iḫ šmt ḥr mtn pn nty wꜣ r ḫns
iw.tw ḥr smit r-ḏd (...)

'How will it be, walking on this path which has now become narrow,
when it is reported that (...)?'

> Sim. *Urk*. IV 656, 5 *ḥr-ntt tw.tw* [*ḥr V...*] (implied by the contrast with *Urk*. IV 656, 3 *r-ntt iw.tw r tḥn*).

(iii) *Mutter und Kind* VIII.1-2

ḏd.tw rꜣ pn iw.tw ḥr ḏt wnm ḥrd pnw psw rꜣ-pw mwt=k[sic]

'One should recite this spell while one has either the child or his mother eat the cooked mouse.'

> Sim. in a later medical text in Middle Egyptian, P. Berlin 3038 (paleographically D.19), 19, 7 *pḫrt swr irt iw.tw ḥr irt pḫrt* 'A potion for drinking which is made while one is making a remedy.'

---

190 Similarly, Vernus 1990a: 62-3.

NB. While the manuscript of *Mutter und Kind* (P. Berlin 3027) dates paleographi-
cally to the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty (or possibly even slightly later),[191] the text
itself has not been subjected to linguistic analysis yet. One element has been
noted, however, within the very passage here quoted: the position of *rȝ-pw*, before
mwt=k rather than after it as would have been the case in Middle Kingdom
Middle Egyptian; parallels for this innovative position are all from the Eighteenth
Dynasty.[192] Another element noted in passing is in *Mutter und Kind* V.10-VI.1
ir.kw rf wḏ-nsw n gb (...) 'I have made a royal decree of Geb (...)'. In the Middle
Kingdom, occurrences of the active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple
with events other than lexical statives (*rḫ* and *ḥm*)—a textual revival of Old
Kingdom uses—display a specific association with funerary self-presentations,
contributing to index these (or a reference to these in *Sinuhe*) linguistically.[193] At
complete odds with this Middle Kingdom usage (compare §6.1.3.2), any such
association is lacking in *Mutter und Kind* where the expression is used merely as
a general token of elevated language (as the context suggests, here probably to
highlight the 'royal decree'). This strongly suggests a post-Middle Kingdom
dating as well.

In the above, (i) and (ii) are from typically innovative registers ('Reden und Rufe' and
direct discourse in a military narrative, respectively). In either passage, *X.tw ḥr sḏm*
occurs alongside other innovative expressions, the new subject pronouns (*tw.tw* and
sw, respectively); the immediate context in *Annals* is more generally replete with
innovative expressions of various sorts.[194]

B. In the literary corpus, pre-Ramesside occurrences of *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* (other than *tw
sḏm* in *Neferti*, *Hymn*, and *Kheti*: §5.3.1-2) are the following:

(iv) *Tale Involving the House of Life* X+5.2-4
ir.in.tw ʿḥʿw r hrw 40 m ḥb nfr n [...]
iw.tw ḥr swr m [...]
'And a period up to fourty days was spent in a beautiful festival of/for [...]
drinking from/in [...]'

> The composition was dated to the (later) Second Intermediate Period on inde-
> pendent grounds (§3.3.1). In the very sentence here quoted, note the construction
> *iri* (time ...) *iw=f ḥr sḏm*, otherwise first documented in Emhab 8-9 (§3.3.1, (iii)),
> and contrasting with earlier *iri* (time ...) *ḥr sḏm* in similar function (§3.3.1, (i)-(ii),
> still in *Cheops' Court*).

---

191 Yamazaki 2003: 2.
192 Kroeber 1970: 54-6 with ex.2-4.
193 Stauder in press a: §3; in the present study also §4.1.3.A.
194 See above, §1.3.3.3, n.210.

(v) *Astarte* (*temp.* Amenhotep II), I.x+10

ḫr mk tw.tw ḥr in n=f inw [...]

'And look, one is bringing him tribute [...]'

> The general linguistic typology of the composition is highly innovative and best
> described as transitional between Middle and Late Egyptian.[195]

> NB. *Ipuwer* 14.11 has *iw.tw ḥr* 'One says', contrasting in an exactly similar with
> *iw ḏd.tw* (12.1). That both constructions could have been present in the original
> text of the composition is possible, but not very likely given that they are used in
> the exact same way in what is a mere quotative expression, i.e. in a context in
> which stylistic differentiation is least meaningful. The reading in 14.11 could
> therefore easily be a modernization (note the very late date of P. Leiden I 344 ro):
> the only reliable contribution it makes to the pattern of attestation of *(X.)tw ḥr*
> *sḏm* is to show that the construction was acceptable to Ramesside scribes, hardly
> a new information.

C. In both non-literary and literary texts, the construction was to become common in
Ramesside times. To quote but one example from a literary composition:

(vi) *Allen droht die Rekrutierung* 3-5

tw.tw ḥr snh smdt nbt

tw.tw ḥr ṯȝi nȝy=sn nꜥ

tw.tw ḥr dit pȝ s r wꜥw pȝ mnḥ r mgi

tw.tw ḥr sḫpr=f (...)

'All dependent personnel is drafted,

the best of them is taken;

The man is made a soldier, the young man a "young fighter",

he is raised (...)'

> Some manuscripts omit *ḥr* in one or several of the above forms, resulting in forms
> *tw.tw sḏm*.[196]

D. The above collection of early attestations is strongly suggestive of a late date of
innovation for the rise of unauxiliated *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* constructions. For the argument
to be complete, one additional step is taken, namely establishing how the passive
counterpart of progressive *NP ḥr sḏm* was realized in Middle Kingdom Middle
Egyptian (the next sub-section).

5.3.5 The passive counterpart of *NP ḥr sḏm* in Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian

Unauxiliated *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* is never found in any securely dated Middle Kingdom
text, literary or otherwise (§5.3.4.2). That this is not a mere gap in documentation is

---

195 In details, Collombert & Coulon 2000: 211-6.
196 Jäger 2004: 273.

demonstrated by a consideration of contexts in which the construction could have been used, had it belonged to the relevant written registers of that time.

5.3.5.1 Documentation

In Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian, an instance of a passive event interpreted as progressive is the following:

> (i) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 332-334
>
> *iw srw ḥr rḏt n=k*
> *iw=k ḥr itt in iw=k m ꜥwꜣy*
> *iw stꜣ.tw n=k skw ḥnꜥ=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!'[197]

The same situation is still observed in *Ipuwer* and *Khakheperreseneb*, two compositions that have a linguistic terminus *ante quem non* in the early Thirteenth Dynasty (§6.2.2.5 and §2.7, respectively):

> (ii) *Ipuwer* 6.9-12
>
> *iw ms hpw nw ḫn(r)t ḏw r ḫnty*
> *šm.tw {m}ms ḥr=s<n> m iwyt*
> *ḥwrw ḥr ngt im m-ẖnw mrwt{ꜣ}*
>
> *iw ms (...)*
>
> *iw ms ḫn(r)t-wr m pr-hꜣ=f*
> *ḥwrw ḥr šmt iit m ḥwwt 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.'[198]

> With the same event, contrast for example passive *šm.tw* and active *ḥwrw ḥr šmt*.

---

197 Translation slightly adapted from Parkinson 2012a: 269-70.
198 Translation slightly adapted from Enmarch 2008: 228.

(iii) *Ipuwer* 2.5-10

iw ms [*ib*] *sḫmw* (...)

wnḫyt ḥr ḏd n(n) tkn im=s

iw ms tȝ ḥr msnḥ mi irr nḥp (...)

iw ms itrw m snf swr.tw im=f

niw.tw m rmṯw

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.'[199]

     Sim. *passim* in *Ipuwer*.

(iv) *Khakheperreseneb* ro 11 (also on O. Cairo JE 50249, 3-4)

rḏ.tw[a] *mȝꜥt <r>-rwty*

isft m ḫn sḥ

ḫnn.tw sḫrw nṯrw

wn{t}.tw mḫrw=sn

'Maat is put outside,
Isfet is within the council;

The counsels of the gods are thrown into tumult,
their directives are neglected.'

a)   On *rḏ.tw*, §2.7.2.2.

In either of these texts, *sḏm.tw=f* is used as the regular counterpart to *NP ḥr sḏm*. What is more, *sḏm.tw=f* is used as the regular counterpart to *NP ḥr sḏm* expressing progressive tense. In the relevant passages in *Ipuwer*, this springs from the fact that the overall temporality is based on the *Sonst-Jetzt* schema, which has *NP ḥr sḏm* in the active (§2.6.2.4). Compare e.g. in (ii), with the same event of 'going', *iw ms* (...) *šm.tw* (...), then *iw ms* (...) *ḫwrw ḥr šmt iit* (...). In *Khakheperreseneb* similarly, ro 11 is part of the lament, not a generalizing statement. Compare e.g. the following verse, ro 11-12 *wnn tȝ <m> sn{t}y-mny irtiw m st nbt* (...) 'The land is in calamity, mourning is in every place (...)'. This lament is presented as a 'meditation' (*nkȝy*) on what 'happens' (*ḫprt*, ro 10), introduced by the observation that 'changes are happening' (*ḫprw ḥr ḫpr*, ro 10). Significantly, this is with *NP ḥr sḏm* expressing progressive aspect, like *ḫnn.tw* and *wn{t}.tw* in (iv).

     The above establishes that in two literary texts that were not composed before the early Thirteenth Dynasty and perhaps only later, *sḏm.tw=f*—not *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm*—is used as the regular passive counterpart to *NP ḥr sḏm* for expressing progressive tense.

---

199 Translation slightly adapted from Enmarch 2008: 222-3.

5.3.5.2 Setting the observations into a broader linguistic context

A. In earlier Middle Egyptian, the expression of the unaccomplished aspect is realized by two formal categories in the active, *N(P) sḏm=f* and *NP ḥr sḏm*. The latter is a dedicated progressive pattern, while the former is unmarked in this respect. Given the presence in the language of a dedicated pattern marked for progressive aspect (*NP ḥr sḏm*), the unmarked pattern (*N(P) sḏm=f*) is most commonly used for general and habitual events, yet can also on occasions be used with events that do not allow a general or habitual reading, if the speaker so chooses:

(a) *In reference to the ongoing speech situation*

- Selection of the unmarked option:

(i) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 73-75

iw mdw=k n=i nn wi ḥr sḏm st

'You speak to me, yet I am not listening.'

- Selection of the dedicated progressive pattern:

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B2 113-114

mk wi ḥr spr n=k n sḏm.n=k st

'Look, I am pleading to you, yet you do not hear it.'

(b) *In a topos associated with the return from an expedition*

- Selection of the unmarked option:

(iii) *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 33 (fuller context: §2.6.3.1, (x))

(...) *st nbt ḥpt=s 2-nw=s*

'(...) every woman hugged her fellow.'

- Selection of the dedicated progressive pattern:

(iv) *Shipwrecked Sailor* 6 (fuller context: §2.6.3.1, (ix))

(...) *s nb ḥr ḥpt sn-nw=f* (...)

'(...) everybody is hugging their fellows; (...)'

In the above examples, the same text, *Shipwrecked Sailor*, once selects the unmarked option (i) and once the dedicated progressive pattern (iv). Phrased in venerable structuralist jargon, the opposition between *NP ḥr sḏm* and *N(P) sḏm=f* is privative, not equipollent.

Turning to passive voice, the morphologically symmetrical counterpart to *NP ḥr sḏm*, *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm*, did not develop until much later than the original grammaticalization of *NP ḥr sḏm* itself (already in the Old Kingdom). For reasons exposed above in relation to *NP r sḏm* (§5.2.5.A), the new analytic *NP ḥr sḏm* initially developed for active, positive events, i.e. for those events that are most common in speech. *NP ḥr sḏm*, which has the lexical verb in the infinitive, does not provide an

inflectional slot to which the by then still solely inflectional morpheme *tw* could be directly accommodated. For passive events to be interpreted as progressive, recourse was then made to the unmarked active pattern, *N(P) sḏm=f*, turned passive by insertion of *tw* in the regular inflectional slot (with only the minor difference that the passive subject is not anticipated to the left of the verb, reflecting the non-prototypical nature of passive subjects). The overall unaccomplished paradigm in Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian is as follows:

	general/habitual events	*ongoing events*
active:	*N(P) sḏm=f*	marked progressive *NP ḥr sḏm*
		unmarked *N(P) sḏm=f*
passive:	←——— *sḏm.tw NP* ———→	

Similar asymmetrical paradigms are not uncommon in natural language. In Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian itself, the other analytic Subject-Verb pattern grammat-icalized from a situational predicate construction, *NP r sḏm*, also has non-isomorphic functional counterparts, both for negative polarity and for passive voice (*nn sḏm=f* and *sḏm.tw=f*, respectively: §5.2.5), with morphologically symmetrical counterparts documented only later (in the early New Kingdom and in the late Middle Kingdom, respectively).

5.3.5.3 Implications

The overall implication is that the morphologically symmetrical counterpart to progressive *NP ḥr sḏm*, *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* did not develop until some time after the Middle Kingdom. When exactly it first developed remains unclear due to the low density of the Second Intermediate Period record. *Ipuwer* and *Khakheperreseneb*, two literary texts that can not date before the early Thirteenth Dynasty, still have *sḏm.tw=f* as a counterpart to *NP ḥr sḏm*. The first, isolated, occurrence of *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* is in a literary composition of the (later) Second Intermediate Period (*Tale Involving the House of Life*, §5.3.4.2, (iv)); the next earliest are from the early Eighteenth Dynasty, often in innovative registers (§5.3.4.2, (i), (ii), (v)). The presence of *tw sḏm* in *Neferti* 10e and 12b therefore carries major implications for dating this composition (further discussion below, §5.7.1.1.C and §5.7.1.2.C).

5.4 *Neferti* 7f, 9c: *Tw* with non-dynamic events

In three places, *Neferti* has *tw* used with non-dynamic events, in 7f (*gȝw* 'lack'), in 9c (*sḏr* 'lie'), and in 9c (*ḥqr* 'be hungry', in a secondary predication depending on an agent represented by *tw* in the main clause) (§6.2.2.4, (vi), (v), and (i), respectively). These instances are possibly to be augmented by *Neferti* 5d and 12d, if *ꜥnḫ* 'live' as used in these places is non-dynamic (uncertain: §6.2.2.4, (x)-(xi)). As will be discussed in details below (§6.2), this construction is not documented in any securely dated Middle Kingdom literary composition. Moreover, early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty

literary registers demonstrably use another, subjectless, construction whenever the first participant of a non-dynamic event is to be left unexpressed (e.g. *Ptahhotep* 10 P *sḏr=ø*). Constructions as in *Neferti* 7f and 9c are therefore subject to a terminus *ante quem non* by the late Twelfth Dynasty.

5.5   Lexical indications for dating

Some elements of the lexicon of *Neferti* are typical of an early New Kingdom horizon, but not fully specific to this: they do not afford a reliable indication for dating (§2.2.2, (i), (iv)). In its written form, the lexical morphology in *Neferti* also includes many late features, more than in other compositions, and some cases individually remarkable: yet, this does not afford a reliable indication for dating either (§2.3.1.2). Against the generally low reliability of possible lexical evidence, two expressions in *Neferti* stand out, in relation to their extra-linguistic referents.

5.5.1   *Neferti* 3c *ḫpš* 'sickle-shaped sword'

In the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty P. Petersburg 1116 B, the single witness here fully preserved, *Neferti* 3c reads:

> *Neferti* 3c Pet.
>
> (...) *ḫp{w} ꜥꜣmw m ḫpš{wt}*[T16, a]*=sn* (...)
>
> '(...) while the Asiatics wander with their sickle-shaped swords (...)'
>
> a)   The only other witness preserving part of 3c, the Ramesside O. DeM 1187, has the bull's foreleg (F23) and reads *ḫp{w}š*[F23] *ꜥꜣmw* [...]. This is garbled, perhaps for a rewriting as 'while the strength of the Asiatics [...](?)'.

Neferti 3c is generally, and without further comment, emended into 'indem die Asiaten *in ihrer Macht* kommen', 'the Asiatics journeying *in their strength*'.[200] Yet, the transmitted text has the 'sickle-shaped sword' semogram (T16).[201] *Ḫpš* 'sickle-shaped sword' is not subject to the usual uncertainties in interpreting patterns of attestation, since the introduction of the word can be dated in relation to the introduction of its extra-linguistic referent in Egypt (§5.5.1.1). The issue then becomes one of assessing whether the reading in Pet. is original or secondary (§5.5.1.2).

5.5.1.1   The word *ḫpš* 'sickle-shaped sword'

The sign of writing (T16) is first documented in the times of Thutmosis III,[202] alongside other signs (also 'repeaters'/'specific determinatives') associated with new words relating to warfare, the chariot (T17)[203] and the horse (E6).[204] A few genera-

---

200 Helck 1992[2]: 20; Parkinson 1997a: 135 (pars pro toto: most translations stand in this tradition).
201 Also noted by Kammerzell 1986: 105, n.18b.
202 *Urk*. IV 726, 17; Davies 1930: I, 20 (Qenamun); after *EG*, p.513.
203 *Urk*. IV 704, 15; 712, 10 (after *EG*, p.513).

tions earlier, the first occurrence of the word *ḥpš* (below) is without the sign T16, suggesting that the sign of writing may have been coined slightly later than the word was introduced into the lexicon.

The first documentation of the word itself is in *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 34, followed by further occurrences in the Eighteenth Dynasty,[205] and then commonly in Ramesside times.[206] Unlike other words associated with warfare first documented in the early New Kingdom (*wrryt* 'chariot',[207] *ssmt* 'horse'[208]), *ḥpš* 'sickle-shaped sword' is derived from native Egyptian stock, namely from age-old *ḥpš* 'foreleg, arm, strength'. Such inner-Egyptian derivation notwithstanding, the association with a new referent, and thereby the new meaning, make *ḥpš* 'sickle-shaped sword' a new word.

> NB. *Wb.* and *DZA* describe the word as 'belegt seit MR',[209] based on one occurrence, Siut V 16. This, from a self-eulogizing context with multiple phraseological parallels in the First Intermediate Period and Middle Kingdom, reads differently: *ink nḫt pḏt ḳn m ḥpš*[F23]=*f* 'I am one strong of bow, valiant with his strong arm' (for *pḏt* 'bow' and *ḥpš* 'foreleg' in parallel, compare e.g. *Sinuhe* B 105: §5.5.1.2, (v)). In a famous passage of an insecurely dated literary text, *ḥpš* has also been translated by 'sword': *Merikare* E 32 *ḥpš*[F23] *pw n nsw ns=f*, e.g. 'Das Schwert eines Königs ist seine Zunge'; 'C'est l'épée d'un roi que sa langue.'[210] This tradition of interpretation was no doubt suggested by the context: *ḥmw m mdwt nḫt=k ḥpš pw n nsw ns=f ḳn mdwt r ꜥḥꜣ nb* (...) 'Be skilful with words, and you will be victorious [...] The *sword* of a king is his tongue, words are stronger than any fight (...)'. In a broad sense, this hits the intended meaning, also conjuring up an imagery that has a long tradition and strongly resonates with Western readers.[211] The Egyptian text is more subtle, deriving its force from an allusion to a topos in self-eulogies, also often said of the king (§5.5.1.2), thus: 'The strong arm of the king is his tongue.'[212]

The real-world referent of the word, the weapon itself,[213] originated outside Egypt: it is archeologically documented in Western Asia in the third millennium[214] and in Southern Mesopotamia by the early second.[215] Its first documentation on Egyptian soil, once thought to be in the New Kingdom,[216] is now earlier, in a tomb from

---

204 *Urk.* IV 652, 10; 663, 9; 663, 10; 697, 16 (*EG*, p.459).
205 *Urk.* IV 726, 17; Davies 1930: I, 20 (Qenamun); *Urk.* IV 1562, 8.
206 See *TLA* #116460.
207 Schneider 1999a.
208 Vernus 2009b.
209 *Wb.* III 270.1-3; *DZA* 27.796.750.
210 E.g. Quack 1992: 25; Coulon 1999: 103; Fischer-Elfert 2000: 263.
211 Some elements sketched in Fischer-Elfert 2000: 263.
212 Similarly e.g. Vernus 2010²b: 206; Moers 2000: 69; Parkinson 1997a: 218.
213 On the *ḥpš* weapon, Vogel 2006; Warnick 2004 (Thomas Schneider and Anthony Spalinger, p.c. 2/2012).
214 Philip 2006: 80-1, 151 (Andrea Gnirs, p.c. 2/2012).
215 The sickle-shaped sword is known since the early second millennium (Susa and Tello), while the sickle-shaped *axe* is attested since the mid-third millennium (Schrakamp 2011; Thomas Schneider, p.c. 2/2012).
216 Schott 1980: 819.

stratum F (Thirteenth Dynasty) in Tell el-Dabᶜa.[217] The spread of the sickle-sword from the Eastern Delta to Southern Egypt is probably to be related to the spread of 'Hyksos influence' at some probably later point during the Second Intermediate Period. A referential use outside a narrowly military context, as in *Neferti* 3c Pet., implies a further time lag.[218]

5.5.1.2 To emend or not to emend?

As mentioned, *Neferti* 3c Pet. is near-universally emended into *m ḫpš=sn* 'in their strength'. The two words, *ḫpš* 'strong arm' and *ḫpš* 'sickle-shaped sword', are distinguished in writing by their semograms only (F 23, a bull's foreleg, and T 16, the weapon, respectively), which are very similar in contour. A confusion of the two semograms is therefore possible, in either direction. The only other witness of the passage, O. DeM 1187 (Ramesside), has the bull's foreleg semogram, but the reading is clearly secondary on other accounts. In the lack of any evidence supporting the common emendation of *Neferti* 3c Pet. *ḫpš* 'sickle-shaped sword' into *ḫpš* 'strength', this entirely rests on the assumption that an emendation is necessary a priori, because the original text of *Neferti*, dated to the Middle Kingdom, should not include an expression as recent as *ḫpš* 'sickle-shaped sword'. When the dating of *Neferti* ceases to be presupposed, this becomes circular.

On the other hand, noting that an emendation lacks any foundation is of course not tantamount to demonstrating that the text as it stands is necessarily original. Some positive indications against the emended reading are therefore adduced in the following. In *Neferti* 3c, *ḫpš* 'strength' would be a word-play with *ḫpi* 'walk around', but so would *ḫpš* 'sickle-shaped sword' (by definition, since both words are from the same root):[219] no argument as to which reading is original can therefore be derived from this. To provide a sounder setting to the following discussion, an examination of uses of the phrase *m ḫpš=f* (*=k/=i*) 'in his (your/my) strength' elsewhere in Middle Egyptian texts is instructive.

(a) *In First Intermediate Period funerary self-presentations*

(i) *Ỉr m ḫpš=f* 'acting with his (own) strong arm': a topos not uncommon in First Intermediate Period stelae, e.g. Heqaib (BM EA 1671), 2; Antef son of Myt 3;

(ii) Related to this but with contextually stronger military overtones is Siut V, 16 *nḫt pḏt ḳn m ḫpš=f* 'one strong of bow, valiant with his strong arm';

---

217 Forstner-Müller 2001 (Andrea Gnirs, p.c. 2/2012).

218 Andrea Gnirs (p.c. 2/2012): '(...) da nicht davon ausgegangen werden kann, daß bereits beim ersten Auftreten einer neuen Waffenart diese sofort ausserhalb eines engeren militärischen Rahmens referenziell verwendet werden konnte.'

219 Another instance of a word-play on the same root, also literary, is in *Amenemhat* 10c, quoted below in the main text (vi).

(b) *Said of the king*

(iii) In Illahun Hymns to Senwosret III, II.4 (*ḥꜥ.wy*) *kmt m ḫpš=k mk.n=k iswt*[*=sʔ*] 'How rejoiced is Egypt in your strength, when you have protected its(?) old traditions!';

(iv) In royal inscriptions: e.g. Thutmosis I's *Tombos Stela* 11-12 (*Urk.* IV 85, 8) *ḫnd pḥwy=fy m ḫpš nḫt* 'who treads on its two ends with his strong arm'; Thutmosis III's *Gebel Barkal Stela* 2 (*Urk.* IV 1228, 18) *it m ḫpš=f* 'who seizes with his strong arm'; 15 (*Urk.* IV 1233, 7) *hd=f tꜣ nb ḥr*[sic] *ḫpš=f* 'he attacks every land on his strength';

(c) *In literature*

(v) *Sinuhe*: B 51-52 *nḫt pw grt ir m ḫpš=f pr-ꜥ nn twt n=f* (...) 'He is a strong one who acts with his strong arm, a hero without peer'; B 104-106 *smꜣ.n=i rmṯ im=s m ḫpš=i m pdt=i m nmtwt=i m sḫrw=i iḳrw* 'I killed the people in it with my strong arm, my bow, my movements, and my excellent plans';

(vi) Elsewhere: *Amenemhat* 10c *in.n=i* {*r*} *drw ḫpwšt m ḫpš=i m ḫprw=i* 'I have reached the limits of the Great Bear through my strength and through my manifestations';[220] *Merikare* E 80 *ḳd=k m ḫpš=k* 'You can sleep (secure) by your strength'; with a different preposition, *Ipuwer* 1.6 *mi ḥr ḫpš* 'Come with strength!'

(d) *Once in Coffin Texts*

(vii) CT I 4/5a-6/7a *ꜣḫw itpw innw mw irrw ḥ(ꜥ)p(y) m ḫpš n itw=sn* 'the *akh*'s who bring water, who make the flood with the strong arms of their fathers.'

A. In all cases, the phrase *m ḫpš=f/=k/=i* is associated with strongly agentive and/or transformative events: *iri* 'act' (*passim*), *smꜣ* 'kill' (*Sinuhe* B 104-106), *ḫnd* 'tread' (*Urk.* IV 85, 8), *hd* 'attack' (*Urk.* IV 1233, 7), *mki* 'protect' (Hymns to Senwosret III, II.4), *ini drw* 'reach the limits' (*Amenemhat* 10c), *ini* (...) *iri* (...) 'bring (...) make (...)' (CT I 4/5a-6/a), in an implicit way also in the nominally phrased *ḳn* 'be valiant' (*Siut* V, 16), with a different preposition also *mi* 'come!' (*Ipuwer* 1.6). To these events the phrase *m ḫpš=f* is associated as the distinguished instrument by which agency is carried out. The only apparent exception, *ḳd* 'sleep' (*Merikare* E 80 (vi)) confirms the tableau with a pointe: the strength of the king, evoked by the phrase *m ḫpš=f* (and thus by the underlying *iri m ḫpš=f*) is what allows him *not* to act, to be in the event least agentive of all, 'sleeping'.

Against this background, *Neferti* 3c, if emended into *m ḫpš=sn* 'with their strength', sounds slightly odd: *ḫpi* (although agentive in a linguistic sense) is not strongly agentive as the above events are, nor transformative at all, and thereby scores much lower than these in semantic transitivity. Among events of motion, contrast *ḫpi* (*Neferti* 3c), a mere 'going about' (not implying any endpoint nor even direction), with *Amenemhat* 10c *ini drw* 'reach the *limits*', an event in which the endpoint is lexically expressed (*drw*); also, with a variation on the prepositional phrase, with *Ipuwer* 1.6 *mi ḥr ḫpš*, where the endpoint is implied by the speaker-oriented motion.

---

220 On this passage, lastly Gnirs 2013b: 146.

As far as the record goes, one acts with salient effects ('kill', 'protect', 'reach the limits', 'come (to the speaker)') 'with one's strong arm'; one does not just 'walk about' (ḫpi).

B. An observation of the contexts in which the phrase *m ḫpš=f* is used is suggestive as well. The phrase has its origins in First Intermediate Period funerary self-presentations (i)-(ii), emphasizing how the speaker did or acquired things by his own, without relying on support from a higher authority.[221] It was subsequently extended to the king (iii)-(iv), also in eulogizing contexts. Literary uses in *Sinuhe* (v) are understood within this same Middle Kingdom context, when the phrase had been extended to the king (B 52, said of the king; B 105, said of Sinuhe, but in a context that echoes phraseology otherwise associated with the king); the inheritance from funerary self-presentations remains clear: B 52, literally *iri m ḫpš=f*; B 105, where *m ḫpš=i* is associated with *pḏt* (as in Siut V, 16: (ii)). Whatever its dating, *Amenemhat* 10c (vi) is in a context similar to the one in Sinuhe B 105, royal deeds. *Merikare* E 80 (vi), also said of a king (to be), itself implies royal contexts such as the above for the rhetoric *pointe* to function (above, A), as does the reference to *ḫpš* in *Merikare* E 32 (§5.5.1.1.NB). In Middle Egyptian literature, the phrase *m ḫpš=f/=k/=i* expresses the instrument of royal agency, in direct or indirect reference to the set phrase that had spread to the royal sphere after its initial development in non-royal funerary self-presentations.

In *Neferti* 3c, if to be emended, the association with Asiatics would stand isolated in the preserved body of Middle Egyptian literature; it must then be read as an element of the inverted world (along the lines of Asiatics being characterized by what otherwise belongs to the king). However, *Neferti* 3c is introductive, before the actual lament formally begins (3f-g *ḫws ib=i* (...); 4a *m wrd* (...)): the context implies no element of inversion (3c-e, quoted below; contrast with the antithetical formulations to follow: 3h-i; 4b-...). Why an expression otherwise used of the king should here be extended to the Asiatics would therefore remain unclear.

C. If, on the other hand, the text is not emended, both oddities vanish. The verse is from a passage (3a-e) at the transition from the framing narrative (1-2) to the lament to follow (3f-12). It provides a first broad description of the 'events in the land' (3a), phrased in concrete terms (compare 3d *šmw* 'harvest'; 3e *ḥtrw ḥr skȝ* 'ploughing cattle spans'). The 'wandering' (ḫpi) 'Asiatics' are characterized through one item culturally conceived of as distinctively associated with them, their weapons:[222]

---

221 Coulon 1997: 121 and n.61.

222 Perhaps to be compared with *Merikare* E 106-107 *pḏt pw šspt ʿȝgsw* 'It is Bow-People, who take up the war-belt(?)'. Whatever the exact meaning of *ʿȝgsw*, this seems to have no satisfying etymology within Egyptian and therefore stands a good chance to be a loanword, borrowed at some point in time not easily determined (§6.2.2.6.3, (ii)). In context, *ʿȝgsw* may have been selected as an apt characterization of the 'Bow-People'.

(viii) *Neferti* 3a-f

iw=f mḥ=f ḥr ḫprt m tꜣ
iw=f sḫꜣ=f ḳni n iꜣbtt
ḫp{w} ꜥꜣmw m ḫpš{wt}=sn
sh=sn ibw n ntyw ḥr šmw
nḥm=sn ḥtrw ḥr skꜣ
ḏd=f ḫws ib=i (...)

'He ponders the events in the land,
he evokes the state of the East:
Asiatics going around with their sickle-shaped swords (/*in their strength*[?!]),
disturbing the hearts of those on the harvest,
taking away ploughing cattle-spans.
He says: 'Stir, my heart, (...)'

Internally to *Neferti*, 3c Pet. *ḫpš* 'sickle-shaped sword' resonates with another passage, in the lament itself:

(ix) *Neferti* 8f-9a

tw r šsp ḫꜥw nw ꜥḥꜣ (...)
iw.tw r irt ꜥḥꜣw m biꜣ (...)

'Weapons of combat will be taken up (...).
And arms/arrows will be made of copper (...)'

> For the expression *ḫꜥw nw ꜥḥꜣ*, compare Thutmosis III's *Poetical Stela* 14 (*Urk.* IV 615, 8) *šsp=k ḫꜥw ꜥḥꜣ* 'You shall take up weapons of combat'; the expression recurs in Amenhotep II's *Syrian Campaigns* (Karnak Stela) 6 (*Urk.* IV 1311, 6).[223]

Similar long-distance echoes abound in *Neferti* providing one dimension of the composition's thorough-going architecture. To give but a few examples, 15a *tw r ḳd inbw ḥḳꜣ ꜥ.w.s.* (...) 'The Walls of the Ruler L.P.H. will be built (...)' echoes, and reverses, 7f *gꜣ.tw ḫnrt* (...) 'one will lack an enclosure (...)'.[224] Similarly, 15d (...) *r rḏt swr ꜥwt=sn* '(...) to make their (*scil.* the foreigner's) flock drink', echoes 8a *ꜥwt ḫꜣst r swr ḥr itrw nw kmt* 'The flock of foreign countries will drink on the river of Egypt (...)' (itself in echo to 6a-d, where the 'river of Egypt' is 'dry' (*šw*)). Extending to Neferti's initial address to his heart, 11g *nn ibḥw irty m mw* 'Eyes will not be moist with water' echoes 3f (...) *rmw=k tꜣ pn* (...) '(...) and beweep this land (...)'. If *Neferti* 3c is read as the text stands, an initial literary characterization of the Asiatics through a weapon culturally conceived of as distinctive of them is echoed in the main part of the composition by other, less culturally specific, designations of weapons, when the lament is raised to more general terms. If *Neferti* 3c is emended, this is lost.

---

223 *ꜥḥꜣ*, for its part, is documented from the Middle Kingdom on, both in the sense of 'weapon' and of 'arrow' (*TLA* #40050); on archeological correlates, Raue 2010: 81, n.20.
224 Parkinson 2002: 198.

5.5.2 *Neferti* 12f *bḥ* 'forced labor'

In earlier times, the second part of *Neferti* 12f used to be read as *b3kw bḥk3*, positing a *hapax legomenon bḥk3*, contextually translated as 'und die Diener sind *oben auf*',[225] or the like. As convincingly argued by Quack,[226] the correct reading is almost certainly *b3kw bḥ* 'Arbeiter vom Corveedienst', providing the subject to the common verb *ḳ3i* 'to be exalted' with its usual semogram (A28). The old reading as *bḥk3* may have been suggested by the lack of a semogram after *bḥ* in both Pet. and C25224, perhaps also by the unexpectedness of *bḥ* in a text then dated to the Middle Kingdom. The reading proposed by Quack, and adopted by most subsequent scholars,[227] is superior on two accounts. It does without positing an otherwise entirely undocumented word. Moreover, the meaning is stronger in the inverted world context of the passage, with a more specifically characterized subject *b3kw-bḥ* 'forced laborers', rather than just generic *b3kw* 'workers', being 'exultant' (*ḳ3i*):

> *Neferti* 12e-f
> *iw ḥwrw r irt ʿḥʿ wr{t} r [...] r ḫpr*
> *in šw3w wnm=sn t3 b3kw-bḥ ḳ3w*

> 'The wretches will make heaps, the great ones will [...] to exist;
> Only poor people will eat bread, forced laborers are high up.'

The word *bḥ*[228] is first documented in a mid-Eighteenth Dynasty administrative document (O. Berlin P 10615, 1; *Urk.* IV 1374, 9)[229] in which, incidentally, it occurs alongside *b3kw* 'work' (*Urk.* IV 1374, 10). A later Eighteenth Dynasty occurrence is from Amenhotep IV's *Gebel Silsilah Stela* 5 (*Urk.* IV 1962, 15).[230] Various further occurrences are from Ramesside times,[231] among which one that has a combination *rmt bḥ* 'men of forced labour',[232] similar to *Neferti*'s *b3kw bḥ*. The pattern of lexical attestation is consistent. If this can be trusted, as seems to be the case, and if Quack's reading is correct, as it almost certainly is, *Neferti* 12f would provide an other element in support of a very late dating.

---

225 Helck 1992²: 50 with n.d: '(...) kann nur aus dem Zusammenhang erraten werden.'
226 Quack 1993a: 78-9.
227 E.g. Parkinson 1997a: 138; Dils et al., *TLA*.
228 Noted as 'nur neuägyptisch' in *DZA* 22.905.220.
229 Noted in F*CD* 83.
230 F*CD* 83; *TLA* #550264;
231 *Nauri Decree* (*passim*: see *TLA* #550263); P. Mallet III.6; IV.3; *DZA* 22.905.300 (P. Turin 1887); *DZA* 22.905.230 (a New Kingdom model letter); *TLA* #56800 (Book of the Dead).
232 *DZA* 22.905.240 (P. Anastasi VI).

5.6   Further indications: The prologue

5.6.1   *Neferti* 1a-b *ḫpr.n swt wn*(*n*) (...)

The incipit of *Neferti* reads:

> *Neferti* 1a-b
>
> *ḫpr.n*[a] *swt wnn*[b] *ḥm n nsw bity snfrw mꜣꜥ-ḫrw m nsw mnḫ m tꜣ pn r-ḏr=f*
>
> 'It occurred, then, that the Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Snefru, justified, was an efficient king in this entire land.'
>
> a) Thus Pet.; OL (O. Liverpool 13624 M) *ḫpr* is secondary, adjusting to Ramesside usage, compare (vi)-(vii) below and K*RI* II 324, 10.
>
> b) Thus Pet.; Ramesside witnesses have *wn*. Both *wnn* (a *mrr=f*) and *wn* (a subjunctive) are grammatical: see below.

As far as grammar proper is concerned, the construction *ḫpr.n swt wnn* (...) is possible since early times. The discourse particle *swt* is documented since the Old Kingdom, including in its 'emploi progressif' to which the use in *Neferti* relates.[233] *Ḫpr.n* introducing finite clauses[234] is well documented in the Middle Kingdom and at least once before,[235] both with a subjunctive[236] and a *mrr=f*,[237] as well as with other constructions.[238] The argument is therefore not one indexed on ongoing linguistic change, but one on a specific usage of a construction and the associated textual convention that made such development possible.

A. The combination *ḫpr swt* itself is documented once in a pre-New Kingdom text, the Fifth Dynasty inscription of Kaiemtjenenet: *Urk*. I 184, 12 *ḫpr swt sḳdwt m wiꜣwy ꜥꜣwy* (...) 'Then occurred (*or*: Occurrence, then, of) the sailing in the two big boats (...)'; sim. 182, 14 (quoted below, (i)). (The English rendering is intended to suggest how the phrasing in Kaiemtjenenet probably emerged out of annalistic style; for similar relations in later times, below, B).

   A closer inspection reveals that the usage of *ḫpr swt* in Kaiemtjenenet and in *Neferti* differ. While the fragmentary state of preservation of Kaiemtjenenet's inscription does not permit a full-scale narrative analysis of the text, it can be observed that none of the two instances of *ḫpr swt* quoted above are from the (now lost) beginning of their respective narrative sequences. More significantly yet, the text preceding the first of the two instances quoted above is sufficiently preserved to show that an earlier event, also of impersonal motion, is introduced by *ḫpr*, without *swt*. The broader sequence thus reads:

---

233 Oréal 2011: 399-409.

234 Studies: Uljas 2006b; 2007a: 194-202.

235 Merer (Cracow MNK-XI-999; First Intermediate Period), 12. The construction in Kaiemtjenent (Fifth Dynasty) to be discussed below is with a verbal noun.

236 Dramatic Ramesseum Papyrus 117; Merer 12; *Debate* 9-10 (with *nn ḫpr*).

237 Dramatic Ramesseum Papyrus 53; 114.

238 With a *sḏm*(*w*)-passive: *passim* in Dramatic Ramesseum Papyrus (occasionally also with a *tw*-passive); with an asyndetically linked clause: *Shipwrecked Sailor* 130.

(i) *Urk*. I 182, 11-14 (Kaiemtjenenet)

ḫpr sḏȝt r mȝ=f ky sp (...)

ḫpr swt iwt r=f [...]

'There occurred (*or*: Occurrence of) the proceeding to see him another time (...)

Then occurred (*or*: Occurrence, then, of) the coming [...]'

As Oréal analyzes:[239] 'L'emploi de *swt* dans ce type de contexte marque en revanche (*scil.* differing from adversative uses of the same particule) *l'addition d'un nouvel épisode à celui qui précède immédiatement*. (...) *swt* porte sur un *enchaînement* d'événements *considérés dans leur succession*' (emphasis AS). In *Neferti*, by contrast, *ḫpr swt* is in absolute text-initial position. To be sure, this also relates more broadly to the '*swt* d'épisode', from which it is derived:[240] as already noted, no argument can be made on the level of grammar itself. Rather than grammar, what is at stake is when text-initial *ḫpr swt*—a distinctive element of a convention in expression, 'une marque textualisante, dont la fonction consiste à marquer l'appartenance à un genre'[241]— developed in actual usage.

B. Text-initial *ḫpr*—without *swt*—is perhaps documented once in the Middle King-dom,[242] then becomes more common in the early New Kingdom.[243] In all these cases, *ḫpr* is morphologically an infinitive used in 'labeling' or 'heading' function, as befits the monumental context. The use of *ḫpr*, emphasizing occurrence and/or epi-sodicity,[244] is generically bound, with occurrences typically to do with a throne 'session' (*ḥmst*) or an 'appearing' (*ḫˁt*) of the king. This usage is hardly remarkable, given the Egyptian lexicon (*ḫpr* is the ordinary expression of 'occurring'[245]) and the prior development of the 'labeling infinitive' construction (to which Kaiemtjenenet's inscription, itself modeled on annalistic style, also relates, if in different ways). Yet, in being itself a convention, such usage, beginning in the Middle Kingdom, constitutes a step toward the text-initial *ḫpr swt* that is here of interest.

Text-initial *ḫpr swt* is documented in royal and other monumentally published inscriptions in the Eighteenth and early Nineteenth Dynasty:

(ii) Ahmose's *Abydos Stela for Tetisheri* 1 (*Urk*. IV 26, 12)

ḫpr swt snḏm ḥm=f m ḏȝdw (...)

'Occurrence, then, of the relaxing of His Majesty in the audience-hall (...)'

---

239 Oréal 2011: 400.

240 See the overall analysis in Oréal 2011: 399-401.

241 Oréal 2011: 400.

242 Piccato 1997: 139; Baines 1996: 162. Text published by Habachi 1985b.

243 E.g. *Urk*. IV 156, 13; 256, 17; 349, 10; also *Berlin Leather Roll* 1.1-2 (for the dating, §4.2).

244 Vernus 1995a: 154, n.652; Loprieno 1996a: 284-5.

245 On the semantics of the root *ḫpr* more broadly, Buchberger 1993.

(iii) *Urk*. IV 180, 15-17 (an inscription of Thutmosis III telling of his rise to kingship)

ḥsbt 1 tpi šmw sw 4
ḫpr swt ḫꜥt sꜣ nsw [...]
'Year 1, first month of Winter, day 4:
Occurrence, then, of the rising of the royal son [...]'

> Beginning of the narrative proper, after a brief first person introduction spoken by Thutmosis.

(iv) *Appointment of the Vizier* 1 (*Urk*. IV 1380, 12)

ḫpr swt ḥmst nsw m ḏꜣdw (...)
'Occurrence, then, of a royal session in the audience-hall (...)'

> Later in Ramses II's *Inscription Dédicatoire* 25 (K*RI* II 324.10);[246] then also in the *Chronicles of Prince Osorkon*, harkening back to earlier textual models in this and in other respects.[247]

In the Second Intermediate Period, no such usage is documented, even though similar contexts are occasionally given (v) (contrast with (iii)):

(v) Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela* 1-2

ḥsbt 2 ḫr ḥm n ḥr grg-tꜣwy (...)
ḫꜥt ḥm=f ḥr st ḥr m ꜥḥ (...)
'Year 2 under the Majesty of Horus Geregtawi (...):
 Rising of His Majesty on the throne of Horus in the palace (...)'

C. Occurrences of text-initial *ḫpr swt* in literary texts have long been noted.[248] Their possible significance, however, has not been fully appreciated due to the early datings often made of several of the compositions here relevant. Leaving *Neferti* aside, all instances are from the Eighteenth and early Nineteenth Dynasty, contemporaneous with similar usage in royal and other inscriptionally published compositions:

(vi) *Neferkare and Sisene* T. IFAO 1214 ro 1 + T. OIC 13539, 1-2[249]

ḫpr swt wn ḥm n nsw bity [*nfr*]-*kꜣ*-[*rꜥ*] *sꜣ-rꜥ* [*pipi*] *mꜣꜥ-ḫrw m nsw* [*mnḫ m tꜣ pn r-ḏr=f*]
'It occurred, then, that the Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Neferkare, the son of Re Pepi, justified, was an efficient king in this whole land.'

> The close parallel with *Neferti* has long been noted.[250]

---

246 Now Spalinger 2009: 17-8.
247 Caminos 1958: 33; noted by Oréal 2011: 400, n.12.
248 E.g. Spalinger 2010: 117-21; 2009: 12-5 and n.51 (with bibliography); Parkinson 1996: 303; Morenz 1996: 111-2; Posener 1957: 123, n.2.
249 For the reconstruction, Posener 1957: 123; for the dating of *Neferkare* to the Eighteenth Dynasty, §4.4.
250 First by Posener 1957: 123, n.2.

(vii) *Heavenly Cow* 1-2 (S + R.II + R.III)[251]

ḫpr [s]w[t w]bn rˁ nṯr ḫpr ds=f (...)

'It occurred, then, that Re, the god who has created himself, rose (...)'

(viii) *Apophis and Seqenenre* 1.1 (*LES* 85, 4)

ḫpr swt wn.in tꜣ n kmt m iꜣdt (...)

'It occurred, then, that the land of Egypt was in a sad state (...)'

> NB. Preserved works of Middle Kingdom narrative literature have incipits of various types,[252] none with *ḫpr swt*: *dd.in* (...)[253] 'Then said (...)' (*Shipwrecked Sailor* 1; similarly in the inscription of Khnumhotep III[254]); *s pw wn* (...) 'There was a man (...)' (*Eloquent Peasant* R 1.1; *Neferpesedjet* 1);[255] complex palimpsestic framing strategies: *Sinuhe*. However, no surviving Middle Kingdom narrative composition has a king-oriented beginning, the expression of which could then be compared with *ḫpr swt* in *Neferti*, *Neferkare*, and *Heavenly Cow*. The appreciation of the possible significance of *ḫpr swt* in *Neferti* can therefore not be made against what would in effect be an *e silentio* argument: it can only be made in relation to the overall history of the expression, as discussed above.

D. Summing up, the use of *swt* in text-initial *ḫpr*(*.n*) *swt* relates to broader functions of the particle documented since early times, of which it is an extension. While no argument on grammar can be made (in itself, such extension would have been possible at all times), one can on the contexts in which such extension—a convention in expression, partly a signal of a certain textual type—actually occurred, as these are otherwise documented in the record.

Text-initial *ḫpr*, without *swt*, is documented once in the Middle Kingdom: this is hardly remarkable in itself, but provides a first step in the historical genealogy of the expression considered. The next step, text-initial *ḫpr swt*, is documented from the early Eighteenth to the early Nineteenth Dynasty in royal inscriptions and in other monumentally published compositions; the period of attestation is the same for literary compositions other than *Neferti*. The pattern of attestation is fairly concentrated in time and consistent across various types of written discourses. With due caution, this could suggest that *Neferti* as well may relate to the same horizon as early attestations of the construction, in the early Eighteenth Dynasty.

5.6.2 *Neferti* 1c *wˁ m nn n hrw ḫpr* (...)

Directly following the incipit just discussed, the next sequence, introducing the courtiers, begins with a fronted temporal expression:

---

251 For the dating of *Heavenly Cow* to the Eighteenth Dynasty, §4.6.
252 Parkinson 2012a: 23; 1996: 303.
253 A *sḏm.in=f* or an infinitive with agential *in*. The former interpretation is more likely in view of the episodic quality of the narrative to follow.
254 Allen 2008.
255 In Ramesside times, also in the inscriptions of Samut son of Kyky and possibly in *Menna's Letter* (Parkinson 2009: 208-9; Morenz 1998; Vernus 1978: 115-9).

Neferti 1c-e

wˁ m nn n hrw ḫpr

ˁḳ pw ir.n ḳnbt nt ẖnw r pr-ˁꜣ ˁ.w.s. r nḏ-ḥrt

prt pw ir.n=sn nḏ<.n>[a]*=sn ḥrt mi nt-ˁw=sn nt rˁ nb*

'One of these days,

the Council of the Residence entered the Palace L.P.H. to pay their respects;

They went out having paid their respects according to their daily custom.'

a)   Thus Pet., followed by OL, DeM 1182, and 1185; DeM 1183 reads *nḏ.n=sn*. The latter
      reading is generally given preference.[256]

A. Fronted temporal expressions are typical of narrative literature in general, provided a language permits these on grammatical grounds. In early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty narrative literary texts such as *Sinuhe*, they are found as e.g. *ḫpr.n tr n msyt* 'When supper-time had come' in *Sinuhe*.[257] Different types of fronted temporal expressions were associated with different literary registers (§2.4.4.4). The synthetic expressions in *Sinuhe* (*sḏm.n=f*'s in setting function) thus contrast with the morphologically more overt ones favored in *Tale of P. Lythgoe* or *Cheops' Court*, e.g. *Tale of P. Lythgoe* ro x+7-8 *ḫr m-ḫt m[š]rw ḫpr ˁḥˁ.n rḏ.n=f* [...] 'Now, after the evening had set, he gave [...]'. To some extent, the contrast is also diachronic: *Cheops' Court* is later than *Sinuhe* and fronted temporal expressions of the more analytic type become more common over time to the point of developing into a characteristic articulating device in Ramesside narrative literature.[258] The expression in *Neferti* 1c is itself of the more analytic type.

B. The expression in *Neferti* 1c is otherwise documented in the following texts:[259]

(i) Sobekhotep VIII's *Inundation Stela* (late Thirteenth Dynasty), face A, 2

wˁ m nn n hrw ḫpr

wn.in ḥm=f ḥr wḏꜣ r pr n imn (...)

'One of these days,

His Majesty proceeded to the temple of Amun (...)'

(ii) *Cheops' Court* 9.21-22

wˁ m nn hrw ḫpr

wn.in rd-ḏdt ḥr šnt=s

'One of these days,

Ruddjedet was suffering.'

---

256 Gardiner 1914: 102, n.1 (cautiously); subsequently Posener 1956: 148; Helck 1992²: 10.

257 For expressions of 'dawning' specifically, Spalinger 2006: 51-85, with references to previous
    studies.

258 For a detailed analysis of this development, Hintze 1950: 10ff.

259 Occurrences (ii)-(v) were already noted by Hintze 1950: 13, n.13; (i) was by Parkinson 2009: 168;
    2002: 140-1.

(iii) Thutmosis IV's *Sphinx Stela* 8 (*Urk*. IV 1542, 10-12)

wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr

iwt pw ir.n sꜣ nsw ḏhwti-ms ḥr swtwt ḥr tr n mtrt

sndm pw ir.n=f n[sic] *šwt nt ntr pn ꜥꜣ*

'One of these days,

the royal son Thutmosis went out strolling at the time of noon;

He relaxed in the shadow of this great god.'

> *Also in two early Ramesside inscriptional compositions:*
>
> (iv) Ramses II's *Inscription dédicatoire* 30 (K*RI* II 325, 5-6)[260]
>
> *wꜥ m nn hrw ḫprw m ḥsbt 1 ꜣbd 3 ꜣḫt 23* (...)
>
> 'One of these days in year 1, third month of Inundation, day 23 (...)'
>
> (v) *Kuban Stela* 8 (K*RI* II 355, 1)
>
> *wꜥ m nn hrw ḫpr ist ḥm=f ḥms ḥr bḥdw n ḏꜥm* (...)
>
> 'One of these days, His Majesty was sitting on the throne of electrum (...)'

In all cases, the expression *wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr* is in episode-initial position, as in *Neferti*. In Sobekhotep VIII's *Inundation Stela*, it immediately follows the initial date (l.1), heading the narrative. In *Cheops' Court*, it introduces the final sequence with Ruddjedet.[261] In Thutmosis IV's *Sphinx Stela*, it opens the main narrative, after the date, titles, and epithets (*Urk*. IV 1540), and after the background provided by the fourfold sequence of *ist*-headed sequences (*Urk*. IV 1541, 1; 1541, 8; 1541, 16; 1542, 5).

C. The sequence of tenses in *Neferti* compares most directly with the one in Thutmosis IV's *Sphinx Stela*, with *wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr* in both cases followed by two *ꜥk pw ir.n=f* constructions. In the two other pre-Ramesside occurrences, by contrast, the construction that follows is *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm*: in Sobekhotep VIII's *Inundation Stela* particularly, the use of a *wn.in=f ḥr sḏm* construction rather than a *ꜥk pw ir.n=f* one is noteworthy, as *wḏꜣ* is an event that could have been expressed by the latter construction:

Neferti:	*wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr*	*ꜥk pw ir.n=sn* (...)
		prt pw ir.n=sn (...)
T. IV's *Sphinx Stela*:	*wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr*	*iwt pw ir.n sꜣ nsw* (...)
		sndm pw ir.n=f (...)
S. VIII's *Inundation Stela*:	*wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr*	*wn.in ḥm=f ḥr wḏꜣ* (...)
(*Cheops' Court*:	*wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr*	*wn.in rd-ḏdt ḥr šnt=s*)

D. In interpreting the above for dating, two observations can be made. In securely dated texts, the expression in *Neferti* 1c, *wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr*, is otherwise documented from the late Thirteenth to the early Nineteenth Dynasty (above, B). Perhaps earlier is

---

260 See Spalinger 2009: 13 and n.53.

261 Further Parkinson 2002: 186-7.

only the occurrence in *Cheops' Court* (type-B terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty: §2.4.4.1.B). When the sequence of tenses is included into consideration, the closest parallel to *Neferti* is in a mid-Eighteenth Dynasty composition, Thutmosis IV' *Sphinx Stela* (above, C). This is suggestive of a broadly later, rather than earlier, dating of *Neferti*.

Taking things from a different angle, *Neferti* 1c has a fronted temporal expression of a more analytic type. This is generally indexical of a register different from e.g. *Sinuhe*; in the prologue of *Neferti*, it provides one among several elements of an intended stylistic contrast with the lament to follow. In Middle Egyptian literature, *wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr* recurs only in *Cheops' Court*, which has further elements in common with the prologue of *Neferti* (§5.1.3.2.B; §5.8.1.1). Like the narrative construction discussed before (1a-b *ḫpr.n swt* (...): §5.6.1), the one in 1c allies the narrative prologue of *Neferti* with what has been termed a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature. As far as the documentation and current understanding go, this tradition begun developing only by the late Twelfth Dynasty. An early Twelfth Dynasty dating of *Neferti* is therefore too early.

5.7   Dating *Neferti*

Linguistic evidence for dating *Neferti* falls in two parts, grammatical constructions to which full-fledged linguistic criteria apply (§5.2-4) and expressions that provide additional indications for dating (§5.5-6).

5.7.1   Temporal range for dating

The linguistic repertoire of *Neferti* accommodates three constructions on which fully developed linguistic arguments for dating can be based:

Tw r sḏm:	6b; 7g; 7h (twice); 8f; 9a (as *iw.tw r sḏm*); 10h; 15a (§5.2);
Tw sḏm:	10e; 12b (§5.3);
Tw with non-dynamic events:	7f; 9c (twice) (also 5d; 12d?) (§5.4; §6.2).

For all three of these constructions, their first documentation in the record is later than the early Twelfth Dynasty to which *Neferti* is often dated. What is more, for all three, other constructions are demonstrably used in similar functions in early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary texts:

	Early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary texts
(X.)tw r sḏm	(subjunctive or prospective) *sḏm.tw=f* (§5.2.5);
(X.)tw (ḥr) sḏm	(basic/'aorist') *sḏm.tw=f* (§5.3.5);
Sḏr.tw	*sḏr=ø* (subjectless active construction) (§6.2.3.3; §6.2.3.5).

That *tw r sḏm*, *tw sḏm*, and *tw* with non-dynamic events are not documented in the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty can therefore not be dismissed as an accidental gap in the preserved record.

The expressions discussed are all integral to the original text of *Neferti*. *Tw r sḏm* and *tw* with non-dynamic events occur in significant numbers in the composition. If these expressions were the results of textual alteration in *Neferti*, such must have been of a fully systematic nature, not otherwise paralleled. Complementarily, possible source constructions from which *tw r sḏm* and *tw* with non-dynamic events could have arisen if textually secondary were considered: all the possible source constructions can be ruled out in *Neferti*, further demonstrating that the relevant expressions are integral to the original text of this composition (§5.2.2; §6.2.1).

In addition, *tw r sḏm* has a major articulating function in *Neferti*, alternating with *sḏm.tw=f*'s (§5.2.3.3). The distribution of the two constructions, and of their respective active pendants, is principled in such ways that it can not have arisen in textual transmission nor through réécriture. As regards *tw sḏm*, this alternates with *tw r sḏm* in a complex large-scale articulation that extends over much of the second part of the lament (§5.3.1.3). This articulation expresses an oscillating temporality in the lament, also announced in explicit words at the opening of that lament when Neferti begins speaking. Moreover, the articulation functions on multiple levels simultaneously and is thorough-going in terms of the distribution of all verbal and non-verbal forms and constructions found in the second part of the lament. This can only have been composed, directly demonstrating that both *tw sḏm*'s and *tw r sḏm*'s in *Neferti* must be integral to the original text.

5.7.1.1 Temporal resolution of individual criteria

The above suffices to disprove a dating of *Neferti* to the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty. In going further, the criteria based on the above expressions must be discussed individually as to their temporal resolution.

A. In terms of bare attestation, *tw* with non-dynamic events (e.g. *sḏr.tw*, 9c) is not documented in any manuscript before the early Eighteenth Dynasty (§6.2.2.4). This does not imply, however, that the construction was innovated as late as the time of its first attestation. The construction is found in a series of Middle Egyptian literary texts, all of which have a sound linguistic terminus *ante quem non* by the late Twelfth or early Thirteenth Dynasty, or even later, on independent grounds: some of these may have been composed in the late Middle Kingdom already. On the other hand, the expression was not innovated before the late Twelfth Dynasty: early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary texts (*Sinuhe*, *Ptahhotep*, *Debate of a Man and His Soul*) consistently have another construction to perform the same function, *sḏr=ø* (§6.2.3.3; §6.2.3.5). The extension of *tw* to non-dynamic events is part of a broader change of which it is the second stage (§6.2.2.4): the first stage of the overall change, consisting in the extension of *tw* to events lacking an agent in their semantic representation, can be dated precisely, to the mid-Twelfth Dynasty (§6.2.2.3). As stage II must have occurred not much later than stage I, it follows that *tw* with non-dynamic events must

have been innovated no later than by the late Twelfth Dynasty, even if not documented then in any securely dated text.

Once innovated, *tw* with non-dynamic events probably spread to higher written registers rapidly. Unlike for example *tw r sḏm* and *tw sḏm*, the change under consideration involves an extension in the functions of an already existing formal category. (As a morphological category, e.g. *sḏr.tw* (9c)—i.e. a form with *tw* in the post-thematic inflectional slot—is not any innovative in itself: compare e.g. *pr.n.tw* in Moᶜalla). That the relevant innovation in function should have been invested indexically, possibly delaying its spread to linguistic registers of literature, is therefore unlikely. The analysis is confirmed by occurrences of innovative constructions relating to stage I of the same change in a mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary text (*Eloquent Peasant*): just as the innovation in stage I, the one in stage II was probably acceptable in literature almost immediately. In sum, *tw* with non-dynamic events must have been possible in a literary text such as *Neferti* as early as the late Twelfth Dynasty.

B. In the form in which it is found in *Neferti*, *tw r sḏm* is literary construction, not inherently but the facto (§5.2.3.4). For anchoring the rise of the construction in time, the result is the same: the higher-order construction *(X.)tw r sḏm*, of which *tw r sḏm* is a variant, must then be considered. This is first found in documentary texts of the late Twelfth and early Thirteenth Dynasty (§5.2.4). In early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary texts (*Sinuhe*, *Ptahhotep*), another construction, subjunctive or prospective *sḏm.tw=f*, is consistently used as the functional counterpart to active *NP r sḏm* (§5.2.5.D).

How fast *(X.)tw r sḏm* spread from the documentary registers in which it is first attested to more formal ones such as in literature can not be assessed on direct descriptive grounds. In literary texts other than *Neferti*, the construction is first encountered as a secondary reading in Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts, but this can be no more than a terminus *post quem non* for the spread. On the other hand, the contrast between *(X.)tw r sḏm* and subjunctive/prospective *sḏm.tw=f* is morphologically salient (as a contrast between an analytic and a synthetic category). This suggests that the former, when initially innovated, could have been marked for register for some while. It suggests, in other words, that the spread of *(X.)tw r sḏm* to higher written registers may have taken time and that the construction was probably not acceptable in literature in such early times as the late Twelfth Dynasty.

To err on the side of maximal caution, it is here nonetheless assumed that the spread could have been immediate. The terminus *ante quem non* imposed by the presence of *tw r sḏm* in *Neferti* is thus set to the late Twelfth Dynasty. This is probably too early, as register is then entirely left out of account. Methodologically, the loss in possible temporal resolution is made up by the gain consisting in making the criterion fully reliable.

C. Like *tw r sḏm*, *tw sḏm* is also a de facto literary expression (§5.3.3.B-C). It must therefore be appreciated in relation to the higher-order construction *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* of which it is a variant. The latter is first attested in a literary text dating to the later Second Intermediate Period. Further attestations are in the early New Kingdom, by this time still mostly in registers that are also otherwise innovative in the expressions they accommodate (§5.3.4.2).

In the mid-Twelfth Dynasty, *Eloquent Peasant* has another construction as the passive counterpart to active *NP ḥr sḏm*, basic/'aorist' *sḏm.tw=f*. Two literary texts that were not composed before the early Thirteenth Dynasty, *Ipuwer* and *Khakheper-reseneb*, similarly have *sḏm.tw=f* as the functional counterpart to active *NP ḥr sḏm*—consistently so and including in contexts that imply a progressive reading (§5.3.5.1). The contexts are similar to the ones in *Neferti*, also from laments, also in the *Sonst-Jetzt* articulation: while *Ipuwer* and *Khakheperreseneb* have *sḏm.tw=f*, *Neferti* has *(X.)tw (ḥr) sḏm*.

(X.)tw (ḥr) sḏm was therefore not innovated before the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty. More precisely, the construction was innovated at some point after the early Thirteenth Dynasty and before the later Second Intermediate Period. When exactly it was innovated can not be established because of the low density of the Second Intermediate Period record.

5.7.1.2 Dating *Neferti* based on full linguistic arguments

The above considerations provide the basis for defining a temporal range for dating *Neferti*. As initially noted, the present author was unable to identify any element in the linguistic typology of *Neferti* that could lend itself to defining a linguistic terminus *post quem non* earlier than the first manuscript attestation of the composition, in the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty (§5.1.4). On the other hand, various expressions, all demonstrably integral to the original composition, imply various termini *ante quem non*. As just discussed, the temporal resolution of these varies:

(a) *Tw* with non-dynamic events (securely 3x, possibly 5x, in *Neferti*):

terminus *ante quem non* by the late Twelfth Dynasty;

(b) *Tw r sḏm* (7x in *Neferti*; also once *iw.tw r sḏm*):

terminus *ante quem non* set to the late Twelfth Dynasty;

> This is a conservative assessment, disregarding issues to do with the spread of the relevant innovation across different written registers. When these are taken into account, the effective terminus *ante quem non* is probably somewhat later;

(c) *Tw sḏm* (2x in *Neferti*):

type-B terminus *ante quem non* by the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty;

> This is the earliest moment in time for which it can not be excluded that the construction could have become possible. The construction may in fact have been innovated only later, at some moment in time between the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty and late Second Intermediate Period.

> NB. Technically, criterion (a) has not yet been established (below, §6.2). Inasmuch as the dating of *Amenemhat*, where the construction recurs, is still an open issue at this stage, the following comments can also be read without (a) being part of the argument: when the dating of *Neferti* is dated based on (b) and (c) alone, the result is the same.

If only one of the above is not entirely wrong, *Neferti* can not date to a period in time before the late Twelfth Dynasty.

For *Neferti* to date as early as the late Twelfth Dynasty, three conditions must be simultaneously fulfilled:

(i) The discussion of the criterion based on *tw sḏm* and of its temporal resolution (§5.3; §5.7.1.1.C) must be outright wrong;

(ii) *Tw r sḏm* must have spread to literary registers almost immediately after it first emerged in documentary ones (compare the discussion in §5.7.1.1.B);

(iii) For both *tw* used with non-dynamic events and *tw r sḏm*, *Neferti* must have been composed right at the time when these were being first innovated.

If only one of the above conditions is not fulfilled, a dating of *Neferti* to the late Twelfth Dynasty is too early still.

If the discussion of *tw sḏm* is correct, this construction implies a terminus *ante quem non* by the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty. More precisely, the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty is the earliest moment in time that can not be excluded based on the evidence available: the low density of the Second Intermediate Period record prevents assessing when more precisely between the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty and late Second Intermediate Period the construction was actually innovated. Practically, setting a terminus *ante quem non* for *(X.)tw (ḥr) sḏm* by the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty requires making hypotheses (α), (β), and (γ). Dating *Neferti* to a time as early as the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty then requires making the same hypotheses and (δ):

(α) *Ipuwer* was composed at the earliest moment in time linguistically possible, the early Thirteenth Dynasty;

(β) *Khakheperreseneb* was composed at the earliest moment in time linguistically possible, the early Thirteenth Dynasty;

(γ) *(X.)tw (ḥr) sḏm* was innovated shortly after *Khakheperreseneb* and *Ipuwer* were composed;

(δ) *Neferti* was composed right at the time when (X.)*tw (ḥr) sḏm* was innovated.

That (α), (β), (γ), and (δ)—all individually hypothetical—should simultaneously apply is unlikely. Accordingly, the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty is probably still too early.

5.7.2   Further indications for dating

Further expressions in *Neferti* are strongly indicative for dating. These come with uncertainties that can not be fully reduced and are therefore to be appreciated at a different level than the grammatical constructions just summarized.

A. *Ḫpš* 'sickle-shaped sword' in *Neferti* 3c Pet. is a late word, as is established by a discussion of the spread of its real-world referent (§5.5.1.1). That the text in Pet. is original as it stands is strongly suggested by a set of converging observations relative

to what would be the alternative reading of 3c, under emendation, with ḫpš 'strong arm' (§5.5.1.2). Events with which the phrase *m ḫpš=f* 'with his strong arm' is otherwise associated are different in nature from ḫpi 'walk around' in *Neferti* 3c. The contexts in which the phrase *m ḫpš=f* is otherwise found in non-literary and literary texts alike have implications or overtones different from the ones in *Neferti* 3c. In *Neferti* 3c, ḫpš 'sickle-shaped sword' reads as a culturally specific designation for a weapon and in context serves to characterize the Asiatics. It is echoed by other, not culturally specific, designations of weapons in the lament when this raises to more general levels. If the text is emended to ḫpš 'strong arm', the semantics of *ḫpi m ḫpš=sn* are odd, the expression differs in its overtones from uses in all contexts otherwise documented, and the long-distance echo internal to *Neferti* is lost. Were it not for the immediate implications for dating, the text as it stands would probably have been accepted without discussion.

Another lexical expression probably providing an indication for a late dating is *bḥ* 'forced labor' (12f: §5.5.2). The word is documented only in the New Kingdom and its pattern of attestation seems generally reliable in view of the nature of its extra-linguistic referent.

B. Among set formulae in the prologue, *wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr* (*Neferti* 1c: §5.6.2) is indexical of register, both in itself and in its type, as a non-synthetic fronted temporal expression. The expression is thereby a tokebn of the studied simplicity of the prologue, and one by which this evokes elements of what has been described as a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian literature. The formula is not attested in any securely dated text before the late Thirteenth Dynasty. It recurs in *Cheops' Court* (type-B terminus *ante quem non* to the early Thirteenth Dynasty; composed probably later than this terminus) and has its most direct parallel in a mid-Eighteenth Dynasty inscription. Taking into account issues of register, this distribution suggests a broadly later, rather than earlier, dating of *Neferti*.

The other set formula, *ḫpr swt* (...) in text-initial position (*Neferti* 1a-b), is documented from the early Eighteenth to the early Nineteenth Dynasty (§5.6.1). The pattern of attestation is concentrated in time and comprises royal compositions, other monumentally published texts, and literary ones. Moreover, the gradual rise of the formula can be traced in the record, emerging in association with certain types of written discourses as these themselves developed. The expression is therefore strongly indicative of a very late dating of *Neferti*.

C. The expressions summarized in the present section are all suggestive of a very late dating, yet all come with some irreducible element of uncertainty. While such uncertainties must be duly noted, not all options are equally likely. When appreciated in terms of a differential likelihood rather than of direct proof, these expressions make *Neferti* tilt strongly toward a very late dating. Most weighty in this respect is text-initial *ḫpr swt*, probably *bḥ* as well; *wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr* is for its part suggestive of a more broadly later dating. *Ḫpš* stands for its own: the presence of this word in *Neferti* is either individually decisive for a very late dating (if integral to the original text, as it probably is) or irrelevant (if secondary, which can not be fully excluded). These

individually probabilistic indications add up into a cumulative indication, still probabilistic yet substantial and dense, for a very late dating.

5.7.3 Some implications

It was argued in the present chapter that the linguistic typology of *Neferti* implies a temporal range for dating that extends from the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty at the very earliest to the early Eighteenth Dynasty. Within the temporal range thus defined, further linguistic indications are strongly suggestive of a very late dating, to the early Eighteenth Dynasty. Even if one considers the former arguments only, the range for dating here proposed is not inconsequential for interpreting the text, since it implies that *Neferti* was not composed as a piece of advocacy for the early Twelfth Dynasty. On a more general level, the dating proposed implies that the Middle Egyptian literary tradition to which *Neferti* relates extended over a fairly long period in time.

When *Neferti* is detached from the early Twelfth Dynasty, the composition reads no less coherently, with many relevant observations already made in previous studies. *Neferti*, a concise and dense composition, draws on multiple subtexts and references. The overall dynamics leading from chaos to restoration echo restoration inscriptions (§5.8.3.3) and the final formulations draw on inscriptional texts affirming kingship more broadly (§5.8.2). Chaos is formulated in motifs and themes that compare with other exponents of the Middle Egyptian literary tradition (§5.1.3.3), with restoration inscriptions (§5.8.3.3), with formulations in royal eulogies here reversed (§5.8.3.4) and with hymns to the Nileflood (§5.8.3.2). The semantics of the composition are enriched by mythical allusions (§5.8.3.1) and probably by one to Menes, the founder of Egyptian monarchy (§5.1.2.1). The reference in 'Ameny' is multi-layered; whether it also included a specific historical referent remains unclear. In view of the later date of *Neferti*, the reference to the 'Walls of the Ruler' (§5.1.2.2) is probably best interpreted as an echo to *Sinuhe*, be the expression fictionalizing or not in that composition.

In the prologue, famous for its reflection of literature, 'choice' language is explicitly presented as a source of 'enjoyment' (§5.8.1.3). Announced at the beginning of Neferti's speech, the oscillating temporality of presentification and prophesy is spun throughout the second part of the lament in compositionally and linguistically complex ways (§5.3.1.3). Nothing comparable is found in any inscriptional composition, including such that form major subtexts of *Neferti*: this oscillating temporality, complexly composed, is proper to the literary work.

5.8 Appendix: The early New Kingdom horizon

The present appendix gathers notes on intertext (broadly understood: not as quotations or allusions, but as defined by a broader horizon in written culture, or, in another formulation, as a 'universe of texts' communicating with and echoing each other). These notes, non systematic in nature, were made in passing while reading a series of

late texts that turned out to be relevant for assessing the linguistic typology of *Neferti*. They are explicitly not presented here as an argument for dating *Neferti*: intertext (in the above broad sense) falls beyond the scope of the present study which for actual argument concentrates on language exclusively. Dating based on intertext (in a narrow or in a broader sense) is also a difficult matter in general, as intertext can be deep in time rather than specific to one horizon in particular, and always requires interpretation in ways that can not be pursued in the present context.[262] Rather than directly for dating, the following notes have another function. As argued in the present chapter on strict linguistic grounds, the temporal range for dating *Neferti* extends from some point in the Second Intermediate Period (mid-Thirteenth Dynasty at the earliest) to the early Eighteenth Dynasty: it thereby includes the Ahmoside/early Thutmoside period as one option. As also discussed, further linguistic indications suggest that this period is in fact the most likely one. The hypothesis of a dating of *Neferti* to the Ahmoside/early Thutmoside period, defined on linguistic grounds, must then be examined as to its broader plausibility, or lack thereof, against elements of the documented horizon of textual productions of this time.

A fair amount of the elements presented below is from inscriptionally published texts. On the other hand, *Neferti* resonates with various Middle Egyptian literary texts, some dating to the Twelfth Dynasty (e.g. *Eloquent Peasant*), some later but still earlier, or possibly earlier, than the early New Kingdom (*Cheops' Court*; *Ipuwer* and *Khakheperreseneb*, respectively) (§5.1.3.2-3). One could then be tempted to interpret the inscriptional texts as 'literarizing' and the earlier literary texts as the ones to which *Neferti*, itself a literary text, would primarily relate. This would be dangerous. Several among the formulations noted below are topical, but so are the ones in the literary tradition to which *Neferti* belongs: as noted, 'clusters of language and imagery' can extend deep in time, and often do (§5.1.3.3.B-D). In addition, the literary intertext (broadly understood) of *Neferti* is by no means limited to the Middle Kingdom: one very important component is hymns to the Nileflood, a tradition presently not documented before the late Seventeenth/early Eighteenth Dynasty and productive in the New Kingdom (§5.8.3.2). Finally, the literary and non-literary spheres, while differentiated notably in terms of decorum, are not autonomous from each other: Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian literature draws a substantial part of its semantic tensions from contemporaneous inscriptional subtexts it evokes and reconfigurates (paradigmatically, *Sinuhe*). That early New Kingdom Middle Egyptian literature would do similarly is then a fair hypothesis; as *Neferkare and Sisene* suggests (§4.4.5.B), this could have been the case more generally.

A final preliminary note concerns the issue of 'firsts'. Several among the elements noted below are first documented, or first documented in the here relevant form, in the early Eighteenth Dynasty. These need not all have been 'absolute firsts': textual productions of the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period have been lost, perhaps in higher numbers than early New Kingdom ones. In the present Appendix, which does not directly concern dating, the issue does not lie with possible 'absolute

---

262 For an introduction to various aspects of intertext as relevant to the study of Middle Egyptian literature, Hagen 2012a: 143-51; Parkinson 2002: 55-63; Moers 2001: 106-54, all with references to previous discussions.

firsts': the aim is only to provide some sense of a productive textual and cultural horizon, effectively documented in a period that constitutes one option, linguistically defined and linguistically distinguished, for dating *Neferti*.

5.8.1   The prologue

Two narrative expressions in the prologue were discussed above as indicative for dating: text-initial *ḫpr swt* (1a-b) and *wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr* (1c) (§5.6). While the latter only suggests a more broadly later rather than earlier dating, the former is not otherwise documented before the early Eighteenth Dynasty and arguably an innovation of that period. The prologue includes a series of further motifs and formulations that find good, or for some even best, parallels in an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon.

5.8.1.1   The 'Royal Tale'

As has often been noted, the prologue of *Neferti* (1-3) evokes, and subverts, the format of the 'Royal Tale'.[263] This developed gradually: an early exponent is the Eleventh Dynasty *Deir el-Ballas Inscription* and a forerunner in some aspects is on a block in the causeway of Sahure's pyramid complex.[264] The oldest securely dated text to make reference to the format of the 'Royal Tale' in a form more specifically comparable to the one evoked in *Neferti* is Neferhotep's Abydos Stela (mid-Thirteenth Dynasty);[265] another pre-New Kingdom instance is in the evocation of the 'Royal Tale' in *Cheops' Court*, a composition dating to some time between the early Thirteenth Dynasty and the late Second Intermediate Period (§2.4.4.1). From the Seventeenth Dynasty and early New Kingdom, a significant amount of texts is preserved that relate to the format of the 'Royal Tale' in ways comparable to *Neferti*.[266] Among these is probably also *Berlin Leather Roll*: as observed in the present study, there are serious indications that this text, while drawing on older materials, is in large parts, and therefore plausibly in the format in which these materials are couched, an early New Kingdom production (§4.2). The late Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom would thus provide a dense context for the 'Royal Tale' in the form in which this is evoked in *Neferti*. (It may be worth repeating that the present Appendix's perspective is about outlining possible contexts, and therefore not primarily about absolute 'firsts'.)

5.8.1.2   The search motif

In the prologue of *Neferti*, the existence of a 'commoner' (*nḏs*) not living in the Residence and to say things about the future is brought to the king's attention, with ample elaboration on that commoner's distinguished qualities (*Neferti* 2b-d). As has

---

263 E.g. Gnirs 2006: 243-8; Parkinson 2002: 195. The term 'Royal Tale' is here used for the sake of convenience only with the understanding that this is not a cohesive type of written discourse, let alone a 'genre'.

264 Text: el-Awadi 2009: 217-8 and pl.13; discussions: Spalinger 2011; Farout 2012.

265 See the analysis in Gnirs 2006: 244-5 and n.207 specifically.

266 Hofmann 2004: 105ff.

often been noted, this motif recurs in *Cheops' Court* (6.26-7.6: §5.1.3.2.B).[267] Equally noteworthy are the parallel formulations in *Neferti* and *Appointment of the Vizier*.[268] These are also about the introduction of a lower-status, yet distinguished, individual to the king. In both texts, a search (*dʿr*) is to be conducted for the king (*n=i*) with the aim of finding someone relating to the broader group of addresses (2pl pronoun as a partitive genitive), distinguished by its various qualities (expressed with ample textual elaboration). Compare:

(i) *Neferti* 1j-n

ḏd.in ḥm=f ʿ.w.s. n=sn

rḫw mtn rḏ.n=i i3š.tw n=tn r rḏt dʿr=tn n=i s3=tn m s3 sn=tn m iḳr ḥnms=tn wḏ sp nfr ḏdty=f nhy n mdwt nfrt ṯsw stpw ḏ3y ḥr n ḥm=i n sḏm st

rḏ.in=sn ḥr ḫwt=sn (...)

'His Majesty L.P.H. said to them:

"Comrades, look, I have had you summoned to have you seek out for me a son of yours who is wise, a brother of yours who is excellent, a friend of yours who may utter a perfect occasion, who will tell some perfect words and choice verses which My Majesty may be entertained to hear."

They then put themselves on their bellies (...)'

(ii) *Appointment of the Vizier* 12-16 (*Urk.* IV 1381, 10-15)

[ḏd].i[n]=f ḫft=sn

ḫw dʿr=tn n=i [...] n ḥmw=tn mḫ3-ib ḥr spw nw [...] m stkn wḏʿwt si3m=f ḫrw[=f]

wn.in=sn ḥr ḫwt=sn (...)

'His Majesty said before them:

"May you seek out for me [...] of your skillful ones, who is inclined to the occasions of [...] in bringing about a decision, making his voice pleasant."

They then were on their bellies (...)'

Neferti and *Appointment of the Vizier* share at least one other common motif, the courtiers' initial introduction to 'pay respects' (*nḏ-ḥrt*: *Neferti* 1d; *Appointment* 4). More noteworthy, because less common, is also that both texts similarly begin with text-initial *ḫpr swt* (*Neferti* 1a-b; *Appointment* 1: §5.6.1).

5.8.1.3   The textual thematization of pleasure associated with words

The prologue of *Neferti* famously thematizes the aesthetic pleasure to be experienced in literature: *Neferti* 1l-m (...) *ḏd.ty=f n=i nhy n mdwt nfrt ṯsw stpw ḏ3y ḥr n ḥm=i n sḏm st* '(...) who will tell me some perfect words and choice verses which My Majesty

---

267 Morenz 1996: 109-10.
268 Also Gnirs 2006: 246, who further emphasizes elements of the historical context; on further aspects of the relevant passage in the context of early Eighteenth Dynasty culture, Gnirs 2013b: 140-1.

will be entertained to hear' (sim. 2j-k). The expression used, *ḏȝi ḥr* (1m; 2k) and the related *sḏȝ ḥr*[269] are common in early Eighteenth Dynasty private tombs in captions to pictorial representations,[270] in various less formulaic contexts,[271] and in royal inscriptions with narrative parts, e.g. *Urk*. IV 676, 10 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*); Amenhotep II's *Sphinx Stela* 27 (*Urk*. IV 1283, 11); Thutmosis IV's *Sphinx Stela* 5 (*Urk*. IV 1541, 9); also on the crown prince Amenmes' vessel (*Urk*. IV 91, 14) and on a private statue (*Urk*. IV 1587, 16), both times in reference to royal activity.[272] In literature, *sḏȝ ḥr* is documented throughout Ramesside times.[273] A single earlier instance is in *Neferkare and Sisene* (§4.4.4.2; for the dating to the Eighteenth Dynasty, §4.4).

Prior to the early New Kingdom, a single instance of the expression *ḏȝi ḥr* is known, as a textual variant of *sḏȝ ḥr* in one Coffin Text passage (CT IV 73a);[274] *sḏȝ ḥr* itself is documented only twice, once in the same Coffin Text place and once in a caption in a Middle Kingdom stela.[275] Weighed against this extreme paucity of earlier attestation, the dense attestation of *ḏȝi* (*/sḏȝ*) *ḥr* in the early New Kingdom horizon is significant; while the expression existed before, what it refers to, 'pleasure, enter-tainment' was apparently less often thematized textually in earlier times, and, when it was, generally expressed differently, notably by *sḥmḫ ib*.[276] In several places in the early New Kingdom, not before in the record, *sḏȝ ḥr* is said of the 'pleasure' associated with words, as it is in *Neferti*.[277] In Nefersekheru's early Ramesside tomb,

---

269 On the more precise meaning of (*s*)*ḏȝ ḥr*, lastly Widmaier 2009: 128.

270 *Ḏȝi ḥr*: *Urk*. IV 976, 13 (Min); 956, 5 (Iamunedjeh); in much later times, *DZA* 31.539.740 and 31.539.780 (Iymiseba; *temp*. Ramses IX). *Sḏȝ ḥr*: *Urk*. IV 1161, 4 (Rekhmire; in the same formulation, Widmaier 2009: 128 (Antef, TT 155); *DZA* 29.880.880-930); *Urk*. IV 955, 16 (Iamunedjeh; in the same formulation, *Urk*. IV 1397, 4 (Qenamun) and *DZA* 29.880.980-881.000); *Urk*. IV 122, 16 (Paheri); *DZA* 29.881.040; *Urk*. IV 456, 2; *DZA* 29.881.140-150; 29.880.810 (*sḏȝ*).

271 *Ḏȝi ḥr*: O. Leipzig 42 ro 1-3 (magical; *DZA* 31.539.820); *DZA* 31.539.830 (a New Kingdom stela). *Sḏȝ ḥr*: O. Glasgow D 1925.69 ro 1 (Vernus 2011: 82 and n.215); P. Leiden I 350 ro III.19.

272 Further, *sḏȝ* alone: *Urk*. IV 1322, 8 (block from the Third Pylon; *temp*. Amenhotep II); *DZA* 29.880.820 (*temp*. Amenhotep III); *sḏȝ ḥr* also later, e.g. in *Kuban Stela* 30 (K*RI* II 358, 13).

273 *Satirical Letter*, P. Anastasi I, 8.7 (quoted below, n.279); *Doomed Prince* 8.7 (*sḏȝyt*: quoted above, §4.4.4.3, (iv)); P. Turin 1966 ro I.14; II.11; *Amenemope* 23.16 (reading *s{t}ḏȝ ḥr* with Dils et al., *TLA*); 27.8 (quoted below, n.279).

274 D1C *ḏȝ=i ḥr n* [*ir*] *nkn=k* 'I (*scil*. Horus) rejoice on account of the one who has done you harm.' B6C has *sḏȝ ḥr*: *sḏȝ*(=*i*) *ḥr n ir nkn n N pn*; so has the third witness of this passage, B2Bo, which is possibly garbled: *sḏȝy=sn ḥr n=i ir nkn=k*. Both D1C (with *ḏȝi ḥr*) and B6C (with *sḏȝ ḥr*) have the boat semogram (sign-list P1). This is probably a playful writing, with P1 used as a so-called 'phonetic determinative' (taken over from *ḏȝi* 'to ferry across' and accommodated onto the homophone word *ḏȝi* 'extend').

275 Louvre C18 (Hann*Lex* 5: 2402c; *DZA* 29.881.020). In *Tale of Hay* X+1.4, *sḏȝ*, noted as a possible early case of the shortened form of *sḏȝ ḥr* in *DZA* (29.880.730), is an instance of 'departing' (as an euphemism for death); similarly Dils et al., *TLA*.

276 On the meaning of *sḥmḫ-ib*, Widmaier 2009: 130, n.b to ex.28c; Toro Rueda 2004: 218-9, 239, 243, and 250; Cannuyer 2002. *Sḥmḫ-ib* is documented since the Old Kingdom (see *TLA* #142430), then in the Middle Kingdom (e.g. Tjetji (BM EA 614), 5; Sehetepibre (CG 20538), I.c.2), and continues to be used in the New Kingdom, notably in parallel to (*s*)*ḏȝ-ḥr* in the captions to pictorial representations mentioned above.

277 The present comments are of course not meant to suggest that literary experience was not associated with enjoyment well before the early New Kingdom: if need be, *Eloquent Peasant*

the *sḏꜣy ḥr* of future readers is famously thematized.[278] From the same period, a section in the *Satirical Letter* begins by characterizing itself as an occasion for *sḏꜣy ḥr*.[279] In the early Eighteenth Dynasty already, one funerary formula describes how 'sweet words' provide *sḏꜣ ḥr*: *Urk.* IV 122, 16-17 (Paheri) *mdwt nḏmt*[280] *nt sḏꜣy ḥr n sꜣ.n ḥꜣty m sḏm=s* 'These are sweet words providing pleasure: the heart can not be sated from hearing them.'[281]

In terms of repertoires, finally, it may perhaps be worth observing that some of the early New Kingdom texts that have *sḏꜣ ḥr* also have one or the other of the two narrative formulae discussed in the prologue of *Neferti*. *Neferkare and Sisene* (T. IFAO 1214 ro 2 *sḏꜣ* [...]; T. OIC 13539, 4-5 *sḏꜣ ib*) has the very same incipit as *Neferti* (T. IFAO 1214 ro 1 + T. OIC 13539, 1-2 *ḫpr swt wn ḥm n nsw bity* [*nfr*]-*kꜣ*-[*rꜥ*] *sꜣ-rꜥ* [*pipi*] *mꜣꜥ-ḫrw m nsw* [*mnḫ m tꜣ pn r-ḏr=f*]; compare *Neferti* 1a-b: §5.6.1). Thutmosis IV's *Sphinx Stela* (5 *sḏꜣ ḥr*) has the same narrative formula that in *Neferti* directly follows the incipit (8 *wꜥ m nn n hrw ḫpr*: compare *Neferti* 1c: §5.6.2).

5.8.1.4 Some further details

Further details in the prologue of *Neferti* are well, and for some of these even best, paralleled in an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon.

(i) *Neferti* 1f *ḫtmw nty r-gs=f*

The prominent mention of a 'sealer on his (*scil.* the king's) side' recurs in *Kamose Inscriptions* St.II 36-38, in Thutmosis I's *Abydos Stela* 5 (*Urk.* IV 97, 2), and in *Berlin Leather Roll* 2.7 (for the dating, §4.2). Such distinguished role of the 'sealer' also finds significant epigraphic and archeological parallels in the Second Intermediate Period, particularly in the late Seventeenth Dynasty.[282]

(ii) *Neferti* 1i, 1n, 2h: The courtiers lying on their bellies

As noted above (§5.1.3.2.A), the set phrase *wn.in=sn ḥr ḫt=sn* (and variants: *Neferti* 1i, 1n, 2h) is paralleled in *Kagemni* (2.5-6). The expression recurs in early Eighteenth Dynasty texts, such as *Appointment of the Vizier* 16 (*Urk.* IV 1381, 15), *Chapelle Rouge*, p.130: VII.1 (H*HBT* II 23, 12), later e.g. Ramses II's *Inscription Dédicatoire* 40 (K*RI* II 326, 10-11). Against this general background, a closer look at the exact formulation in *Neferti* is worthwhile: 1i *wn.in=sn ḥr ḫt=sn m-bꜣḥ-ꜥ ḥm=f ꜥ.w.s. m*

---

demonstrates that it was. In more elaborate ways, see the discussion in Parkinson 2002: 83-4 and Vernus 2011: 78-83, with which I side fully; for a discussion, both comparative and contrastive, of literary pleasure in *Neferti* and *Eloquent Peasant*, Parkinson 2002: 174-5. What is at stake here is only whether, and if so how, 'pleasure' was textually thematized, or not, at various times.

278 Osing 1992b, pl.4, east wall southern half, l.3; see Parkinson 2002: 84.

279 P. Anastasi I, 8.7 *i.ir=i n=k m sḥy mi sḏꜣy ḥr ḫpr.ti m sḥ{s}<m>ḫ-ib n ḥr-nb* 'I make a composition for you as an entertainment so that you (*or*: it) will be made an amusement to everybody.' In later times also *Amenemope* 27.7-8 *ptr n=k tꜣy 30 n ḥwt se* (*m*) *sḏꜣy-ḥr se* (*m*) *sbꜣyt* 'Look at these thirty chapters: they are an occasion of pleasure, they are an occasion of instruction.' See Vernus 2011: 81-3.

280 With a *A ø* construction, a very early example of such: see Winand 2013: 87.

281 Sim. Senemiah 32 (*Urk.* IV 510, 14-15); also in TT 260 (of the Overseer of fields of Amun User, *temp.* Thutmosis III); see Vernus 2011: 39, n.62 and 80 with n.203.

282 Full discussion in Gnirs 2006: 247-8.

wḥm-ꜥ 'They then were on their bellies in the presence of His Majesty L.P.H. once again' (1n *rḏ.in=sn ḥr ẖwt=sn m-bꜣḥ-ꜥ ḥm=f ꜥ.w.s. m wḥm-ꜥ*; 2h *wn.in=f ḥr ẖt=f m-bꜣḥ-ꜥ ḥm=f ꜥ.w.s.*). M *wḥm-ꜥ* 'again' (*Neferti* 1i and 1n) is apparently only documented in the New Kingdom: in an early Eighteenth Dynasty narrative, Ahmes son of Abana 11 (*Urk*. IV 4, 2) *wn.in.tw ḥr rḏt n=i nbw n ḳnt m wḥm-ꜥ* 'I was given the gold of bravery again'; in an early Eighteenth Dynasty funerary text: *Urk*. IV 114, 1 (Paheri) (...) *ḫpr ꜥnḫ=k m wḥm-ꜥ* '(...) so that it happens that you live again';[283] and in Book of the Dead.[284] (This is of course no lexical indication for dating: used verbally, the expression *wḥm ꜥ* is already documented in the Middle Kingdom,[285] implying that the adverbial expression *m wḥm-ꜥ*, although not directly attested then, could have existed already.) As regards *m-bꜣḥ-ꜥ* 'in front of' in the same formulation (*Neferti* 1i, 1n, and 2h), the expression, which remains fairly rare in the overall pre-New Kingdom record,[286] is abundantly used in *Chapelle Rouge* (H*HBT* II 9, 4; 26, 1; 26, 17; 27, 1), as well as occasionally in Thutmosis III's times (*Urk*. IV 776, 14; 897, 9).[287] In one case, it occurs in a context directly similar to the ones in *Neferti*: *Chapelle Rouge*, p.99: I.14 (H*HBT* II 9, 4[288]) *m-ḫt nn rḏt=s s(i) ḥr ẖt=s m-bꜣḥ-ꜥ ḥm=f* 'After this, her putting herself on her belly in the presence of His Majesty.' In a Middle Kingdom literary composition, the shorter expression, *m-bꜣḥ*, is used in a comparable context: *Shipwrecked Sailor* 67-68 *iw=i ḥr ẖt=i m-bꜣḥ=f* 'while I was on my belly in front of him (*scil.* the Serpent, a high-status participant).'

(iii) *Neferti* 3f, 4a *ḫws ib=i* (...) *m wrd* (...) 'Stir, my heart, (...) Do not tire (...)'
As observed by Posener,[289] *Neferti* 3f tightly compares with *Urk*. IV 1154, 5 (Rekhmire) *ḫws ꜥwy=tn rḥw* 'Remuez vos bras, camarades!' Following Posener's penetrating comments, *ḫwsi*—a verb generally used for building activities—could have more basically meant 'mélanger dans un récipient' (an activity also visually expressed by the sign A34). This meaning, metaphorically extended to the heart (*Neferti*) or to the arms (Rekhmire), would have been available at all times; what the occurrences in Rekhmire and *Neferti* document is only the actual usage of what based on the extant record seems to have been a rare meaning. Neferti goes on addressing his heart a second time: 4a *m wrd* (...) 'Do not tire (...)'. Similar addresses are found in the Harpists' Songs: *Antef's Song* A, P. Harris 500 ro VI.11 + Paatonemhab 8-9 *m bꜣgꜣy ib=k*; *Antef's Song*n C (Paser, TT 106), 4 *m wrd* [*ib=k* …] (more fully preserved in version D (Inherkhau, TT 359), 8-9).

---

283 Sim. perhaps *DZA* 22.554.010 (My; partly broken); also in a funerary context, in early Ramesside times, *DZA* 22.553.990 (Paser) *n m(w)t bꜣ=f m wḥm-ꜥ* 'without his *ba* dying a second time'.

284 *DZA* 21.516.880; .890; 22.554.000; .020; .030.

285 Such uses are either in finite constructions or in labelling/heading infinitives. Still with full lexical meaning of the component parts, *Sinuhe* B 61-62 *titi=f n wḥm.n=f ꜥ* 'when he tramples, he does not repeat his blow'; lexicalizing into a compound: Kheti (Gardiner 1917: pl.IX; late D.11?), 5 *wḥm.n(=i) ꜥ m kt ḥtt* (...) 'I made a trial a second time with another gallery (...)'; sim. P. Reisner II (Simpson 1965: 32; pl.12, 18); Wadi el-Hudi 4 (*temp.* Mentuhotep IV), 3; Wadi el-Hudi 14 (*temp.* Senwosret I), 17. References drawn from Hann*Lex* 5: 718c.

286 E.g. Pyr. §1189b; CT IV 300a; Nesimontu A16; Cairo 20542 a7.

287 In the latter text alongside *m-bꜣḥ* (*Urk*. IV 897, 7): a neat case of linguistic dissimilation.

288 The Deir el-Bahari parallel has the shorter expression, *m-bꜣḥ* (H*HBT* II 9, 4).

289 Posener 1956: 149-50.

5.8.2 The final affirmative section

The final affirmative section of *Neferti* (13-15) is phrased in topical terms that recur in various periods, in the Middle Kingdom, in the early New Kingdom, and in other times: the section would thus fit into diverse temporal horizons. How it would fit into an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon specifically is here selectively illustrated by two Hatshepsutian compositions that 'announce' (*sr*) kingship, *Chapelle Rouge*—already evoked above in relation to one very minor detail tightly paralleled in *Neferti* (§5.8.1.4, (ii))—and *Speos Artemidos*.

5.8.2.1 'Announcing' (*sr*) kingship: Hatshepsut's *Chapelle Rouge*

Several Hatshepsutian compositions 'announce' (*sr*) Hatshepsut's kingship. While the word *sr* is common since Pyramid Texts and across Egyptian textual history,[290] its frequent occurrences in Hatshepsutian texts could[291] relate to this queen's particular 'Sendungsbewusstsein',[292] also manifest in her recurrent concern with later reception.[293] In the most immediate of the many readings it supports, *Neferti* is about 'announcing' (*sr*; 5f) a 'king to come' (13a; more broadly 13-15); Hatshepsut's *Chapelle Rouge* is also about 'announcing' 'kingship': *Ch.R.*, p.133: VIII.1 (H*HBT* II 25, 9-10) '[... giving a] very important [oracle] in presence of this perfect god, announcing for me the kingship of the Dual Land (*ḥr sr n=i nsyt tȝwy*)'.[294] In another place, *sr* is associated with 'what will happen' (*ḫpr.t=sy*), an expression that famously recurs in *Neferti* (2m; 2n): Hatshepsut's Southern Obelisk, Basis 3 (*Urk.* IV 370, 1-2) (...) *ḏd=sn n=s ḫpr.t=sy n sr.t*[.. *n*[?]]=*s* '(...) to whom they say what will happen, to whom(?) they did not announce [...]'. Both *Neferti* and *Chapelle Rouge* include statements of effective occurrence in their closing sections.[295]

In *Neferti* 13 and *Chapelle Rouge* alike, the announced king's assuming kingship is expressed as a sequence of 'lifting' (*wts*) a crown, 'uniting' (*smȝ/ȝbḫ*) the powers embodied by crowns, and 'appeasing' (*sḥtp*) these. Compare: *Ch.R.*, p.116: IV.16-17 (H*HBT* II 17, 14-15) *wts=s ḫkrw rꜥ šmꜥ=s mḥw=s ȝbḫ m tp=s sḥtp=s m wpt=s* 'She will *lift* the ornaments of Re, the Southern and Northern Crown being *united* on her head; She will *appease* what is on her forefront'; *Neferti* 13c-d (...) *iw=f r wts dšrt*

---

290 On the root *sr* in general, Cannuyer 2010; on *sr* with a perspective on Middle Egyptian literary texts specifically, Enmarch 2007; Moers 2002: 299-300.

291 Various occurrences in royal texts are mentioned below. In a private inscription, in a context that is not phraseologically bound, Senemiah 11-12 (*Urk.* IV 500, 11-14) *wnw m sḏm mk st ḫpr srwt ḏddt r=s n ḫpr mitt ḏr rk nṯr ḏr gnwt nt imiw-ḫt wpw-ḥr sȝt imn n ḫt=f* [...] 'What had been heard, see it has happened. The prophesies that had been said about her, nothing alike had happened since the time of the god, since the annals of the ancestors, except Amun's bodily daughter [...].' On Senemiah in relation to Hatshepsutian royal compositions, §6.3.1.1.NB.

292 Assmann 2006.

293 E.g. Northern Karnak Obelisk, Basis 16-17 (*Urk.* IV 365, 6-10); *Speos Artemidos* 8 (*Urk.* IV 384, 12); *Urk.* IV 350, 8 (*Punt Expedition*): full quotations below, §6.2, n.b on *Amenemhat* 11c-d.

294 Also *Ch.R.*, p.133: VIII.4 (H*HBT* II 25, 15/16).

295 *Ch.R.*, p.150: XV.13 (H*HBT* II 33, 13) *rḫ.kwi ntt mrt.n=f ḫpr* 'I know that what he has wished has occurred'; compare *Neferti* 15g (...) *mȝȝ=f ḏdt.n=i ḫpr* '(...) when he sees that what I have said has occurred'.

iw=f r smȝ šḫmty iw=f r sḥtp nbwy 'He will *lift* the Red one; He will *unite* the Two Powers; He will *appease* the Two Lords.'[296]

In *Neferti* 14 and *Chapelle Rouge*, the announced kingship is related to, and justified by, 'disorder' and 'strife' to be suppressed: *Ch.R.*, p.107: II.11-12 (H*HBT* II 12, 11/12-13/14) '(...) you will establish laws and you will dispell disorder and end (*lit.* cut off the arm of) the condition of strife' ((...) *smn=t hpw dr=t ḫnnw bḫn=ṯ ʿ ḫrt hȝʿyt*; compare *Neferti* 14c and 14h). This happens through the 'awe' (/'wrath', 'terror', etc.) emanating from the king: *Ch.R.*, p.248: 'then the awe you inspire (*šfšft=t*) shall be in the Nebut and the fear you inspire (*snḏ=t*) in the Nine Bows'[297] (compare *Neferti* 14d-f *snḏw=f, šʿt=f, dndn=f, šfšft=f*). Royal awesomeness is materialized in the king's 'flame' (*Ch.R.*, p.106: III.1-4 (H*HBT* II 11, 3-7) *sḏt, hh, snws, wȝwȝt, ḫt*;[298] compare *Neferti* 14f *nswt*), directed against 'those who conceived of rebellion' (*kȝw sbi*): *Ch.R.*, p.107: III.7-9 (H*HBT* II 12, 1/2-3/4): '(...) so that the wrath you inspire seizes who acts in crime, so that the ones who conceived of rebellion belong to the power of your striking-force' ((...) *iṯ šʿt=ṯ ir m ḫbnt kȝw sbit n pḥw ȝt=t*; compare *Neferti* 14c). The outcome is 'pacification' (*shryt*: *Ch.R.*, p.144: XI.6 (H*HBT* II 32, 3); *Neferti* 14h).

5.8.2.2 Affirmation set against previous trouble: *Speos Artemidos*

Another Hatshepsutian composition 'announcing' (*sr*) kingship is *Speos Artemidos*.[299] This is all the more relevant to *Neferti* as it is also a restoration inscription (below, §5.8.3.3). Moreover, *Speos Artemidos* presents destruction in relation to 'Asiatics' (*ʿȝmw*), as epitomizing general forces of chaos and in an historically specific reference (37-38; *Urk.* IV 390, 7-10). 'Asiatics' are similarly prominent in *Neferti*, associated with the outer world of chaos threatening creation (3c-e; 7d-e; 15b: note the targeted distribution over the composition, in the prologue, in the lament, and in the final affirmative section).[300]

Beginning with a detail, the motif of the uraeus pacifying is phrased in almost identical terms in *Speos Artemidos* and *Neferti*.[301] Compare: *Speos Artermidos* 12 (*Urk.* IV 385, 12) *iw ʿrt tpt ḥȝt=i ḥr shryt n(=i) tȝw nb* [...] 'For the Uraeus on top of my front is for me pacifying all lands'; *Neferti* 14h *iw ʿrʿt imt ḫnt=f ḥr shryt*[302] *n=f hȝkw-ib* 'For the Uraeus on his forehead will be pacifying for him the discontent.' While the motif itself is common at all times, only one fairly close parallel to the

---

296 Further *Ch.R.*, p.136: IX.4 (H*HBT* II 26, 10) *wṯs=i ḥḏt ẖnm=i nt* 'I will lift the White Crown, I will unite with the Red Crown'; with different events, p.148, XIV.5-6 (H*HBT* II 31, 9-10).

297 Further e.g. *Ch.R.*, p.115: IV.8-9 (H*HBT* II 16, 13-14) *d=i šfšft=s ḥr tȝw nbw ḥryt=s ḫt hȝswt nbt* 'I place the awe she inspires on all lands, the terror she inspires through all foreign countries'; p.107: III.8 (H*HBT* II 12, 1/2) (*šʿt=t*); p.142: X.7 (H*HBT* II 30, 11) (*ḥryt=i*).

298 Further *Ch.R.*, p.142: X.7-8 (H*HBT* II 30, 13) (*nbiw*).

299 Gnirs 2006: 237.

300 In addition, it has been argued that in *Neferti* as well, the 'Asiatics' could be in allusion to actual historical events (Gnirs 2006: 248-51 and further, 224-8).

301 Noted by Vernus 1990a: 1-2.

302 Thus Pet., like *Speos Artemidos* (and further *Ch.R.*, p.144: XI.6 (H*HBT* II 32, 3)); C25224 has the shorter spelling, *shrt*.

formulation in *Speos Artemidos* and *Neferti* has been noted,[303] *Ipuwer* 7.3-4 *mtn is wꜣ r sbiw ḥr iꜥrꜥt nḫt nt rꜥ shr tꜣwy* 'For look, it has come down to rebellion against the powerful uraeus of Re which pacifies the Dual Land.' Unlike in *Ipuwer*, the uraeus in *Speos Artemidos* and *Neferti* is the king's, pacifying 'for' the king. On the level of a specific grammatical detail, the pacification by the uraeus is in *Speos Artemidos* and *Neferti* similarly introduced by *iw*, here with both assertive and connective force, relating the statement to the preceding declarations of forceful pacification through terror emanating from the king.[304]

Most importantly, *Speos Artemidos* and *Neferti* have the same argumentative articulation. In both texts, the affirmation of kingship is related to restoration after chaos.[305] In *Neferti*, the 'announced' advent of a new king is set against a previous situation in which the Sungod had come to be lacking. Without the elaboration that makes for the specific poetry of the literary text, the very same articulation, and thereby argument, is read in the inscriptional composition:

> 'This land is destroyed (5a *ḥd tꜣ pn*) (...) The sun disk is veiled and will not shine (5c *itn ḥbs nn psd=f*) (...)
>
> Re will separate himself from men (11d *iw rꜥ iwd=f sw <r> rmt*)
>
>> —This (*scil.* the whole lament spoken by Neferti)[306] all means that a king is to come (13a *nsw pw r iyt*) (...)'.

> '(...) they ruled without Re (*m-ḥmt rꜥ*) and he did not act by divine decree
>
>> —until My Majesty (*nfryt-r ḥmt=i*): I am now established on the thrones of Ra: I have been announced (*sr.n.tw=i*) from the ends of years as a born-conqueror; I am now come (*i.kwi*) as the unique Horus (...) This is the regulation of the father of the fathers, now come at his dates, Re (*iw r sww=f rꜥ*).
>>
>> Destruction will not occur (*n ḫpr ḥdt*) (...) the sun disk shines (*psd itn*) (...)' (*Speos Artemidos* 38-42; *Urk.* IV 390, 9 - 391, 3).

5.8.3   The lament

5.8.3.1   Mythical elements alluded to in the lament

The lament associates chaos with the withdrawal of the Sungod (11d) who has to re-create (4c); salvation will come from the south (13a-b), probably in an allusion to the myth of the return of the distant goddess. The absence of the Sungod is also a central

---

303 Vernus 1990a: 2, n.2.

304 *Speos Artemidos* 11-12 (*Urk.* IV 385, 10-12) (...) *kmt dšrt ḥr ḥryt=i bꜣw=i ḥr sks ḫꜣswt iw ꜥrt* (...) '(...) the Black and the Red Land are under the effect of the terror I inspire, my power making the foreign countries bow down. For the uraeus (...)'; *Neferti* 14g-h (...) *iw sbiw nw dndn=f ḫꜣkw-ib nw šfšft=f iw ꜥrt* (...) '(...) The rebels belong to the anger he inspires, the discontent to the awe he inspires. For the ureaus (...)'.

305 Similarly Gnirs 2006: 253.

306 On the *pw*-marked thetic construction introducing the final resolution as an interpretive gloss to the preceding lament, §5.1.4.2, (iv); Parkinson 2002: 198.

motif in *Speos Artemidos*, set in relation to the Hyksos (38; *Urk.* IV 390, 9-10: §5.8.2.2). The withdrawal of the Sungod from its creation and the myth of the return of the distant goddess find their first extensive textual expression in *Heavenly Cow*,[307] an Eighteenth Dynasty composition (§4.6).[308]

(These need not all have been 'absolute firsts': for example, the rebellion of mankind—a theme not found in *Neferti* but associated with the withdrawal of the creator-god in *Heavenly Cow*—is present in texts that could be earlier than the early New Kingdom.[309] Moreover, ideas or representations may have existed before their first documented, or even first actual, textualization.[310] It may be worth repeating, then, that the present Appendix's perspective is about outlining documented contexts, and therefore not about possible 'absolute firsts': for the mythical elements alluded to in *Neferti*, the mostly densely documented context is the Eighteenth Dynasty.)

5.8.3.2 Hymns to the Nileflood

In a seminal note, Fischer-Elfert observed that hymns to the Nileflood provide an important element of intertext for Middle Egyptian literary laments, with the latter reversing the positive imagery of the former down to details.[311] Developing this observation, Parkinson noted the 'association between the cycle of the year and political events' in a later New Kingdom text also mentioning the Nileflood,[312] and proposed that 'a core social context is perhaps the transition from king to king—the interregnum which threatens individual death, social disruption and cosmic chaos (...)'.[313] *Neferti* is also a lament, and one leading to the advent of a new king.

---

307 E.g. Gnirs 2006: 252-3.

308 Incidentally, note that *Heavenly Cow* and *Neferti* both have the *ḫpr swt* type of incipit (§5.6.1, (vii) for the former composition).

309 The theme finds a literary treatment in *Merikare*: this text has traditionally been dated to the Middle Kingdom but an early Eighteenth Dynasty date of composition has recently been argued for in extensive details (Gnirs 2006; also, for the final section, Bickel 1994: 178-9, 219); there are also linguistic indications for such late dating, although these remain too weak to be decisive (§2.8). The rebellion of mankind recurs in BD 175a, a text not documented before the New Kingdom, but for which it has been speculated that it could be drawing on earlier material: this hypothesis is based on the observation that BD 175b draws on earlier material and that BD 175a may then have as well (Stadler 2009: 370-80). Securely earlier than the early New Kingdom is only a possible allusion, in reference to Horus, in CT V 150c-151a (...) *n ḥr nb m prt=f r pt špt r rmṯ* '(...) for Horus, the lord, in his going out to the sky, angry against men' (Parkinson 2002: 131). Whether Horus' anger against men and withdrawal can be read as implying the rebellion of mankind is uncertain, however.

310 For example *Shipwrecked Sailor* includes allusions to esoteric knowledge otherwise first documented in text in *Litany of the Sun* and Book of the Dead (Parkinson 2002: 139, with references to previous studies). (On *Litany of the Sun* as dating to the early New Kingdom, at least in its present wording, Werning 2011: §4 and above, §2, n.395).

311 Fischer-Elfert 1986: 45, n.1: '(...) Ich bin der Meinung, daß der GrN (*scil. Hymn to Hapi*) wie der hier behandelte Text (*scil.* another hymn to the Nileflood, O. DeM 1675; see below, B) das exakte positive Gegenstück zu den Schilderungen in den Admonitions als der markantesten Repräsentation von Chaosbeschreibungen darstellen (...)'.

312 The text is Amunnakht's hymn for the coronation of Ramses IV (Bickel & Mathieu 1993: 41-3).

313 Parkinson 2002: 59.

A. *Neferti* laments the 'land' (*tȝ*) which goes through 'calamity' (*sny-mny*: 8e; 12a). 'Goodness' (*bw-nfr*) is 'destroyed' (7a) or 'gone' (7c; 10a) and 'the whole land is perished' (4d *tȝ ȝḳ r-ȝw*); 'lack' is all-pervasive (*gȝw*: 5e; 6g; 8b). *Hymn to Hapi*, by contrast, describes a world of plenty (*passim*, e.g. 2.3-4; 4.1-2; 4.9-10; 12.1-6) in which 'one does not lack (*gȝw*) it (in context: wood)' (5.2). 'Goodness (*bw-nfr*) is spread in the streets, the whole land (*tȝ r-ȝw*) twitching' (12.7-8). *Sny-mnt* itself is implicit in *Hymn* where the Nileflood is said to be the one 'who creates rapacity so that the whole land (*tȝ*) suffers (*mn*)' (3.2).[314]

At the level of individual motifs, Neferti laments that 'one will laugh (*sbt*) loud at disease' (9b), reversing the positive imagery associated with 'laughing' in *Hymn* 3.7-8.[315] The coming of the Nileflood is required for organs and society to function, for 'when it (*scil.* the Nileflood) delays, noses are blocked, everybody is orphaned' (2.5-6); in the literary lament, 'the river of Egypt is dry' (6a) and people are 'deaf' (8d; also, in a different context, 5e),[316] society is upturned (*passim*, e.g. 12e-f). The imagery associated with 'fish' (*rmw*), 'migratory birds/water fowl' (*ḳbḥw*), and 'birds coming down' (*ȝpd hȝi*) (*Hymn* 2.1-2) is taken to an entirely different sense in *Neferti* (6f-g and 7e; see below, B). Forces of the outer world, associated with chaos, are tamed in *Hymn*: '(...) so that one captures for you the lions in the desert (*hȝst*)' (13.5); in *Neferti*, they have intruded Egypt to its very core: 'the flock of desertic countries (*hȝst*) will drink water on the river of Egypt' (8a).

As argued above, *Hymn to Hapi* dates to the late Seventeenth or early Eighteenth Dynasty (§3.4). While motifs and imagery present in *Hymn* may have existed in earlier times, these are thereby documented as productive in the early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon here under consideration.

B. Another composition worth reading in conjunction with *Neferti* is the hymn to the Nileflood preserved on O. DeM 1675 ro+vso.[317] This Ramesside hymn draws on motifs in *Hymn*, yet develops these in further ways, thereby bearing witness to the productive nature of this tradition in the New Kingdom.[318]

In the hymn on O. DeM 1675, 'the whole land is grown green' (ro 9 *tȝ (r)-ȝwt=f ȝhȝh*), contrasting with *Neferti*, where 'the whole land is perished' (4d *tȝ ȝḳ r-ȝw*; also 10b). In the literary lament, ruin in such that the 'Re must begin to re-create' (4c *šȝꜥ rꜥ m grg*). In the hymn, by contrast, the land is in its primeval state of creation: 'the land is a Nun' (ro 4 *tȝ m nwn*).[319]

As in *Hymn to Hapi*, 'goodness' (*bw-nfr*) is found and a source of joy (ro 12): rejoicing is easy (in extensive variation, ro 7-11), laughing plain (ro 10-11). In *Neferti*, 'goodness' is 'destroyed' (7a) or 'gone' (7c; 10a), speech is difficult and painful (11b), laughing ill-directed (9b). In the hymn, plenty is described as an abundance of

---

314 Noted by van der Plas 1986: I, 85, n.269.
315 Parkinson 2002: 59, n.12, also noting *Ipuwer* 3.13 'Laughter has perished.'
316 The motif recurs in other literary compositions, see Parkinson 2002: 172-3. In *Neferti*, it may resonate both with these and with the tradition of hymns to the Nileflood.
317 Text, translation, and study: Fischer-Elfert 1986: 31-62.
318 Fischer-Elfert 1986: 60.
319 Fischer-Elfert 1986: 34, n.k: 'Ägypten (...) befindet sich in demselben Zustand wie zu Beginn der Schöpfung (...)'.

fish and birds, animals and vegetation, besung in extensive details (vso 6-11); food is plenty (e.g. ro 9-10) and people sated (ro 10). These are the 'things of goodness' (7a) that Neferti laments as things past: food, confiscated by Syrians (7d), is only to be asked by blood (9a); people are in need: 'the grain is little' (11c) and 'every mouth is filled with: I am in want' (10a).

When the Nileflood comes, sensory organs function properly: 'the ears snatch (again) what is called' (ro 15) (also *Hymn to Hapi* 2.5); in *Neferti*, people are 'deaf' (*id*) (8d; also 5e). The world of the hymn extends to social aspects: 'the poor (*šw3w*) are (like the) magnates, the great (*wrw*) are (like the) small, who has reached poverty is strong' (vso 13-14).[320] In the literary lament, 'the wretches will make heaps, the great ones (*wrw*) will [...] to exist; only poor people (*šw3w*) will eat bread, forced laborers are high up' (12e-f). In the hymn, 'the small respect (*tri*) the great (*wrw*)' (ro 16); in *Neferti*, 'respect' is lacking: 'look, what should be spoken against will be respected (*m stryt*)' (3h).

The motif of migratory birds is in the hymn a sign of the Nileflood (also *Hymn to Hapi* 2.1-2):[321] 'The migratory bird (*ẖbḥw*) is descended (*h3i*)[322] and finds the Southern Part as a lake; it settles on the tells of Upper Egypt, Chemmis having become their[sic] nest (*š3*)' (vso 6-8). In *Neferti*, this motif is taken to an altogether different meaning: 'Alien birds (*3pdw ḏrḏrit*) will breed in the lagoons of the Delta, having made its[sic] nest (*š3*) upon its neighbors (...)' (6f-g). The motif is probably spun further just a few verses below, with, in one possible interpretation, the 'alien birds' being specified as the 'Asiatics' (*ʿ3mw*) who 'have descended (*h3i*) to Egypt' (7e). In the hymn, 'the flock in the valley flees in fear' (vso 11-12 *ʿwt m int ifd=f sw m 3ʿʿ*): wildlife, associated with chaotic forces, is at its proper place, the fringes, just as it is tamed in *Hymn to Hapi* (13.5).[323] In the literary lament, the 'flock (*ʿwt*) of desertic countries (*h3st*)'[324] has intruded to the core of Egypt, its river (8a).

5.8.3.3   Restoration inscriptions

Neferti has restoration inscriptions as one of its subtexts. Better than with Middle Kingdom exponents sometimes evoked,[325] this may be preliminarily illustrated by a text slightly later than the first manuscript of *Neferti*, Tutankhamun's *Restoration Stela* (*Urk*. IV 2025-32). Distinctive formulations found in the *Stela* and *Neferti* (and

---

320 The translation follows the interpretation by Dils, *TLA*. Fischer-Elfert 1986: 54 and 56 interprets differently, as '(...) die totale Umkehr der sozialen Schichtung in den Jahren eines „trägen Nils" (s. rt. 2).'

321 Fischer-Elfert 1986: 52.

322 Spelled <*ḥnwy*>; see Fischer-Elfert 1986: 51, n.a.

323 Fischer-Elfert 1986: 57, who already draws the parallel with *Neferti* 8a.

324 For another interpretation of *ʿwt h3st* in 8a, Gnirs 2006: 250-1: the two interpretations are not mutually exclusive.

325 Parkinson 2002: 194 mentions *Tod Inscription* and Sarenput I's inscription in the Heqaib chapel in Elephantine. Both tell of ruin and restoration in ways characteristic of this type of written discourse, but so do other restoration inscriptions across the second millennium. The dating of *Tod Inscription* to Senwosret I, commonly hypothesized, is not secure (Buchberger 2006).

in other texts) concern the 'destruction' (*ḥdi*) of 'what had been made' (*iryt*).[326] Restoration itself is expressed in highly topical terms, with Isfet dispelled and Maat reestablished.[327] The outcome is 'jubilation' (*ršw*, and other expressions), of the gods in the *Stela*, of the people in *Neferti*.[328] In common to the two texts is further the motif of the gods 'neglecting', or 'separating themselves' from, the land.[329] So is the rare, and therefore significant, *sny-mnt* 'calamity', said of the 'land' (*tꜣ*).[330]

Also a restoration inscription, *Speos Artemidos* was discussed above as a text that associates destruction with 'Asiatics' (*ꜥꜣmw*) and 'announces' (*sr*) the advent of a king (here a queen), setting this against the background of the previous absence of the Sungod (§5.8.2.2). More specific than with any other exponent of this type of written discourse are motifs shared between *Neferti* and Ahmose's *Tempest Stela*.[331] Like *Neferti*, *Tempest Stela* combines elements typical of restoration inscriptions with the format of the 'Royal Tale'. Both texts include the motif of 'being cast to the ground' (*wnn* (...) *m ptḫ r tꜣ*: *Tempest Stela* ro 17-18/vso 20; *Neferti* 3i: §5.1.3.3.D). Destruction of 'what had been done' (*iryt*) is phrased in near-identical terms: 'What is done is what had not been done' (*Tempest Stela* ro 15-16/vso 18 *iryt tmmt ir*; *Neferti* 4c *iryt m tmmt ir* (sim. 10d)).[332] In both texts, water is not at its rightful place, if in opposite ways: 'Their corpses were floating on the water like clumps of papyrus (even) in the doorway and the inner apartments (of the palace) for a period of up to [...] days'[333] (*Tempest Stela* ro 9/vso 10-11); 'The river of Egypt is dry (...) its way having become a sandbank; The bank will be a flood, the place of water will be what was the place of the bank' (*Neferti* 6a-d). The sky is obscured, making it impossible to see: '(...) with darkness in the western part of the sky, clouded (*šnꜥ.ti*) without interruption (...) a torch could not illuminate the Dual Land' (*Tempest Stela* ro 7-10/vso 8-12); 'The sun disk is veiled and will not shine so that the people can see; One can not live when clouds cover (*šnꜥ*)' (*Neferti* 5c-d; the motif further in 11d-i: §5.8.3.4).

5.8.3.4 Royal eulogy and its literary reversal: Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy*

Neferti's final affirmative section (13-15) twice appeals to the people to 'rejoice' in response to the king's advent, thus: 'Rejoice,[334] the one who will have witnessed it,

---

326 *Restoration Stela* 10 (*Urk.* IV 2027, 20) (...) *ḥd=sn iryt* '(...) destroying what had been made' (*iryt* further in 17 (*Urk.* IV 2029, 8), as something to be 'surpassed' (*sni*) in restoration); *Neferti* 10c-d *ḥdd m iryt* (...) 'Destruction is in what had been done (...)' (see §5.3.1.2).

327 *Restoration Stela* 5 (*Urk.* IV 2026, 17-18) *dr.n=f isft ḫt tꜣwy mꜣꜥt mn.ti* [*m st=s*] 'He has dispelled Isfet through the Dual Land, Maat being established in its (rightful) place'; *Neferti* 15e *iw mꜣꜥt r iyt r st=s isft dr sy r rwty* 'Maat will return to its (rightful) place, Isfet being dispelled to the outside.'

328 *Restoration Stela* 23-25 (*Urk.* IV 2030, 13-19); *Neferti* 14a; 15f: further below, §5.8.3.4.

329 *Restoration Stela* 8 (*Urk.* IV 2027, 12) *nṯrw mkḫꜣ=sn tꜣ pn* 'the gods neglected this land'; *Neferti* 11d *iw rꜥ iwd=f sw <r> rmt* 'Re will separate himself from the people.'

330 *Restoration Stela* 7-8 (*Urk.* IV 2027, 11), quoted above §2.6.3.1, (iii); *Neferti* 8e; 12a. Discussed above, §5.1.3.3.B; previously noted by Blumenthal 1982: 5, n.38; Gnirs 2006: 250, n.242.

331 Also Gnirs 2006: 228ff, 243.

332 Similarly Parkinson 2002: 196; for the broader context in *Neferti*, §5.3.1.2, introduction.

333 Translation Wiener & Allen 1998: 3.

334 In the parallel 14a (preserved only in Pet.), *ršy* has the plural strokes, implying a reading as an imperative. In the present passage (preserved in both Pet. and C25224), no plural strokes are

the one who will be following (*šms*) the king!' (15f; sim. 14a). As already noted, such response is also called for in restoration inscriptions (Tutankhamun's *Restoration Stela* 23-24 (*Urk.* IV 2030, 13ff.); *Speos Artemidos* 35 (*Urk.* IV 390, 2)), a type of texts overtly evoked in *Neferti*. In the closing section of a eulogy, a similar appeal, including an appeal to loyalism, is voiced in Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* (*Urk.* IV 14-24), a composition that also evokes internal dissent and rebellion:[335] 'Listen, patricians, mankind, common folks, everybody! Follow (*šms*) the king in his strides (...)!' (21-22; *Urk.* IV 20, 9-10). This appeal, in similar structural positions in *Neferti* and *Karnak Eulogy*, gains some significance in view of what it is set against in either text. In one passage in particular, these directly resonate with one another:

(i) Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* 17-19 (*Urk.* IV 19, 6-12)

dgg.tw=f mi rˁ wbn=f mi psdw itn mi ḫˁ ḫpri m irty
stwt=f m ḥrw mi itm m iȝbt pt (...) *mi psd iȝḫw m-ḥr-ib hrw* (...)

'When he (*scil.* the king) is seen like Re as he rises, like the shining of the sun disk, like the appearing of Khepri in the eyes,
his rays are in the faces like Atum in the eastern part of the sky (...) like the shining of the Radiant One at midday (...)'

(ii) *Neferti* 11d-i

iw rˁ iwd=f sw <r> rmṯ
wbn=f wn wnwt nn rḫ.tw mtrt (...)
nn bȝk ḥr dgȝ.tw nn ibḥ irty m mw
wnn=f m pt mi iˁḥ (...)
wnn is stwt=f m ḥr m sp m[sic] *imiw-ḫȝt*

'Re will separate himself from people:
He will rise when it is time, yet one will not know noon; (...)
No face will be bright when he is seen, no eyes will be moist with water;
He will be in the sky, but only as the moon-god; (...)
For his rays on the face are an occasion of the ancestors.'

In *Neferti*, 11d-i (toward the end of the lament) echoes 5c-d (toward the beginning of the lament), which resonates with another Ahmosean composition, *Tempest Stela* (§5.8.3.3): the two sequences frame the lament. As to 11d-i itself, what in Ahmose's *Karnak Eulogy* is stated in affirmative terms is in *Neferti* reversed in every detail:

---

written and an alternative interpretation as a subjunctive is possible: 'May he rejoice, the one (...)'. In analogy to 14a, I interpret 15f as also an imperative.
335 L.25-26 (*Urk.* IV 21, 10-17).

- Shining/not shining:

mi rˁ wbn=f mi psdw itn mi ḫˁ ḫpri m irty

→ *wnn=f m pt mi iˁḥ*

- Seeing/not seeing:

dgg.tw=f (...) m irty

→ *nn b3ḳ ḥr dg3.tw nn ibḥ irty m mw*

- Shining at midday/noon not to be known:

mi psḏ i3ḫw m-ḥr-ib hrw

→ *wbn=f wn wnwt nn rḫ.tw mtrt (...)*

- 'Rays in the faces'/now a thing past:

stwt=f m ḥrw

→ *wnn is stwt=f m ḥr m sp m*ˢⁱᶜ *imiw-ḫ3t*

While the inscriptional composition is an eulogy of the king, the literary one tells of a situation when the king, yet to come, is absent.

5.8.4 Closing remark

For reasons stated in the introduction to this Appendix, the cultural and textual horizon outlined above is not here exploited as evidence for dating *Neferti*. A different question was asked, namely whether the early New Kingdom could provide a possible horizon for the composition of *Neferti*. The question naturally arises because this period is one option within the reliable range for dating argued for above on linguistic grounds (mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (at the very earliest) – early Eighteenth Dynasty: §5.2-4; §5.7.1). Moreover, it is the one option that a series of further linguistic indications suggest to be the most likely (§5.5-6; §5.7.2).

As outlined in this Appendix, the cultural themes, motifs, imagery, and formulations in *Neferti* are densely present in the early New Kingdom. Significant encounters are particularly in Ahmosean and Hatshepsutean compositions (*Karnak Eulogy*, *Tempest Stela*, *Chapelle Rouge*, *Speos Artemidos*), further in hymns to the Nileflood which, as far as current documentation go, are themselves a late development. Other relevant texts include for example *Appointment of the Vizier*, *Neferkare and Sisene*, or *Heavenly Cow*. In all its parts—the prologue (§5.8.1), the final affirmative section (§5.8.2), and the central lament (§5.8.3)—*Neferti* can be related to an early New Kingdom cultural and textual horizon, more densely than to any other horizon documented in the record. To the specific question asked in this Appendix, a definite positive answer can be given.

In the present chapter, I discuss the typology of a composition for which only a broad dating can be defined on strong linguistic grounds, the *Teaching of Amenemhat*. In doing so, I also introduce one criterion of wider application based on the use of the passive morpheme *tw* with non-dynamic events (§6.2). It is argued that this construction implies a terminus *ante quem non* by the late Twelfth Dynasty for compositions that include it. Linguistic indications for a narrower dating of *Amenemhat*, not fully secure in interpretation, are examined in turn (§6.3).

6.1   Evidence for an early dating?

6.1.1   Introduction

A. The *Teaching of Amenemhat*[1] is documented from the early Eighteenth Dynasty on. Attestation is immediately fairly dense, on various supports, and in more than one place in the country.[2] Early Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses include writing boards, T. Brooklyn I A+B and T. Brooklyn II ro+vso ('fr. 18. Dyn.'), and ostraca, O. Qurna 85/69 + O. Cairo JdE 95601a-c ('fr. 18. Dyn.') and O. Senmut 142-145 (Hatshepsut). The main early witness, P. Millingen, now lost, has been dated to the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty; also from the Eighteenth Dynasty is another writing board, T. Carnarvon 5 ro+vso. To this, three excerpts inscribed on the walls of the tomb Assiut N13.1 are now to be added, one with a very substantial part of the composition (graffito 1a: *Amenemhat* 1a-3d; graffito 1b: *Amenemhat* [1a?-]3b-10c; graffito 1c: *Amenemhat* 1a-2e).[3] Graffiti 1a and 1c have been dated paleographically to the early Eighteenth Dynasty[4] and are therefore among the earliest witnesses of *Amenemhat* currently known. The presence of the text in excerpts in different parts of the country implies some time of previous circulation,[5] but the time depth of this can not be assessed. *Hymn to Hapi* is also documented on an early Eighteenth Dynasty writing board and in a very early graffito in Assiut, yet the composition dates to the late Seventeenth/early Eighteenth

---

1   Text: Adrom 2006. For studies, Parkinson 2002: 317 and additional references in Gnirs 2013b.
2   Adrom 2006: IX-XVII (from which the datings given in the text are drawn); further discussion by Gnirs 2013b: 132-4.
3   Verhoeven 2013. Graffito 1c is published and discussed in Verhoeven 2012a.
4   Verhoeven 2013: §5.b; 2012a: 208-9.
5   Verhoeven 2013: §5, *fine*.

Dynasty on linguistic grounds: this demonstrates that previous circulation need not have been long.

Amenemhat has near-universally been dated to the early Twelfth Dynasty based on a reading of the composition in direct relation to the history of that period.[6] More recently, a dating to the early Eighteenth Dynasty has been proposed based on an analysis of multiple encounters in contents and form with early Eighteenth Dynasty textual productions.[7] The dating to the early Twelfth Dynasty, long unquestioned and thus distinguished in modern interpretation, deserves a preliminary note. Just as in the similar section on *Neferti* (§5.1), the aim is here not to argue against this dating, nor for that matter in favor of or against any other dating, but only to assess what general options are given before the issue is considered from a perspective on language.

B. The common dating of *Amenemhat* to a period close in time to the events it refers to is based on a reading of the composition as a piece of advocacy for Senwosret I. In P. Chester Beatty IV vso 6.14, the *Teaching* is said to have been composed by 'Kheti' 'when he was at rest', with the anaphoric pronoun commonly interpreted in reference to the old king (the reading is not unchallenged[8]). A linguistic argument has been proposed to define a terminus post quem non by the mid-Twelfth Dynasty.[9] A dating more broadly to the Middle Kingdom, as opposed to a later one, takes argument on the common Middle Egyptian literary tradition to which *Amenemhat* belongs, including various elements by which the composition resonates with *Sinuhe*. Possible quotations from *Amenemhat* into other texts have also been evoked as evidence for a broadly earlier, rather than later, dating (§6.1.2).

How the composition may have alluded to historical events can not be determined. Reference to historical events in literature is generally complex and oblique, rather than direct.[10] The text of *Amenemhat* itself includes a series of explicit fictionalizing elements.[11] What has been called the 'propaganda model' of Middle Egyptian literature is an hypothesis only (§5.1.2.3): *Neferti*, a text that has been interpreted

---

6   As with other Middle Egyptian literary works, Posener 1956: 61-86 is a milestone in the history of interpretation (for the subsequent discussion, see Gnirs 2013b: 129-30). Internally to this tradition of a very early dating, possible coregencies in the early Twelfth Dynasty have been discussed in a debate opposing proponents of a dating of *Amenemhat* to Senwosret I with Amenemhat speaking *post mortem* (e.g. Burkard 1999) and proponents of a dating to the late reign of Amenemhat I with the old king speaking after what is then hypothesized to have been a failed attempt on his life (e.g. Jansen-Winkeln 1991; 1997; Thériault 1993). Under the same assumption of a securely established dating of the composition to the early Twelfth Dynasty, *Amenemhat* has more broadly been exploited as a source, direct or indirect, for the history of that period (e.g. Obsomer 1995; Lorand 2011; see Giewekemeyer 2013).

7   Gnirs 2013b: 129-51. Some time before the debate on dating inflamed for good, Grimal 1995 also proposed a dating to the early Eighteenth Dynasty based on the manuscript tradition and a possible relevance of the subject matter of *Amenemhat* to the historical constellation Hatshepsut-Thutmosis III. That a dating of *Amenemhat* to the early Eighteenth Dynasty could be 'immerhin denkbar' and one to the early Twelfth Dynasty not as secure as was then generally assumed, was simultaneously observed by Blumenthal 1996: 131.

8   Quack 2003: 184.

9   Vernus 1990a: 185; subsequently Parkinson 2002: 316-7; Lorand 2011: 13, n.17.

10   Moers 2001: 38-79, particularly 38-54; also Parkinson 2002: 8-10, critically discussing various historicist interpretations of *Amenemhat*.

11   Emphasized by Parkinson 2002: 241-8.

within this frame alongside *Amenemhat*,[12] was argued above not to have been com-
posed before the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty and probably later still (5): if so, the main
other text on which the model was initially based and subsequently developed does
not support that model.

    The ascription of the work to 'Kheti' in P. Chester Beatty vso 6.14 and the
mention of the same literary figure in *Eulogy of Dead Writers* are relevant to the study
of the Ramesside reception of the work, not to its composition.[13] Shared patterns of
transmission and reception not uncommonly group works that were demonstrably
composed in different periods (§5.1.3.1.B). *Amenemhat* belongs to a common Middle
Egyptian literary tradition, but this need not have been compact in time (e.g. §1.3.2.3;
§3.4.5.C; §5.1.3.2-3). Resonances between *Amenemhat* and *Sinuhe* are significant but
interpreting these as implying a common horizon in composition is only one among
several options (§6.4.3). Possible quotations from *Amenemhat* into other texts and the
Middle Egyptian language of the composition merit individual discussion (§6.1.2-3).

6.1.2   A terminus *post quem non* by quotations or allusions?

In attempting to define a terminus *post quem non* earlier than the first manuscript
attestation of the composition, possible quotations of *Amenemhat* into other texts have
been evoked. As a general note, caution is required in identifying possible quotations
or allusions due to the densely intertextual nature of Middle Egyptian written cul-
ture.[14]

A. It has been suggested that *Amenemhat* 11a-d is alluded to in Bebi's funerary
inscription (Second Intermediate Period):[15]

    (i) *Amenemhat* 11a-d
    ink ir it mr npri
    tri.n wi ḥꜥpy ḥr pgꜣ nb
    n ḥḳr.tw m rnpwt=i n ib.tw im
    iw ḥms.tw m irt.n=i ḥr sḏdt im=i

    'I am a maker of barley, beloved of Nepri;
    The Nileflood honored me on every open space(?).

    There was no being hungry in my years, no being thirsty then;
    One could relax through what I had done, telling of me.'

---

12   Following Posener 1956, e.g. Burkard 1999: 164: 'Sie (*scil.* the *Teaching of Amenemhat*) kann
     meines Erachtens nur den Sinn haben, die Nachfolge durch Sesostris I. zu legitimieren, so wie
     Amenemhet I. selbst sich durch den "Neferti" legitimierte.'
13   Simon 2013: 262-5; Moers 2009; 2008; Quirke 2004a: 31-3; Gnirs 2013b: 130-2; §5.1.3.1.A in the
     present study. On compositions that have been asssociated with 'Kheti', also §3.4 (*Hymn*) and
     §6.2.2.6 (*Kheti*).
14   E.g. Hagen 2012a: 143-51 (in general) and 151-73 (applied to *Ptahhotep*); Parkinson 2009: 126;
     2002: 48-9; Moers 2001: 106-54; all with references to previous discussions.
15   Morenz 2006: 55-6; 1996: 178-9; 2012a: 141-2; initially Posener 1956: 77, n.6.

(ii) Bebi 3-4a (horizontally) + 4b (vertically) (tomb el-Kab 8[bis])

ink ir it mry nfr[sic]

rs-tp m prt ḳn ꜥ m šmꜣ[sic]

ꜣtw n ṯt ḥḳꜣ bbi wḥm-ꜥnḫ ḥmt=f mrt=f ḫkrt-nsw ḫkr-rs

iw ḥḳ(r) ḫprw m ꜥšꜣw n rnpwt

rḏ.n(=i) it n niwt(=i) m ḥḳ(r) nb (...)

'I am a maker of barley, beloved of Nepri,
vigilant in the winter, with a strong arm in the summer
—the officer of the ruler's guard Bebi repeating life, his beloved wife the
king's ornament Khekerres.

Hunger happened through a great many years;
I gave barley to my town in every famine (...)'

The famine motif (Bebi 4b; *Amenemhat* 11c-d) is among the most generic in Earlier
Egyptian texts, also developing into an idealbiographical topos.[16] The phrasing *ink ir
it mr npri* (Bebi 3; *Amenemhat* 11a) is generic as well: in particular, references to *npri*
are not uncommon in the times of Bebi's inscription, the Second Intermediate
Period.[17] Thus, in another funerary inscription (iii), and in a literary text, said of the
king, with the god's name to denote grain, as in *Amenemhat*:[18]

(iii) Horherkhutef 1

nfr[sic] *ir bdt*

'Nepri, who makes emmer'

(iv) *Eulogistic Account of a King* X+3.x+5

srd=f npri

'he makes Nepri flourish'

Rather than as an allusion, common elements in *Amenemhat* and Bebi are therefore
better interpreted as more broadly intertextual, reflecting a common repertoire of
motifs, shared 'clusters of language and imagery' (Parkinson): these had currency
over a protracted period of time.[19]

B. It has also been suggested that *Amenemhat* 14a-c is quoted in *Ipuwer* 6.12-14. If
so, the latter composition would provide a terminus *post quem non* for the former.
Under the often evoked dating of *Ipuwer* to the late Middle Kingdom (see, however,

---

16 E.g. Moreno García 1997: part II (with a focus on the original development of the motif in the late
Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period).

17 Similar motifs of course recur in other times as well, thus in an idealbiographical context in
Mentuhotep son of Hapy (probably early D.12, see Schenkel 1964), 7-9 *rḏ.n=i tꜣ n ḥḳr ḥbsw n ḥꜣy
ink sꜣ npri hi n tꜣyt (...) iw ḫpr.n ḥꜥp šr rnpt 25 n rḏ=i ḥḳr spꜣt=i (...)* 'I have given bread to the
hungry, clothes to the naked. I am a son of Nepri, a husband of Tayt (...) There occurred a small
Nileflood in year 25: I did not let my nome be hungry (...)'. Similarly noted by Vernus 2010²b:
458, n.4 ('phraséologie analogue').

18 Parkinson 1999: 184, n.43.

19 Similarly Gnirs 2013b: 148.

below: §6.2.2.5), *Amenemhat* must then have been composed in the Middle Kingdom (early or late), not later. Compare:

(v) *Amenemhat* 14a-c

iw ms msw/msywt[a] *ꜥšꜣwt m mrwt*

rḫ ḥr tiw wḫꜣ ḥr m-biꜣ

ḥr-ntt n rḫ=f st šw m ḥr=k

'But now, the children(?) of the masses are in the streets;

The wise going "yes", the fool going "no";

Because he does not know it, being deprived of your sight.'

a) The reading of this crucial word is unclear, with variation both in the spelling of the stem and in the semogram (see below).

(vi) *Ipuwer* 6.12-14

iw ms msw srw ḫꜣꜥ m mrwt

rḫ ḥr tiw wḫꜣ ḥr m-biꜣ

nty n rḫ=f s(i) ꜥn m ḥr=f

'But now, the children of officials are thrown into the streets;

The wise going "yes", the fool going "no";

He who does not know it, it is fair in his sight.'

The similarities are here of a specific nature and a quotation in one direction or another has long been evoked. A century ago, Gardiner observed that while *iw ms* recurs multiple times throughout a long section of *Ipuwer* which it contributes defining, it occurs only once in *Amenemhat*. Accordingly, Gardiner found it natural to view *Amenemhat* 14a-c as a quotation from *Ipuwer* 6.12-14.[20] Helck and Fecht, however, argued that the quotation was the other way around, from *Amenemhat* into *Ipuwer*.[21] This view subsequently won wide acceptance, probably also due to the realization that *Ipuwer* was not composed before the late Middle Kingdom, i.e. later than the dating then assumed for *Amenemhat* based on the events it refers to. While the hypothesis of a quotation of *Amenemhat* into *Ipuwer* went unchallenged for a long while,[22] rather different perspectives have now emerged from Oréal's and Enmarch's critical discussions.[23]

(a) The issue is made complex by the textual instability in the crucial *msw/msywt*[?]. Helck emends the text into *iw ms *msdt ꜥšꜣt m mrwt* 'But now, there is much hate in the streets.' Fecht, for his part, does not emend and reads with *msywt* as found in part of the manuscript tradition; the author then relates this to a word not otherwise directly attested, **msjwjt* 'complaint' (*iw ms msywt ꜥšꜣt m mrwt* 'But now, there is much complaint in the streets'). Both Helck's and Fecht's proposals account for the

---

20 Gardiner 1909: 3, n.1

21 Helck 1967: 466; Fecht 1972: 11-3, 153, 225.

22 In a fairly recent textbook (Burkard & Thissen 2012[4]: 139; first edition 2003), the hypothesis could still be presented as: 'das ist communis opinio.'

23 Oréal 2011: 276-7; Enmarch 2008: 23. Note that contrary to what the publication dates might suggest the two authors did not have knowledge of each other's works.

A2 semogram found in most witnesses (including, probably, in P. Millingen), which would have to be secondary under the alternative reading as *msw* 'children'. On the other hand, there is no evidence internal to the text supporting Helck's emendation. As to Fecht's position, this is not supported by P. Millingen, the sole Eighteenth Dynasty witness here preserved: unlike several Ramesside witnesses that have *msywt*, P. Millingen has *msw* (whatever *msw* may be). Both interpretations that posit a quotation from *Amenemhat* into *Ipuwer* thus come with a rather speculative reading of the supposed donor, by emending and/or by positing what would be a *hapax legomenon*.[24] That *Amenemhat* should be the donor can then only be based on an argument external to the issue under consideration: 'A somewhat more secure ground for asserting that *Ipuwer* quotes *Amenemhat* is the probability, based on subject matter, that *Amenemhat* was composed under Senwosret I (...)'.[25]

(b) The text is problematic in all extant witnesses. None clearly has *msw* 'children': some have a stem *msw*, but with the unfitting A2 semogram, while other ones that have a semogram of 'giving birth' (possibly secondary) have a stem *msyt*. The lack of any coherent spelling of *msw* 'children' could then suggest that the text was not altered into, but from, *msw* 'children';[26] this is admittedly slightly speculative, yet significantly closer to the textual evidence as it stands.[27] In itself, a reading *msw* 'children' in *Amenemhat* 14a would be neutral as to whether a possible quotation was from or to *Amenemhat*. Assessing this is made difficult by the thorough-going integration of *Amenemhat* 14a-c and *Ipuwer* 6.12-14 into the respective contexts of either composition. However, a slight indication might be given in the old Gardinerian observation that *iw ms* is in *Ipuwer* a core articulating device of the lament, while it occurs only once in *Amenemhat*.[28] A plausible scenario has also been recently proposed by which *Amenemhat* 14a-c would be quoting from a composition, *Ipuwer*, that provides a paradigmatic illustration of the inverted world:[29] this quotation, and the thereby evoked subtext and associations, could have served to introduce the current speaking situation of a king who, despite the just exposed positive and normative actions of his reign (10-13), was still subject to the most untoward event of all, a regicide. Differences in textual detail between *Ipuwer* 6.12-14 and *Amenemhat* 14a-c are directly accounted for under this scenario.[30]

(c) If this interpretation is correct, *Ipuwer* would provide a terminus *ante quem non* for *Amenemhat*, not the other way around. Although the precise dating of *Ipuwer* remains insecure, the composition has a linguistically defined range for dating extending from the early Thirteenth to the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty (§6.2.2.5). A pre-Thirteenth Dynasty dating of *Amenemhat* could then be maintained only under additional hypotheses:

---

24 In more details, Oréal 2011: 276 and Enmarch 2008: 23.
25 Enmarch 2008: 23-4.
26 On issues to do with changes in semograms, further Enmarch 2008: 23 (NB: not fully congruent with Adrom 2006: 75-6).
27 Similarly, Oréal 2011: 276; Enmarch 2008: 23; Parkinson 1997a: 208.
28 Oréal 2011: 276.
29 Oréal 2011: 276-7.
30 In details, Oréal 2011: 277.

(α) Rather than as a quotation or an allusion, the similar formulations in *Ipuwer* 6.12-14 and *Amenemhat* 14a-c could be interpreted in broader intertextual terms, with the two texts drawing independently on a common motif. This is unlikely: in isolation, *rḫ ḥr tiw wḫꜣ ḥr m-biꜣ* in *Amenemhat* 14b / *Ipuwer* 6.13 could well be, and possibly is, a common saying, and the motif of children cast into the streets (*Amenemhat* 14a / *Ipuwer* 6.12-13) could as well. The direct sequence of the two motifs in both texts is already more remarkable. The similarities between the two texts extend further, to elements in *Amenemhat* 14c and *Ipuwer* 6.13-14 (*ḥr-ntt/nty n rḫ=f st/s(i) šw/ꜥn m ḥr=k/=f*).

(β) Under a redactionalist hypothesis for *Ipuwer*, one could speculate that the section from which *Amenemhat* would be quoting is part of an older layer in *Ipuwer*.[31] The most recent study of *Ipuwer*, however, provides strong arguments against a redactionalist hypothesis for this composition.[32]

(γ) Alternatively, a quotation from a common unpreserved source could be proposed. This can of course not be ruled out, yet remains entirely *ad hoc* in the present context.

In sum, the relationship between *Ipuwer* 6.12-14 and *Amenemhat* 14a-c does not provide a terminus *post quem non* for the latter composition: if anything, it would rather seem to provide a terminus *ante quem non*, with immediate implications for the dating of *Amenemhat* (post-*Ipuwer*, itself not composed before the early Thirteenth Dynasty and possibly later). As is often the case in the study of quotations, however, the argument is not fully secure. In addition, quotations and allusions do not fall under the self-defined restrictive scope of the present study. In the present context, a conservative assessment of the issue is therefore made, namely that the contact between *Ipuwer* 6.12-14 and *Amenemhat* 14a-c can not be taken to provide evidence for an early dating of the latter composition. Whether it provides evidence for a later dating of *Amenemhat*, which could well be the case, is here left open.

6.1.3   Language

6.1.3.1   Middle Egyptian language: A discussion of *Amenemhat* 7c-f

As mentioned above, a linguistic terminus *post quem non* to the mid-Twelfth Dynasty has been proposed for *Amenemhat*. However, the criterion involved—Vernus' aspectual *post quem non* criterion—does not apply, because all synthetic present tense constructions in *Amenemhat* are passive (9b-d: quoted above, §2.3.4.2.2, (viii)): these have a diachronic evolution different from active ones (§5.3.4-5). In addition, the criterion would only define a terminus *post quem non* to the mid-, or even late, Eighteenth Dynasty, not an earlier one (§2.6.3).

The forms, constructions, and particular functions of these in *Amenemhat* are all documented in productive use in higher written registers down to the time of the first

---

31   This is the solution selected by Oréal (2011: 276-7), who assumes an early dating of *Amenemhat*.
32   Enmarch 2008: 9-18; more generally also Parkinson 2002: 16.

manuscript attestation of the composition, in the early Eighteenth Dynasty. Pars pro toto, this is illustrated by the following much discussed passage:[33]

(i) *Amenemhat* 7c-f

ir šsp=i[a] *ꜣ st*[b] *ḫꜥw m ḏrt=i*

iw ḏ.n=i ḫt ḥmw (...)[c]

nn swt ḳn m grḥ nn ꜥḥꜣ wꜥ{t}

nn ḫpr sp mꜥr m-ḫmt mkw

'If I only[d] took them up with weapons in my hand,

I would—I swear[e]—have made the cowards retreat (...)

But there is no brave one at night, no one who could fight alone;

Success will not occur without a helper.'

a)   Thus in P. Millingen; on the *sḏm.n=f* in Ramesside copies, see the discussion below.

b)   Often read as *ꜣs{t}* 'quickly';[34] this, however, is a Ramesside reinterpretation (compare the semogram in Ramesside manuscripts, lacking in P. Millingen). The text of P. Millingen is coherent as it stands, and semantically much stronger (see below).[35]

c)   The phrase at the end of the verse poses an unsolved philological problem;[36] I have no original proposal to contribute.

d)   As an English rendering of the 'ꜣ of restrictive identification' (see below).

e)   For this rendering of the here strongly assertive value of *iw*, see below.

The *ir*-headed clause in 7c has been read as a past unfulfilled condition, based on the text in Ramesside witnesses (*ir šsp.n=i*). This is unsatisfactory, as P. Millingen clearly has *ir šsp=i*. An interpretation of *ir šsp=i* as a temporal clause has also been proposed,[37] but this construction remains undocumented in Middle Egyptian.[38] Alternatively, it has been suggested that the whole of 7c-f should be viewed as a *ir A B* (*pw*) glossing pattern, with *ir* introducing the two verses 7c-d as a topic (A) to the subsequent verses 7e-f, functioning the way glosses otherwise do (B).[39] This reading adequately captures some of the semantics of the overall passage (see below), but is not possible on grammatical grounds.[40] The *ir*-headed correlative system must then extend over 7c-d only,

33   The passage has been central in discussions as to whether the attempt on the king succeeded or not (Burkard 1999: 159-61; Jansen-Winkeln 1997: 128-30; 1991: 252-5; Obsomer 1995: 118-20). I follow the interpretation convincingly argued for by Oréal (2011: 47-8), adding further comments.

34   E.g. Dils et al., *TLA*; Vernus 2010[2]b: 221; Burkard 1999: 159.

35   Oréal 2011: 47-8 and n.61.

36   Detailed reviews of proposals in Burkard 1977: 308-9; Dils et al., *TLA*.

37   Jansen-Winkeln 1997: 129-30; 1991: 253-5.

38   Burkard 1999: 159-60.

39   Burkard 1999: 159-61; Burkard & Thissen 2012[4]: 119-20, with a translation as: 'Was das "Ich ergriff schnell die Waffen mit meiner Hand, und schon habe ich die Feiglinge durch Gegenwehr zurückgetrieben" betrifft: Es gibt aber doch keinen Tapferen in der Nacht, nicht den Kampf eines Einzelnen, nicht gelingt Glückliches ohne Helfer!' (Burkard 1999: 161). In this interpretation, *šsp=i* is taken to be a 'narrative' infinitive (Burkard 1999: 160, comparing with *Sinuhe*). In 7d, 'das *sḏm.n=f* im folgenden Vers setzt diese Form dann fort (...)' (Burkard 1999: 160).

40   In 7c, *šsp=i* can not be a 'narrative' construction of the infinitive, because this is only used in the textual foreground, opening a segment in a narrative chain at text-articulating junctures (provi-

with *ir šsp=i* (...) (however to be analyzed) the protasis and 7d *iw ḏ.n=i* (...) the here *iw*-headed apodosis. For *šsp=i*, it has been proposed that this could be a verbal noun, introduced by *ir*.[41] As the particle *ꜣ* would require some finite verb, this would entail that 7c must have originally read *ꜣs* 'quickly' (as in Ramesside witnesses), not *ꜣ st* (as in P. Millingen).[42] However, Ramesside witnesses have a secondary text in 7c, extending to the form of *šsp* itself, always *šsp.n=i*, not *šsp=i*. Accordingly, *šsp=i* (P. Millingen) must be interpreted as a subjunctive, as is overly common in *ir*-headed protases. Following the reading convincingly argued for by Oréal,[43] the particle *ꜣ*, which expresses 'restrictive identification', here bears not as much on the verb itself (*šsp=i*) as it does on the following circumstantial determination (*ḥꜥw m ḏrt=i*). In the context of an hypothetical clause (*ir šsp=i ꜣ st ḥꜥw m ḏrt=i*), this results in an interpretation as counter-factual.[44] The rather complex grammar of *Amenemhat* 7c-d was not understood by Ramesside scribes who altered the text of 7c into *ir šsp.n=i*, thereby expressing broadly similar semantics—a past unfulfilled condition—in simpler grammar. (In addition, the alteration may also have been supported by a regressive harmonization to the *sḏm.n=f* in 7d *iw ḏ.n=i*.)

The above sketch of a long debate illustrates the complexity of the grammar in *Amenemhat* 7c-d, which caused substantial problems to Ramesside readers already. Yet, the passage has nothing in it that is not also found in productive use in early Eighteenth Dynasty compositions. The central issue lies with the semantics of *ꜣ* in 7c, used for 'restrictive identification'.[45] For this expression, compare:

---

sionally Feder 2004). The 'narrative' infintive is also indexically over-determined elsewhere in Middle Egyptian literature, notably in *Sinuhe* itself (§4.1.3.B). As regards 7d *iw ḏ.n=i*, a reference to the 'confirmative' function of *iw* (Burkard 1999: 160) is relevant (see below), but *iw ḏ.n=i* can not be continuative with respect to the preceding *šsp=i* (similarly Oréal 2011: 421, n.49). Similar comments by Vernus 2010²b: 227, n.37.

41 Vernus 2010²b: 227, n.37.
42 Vernus 2010²b: 221 ('je me précipitai').
43 Oréal 2011: 47-8.
44 Oréal 2011: 47: '(...) *ꜣ* joue un rôle dans l'interprétation de la protase comme inactuelle. C'est là un effet de sens qui résulte de sa valeur fondamentale conditionnée par un contexte déjà marqué comme hypothétique.' And further (47-8): 'L'intention est d'atténuer l'idée, potentiellement scandaleuse, que le souverain ne soit pas invincible en insistant sur les circonstances de l'agression, qui a surpris la victime à l'heure du repos, dépourvue des armes nécessaires au combat. (…) Sa défaite se trouve alors présentée comme liée au fait qu'il a été pris en traître, la lâcheté de ses assaillants ne lui laissant aucune possibilité de combattre.'
45 Oréal 2011: 39-48, from which the examples and references given below are also drawn.

(ii) Thutmosis II's *Aswan Inscription* 10-11 (*Urk.* IV 139, 12-16)

ꜥnḫ=i mr (w)i rꜥ (...)

n^sic ḏ=i 3 ꜥnḫ m ṯ3y=sn

w3ḥ=i 3 mwt im=sn

'As truly as I live and as Re (...) loves me,
I will not leave even one person alive among their male men,
I will lay only death among them.'

> Sim. 14 (*Urk.* IV 140, 14: quoted above, §1.2, (viii.β)); *Chapelle Rouge*, p.125:
> VI.8-11 (H*HBT* II 21, 5-9/10: quoted above, §4.2.1, (viii)); Thutmosis III's
> *Karnak Building Inscription* 6 (*Urk.* IV 158, 9).

In *Amenemhat* 7d, *iw*, which is not syntactically required, imparts some additional force to the statement. Based on a comparison with similar contexts, it appears that *Amenemhat* 7c-d is loosely modeled on formulations such as in oaths—an interpretation that is consistent with the overtly apologetic tone of the context. This construction is itself common in the early Eighteenth Dynasty:

(iii) Ahmes Pennekhbet 4-5 (*Urk.* IV 38, 10-11)

w3ḥ p3 ḥḳ3 ꜥnḫ ḏt

iw n tš=i r nsw ḥr pri (...)

'As the Ruler, living forever, endures,
I did not swerve from the king on the battlefield (...)'

> Sim., also with a negative construction, Thutmosis III's *Karnak Building Inscrip-*
> *tion* 2 (*Urk.* IV 846, 17 - 847, 3); with *iw* preceding a subjunctive *sḏm=f* (sic), *Urk.*
> IV 651, 2-6 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*); with *iw* set twice, first before a *ir*-headed
> nominal topic, then before a *ni-P N* adjectival pattern expressing possession,
> Hatshepsut's Northern Karnak Obelisk, Basis D 18-23 (*Urk.* IV 365, 14 - 366,
> 17);[46] before a *sḏm.n=f*, *Urk.* IV 751, 17 - 752, 4 (Thutmosis III's *Annals*); *Urk.* IV
> 843, 6-10 (an inscription of Thutmosis III in Karnak); *Heavenly Cow* 53-55; before
> *subject – pseudoparticiple*, *Heavenly Cow* 53-55; 104-105.[47] While the construc-
> tion is particularly common in the early Eighteenth Dynasty, it is of course not
> exclusive to that period, compare for example the much earlier Moꜥalla V.β.1.

6.1.3.2   A direct dating to the Twelfth Dynasty? *Amenemhat* 6f *ir.kw*

Ir.kw in *Amenemhat* 6f deserves a discussion of its own. The immediate context is as follows:

(i) *Amenemhat* 6e-f

isw^a spḫr ḫꜥw nḏ-r3 ḥr=i

ir.kw mi s3-t3 n smt

'...?[b], the weapons were made to circulate (...?)[c] on me,
who was/had been made (/who acted?) as a worm in the desert.'

---

46 On the doubling of *iw* in this passage, Borghouts 2006: 93, ex.18.

47 Except the ones in *Heavenly Cow*, these examples are drawn from *EG* §468.1.

a) Thus P. Millingen, the only Eighteenth Dynasty witness here fully preserved; the Eighteenth Dynasty T. Carnarvon 5, partly broken, probably had *ist*, as Ramesside witnesses consistently have. An emendation of P. Millingen into *ist* has been proposed,[48] but *isw* in P. Millingen is correctly determined by the A2 semogram and has the much rarer of the two particles. *Ìst*, the *lectio facilior*, may therefore be secondary.[49]

b) The meaning of *is(w)*, here and in general, remains unclear: the traditional rendering of *is(w)* as a particle with presentative and/or 'super-assertive' force ('behold', 'siehe') is possible, yet blissfully vague.[50] Analysis is not helped by the fact that the expression is uncommon (§2.8.2.2, (i)).

c) The much discussed sequence *nḏ-rꜣ ḥr=i* has so far eluded a definite interpretation.[51] As this does not directly bear on the issue discussed below, no attempt at deciding between various proposals is made.

The specific issue to be discussed here is whether *ir.kw* is passive[52] or active.[53] If the latter were true, an argument for a dating to the Twelfth Dynasty could be given.

A. At first, an active reading seems more likely in view of the following preposition. Used passively with a meaning 'made into', *iri* is typically followed by the preposition *m*.[54] Followed by *mi*, as in *Amenemhat* 6f, *iri* is typically active. Compare:

(ii) Wepwawetaa, Munich Gl. WAF 35, 16

(...) *ir.kw m ꜥk nn ḏd=f*

'(...) made someone who could enter without being told.'

(iii) Iykhernefret 10

ir.k(w) mi wḏt.n nbt ḥm=f (...)

'I have acted in conformity to everything His Majesty has ordered (...)'

Assuming that 6f *ir.kw* is correctly read actively, this could be turned into a valuable criterion for dating based on the following considerations. The active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple with events other than lexical statives (*rḫ* 'to know' and *ḫm* 'not to know') is exceedingly rare in the Middle Kingdom (seven cases in total) and does not belong to the standard repertoire of Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian.[55] The construction is then associated with funerary self-presentations (five instances), which it contributes indexing as a type of written discourse. It recurs in *Sinuhe* (B 45, B 114), as one among several strategies framing this composition as a

---

48 E.g. Oréal 2011: 253, n.179. This is based on the author's broader analysis of the functions of *is(w)*, not on internal evidence in *Amenemhat*.

49 Similarly Burkard 1977: 166; Dils et al., *TLA*.

50 The traditional analysis of *is(w)* is challenged by Oréal 2011: 252-3. The author's discussion is based on a set of mostly older examples which may either involve another particle, or the same particle with partly different functions.

51 Various proposals discussed in Dils et al., *TLA*; further Vernus 2010²b: 234.

52 E.g. Vernus 2010²b: 220; Parkinson 1997a: 207.

53 E.g. Burkard 1999: 158; *EG* §312.

54 Also observed by Jean Winand (p.c. 5/2011).

55 Stauder in press a: §3.

fictionalized self-presentation (§4.1.3.A). *Amenemhat* is itself, among other things, framed as a fictionalized self-presentation. If to be read actively, *ir.kw* in *Amenemhat* 6f could then be related to a cultural horizon in the use of written language similar to the one documented in *Sinuhe*, and beyond, in Twelfth Dynasty funerary self-presentations (see further below, B). The argument, technically one by 'direct dating' (§4), would then point to a Twelfth Dynasty dating for *Amenemhat*.

> NB. Assuming that *Amenemhat* 6f is correctly read as active, only two objections could be raised against the above argument for dating the composition to the Twelfth Dynasty. As the brief discussion below shows, both could be dismissed.

> (a) One other instance of the construction is in *Mutter und Kind* V.10-VI.1 *ir.kw rf wḏ-nsw n gb* (...) 'I have made a royal decree of Geb (...)'. The text is arguably later than the Middle Kingdom (§5.3.4.2, (iii)) and the construction thereby documented, if only once, after the Twelfth Dynasty. This, however, would not weaken the above hypothetical argument: in *Mutter und Kind*, the antiquated construction of the active-transitive pseudoparticiple is used merely as a general token of elevated language, lacking the specific associations observed in Middle Kingdom self-presentations and in *Sinuhe*. *Amenemhat* 6f, by contrast, would be displaying precisely such associations.

> (b) Another objection that could be raised is that the construction in *Amenemhat* 6f may not relate to Middle Kingdom self-presentations directly, but could rather be inheriting from the similar usage in *Sinuhe* itself, by a textual genealogy internal to literature. The construction in *Amenemhat* 6f would then lose its anchoring to the Twelfth Dynasty horizon in written culture here relevant. (This possibility has to be discussed, as several elements of a dense relation between these two literary works are otherwise observed: §6.4.3.) However, such scenario would be unlikely: when the use of the active-transitive pseudoparticiple in *Sinuhe* and in contemporaneous self-presentations is set in perspective, it appears that the web of cultural significations associated with the construction was established only in the Twelfth Dynasty.[56] Even if *Amenemhat* had gotten the active-transitive *ir.kw* from *Sinuhe* directly rather than from Twelfth Dynasty funerary self-presentations, it must still have gotten it during the Twelfth Dynasty, or not much later.

> The two above objections being thus dismissed, *Amenemhat* 6f would provide valuable evidence for a Twelfth Dynasty dating of the composition—if to be read actively.

B. Upon closer inspection, an active reading of *Amenemhat* 6f turns out to be impossible. The clause introduced by *ir.kw* (6f) continues the preceding one (6e) with *ir.kw* itself being hooked on a first person singular pronoun in that clause ((...) *ḥr=i*). In all documented Middle Kingdom occurrences, the active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple is exclusively found in absolute sentence-initial, or even paragraph-initial, positions. Moreover, this empirically observed correlation is an intrinsic feature of the construction for the following reasons. In the Old Kingdom already, the

---

56 Stauder in press a: n.52.

active-transitive pseudoparticiple was used in absolute sentence-initial, or even paragraph-initial, positions exclusively, with strong text-articulating functions. Middle Kingdom uses, which directly inherit from Old Kingdom ones by a textual genealogy, also inherit this association with paragraph-initiality, exploiting it for text-articulating purposes of their own.[57] Compare:

(a) *Old Kingdom textual models*

(iv) Weni 5 (*Urk.* I 99, 10-12) (introducing the sequence dealing with Weni's funerary equipment):

[*d*]*bḥ.k*(*i*) *m-ˁ ḥm n nb*(*=i*) *in.t*(*i*) *n*(*=i*) *inr ḥḏ ḳrs m rʒ-ʒw*

'I asked from the Majesty of my Lord that there be brought to me a coffin of white stone from Tura.'

(b) *Textual revival in Middle Kingdom self-presentations*

(v) Iykhernefret:

Part A (ll.2-9): royal order of mission;

Part B (ll.10-24): Iykhernefert carrying out the royal mission; introduced by l.10 *ir.k*(*w*) *mi wḏt.n nbt ḥm=f* (...) 'I acted according to everything His Majesty had ordered (...)'

(vi) Khentemsemti:

Part A (ll.2-10): general honors and praise by the king;

Part B (ll.11-14): appointment to inspect temples, trip to Elephantine and back to Abydos;

Part C (ll.14-22: funerary contents): introduced by l.14 *wḏ.k*(*w*) *rn=i* (...) 'I have placed my name (...)'

(c) *In Middle Kingdom narrative literature*

(vii) *Sinuhe* B 45, B 114, *ḏd.k*(*i*) (...) 'I said (...)', introducing the encomium to Senwosret and the inner monologue before the fight with the strongman of Retenu, respectively.

In no case is an active-transitive pseudoparticiple with an event other than lexical statives ever dependent on a preceding segment of discourse. This restriction is not a gap in attestation, because it directly relates to the very status of the construction in grammar: as discussed, this is not a regular construction, but the product of a textual genealogy. No similar restriction bears on the passive construction of the pseudo-participle, which is routinely used in dependency of a preceding segment of discourse, anaphorically hooked on some preceding expression. Compare, from an otherwise similar register:

---

57 Stauder in press a: §3.2.

(viii) Wepwawetaa, Munich Gl. WAF 35, 15-16

isṯ wi ḫd=i r nḏ ḥrt (...)

ḫtmtyw (...) *ḥr m33 sṯ3=i r pr-nsw*

ir.kw m ꜥḳ nn ḏd=f

'Now I used to fare downstream to pay homage (...);

The sealers (...) were watching me being introduced to the palace,

made someone who can enter without being told.'

Unlike in (iv)-(vii), the pseudoparticiple in (viii) (and in similar examples) is dependent on a preceding segment of discourse, semantically, syntactically, and anaphorically. The exact same syntax is in *Amenemhat* 6e-f. On grounds of grammar, no reading other than a passive one is therefore possible. As to the preposition *mi* in *Amenemhat* 6f, this may be untypical after a passively interpreted construction of *iri* (above, A, beginning), yet is readily accounted for as a token of literary language: similes are common in fictional literature, a type of discourse in which state-of-affairs discussed may be 'as' something else than they usually are.[58]

Unlike the active-transitive one, the passive construction of the pseudoparticiple is common at all periods relevant for dating, making *ir.kw* in *Amenemhat* 6f entirely uncriterial.

6.2   *Amenemhat* 11c-d: *Tw* with non-dynamic events

In *Amenemhat*, the following passage combines *tw* with non-dynamic events, *ḥḳr* 'be hungry', *ibi* 'be thirsty', and *ḥmsi* 'sit':

Amenemhat 11c-d

n ḥḳr.tw m rnpwt=i n ib.tw im

iw ḥms.tw m irt.n=i ḥr sḏdt im=i[a]

'There was no being hungry in my year, no being thirsty then;

One could relax through what I had done, telling of me.'

a)   The extant witnesses read *ḥr sḏd*[PLUR].*tw im=i*, for an original *ḥr sḏdt*[PLUR] *im=i* (§6.2.1.1, (ii)). The phrase itself is fully preserved only in Ramesside manuscripts. That it was already part of the pre-Ramesside text of *Amenemhat* is demonstrated by T. Brooklyn II vso, which preserves the end of the phrase, [...]*m=i*.

For the motif in the second part of 11d, compare Hatshepsut's Northern Karnak Obelisk, Basis D 16-17 (*Urk.* IV 365, 6-9) *isṯ ib=i ḥr itt-int ḥr k3t mdw rḫyt m33.t=sn mnw=i m-ḫt rnpwt sḏd.t=sn m irt.n=i* 'My heart was wavering, conceiveing of the words of the people who will see my monuments after the years,

---

58   One is reminisced of the density of *mi*'s in *Sinuhe*, e.g. B 224-225 *iw mi sšm rswt* 'It was like the nature of a dream' (Parkinson 2006; 2002: 280); dream-like elements recur as a fictionalizing device in *Amenemhat* as well (Parkinson 2002: 242). For the simile in 6f specifically, Parkinson 2002: 244.

who will tell from what I have done.' In the Hatshepsutian context, the motif relates to this queen's concern with posterity, e.g. *Speos Artemidos* 8 (*Urk.* IV 384, 12) *ib=i nṯr ḥr ḏʿr n m-ḫt* 'My divine heart is looking for posterity'; *Urk.* IV 350, 8 (*Punt Expedition*) *iw=i r rḏt ḏd.tw n m-ḫt* 'I will cause that they speak (of it) in the future.' The motif of the reception of royal deeds recurs in the closing of Thutmosis III's *Gebel Barkal Stela* 48 (*Urk.* IV 1242, 15) *sḏdt.n rmṯ* [...] 'What people have told [...]'.

As to be discussed below, this construction, in *Amenemhat* and in various other Middle Egyptian literary compositions, is relevant for dating.

6.2.1   Intrusive *tw*'s in textual transmission

Instances of intrusive *tw*'s are occasionally found in New Kingdom manuscripts of Middle Egyptian literary compositions.[59] In considering *Amenemhat* 11c-d for dating, a preliminary requirement is therefore to assess whether the *tw*'s are here integral to the original composition, or not.

6.2.1.1   *-t → tw*

Secondary *tw*'s are mostly found in contexts in which they arise from a reinterpretation of an ending *-t* of a non-finite form. This ending *-t* can be from an original participle or from an original infinitive.

> *Feminine participle → 'passive' relative form*:
>
> (i) *Neferti* 10c-d[60]
>
> *ḫdd m iryt*
> *wš.tw*[a] *m gmyt*
> *iryt m tmmt ir*
>
> 'Destruction is in what had been done,
> *what is being lost*[b] is what had been found,
> what is done is what had not been done.'
>
> a)   Thus in both Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses: Pet. *wš.[t]w*; C25224 *wš.tw*.
>
> b)   Translating as the text stands.

The text as it stands has a 'passive' relative form, in itself a rare construction. In addition, *wš* is mostly used as an intransitive verb; this makes a 'passive' relative form, which would have to be derived from the rare transitive uses of *wš*, unlikely. The secondariness of *wš.tw* is also apparent in view of the following clause, which has *iryt*, a perfective participle. The reading *wš.tw* in Pet. and C25224, although coherent within its own clause, thus conflicts with the broader articulation of the passage. The alteration of *wšt* (a participle) into *wš.tw* (a 'passive' relative form, with haplography for *wš{t}.tw*) was facilitated by the feminine ending *-t* of the participle; it was also

---

59   For instances of intrusive *tw*'s in Ramesside copies of *Late* Egyptian texts, Gardiner 1937: 142.

60   On textual issues in this passage, also §5.3.1.2; Quack 1993a: 78.

helped semantically, since the first part of each of the three clauses is about the present situation. In the original text, this was expressed in the third clause by a perfective participle with resultative interpretation and thereby present relevance (*iryt*). In the altered text, *wš.tw* makes the present tense explicit.

> -t marked infinitive → 'passive' relative form

> (ii) *Amenemhat* 11d

> *iw ḥms.tw m irt.n=i ḥr sḏd*[PLUR]*.tw im=i*

> 'One could relax through what I had done, *on account of what was told of me*.'

The text as preserved in the extant witnesses does not yield a satisfactory meaning. The relative form is secondary to an original infinitive, with *ḥr sḏdt* 'telling of me' hooked on the implied agent of the main passive predicate, *ḥms.tw*. The alteration *ḥr sḏdt*[PLUR] → *ḥr sḏd*[PLUR]*.tw* duplicates the formal expression of the unspecified agent in *ḥms.tw*, the third in a sequence of *tw*'s in 11c-d.

6.2.1.2   Easing referent tracking

A secondary *tw* can also emerge as the result of a broader constructional reinterpretation, generally accompanied by a change in meaning. The following cases are instructive as to the contexts in which such processes, much rarer than the ones just discussed, can take place.

A. Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses of *Loyaliste* present the following alternation:

> (i) *Loyaliste* 9.4

> TC *m ꜣḫ r=sn ḫr* [*ḥmwt=tn*]

> '(Another occasion for fortifying(?) your hearts), more efficient than those (*scil.* the words or maxims previously spoken) with your servants'

> PL *m ꜣḫ<t>*[a]*.tw r=s ḫr ḥmwt=tn*

> '(...) as something *about which one becomes efficient* with your servants'

> a) Haplography. The feminine ending, implied by the feminine resumptive pronoun, is written out in the later O. BR+OV *m ꜣḫt.tw im=s ḫr ḥmwt=tn* '(...) as something *by which* one becomes efficient with your servants' (with an additional alteration, *r → m*).

An attributive form, the feminine of the adjective *ꜣḫ*, is here reinterpreted into another attributive form, the 'passive' relative form *ꜣḫ<t>.tw/ꜣḫt.tw*. If an intermediary stage *m ꜣḫ* 'efficient' → **m ꜣḫt* 'as *something* efficient' is posited, the change could relate to the type discussed above (feminine participle → 'passive' relative form: §6.2.1.1, (i)). Be this as it may, the crucial observation is that the intrusive *tw* is not merely inserted, but comes with a reinterpretation of the overall construction and meaning of the passage. This is manifest in the change from TC *r=sn* → PL *r=s* → O. BR+OV *im=s*. In TC, the pronoun *=sn* in 9.4 was anaphoric to 9.2 *iry*, itself anaphoric to 9.1 *nn* 'these' (*scil.* the words previously spoken). In PL and the later tradition, the altered pronoun *=s* is anaphoric to the implied antecedent of *ꜣḫ<t>.tw*, an attributive form with 'neutral' reference. In the process, the meaning of the passage is altered signifi-

cantly: a comparison with the previously spoken words is lost. The slightly unnatural use of the preposition *r* in PL is significant as a textual hangover, regularized only in later versions (*r → m*).

The semantically thorough-going process of textual alteration of which the insertion of *tw* is the most visible part has to do with the complex chain of reference still preserved in TC. The anaphoric expression in 9.4, *=sn*, has its antecedent not in 9.3, but further up, in 9.2 (*iry*). This antecedent (*iry*) is itself an anaphoric expression, with an antecedent in 9.1 (*nn*), some three verses before *=sn* (9.4). In 9.1, *nn* itself, although not an anaphoric expression, is a demonstrative one, not a full noun: this points to the maxims or words previously spoken. In the text as preserved in TC, the chain of reference extends over a long distance and referent tracking is complex. By contrast, the antecedent of *=s* in PL and the later tradition is straightforwardly identified.

B. In the same composition, now comparing the Middle Kingdom version (*Sehetepibre*) with the long one documented in New Kingdom copies (*Kairsu*), the following alternation is observed:

(ii) *Loyaliste* 3.6

Sehetepibre ḥtp=f r tpr ṯꜣw

'He calms down for air to be breathed.'

Kairsu ḥtp=f tpi.tw[a] *ṯꜣw=f*

'He calms down so that one can breathe his air.'
or: 'When he calms down, one breathes his air.'[b]

a)   PR inserts *iw*: *ḥtp{w}=f iw tpi.tw ṯꜣw=f*

b)   Both translations are equally acceptable grammatically, the former as an emphatic construction, the latter with *ḥtp=f* a setting to *tpi.tw* the main clause. The insertion of *iw* in PR suggests that some readers at least preferred the latter interpretation. This may, but need not, extend to other New Kingdom witnesses, which are morphologically undistinctive in this respect.

Descriptively, the non-finite construction in *Sehetepibre* (*r + infinitive*) is turned into a finite one in *Kairsu* (*tpi.tw*). In the process, the mono-clausal syntax in *Sehetepibre* is made bi-clausal in *Kairsu*. Major changes in syntax do not here entail any significant shift in meaning, unlike in the case just discussed (above, A). The process is no less interesting as to the dynamics of textual change at play, which imply two major dimensions.

The first lies with the participants involved. In *Sehetepibre*, the participant implicit in *r tpr*, the people/mankind, differs from the clausal subject, the king (*=f* in *ḥtp=f*). The construction *r + infinitive* is here of the less common type in which the participant implicit in the infinitive is not co-referential to the clausal subject (*sḏm=f*$_i$ (...) *r sḏm*$_j$ (...)). In altering the construction into a finite one (*r tpr → tpi.tw*), *Kairsu* makes it formally explicit that the participant who is to breathe is distinct from the clausal subject. Another aspect of the change lies in *ṯꜣw → ṯꜣw=f*, also making for an easier

identification of participants in *Kairsu*. The construction is thus made easier for the reader to process.

In appreciating the change, the broader context is relevant as well. In *Sehetepibre*, the distich 3.5-6[61] reads:

(iii) *Loyaliste* 3.5-6 (*Sehetepibre*)

ḳbb fndw wꜣ=f r nšnw
ḥtp=f r tpr ṯꜣw

'Noses are blocked when he falls into storm;
He calms down for air to be breathed.'

In terms of the participants involved, the articulation is chiastic: 3.5 the people (metonymically evoked by *fndw*) – the king; 3.6 the king – the people (implicit in *r tpr*). The syntax, for its part, is bi-clausal in 3.5, but mono-clausal in 3.6. In *Kairsu*, the syntax of 3.6 is itself made bi-clausal and thereby harmonized to the one in 3.5. The chiastic symmetry of participants is thus reproduced on the level of syntax. By the same change by which referent tracking is eased, the articulation of the distich is also regularized.

C. A different case of intrusive *tw* is finally the following, documented in a Ramesside witness of *Sinuhe* (no Eighteenth Dynasty witness is here preserved):

(iv) *Sinuhe* B 51

B (...) *smi=f šꜣt.n=f ḫpr*

'(...) he (*scil.* Senwosret) reported that what he (*scil.* Amenemhat) had determined had occurred.'

R (...) *smi=f n=f šꜣt=f ḫpr*

'(...) he (*scil.* S.) reported *to him* (*scil.* A.) that what he (*scil.* A.) ordered had occurred.'

AOS, DM2 (...) *smi.tw šꜣ{ꜥ}.n=f ḫpr*

'(...) it was reported that what he (*scil.* A.) had determined had occurred.'

Both clauses in B 51 have third person singular anaphoric pronouns (*=f*) as their subject (*smi=f*) or in it (*šꜣt.n=f*). The two pronouns have different antecedents in the previous pair of clauses (Senwosret and Amenemhat, respectively). This results in an overall construction that is difficult to process, due to the double, simultaneously running, chain of anaphoric reference: B 50-51 *ntf dꜣr ḫꜣswt iw it=f m-ḫnw ꜥḥ=f smi=f šꜣt.n=f ḫpr* 'It is he (*scil.* S.) who subjugated foreign countries, his father (*scil.* A.), for his part,[62] stayed inside his palace; *he* (*scil.* S.) reported that what *he* (*scil.* A.) had determined had occurred.'

Already R displays one minor change, the insertion of a third person dative after *smi=f.* As it is clear that the son reports to the father, not the other way around, this change makes the clause slightly easier to process: '(...) he reported *to him* (...).' In

---

AOS, the process of simplification is pushed further with the replacement of the first of the two anaphoric pronouns by *tw*. As a result, only one anaphoric pronoun is left in AOS, suppressing any difficulty for the reader.

D. As will be demonstrated below, subjectless constructions are regularly used in early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian with events similar to the ones in *Amenemhat* 11c-d (§6.2.3.3). When this can be observed directly, subjectless constructions are stable in textual transmission into the Eighteenth Dynasty and beyond:

>   (v) *Sinuhe* B 59
>
>   B   *n rḏ.n=f ḥms*^{A17}=ø$^{A1-PLUR, a}$ *ḥȝ ib=f*
>
>   R   *n rḏ.n=f ḥms*[^{A17}]=ø *ḥȝ ib=*[*f*]
>
>   G   [*...ḥms*]^{A17}=ø^{b} *ḥȝ ib=f*
>
>   AOS   *nn rḏ.n=f ḥms*^{A17}=ø *ḥȝ ib=f*
>
>   'He does not allow one to rest around his heart.'
>
>   a) For the sequence <A1 PLUR> as a secondary correction in B, below, §6.2.3.3, (ii).
>
>   b) Although the word stem is in lacuna, the presence of the semogram makes an identification of the construction as a subjectless one secure.

Subjectless constructions involve the exact same issues in referent tracking as *tw*-marked ones. As both constructions are just as easily processed, the insertion of *tw* would not come with any gain. That subjectless constructions such as the one above are stable in textual transmission therefore comes as no surprise.

6.2.1.3   *Amenemhat* 11c-d

As the above discussion demonstrates, intrusive *tw*'s are not merely inserted in the course of textual transmission. Rather, contexts matter a great deal. Cases of *tw* arising from an ending -*t* (§6.2.1.1) are the most common, tend to affect the meaning the least, and can occur fairly spontaneously in later manuscripts where appropriate semantic contexts are given. Cases of secondary *tw* not arising from an ending -*t* (§6.2.1.2) are more sporadic. They often affect the meaning of a passage, slightly (§6.2.1.2.C) or more profoundly (§6.2.1.2.A). They can also effect stylistic regularization (§6.2.1.2.B). Such changes are part of broader constructional changes: in the cases presented above, these all result in easing referent tracking. Contexts discussed include a case of a long-distance anaphoric chain (§6.2.1.2.A), an infinitival construction with the implied participant not co-referential to the subject of the main clause (§6.2.1.2.B), and a case of a double, simultaneously running, anaphoric reference (§6.2.1.2.C). Conversely, when no gain in referent tracking would be obtained by inserting *tw*, constructions without *tw* remain stable (§6.2.1.2.D). That changes implying the insertion of *tw* should correlate with issues to do with referent tracking is not surprising: in serving to express non-specified reference, *tw* itself has functions in the grammar of reference. In the case of *Amenemhat* 11c-d, the *tw*'s—twice after the negation *n*, then after *iw*—can not have arisen from an ending -*t*. Nor does the context involve any difficulty in referent tracking. Accordingly, none of the above documented scenarios of textual alteration applies to *Amenemhat* 11c-d.

6.2.2 The spread of *tw* to non-dynamic events

6.2.2.1 Introduction

In Old and earlier Middle Egyptian, *tw* is exclusively an inflectional marker of the passive. Its occurrence is then subject to the general condition of passivization in Earlier Egyptian, also observed with *sḏm(w)*-passives. This states that an event to be passivized—be it syntactically a transitive or an intransitive verb—must have an agentive participant in its semantic representation.[63] With events that do not fulfill this condition, some other construction is used instead. With semantically different types of syntactically intransitive verbs, compare in Ankhtifi:

(a) *Events with an agentive participant in their semantic representation—e.g. verbs of directed motion (pri, spr r)*[64]

Tw-passive:
(i) Moᶜalla II.η.2
n pr.n.t(w) n snḏ=f
'There was no coming out (*scil.* by the enemy troops) for fear of him.'

   Sim. II.θ.2

Sḏm(w)-passive:
(ii) Moᶜalla II.ε.3
spr r(=i) r=s
'One had reached me about it.'

(b) *Events with no agentive participant in their semantic representation—e.g. mwt*

(iii) Moᶜalla IV.17-18
n-sp ḏ(=i) ḫpr m(w)t n ḥḳr m spȝt tn
'Never did I allow that there would be starving in this nome.'

   An event of *mwt*'ing can not be combined with *tw* in the stage of language represented in Ankhtifi. Instead, the event is nominalized and set as the subject of an expression of 'occurring' (*ḫpr*).

In the course of the first half of the second millennium BCE, *tw* is gradually extended to events that do not fulfill this semantic condition of passivization, including *ḥḳr* 'be

---

63 Stauder in press b: §2.2.3; in prep.
64 English only marginally licenses the passivization of syntactic intransitives, hence the various translational equivalents provided here, with an event-nominalization in a presentative construction (i) or with an impersonal subject (ii). In Earlier Egyptian, the condition for passivization is defined in solely semantic terms and thereby more inclusive than in English. Incidentally, the alternative Egyptian construction in (iii) is not unsimilar structurally to the one in the English rendering of (i).

hungry', *ibi* 'be thirsty', and *ḥmsi* 'sit' as in *Amenemhat* 11c-d. The issue is therefore to date the relevant part of the change more precisely.[65]

6.2.2.2   Tracking the change: Issues of method

With many events and event-types, agentivity is not a lexically specified feature in Earlier Egyptian. Accordingly, agentivity must be appreciated in actual context and in individual occurrences. In particular, translational equivalents can be, and often are, misleading. This is preliminarily illustrated below.

A. Contrary to what some equivalents in translational languages could suggest, *gr* 'be silent, cease, etc.' is more often than not agentive in Middle Egyptian. Compare the use in the imperative (i), a construction that is restricted to agentive events in Middle Egyptian,[66] or in the *prt pw ir.n=f* construction (ii), a construction that strongly correlates with such:[67]

> (i) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 110-111
>
> *in-mrwt wn=f ḥr ḏd gr*
>
> 'In order that he keeps speaking, be silent!'[68]

> > Further note the agent-oriented prepositional phrase (*in-mrwt* (...)).
> >
> > Sim. e.g. Heqanakht II ro 37; with a negative imperative, e.g. *Ptahhotep* 375 P.

> (ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 80-81
>
> *gr pw ir.n imi-rȝ pr-wr mrw sȝ rnsi*
>
> 'Then the high steward Meru's son Rensi was quiet.'[69]

Outside such constructions that are directly diagnostic in themselves, agentivity must be assessed in context. In the following passage, *gr* is agentive because it expresses self-control ('control' is a defining property of agentivity):

> (iii) *Semna Stela* (Senwosret III's), 8
>
> *pḥw pḥ.t(w)=f*
> *grw gr.t(w)*
> 'Who attacks when attacked,
> who remains silent when one remains silent;'

An agentive reading of *gr* is further substantiated by the subsequent elaboration, where the event of *gr*'ing is equated with a (prototypically agentive) *s*-causative: *Semna Stela* 9-10 *ir gr m-ḫt pḥ sšḫm ib pw n ḫrwy* 'As to remaining quiet after the attack, this is strengthening the heart of the enemy.' *Gr.tw* in *Semna Stela* 8 is therefore consistent with uses of *tw* as an inflectional passive marker. It offers no evidence

---

65 For an analysis of the factors and mechanisms of the change, Stauder in press b; in prep.
66 The correlation is observed in text. It recurs in many languages and finds a functional basis on a pragmatic level: for a manipulative speech act to be felicitous, the manipulee better be agentive.
67 Winand 2006: 80.
68 Note that the imperative triggers an agentive reading of 'be X' clauses in English.
69 An apt rendering in French could be as '(...) *fit* silence'.

for dating the linguistic change here discussed (extension of *tw* to non-passivizable events).

B. Control is also relevant to the semantics of *ꜥḥꜥ* in the following passage in Sinuhe's encomium to Senwosret:

(iv) *Sinuhe* B 55-56

n ꜥḥꜥ.n.tw m hꜣw=f

'One can not maintain one's position in his presence.'[70]

Outside actual context, *ꜥḥꜥ* can mean 'stand, be standing' (not agentive, and therefore not passivizable) or 'stand up' and 'keep standing' (in this case implying an agent in its semantic representation, and therefore passivizable). In *Sinuhe* B 55-56, the context implies an agentive reading: not 'be standing', but 'maintain oneself in standing position' in the overwhelming presence of the king. Put differently, what one can not do is keep *control* of oneself in the presence of the king.[71] While *ꜥḥꜥ* and *ḥmsi* (as in *Amenemhat* 11d) may be presented as antonyms in a lexicon, the strong implication of control in *Sinuhe* B 55-56 is lacking entirely in *Amenemhat* 11d. Accordingly, the former passage is an inflectional passive, the latter not any more.

C. Agentivity can finally vary depending on the argument structure of a verb. While *ꜥnḫ* 'to be alive' is typically non-agentive, *ꜥnḫ m* 'live on (sthg.)', i.e. 'feed on (sthg.)', is agentive. This is illustrated for example in the following passage, where *ꜥnḫ m* is in parallelism with a verb of ingestion, *wšb m*:[72] Pyr. §394b[WT] (...) *m nṯr ꜥnḫ m itiw=f wšb m mwwt=f* '(...) as a god living on his fathers, feeding on his mothers'. A similar construal applies to the following *tw*-marked examples in Middle Egyptian literary texts:

(v) *Sinuhe* B 236

ꜥnḫ.tw m ṯꜣw n ḏd=k

'One lives on the breath of your giving.'

(vi) *Loyaliste* 9.8

ꜥnḫ.tw m imy ꜥwy=sn

'One lives on what is in their arms.'

> In both cases, the *m*-introduced phrase is part of the argument structure of *ꜥnḫ* (*ꜥnḫ m* 'live on'). A different case is when *m* introduces a location, as in *Neferti* 12d. The prepositional phrase then expresses a mere circumstance and the event is not agentive: §6.2.2.4, (xi).

---

70 Sim. *Ipuwer* 10.11 *n{n} ꜥḥꜥ.n.tw* [...]. The context is too damaged to support a semantic analysis.

71 Compare B 252-253 *wn.k(w) rf dwn.kw ḥr ẖt=i m.n(=i) wi m-bꜣḥ=f* (...) 'Being thus stretched out on my body, I had lost myself in his presence (...)'. More generally, Sinuhe's changing positions form a major semantic thread throughout the composition (Stauder in press a: Appendix).

72 Semantically, events of ingestion are not highly transitive because they do not affect their second participant and because their first participant is itself self-affecting. Yet, their first participant is still agentive.

Accordingly, ꜥnḫ.tw m in *Sinuhe* B 236 can not be taken as evidence to date the linguistic change under consideration. Conversely ꜥnḫ.tw m in *Loyaliste* 9.8 does not provide evidence for dating the long version of that composition.

> NB. In a similar vein, translation equivalents of wḏd as 'suffer' can be misleading as they may suggest that this verb is non-agentive. Compare, with wḏd used after rḫ 'to be able (to do sthg.)', implying an at least weakly agentive reading, *Khakheperreseneb* ro 13-14 ḥꜣ n=i ib m rḫ wḏdw 'If I only had a heart that knows how to endure!' In Middle Egyptian literature, the two *tw*-marked instances of wḏd are from transitive constructions of wḏd with meanings such as 'have patience with, endure (sthg.)' and thereby themselves at least weakly agentive: (a) *Khakheperreseneb* vso 5 n wḏd.tw smi n mdt 'They have had no patience with the reply to a speech'; (b) *Neferti* 11a nn wḏd.n.tw[73] pr n rꜣ{=i} 'What comes from the mouth can not be endured.' As they comply with the semantic condition for passivization, these instances of wḏd combined with *tw* do not contribute to dating the change under discussion. Nor, conversely, are they criterial for assessing the date of composition of the two texts in which they occur.

6.2.2.3   The first step of the change: *Tw* spreading to events that lack an agentive participant in their semantic representation

The morpheme *tw* is observed spreading to events that lack an agentive participant in their semantic representation during the Twelfth Dynasty. The earliest occurrences are from *Eloquent Peasant* (i)-(iii), a text dated to the mid-Twelfth Dynasty (§3.1.2). Another very early instance of the construction is found in an only slightly later graffito (iv):

(i) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 252-254
sꜥnḫw m rḏ m(w)t.tw
sḥtm m rḏ ḥtm.tw
'Lifegiver, let not die!
Destroyer, let not perish!'

(ii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 321-322
iw ḫr.tw n ḥnt wꜣ
'One falls far for greed.'

(iii) *Eloquent Peasant* B1 131-132
srfw ḥr rḏt nšp.tw
'He who breathes calmly is making people pant.'

---

73   Thus Pet.; C25224 is garbled: *n wšꜣ?.n.tw m prw {m pr} rꜣ{=i}*.

(iv) Antef's Sehel Graffito (*temp*. Senwosret III), 8-9

ꜣḫ st n irr st r irrw n=f st
n wrd.n.tw ḥr[sic]*=s ṯꜣw pw m rꜣ*

'It is more beneficial to who does it than to him for whom it is done;
one can not become weary because of it; it is the breath in the mouth.'

> Other, contemporaneous and later, instances of the same formula[74] have *nn nw m wrdt ḥr=s* 'this is not something through which one becomes weary', with an extended construction of the passive participle with indirect co-reference, not a finite form. Antef's Graffito deviates from the standard phrasing, as is also manifest in the preposition (*ḥr* for *ḥr*); such deviation is perhaps to be interpreted as reflecting a less formal register.

Earlier in the Twelfth Dynasty, a subjectless active construction is used in an exactly similar function. Contrast *rḏ m(w)t=ø* in (v) with innovative *rḏ m(w)t.tw* in *Eloquent Peasant* (i):

(v) Antef (BM EA 1628; *temp*. Amenemhat I?[75]), 8
n rḏ=i m(w)t=ø
'I did not let die.'

> NB. One additional passage must be discussed in the present context:
>
> (vi) *Ptahhotep* 447 (only in P)
> *ꜥnḫ(.)tw tr n sft=f*
> 'You are alive for the time he is merciful.' (α)
> *or*: 'One lives only for the time he is merciful.' (β)

In interpretation (α), the construction would be a *nfr sw* pattern ('adjectival predicate construction') with a second person singular dependent pronoun subject. In interpretation (β), the construction would be with a finite *tw*-marked form (here a *mrr=f*). If the latter interpretation is correct, *Ptahhotep* 447 would be yet another instance of *tw* accommodated to an event lacking an agent in its semantic representation. Depending on the exact date of composition of *Ptahhotep* (range for dating, (late Eleventh) – mid-Twelfth Dynasties: §2.4.3.3), this could then be slightly earlier than the above instances (i)-(iv). Following the option taken in the main edition of the text,[76] interpretation (β) has subsequently been adopted by most modern readers of the text, although the issue has never been discussed for itself. The preference for interpretation (β) may have been induced by the fact that passives are not uncommon in *Ptahhotep* in general—not an argument in itself. It may have been additionally favored by to the fact that passive *ꜥnḫ.tw* (with different semantics) recurs in several places in Middle Egyptian literature (*Sinuhe* B 236; *Loyaliste* 9.8; *Neferti* 5d;

---

74 Study: Vernus 1976.
75 Franke 2007b: 167-74.
76 Žába 1956: 96.

12d)[77]—not an argument either. Read for itself, *Ptahhotep* 447 is equally coherent under either interpretation: while interpretation (β) could find some weak support in the generalizing context of 446-448, interpretation (α) could find some weak support in the interplay of participants in the maxim, the superior and the addressee.[78] Noteworthy, on the other hand, is 410 *ʿnḫ sw ḫr=s* 'he lives through it', which, in a different context, has *ʿnḫ* in a *nfr sw* construction, as would be the case under interpretation (α). Also noteworthy is 403 L1, in context: 401-403 L1 [*i*]*m ḫr s33=k* [*ḫ*]*r km=f iw šsp r wḏwt sf nfr tw ḫr=s ʿnḫ* […] 'Cause your wisdom to fall upon its completion! For the image stands in relation to the orders of the merciful. You are good through it, alive […]'. In sum, while *Ptahhotep* 447 is not fully clear, interpretation (α) is probably to be preferred.

As the above passages collectively demonstrate, *tw* was being extended to non-agentive events by the mid-Twelfth Dynasty.

6.2.2.4 The second step of the change: *Tw* spreading to non-dynamic events

The construction just discussed comes close to the one in *Amenemhat* 11c-d, yet still differs from it: the *tw*-marked events in *Amenemhat* 11c-d—*ḫkr* 'be hungry', *ibi* 'be thirsty', and *ḥmsi* 'sit'—are not only non-agentive, they are also non-dynamic. While non-dynamicity necessarily implies the lack of an agentive argument in semantic representation, the reverse does not hold true: an event can lack an agent in its semantic representation, yet be dynamic, as in the examples above: *mwt* 'die', *ḥtm* 'perish', *ḫr* 'fall', *nšp* 'pant', *wrḏ* 'become weary' (§6.2.2.3, (i)-(iv)). Events that in addition to being non-agentive are also non-dynamic therefore lie one further step away from the semantic condition of passivization. This is schematically expressed in the following scale:

Events with an agent in their semantic representation (e.g. pri, spr)

Fully regular use with all inflectional passives (*tw*-passives and *sḏm*(*w*)-passives alike): §6.2.2.1, (i)-(ii).

(I) *Dynamic events lacking an agent in their semantic representation* (e.g. *mwt, ḥtm, ḫr, nšp, wrḏ*)

Extension of use of *tw*, by the mid-Twelfth Dynasty: §6.2.2.3.

(II) *Non-dynamic events* (e.g. *ḫkr, ibi, ḥmsi*)

Further extension of use of *tw*: the present section.

---

77 Of these, the first two are still agentive (§6.2.2.2, (v)-(vi)) and thereby different from *Ptahhotep* 447 if to be interpreted as under (β). For the two *Neferti* instances, below, §6.2.2.4, (x)-(xi).

78 *Ptahhotep* 441-448 *ḥms s3=k n ḥr-tp=k imi-r3=k n pr-nsw wnn pr=k mn ḥr ḥwt=f ḏb3w=k m st iry ḳsn pw itnw m ḥr-tp ʿnḫ tw tr n sft=f n ḫ3b.n ḳʿḥ n kft=f* 'Bow your back to *your superior, your overseer* in the palace. *Your* house will be enduring on *his* goods, your rewards be at their proper place. An opponent who is a *superior* is a painful situation: *you* are alive (/one lives only) for the time *he* is merciful. The arm of the one who uncovers himself can not bend(?).'

The overall change consisting in the accommodation of *tw* to events from which it was previously excluded is a process of extension. Extension is gradual, proceeding step by step to the next, semantically most closely related, event types. The increased distance to the condition of passivization expressed in the above scale thereby translates diachronically into a relative chronology of spread: when beginning to be extended to non-passivizable events, *tw* was first extended to dynamic events lacking an agent in their semantic representation (stage I), only subsequently to events that are not even dynamic (stage II).

This analysis is independently confirmed by an examination of the textual distribution of constructions bearing witness to stage II. Other than in *Amenemhat* 11c-d, early occurrences of *tw* with non-dynamic events (stage II) are the following, here presented by events:

Ḥḳr 'be hungry' (as in *Amenemhat* 11c *n ḥḳr.tw m rnpwt=i*):

(i) *Neferti* 9c

nn sḏr.tw ḥḳr n m(w)t

'the night will not be spent starving to death'

> *Ḥḳr*, a pseudoparticiple, is in a secondary predicate construction dependent on *tw* in the main clause and therefore relevant in the present context.

Ỉbi 'be thirsty' (as in *Amenemhat* 11c *n ib.tw im*):

(ii) *Ipuwer* 2.10

ib.tw mw

'one thirsts for water'

> Note the rare transitive construction of *ibi*.

Ḥmsi 'sit' (as in *Amenemhat* 11d *iw ḥms.tw m irt.n=i ḥr sḏdt im=i*):

(iii) *Ipuwer* 5.11

ḥms.tw ḥr bꜣwt

'one sits in bushes'

(iv) *Kheti* 25.3

iw ḥms.tw ḥnꜥ ksm-ẖt

'for one sits with the defiant man'

> Thus in all but two witnesses, one of which obviously corrupt.[79] The last editor of the text emends into {*iw*} *ḥms tw ḥnꜥ ksm ẖt* 'sondern sitze ruhig da und bezwinge dein Inneres.'[80] This is impossible on grounds of grammar. *Ḥnꜥ* + *infinitive* in continuation to an imperative is a Middle Egyptian construction, but with strong

---

79 Divergent are only O. DeM 1039 *iw ḥms=k* (...) and O. Tur. 57082 (...) {*m*}°*tw=k m ḥms ḥnꜥ* (...) or (...) *m*{°}*tw=k* {*m*} *ḥms* (...). That the latter is corrupt is immediate; for the former as secondary as well, see the discussion.

80 Jäger 2004: 114.

associations in terms of registers. The construction can be found in Middle Egyptian literary texts (§2.4.4.3, (ii)-(iii)), yet never in the maxims of any Middle Egyptian teachings: these always have subjunctive *sḏm=f* in similar function. The proposed emendation is also ruled out on contextual grounds, as it relies on the claim that a second person construction (either *iw<=k> ḥms.ti* or *ḥms tw*) should here be required. An examination of the context, however, demonstrates otherwise, with 25.3b parallel to 25.2b: both express general maxims after a negative imperative. A passive, not a second person, therefore fits this context. *Tw* is original in 25.3b just as it is in 25.2b:[81]

> 25.2 *m ḏd mdwt n ḥ3p*   *iw ḥ3p-ḫt ir=f n=f ikm*
> 25.3 *m ḏd mdwt n pr-ib*   *iw ḥms.tw ḥnꜥ ksm-ḫt*
>
> 'Do no speak words of secrecy; for the discrete man makes himself a shield.
> Do not speak words of recklessness; for one sits with the defiant man.'

(A different situation is in 6.3, where only two witnesses, P. Sallier II and O. Leipzig 20, have a passive form of *ḥmsi* (*iw ḥms.tw* and *ḥms.tw*, respectively). As the three anaphoric pronouns in 6.2 imply, 6.3 is itself phrased in the third person, not in the passive, thus *ḥms=f* (...).[82] In 6.3, unlike in 25.3, *ḥms.tw* is secondary.)

Sḏr 'lie':

(v) *Neferti* 9c

nn sḏr.tw ḥkr n m(w)t

'the night will not be spent starving to death'

G3w 'lack':

(vi) *Neferti* 7f

g3.tw ḫnrt

'a stronghold will be lacking'

> Note the transitive construction of *g3w*.[83]

(vii) *Loyaliste* (long version), 9.9

g3w/g3y.tw r=s sḫm šw3ww

'when one lacks it, poverty reigns'

(viii) *Hymn* 5.2

nn g3y.tw r=s

'without one lacking it'

---

81 Similarly Vernus 2010²b: 250; Dils, *TLA*.
82 Similarly Jäger 2004: 134, who however wrongly reads *iw ḥms=f* (*iw* only in P. Sallier II): the construction is 'emphatic', with initial *ḥms=f*.
83 Kammerzell 1986: 106, n.33c.

Šw 'be free of':

(ix) *Ipuwer* 10.6

nn šw.tw m [...]

'one will not be free of [...]'

NB 1. In the following constructions of *ꜥnḫ*, the event is non-agentive but it remains unclear whether it is also non-dynamic:

> (x) *Neferti* 5d
>
> *nn ꜥnḫ.tw ḥbs šnꜥ*
>
> 'one will not stay alive when clouds cover'
>
> (xi) *Neferti* 12d
>
> *ꜥnḫ.tw m ẖrt-nṯr*
>
> 'one will live in the necropolis'

Unlike the instances of *ꜥnḫ m* 'live on' discussed above (§6.2.2.2, (v)-(vi)), the events of 'living' here do not imply an agent in their semantic representation. They therefore bear evidence to stage I having been reached by the time *Neferti* was composed. Whether the events of *ꜥnḫ*'ing in *Neferti* 5d and 12d are also non-dynamic, thereby possibly bearing witness to stage II, remains unclear. This is because *ꜥnḫ* can be construed both dynamically and non-dynamically in Egyptian, compare e.g. Pyr. §1724a[PM] *ꜥnḫ ꜥnḫ.ti it wsir N m rn=k pw ẖr nṯrw* 'Live, be alive, father Osiris N, in this name of yours by the gods!' (*ꜥnḫ* dynamic (and agentive) in the imperative, then non-dynamic in the pseudoparticiple as a stative pendant to the imperative).

NB 2. In the following passage, uncertainty comes from an unstable text:

> (xii) *Hymn* 12.2 (about half of mss., e.g. O. DeM 1176 ro)
>
> *ḫr s33.tw m inw š3w*
>
> 'then one is sated with the products of the fields.'

The manuscript tradition is split, roughly evenly, between readings as *s33.tw* and as *s33*(=)*sn* (in details, §3.4.2.1). Accordingly, *Hymn* 12.2 *s33.tw* can not be used as evidence for dating the composition of *Hymn* itself. Just as in *Kheti* 6.3 ((iv), *fine*), this passage only shows that a construction *s33.tw* was acceptable to New Kingdom scribes—hardly a new result by this stage.

As the above collection demonstrates, there is no single occurrence of *tw* with a non-dynamic event in any text securely dated to the Twelfth Dynasty, let alone to the earlier part thereof. All occurrences of the construction other than the ones in *Amenemhat* are from compositions that based on independent linguistic grounds have a solid terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty, or later:

Neferti ((i), (v), (vi); also (x)-(xi)?)—dating, §5:

- *tw r sḏm*: *ante quem non* by the late Twelfth Dynasty (§5.2);

- *tw sḏm*: type-B *ante quem non* by the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (§5.3);

- various further indications for a yet later dating (§5.5-6);

Ipuwer ((ii), (iii), (ix))—dating below, §6.2.2.5:

- *NP ḥr sḏm* used with non-progressive events: *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty, or late Twelfth at the earliest (§2.6.2.4);

- various further indications for a dating no earlier than the early Thirteenth Dynasty (§6.2.2.5);

Kheti (iv)—dating below, §6.2.2.6:

- *tw sḏm*: type-B *ante quem non* by the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (§5.3.2.2);

- *ist + progressive construction* before the main clause: *ante quem non* by the Second Intermediate Period, exact parallels only in the early Eighteenth Dynasty (§6.2.2.6.2);

Loyaliste, long version (vii)—dating, §4.5:

On compositional grounds, the long version of *Loyaliste* (*Kairsu*) is secondary to the short one (*Sehetepibre*) (§4.5.5). At least one construction in the first part of *Kairsu* points to an early Eighteenth Dynasty date for the section in which it is found (§4.5.2). Further indications in the second part of *Kairsu* also suggest a late dating for various sections thereof (§4.5.3). Whether the whole long version was composed at once can not be demonstrated on linguistic grounds.

Hymn to Hapi ((viii); also (xii)?)—dating, §3.4:

- *sw m N* in a balanced context: *ante quem non* by the late Seventeenth Dynasty (§3.4.1);

- *ḥr-sḏm=f* in the second member of a correlative system: *ante quem non* to the same period (§3.4.2);

- *tw sḏm*: type-B *ante quem non* by the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (§5.3.2.1);

- one further indication suggesting an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon (§3.4.4).

6.2.2.5 Digression: Notes on *Ipuwer*

The construction here under discussion recurs three times in *Ipuwer* (2.10 *ib.tw*; 5.11 *ḥms.tw*; 10.6 *šw.tw*): a note on *Ipuwer* is therefore in order. *Ipuwer* is the composition on which the debate on dating first inflamed half a century ago, when against the then prevalent First Intermediate Period dating one to the Second Intermediate Period was proposed.[84] Redactionalist approaches, developing at roughly the same time, have now been rejected by most authors.[85] In recent times, the late Middle Kingdom (late Twelfth to mid-Thirteenth Dynasty) has been favored, notably based on institutional

---

84 Van Seters 1964, based on an analysis of historical detail and context; now also van Seters 2013; pursuing this tradition in a more strongly archeological perspective, Raue 2010, particularly 80-1.

85 Summary and critical discussion by Enmarch 2008: 9-18; in more general terms, also Parkinson 2002: 16.

analysis.[86] Most often mentioned are *ḫnrt* 'labor enclosure' (6.10) and *ḫnrt wr* 'great labor enclosure' (6.12).[87] The latter is not documented before the reign of Senwosret III,[88] which has been taken as a terminus *ante quem non* for *Ipuwer*. By the same token, a terminus *post quem non* before the early New Kingdom is generally considered to be established, as *ḫnrt wr* is last documented in a directly referential usage in a securely dated text by the Seventeenth Dynasty (*Stèle Juridique* 12).[89] However, the expression recurs, if perhaps not any more in a directly referential usage, in *Duties of the Vizier* R 14 (*Urk.* IV 1109, 3),[90] a composition that on linguistic grounds was argued to date to the time of the Aametju-User-Rekhmire vizieral dynasty (§2.8.3.5); simple *ḫnrt*, for its part, is not uncommonly found in the New Kingdom.[91] Other institutions mentioned in *Ipuwer*—notably *ḥwwt wrt* 'great domains' (6.12) and *imi-rꜣ niwt* 'overseer of the city' (10.7)—are 'compatible with a late Middle Kingdom or Second Intermediate Period dating',[92] yet both recur for example in the titularies of early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty viziers.[93] Illustrating how brittle a terminus *post quem non* to the later Second Intermediate Period would be, both *ḫnrt wr* and *ḥwwt wrt* are from 6.12, a line that also has *pr-hꜣ=f* 'bustling activity', here with a contextual interpretation as 'commotion': this expression is paralleled closely only in *Speos Artemidos* 23 (*Urk.* IV 387, 13),[94] an inscription that is itself contemporaneous with documented occurrences of both *ḫnrt wr* and *ḥwwt wrt*.

Despite the length of the composition, a linguistic dating of *Ipuwer* remains difficult.[95] The sole preserved manuscript, P. Leiden I 344 ro, is late (probably later Nineteenth Dynasty)[96] and the text is at times unstable (compare for example the difficulties encountered in interpreting the Ipuwerean construction *N sḏm.tw*: §2.3.4.2.1). The composition itself is densely intertextual and relies heavily on a limited set of recurrent grammatical expressions: both factors reduce linguistic distinctiveness. In lieu of a full-fledged linguistic analysis of *Ipuwer*, yet to be provided, the following notes are mainly aimed at establishing a broad terminus *ante quem non* for the composition, as is relevant to the diachronic appreciation of the linguistic change discussed in the present section. As regards a terminus *post quem non*, the consistent Middle Egyptian linguistic register in a literary composition strongly

---

86 E.g. Quirke 2004a: 140; similarly Enmarch 2008: 18-24, including a discussion of linguistic elements (see below). Quirke 2004a: 140 also mentions the name 'Ipuwer' as pointing to a Middle Kingdom dating; see however Enmarch 2008: 29.

87 Initially van Seters 1964: 18.

88 Quirke 1988: 96-7.

89 Enmarch 2008: 21.

90 Van den Boorn 1988: 125-8 and *passim*; Quirke 1988: 98; 2004b: 94.

91 Van den Boorn 1988: 126-7 and n.27.

92 Enmarch 2008: 21.

93 For the former, see Hagen 2012a: 223-4, 226.

94 Gardiner 1909: 51. *Pr-hꜣ=f* is of course not meant as a criterion for dating *Ipuwer* either, as the pattern of attestation of the expression remains all too slim. For related yet different expressions, common in earlier times already, Borghouts 1994: 28.

95 Various notes by Winand 2013: 86-8; Oréal 2011: 138, n.81; Enmarch 2008: 20-1; Vernus 1990a: 188-90; 1990b: 1044-5, n.25; see below.

96 Enmarch 2005: 10.

speaks against any post-mid/late Eighteenth Dynasty dating of *Ipuwer*, or of parts thereof. So do individual expressions (e.g. (i) and (ii) below).

(i) *Passim*, *NP ḥr sḏm* weakened into a general relative present tense[97]

By Vernus' aspectual *ante quem non* criterion (§2.6.2), this implies a terminus *ante quem non* to the early Thirteenth Dynasty, or late Twelfth at the very earliest.

> NB. Only a subset of all instances of *NP ḥr sḏm* in *Ipuwer* are relevant for dating because most are from the lament, in contexts in which the temporal articulation is based on the 'Sonst-Jetzt' schema. In these, *NP ḥr sḏm* expresses progressive aspect, as it already did in earlier times. Compare the discussion above, §2.6.2.4.

(ii) *Ipuwer* 4.11-12 *nfr pw pẖrt iry* 'There is no remedy thereto'[98]

The *nfr pw* negation[99] is first attested in late Twelfth Dynasty documentary registers, then continuously until the Eighteenth Dynasty. In literary registers, the expression recurs only once, in *Cheops' Court*, significantly in a maidservant's speech (11.23) (§2.4.4.1.C; §2.4.4.7.A).[100] The presence of *nfr pw* in *Ipuwer* therefore suggests a terminus *ante quem non* by the Thirteenth Dynasty.

(iii) *Ipuwer* 4.6 *ptr nt<t> tw r irt* 'What shall one do?'[101]

Nty/ntt tw r sḏm is first attested in late Twelfth Dynasty documentary registers, then in an early Thirteenth Dynasty royal inscription modeled on legal registers, and was to become standard in later times (§5.2.4). The reading in 4.6 is probably original.[102] In a literary register, this is suggestive of a dating no earlier than the early Thirteenth Dynasty and excludes a dating before the late Twelfth Dynasty (§5.2).

(iv) *Ipuwer* 3.8 *r-mn-m kftiw n ii.n=sn* 'From as far as Crete(?) they (*scil.* pine and oil) do not come'[103]

The preposed construction of a prepositional phrase expressing extension is directly paralleled only in *Khakheperreseneb* ro 6-7 *šꜣꜥ-r ẖt tpt nfryt-r iww ḥr-sꜣ sny=sn r swꜣt*

---

97 Vernus 1990a: 188-90; 1990b: 1044-5, n.25.

98 Noted by Enmarch 2008: 21.

99 Study: Brose 2009.

100 On *Ipuwer* 4.11-12 possibly alluding to *Cheops' Court* 11.23-24, Enmarch 2008: 102.

101 Noted by Enmarch 2008: 98.

102 As noted by Enmarch 2008: 98, similar rhetorical questions are in 3.7 *ptr irti=n r ꜥšw n sꜥḥw=n* (...) 'What will we do about pines for our mummies (...)' and 3.13 *ptr irt=n r=s* (...) 'What will we do about it (...)'. This is no indication of a secondariness of 4.6, since contexts partly differ: in 3.7, the first person plural pronoun is also used later in the clause. *Tw* in 4.6 may also point to 'a lower linguistic register (...), possibly indicating greater urgency in the speaker's discourse' (Enmarch 2008: 98).

103 This passage has been the subject of debate (Enmarch 2008: 88-9 with a critical review of previous proposals); I follow the reading argued for by Enmarch on convincing semantic grounds (similar interpretation already in Vernus 1995a: 14, n.q). (NB: In 2006-2007, when his manuscript was submitted, Enmarch also argued that a reading of *r-mn-m* as *rmnn* 'Lebanon' is unlikely because this toponym is undocumented before Thutmosis III. This argument, in itself a weak one, does not hold any more, as two early instances of *rmnn* 'Lebanon' have now surfaced in Khnumhotep III's inscription in Dahshur (*temp*. Senwosret III), 3A5 and 3D2 (Allen 2008: 11, 13). Other parts of Enmarch's argument remains unaffected by this new find.)

'From the first generation to the ones that come afterward, they imitate what has passed.' Related constructions are found in the early Eighteenth Dynasty (§2.7.3.2.B, (viii)-(x)). The dating of *Khakheperreseneb* itself remains uncertain (early Thirteenth – early Eighteenth Dynasty: §2.7.4).

(v) *Ipuwer* 12.4 *ḥw-ny-r-ḥr* 'combat'

The expression is found in only one other literary text, in *Amenemhat* 7b. In the non-literary record, it is not documented before the Eighteenth Dynasty. For reasons discussed in details below, the expression was certainly not innovated before the late Middle Kingdom; for related reasons, the expression does not easily arise in the course of textual transmission and is therefore most likely to be original in *Ipuwer* (§6.3.2.2).

(vi) *Ipuwer* 7.1 and *passim*, *mṯn is*

The combination of *mk* with *is*, recurrent in *Ipuwer* 7.1-9.7 and beyond,[104] may be documented only twice in the Middle Kingdom, both times in magical texts (P. Turin N. 54003 vso 19; P. Ramesseum IV C 12-15).[105] It is, on the other hand, fairly common in the early New Kingdom, in various types of texts such as Hetep's Letter to Ipuresti,[106] in the tomb of the High Priest Amenemhat (TT 97), or in Horemheb's *Decree*.[107] From the same period, another example is Rekhmire 10 (*Urk.* IV 1074, 11) *mk is irty=i ḥr hꜣb=i n ḥꜣty=i* 'For, see, my eyes are sending me to my heart.' It has been proposed that this clustering of occurrences in the Eighteenth Dynasty may be indicative of a late date of composition of the relevant sections in *Ipuwer*.[108]

(vii) *Ipuwer* 12.14 *in-iw rf mniw mr m(w)t* 'What does it mean, a shepherd who loves death?' *or*: 'Is that really a shepherd, the one who loves death?'[109]

Under either interpretation, *in-iw* is the compound interrogative particle. While documented in emphatic constructions in earlier times, this spreads to non-verbal clauses only in the Second Intermediate Period and becomes more common only in the Eighteenth Dynasty.[110] Under the second interpretation, the pattern is of the *A ø* type, itself not securely documented before the New Kingdom.[111]

---

104 Enmarch 2008: 151-2; for a semantic analysis of the combination in *Ipuwer*, Oréal 2011: 138.
105 Oréal 2011: 138 and n.79.
106 Text: Buchberger 1991.
107 References in Oréal 138 and n.80-1. In *A Man* 3.5, also quoted by Oréal, the text is unstable.
108 Oréal 2011: 138, n.81 (under a redactionalist perspective for *Ipuwer*): 'Il est à noter que l'appartenance commune de plusieurs de ces exemples représente un indice en faveur d'une datation dans la XVIIIᵉ dynastie du passage concerné des *Admonitions*, dont la composition diachroniquement hétérogène à partir d'un noyau ancien est d'ailleurs considérée comme probable.'
109 These interpretations are discussed by Winand 2013, who concludes that both are possible. The author also convincingly argues that alternative interpretations that have been proposed (to the ones mentioned by Winand, add Quack 2004: 359) are problematic, either grammatically or semantically. The passage shows some hesitation by the scribe, also discussed by Winand.
110 Winand 2013: 86, 88.
111 Winand 2013: 87-8.

(viii) *Ipuwer* 12.14 *ḥr k3 wḏ=k irt wšb* 'And then you should order the making of an answer.'

The combination of *ḥr* and *k3* is to my knowledge unique. It is most naturally interpreted as consisting in *k3 sḏm=f* preceded by *ḥr* with connective force. While *k3 sḏm=f* is common both in the Twelfth and in the Eighteenth Dynasty, the particle *ḥr* can be made to precede virtually any construction in Late Egyptian.[112] If so, an indication for an early New Kingdom dating of *Ipuwer* could be given. Under the hypothesis of a pre-New Kingdom dating of *Ipuwer*, either *ḥr* or *k3* must then have been secondarily inserted in 12.14: this is not impossible in view of the date of P. Leiden I 344 ro.

> NB. It has been suggested that analytic strategies for relativizing verbal clauses, not uncommon in *Ipuwer*, could be an indication for a dating to the late Middle Kingdom or Second Intermediate Period.[113] Diachronically, analytic (i.e. *nty*-marked) strategies for relativizing verbal clauses were to supersede synthetic ones (i.e. participial constructions and relative forms). Yet, the process was gradual, proceeding at different paces depending on various environments. Cases of analytic verbal relativization in *Ipuwer* are: (a) negative, *nty n sḏm=f* (6.13); (b) with non-dynamic semantics, *nty pseudoparticiple* (2.2; 3.14; 5.1); and (c) with the analytic future, *nty r sḏm* (4.6; 14.12). For all of these, instances of analytic verbal relativization are documented in literary texts securely dated to the Twelfth Dynasty, compare: for (a), e.g. *Shipwrecked Sailor* 73 *nty n m3.t(w)=f* 'one who has not been seen'; for (b), e.g. *Debate* 49 *ky b3 nty ḥkr* 'another soul which is hungry'; for (c), e.g. *Ptahhotep* 50 *nty r tht st* 'who will transgress them'. That in all cases analytic verbal relativization strategies develop early is explained on semantic and functional grounds. *Nty pseudoparticiple* (b) expresses non-dynamicity in more explicit ways than a mere participle would do. Although the details are still poorly understood, a similar semantic explanation probably accounts for the comparatively early development of *nty r sḏm* (c). As regards (a), the early development of analytic relativization with negative events has to do with processing, which is always more difficult with negative than with positive events, and is eased by an analytic strategy (as opposed to a synthetic one, here with *tm*).

In the above, (i) is a full-fledged argument, individually implying a terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty, or the late Twelfth at the very earliest. A terminus *ante quem non* to the Thirteenth Dynasty is confirmed by (ii) and (iii). The expression in (iv) also speaks to such terminus, perhaps even to a later one depending on when *Khakheperreseneb* is dated; similar comments extend to (v). The expressions in (vi)-(viii) could be interpreted as suggestive of a yet later date of composition, but the indications they provide remain too weak to support any firm conclusion. Pending a fuller study of the linguistic typology of *Ipuwer*, a range for dating comprising the period from the early Thirteenth Dynasty to the mid-Eighteenth is therefore proposed.

---

112 See Neveu 2001.
113 Enmarch 2008: 21.

6.2.2.6 Digression: Notes on *Kheti*

The construction here under discussion, *tw* with non-dynamic events, also recurs in *Kheti* (25.3 *ḥms.tw*), where it is original (§6.2.2.4, (iv)). In appreciating the rise of the construction with a view on dating *Amenemhat*, a brief discussion of *Kheti* is therefore required as well. The *Teaching of Kheti*[114] is documented from the Eighteenth Dynasty on, in various papyri, two writing boards, three ostraca, and two graffiti in the tomb Assiut N13.1.[115] Of these, T. Louvre 693 dates to the beginning or middle part of the Dynasty, while O. Senmut 147 and 148 were found by the tomb of Senenmut; Assiut graffiti 3a (with the beginning of the composition, *Kheti* 1-6) and 3b (with its end, *Kheti* 30)[116] await paleographical analysis.

The composition is commonly dated to the early Twelfth Dynasty.[117] This is based on a reading of the text in relation to an educational model of early Twelfth Dynasty literature, the Ramesside ascription of *Amenemhat* to a literary figure 'Kheti', and the additional understanding that *Amenemhat* should date to the events it refers to.[118] Pointing to encounters in phrasing, contents, and structure with *A Man to His Son* and *Loyaliste*, it has been suggested that these compositions and *Kheti* could have formed a scribal curriculum composed in successive stages during the reign of Senwosret I.[119] A dating to the late First Intermediate Period has also been proposed, based on one passage in Siut IV supposedly resonating with *Kheti*.[120] A linguistic argument has been voiced that *Kheti* should have been composed before the mid-Twelfth Dynasty.[121]

Yet, the dating of *Amenemhat* to the early Twelfth Dynasty is itself an hypothesis only, contingent upon a directly referential reading of that composition. The literary figure 'Kheti' must be interpreted in its Ramesside context and can not support a dating of any composition.[122] The interpretation of *Kheti* in relation to an educational context has a long Egyptological tradition, but is uncertain.[123] Among texts resonating with *Kheti*, *A Man to His Son* has a linguistic terminus *ante quem non* by the late Twelfth Dynasty (§2.6.2.6.B; §2.6.2.7.B). The long version of *Loyaliste*, which is most relevant for comparison with *Kheti*, is in some parts at least late (§4.5). As to the linguistic argument proposed for an early dating, the relevant constructions in *Kheti* are demonstrably integral to the original text (§2.3.3), but the criterion itself only implies a terminus *post quem non* to the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty (§2.6.3), later there-

---

114 Text: Jäger 2004. 'Kheti' was conclusively identified as the teaching authority by Verhoeven 2010: 196, putting a long lasting debate to rest.

115 Detailed presentation: Widmaier 2013: §2.1.

116 Verhoeven 2013: §4.

117 Detailed presentation and reflection of the Forschungsgeschichte by Widmaier 2013: §1.

118 References in Widmaier 2013: §1.1; Jäger 2004: 189.

119 Fischer-Elfert 1999: 381-99, elaborating on observations initially made by Posener 1956: 117-41.

120 Jäger 2004: 189-91. The passage is Siut IV 66-67; for this, further Widmaier 2013: §1.2, with n.68-70.

121 Vernus 1990a: 185.

122 From various perspectives, Widmaier 2013: §1.1; Gnirs 2013b: 130-2; Simon 2013: 264-5, 266-71; Moers 2009; 2008; Quirke 2004a: 31-3; in the present study also §3.4.5.C and §5.1.3.1.A.

123 With a detailed discussion of the Forschungsgeschichte, Widmaier 2013: §1.2. Critically on educational contexts for literature, also Hagen 2006; Parkinson 2002: 235-41 (in general), 273-7 (for *Kheti* specifically).

fore than the first manuscript attestation of the composition. Accordingly, *Kheti* is presently undated.[124] Significantly, the most recent study of the composition renounces dating altogether and focuses instead on interpreting the text in relation to the New Kingdom contexts in which it was surely read and circulated.[125]

Some marginal notes on what language can contribute to the issue are here presented. Like for *Ipuwer*, these do not provide a full linguistic study of the text and are only aimed at establishing a broad terminus *ante quem non* as is relevant to the diachronic appreciation of the linguistic change discussed in the present section (§6.2). A linguistic analysis of *Kheti* is hampered by the often technical vocabulary, the limited variety in grammatical constructions, and the state of preservation of the text. As regards the last, the transmitted text is in many ways linguistically late, in orthography (e.g. 20.2 *ḥl* (<*ẖȝnr*>) for ancient *ḥȝ*[126]) and in grammar (e.g. *ḥr* routinely before *wnn* in most Ramesside witnesses in 8.3; 10.2; 13.3; 19.5; 22.1).[127] Several such features can be identified as secondary, either on internal grounds or by comparison with Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses where such are preserved (e.g. T. Louvre 693 in 22.1, without *ḥr*[128]). Yet, this often still falls short of providing a reliable sense of what the original text was, thereby reducing the amount of text available for linguistic analysis. On the other hand, various important elements can also be shown not to be secondary, thus, among constructions already discussed in other contexts: the distribution of *N(P) sḏm=f* and *NP ḥr sḏm* throughout *Kheti* (§2.3.3); *tw sḏm* in 3.5-6 (§5.3.2.2); *ḥms.tw* (original in 25.3, secondary in 6.3 in the two manuscripts in which it occurs: §6.2.2.4, (iv)). Some discussion of the linguistic typology of *Kheti* is therefore possible.

6.2.2.6.1 *Kheti* 3.5-6 (...) *tw nḏ-ḥrt=f tw hȝb=f* (...)

A. The construction *tw sḏm* was argued above to point to a terminus *ante quem non* by the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (§5.3). As also discussed, the construction is integral to the original text of *Kheti* (§5.3.2.2). The *ante quem non* is a type-B one: the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty is not necessarily the earliest moment in time in which the construction became possible, but only the earliest for which based on the evidence available it can not be excluded any more that it may have been possible. The actual innovation may have taken place later between the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty and late Second intermediate Period (§5.7.1.1.C; §5.7.1.2.C).

B. Thus far goes the argument when strictly indexed on what can be described of ongoing linguistic change—with the conditioning possibility for the de facto literary construction *tw sḏm* (§5.3.3) being related to the rise of the higher-order and not exclusively literary *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm* (§5.3.4-5). On an explicitly more speculative level, the very literary nature of *tw sḏm* deserves a comment of its own. Beyond *Kheti*, the

---

124 Similarly already Parkinson 1997a: 274.

125 Widmaier 2013.

126 For *ḥl* as a late orthography, e.g. K*RI* II 362, 1; in manuscripts of a Middle Egyptian composition, *ḥl* also e.g. in *A Man* 19.12.

127 On *ḥr wnn* in Late Egyptian, Neveu 2001: 67-78.

128 Jäger 2004: 104; Burkard 1977: 107. For a case of *ḥr wnn* identified as secondary on internal grounds, e.g. *Kheti* 8.3 (§5.3.2.2, (i)).

construction recurs in *Hymn to Hapi* and *Neferti*, and only in these (§5.3.1-2). The former composition was argued above to date to the late Seventeenth/early Eighteenth Dynasty (§3.4); for the latter, no such precise dating could be obtained based on full criteria strictly indexed on ongoing linguistic change but various additional indications concur in suggesting that the early Eighteenth Dynasty is the most likely period of composition (§5.5-6; §5.7.2). In all three compositions in which *tw sḏm* occurs, this involves at least one instance of *tw nḏ-ḥrt* 'one is greeting', arguably a literary trope (§5.3.3). The presence of *tw sḏm* in *Hymn to Hapi*, *Neferti*, and *Kheti*, and only in these, could then be interpreted as an element of a literary horizon shared by these three compositions.

Under the hypothesis of a pre-New Kingdom date of composition of *Kheti*, a scenario must then be contemplated by which this composition (or another one now lost) would have been the first to innovate *tw sḏm*; *tw nḏ ḥrt* would then have become a literary trope when subsequently taken up in *Hymn to Hapi* and *Neferti*. This is very unlikely in view of the thorough-going integration of the construction *tw sḏm* in the large-scale temporal articulation of *Neferti* (§5.3.1.3). There is therefore some likelihood in the hypothesis associating *tw sḏm* with a late Seventeenth/early Eighteenth Dynasty literary horizon. This is no proof, however: as noted in another context, assessing how compact or extended in time elements of a literary tradition may have been remains difficult in general (§5.1.3.2-3). In the present case, the situation is more favorable because a literary trope (*tw nḏ ḥrt*) here involves a grammatical construction (*tw sḏm*) that is itself highly specific. Even so, no full certainty can be achieved.

6.2.2.6.2 *Kheti* 1.3 *ist rf sw m ḫntyt* (...)

After the title, *Kheti* has a brief opening narrative, the first clause of which is remarkable on various accounts.

> *Kheti* 1.1-2.1
> *ḫꜣti-ꜥ m sbꜣyt irt.n s n ṯꜣrt dwꜣ=f sꜣ ḫty rn=f n sꜣ=f ppi*
> *ist rf sw m ḫntyt r ḫnw r rḏt=f m ꜥt-sbꜣ nt sšw m-ḳꜣb msw srw imiw-ḥꜣt nt ḫnw*
> *ꜥḥꜥ.n ḏd.n=f n=f* (...)
>
> 'Beginning of the teaching made by a man of Sile(?), Duaf's son Kheti by name, to his son Pepi.
>
> Now, he was travelling upstream to the Residence to put him into the school of scribes in the midst of the children of the foremost officials of the Residence.
>
> He then said to him: (...)'

A. *Ist rf* is well documented in Middle Kingdom narrative literature (e.g. *Sinuhe* R 11; B 268; *Eloquent Peasant* B1 102). In these texts, the expression serves to introduce a new segment of text, linking this to and simultaneously detaching it from what precedes, in ways that vary depending on individual contexts.[129] Against this background, the use in *Kheti* 1.3—at the very beginning of the 'micro-narrative', not

---

129 Oréal 2011: 235-8.

relating to any preceding segment—stands out. What comes closest to it in Middle Kingdom narrative literature is *Sinuhe* R 11 *ist rf sb.n ḥm=f* (...) 'Now, His Majesty had sent (...)'. Although near the beginning of the tale, this already follows a preceding segment of narrative text, the royal apotheosis and courtly mourning (R 5-11). In *Kheti* by contrast, *ist rf* directly follows the title: it does not provide a textual 'pivot' with respect to some preceding segment, as there is none.

Ist in absolute initial position is, on the other hand, found in early Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptions.[130] This use—the result of a development the steps of which can be traced—seems to be an innovation of that time.[131] In the early Eighteenth Dynasty, *ist rf* can thus be used to launch a narrative, as in Ahmose's *Tempest Stela*[132] where it occurs just after the royal titulary (which in effect functions as a title):

(i) Ahmose's *Tempest Stela* ro 1-3/vso 1-4 (H*HBT* I 104-105, 1/2)

ḥr ꜥ3-ḫprw (...) *ꜥnḫ ḏt*	titulary
s[t][a] *rf iwt*[b] *ḥm=f* [...] (...)	*st* (with an event of directed
ist grt ḥms.n ḥm=f (...)	motion, compare *Kheti* 1.3)
ist rf i[mn ...] (...)	
in ḥm=f ḫnt (...)	structurally, compare *Kheti* 2.1

'Horus Aakkheperu (...) living forever.

Now His Majesty's coming [...] (...)

Now His Majesty sat down (...)

Now Amun (...)

His Majesty sailed upstream (...)'

a) *St*[133] is here a mere variant spelling of *ist*, distinguished from the following two for stylistic effect (compare the sequence *st rf ... ist grt ... ist rf ...*).[134]

b) The presence of an infinitive after *st* is remarkable as *st* otherwise serves to introduce finite constructions only. The construction is interpreted as a hybrid, combining *st* with the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive, both of which are paragraph-initial constructions and thereby otherwise mutually exclusive; see further §4.4.2.2, (ii).

One is tempted, therefore, to relate *ist rf* in *Kheti* 1.3 directly to such uses in early Eighteenth Dynasty inscriptions. Before doing so, however, one must contemplate the possibility that *Kheti*, a literary text, could here be displaying an extended use of *ist*,

---

130 Oréal 2011: 243-4.

131 Oréal 2011: 242-3.

132 Noted by Oréal 2011: 244.

133 In view of the following infinitive (*iwt*), the possibility has been discussed that *ḫft*, not *st*, should be read here (Wiener & Allen 1998: 6, evoking this as an hypothesis then dismissed): this is ruled out by the fact that *ḫft* + infinitive can not begin a text; accordingly, *st* must to be read (similarly Beylage 2002: 80; Klug 2002: 37; Wiener & Allen themselves).

134 For such sequences of *ist*-headed clauses after what functionally amounts to a title, e.g. Thutmosis IV's *Sphinx Stela* (*Urk.* IV 1541, 1; 1541, 8; 1541, 16; 1542, 5).

going beyond what is otherwise documented in Middle Egyptian literature.[135] Accordingly, the argument must be strengthened by further analysis.

B. In *Kheti* 1.3, text-initial *isṯ* is followed by a progressive construction, in the form that befits *ḫnti*, as *NP m ḫntyt* (*isṯ rf sw m ḫntyt*). A different construction is found in the Twelfth Dynasty:

> (ii) *Sinuhe* R 15-16
>
> *ti sw ḥm ii=f in.n=f sḳrw-ꜥnḫ n ṯḥnw mnmnt nbt nn ḏrw=s*
> *smrw nw stp-s(ꜣ) hꜣb=sn r-gs imnty (...)*
>
> 'Now, he was coming back having gotten prisoners from Tjehenu and all sorts of cattle without number;
> The companions of the Palace, they sent to the western side (...)'

In (ii), the event after *isṯ* is ongoing, as in *Kheti* 1.3. Yet the aspectually unmarked *N(P) sḏm=f*—not a marked progressive construction, as in *Kheti* 1.3—is used.[136] This finds an explanation along the following lines. *NP ḥr sḏm*, an 'extensive unaccomplished', can only be used when some frame is given to which this aspectual 'extension' can be related. *Ꞌsṯ*, on the other hand, has backgrounding functions in the Middle Kingdom. In a textually backgrounded clause, the aspectual 'extension' expressed by *NP ḥr sḏm* must then be related to some event in the preceding discourse. Significantly, *NP ḥr sḏm* can occur in *isṯ*-headed clauses in the Middle Kingdom, but only when these follow the textually foregrounded clause to which they relate:

> (iii) Hammamat 192 (*temp.* Mentuhotep IV), 20-21
>
> (...) *rḫs bḥsw sft ꜥnḫw ḏ snṯr ḥr sdt*
> *isṯ mšꜥ n 3000 m ḫnww spꜣwt tꜣ-mḥw ḥr šms=f m ḥtp r tꜣ-mri*
>
> '(...) Veals were slaughtered, goats butchered, incense put on the fire.
> Meanwhile, an expedition of 3000 sailors of the nomes of Upper Egypt was following him in peace to Egypt.'

Against this background, the construction *sw m ḫntyt* in *Kheti* 1.3 is odd. This can not be explained in relation to event-semantics or Aktionsart: just like *Sinuhe* R 15-16, *Kheti* 1.3 is with an event of directed motion, also with telic Aktionsart (*ḫnti*, *iwi*);

---

135 Oréal (2011: 235) discusses *Kheti* 1.3 in the section devoted to Middle Kingdom narrative literature, without however arguing why the passage should relate to these rather than to later usages documented in the inscriptional sphere (the author's discussion only bears on the understanding of *Kheti* 1.3 in context, also with a view on the presence of *rf* after *isṯ*). Oréal's classification may have been based on types of written discourses, treating literary texts as a group.

136 There are of course also other instances of *isṯ*-headed clauses with *N(P) sḏm=f* in Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian that do not lend themselves to a progressive interpretation. Compare Wepwawetaa, Munich Gl. WAF 35, 15-16 *isṯ wi ḫd=i r nḏ ḫrt* (...) *ḫtmtyw* (...) *ḥr mꜣꜣ stꜣ=i r pr-nsw* (...) 'I used to fare downstream to pay homage (...); The sealers (...) were watching me being introduced to the palace (...)'. In a construction formally similar to the one in *Sinuhe* R 15-16, the interpretation is here habitual, not progressive. That the same construction can be interpreted as progressive or habitual accords with the aspectually unmarked nature of *N(P) sḏm=f*. The interpretation is a context-based one: as *Sinuhe* R 15-16, also with a telic event (*iwi*), demonstrates, the telic Aktionsart of the event (*ḫdi*) plays no role (*pace* Malaise & Winand 1999: 507, ex.1344).

yet, only the latter has a progressive construction. As also discussed, the reading in *Kheti* 1.3 can not be accounted for as textually secondary: *N(P) sḏm=f* is stable in this text and the progressive construction in 1.3 thereby original (§2.3.3). The progressive construction in *Kheti* 1.3 can not, therefore, be accounted for under a Middle King-dom dating of this composition.

C. In early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty Middle Egyptian, things have changed: *NP ḥr sḏm* is now found after *ist*, not only in clauses that follow the clause they relate to,[137] but also in such that precede it. This innovation is interpreted in relation to broader changes affecting the functions of *ist*, which can now launch the narrative (compare above, (i) and *Kheti* 1.1-2.1 itself), or a new section thereof. In such text- or paragraph-initial uses, *ist*-headed clauses have acquired a more autonomous status, not directly dependent on another clause. *NP ḥr sḏm* can be used in such contexts because the aspectual 'extension' it expresses is not related to some other segment of discourse (contrast with B) but measured with respect to the semantics of the event itself, as ongoing.

This is illustrated by the following examples. Both have *ist NP ḥr sḏm* before the clause this relates to, as in *Kheti* 1.3-2.1. In addition, the first example illustrates the broader sequence of tenses *ist NP ḥr sḏm – ꜥḥꜥ.n sḏm.n=f*, as in *Kheti* 1.3-2.1. The second illustrates *ist NP ḥr sḏm* after a title (here the infinitive), as in *Kheti* 1.1-3; that it further has *NP m ḫntyt*, as *Kheti* 1.3 itself has, is almost anecdotal at this point.

(iv) *Urk*. IV 842, 16-17 (inscription on a column of Thutmosis III in Karnak)

st pꜣy{t} ḥr wꜣyt r ḫpr im=sn
ꜥḥꜥ.n smnḫ.n st ḥm=i m inr n rwḏt (...)

'Now, this was about to happen to them.
My Majesty then perfected it with sandstone (...)'

(v) Amenhotep II's *Syrian Campaigns* (Memphis Stela), 13-14 (*Urk*. IV 1304, 15-18)

rḏt ḥtpw n ḥm=f in dmi pn
ist ḥm=f m ḫntyt m-ẖnw pꜣ ꜥꜣmḳw sꜣwrinꜣ
gm.n=f wpwti (...)

'Proposing peace to His Majesty by this town.
Now, His Majesty was sailing upstream in the valley of Saurina.
He found a messenger (...)'

6.2.2.6.3 Two lexical notes

The lexicon of *Kheti* includes many technical terms of various sorts. While some of these are of later attestation only, no reliable indication for dating can be derived as the patterns of attestation of such words are over-determined by the nature of the written record at various periods ('what things are talked about in what types of

---

137 E.g. *Urk*. IV 663, 2; 1305, 11; 1312, 4-5; also *Urk*. IV 365, 6 (following another clause, itself introduced by *ist*).

written discourses documented in what periods?'). Two lexical expressions deserve a special note, however.

(i) *Kheti* 2.1 *ḳnḳnw* 'beatings'

As observed by Jäger,[138] *ḳnḳn* seems to be documented in pre-New Kingdom times only as a technical term to do with textile working and in medical texts; the more general meaning of 'beating' becomes common only with the New Kingdom.[139] *Ḳnḳn* in *Kheti* 2.1 could then be interpreted as suggestive of a late dating. Working under the hypothesis that *Kheti* should have been composed much earlier, Jäger went on to suggest that *ḳnḳn* could have carried some specific expressive overtones in *Kheti*, associated with the word's by then still technical sense.[140] That Jäger's proposal was made under an a priori assumption on dating does not affect the fact that it delineates a real possibility, in a literary text. Accordingly, *ḳnḳn* in *Kheti* 2.1 is bound to remain somewhat uncertain in its appreciation for dating.

(ii) *Kheti* 9.3, 10.3 *ꜥꜣgsw* 'belt(?)'

This very rare word recurs in another literary text of insecure dating, *Merikare* (E 107 = C III, 4, M not preserved). The exact meaning of *ꜥꜣgsw* remains unclear, due to the word's low frequency.[141] The word is generally identified as a loanword and it has been proposed that the loan dates to the New Kingdom.[142] If securely established, this would be consequential for dating, because *ꜥꜣgsw* stands a strong chance to be integral to the original text of *Kheti*. It occurs twice, in all witnesses of either passage, and is therefore integral at least to the archetype(s) from which all extant witnesses of the composition derive.[143] In addition, the referent of *ꜥꜣgsw*, whatever its exact nature, would seem to fit tightly the meaning of the two passages in *Kheti* in which the word occurs.[144] Yet, the source of borrowing that has been proposed for *ꜥꜣgsw* turns out to be problematic upon closer inspection, both semantically and phonologically.[145] While in the absence of an inner-Egyptian derivation the *ꜥꜣgsw* may well be a loanword, the date of its borrowing therefore remains unclear.

---

138 Jäger 2004: 131, n.2.
139 Hann*Lex* 5: 2526c (#34456). *Ipuwer* 8.10 and 8.12 are generally read with *ḳnḳn*, but this is better read as *wnm* (§2.6.2.4, (ii)). An indirect attestation of the non-technical meaning is perhaps found in some derivatives (Hann*Lex* 5: 2526c-2527a: #49947 and #34472).
140 Jäger 2004: 131, n.2.
141 Discussions in Seibert 1967: 134-6; Quack 1992: 63, n.c.; Jäger 2004: 74, 76-7, 137, 139.
142 Hoch 1994: 82, #102.
143 I thank Kai Widmaier (p.c. 5/2011) for discussion of the issue.
144 For *Kheti* 9.3, this is also explicitly the impression expressed by Jäger (2004: 74): 'Wenn auch die genaue Bedeutung dieses Ausdrucks (*scil.* *ꜥꜣgsw*, AS) nicht klar ist, so kann wohl doch am überlieferten Text festgehalten werden, zumal es wie im Vers zuvor um Kleidung gehen dürfte.'
145 I thank Thomas Schneider (p.c. 8/2011) for the following comment: 'Hoch befürwortet die Etymologie von Helck für den Lautstand des NR, aber die Etymologie kann nicht richtig sein. Das Wort (*scil.* the source for the borrowing proposed by Hoch, AS) bezeichnet nicht das Flechten von Textilien, sondern moralische „Verdrehtheit" – mit einem Gürtel hat das kaum etwas zu tun. Ausserdem besteht ein Problem mit der Wiedergabe des Sibilanten.'

6.2.2.6.4   Dating *Kheti*

In the above, the two pieces of lexical evidence mentioned last are perhaps indicative of a late dating but remain ultimately uncertain in interpretation (§6.2.2.6.3): in good method, they are better left out of consideration.

A. Different is the case of the construction in *Kheti* 1.3 *ist rf sw m ḫntyt* (§6.2.2.6.2). In its various relevant dimensions (textual function, selection of verbal forms), the construction is not documented in the Middle Kingdom. It is, on the other hand, documented in the early Eighteenth Dynasty, in all relevant details. Moreover, Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian demonstrably uses another verbal construction in a comparable environment with the exact same types of events, and does so for reasons that can be explained on principled semantic grounds. In addition, the rise of the construction as documented in the early Eighteenth Dynasty can be related to changes in the functions of *ist* itself, also on principled semantic grounds. In a conservative assessment, the construction in *Kheti* 1.3 therefore implies a post-Twelfth Dynasty date of composition.

Whether the construction more narrowly points to an early Eighteenth Dynasty date of composition is bound to remain slightly uncertain as far as direct attestation is concerned: as so often, the low density of the Second Intermediate Period written record is critical. The exact parallels found in the early Eighteenth Dynasty are suggestive, however.

B. Such analysis of *Kheti* 1.1-2.1 is consistent with the analysis made before of the construction in *Kheti* 3.5-6, *tw sḏm* (§5.3; §5.3.2.2 for its use in *Kheti*). On strict linguistic grounds, this implies a terminus *ante quem non* by mid-Thirteenth Dynasty for *Kheti*. This is a type-B *ante quem non*: the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty is the earliest moment in time for which based on the evidence available it can not be ruled out that the construction may have become possible, not necessarily the earliest moment in time when it actually was

Based on additional considerations to do with the literary nature of *tw sḏm*, the construction in *Kheti* 3.5-6 seems indicative of an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon, but this can not be proven beyond doubt (§6.2.2.6.1.B).

C. *Kheti* thereby includes two constructions that both point to a type-B *terminus ante quem non* by the early, or mid-Thirteenth Dynasty, respectively. As also discussed, both constructions are integral to the original text of the composition. In addition, both constructions individually suggest that a dating to the early Eighteenth Dynasty is more likely.

As a recent study, not concerned with dating, demonstrates in details, *Kheti* reads well in an early New Kingdom context.[146] In terms of literary history, the type of literary discourse first exemplified by *Kheti* was to enjoy considerable popularity in Ramesside 'Berufstypologien',[147] itself part of a broader then developing 'scribal

---

146 Widmaier 2013.
147 Jäger 2004.

literature'.[148] Although no argument is here taken on these levels, it may be observed that a very late dating of *Kheti*, as suggested by language, would fit this horizon well.

6.2.2.7 Interim summary

Early attestations of *tw* with non-dynamic events (§6.2.2.4) are all from texts that based on independent arguments have a terminus *ante quem non* no earlier than the Thirteenth Dynasty (*Neferti*, *Ipuwer*, *Kheti*, *Hymn*, the long version of *Loyaliste*). Moreover, the relevant linguistic innovation was analyzed as stage II of a change of which stage I can itself be dated precisely to the mid-Twelfth Dynasty (§6.2.2.3). The pattern of attestation of the overall change is therefore consistent, suggesting that stage II of this change was not reached before—and probably not later than—the late Twelfth Dynasty.

To strengthen the argument further, one additional step is taken in the next section. This consists in demonstrating that some other construction was consistently used in the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty when the reference of the main participant of a non-dynamic event was to be left unspecified.

6.2.3 Functional counterparts of *tw*-marked forms with non-dynamic events in early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian

In the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian, various constructions serve as the functional counterparts of *tw*-marked constructions with non-dynamic events. (That these functional counterparts should be more than one is almost a direct consequence of the definition of 'functional counterpart relationship' itself.) However, not all of these constructions are equally relevant for appreciating *Amenemhat*, a literary text.

6.2.3.1 Actor nominalization of the event

In general terms, *tw*-marked constructions may be conceived of as serving to leave the reference of the first, or sole, nuclear participant of an event unspecified. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that actor nominalization can provide one functional counterpart to *tw*-marked constructions with non-dynamic events:

> *Beni Hassan* I 8, 19-20 (*Urk.* VII 16, 8-11; Ameny, *temp.* Senwosret I)
>
> *iw ḫpr.n rnpwt ḥkrw*
> *ꜥḥꜥ.n skꜣ.n=i ꜣḥwt nbt nt mꜣ-ḥḏ* (...)
> *n ḫpr ḥkr*[A2-A1] *im=f*
>
> 'Years of hunger occurred.
> I cultivated all fields in the Oryx-nome (...)
> No one happened to be hungry therein.'[149]

The construction is broadly related to, yet different from, the construction *nn* + *participle*. The latter is common throughout Middle Egyptian with all types of events,

---

148 Widmaier 2013: §4; Ragazzoli 2010.

149 An interpretation as an actor nominalization—rather than as a subjectless construction (§6.2.3.3) or an event nominalization (e.g. §6.2.2.1, (iii))—is imposed by the 'seated man' semogram (A1).

expressing non-existence. E.g., in the same sequence, *BH* I 8, 19 (*Urk*. VII 16, 6-7) (...) *nn wn m3r n h3w=i nn ḥkr n rk=i* (...) '(...) there was no wretched one in my surroundings; there was no hungry one in my time (...)' (the last of a series of seven statements of negative existence: *BH* I, 18-19; *Urk*. VII 16, 1-7). In the passage quoted above, by contrast, the actor-nominalized event is the subject of a predicate expressing non-occurrence (*n ḫpr*) and thereby part of the main narrative chain. Only this construction can be viewed as a functional counterpart to *tw*-marked constructions with non-dynamic events.

6.2.3.2 Active construction with a non-specified subject *s* 'a man'

The non-specified reference of the main participant of the event can also be realized by inserting *s* 'a man' in the subject slot. In this construction—syntactically an active one—*s* is interpreted non-referentially:

(i) Mentuwoser (*temp.* Senwosret I), 11-12

n sḏr s ḥkrw r dmi=i

'The night was not spent hungry in my town.'

A. A very brief digression is here in order. The active construction with *s* 'a man' is regular in Middle Egyptian of all periods, whenever the non-specified subject is an antecedent to a subsequent anaphoric reference. In such cases, the construction with *s* also provides the functional counterpart to a *tw*-marked form, because *tw* can not generally support a subsequent anaphoric reference.[150] Compare, directly following each other:

(ii) *Debate* 109-111

ḏd=i n m min
sḫꜥr s m sp=f bin
ssbt=f bw-nb iw=f ḏw

'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.'

(iii) *Debate* 111-113

ḏd=i n m min
iw ḥꜥḏ3.tw
s nb ḥr iṯṯ snw=f

'To whom can I speak today?
There is plundering,
everybody robbing their brothers.'

In both (ii) and (iii), the events *sḫꜥr* and *ḥꜥḏ3* are passivizable, since they fulfill the condition of having an agentive participant in their semantic representation. In (iii), the

---

150 For an altogether exceptional case where *tw* seems to function as the antecedent to a subsequent anaphoric reference, *Ptahhotep* 343 (§2.4.3.2, (xviii)).

non-specified agent is not an antecedent to a subsequent anaphoric reference and a construction with *tw* is used (*ḥꜥḏꜣ.tw*). In (ii), by contrast, the non-specified agent of *sẖꜥr* is an antecedent to a subsequent anaphoric reference (=*f* in *sp=f*, then in *ssbt=f*), preventing the use of *tw* with *sẖꜥr*. The active construction with *s* 'a man' is then made recourse to.

B. While formally identical, the construction in (i) differs from the one in (ii). In the latter, the event is passivizable and the avoidance of *tw* is solely dictated by the subsequent anaphoric reference, as is directly shown by the contrast with (iii). In (i), there is no subsequent anaphoric reference and the construction with *s* is selected because *sḏr* 'lie', a non-dynamic event, does not fulfill the semantic condition for passivization. Accordingly, the construction with *s* is another functional counterpart of *tw*-marked constructions for non-dynamic events.

6.2.3.3   Subjectless active construction

The non-specified nature of the first participant can be realized by a subjectless construction, also syntactically active. This is the very same construction that was already noted above to provide the functional counterpart to non-agentive dynamic events in the early Twelfth Dynasty (before stage I of the overall change: §6.2.2.3, (v)). With non-dynamic events (before stage II of the change), compare:

(i) *Ptahhotep* 10 P

sḏr=ø n=f ẖdr rꜥ nb

'Because of it one lies anguished, every day.'

> The passage has caused considerable philological difficulties, to New Kingdom editors of the text[151] and to modern readers alike.[152] Various issues are at play.
>
> (a) By lack of an alternative possibility, the antecedent of =*f* must be sought in 9 *iḥw* 'weakness' (or, equivalently, in the overall series of negative qualities described in the preceding verses: 8-9 *tni*, *iꜣw*, *wgg*, *iḥw*).[153] Compare the similar construction in 17 *ḳs mn n=f n ꜣw* 'the bone aches because of it continuously.'
>
> (b) The reading *ẖdr*, which has often been emended into *ẖrd* 'be a child', is supported by the spelling (both the ordering of phonograms and the 'bad bird' semogram (G 37)). The word is paralleled in *Eloquent Peasant* B1 169-170, in a context that also tells of anguish: (...) *ẖdr.kw m hꜣw ir ḏr=k* '(...) for I am anguished at your very side!'
>
> (c) With *n=f* referring to the cause of the situation and *ẖdr* expressing 'anguish' or the like, three possibilities remain for interpreting the verse:

---

151 Both extant New Kingdom versions, L2 and C, reinterpreted the verse as well as moved it (to D 15); see Burkard 1977: 193-4.

152 See the great many translations and associated interpretations gathered in Dils et al., *TLA*, with full references.

153 A reading of 10 as 'weil man (< er) sich täglich verjüngend die Nacht verbracht hat' (Junge 2003: 188) is not possible because an anaphoric pronoun can not have indefinite reference in Earlier Egyptian. An interpretation as 'Das Schlafen fällt ihm schwer jeden Tag' (Burkard 1977: 193-4) is not possible either, due to the context and the lack of an antecedent to =*f* in this reading.

- (α) *sḏr* is a participle, subject to *ẖdr*, itself a pseudoparticiple: 'The one spending the night for it is anguished every day';

- (β) *sḏr* is a *mrr=f* form, with *ẖdr*, a participle, as its subject: 'The anguished one is lying because of it every day';

- (γ) *sḏr* is a subjectless *mrr=f* form and *ẖdr* a pseudoparticiple embedded in a secondary predication: 'Because of it one lies anguished, every day.'

Of the above, (α) and (β) are to be rejected, because the syntax would imply that the prepositional phrase relates to *sḏr*, not to *ẖdr*. This stands in contradiction with the fact that *n=f*, in reference to the evils of old age just described (8-9) is semantically the source of 'anguish', not of the lying position. Although not quite as directly, there is also a stylistic objection to both (α) and (β): these readings would place a human participant (*sḏr*, respectively *ẖdr*) in subject position, at complete variance with the overall tenor of the broader passage (*Ptahhotep* 7-27), which is oriented on situations (*tni*, *iꜣw*, *wgg*, *iḥw*, *pḥty*, *bw-nfr*, *dpt*, *bin*) or on body parts (*irty*, *ꜥnḥwy*, *rꜣ*, *ib*, *ḳsw*, *fndw*), not on human participants. This leaves reading (γ) as the only possibility.

Equivalently, now phrased in positive terms, the argument runs as follows. Syntactically, *n=f* can only have scope over *sḏr* (compare the position of the prepositional phrase, before *ẖdr*, not after it). Semantically, however, *n=f* is the source of *ẖdr*. To resolve the apparent paradox, *ẖdr* must itself be embedded into a higher clause, of which *sḏr* must then be the predicate.

A construction of *sḏr* with a non-specified subject (differently realized) on which a pseudoparticiple is dependent as a secondary predicate is well paralleled, e.g. Mentuwoser 11-12 *n sḏr s ḥḳrw* (...) (§6.2.3.2, (i)); *Neferti* 9c *nn sḏr.tw ḥḳr* (...) (§6.2.2.4, (v)).

(ii) *Sinuhe* B 59

n rḏ.n=f ḥms[A17]*=ø*[A1-PLUR] *ḥꜣ ib=f*

'He does not allow that one rests around his heart.'

The sequence <A1-PLUR> was secondarily inserted in B, which apparently reads as 'resteners' (actor-nominalization).[154] That the original construction is subjectless is imposed by the following considerations. (a) All later witnesses (R, G, AOS: above, §6.2.1.2, (v)) have the subjectless construction, suggesting that the semograms were inserted by the B-scribe. (b) The whole passage is verbally composed, compare in particular the contrast *ꜥḥꜥ* – *ḥmsi* in B 55-59:

iꜥ-ẖr pw tšꜣ wpwt	*n ꜥḥꜥ.n.tw m hꜣw=f* (...)
wmt-ib pw mꜣꜣ=f ꜥšꜣt	*n rḏ.n=f ḥms=ø ḥꜣ ib=f*

'He is vengeful, a smasher of foreheads, one can not maintain one's position in his presence (...);

He is stout-hearted when he sees the multitude; he does not allow that one rests around his heart.'

---

154 Parkinson 2009: 283.

(iii) *Debate* 108

ḥtp=ø ḥr bin

'There is contentment about evil.'

> This is the reading adopted by the initial editors of the text[155] and in most recent treatments thereof.[156] Other interpretations that have been proposed are: (α) *ḥtp ḥr bin* 'the bad face is satisfied' (a *nfr sw* construction) and (β) *ḥtp-ḥr bin* 'the one happy of face is evil' (a *subject – pseudoparticiple* construction).[157] Reading (α) is ruled out by the contrast of *bin* with *bw nfr* in the next verse,[158] as well as by the bizarreness of the formulation that would result under such reading.[159] Reading (β) sets a posited *ḥtp-ḥr* in parallel to *nḫt-ḥr* in the preceding verse,[160] but also results in a bizarre idiom,[161] as well as in a meaning that is awkward when the broader context is taken into account.

(iv) *Debate* 123-124

iw šw=ø m ꜥḳ-ib

'There is a lack of intimates.'

> Two interpretations are possible in theory, both with subjectless constructions: (α) *iw šw=ø m ꜥḳ-ib* (a subjectless *sḏm=f* as in (i)-(iii)) and (β) *iw ø šw m ꜥḳ-ib* (a subjectless *subject – pseudoparticiple* construction). As far as the context goes, both these interpretations are equally possible.[162] However, the constructional semantics of a *subjectless – pseudoparticiple* construction *iw ø nfr(w)* 'it (*scil.* the situation) is good' would imply a basic meaning of *Debate* 123-124 along the lines of: [?!]'It (*scil.* the here described situation) is free of intimates.' This makes reading (β) highly unlikely, probably impossible.

The above examples establish subjectless active constructions as yet another functional counterpart of *tw*-marked constructions with non-dynamic events.

6.2.3.4   Formulaic language in inscriptional registers?

Among the passages presented above, Mentuwoser 11-12 and *BH* I 8, 20 (Ameny) have formulations tightly similar to ones in *Neferti* and *Amenemhat*. The inscriptional texts are from the reign of Senowsret I, the very period to which *Neferti* and *Amenemhat* have often been dated as well. In closely comparable formulations, the texts securely dated to the early Twelfth Dynasty consistently avoid *tw* with non-dynamic events, while the ones to be dated consistently use it. Contrast:

---

155 De Buck 1947: 28; Faulkner 1956: 38, n.90
156 E.g. Allen 2011: 92; Dils et al., *TLA*.
157 Full references in Allen 2011: 92; Dils et al., *TLA*.
158 Allen 2011: 92.
159 Dils et al., *TLA*: 'man fragt sich jedoch, ob das Böse in der ägyptischen Bildsprache ein Gesicht hat.'
160 See however Allen 2011: 91 for the possibility of an alternative reading of the latter.
161 Dils et al., *TLA*: '(...) normalerweise das Herz und nicht das Gesicht zufrieden ist.'
162 Compare, respectively, 112 *iw ḥꜥḏ3.tw* 'There is plundering' and 107 *iw sf 3ḳ* 'Mercy has perished.'

(i) Mentuwoser 11-12   – *temp*. Senwosret I:

n sḏr s ḥḳrw r dmi=i ('The night was not spent hungry in my town.')

(ii) *Neferti* 9c   – *temp*. ?:

nn sḏr.tw ḥḳr n m(w)t ('The night will not be spent starving to death.')[163]

(iii) *BH* I 8, 20 (Ameny)   – *temp*. Senwosret I:

n ḫpr ḥḳr im=f ('No one happened to be hungry therein.')

(iv) *Amenemhat* 11c   – *temp*. ?:

n ḥḳr.tw m rnpwt=i ('One was not hungry in my years.')

This suggests that *Neferti* and *Amenemhat* are later than the reign of Senwosret I to which Mentuwoser and Ameny date. However, language in inscriptional self-presentations can be formulaic to various degrees, with the practical effect that the date of inscription (here Senwosret I) can not be equated with the actual linguistic age of a formula. Strict methodological caution therefore requires that the evidence from inscriptional registers be appreciated as circumstantial only, adding up to the evidence found in literary registers themselves (the next section).

6.2.3.5 Functional counterparts in early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary texts

A. In the same period, literary texts—*Ptahhotep*, *Sinuhe*, *Debate*[164]—themselves consistently avoid *tw*-marked constructions with non-dynamic events. In these texts, a subjectless active construction is always used when the main participant of a non-dynamic event is to be left unspecified (§6.2.3.3, (i)-(iv)). This establishes the following counterpart relationship for intransitive events in early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary registers of Middle Egyptian:

Early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian:
Intransitives with non-specified reference of their main participant

Dynamic: *pr.tw*

                    mwt=ø (... – early D.12) → *mwt.tw* (mid-D.12 – ...)

Non-dynamic: *sḏr=ø*

---

163 *Neferti* 9e also has *s* with a non-dynamic event. Unlike in Mentuwoser 11-12, this is due to the subsequent anaphoric reference: *ḥms s r ḳꜥḥ=f sꜣ=f* 'One will sit bowing *their* back'; for this construction, §6.2.3.2.A.

164 As discussed, *Ptahhotep* dates to a period from the late Eleventh to the mid-Twelfth Dynasty; within this range, the Twelfth Dynasty is more likely (§2.4.3.3). *Sinuhe* and *Debate of a Man and His Soul* both have the same terminus *post quem non* by Amenemhat III (on the date of the Berlin Library, Parkinson 2009: 76). The former text was probably composed later than the reign of Senwosret I himself because some time is required for historical events to be turned into the setting of a fictional work. As to *Debate*, Allen's (2011: 121) dating to the 'first half of Dynasty XII' is based on Vernus' *post quem non* criterion, which can not be upheld (§2.6.3); the place of *Debate* in the Twelfth Dynasty therefore remains unclear.

Internally to individual texts, this counterpart relationship is illustrated by the following contrasts:

(i) *Ptahhotep*

293 P	*pr.tw ḥr irt=f* (...)	'One will renounce applying it (...)'[165]
10 P	*sḏr=ø n=f ḫdr rꜥ nb*	'Because of it one lies anguished, every day.'

(ii) *Sinuhe*

Aq/B 1	*nis.n.tw n wꜥ im* (...)	'One among them was summoned (...)'[166]
B 59	*n rḏ.n=f ḥms=ø ḥꜣ ib=f*	'He does not allow that one rests around his heart.'

Sim., directly echoing each other, B 55-59:

(...) *n ꜥḥꜥ.n.tw m hꜣw=f*
(...) *n rḏ.n=f ḥms=ø ḥꜣ ib=f*

'(...) one can not maintain one's position in his presence;
(...) he does not allow that one rests around his heart.'

   (For *ꜥḥꜥ.n.tw* as implying an agent, §6.2.2.2, (iv).)

(iii) *Debate*, Second Litany (108-125)

ḏd=i n m min	*ḥtp=ø ḥr bin* (...)
ḏd=i n m min	*iw ḥꜥḏꜣ.tw* (...)
ḏd=i n m min	*n sḫꜣ.t(w) sf*
	n ir.t(w) n ir m tꜣ ꜣt (...)
ḏd=i n m min	*iw šw=ø m ꜥḳ-ib*
	inn.tw m ḥmm r srḫt n=f (...)

'To whom can I speak today?	There is contentment about evil, (...)
To whom can I speak today?	There is plundering, (...)
To whom can I speak today?	Yesterday has not been remembered, there has been no acting in this time for the one who acted. (...)
To whom can I speak today?	There is a lack of intimates, one resorts even to an unknown man to complain to him (...)'

---

165 Sim. e.g 480 *n wḥ.n.tw m šꜣ sw* 'One can not escape from who has fated it'; 586 *swꜣ.t(w) ḥr spw=f* (...) 'His deeds will be passed over (...)'.

166 Sim. e.g. B 38 *wḥm.tw n=i* 'it was reported to me'; B 40-41 *n psg.t[w r ḥr]=i* 'my face had not been spat upon'; etc.

B. Against the background of the change discussed in the present section, the grammar of *Amenemhat* 11c-d is then sited as follows:

(a) *Physical and mental states*

| *Amenemhat* 11c | *n ḥkr.tw m rnpwt=i* |
| | *n ib.tw im* |

| | *Neferti* 9c | *(...).tw ḥkr* |
| | *Ipuwer* 2.10 | *ib.tw* |

early/mid-D.12 literary: *ḥtp=ø ḥr bin* (*Debate* 108)

(early D.12 inscriptional:
n ḫpr ḥkr im=f (*BH* I 8, 20; Ameny))

(b) *Bodily positions*

| *Amenemhat* 11d | *iw ḥms.tw (...)* |

	Ipuwer 5.11	*ḥms.tw*
	Kheti 25.3	*ḥms.tw*
	Neferti 9c	*sḏr.tw*

early/mid-D.12 literary: *n rḏ.n=f ḥms=ø ḥꜣ ib=f* (*Sinuhe* B 59)

sḏr=ø n=f ḫdr rꜥ nb (*Ptahhotep* 10 P)

(early D.12 inscriptional:
n sḏr s ḥkrw r dmi=i (Mentuwoser 11-12))

And further, beyond Amenemhat, e.g. events of 'lacking'

	Neferti 7f	*gꜣ.tw ḫnrt*
	Hymn 5.2	*gꜣw.tw r*
	Loyaliste 9.9	*gꜣw.tw r*
	Ipuwer 10.6	*šw.tw m*

early/mid-D.12 literary: *iw šw=ø m ꜥk-ib* (*Debate* 123-124)

In short, the *tw*-marked forms in *Amenemhat* 11c-d are not early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty literary Middle Egyptian.

6.3   Possible indications

Other elements in *Amenemhat* could be suggestive for dating. While these do not have full conclusive force in themselves, they are worth discussing within an overall assessment of the linguistic typology of the composition.

6.3.1   Interpreting a linguistic selection: *Amenemhat* 15c *twt*

The closing section of *Amenemhat* has an instance of the old independent pronoun:

> *Amenemhat* 15a-c
>
> *mk ir.n=i ḥȝt*[a] *ṯs=i n=k pḥwy*
> *ink mni n=k*[b] *nty m ib=i*
> *twt*[c] *wȝḥ ḥdt (n*[d]*) prt-nṯr*
>
> 'See, I have made the beginning so that I can tie the end for you.
> I have come to harbor for you, my heart's desire;[e]
> You now[f] wear the White Crown of the offspring of the god.'

a) The word is not preserved in P. Millingen. Among Ramesside witnesses, three have *ḥȝt* while six have *ḫr-ḥȝt*. The former is probably original in view of the balancing *ḥȝt* – *pḥwy*.[167] The latter reading is coherent as well: 'I have acted before (...)'.

b) The verse is not preserved in P. Millingen. The dative phrase *n=k* is missing in some witnesses.

c) The beginning of 15c, lost in P. Millingen, is preserved only in Ramesside witnesses. That *twt* is original is implied by the two balanced focus constructions in 15b-c *ink mni* (...) *twt wȝḥ* (...) '*I* (*scil*. Amenemhat) have come to harbor (...); *you* (*scil*. Senwosret) wear (...)'. To Ramesside readers, the *twt*-headed cleft construction often proved difficult, as shown by its reinterpretation into a 'Present I'-type construction in some witnesses (§2.3.4.1, (v)).

d) *N* (written with the sign for negation, D35) is only in P. Millingen. With or without *n*, *prt-nṯr* could be genitival to *ḥdt*. Without *n*, *prt-nṯr* could also be a vocative, echoing *nty m ib=i* in 15b.

e) I read with *mni* intransitive and *nty m ib=i* in apposition to the dative *n=k*, referring to Senwosret.[168] Under a transitive reading of *mni*, *nt{y}<t> m ib=i* would refer to the old king's desire, 'I alone have brought to harbour my heart's desire for you.'[169]

f) 'Now' as a rendering of the balanced focus constructions in 15b-c *ink mni* (...) *twt wȝḥ* (...).

The old independent pronouns *twt* and *swt* are uncommon in post-Coffin Text Middle Egyptian and antiquated in the Middle Kingdom already. No *post quem non* criterion indexed on linguistic change can here be derived: if one were, *Amenemhat* would pre-

---

167 Similarly Burkard 1977: 102, 309-10.

168 Similarly e.g. Gnirs 2013b: 145. Intransitive *mni* as an euphemism for passing away said of a king also in *Kagemni* 2.7-8.

169 E.g. Parkinson 1997a: 208.

date the Middle Kingdom. Rather, the object of inquiry is the raison d'être for the remarkable selection of an old independent pronoun rather than a common Middle Egyptian one, *ntk*.

6.3.1.1   Old independent pronouns in post-Coffin Text Middle Egyptian

In post-Coffin Text Middle Egyptian, occurrences of the old independent pronouns are in the following texts and types of texts:[170]

- MK, inscriptional:	*Chapelle Blanche* n°170; 253; 259;[171]
- MK, literary:	*Ptahhotep* 398 L1[172] (P reads differently[173]);
- Early D.18, royal:	in the *Royal Cycle*, as part of a broader repertoire of archaizing expressions: common (§4.7.1);
	(for the dating of the *Cycle* to Hatshepsut, §4.7);
- Early D.18, private:	Senemiah (*temp.* Hatshepsut), 18 (*Urk.* IV 503, 17):[174] see below, NB;
- Early NK, funerary:	in Book of the Dead: not uncommon;[175]
	in Netherworld Books documented from the early NK on, alongside other archaizing expressions: not uncommon;[176]
- Probably early D.18:	*Berlin Leather Roll* 2.9;
	(for the dating, probably to the early Eighteenth Dynasty, §4.2; in 2.9 itself, note the late *r3-ḥry* (§4.2.4, (i)): *twt r3-ḥry n-s=imy* 'Thou are the chief thereof.');
- Dating uncertain:	*Hymns to the Diadem* (1.5; 19.3; 20.2);
	(manuscript dating to the late SIP/early D.18;[177] date of composition unclear, possibly recent[178]).

---

170 P. MMA 27.3.560 (letter of Tit to Djehuti, *temp.* Hatshepsut), 2-3 has been quoted as one further instance of *twt*, in an early Eighteenth Dynasty documentary register (Brunner 1986²: 175, n.3; Vernus 1990a: 65, n.33). As Joachim Quack points out (p.c. 6/2010), this remains uncertain and another interpretation is probably to be preferred (§2.7.3.2, (iv)).

171 Lacau & Chevrier 1956: 73, 93, 95.

172 *Swt k3 ḏd mrwt* 'He is the ka, who gives love.'

173 *K3w pw r(w)d mrwt* 'Growing love is sustenance.'

174 The interpretation of the passage is difficult: *swt pw wnn išst iry(=i) ḏ=f r ḥ3t*. Vernus (2006: 165, ex.90 and n.143) reads: 'le fait est que c'était bien lui celui qui avait disposition et propension à agir (litt.: celui qui existait "quoi? je vais agir?") si bien qu'il se portait en avant.' Gardiner (*EG* §500.5: 'we can only guess (...)') proposed: 'He was one who, whatever was done, advanced (the matter)'.

175 See *TLA* #130830.

176 Werning 2013: #8.

177 Erman (1911: 6) notes paleographical similarity with P. Westcar, P. Rhind Mathematical, and P. Ebers.

NB. The occurrence of an old independent pronoun in Senemiah, a private inscription, is singular. The pronoun is here as well in reference to Hatshepsut and thereby indexical in context. Senemiah significantly includes a mention of the queen's expedition to Punt;[179] *Punt Expedition* is among Hatshepsutian compositions to have the same pronouns. Senemiah accommodates other tokens of a high linguistic elaboration. Among these are instances of the construction *N sḏm.n* in complex sequences: as *N sḏm.n sḏm.n* (14 (*Urk.* IV 501, 15-16)) and as *N pseudoparticiple sḏm.n* (twice: 11 (*Urk.* IV 500, 9-10); 12 (*Urk.* IV 501, 4-5)). The construction *N sḏm.n* is documented in specific high registers of the Middle Kingdom (§1.2, (xi); in a variant, §2.4.3.3.A), then in the early Eighteenth Dynasty again, notably in *Chapelle Rouge*, p.98: I.2-3 (H*HBT* II 7, 11: §3.4.4, (iii); §4.3.2.1, (v)); p.120: V.7-8 (H*HBT* II 19, 2: §3.4.4, (iv)).[180] Noteworthy in Senemiah are also instances of the reduplicated passive participles in 11 (*Urk.* IV 500, 8; 500, 12). In the early Eighteenth Dynasty, these recur notably in *Punt Expedition* (§2.7.2.1, (ii)). Very remarkable is finally 21 (*Urk.* IV 505, 4) *snktkt*. As emerges from a study of *ktkt*,[181] *snktkt* is probably a neologistic formation, based on a long obsolete derivational pattern.[182] In the early Eighteenth Dynasty, this formation is exceedingly rare; it recurs in Hatshepsutian compositions (*snb3b3*: *Chapelle Rouge*, p.107: III.6-7 (H*HBT* II 11, 14/15-16), see §4.1.2.B; sim. *Urk.* IV 260, 1 *niwiw*). The singular selection of the old independent pronoun in Senemiah thus accords with other selections in this composition (*N sḏm.n*; reduplicated passive participles; (*s-*)*n-ABAB*), all pointing to the same Hatshepsutian horizon.

---

178 While no attempt at a linguistic dating of *Hymns to the Diadem* can be undertaken in the present study, a few elements noted in passing may be mentioned. Regarding the old independent pronouns themselves, the masculine form *twt* is consistently used even though a feminine entity is always addressed: 1.5-2.1 *twt nbt ḫˁw* 'Thou are the Lady of crowns'; 19.2-3 *in.n sbk šdty ḥr ḥry-ib iwnw irt=f twt ḥˁt.n nṯrw m-ḫt=s* (...) 'Sobek of Crocodilopolis, Horus who presides over Heliopolis, has gotten his Eye—Thou—behind which the gods have rejoiced (...)'; 20.2-3 *twt it n=f m3ˁ-ḫrw* 'It is Thou who seizes triumph to him.' That *twt*, not *ṯmt*, is used speaks for paradigm reduction, and therefore points to a time when the obsolescence of the old pronouns was well under way, certainly after the Old Kingdom. The use of masculine forms for feminine referents is directly paralleled in Hatshepsutian texts (see above). The text also includes various instances of the formal *pwy* demonstratives: *irt twy nt ḥr* (1.1; 5.5-6.1); *rn=t pwy n iˁrt* (10.2), *rn=s*^{sic} *pwy n ḳbḥyt* (10.3), *rn=s pwy n sḥmty* (11.3). *Pwy* demonstratives are first attested in the Twelfth Dynasty and their documentation remains sparse throughout the Middle Kingdom. They recur in *Cheops' Court* (§2.4.4.6, (iii)), then in the early New Kingdom. In the latter, they are fairly common in some registers, thus in Book of the Dead and in some early Thutmoside inscriptions to do with kingship, notably of the times of Thutmosis III. In *Hymns to the Diadem*, the formal *pwy* demonstratives are used alongside the also formal *pw* demonstratives (the latter in 16.3; 19.1; 2; 3; 5). A similar constellation is observed in Book of the Dead and in some Thutmoside inscriptions. The above comments are not to belittle the very real possibility that *Hymns to the Diadem* may have drawn on much earlier textual material, possibly abundantly so. They only suggest that the composition in its present form may be fairly recent, particularly as regards the matter here of interest, pronouns.

179 Enmarch 2007: 77, n.h.

180 Close in time are further Thutmosis II's *Aswan Inscription* 6 (*Urk.* IV 138, 14) and Rekhmire 5 (*Urk.* IV 1073, 4): both quoted above, §1.2, (xi.β).

181 Vernus in press: §5.1.

182 Discussion by Vernus 2009a: 305; Stauder 2013: §6.5.

The early New Kingdom is distinguished by a strikingly higher density of occurrences: the difference with the Middle Kingdom is too marked for this to be accounted for simply by the fact that more texts have survived from the early New Kingdom. On the other hand, the presence of *swt* in *Ptahhotep* 398 L1 demonstrates that the old independent pronoun was not entirely unknown to Middle Kingdom littérateurs either. In making sense of the selection of the independent pronoun in *Amenemhat* 15c, an interpretive approach is therefore required, both of the pattern of attestation of the old independent pronouns and of *Amenemhat* 15c itself.

6.3.1.2 Interpretation

A. In the Middle Kingdom, occasional uses of the old independent pronoun in *Chapelle Blanche* partake to general archaizing tendencies of this monument, also observed on other levels such as orthography. As to *Ptahhotep* 398 L1, this remains isolated in the whole body of Middle Kingdom literature and is accordingly difficult to interpret; in the lack of any better explanation, *swt* may perhaps relate to archaizing tendencies characteristic of *Ptahhotep* on other levels as well (§2.4.3.2, (xiii); §2.4.3.3.B). In literature, pronouns of the recent series (*ntk*, *ntf*) are regularly used otherwise, including in an address to the king (*Sinuhe* B 232-233 *ntk is ḥbs ꜣḫt tn* 'For it is you who veils this horizon.').

In the early Eighteenth Dynasty, by contrast, the old independent pronouns experience a textual revival in two types of texts mainly, funerary literature and texts to do with royal ideology and legitimization. Both define associations that are of a rather more specific nature than mere archaism.

B. In *Amenemhat*, the old independent pronoun is in the closing section, which has strong funerary overtones. *Twt* is used just after *mni* 'come to harbor' (15b) and just before the old king's descending into the Sun-barque (15e *hꜣ.n=i m wiꜣ n rꜥ*).

The funerary dimension is salient throughout the composition, with various echoes of motifs or expressions that are best paralleled in the Book of the Dead. These include *sꜣ-tꜣ* 'worm' as a being the deceased is likened to or identified with (6f; cf. Book of the Dead 87 Nu 3);[183] *stꜣ*, a rare expression for 'attack, attempt' (8a; cf. Book of the Dead 17 Nu 75; 84);[184] and *ḫpš*, a recherché designation of the 'Great Bear', for common *msḫtiw* (10c, cf. Book of the Dead 17 Nu 47).[185] As mentioned, the textual revival that the old independent pronouns experience in the early New Kingdom concerns notably the Book of the Dead.

C. The old independent pronouns are also common in Hatshepsutian texts to do with royal ideology and legitimization.[186] The subject is mostly, although not exclusively, the queen herself. The association with rising to kingship is given by the contents of

---

183 Parkinson 2002: 244, observing: '(...) this image may evoke the potential crises of the solar cycle: in the later Book of the Dead spell 87, the deceased wishes to identify himself with a 'worm' which 'sleeps and is (re)born daily', like the Sungod (...)'. The author further notes the contrast with CT VII 98i, where the *sꜣ-tꜣ* worm is presented as an enemy (n.7).
184 Gnirs 2013b: 147.
185 Gnirs 2013b: 147.
186 For a discussion in terms of the repertoires these pronouns relate to, §4.7.1.

these texts, and in some places directly expressed: *Urk.* IV 221, 14 *swt ḥḳȝ.t=s(y) tȝwy*[187] 'She is the one who will rule the Dual Land'; *Urk.* IV 229, 12 *twt nsw itt ḥʕ ḥr st ḥr n ʕnḫw ḏt* 'Thou are a king who seizes having risen on the seat of Horus of the living, eternally.'[188] The association with kingship recurs in *Berlin Leather Roll* 2.9 *ṯwt rȝ-ḥry n-s=imy* 'Thou are the chief thereof.'

In *Amenemhat* 15c, *twt* is in an address by a father to his son who is to rise to kingship, just as in Hatshepsutian texts (the divine father speaking to the queen). In the closing section of *Amenemhat*, *twt* occurs alongside a series of expressions (15a *ḥȝt, pḥwy*; 15b *mni*; 15c *prt-nṯr*) that recur in Ineni's account of Hatshepsut's accession to the throne (*Urk.* IV 60, 5-8).[189] In the two examples from Hatshepsut's *Royal Cycle* quoted above, *ḥḳȝ* and *ḥʕi* are textually associated with the old independent pronouns; in *Amenemhat*, the same expressions are in the opening address to Senwosret (1d), while the old independent pronoun is in the closing address (15c), thus framing the composition.[190]

D. The above identifies a specific configuration of written language in which the selection of *twt* in *Amenemhat* 15c makes sense. This horizon is effectively documented, the only one to be so, and semantically dense. While there is no way to fully exclude other possibilities, this constellation seems suggestive.

6.3.2 Lexicon

Lexical evidence in *Amenemhat* is not plenty, nor is it expected to be given the conciseness of the composition and the high amount of vocabulary shared with other literary texts.[191] Three expressions mentioned before would fit well into an early Eighteenth Dynasty context, but no reliable indication for dating can be based on these because the first two are indirectly attested in earlier times and all three are uncommon: *mṯwn* '(fighting) arena' (5d: §2.2.2, (iii), (v)), *mwnf* 'garrison' (7b: §2.2.2, (iv)), and *nfr-ib* 'pleasure' (6b; 14f: §2.2.2, (ix)). In literary texts, *mwnf* recurs only in *Neferti* (7f), a composition for which a very late dating was argued to be likely (§5); this lexical encounter may also be due to the shared contents to do with combat. More remarkable is *nfr-ib*, which recurs in only one text overall, *Teaching of Aametju* (43: §1.3.2, (v)): this text, an Eighteenth Dynasty composition, is relevant to *Amenemhat* on non-linguistic levels as well.[192] Of some significance are possibly also the three afore mentioned expressions otherwise found in Book of the Dead: *sȝ-tȝ* 'worm' (as a being the deceased is likened to or identified with: 6f), *stȝ* 'attack, attempt' (8a), and

---

187 On the exceedingly rare cleft construction *independent pronoun – sḏm.t=f(y)*, §4, n.366.

188 Sim. *Urk.* IV 343, 10 *ṯwt nsw itt tȝwy ḥȝt-špswt-ḫnm-imn* 'Thou are the king who seizes the Dual Land, Hatshepsut-Khenemamun.'

189 Analyzed by Gnirs 2013b: 145; also below, §6.3.2.1.

190 Framing strategies are dense in *Amenemhat*, making the opening section (1) and the closing one (15) resonate with one another in multiple ways. Beyond the above, also Gnirs 2013b: 144-5 and below, §6.3.2.1. Further, Parkinson 2002: 242, on *ḥʕi* 'rising' (1d) echoed by *hȝi* 'descending' (15e).

191 Konrad 1999; Lepper 2008: 253-61; further discussion by Gnirs 2013b: 147.

192 Gnirs 2013b: 142-4.

ḫpš, 'Great Bear' (10c) (§6.3.1.2.B).[193] The last two, both rare, recur at a small distance from each other in BD 17. Measured against the conciseness of the composition, such elements possibly pointing to a late lexical horizon are noteworthy: collectively, they are perhaps suggestive, with the understanding that they of course remain insufficient to support any firm claim in themselves.

Two further lexical expressions in *Amenemhat* are less subject to the usual uncertainties associated with the lexicon and therefore merit individual discussion: *nsy* 'to rule' (1d) and *ḥw-ny-r-ḥr* 'combat' (7b).[194]

6.3.2.1   *Amenemhat* 1d *nsy* 'to rule'

Nsy 'to rule' is a denominative formation on *nsw* 'king'. Another denominative formation on the same noun is documented once in Pyramid Texts, *swt(i)* 'be kingly':[195] this is distinct, morphologically and semantically, from *nsy* 'to rule'. The latter, as in *Amenemhat* 1d, is not otherwise documented before the Eighteenth Dynasty and is fairly common in the New Kingdom.[196] Rather than *nsy*, pre-New Kingdom texts use other expressions for 'to rule', mostly *ḥḳꜣ*, also *iri nsyt m* 'perform kingship in' and *iri nsw* 'act as a king'.[197]

In *Amenemhat*, *nsy* is part of a formulary that is itself documented only in the New Kingdom:[198]

---

193 Gnirs 2013b: 147.

194 On another expression, *snnw ꜥnḫw* 'living representations' (5a), Gnirs 2013b: 141 and n.112; Bickel 1994: 216; Blumenthal 1985: 106-7; Ockinga 1984: 52-6; Westendorf 1981. Refering to mankind as a representation of the god, the expression is not found in any securely dated pre-New Kingdom text; in Middle Egyptian literature, it recurs only in *Merikare* E 132, a composition for which some indications could suggest an early Eighteenth Dynasty date of composition, yet not in ways strong enough to support any definite conclusion (§2.8). The idea of the *king* as a 'representation' (*snnt*) of the god is more common, e.g. Thutmosis III's *Stèle Poétique* 13 (*Urk.* IV 615, 2) *snn=i* 'my representation' (sim. in *Divine Birth*, noted by Gnirs 2013b: 141, n.112); expressed with other words, also e.g. Iykhernefert Neferhotep III's *Karnak Stela* 9 (H*HBT* 45, 15) *twt ꜥnḫ n rꜥ*; Rahotep's *Coptos Decree* 8 *ḫnty=f*.

195 Pyr. §2169b[N] *wr.t(i) mr nsw swt.t(i) mr rꜥ* 'be great like the king, be kingly like Re'; also in the parallel passage Pyr. §1343a-b[P] *wr N pn mr nsw swty mr rꜥ* 'This N is great like the king, kingly like Re.' (Faulkner's (1969: 211, n.1) interpretation as 'a nisba from *swt*' is compatible with one as a denominative, since denominatives can be nisba's morphologically.)

196 'Belegt seit D.18' according to *DZA* 29.820.090. Occurrences in inscriptional contexts include *Urk.* IV 58, 16 (Ineni); 236, 5 (in a legend to Hatshepsut's *Royal Cycle* in Deir el-Bahari); 372, 3 (Hatshepsut's Karnak Obelisk); L*D* III 72, 18 (Klug 2002: 380; *temp.* Amenhotep III); Tutankhamun's *Restoration Stela* 26 (*Urk.* IV 2031, 7). In Ramesside times, also Mariette, *Abydos*, App. B, tableau, C[sic] (*temp.* Sethi I); K*RI* II, 476, 7; van Dijk 1979: 23, 2 (in a Luxor Building Inscription of Ramses III); *DZA* 29.820.860 (an inscription of Ramses III in Medinet Habu); *DZA* 29.820.850 (Stela Vienna 142). Beyond inscriptions, also *DZA* 29.820.760 (*Amduat*, sixth hour; discussed by Gnirs 2013b: 147, n.154); Book of the Dead 17, in a gloss: *pty sw rꜥ m šꜣꜥ=f ḥḳꜣt irt.n=f šꜣꜥ rꜥ pw nsw (...)* (Lapp 2006: 12-4) 'Who is he, Re when he begins to rule (*ḥḳꜣ*) what he has created? This means that Re begins to rule (*nsw*) (...)'. The gloss, absent in CT 335 and still lacking in queen Mentuhotep's coffin (Thirteenth Dynasty), is first documented in early Eighteenth Dynasty versions of the spell (in details, Bickel 2013a: 205-7).

197 E.g. Stela of Sankhenre Mentuhotepi 2 *iri nsw* 'act as a king'; sim. 4; *Cheops' Court* 10.13 *iri nsyt m* 'perform kingship in (...)'; sim. 10.21; 11.1.

198 Detailed analysis: Gnirs 2013b: 144-5.

(i) *Amenemhat* 1d-e

(...) *nsy=k tꜣ ḥḳꜣ=k idbw ir=k ḫꜣw ḥr nfr*

'(...) and be king of the Land, rule the Banks, make an addition to the good.'

(ii) *Urk*. IV 58, 16 - 59, 1 (Ineni: accession of Thutmosis II)

(...) *nsy=f kmt ḥḳꜣ=f dšrt it.n=f idbwy*

'(...) in order that he be king of the Black Land, that he rule the Red Land, having seized the Two Banks (...)'

> Sim. Mariette, *Abydos*, App. B, tableau, C^sic (*temp.* Sethi I) *nsy=k pt tꜣ ḥḳꜣ=k idbwy ir=k ḫꜣw ḥr nfr* 'May you be king of heaven and earth, may you rule the Two Banks, may you make an addition to the good.'

It can not be ruled out that such formulary existed in earlier times already, even if not documented then in the extant record. The point here to be made then lies in the conjunction of the two observations, *nsy* as part of such formulary and the pattern of attestation of *nsy* as an expression in the lexicon. The word is not documented before the early New Kingdom and is associated with a specific formulary in both *Amenemhat* and early New Kingdom texts. As the meaning and textual distribution of *nsy* suggest, the locus of its innovation can hardly have been in ordinary linguistic interaction: like *swt(i)* 'be kingly' in much earlier times, the word is probably a neologistic formation. Together, this points to *nsy* being a new word innovated precisely in the context of such discourse about kingship, of which the formulary would itself be another token.

This interpretation gains further substance in view of how another accession to the throne is phrased in Ineni. A few lines after the accession of Thutmosis II (ii), the accession of Hatshepsut is phrased with *prt-nṯr* 'the offspring of the god', *ḥꜣtt* 'bow warp' (of Upper Egypt), *mnit* 'mooring post' (of the southern countries), and *pḥwyt* 'stern warp' (of the Delta) in close succession (*Urk*. IV 60, 5-8). Reinterpreted, the same expressions recur in immediate collocation in the closing section of *Amenemhat*:[199] 15a-c 'See, I have made the beginning (*ḥꜣt*) so that I can tie the end (*pḥwy*) for you. I have come to harbor (*mni*) for you, my heart's desire; You now wear the White Crown of the offspring of the god (*prt-nṯr*).' *Ḥꜣtt* 'bow warp' and *pḥwyt* 'stern warp' are thereby echoed as *ḥꜣt* 'beginning' and *pḥwy* 'end', to express one core theme of *Amenemhat*, succession of the two kings (the allusion to the formulary is strenghtened by *ts* 'tie', said of *pḥwy*, in *Amenemhat* 15a). *Mnit* 'mooring post' is echoed as *mni* 'come to harbor', according with the strong funerary overtones of the closing section of *Amenemhat*. Among the above, *prt-nṯr* may itself not be documented before the early New Kingdom.[200]

Both in its opening and its closing sections, *Amenemhat* thus displays very significant encounters with early Eighteenth Dynasty formulations of throne succession. *Nsy*, an expression not documented before the early Eighteenth Dynasty, is itself associated with such formulations in *Amenemhat*. Such framing function of the web of

---

199 In details, Gnirs 2013b: 144-5.
200 Gnirs 2013b: 145.

expressions of which *nsy* is part then also demonstrates that *nsy* is integral to the original text of *Amenemhat*.

6.3.2.2 *Amenemhat* 7b *ḥw-ny-r-ḥr* 'combat'

The word has a rich history consisting in successive processes of demotivation and remotivation,[201] the earlier stages of which are here of interest. The expression—originally either 'striking the face' or 'striking in front'—is first attested in the Middle Kingdom. Already fully lexicalized, it then appears in the form *ḥwn-ḥr* (*<ḥ-n-ḥr>*[202] and *<ḥ-n-ḥr*[A24]*>*[203]). In a later stage of development, the same word appears as *ḥw-ny-r-ḥr* (*<ḥ*[A24]*-ny-r-ḥr*[D40]*>*, with variants). In securely dated texts, this stage is first documented in the Eighteenth Dynasty, in Thutmosis III's *Gebel Barkal Stela* 7 (*Urk.* IV 1230, 13)[204] and in Amenhotep II's *Amada Stela* 3 (*Urk.* IV 1290, 11)[205] and 7 (*Urk.* IV 1292, 7-8).[206] Possibly earlier is an instance in *Ipuwer* (12.4), depending on when this composition is dated.

Crucial for interpretation is the observation that the recent form of the word, *ḥw-ny-r-ḥr*, is not merely the result of a graphic change, but also and mainly of a morphological one. Changes leading to the newer form include: (a) graphic moderniza-tion:[207] *<ḥ-n>* > *<ḥ-ny>*; (b) semantic reinterpretation or morphological moderniza-tion:[208] *ḥr* > *r-ḥr*; (c) semantic demotivation, leading to a new segmentation, itself graphically reflected (*ḥwn* > *ḥw*[A24]*-ny*).[209] Of the above, (c) certainly, and (b) possibly, are linguistic in nature.

Amenemhat 7b and *Ipuwer* 12.4 thereby have a recent form (in the linguistic sense) of what in itself is an older word. While not securely documented before the early New Kingdom, this new form of the word could have developed earlier, during the Second Intermediate Period or even in the late Middle Kingdom: the low density of the record does not permit to assess this further. It did not develop before, however, since earlier Middle Kingdom instances of the same word come with a different morphology.

This leaves the issue of assessing whether *ḥw-ny-r-ḥr* is integral to the original text of *Amenemhat* or not. The expression is not merely a modern spelling of an old word, but a morphologically new form of that word. Should *Amenemhat* have been composed at a time when the old form of the word was in use, one must assume that

---

201 Detailed study by Vernus 2003a: 274-6, based on a rich documentation initially gathered in Wilson 1932. The following is largely inspired by Vernus' analyses, except for *Amenemhat* 7b itself, which the author does not mention.

202 Berlin 22820, 3.

203 Hatnub 26, 5.

204 The text as inscribed (*ḥd t3w nbw m ḥw t3 r ḥr=f*) makes no sense (see Klug 2002: 196, who leaves it untranslated); *ḥw-ny*[!]*-r-ḥr* is read with a very minor emendation only (originally Barns 1972: 162; followed by Beylage 2002: 182, n.558).

205 Broken in the Elephantine duplicate.

206 Further *DZA* 26.647.690 (Luxor Hypostyl Hall; Amenhotep III); the expression is not uncommon in Ramesside times, see *TLA* #650061.

207 Vernus 2003: 275.

208 Depending on whether *ḥr* is originally a noun ('face') or an adverb ('in front'), see Vernus 2003a: 274-5.

209 Vernus 2003: 275.

later scribes would have been aware of the historical relationship between *ḥwn-ḥr*[(A24)] and *ḥ*[A24]*-ny-r-ḥr*[D40], a relationship patiently reconstructed by Egyptologists interested in such matters. This is not entirely impossible, but unlikely.

> NB. The two earliest securely dated occurrences of *ḥw-ny-r-ḥr* are in two texts—Thutmosis III's *Gebel Barkal Stela* and Amenhotep II's *Amada Stela*—that resonate with *Amenemhat* in further ways as well. As a standard formulation of royal progress, the former text has *ḥsi*[210] (as in *Amenemhat* 10a) and both have *ini ḏrw* 'reach the limit'[211] (as in *Amenemhat* 10c).[212] Yet another standard expression in such texts is *sp mꜥr*,[213] as in *Amenemhat* 7f which against such background can be read as reversing the topical formulation:
>
> > *Gebel Barkal Stela* 20 (*Urk.* IV 1234, 14) *sp mꜥr ḫpr m-ꜥ=i im=sn* 'Success has occurred on them through my agency.'
> >
> > *Amenemhat* 7f *nn ḫpr sp mꜥr m-ḫmt mkw* 'Success will not occur without a helper.'[214]
>
> The encounter extends to the preceding verse, which sounds as a reversal of a related topical formulation: *Gebel Barkal Stela* 4 (*Urk.* IV 1229, 14) *nsw pw ꜥḥꜣ wꜥ* 'He is a king who fights alone'; *Amenemhat* 7e *nn ꜥḥꜣ wꜥ{t}* 'There is no one who could fight alone.'[215] This is one among various elements by which *Amenemhat* resonates with early Thutmoside inscriptions.[216]

---

210 *Gebel Barkal Stela* 14-15 (*Urk.* IV 1232, 20); 36 (*Urk.* IV 1239, 4).

211 *Gebel Barkal Stela* 3 (*Urk.* IV 1229, 5); also *Amada Stela* 6-7 (*Urk.* IV 1292, 3-4).

212 That these are standard formulations in the early New Kingdom is shown by the fact that *ḥsi* and *ini ḏrw tꜣ* recur alongside one another in other texts as well, e.g. Thutmosis I's *Tombos Stela* 10 (*Urk.* IV 85, 4) and 11 (*Urk.* IV 85, 7), respectively. On the expression *ḏrw tꜣ* in *Amenemhat*, further Gnirs 2013b: 146-7.

213 Beyond the passage quoted below, indirectly (*mꜥr*; *wꜣḥ sp*) also 26 (*Urk.* IV 1236, 8) and *Amada Stela* 8 (*Urk.* IV 1293, 1-2).

214 Compare the fuller quotation above, §6.1.3.1, (i).

215 As one among several layers of meaning, this stands in no contradiction to the observation that internally to *Amenemhat* *wꜥ* in 7e also resonates with 2c, where the loneliness of the king allies him with the Sungod (Parkinson 2002: 247).

216 On the motif of the reception of royal deeds (*Amenemhat* 11d), recurrent in early Thutmoside royal inscriptions including in *Gebel Barkal Stela* (48; *Urk.* IV 1242, 15), see §6.2, comment to the main example. Other elements are discussed by Gnirs 2013b: 149-51. One detail is *šmt ṯsmw* 'dog-walk' (*Amenemhat* 12c), paralleled in *Punt Expedition* (*Urk.* IV 321, 10-11) and in an inscription of Thutmosis III in Wadi Halfa (*Urk.* IV 809, 10-11), see Gnirs 2013b: 150 (also observing that the parallel is more specific than with the formulation in *Sinuhe* B 222-223). A later occurrence of the phrase is in Merenptah's *Amada Stela* 12-13 (K*RI* IV 2, 6), see Manassa 2003: 36-7.

6.4 Dating *Amenemhat*

6.4.1 Temporal range for dating

The linguistic dating of *Amenemhat* is primarily based on the construction of *tw* with non-dynamic events, three times in 11c-d (*ḥḳr.tw*, *ib.tw*, *ḥms.tw*). As emerges from a preliminary discussion of the conditions under which *tw*'s can intrude a text in the course of textual transmission, there is no plausible scenario by which the constructions in *Amenemhat* 11c-d could be textually secondary (§6.2.1). As the subsequent discussion demonstrates, a full-fledged linguistic argument can be based on this construction (§6.2.2-3). The construction of *tw* with non-dynamic events is never attested in any text, literary or otherwise, in the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty, nor in earlier times. Other than in *Amenemhat* 11c-d, first attestations are in a series of Middle Egyptian literary compositions all of which have a sound terminus *ante quem non* by the early Thirteenth Dynasty or later based on independent grounds (*Ipuwer*, *Neferti*, *Kheti*, *Hymn*, the long version of *Loyaliste*: §6.2.2.4).

   The rise of the construction of *tw* with non-dynamic events can be related to a broader process of linguistic change consisting in the extension of *tw* to events that do not meet the semantic condition for passivization in Earlier Egyptian. Stage I of the change—the extension of *tw* to events that lack an agent in their semantic representation—can be dated precisely to the mid-Twelfth Dynasty (§6.2.2.3). The here relevant stage II—the further extension of *tw* to non-dynamic events—was reached later only, although not much later considering the nature of the change, probably therefore by the late Twelfth Dynasty already.

   Early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty texts consistently use a set of other constructions with non-dynamic events whenever the reference of the main participant is to be left unspecified (§6.2.3). Among these, constructions in inscriptional texts are suggestive in formulations closely parallel to the ones in *Amenemhat* and *Neferti*: while these two compositions have *tw*, early Twelfth Dynasty inscriptional texts have altogether different constructions. In appreciating the evidence provided by such inscriptional registers, a caveat resides in that they may in part reflect formulaic language. No similar note of caution extends to literary texts. In *Sinuhe*, *Ptahhotep*, and *Debate of a Man and His Soul*, subjectless constructions (e.g. *sḏr=ø*, *ḥtp=ø*) are consistently used with non-dynamic events as the functional counterparts to *tw*-marked constructions in the same texts (e.g. *pr.tw*, *ḫ3ḏ ͨ.tw*). *Amenemhat* 11c-d, by contrast, has the *tw*-marked construction extended to non-dynamic events, *ḥḳr.tw*, *ib.tw*, *ḥms.tw*.

   The construction considered thereby meets all conditions required for a full-fledged linguistic argument indexed on linguistic change to be devised: exhibiting a consistent pattern of early attestation, demonstrating that some (set of) other construction(s) was (were) used in earlier times to perform similar functions, and relating the relevant innovation to a broader, well analyzed and temporally well anchored, process of change. Accordingly, the constructions in *Amenemhat* 11c-d—and similar ones in *Ipuwer*, *Neferti*, *Kheti*, *Hymn*, and the long version of *Loyaliste*—are not early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian.

As the construction of *tw* with non-dynamic events involves a functional extension of an already existing formal category (*tw* after the verbal stem: *pr.tw → sḏr.tw*), there is no reason to assume that it was any particularly indexical of register when innovated. Unlike for other constructions discussed in the present study, *tw* with non-dynamic events may therefore have been acceptable in literary registers very rapidly. The construction could then have been first used in a literary text almost immediately when stage II in the overall change was reached, as early as the late Twelfth Dynasty.

As also discussed, *Amenemhat* includes no expression that would point to a dating earlier than the first manuscript attestation of the composition (§6.1.3). This was notably demonstrated by considering one of the grammatically most complex sequences in the whole text: as it turns out, all components that made for the difficulty of this passage both in ancient and in modern times are documented in productive use in higher written registers of the early Eighteenth Dynasty. Accordingly, the temporal range for dating defined on strong linguistic grounds extends from the late Twelfth Dynasty (the earliest possible date for the construction in 11c-d) to the early Eighteenth Dynasty (the earliest manuscript attestation of the composition).

6.4.2   Further linguistic indications

In assessing whether some period within the broad temporal range just defined is more likely than other ones, further expressions are suggestive (§6.3).

A. In the lexicon, *ḥw-ny-r-ḥr* 'combat' (7b: §6.3.2.2) is the recent form of a word that is documented as *ḥwn-ḥr* in the Middle Kingdom. Based on the fact that the contrast between the two forms involves semantic reinterpretation and morphological reanalysis, an argument can be made that the expression is almost certainly original in *Amenemhat* 7b. While not securely documented in this recent form before the early Eighteenth Dynasty, *ḥw-ny-r-ḥr* may perhaps have been innovated earlier, but not before the late Middle Kingdom: this confirms that *Amenemhat* was not composed in the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty.

Another lexical expression, *nsy* 'rule' (1d), is probably a neologistic formation coined in the context of discourses on kingship (§6.3.2.1). The expression is not documented before the early New Kingdom. Nor is the broader formulary with which it is associated in *Amenemhat* and in other texts. The structural position of *nsy* in *Amenemhat*, as one among several elements of a formulary spread over and thus framing the overall composition, implies that it is integral to the original text.

While not at the level of individual expressions, a series of further elements are noteworthy in appreciating the broader lexical typology of *Amenemhat*. These include a series of specific lexical encounters with Book of the Dead, all concerning rare expressions. The lexical collocations in the formulary just mentioned, echoed in *Amenemhat* 1d-e and 15a-b, may also be indicative, as collocations. Of interest is finally *nfr-ib* (6b; 14f), which recurs in only one other text, the early Eighteenth Dynasty *Teaching of Aametju*, a text that may also be relevant to other, non-linguistic, aspects of *Amenemhat*.

B. In the closing section, the selection of the old independent pronoun *twt* (15c) is remarkable (§6.3.1). These pronouns are only sparsely documented in the Middle Kingdom and experience a textual revival in the early New Kingdom, in funerary literature and in discourses about rising to kingship. The exact same associations and overtones, which go well beyond mere linguistic antiquarianism, are observed in *Amenemhat* itself, in singular details. The selection of the old independent pronoun in *Amenemhat* 15c makes sense in relation to a specific early Eighteenth Dynasty configuration in written language. In what is preserved in the record, the same selection is uninterpretable against any other background.

C. Based on the cumulated indications summarized above, the present author finds a very late dating within the temporal range previously defined (late Twelfth Dynasty – early Eighteenth) the most likely option. This is an hypothesis only, if one based on a detailed examination of the overall linguistic typology of the composition. Only the terminus *ante quem non* to the late Twelfth Dynasty rests on fully secure grounds.

6.4.3 *Amenemhat* and *Sinuhe*

Even if broad, the range for fully reliable dating here proposed (late D.12 – early D.18: §6.4.1) is not inconsequential for interpretation: *Amenemhat* is later than the events it evokes by at least a century, perhaps by much more. (Beyond language, similar implications would also spring from the pervasive fictionalizing dimensions in the composition:[217] for an historical setting to be fictionalized, some time is generally required.) The composition does not support a 'propaganda model' of the functions of Middle Egyptian literature. Nor can it be read against such an interpretive frame.

Under the range for dating here proposed, *Amenemhat* is also later than another literary composition that refers to the same early Twelfth Dynasty horizon, *Sinuhe*. (Beyond language, issues of decorum would also point to this direction: the events that in *Sinuhe* remain unspeakable of are in *Amenemhat* directly represented.) Encounters between *Sinuhe* and *Amenemhat* abound: the possible relationship between the two compositions must therefore be reassessed.

A. Both *Sinuhe* and *Amenemhat* offer a literary treatment of the demise of Amenemhat I. Both compositions thereby concern royal succession, presented in paradigmatic terms on an occasion that is deeply problematic. In either text, the contrastive parallelism between the two kings, Amenemhat and Senwosret, is highlighted: in *Sinuhe* for example in the first introduction of the two kings[218] or in the encomium;[219] in *Amenemhat* for example by the very speech situation or directly in

---

217 Parkinson 2002: 242, 244, 248; the discussion in Moers 2001: 38-79 carries similar implications.

218 The first textual mentions of the two kings echo one another, notably in the contrast between *nṯr* and *nṯr nfr* underscored by the common cataphoric construction: R 6 *ꜥr nṯr r ꜣḫt=f nsw bity sḥtp-ib-rꜥ* 'Ascending of the god to his horizon—the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Sehetepibre'; R 12-13 (...) *sꜣ=f smsw m ḥry iry nṯr nfr s-n-wsrt* '(...) his oldest son at its head—the young god Senwosret'.

219 *Sinuhe* B 50-51 *ntf dꜣr ḫꜣswt iw it=f m-ḫnw ꜥḥ=f smi=f šꜣt.n=f ḫpr* 'It is he (*scil.* S.) who subjugated foreign countries, his father (*scil.* A.), for his part, stayed inside his palace; he (*scil.* S.) reported that what he (*scil.* A.) had determined had occurred.' In the first part of the passage

the closing section.[220] Royal succession is projected as one major large-scale framing strategy. In *Sinuhe*, the court's initial mourning of the old king's death is ultimately reversed in Sinuhe's epiphanic reintegration into the new king's court;[221] Amenemhat's initial apotheosis, phrased in monumental terms (R 5-8: compare the 'narrative' construction of the infinitive *ꜥr* 'ascending' after the date), is echoed in Sinuhe's own becoming a 'statue' (B 307 *twt*). In *Amenemhat*, the young king's 'rising' to kingship (1d *ḫꜥ*) counterbalances the old king's 'going down' into the solar barque (15e *ḥꜣi*);[222] the opening and the closing sections resonate with each other through elements of a common formulary distributed over these (1d-e; 15a-c).[223]

Both *Sinuhe* and *Amenemhat* are framed as fictionalized self-presentations and integrate phrases from the stock of the ideal biography.[224] In both compositions, these are subverted by context. An example in *Sinuhe* is B 26-27 (the *foreign* sheikh giving water *to* Sinuhe), resonating with B 96 (Sinuhe giving water, *abroad*); the subversion of funerary self-presentations occasionally extends to language itself (B 45, B 114: the active-transitive construction of the pseudoparticiple introducing Sinuhe's speeches to the *foreign* king).[225] In *Amenemhat*, topoi of the ideal biography are similarly subverted, by being set in the mouth of a king, by the overall apologetic context of their utterance (e.g. 3c-d; 4; 11), and by their integration with elements of royal deeds (10; 12; further 7e-f[226] and 11d[227]). In the central lyric at the apex of the overall arc-form in *Sinuhe* (B 149-156), topoi from the ideal biography and Sinuhe's actual situation are opposed in strongly antithetical formulations, expressing intensified inner conflict.[228] Amenemhat's dark questioning of the events is similarly phrased in antithetical formulations in which topoi of the ideal biography are made to clash with actuality (4). Both texts present narrative elements of the fashioning of a life-story, yet one that does not bring about the expected accomplishment (in *Sinuhe*, during his stay abroad; in *Amenemhat*, 10; 12); rather, they lead up to a highly dramaticized turning point (*Sinuhe* B 149-156; *Amenemhat* 14a-c[229]). Both compositions include a final, or near-final, ekphrasis of the tomb (*Sinuhe* B 300-308; *Amenemhat* 13[230]).

Both *Sinuhe* and *Amenemhat* have central climactic episodes consisting in the fight with unnamed representatives of the 'outer' or 'chaotic' world (the strongman of

---

quoted, the parallelism is underscored by the here contrastive *iw*. In the second part, this is carried forth through the complex double anaphoric chain (see §6.2.1.2, (iv)).

220 Compare the balanced cleft-constructions in 15b-c *ink mni* (...) *twt wꜣḥ* (...) 'I (*scil.* A.) have come to harbor (...), *you* (scil. S.) wear (...)' (§6.3.1).

221 To single out one detail, R 9 *rwty wrty ḥtmw* 'the Great Double Portal was closed' is echoed in B 285 *šm.n m-ḫt r rwty wrty* 'and afterwards we went to the Great Double Portal' (now open). *Rwty wrty* may further be echoed in *bꜣty* 'the two bushes' (B 5, in Sinuhe's flight), a rare dual formation with a noun that does not come in natural pairs (Hanna Jenni, p.c. 12/2011).

222 Parkinson 2002: 242.

223 See above, §6.3.1.2.C; §6.3.2.1, *fine*.

224 For *Amenemhat*, lastly Gnirs 2013b: 134-51.

225 Stauder in press a: §3.2; in the present study also §4.1.3.A.

226 See §6.3.2.2.NB.

227 See §6.2, note to the main example.

228 Stauder in press a: §2; Moers 2001: 256-7.

229 See §6.1.2.B.

230 Gnirs 2013b: 135; Blumenthal 1984: 87-8.

Retenu; the plotters[231])—a centrality that was well recognized by ancient readers of either work.[232] In both compositions, anomic elements happen at night-time (marked by *msyt* and *ḫꜣw* in both texts): in Sinuhe's flight[233] and in Amenemhat's weakness in the face of the assailants.[234] Extensive apologetic discourses follow, phrased in strikingly similar terms.[235] Dream-like elements are pervasive in both texts, signaling their fictional nature.[236]

B. The conjunction of the above elements is strongly suggestive of a contact between *Sinuhe* and *Amenemhat*. In itself, this could be interpreted in various ways, as reflecting a common context of composition or as a literary dependency in one direction or another.[237] Based on the terminus *ante quem non* proposed for *Amenemhat* on linguistic grounds, it is submitted that the composition of *Amenemhat* is part of the literary reception of *Sinuhe*.[238] The reception of *Sinuhe*, well documented in general,[239] thereby appears to have extended beyond allusions of various sorts, to inform aspects of a new literary composition: in ancient as in modern times, literature is a stimulus for more literature.

Under this scenario, the literary reference to the early Twelfth Dynasty in *Amenemhat* is not directly to the events themselves but to their cultural memory, as mediated notably by another text, itself literary, *Sinuhe*. *Amenemhat*, a semantically dense composition and a 'teaching' only by extension, addresses core high-cultural contents such as royal succession and the intrusion of the anomic in a virtuosic play with multiple subtexts, including funerary self-presentations, funerary literature, hymns to the Nileflood, texts to do with the accession to kingship, and narratives of royal deeds. As emerges from the present discussion, one additional subtext of the composition is in previously composed narrative literature itself.

---

231 For a narratological study of *Amenemhat* 6-8, Suhr-Gordon 2008.

232 On the centrality of the combat episode in the Ramesside reception of *Sinuhe*, Parkinson 2009: 193; similarly in the Ramesside reception of *Amenemhat*, Morenz 2012a: 142-3; Gnirs 2013b: 135 and n.64.

233 *Sinuhe* B 11-20 *ḫpr.n tr n msyt* (...) *ir=i šmt tr n ḫꜣw* (...) 'When it became supper-time (...) I made my way at night-time (...)'.

234 *Amenemhat* 6a *r-sꜣ msyt pw ḫꜣwy ḫpr* (...) 'It was after supper, night-time had come (...)'.

235 E.g. *Sinuhe* B 223-224 *is wꜥrt tn irt.n bꜣk <im> n ḥmt<=i> s(i) nn s(i) m ib=i n ḳmd=i s(i)* (...) 'Now, this flight which this humble servant made, I had not planned it, it was not in my heart, I had not plotted it (...)'. Extensively in *Amenemhat* as well (7e-9; 14a-c), e.g. 8d-e *ḥr-ntt n ḥr=i st n ḥmt=i st n in ib=i wsfꜣt nt bꜣkw* 'For I had not feared it, I had not planned it, my heart had not thought of the negligence of servants.'

236 In *Sinuhe*, Parkinson 2006; 2002: 160-1; in *Amenemhat*, Parkinson 2002: 242, 244.

237 See for example the scenarios discussed by Winand (in press a) relative to a contact between *Sinuhe* and *Shipwrecked Sailor*.

238 Independently from the present author and from one another, Moers (in press) and Winand (in press a: §8) now also evoke the possibility of a dependency of *Amenemhat* upon *Sinuhe*.

239 E.g. Parkinson 2009: 173-87, particularly 176-80, 182.

7 CONCLUSION

7.1 Methods and strategies

Possible strategies for linguistic dating vary greatly depending on the nature of the objects to be dated and on the time period for possible dating. In the case of Middle Egyptian literary texts, relevant issues to do with the objects themselves include textual transmission in a manuscript culture, the configuration of language in literature and associated issues of register, the conciseness of most texts, and the densely intertextual nature of Middle Egyptian literature in general. Relevant contextual dimensions include the shortness of the time period for dating (from ca. 1950 to 1450 BCE), the low density of the contemporaneous written record, and the substantial linguistic continuity in relevant written registers during that period. These contextual dimensions conspire to make the primary description of linguistic change often difficult. In addition, morphological change is almost entirely trapped in a dead angle due to the nature of the writing system, so that dating must mainly rely on grammatical change. Except in a few favorable cases, possible lexical indications can only have a complementary status in the argument.

Like other dimensions that can be considered for dating Middle Egyptian literary texts, linguistic approaches thus come with limitations of their own. Individual linguistic arguments that can be made weigh differently, ranging from the merely suggestive to the individually decisive: an explicit discussion of the force, or weakness, of individual arguments or indications is in all cases essential in appreciating the linguistic typology of a Middle Egyptian literary text being studied. Several of these limitations are intrinsic and will therefore remain, while other ones can be worked on in future research.

7.1.1 The objects to be dated: General issues

Any linguistic dating is contingent upon the stability or fluidity of texts. Eighteenth Dynasty witnesses, on which the present study is based for the most part, generally display a much better text than Ramesside ones do, yet are not immune to textual alterations either. As *Ptahhotep* directly demonstrates, an Eighteenth Dynasty manuscript of a text originally composed in the Twelfth can include distinctively late linguistic features (§2.3.5). In the case of *Ptahhotep*, these late features of the L2 text can be shown to be secondary on text-internal grounds, i.e. without drawing any

knowledge of the text in P, nor even of the existence of P and L1, into account. A linguistic dating of *Ptahhotep* based on the L2 text would therefore not have resulted in wrongly ascribing the composition to the Eighteenth Dynasty. More generally, working on Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts requires that principled strategies for assessing the likelihood for a given expression to be original, or not, must be devised. The goal is not to reconstruct an Urtext but to assess the textual status of individual constructions that could be relevant to dating. The possibility for doing so varies widely, depending on what (type of) expression(s) is considered and on the particular context in which a given expression is used in a given text.

A very general strategy is to examine how tightly an expression fits its context. A textually secondary expression can sometimes be identified as such directly by traces the alteration has left in the immediate textual surroundings or by a particular hybrid form under which that expression presents itself in a manuscript being studied (e.g. §2.3.2.2, (i) for a lexical expression; §2.3.3.F, §2.3.5, and §2.8.3.2.NB for grammatical ones). Conversely, when an expression fits its context in very specific ways, an argument can be derived that it is in all likelihood original (e.g. §3.4.1.4). A further step consists in considering how likely an expression, or type of expression, is to undergo alteration in general. Grammatical expressions vary widely in their propensity to do so (e.g. §2.3.3). Moreover, some expressions can be shown to undergo alteration only under very specific conditions, not randomly (e.g. §6.2.1). While individual histories are always possible (e.g. §5.2.1), such combined considerations can support claims phrased in terms of at times strongly differential likelihood.

An additional strategy is to ask what the original text could have been assuming that the transmitted one is secondary in the expression considered, and by what processes such hypothesized older text could have been altered to the documented one. With grammatical expressions, possible 'source constructions' (in a textual sense) are considered: when no plausible candidate for such can be proposed, the likelihood for the expression in the transmitted text to be original is assessed as high (e.g. §5.2.2.B and *passim* throughout the present study: a common strategy). Making a similar type of argument with lexical expressions is considerably more difficult, yet occasionally possible based on their meaning (e.g. §5.6.1; §5.6.2) or their morphology (§4.6.7.A; §4.6.7.B; §6.3.2.2).

In some cases, strong arguments can be derived from an examination of a composition as a whole. The argument is then that the expression in the text as it stands is consistent with how the text functions as a whole in the relevant dimension (e.g. §2.3.3, in relation to the overall temporality of *Kheti*; §3.2.2.B, *fine*, in relation to the lexical and literary typology of *Fishing and Fowling*). As a variant to this, the status of a given construction as integral to the original text can occasionally be established through an analysis of the role of the construction considered in large-scale compositional patterns extending over much of the text discussed. The argument then consists in identifying such a complex large-scale pattern in a composition which included one, in showing that the construction concerned is an integral component of this pattern, and in demonstrating further that the pattern identified is too complex or thorough-going to have arisen as a chance artifact of transmission or through localized réécriture (§5.2.2 and §5.2.3.3; §5.3.3).

As regards language in literature, important consequences for dating spring from the densely intertextual nature of Middle Egyptian literature, from the high degree of standardization of Middle Egyptian in general, and from the substantial cultural, and thereby linguistic, continuity in textual expressions of Middle Egyptian culture more broadly. Both in literature and in the external record, this results in recurrent configurations of language that are only limitedly distinctive of time. In dating, these dimensions are felt at their strongest in teachings, which are composed with a relatively limited set of grammatical constructions, include much pre-configured language, and are typically the least linguistically distinctive among types of Middle Egyptian literary discourses (e.g. §2.6.2.7.B; §2.8; §4.5). Significantly, the main indication for dating the long version of *Loyaliste* resides in a construction that is not indexed on linguistic change (§4.5.2). In *Amenemhat*, the core argument for dating concerns an expression in a section modeled on funerary self-presentations, an expression, therefore, that is not part of the general stock of formulations associated with teachings (§6.2).

Further blurring factors lie with expressions, or uses of expressions, that are mainly, or uniquely, documented in literature (e.g. §2.4.2; §2.4.5); by definition, these are difficult, or impossible, to anchor to changes documented in the external record. Moreover, linguistic registers of Middle Egyptian literature are internally variable, including within the same composition (§2.4.3.1). They also display an at times considerable breadth, with expressions of different ages coexisting alongside each other within the same composition (§2.4.3.2). Differences in linguistic register only limitedly project over time, and not linearly (§2.4.4). More generally, language in literature is subject to manipulation by compositions, expressive or indexical. No linear relative chronology reflecting ongoing linguistic change can therefore be established for Middle Egyptian literature. In all cases linguistic selections must be interpreted (e.g. §2.4.4; §3.1.3; §4.4.5.B; §6.3.1).

7.1.2   Dating indexed on linguistic change

The most common strategy for linguistic dating consists in providing a terminus *ante quem non* and a terminus *post quem non*, thereby defining a temporal range within which a text could have been composed. Criteria for establishing such upper and lower chronological bounds are then based on innovation and obsolescence in written language. They are, in other words, indexed on ongoing linguistic change as reflected in relevant written registers (linguistic change in spoken language is both inaccessible empirically and irrelevant to the issue). By definition, these strategies are directly contingent upon the precision with which ongoing linguistic change can be described and analyzed in the early/mid-second millennium written record. As the record is itself an ultimately artifactual object, patterns of attestation must be assessed as to their reliability in all cases. The low density of the record makes the task no easier. In addition, innovative expressions do not simply supersede older ones in similar functions, but coexist with these, often over protracted periods in time (e.g. §2.6.3). This results in an inherent thickness of language, in general and particularly so in the early/mid-second millennium written registers relevant to the present study.

Conditioned by such difficulties, the current description of Middle Egyptian remains incomplete in many ways, especially when it comes to changes within Middle Egyptian and to the more subtle dimensions of linguistic meaning and function that are often the ones most relevant for dating.

In assessing patterns of attestation as to their reliability, various strategies, ideally to be combined, can be pursued. Patterns of attestation are most likely to be reliable when the expression is frequent in language, and therefore in text; when in earlier times another expression can be shown to have been used in similar functions; and when the change under consideration can be interpreted in relation to a broader process of change of which it is a part. In terms of the above conditions, lexical expressions often fare badly: many are low in text frequency and changes affecting them are individual histories, not to be related to broader processes of linguistic change. In addition, patterns of attestation of lexical expressions can be over-determined by whatever subject matters and types of written discourse, and thereby semantic fields and registers, happen to be documented in the record in various periods. Only in some cases does a lexical expression individually provide a valuable indication for dating: when an expression is common in text and has a meaning less subject to the vagaries of attestation (thus with prepositions or adverbial expressions, e.g. §2.8.3.4, (ii); §4.2.3); when a pattern of attestation can be interpreted as coherently pointing to a certain horizon in time (e.g. §5.8.1.3); when change can be traced in some details in the record (e.g. §2.7.3.3, (i); §4.6.7.A; §6.3.2.2); or when the first documentation of a lexical expression can be related to the introduction of a new referent (e.g. §5.5.1; probably §5.5.2; possibly §2.8.3.6.B). In most cases, possible lexical evidence can only be treated as cumulative, with various expressions weighing differently. The lexicon is then appreciated as a complementary indication, not as a self-standing argument, within the overall linguistic typology of a composition being studied.

Grammatical expressions differ from lexical ones in having a more general linguistic meaning or function. Accordingly, they are less subject to the vagaries of attestation, some are fairly frequent in text, and changes affecting them can in various cases be analyzed in relation to broader processes of changes: in short, their patterns of attestation can often be subjected to a principled discussion. However, changes affecting grammatical expressions are not many in the time period considered, and not all can be described in the record in ways that are as detailed as would be required for a temporally precise dating criterion to result. Unsurprisingly, strong dating criteria based on changes that can be interpreted in the broader context of other changes are themselves very few. Among these, the best are often the ones that target changes in the functions of expressions, rather than in their form: examples include criteria based on a change in the expression of aspect (§2.6.2), in the functions of *p₃* (§2.4.4.1.B), and in the expression of passive voice (§5.2; §5.3; §6.2). With all of these, linguistic form is uncriterial, since it remains stable over the time period concerned; as regards the mere presence or absence of *p₃* in a Middle Egyptian literary text, this is a matter of register, not of time (§2.4.4.2). Only very few criteria can be based on changes in linguistic form, for example the rise of the new subject pronoun. This is of limited practical application (only two texts: §3.4.1; §4.4.3.1), unsurprisingly so: in being

highly innovative on the level of linguistic form, the new subject pronoun is demonstrably subject to restrictions to do with register well into the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty. More generally, expressions that are saliently innovative in their form tend to be indexical of register in all Middle Egyptian times and registers here relevant: while they can be found in other contemporaneous types of written discourses, at times even in regular use, they are generally not expected to be selected by composers of Middle Egyptian literary texts of any period. One immediate consequence is also that their absence in a given composition is not an indication for an earlier dating.

Post quem non criteria are considerably more difficult to devise than *ante quem non* ones. Equivalently, *post quem non* criteria can be devised, but will typically come with a considerably lesser temporal resolution than *ante quem non* ones. This is largely for structural reasons: obsolescence (on which the former are to be based) is inherently more difficult to track empirically than innovation (on which the latter are based). Moreover, the innovation of a new expression, or of a new function of an existing expression, does not entail the immediate obsolescence of an older expression used in similar function, or of an older function of the same or of another expression. Accordingly, obsolescence can not be established through a consideration of a related innovation in the same linguistic domain, but must be established directly for itself. The study of obsolescence is then necessarily subject to the limitative conditions mentioned first (detailed case study, §2.6). This situation becomes critical in the period relevant for dating Middle Egyptian texts, which is fairly short in linguistic terms and characterized by a strong linguistic continuity in relevant registers. In practice, *post quem non* criteria point to periods later, if sometimes not by much, than the first manuscript attestation of the texts to be dated (§2.6.3; §2.7.2; §2.8.2; §5.1.4; §6.1.3.1); an exception is only *Ipuwer*, for circumstantial reasons (the very late date of the sole preserved manuscript of the composition). In the future, a refined diachronic description of Middle Egyptian grammar could perhaps lead to identifying some expressions not documented any more in productive usage in early New Kingdom times. However, such expressions would probably have to be fairly specific ones: other ones, including uncommon or subtles ones, have already been shown not to support *post quem non* criteria for the time period relevant. As suggested below, arguments for excluding late datings are best based on altogether different strategies, not indexed on linguistic change directly or not based on expressions considered individually.

Ante quem non criteria come with strong limitations of their own, which are also in large part structural. As mentioned, various conditions are required to assess the reliability of patterns of attestation in the record and changes that meet the full set of these conditions are not many during the time period concerned. Moreover, several of these changes happened to occur, or to begin, during the late Twelfth or early Thirteenth Dynasty, not later, not earlier (e.g. §2.6.2; §5.2; §6.2). In other cases, the low density of the written record, particularly in the centuries after the Twelfth and before the Eighteenth Dynasty, makes it difficult to assess when exactly an expression was innovated in relevant written registers. In several cases, an expression first documented in the early Eighteenth Dynasty can be demonstrated not to be Twelfth

Dynasty Middle Egyptian based on an interpretation of patterns of attestation, the exhibition of other expressions used in Twelfth Dynasty Middle Egyptian to perform similar functions, and an analysis of broader processes of linguistic change to which the change concerned relates. The relevant innovation could then have occurred at any time between the early Thirteenth and early Eighteenth Dynasty: when it actually did remains beyond empirical description. For methodological reasons, the terminus *ante quem non* must then be set to the early Thirteenth Dynasty, as the earliest moment in time for which given the evidence available it can not be ruled out any more that the innovation may have taken place (type-B terminus *ante quem non*). As the double negation expresses, this is only a terminus *ante quem non* for the actual terminus *ante quem non*: the relevant innovation may in fact have taken place later than the time to which the terminus had to be set (e.g. §2.4.4.1.B; §5.3; 6.2.2.6.2).

Compounded with the conciseness of many compositions and other factors reducing their linguistic distinctiveness, these restrictive conditions to which *ante quem non* and *post quem non* criteria are subject directly determine the temporal ranges for dating that can be defined. To make such temporal ranges as reliable as possible, these are based strictly on the *ante quem non* criteria that meet the full set of conditions recalled above (frequency, documentation of other expressions used in similar function in earlier times, possibility of an analysis in relation to broader process of change). Moreover, various expressions are treated as type-B *ante quem non* criteria, thus as pointing to a terminus set to a time possibly earlier than the actual time of the innovation they concern. As current *post quem non* criteria point to periods later than the first manuscript attestation of most compositions to be dated, it is the latter that in practice provides the terminus *post quem non*.

That the early Eighteenth Dynasty is often included in temporal ranges for dating does not in itself mean that a composition must necessarily be as late. The case of *Ptahhotep* may serve as a reminder: if no Middle Kingdom copies had survived, late features in the text could be identified as secondary on criteria internal to L2 and no erroneous claim would be made that *Ptahhotep* was composed in the Eighteenth Dynasty. However, it would be difficult to declare the early Eighteenth Dynasty impossible on linguistic grounds. Conversely, that earlier periods are included in temporal ranges for dating does not mean that a composition must necessarily be as early. For example, no terminus *ante quem non* later than to the early Twelfth Dynasty could be defined for *Chapelle Rouge*: based on criteria indexed on linguistic change, the composition is dated to a broad period ranging from the early Twelfth Dynasty to its 'manuscript' terminus *post quem non*, under Hatshepsut. Yet, the compostion can be securely dated to the early Eighteenth Dynasty based on other linguistic strategies (§4.1.2); it is much later, therefore, than its linguistic terminus *ante quem non*. With a literary composition similarly, no terminus *ante quem non* other than to the Middle Kingdom could be defined for *Sporting King* by the above strategies indexed on linguistic change, yet there are strong linguistic indications of an altogether different sort that this is in all likelihood an Eighteenth Dynasty composition (§4.3).

When only a broader dating is possible based on criteria indexed on linguistic change, this mainly reflects the conditions under which linguistic dating has to be carried out. Put differently, all periods within the range for dating must be considered equally likely unless specified otherwise. In subsequently assessing if any period within a temporal range proposed is distinguished as more likely than others, further indications for dating can often be drawn into account. These can be valuable, individually or collectively, but have a secondary status with respect to the main argument: unlike the full-fledged linguistic criteria based on which the basic temporal ranges for dating are proposed, these indications are of a sort that does not permit to bound all uncertainties associated with them. In favorable cases, however, such uncertainties can be considerably reduced. In addition, altogether different strategies can sometimes be pursued (the next section).

7.1.3 Alternative strategies

In dating indexed on ongoing linguistic change, the varying degrees of temporal resolution that can be achieved are externally imposed by diverse factors, several of which structural, other ones ultimately determined by chance. Complementarily, an altogether different approach is sometimes possible when a composition includes one or several expressions that diverge from regular usage and when such divergence can be meaningfully related to a specific horizon in written language. Uncommon, or even unique, constructions, often hybrid or otherwise aberrant in their semantic or syntactic makeup, are thereby considered. These—which could not have arisen under the conditions of regular linguistic interaction—are related to configurations of written language where similar phenomena are documented. They are then further interpreted in relation to the broader cultural contexts they may reflect. When an at first aberrant construction can be shown to be principled in its makeup, or when it can be shown to fit the particular expression or linguistic typology of a text being studied, an argument also results to imply that this construction is not a secondary artifact of textual transmission. Dating then directly targets the relevant horizon in written language; in most cases, fairly precise datings result ('direct dating': §4).

No more than general guidelines can be defined for 'direct dating': in all cases, individual interpretive strategies must be pursued to accord with the particular expression, not solely linguistic, of a text being studied. For example *Heavenly Cow*, which can be dated by such strategy (§4.6), differs in its linguistic typology from all other texts included in the present study. Among literary texts, *Sporting King* has a construction that accommodates the conflicting semantics of two other constructions: the overall construction is paralleled in early Eighteenth Dynasty times, only then, and is demonstrably an innovation of some written discourses of that period. The same composition includes a construction that is aberrant in its form: this is unique, purely textual in origin, and places *Sporting King* in the reception of the R tradition of *Sinuhe* as otherwise documented in the early Eighteenth Dynasty (§4.3). A construction in *Neferkare and Sisene* is aberrant in how it accommodates two semantically and syntactically incompatible elements, yet makes perfect expressive sense in the specific context of the *Tale*. Texts of the early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty afford direct parallels

for this construction, for the relevant components thereof, and for the general principle presiding over such recombination; no other period in the early/mid-second millennium BCE does (§4.4). If *Sinuhe* had to be dated linguistically, the most powerful argument for a dating into the Twelfth Dynasty would be with an examination of the indexical over-determinations of some constructions as these are used in the *Tale*, expressing and twisting webs of cultural significations established in other types of written discourses. The relevant webs of significations are observed to be fully active in the Twelfth Dynasty only (§4.1.3).

That a composition should accommodate constructions lending themselves to a 'direct dating' is contingent upon its particular contents and expression. In *Sinuhe*, this is to do with how this composition in particular evokes biographies and expedition accounts, in a palimpsest that extends to the linguistic level. Altogether different is the case of *Neferkare and Sisene*, where the presence of the aberrant expression mentioned is interpreted as a token of the parodistic tone also otherwise observed in this text. In general, only a few Middle Egyptian literary texts include elements supporting similar approaches; other types of written discourses that are more strongly over-determined in their language may include more.

All the above strategies have in common to target individual expressions, for how they relate to ongoing linguistic change as reflected in written registers, or for how they relate to specific configurations, culturally determined, in written language. A complementary strategy, only limitedly explored in the present study, consists in looking at coherent sets, or if possible even repertoires, of expressions. This approach permits to circumvent some of the difficulties and limitations associated with strategies that target individual expressions, the low number and at times unprecise temporal resolution of *ante quem non* criteria, the current and in part structural difficulty in devising *post quem non* criteria pointing to a period earlier than the first manuscript documentation, and the necessarily limited number of expressions that lend themselves to a 'direct dating'. The perspective is thereby on groups of individually noteworthy expressions in a text to be dated that recur alongside each other in other texts as well. When sets of expressions can be shown not only to recur alongside each other but to cohere, they also contribute a direct indication that the expressions considered are integral to the original composition. While textual alteration can result in elements typical of some later period than the composition, a repertoire that is cohesive, either in itself or with respect to the specific expression of a text to be dated, can only have been composed.

'Dating by repertoires', as the strategy may be termed provisionally, has to do with a refined study of registers. It is also related to 'direct dating' inasmuch as a certain horizon in the configuration of written language is directly targeted in either approach. The intimate connection between the two strategies is illustrated in the present study by the case of the Old Egyptian expressions in (Hatshepsut's) *Royal Cycle*. These do not form an Old Egyptian layer, but consist in a selection of mostly formally salient expressions. While some of these individually recur in the Middle Kingdom, their collection is paralleled only in inscriptions dealing with kingship of the times of Hatshepsut/Thutmosis III. Significant of the coherence of such repertoire

is that several of these expressions are used in the *Cycle* carrying specific indexical overtones, just as they do in other inscriptions of Hatshepsut/Thutmosis III (§4.7.1). In a similar vein, one of the indexically over-determined expressions that permit a linguistic dating of *Sinuhe* to the Twelfth Dynasty is part of a set of expressions shared between this composition and Khentemsemti's mid-Twelfth Dynasty biographical inscription. The linguistic communication between the two texts can be assessed as significant because several of the expressions involved are otherwise very uncommon and because Khentemsemti is a short text (§4.1.3.C). In *Merikare*, elements of a communication with a series of early Eighteenth Dynasty texts are not similarly dense and concern expressions that, if individually noteworthy, are less strongly remarkable than the ones shared by *Sinuhe* and Khentemsemti. While there could be some indication for dating *Merikare*, this can not support a claim as strong as could be made for *Sinuhe* (§2.8.3.7; §2.8.4.B).

Speaking prospectively, repertoires could be considered on a broader scale as well as set in relation to what might be termed the overall syntactic texture of a composition to be dated. It is the present author's impression that the petitions of *Eloquent Peasant* or *Debate of a Man and His Soul* could probably be identified as having been composed in the Middle Kingdom on these levels: on the dimensions just evoked, these differ from compositions for which a post-Middle Kingdom dating is proposed in the present study. The experiment may seem biased, since *Eloquent Peasant* and *Debate* are not documented in early New Kingdom manuscripts; yet, as *Ptahhotep*, *Sinuhe*, and *Loyaliste* collectively suggest, the dimensions to be concerned are only limitedly altered in textual transmission during the centuries here relevant. If sufficiently refined, such approach could in part replace *post quem non* criteria in supplying the relevant information that these currently and possibly for structural reasons fail to provide.

Like in other domains of inquiry, some matters may remain undecidable. For example *Ptahhotep*, a teaching, may turn out less linguistically distinctive than *Eloquent Peasant* or *Debate of a Man and His Soul* under the approach just outlined.[1] In a similar way, *Aametju*, another teaching, is linguistically undatable: its linguistic typology, just as its 'style', would fit a Twelfth Dynasty dating perfectly (§1.3.2.3). While *Aametju* was composed in the Eighteenth Dynasty, *Ptahhotep* was in the Twelfth. That linguistically defined ranges for dating other teachings such as *A Man to His Son* or *Merikare* extend from the late (/later?, respectively) Twelfth Dynasty to the Eighteenth relates to the same phenomenon of linguistic undistinctiveness, highest in this type of literary discourse. This may prove intrinsic.

---

1 The undecidability here discussed concerns the productive period of the Middle Egyptian literary tradition. The question of whether *Ptahhotep* could have been composed before the Twelfth Dynasty is for its part easily answered on linguistic grounds (§2.4.3).

7.2   Proposed datings and ranges for dating

The following datings or ranges for dating are proposed. When not specified other-
wise, no period in a temporal range proposed is linguistically distinguished as more
likely than any other one.

> *A Man to His Son*:   late D.12 – early D.18 (§2.6.2.7.B)

Only one construction in *A Man to His Son*, a philologically difficult text, was
discussed (§2.3.4 for the reading). This implies a terminus *ante quem non* to the early
Thirteenth, or perhaps late Twelfth, Dynasty (§2.6.2.6.B; §2.6.2.7.B). As no overall
examination of the composition was carried out, the terminus is here set to the highest
date that can not be excluded. Pending further examination, the linguistic typology of
A Man—a teaching, and highly intertextual—seems largely undistinctive.

> *Amenemhat*:   late D.12 – early D.18 (§6)
>
>   (more probably early D.18?)

One construction supports a full-fledged argument implying a terminus *ante quem
non* to the late Twelfth Dynasty (§6.2).

> The lexicon displays possibly significant encounters with some early Eighteenth
> Dynasty texts (§6.3.2). A dating to this time could also be supported by one
> specific linguistic selection in the composition (§6.3.1). The expression concerned
> carries overtones in *Amenemhat* that make sense in relation to configurations of
> written language otherwise documented in the early Eighteenth Dynasty; in the
> preserved record, the same selection is uninterpretable against any other
> background. A dating to the early Eighteenth Dynasty—here presented as an
> hypothesis only—thus seems the option most consistent with the overall linguistic
> typology of the composition.

> *Cheops' Court*:   early D.13 or later – late SIP (?) (§2.4.4)

The terminus *ante quem non* is based on the functions of *p3*, already weakening in
deictic force (§2.4.4.1.B): in *Cheops' Court*, *p3* displays a more advanced stage of
development than in late Twelfth Dynasty documentary texts. This is a type-B *ante
quem non*: the next stage of development in the functions of *p3* would only be reached
by the early Eighteenth Dynasty. When between the early Thirteenth and early
Eighteenth Dynasty the stage of development as in *Cheops' Court* was actually
reached can not be established since it first documented in *Cheops' Court* itself. A
terminus *ante quem non* to the early Thirteenth Dynasty may therefore be too early.

> (Elements that have been described as 'Late Middle Egyptian' in *Cheops' Court*
> are primarily to do with the linguistic register of the composition, as determined
> by its literary register: they do not support conclusions for dating.)

Eloquent Peasant: mid-D.12 (§3.1.2)

The one linguistic argument classically evoked in dating *Eloquent Peasant* to the mid-Twelfth Dynasty turns out not to apply to this composition (§2.6.2.1-3). However, a series of other constructions concur in pointing to the Twelfth Dynasty and one to the mid-part thereof precisely (§3.1.2).

Eulogistic Account of a King: (late?) SIP (§3.3.2)

In what is preserved of the composition, one construction suggests a dating close in time to the single manuscript (§3.3.2). So does one adverbial expression (§4.2.3).

Fishing and Fowling: probably D.18 (§3.2)

While the fragmentary state of the composition does not support much in ways of a grammatical analysis, one construction implies a terminus *ante quem non* to the early Thirteenth, or perhaps late Twelfth, Dynasty (§2.6.2.6.A; §3.2.1). Two lexical expressions in the text are otherwise typical of Ramesside literature to come, have highly consistent patterns of attestation, and are arguably integral to the original text. Their presence in *Fishing and Fowling* makes a dating to the Eighteenth Dynasty the most likely option (§3.2.2).

Hymn to Hapi: late D.17 – early D.18 (§3.4)

Two grammatical expressions both individually define termini *ante quem non* to the late Seventeenth Dynasty (§3.4.1-2). A third implies a type-B terminus *ante quem non* to the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (§3.4.3; §5.3). A fourth suggests a composition during, or close to, the early Eighteenth Dynasty (§3.4.4). In addition, a series of these expressions are combined with other ones in ways that also point to an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon in written culture (§3.4.5.B).

> Based on the last observation and on how the expression mentioned first is documented spreading across written registers, a dating to the early Eighteenth Dynasty is slightly more likely than one to the late Seventeenth.

Ipuwer: early D.13 – mid-D.18 (§6.2.2.5)

One construction implies a terminus *ante quem non* to the early Thirteenth, or perhaps late Twelfth, Dynasty (§2.6.2.4). A series of indications confirm a dating no earlier than the Thirteenth Dynasty (§6.2.2.5). Indications for a dating to the Eighteenth Dynasty are either weak or possibly textually secondary. The consistently Middle Egyptian language of the composition speaks against a composition after the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty, as do individual expressions in the composition (e.g. §6.2.2.5, (i) and (ii)). The text is often unstable, reducing prospects for a linguistic analysis.

Khakheperreseneb: early D.13 – early D.18 (§2.7)

One construction, the same as in *Ipuwer*, implies a terminus *ante quem non* to the early Thirteenth, or perhaps late Twelfth, Dynasty (§2.6.2.5). Various indications confirm a dating no earlier than the Thirteenth Dynasty (§2.7.3). Possible indications for a dating close in time to this terminus *ante quem non* are inconclusive (2.7.2); similarly inconclusive are possible indications for a dating close in time to the first manuscript attestation of the composition (§2.7.3). In interpreting the linguistic typology of the *Khakheperreseneb*, its claimed concern with tradition may be relevant.

Kheti: (*mid-D.13 or later*) – early D.18 (§6.2.2.6)

Two constructions support full-fledged linguistic arguments. One implies that a dating to the Twelfth Dynasty is linguistically too early (§6.2.2.6.2). The other one implies a type-B terminus *ante quem non* to the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (§5.3): the construction may in fact have become possible only later (compare the comments below on *Neferti*, which has the same construction).

> Both constructions further suggest that a dating to the early Eighteenth Dynasty is significantly more likely than an earlier dating within the temporal range defined.

Loyaliste, long version: early D.18 probably in large parts (§4.5)

The composition—a teaching, and highly intertextual—is largely undistinctive linguistically. On compositional grounds, the long version of *Loyaliste* (a *Teaching of Kairsu*) is secondary to the short version (*Sehetepibre*) (§4.5.5). One expression in the first part of *Kairsu* directly dates the verse in which it occurs and the ones that surround it to the early Eighteenth Dynasty (§4.5.2). Other expressions mostly in the second part of *Kairsu* also suggest an early Eighteenth Dynasty dating for the verses in which they occur (§4.5.3). On strict methodology, linguistic arguments or indications for dating can have scope only over individual (groups of) verses in *Kairsu*, not necessarily extending to the long version as a whole. Whether *Kairsu* as a whole is an early Eighteenth Dynasty production therefore falls beyond the scope of the present study.

Merikare: (later?) D.12 – early D.18 (§2.8)

                                        (late in this temporal range??)

One element of morphology implies a secure terminus *ante quem non* to the Twelfth Dynasty, ruling out a dating of *Merikare* to its Herakleopolitan setting. When set against the background of the spread of the relevant change in time and across registers during the Middle Kingdom, the same expression suggests that a dating to a time as early as the earlier Twelfth Dynasty, although not to be ruled out fully, is unlikely (§2.8.3.2). Other than this, grammatical expressions do not provide reliable indications neither for an earlier dating nor for a later one within the broad temporal range thus defined (§2.8.2-3).

A few lexical expressions could be indicative of a late dating (§2.8.3.4). Moreover, these and other noteworthy expressions recur alongside each other in a series of early Eighteenth Dynasty texts (§2.8.3.7). Such constellation could be interpreted as suggestive of a late dating of *Merikare*, but is not dense enough to support any firm conclusion.

Neferkare and Sisene: D.18 (§4.4)

One hybrid combination—aberrant in Middle Egyptian grammar, yet principled in how it functions in context—directly relates the composition to an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon in written culture (§4.4.2). In addition, *Neferkare* includes a series of innovative expressions with termini *ante quem non* by the very late Second Intermediate Period (§4.4.3). Given the mostly late manuscripts of the composition, not all of these expressions are necessarily original, but some arguably are. The construction mentioned first is for its part so specific that it must be original.

Neferti: (*mid-D.13 or later*) – early D.18 (§5).

Three constructions in *Neferti* support full-fledged linguistic arguments. One implies a terminus *ante quem non* to the late Twelfth Dynasty (§6.2). The second implies a terminus *ante quem non* to the early Thirteenth Dynasty, or perhaps late Twelfth, depending on how spread across registers is modeled (§5.2). The third implies a terminus *ante quem non* to the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (§5.3).

The last is a type-B *ante quem non*, determined in its temporal resolution by the low density of the Second Intermediate Period record. Earliest occurrences of the construction are otherwise from the late Second Intermediate Period and early Eighteenth Dynasty; the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty is only the earliest period for which based on the written evidence available it can not be ruled out any more that the construction may have then been first innovated. The construction was therefore innovated at some point between the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty and the late Second Intermediate Period.

Additional indications for dating consist in two remarkable lexical expressions and in two narrative formulae (§5.5-6). Individually and collectively, these very strongly suggest that *Neferti* was composed in the early Eighteenth Dynasty.

Ptahhotep: (*late D.11*) – early/mid-D.12 (§2.4.3.3)

Any dating earlier than the Middle Kingdom is ruled out linguistically. A dating to the late Eleventh Dynasty is less likely than one to the Twelfth.

Sporting King: probably D.18 (§4.3)

The dating is based on two expressions, none of which could have arisen in regular linguistic change and both to be related to a definite horizon in written culture. The first places *Sporting King* in the reception of the R tradition of *Sinuhe*, as documented for the very expression concerned in other early Eighteenth Dynasty texts and only in these (§4.3.2). The second expression, consisting in the combination of two elements

otherwise semantically exclusive of each other, is demonstrably an innovation of early/mid-Eighteenth Dynasty royal inscriptions (§4.3.3). For *Sporting King* to have been composed before the Eighteenth Dynasty, both these expressions must be textually secondary: based on further considerations, this is very unlikely.

Tale Involving the House of Life: (late?) SIP (§3.3.1)

Two constructions place the composition in the Second Intermediate Period, probably in the later part thereof, and thereby close in time to its manuscript attestation.

(Not discussed in the present study: *Djedefhor*; *Oxford Wisdom Text*; *Tale of a King and the Ghost of Snefer*.[2])

Although not literary texts in a narrow sense, three other compositions were included in the main discussion:

Berlin Leather Roll: probably D.18 (§4.2)

Various expressions strongly suggest that *Berlin Leather Roll* is genuinely a product of the early Eighteenth Dynasty, not merely in redactional terms. A newly composed text, *Berlin Leather Roll* probably drew on earlier materials, textual or phraseological, according with what the functions of a pseudepigraphy in early New Kingdom times seem to have been. What these earlier materials were, in what amounts they were drawn upon, and how they were integrated by early Eighteenth Dynasty composers are essential questions in appreciating what 'composition' here textually means. Answering these questions in details remains beyond the reach of a linguistic analysis and possibly of any type of analysis.

Heavenly Cow: D.18 (§4.6)

A whole series of expressions unambiguously relate the composition to a distinctively Eighteenth Dynasty horizon in written culture. When more precisely during the Eighteenth Dynasty *Heavenly Cow* was composed is difficult to assess based on linguistic grounds: a few indications weakly speak to a later rather than earlier dating within the Dynasty.

The *Royal Cycle*:   Hatshepsut (§4.7)

The dating to Hatshepsut is established through an examination of the particular configuration of Old Egyptian expressions in the *Cycle* (§4.7.1). Not archaizing, a series of other expressions are also distinctive of an early Thutmoside horizon of Middle Egyptian (§4.7.2). Whether *sw*-headed constructions provide yet another argument for an early New Kingdom dating is left open in the present study (§4.7.3).

---

2   The second and third of these compositions are highly fragmentary. The text of the first is unstable, and the third is preserved in a very late manuscript only. In addition, *Djedefhor* and *Oxford Wisdom Text* are teachings, reducing their linguistic distinctiveness.

By ways of Gedankenexperimente, three more compositions were subjected to linguistic dating:

Chapelle Rouge: early D.18 (§4.1.2)

Various constructions relate the composition to an early Eighteenth Dynasty horizon in written culture (§4.1.2.C-E). This is the only way to date *Chapelle Rouge*: based on classical strategies indexed on linguistic change, only a terminus *ante quem non* to the early Twelfth Dynasty could be defined (§4.1.2.A).

The L2 text of *Ptahhotep* 60-83:   D.18 (§2.3.5)

The section on disputants (D 60-83) includes various late constructions. These can be identified as textually secondary based on criteria internal to the L2 text, without taking any knowledge of the Twelfth Dynasty versions of *Ptahhotep* into account. Dating *Ptahhotep* 60-83 based solely on L2 would therefore not have resulted in wrongly ascribing the original composition to the Eighteenth Dynasty. On the other hand, the stage of the text now documented in L2 can be dated linguistically to Thutmoside times for the section on disputants—in itself an interesting result regarding the history of the composition.

Sinuhe: D.12 (§4.1.3)

The composition is directly dated to the Twelfth Dynasty based on a configuration of written language that includes constructions otherwise found in contemporaneous inscriptional texts, funerary self-presentations and expedition accounts. The overall web of cultural significations associated with these expressions, evoked and subverted in the literary composition, was active in the Twelfth Dynasty; it was not at any other times. A dating to the Twelfth Dynasty is also suggested by a set of uncommon expressions shared with one biographical inscription of that period. The language of *Sinuhe* is highly composed, in relation to broader palimpsestic strategies that are essential to the meaning of this composition in particular.

(Whether *Sinuhe* could have been dated similarly if preserved only in Eighteenth Dynasty copies can not be directly assessed, as too little of it is preserved.)

7.3   Some implications

The importance traditionally given to dating the original composition of literary texts to some extent reflects the need that could be felt for historical contexts for inter-pretation, in strategies emphasizing the original (and thereby, if often implicitly, the intended) meaning. Instead, recent research has increasingly concentrated on the plural histories of texts in their documented contexts of circulation and consumption, emphasizing issues such as the significations the texts may have had to various audiences in various periods, and the ways these audiences, including scribes, may

have engaged with the texts, contributing to shape them further.[3] The present study is itself of this broader shift in perspective, in showing that very precise datings may in some cases remain elusive, and in submitting that the historicist-functionalist datings traditionally contemplated in all cases conflict with what linguistic analysis suggests.

Yet, as the latter point already illustrates, a discussion of when texts may, or may not, have been originally composed has not lost all interest either—even if the question may seem somewhat peripheral in paradigms that emphasize the plural histories of texts, and despite the fact that original composition is a concept thoroughly alien to and irrelevant in the literary tradition being studied. Even when datings are not fully precise, some interpretive options relating to original contexts can be ruled out, opening to way to a renewed examination of other lines of inter-pretation. Some assessment of possible periods of composition is also relevant to the diachronic study of linguistic registers in literature, thereby to literary registers them-selves, and further to aspects of Middle Egyptian written culture in various periods more generally. Dating the texts also contributes to a study of their lives: it is for instance only through establishing elements of a relative chronology of composition of texts that hypotheses about how some texts could have been composed in the literary reception of other ones, resonating with these, can begin being mapped out.

7.3.1   Prior circulation

The preservation of a literary manuscript over several thousand years may be favored by certain conditions—the geology of the Theban necropolis being a case in point—but is ultimately a matter of chance. Patterns of early attestation of literary texts are always relevant for interpretation as they define contexts in which these texts were read. Whether they are representative for composition is an altogether different issue, however. This can only be an empirical question, necessarily to be addressed at the level of individual cases.

Under the datings proposed above, several compositions have a linguistically defined terminus *ante quem non* close in time to their first manuscript attestation. Examples in the Middle Kingdom are *Ptahhotep*, and even more tightly so *Eloquent Peasant*; in the late Second Intermediate Period and early Eighteenth Dynasty, *Hymn to Hapi*, probably also *Eulogistic Account of a King* and *Tale Involving the House of Life*. For other compositions, alternative linguistic strategies or additional indications permit to establish, or make likely, a dating close in time to their first manuscript attestation as well. In the Middle Kingdom, this is the case of *Sinuhe*; in the early New Kingdom, an example is *Neferkare and Sisene*, probably also *Fishing and Fowling*, *Sporting King*, *Neferti*, and *Kheti*.

Some of these compositions are documented in single manuscripts: in the late Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom, probably *Eulogistic Account of a King*, *Tale Involving the House of Life*, *Fishing and Fowling*, and *Sporting King*; in

---

3   E.g. for Twelfth Dynasty compositions, Hagen 2012a (*Ptahhotep*); Parkinson 2009 (*Sinuhe*); for a
     composition first documented in early Eighteenth Dynasty manuscripts, Widmaier 2013 (*Kheti*); in
     a similar perspective more generally, Gnirs 2013a; 2008; Loprieno 2006: XXIX-XXX.

the Middle Kingdom similarly, *Shipwrecked Sailor*, *Debate of a Man and His Soul*, and several more. Other ones are near-immediately documented in more than one manuscript: in the Middle Kingdom, *Sinuhe*, *Ptahhotep*, or *Eloquent Peasant*; in the early New Kingdom, *Hymn to Hapi*, probably also *Kheti* and *Neferti*. Among these are compositions documented in more than one place in the country, often also in excerpts: in the Middle Kingdom, *Sinuhe*; in the early New Kingdom, *Hymn to Hapi*, probably also *Kheti* and *Neferti*.

By definition, the presence of a composition on a manuscript implies some time of prior circulation. Yet, no general argument can be made to further imply that this prior circulation must have been over a longer period in time: depending on individual cases, it may, or may not. Presenting this, not as a premise, but as a result, independently established, it turns out that in several cases patterns of early attestation are not that divorced from what can be said about original periods of composition. However fragmentarily in terms of contexts (geographical, social), patterns of early attestation do in these cases reflect the general time of early circulation of literary texts in fairly faithful ways.

7.3.2   Linguistic registers of Middle Egyptian literature

As suggested by a preliminary discussion of aspects of the linguistic situation in the early/mid-second millennium (§1) and now confirmed and fleshed out by those texts that could be dated more precisely in the present study, Middle Egyptian remained the ordinary vehicle for composing new literature down to the early, and perhaps even mid-, Eighteenth Dynasty. Among the texts that could be dated to periods after the Middle Kingdom, some do not include any innovative expressions at all: dating was possible only through strategies other than classical ones indexed on linguistic change. Those texts that include innovative expressions generally do not include many: they can not therefore be described as couched in some transitional variety. Moreover, the relevant innovative expressions—often to do with linguistic function rather than with form—are of an altogether different type than the ones that are sometimes mentioned in relation to the notion of 'Late Middle Egyptian'. The latter are found in the mid-/late Twelfth Dynasty already, including in literature, display close associations with register, and are an integral part of Middle Egyptian itself, conceived of in its intrinsic thickness (§2.4.4).

While the inception of Middle Egyptian written literature goes back to the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty, a few elements of a differentiation in linguistic register are observed since the later Twelfth Dynasty (e.g. *Tale of P. Lythgoe* and *Tale of Hay*: §2.4.4.4). Although not many, these seem to provide a linguistic counterpart to what has been described as a then burgeoning 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature. *Eloquent Peasant* and *Kagemni* also include discrete elements of such registers as a component of the studied simplicity of their framing sections and dialogues (§2.4.4.2.2.A-B; §2.4.4.3). In later times, *Cheops' Court* demonstrates that the distinction between the 'low' and 'high' traditions was fluid as far as language is concerned: the repertoires of *Cheops' Court*, which are more complex than may seem at first, relate to *Sinuhe* as much as they do to *Tale of Hay* (§2.4.4). There are no two

different varieties of Middle Egyptian in literature, only elements of a differentiation, diversely modulated in various compositions.

In the early New Kingdom, linguistic registers of Middle Egyptian literature also display elements of a subtle internal differentiation, although charting these in details is hampered by the lack of a precise dating for several major compositions that could be relevant. Bound to a specific context (the *Vizieral Cycle*) and possibly never published in any form other than the presently documented inscriptional one, yet no less literary in its form and intertextual references, the poorly preserved *Teaching of Aametju* is composed in a very pure Middle Egyptian with no innovative expression at all and some thoroughly recherché ones (§1.3.2.3). This accords with *Aametju* being a teaching, a type of Middle Egyptian literary discourse that more than any other is deeply bound to tradition in ways that are simultaneously intertextual, formal, and linguistic. Similar comments extend to the long version of *Loyaliste* as documented from the early Eighteenth Dynasty on, parts of which at least are late in composition. Also a teaching, *Loyaliste* is largely undistinctive linguistically; the composition includes only a few innovative expressions and the strongest indication for dating is significantly afforded by a construction that did not originate in linguistic change.

Hymn to Hapi, dating to the late Seventeenth/early Eighteenth Dynasty, includes more innovative features. These suggest that its linguistic format was less tightly bound to older models than was the case for teachings. Perhaps relevant is also the innovative character of contemporaneous hymnic productions on non-linguistic levels. *Neferkare and Sisene*—a tale, and one continuing the tradition previously documented in *Cheops' Court*—accommodates a few saliently innovative features (some of which at least seem integral to the original text) and displays one remarkable element of outright linguistic hybridity. The former are probably to be interpreted in relation to the lowly subject matter and parodistic tone of the composition; the latter seems to be in ironic reference to similar usages in extremely high contemporaneous registers, evoked and contextually subverted in *Neferkare*. Probably dating to the early Eighteenth Dynasty, *Neferti* accommodates a high amount of linguistically innovative expressions, more than any of the compositions mentioned above. While resonating with earlier exponents of the Middle Egyptian literary tradition, the composition also differs from these in many ways, in its form, in elements of its intertext, and in its language.

In all cases, including those compositions that accommodate comparatively more innovative expressions (*Hymn*, *Neferkare and Sisene*, *Neferti*), the language is Middle Egyptian. A similar comment extends to compositions that on grounds of aspects of their literary typology have been described as forerunners of Ramesside literature to come: *Tale Involving the House of Life*, *Eulogistic Account of a King*, *Fishing and Fowling*, and *Sporting King*. The first two, dating to the (later) Second Intermediate Period, accommodate a few innovative expressions, but not many. *Sporting King*, probably dating to the Eighteenth Dynasty, does not have any features that would be innovative in terms of linguistic change; the linguistic dating is based on two expressions, both artificial, that directly relate the composition to a specifically Thutmoside horizon in Middle Egyptian written culture. *Fishing and Fowling*, probably from the same time, does not have any grammatically innovative features either: the dating is

based on two saliently recent lexical expressions, according with other elements in the composition by which this can also be viewed as anticipating aspects of Ramesside literature to come. Not traditionally mentioned in this context, yet relevant, is also *Kheti*. The composition—dating to a period no earlier than the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty, and probably as late as the early Eighteenth—is framed as a teaching in the Middle Egyptian tradition, yet also an early exponent of a type of literary discourse that would enjoy considerable popularity in Ramesside times ('Berufstypologien', more broadly 'scribal literature'); linguistically, *Kheti* includes very few innovative expressions.

Also a forerunner of Ramesside written culture, *Astarte* (*temp.* Amenhotep II) differs from all the above in being composed in a variety genuinely transitional between Middle and Late Egyptian. On non-linguistic levels similarly, *Astarte* is highly innovative, with little direct antecedents in earlier textual productions (§1.3.2.2). In its general principle, such configuration compares with one component in the register of *Kamose Inscriptions* (§1.3.3.2). In these, a very high level of Middle Egyptian, reminiscent of an older tradition of narrative literature, coexists with a dense web of highly innovative expressions. The latter accord with a novelty in contents, format, and type of discourse, asserted in a self-conscious manner not least through language itself.

In no period during the productive development of Middle Egyptian literature was there a specifically literary variety of Middle Egyptian (§2.4). In the Twelfth Dynasty, the linguistic repertoires of literature are essentially the same as in other textual productions of the time, drawing on various registers in these. Among Middle Egyptian literary texts composed after the Middle Kingdom, some accommodate innovative expressions not found in inscriptional registers, but these remain isolated: occasional linguistic selections do not define a variety. In its language, as in other aspects, Middle Egyptian literature is deeply embedded in a broader Middle Egyptian culture, drawing on this for articulating the cultural significations and semantic tensions it expresses. One particular dimension of this configuration lies in occasional direct references to specific elements of language that go beyond ordinary usage in inscriptional texts, both in the Twelfth Dynasty (e.g. *Sinuhe*: §4.1.3; *Ptahhotep*: §2.4.3.3.B) and in the Eighteenth (e.g. *Neferkare and Sisene*: §4.4.2; *Sporting King*: §4.3.2-3). A specifically literary use of language is only when such direct references are additionally played with, often ironically, in the literary texts, resulting in what semantically may be termed a 'linguistic dissonance' (in *Sinuhe* and *Neferkare*), itself a sign of literature.

7.3.3 A gradual development

The study of Middle Egyptian literature has traditionally concentrated on the Middle Kingdom as the main period of production. A strong focus has often been on the early Twelfth Dynasty, while recent studies have also increasingly emphasized the late Middle Kingdom as a possible context for productive creation; the early New Kingdom has only marginally been evoked, being more commonly described as a context of reception, however rich this may itself have been. The datings and ranges for

dating proposed in the present study alter this perspective in various ways, with respect to the general development of Middle Egyptian literature, to possible frames of interpretation for individual works, and to issues of reception.

Under the datings here proposed, the development of Middle Egyptian literature as documented in the body of preserved works appears to have been more gradual and polyphonic. While the earliest compositions date to the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty, the production of new Middle Egyptian literary texts continued until the early Eighteenth Dynasty with various traditions running in parallel. What on grounds of literary typology has been described as a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature has early roots in the late Twelfth Dynasty and is documented in a more substantially developed form in later times (*Cheops' Court*), then in the early New Kingdom (*Neferkare and Sisene*). Meanwhile, teachings in the full Middle Egyptian tradition were also composed: from the early Eighteenth Dynasty are *Aametju*, arguably *Kheti*, and the long version of *Loyaliste* probably in substantial parts. Framed as a teaching, yet also strongly relating to narrative literature and echoing *Sinuhe*, *Amenemhat* was not composed before the late Twelfth Dynasty, and possibly much later. Among works addressing central theodic concerns, *Ipuwer* was not composed before the Thirteenth Dynasty, nor was another lament in the same tradition, *Khakheperreseneb*. Making reference to a Middle Egyptian literary tradition of which *Eloquent Peasant* (mid-Twelfth Dynasty) is one much earlier exponent, *Neferti* was not composed before the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty, and probably only in the early Eighteenth. As teachings paradigmatically do, *Neferti* demonstrates the time-depth of the Middle Egyptian literary tradition, as defined by 'clusters of language and imagery', themes and motifs, later patterns of transmission and reception, and language.

While the above presentation is necessarily sketchy, what emerges is a general tableau in which literary typology does not project over time in linear ways: several productive threads are in part contemporaneous. What also emerges is a perhaps more gradual transition to Ramesside literature. Middle Egyptian and Late Egyptian literature contrast in types of literary discourses, in cultural themes and decorum, and in their relationship to other types of written discourses; they also contrast in cultural status and functions, in modes of circulation of texts, and in different lives of these after the end of the New Kingdom; not least, they contrast in language. On the other hand, there was a productive tradition of Middle Egyptian literature down to the early New Kingdom; in particular, several texts that on grounds of aspects of their literary typology have been described as forerunners of Ramesside literature to come were then composed: *Neferkare and Sisene*, *Sporting King*, *Fishing and Fowling*, and the short praise of a city on O. Nakhtmin 87/173. Not much older are *Tale Involving the House of Life* and *Eulogistic Account of a King*.

Under the datings here proposed, other compositions of the early New Kingdom include *Hymn to Hapi* and probably *Kheti*. Hymns to the Nileflood, not presently documented before the New Kingdom, would be popular in Ramesside times. A similar comment extends to 'Berufstypologien', more broadly 'scribal literature', of which *Kheti* is the earliest exponent. Although lacking any direct descendants in Ramesside times, *Neferti*, probably also an early Eighteenth Dynasty composition,

strongly resonates with hymns to the Nileflood, as it does with inscriptional compositions of its time, aspects of which were developed further in early Ramesside times. The prologue in *Neferti* has elements that are not found in any pre-Eighteenth Dynasty literary composition and recur in early Ramesside works, such as *Apophis and Seqenenre* (§5.6.1, (iii)), or *Doomed Prince* and *Satirical Letter* (§5, n.273). In significant ways the prologue also relates to what has been described as a 'low tradition' of Middle Egyptian narrative literature, documented by *Cheops' Court* and *Neferkare and Sisene* notably; this tradition was itself continued, if differently, in Late Egyptian narrative literature.

Neferti also strongly resonates with Middle Egyptian laments, *Khakheperreseneb* and *Ipuwer*. One major question that does not find an answer in the present study is when the type of literary discourse these are exponents of, lacking direct descendants in Late Egyptian literature, ceased to be productive. This is contingent upon the dating of *Ipuwer* and *Khakheperreseneb*, which remains frustratingly uncertain: both could have been composed close in time to their linguistic terminus *ante quem non* in the early Thirteenth Dynasty, just as they could have been composed in significantly later times.

7.3.4 The early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty

The long and important reign of Senwosret I has been described as a golden age of literary production in Egypt, with literature dated to the early Twelfth Dynasty being read in terms of loyalism, legitimization, or advocacy, and as a way to foster the widening scribal elites' support to the new dynasty while also presenting them with normative cultural values. The datings and ranges for dating proposed in the present study conflict with such functionalistic interpretation of the early development of Middle Egyptian literature. It was submitted that *A Man to His Son*, parts of *Loyaliste*, and *Kheti* all linguistically date to periods later than the early Twelfth Dynasty. Possible contexts for these texts are therefore to be sought in other periods in which loyalism was also an important issue, to be thematized in a literary form. For interpretation, previous analyses of loyalistic themes and motives, and of the dense intertext notably between *A Man to His Son* and the long version of *Loyaliste*, remain essential and untouched by the later datings here proposed. More consequential for interpretation are the datings submitted for *Amenemhat* and *Neferti*, with a terminus *ante quem non* by the late Twelfth Dynasty for the former and a still later one for the latter. Both texts are thereby significantly later than the events in the early Twelfth Dynasty they evoke (*Amenemhat*) or may evoke (*Neferti*): neither composition can be read as a piece of advocacy for the rulers of that period, nor exploited as source material, however subtly mediatized, for its history. These texts must be read for their semantic density, their composition, and their language (here not solely in a linguistic sense). As their rich intertext (broadly understood) demonstrates, layers and significations that can be sensed are many.

Although deprived of a significant share of the compositions that had been ascribed to it, the early/mid-Twelfth Dynasty remains a foundational period. If in a rather less explosive initial development than has sometimes been assumed, the period

did witness the inception of written literature. The contexts for such developments have been analyzed in relation to social changes and expanding literacy during the Middle Kingdom, and/or in relation to changes in written discourses that occurred in the preceding First Intermediate Period.[4] The early Middle Kingdom also witnessed a reconfiguration of styles of writing and a new standardization of higher registers of language, of which Middle Kingdom Middle Egyptian, and possibly what in a native phrasing was refered to as the 'speech of officials', were a product. Typical of several early works of Middle Egyptian literature is a strongly reflexive focus on rhetorics, and thereby on language, which is significant in this context (e.g. *Ptahhotep*, *Eloquent Peasant*). Also typical of early Middle Egyptian literature is the often noted thorough-going relationship with other types of written discourses, such as biographies, expedition accounts, royal inscriptions and hymns, or funerary corpora (for the last, e.g. *Debate of a Man and His Soul*, *Herdsman*). On a linguistic level as well, works such as *Sinuhe* and *Ptahhotep* richly resonate with contemporaneous inscriptional texts, extending to specific archaizing tendencies and aspects by which written language can be over-determined in these, then partly reconfigured in the literary compositions (§2.4.3.2; §4.1.3). This is significant as both texts stand at, or very close to, the beginning of a tradition of written literature in Egypt. Beside whatever oral sources it may also have had, this naturally drew on previously existing types of written discourses.

As also emerges from the present study, the influence of *Sinuhe* was profound, extending beyond occasional allusions in inscriptions to new literary compositions themselves. *Amenemhat* was composed in the literary reception of *Sinuhe* (§6.4.3), and echoes of *Sinuhe* are found in *Neferti* and *Sporting King* (§5.1.2.2; §4.3.2). By such process, events in the early Twelfth Dynasty alluded to in *Sinuhe* were made a classical literary setting for later compositions to weave their own discourses on: a tradition of the early Twelfth Dynasty was invented in literature. As the Ramesside pairing of 'Neferti' with 'Kheti' may further suggest, perhaps even a tradition of an actual early Twelfth Dynasty historical literature was then invented.

7.4 Prospects

As emphasized from the outset of the present study, a refined dating of Middle Egyptian literary texts requires that all relevant dimensions be made to contribute: language (taking into account the specific configurations of written language in literature); intertext and cultural themes (taking into account the ways these are addressed in literature and thereby issues of decorum); social contexts and functions as these can be modeled (with the difficulty that such modeling is done against the background that several texts are insecurely dated); archeological evidence, institutional analysis and possible historical detail (not necessarily to be read in strictly referential terms and therefore also in need of due interpretation); manuscript

---

4 Syntheses in Parkinson 2002: 64-6 and Moers 2001: 167-70, both with references to previous discussions.

documentation and issues of circulation (under a full realization of the fragmentary nature of the preserved record). As this somewhat Borgesian listing implies, these dimensions have to be weighed against each other, in ways yet to be defined and individually for each text. Studying the linguistic aspect is important, not because language would be a positive given (it is not), but because language is a dimension of literature that can be manipulated by composers in various ways, or left out of such manipulation, resulting in configurations that can be subjected to a principled set of interpretive strategies.

The possibility of a linguistic dating of Egyptian texts more broadly has only recently merited more intensive study. According with this state of the art, contradictory positions on method have been voiced and the question is sometimes asked whether Egyptian texts can be linguistically dated at all. The present author finds this question ill-defined: different types of Egyptian written discourses make different types of linguistic selections, come with different patterns of transmission and textual histories, and are composed against the background of different linguistic situations. The issue therefore lies in defining a set of strategies commensurate to each type of texts to be dated: inasmuch as language is embedded in culture, no universal method can be given.

As regards Middle Egyptian literary texts specifically, a perhaps disarmingly simple observation is that major prospects for progress still lie in much additional descriptive study of Middle Egyptian grammar itself, in text. Among the main arguments used in, or specifically devised for, the present study, almost none would have been available until the late 1980's or much later yet, well half a century or more after Middle Egyptian grammar had been first codified in its Gardinerian form. In the decades when the common dating of Middle Egyptian literary texts to the Middle Kingdom gradually emerged, subsequently to win wide acceptance, this was largely consistent with what was then known of Middle Egyptian (mostly as an inventory of easily identified forms, taking little account of linguistic function) and with how early/mid-second millennium Egyptian language history itself was then viewed (mostly as a linear sequence, taking little account of differences in registers, more broadly of cultural factors that preside over the configuration and performance of written language). Going beyond the communal grammar of the 1980's, a study of aspect, initially independent of any ambition at dating texts, resulted in a powerful *ante quem non* criterion; so did a detailed description of -ḫr-marked construction, even though the full implications for dating were not immediately realized. More recently, a study of changes in passive voice has led to various criteria based on these, while a study on 'particles' has contributed further insights relevant for dating. It is therefore a legitimate extrapolation to assume that additional descriptive work in Middle Egyptian grammar will result in further criteria for dating, currently unavailable. Another *post hoc* observation is that several of the arguments here discussed have to do with linguistic function rather than with linguistic form; this is not surprising, as function is often less directly manipulated by composers than form. As linguistic function is more difficult to study, it has also been investigated relatively less, leaving more space for progress.

Beyond individual expressions, recurrent clusters of such could also be increasingly considered, implying extensive comparative studies of the linguistic repertoires of various types of written discourses, literary and not. This will be a time-intensive, yet promising, effort: for example, there is some indication that *post quem non* arguments for dating, so badly lacking at present, could be defined at these levels. As the present study has already illustrated, such study of repertoires can not consist in a mere listing of expressions and must be thoroughly interpretive at once. Linguistic function is in text and involves multiple dimensions of meaning, including the cultural and the indexical. Grammar, which is no algorithm, is itself to be read: for how language is configured in a group of texts, and for what it does in an individual composition.

Progress in linguistic dating is slow, because of the great many dimensions simultaneously involved, because methods and strategies are themselves yet to be defined and refined, and because investigations must extend well beyond the group of texts primarily considered. It is the present author's experience, however, that the endeavor of dating texts by their language is a thoroughly rewarding one. In requiring that all aspects relevant to language in use are drawn into the picture, this provides a powerful motivation to address a whole series of issues from a fresh perspective and to devise methods and strategies for doing so: grammar itself, to begin with, but also aspects of the dynamics of textual alteration in transmission, the ways by which different types of written discourses relate to or differ from each other linguistically and therefore more broadly, and elements of the cultural and individual significations conveyed by texts as expressed and supported by language. While the immediate result is not always a fully precise dating of texts, much is being learnt in the process.

TEXTS

A fragmentary stela from Karnak	van Siclen III 2010: 368.
Aametju	Dziobek 1998: 23-43, pl.2; for the readings, also Vernus 2010^{2}b: 59-61, 71-2.
Abkau	Barbotin 2005: 140-1.
Abydos Boundary Stela usurped by Neferhotep	Leahy 1989; H*HBT* 18-9.
Ahmes-Nefertari's *Donation Stela*	H*HBT* 100-3.
Ahmose's *Tempest Stela*	Wiener & Allen 1998; H*HBT* 104-10.
Akhenaten's *Second Proclamation*	Murnane & van Siclen III 1993: 69-109.
Allen droht die Rekrutierung	Jäger 2004: 272-4.
A Man to His Son	Fischer-Elfert 1999.
Amenemhat	Adrom 2006.
Ameniseneb (Louvre C11 and C12)	Baines 2009; Kubisch 2008: 139-45; Simpson 1974: pl.80; H*HBT* 7-9.
Ani	Quack 1992.
Antef (BM EA 1628)	Franke 2007b.
Antef's Sehel Graffito	Habachi 1953.
Antefiqer's *Girgawi Inscription* (*RILN* 73)	Žába 1974: 98-109.
Antefnakht's Stela	Vernus 1996c; H*HBT* 77.
Apophis and Seqenenre	*LES* 85-9.
Appointment of the Vizier	Helck 1955a; Dziobek 1998: 3-21, pl.1.
Astarte	Collombert & Coulon 2000.
Bebi, el-Kab tomb 8bis	Kubisch 2008: 274-9.
Book of the Dead (Nu)	Lapp 2006.
Berlin Leather Roll	de Buck 1938.
Chapelle Blanche	Lacau & Chevrier 1956-1969.
Chapelle Rouge	Lacau & Chevrier 1977-1979; H*HBT* II 7-33.
Cheops' Court	Blackman 1988.
Debate of a Man and His Soul	Allen 2011.
Deir el-Ballas Inscription	Darnell 2008.

Doomed Prince	*LES* 1-9.
Duties of the Vizier	van den Boorn 1988.
Eloquent Peasant	Parkinson 1991a.
Emhab	Klotz 2010; Kubisch 2008: 238-44; H*HBT* 97-8.
Eulogistic Account of a King	Parkinson 1999.
Fishing & Fowling	Caminos 1956: 1-21; pl.1-7.
Fowler	Parkinson 2004.
Hammamat 19 (Meri)	Goedicke 1964; Couyat & Montet 1912: 41-2, pl.5.
Hammamat 192 (Vizier Amenemhat)	Couyat & Montet 1912: 98-100, pl.37.
Hatnub	Anthes 1928.
Hay (Tale of)	Collier & Quirke 2004: 44-7.
Heavenly Cow	Hornung 1982.
Heqanakht	Allen 2002a.
Herdsman	Schneider 2007.
Herwerre (*Sinai* 90)	Gardiner, Peet & Černy 1952: pl.25a-26; 1955: 97-9.
Hezy	Kanawati & Abd er-Raziq 1999: pl.33, 59.
Horemkhauef	Kubisch 2008: 310-4; H*HBT* 49-50; Hayes 1947.
Horherkhutef of Edfu	Kubisch 2008: 203-6.
Horus and Seth (Middle Kingdom)	Collier & Quirke 2004: 20-5.
Hymns to the Diadem	Erman 1911.
Hymn to Hapi	van der Plas 1986.
Ini (BM EA 334)	*HTBM* III pl.6.
Inscription Dédicatoire (Ramses II's)	Spalinger 2009; K*RI* II 323-36.
Installation of the Vizier	Faulkner 1955; Dziobek 1998: 55-66, pl.3a-b.
Ipuwer	Enmarch 2005.
Iykhernefret	Schäfer 1913: 169-75; Simpson 1974: pl.1; Sethe 1928²b: 70-1.
Kagemni	Gardiner 1946a.
Kamose Inscriptions	H*HBT* 82-97.
Khakheperreseneb	Parkinson 1997b.
Khentemsemti	*HTBM* II, 8-9; Simpson 1974: pl.61; Sethe 1928²b: 75.
Kheti	Jäger 2004.

Khusobek	Peet 1914; Baines 1987; Sethe 1928[2]b: 82-3.
Kuban Stela	K*RI* II 353-60.
Litany of the Sun	Hornung 1975.
Loyaliste	Posener 1976.
Mentuhotep (CG 20539)	Lange & Schäfer 1908: 150-8; 1925: pl.41-2.
Mentuhotep son of Hapy (UC 14333)	Goedicke 1962; Stewart 1979: pl.18.
Mentuwoser (MMA 12.184)	Ransom 1913; Sethe 1928[2]b: 79-80.
Merikare	Quack 1992.
Mo[c]alla (Ankhtifi)	Vandier 1950.
Moscow Mythological Story	Caminos 1956: 40-50, pl.17-23; Korostovtzev 1960.
Mutter und Kind	Yamazaki 2003.
Neferhotep's *Great Abydos Stela*	H*HBT* 21-9.
Neferhotep (TT 50)	Hari 1985.
Neferkare and Sisene	Posener 1957.
Neferpesedjet	Collier & Quirke 2004: 42-3.
Neferti	Helck 1992[2].
Nesimontu	Obsomer 1993; Simspon 1974: pl.14; Barbotin 2005: 142-4.
Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree*	H*HBT* 73-4.
O. Cairo 25372	Kroeber 1970: 95-6.
O. DeM 1675 ro+vso	Fischer-Elfert 1986: 31-62.
O. Nakhtmin 87/173	Guksch 1994; Ragazzoli 2008: 26.
Paheri (tomb of)	Tylor & Griffith 1894.
Pahu's Prayer	Darnell 2010.
P. Berlin 10056	Vernus 1990a: 186.
P. Berlin 10073	Luft 1992.
P. Berlin 10463 (Sennefer to Baki)	Caminos 1963.
P. BM EA 10107 ro (Ptahu to Ahmes Peniati)	Glanville 1928.
P. Harris Magical	Leitz 1999.
P. Leiden I 348	Borghouts 1971.
P. Louvre 3230B (Tay to Ahmes Peniati)	Peet 1926.
P. Lythgoe (Tale of)	Simpson 1960.
P. MMA 27.3.560 (Tit to Djehuti)	Hayes 1957: 89-90, fig.1-O, pl.XIII.2.
P. Ramesseum II	Barns 1956: 11-4, pl.7-9; Parkinson 2012b.

P. Ramesseum III	Barns 1956: 15-23, pl.10-5; Parkinson 2012b.
Ptahhotep	Žába 1956.
P. UC, Illahun (non literary)	Collier & Quirke 2002; 2004; 2006.
Rahotep's *Coptos Stela*	Stewart 1979: 17-8; H*HBT* 59-60.
Rudjahau	Faulkner 1951.
Rekhmire	Gardiner 1925; *Urk.* IV 1071-85.
Sarenput, Stela 9 (Aswan Museum #1373)	Franke 1994: 154-7; Habachi 1985a: pl.24.
Sasobek	Barns 1956: 1-10, pl.1-16; Parkinson 2012b.
Satirical Letter	Fischer-Elfert 1983.
Seankhenre Mentuhotepi's Stela	Vernus 1989; H*HBT* II 3.
Semna Stela (Senwosret III's)	Sethe 1928²b: 83-4.
Seneferibre Senwosret IV's *Karnak Stela*	H*HBT* 41.
Shipwrecked Sailor	Blackman 1932: 41-8.
Sinuhe	Koch 1990.
Siut	Griffith 1889; Edel 1984.
Sobekemsaf's *Medamud Endowment Inscription*	H*HBT* 62.
Sobekhotep I's *Abydos Stela*	Barbotin 2005: 88; H*HBT* 5.
Sobekhotep IV's *Karnak Stela*	H*HBT* 31-4.
Sobekhotep VIII's *Inundation Stela*	H*HBT* 46-7; Baines 1974; 1976.
Speos Artemidos	Allen 2002b; *Urk.* IV 383-91.
Sporting King	Caminos 1956: 22-39, pl.8-16.
Stèle Juridique	Lacau 1949; H*HBT* 65-9.
Tale Involving the House of Life	Parkinson 1999.
Teaching of the High-Priest Amenemhat	Gardiner 1910; *Urk.* IV 1408-11.
Tod Inscription	Barbotin & Clère 1991.
Two Brothers	*LES* 9-30.
Uronarti Quay Inscription	Dunham 1967: pl.XXV.
Visitors' graffiti in the Memphite necropolis	Navrátilová 2007.
Wadi el-Hôl #8	Darnell 2002: 107-19.
Wadi el-Hudi I	Sadek 1980.
Wenamun	*LES* 61-76.
Wepwawetaa, Munich Gl. WAF 35	Simpson 1974: pl.30; Sethe 1928²b: 73-4.

REFERENCES

Abd el-Fatah, Ahmed & Susanne Bickel. 2000. Trois cercueils de Sedment, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, 1-36.

Adrom, Faried. 2006. *Die Lehre des Amenemhet*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 19, Turnhout.

Allen, James. 1984. *The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts*, Bibliotheca Aegyptia 2, Malibu.

——. 1994. Colloquial Middle Egyptian: Some observations on the language of Heka-Nakht, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 4, 1-12.

——. 2002a. *The Heqanakht Papyri*, Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 27, New York.

——. 2002b. The Speos Artemidos Inscription of Hatshepsut, in: *Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar* 16, 1-17, pl.1-2.

——. 2004. Traits dialectaux dans les textes des pyramides du Moyen Empire, in: Susanne Bickel & Bernard Mathieu (eds), *D'un monde à l'autre. Textes des pyramides, Textes des sarcophages*, Bibliothèque d'étude 139, Cairo, 1-14.

——. 2005. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, Writings from the Ancient World 23, Atlanta.

——. 2008. The Historical Inscription of Khnumhotep at Dahshur: Preliminary report, in: *Bulletin of the American Society of Oriental Research* 352, 29-39.

——. 2009. Old and New in the Middle Kingdom, in: David Silverman, William Simpson & Josef Wegner (eds), *Archaism and Innovation: Studies in the Culture of Middle Kingdom Egypt*, New Haven/Philadelphia, 263-75.

——. 2011. *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.

——. 2013. *The Ancient Egyptian Language. An Historical Study*, Cambridge.

Altenmüller, Hartwig. 2008. Der König als Vogelfänger und Fischer (*nbty wḥꜥ*) – Zu frühen Belegen eines traditionellen Motivs, in: Eva-Maria Engel, Vera Müller & Ulrich Hartung (eds), *Zeichen aus dem Sand. Streiflichter aus Ägyptens Geschichte zu Ehren von Günter Dreyer*, Menes. Studien zur Kultur und Sprache der ägyptischen Frühzeit und des Alten Reiches 5, Wiesbaden, 1-18.

Altenmüller, Hartwig & Ahmed Moussa. 1991. Die Inschrift Amenemhets II. aus dem Ptah-Tempel von Memphis: Ein Vorbericht, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 18, 1-48.

Anderson, Stephen & Edward Keenan. 1985. Deixis, in: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Fieldwork*, Cambridge, vol. III, 259-308.

Anthes, Rudolf. 1928. *Die Felsinschriften von Hatnub nach den Aufnahmen Georg Möllers*, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Aegyptens 9, Leipzig.

Assmann, Jan. 1969. *Liturgische Lieder an den Sonnengott. Untersuchungen zur altägyptischen Hymnik* I, Münchner Ägyptologische Studien 19, Berlin.

——. 1985. Gibt es eine 'Klassik' in der ägyptischen Literaturgeschichte? Ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte der Ramessidenzeit, in: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, *Supplement* VI, 35-52.

——. 1991. *Stein und Zeit*, München.

——. 1999². *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, Fribourg/Göttingen.

——. 2006. Das Sendungsbewusstsein der Hatshepsut, in: Gerald Moers, Heike Behlmer, Katja Demuß & Kai Widmaier (eds), *jn.t ḏr.w – Festschrift für Friedrich Junge*, Göttingen, vol. I, 59-72.

el-Awadi, Tarek. 2009. *Sahure – The Pyramid Complex. History and Decoration Program in the Old Kingdom*, Abusir XVI, Prague.

Backes, Burkhard. 2011. Zur Anwendung der Textkritik in der Ägyptologie. Ziele, Grenzen und Akzeptanz, in: Alexandra Verbovsek, Burkhard Backes & Catherine Jones (eds), *Methodik und Didaktik in der Ägyptologie*, München, 451-79.

Baines, John. 1974. The Inundation Stela of Sobekhotpe VIII, in: *Acta Orientalia* 36, 39-54.

——. 1976. The Sobekhotpe VIII Inundation Stela: An additional fragment, in: *Acta Orientalia* 37, 11-20.

——. 1986. The Stela of Emhab: Innovation, tradition, hierarchy, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 72, 41-54.

——. 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.

——. 1996. Classicism and Modernism in the Literature of the New Kingdom, in: Antonio Loprieno (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 10, Leiden/Boston, 157-74.

——. 2009. The Stelae of Amenisonbe from Abydos and Middle Kingdom Display of Personal Religion, in: Diana Magee, Jeanine Bourriau & Stephen Quirke (eds), *Studies in Honour of Jaromir Malek at the Griffith Institute*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 185, Leuven, 1-22.

——. 2012. Scripts, High Culture, and Administration in Middle Kingdom Egypt, in: Stephen Houston (ed.), *The Shape of Writing. How and Why Writing Systems Change*, Santa Fe/NM, 25-62.

Barbotin, Christophe. 2005. *La voix des hiéroglyphes. Promenade au département des Antiquités égyptiennes du musée du Louvre*, Paris.

——. 2012. Le Dialogue de Khâkheperrêseneb avec son *ba*. Tablette British Museum EA 5645/Ostracon Caire JE 50249 + Papyri Amherst III & Berlin 3024, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 63, 1-20.

Barbotin, Christophe & Jacques Jean Clère. 1991. L'inscription de Sésostris Ier à Tôd, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 91, 1-32.

Barns, John. 1956. *Five Ramesseum Papyri*, Oxford.

——. 1968. A New Wisdom Text from a Writing Board in Oxford, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 54, 71-6.

——. 1972. Some Readings and Interpretations in Sundry Egyptian Texts, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 58, 159-66.

Barta, Winfried. 1985. Das Personalpronomen der *wj*-Reihe als Proklitikon im adverbiellen Nominalsatz, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 112, 94-104.

Baud, Michel & Dominique Farout. 2001. Trois biographies d'Ancien Empire revisitées, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 101, 43-57.

Baumann, Andrew. 1998. *The Suffix Conjugation of Earlier Egyptian as Evidenced in the Underworld Books* (UMI), Ann Arbor.

Beaux, Nathalie. 1990. *Le cabinet de curiosités de Thoutmosis III: Plantes et animaux du 'Jardin botanique' de Karnak*, Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 36, Leuven.

Bennett, Christopher. 2002. A Genealogical Chronology of the 17th Dynasty, in: *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 39, 123-55.

Berlev, Oleg. 1976. Review of Simpson, *The Terrace of the Great God at Abydos*, in: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 33, 324-6.

——. 1981. Review of Posener, *L'enseignement loyaliste*, in: *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 76, 14-5.

——. 1987a. The date of the 'Eloquent Peasant', in: Jürgen Osing & Günter 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, 78-83.

——. 1987b. A Social Experiment in Nubia During the Years 9-17 of Sesostris I, in: Marvin Powell (ed.), *Labour in the Ancient Near East*, New Haven, 143-57.

Beylage, Peter. 2002. *Aufbau der königlichen Stelentexte vom Beginn der 18. Dynastie bis zur Amarnazeit*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 54, Wiesbaden.

Bickel, Susanne. 1994. *La cosmogonie égyptienne avant le Nouvel Empire*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 134, Fribourg/Göttingen.

——. 2013a. Die Zäsur im Weltbild und die Interpretation der Geschichte, in: Susanne Bickel (ed.), *Vergangenheit und Zukunft. Studien zum historischen Bewusstsein in der Thutmosidenzeit*, Aegyptiaca Helvetica 22, Basel, 203-19.

—— (ed.). 2013b. *Vergangenheit und Zukunft. Studien zum historischen Bewusstsein in der Thut-mosidenzeit*, Aegyptiaca Helvetica 22, Basel.

Bickel, Susanne & Bernard Mathieu. 1993. L'écrivain Amennakht et son *Enseignement*, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 93, 31-52.

Biston-Moulin, Sébastien. 2012. *La légitimité du roi au début de la XVIIIe dynastie. Essai d'analyse phraséologique et historique du règne d'Hatchepsout* (PhD University Paul Valéry-Montpellier III; *non vidi*).

Björkman, Gun. 1964. Egyptology and Historical Method, in: *Orientalia Suecana* 13, 9-23.

Blackman, Aylward. 1932. *Middle-Egyptian Stories. Part I*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 2, Bruxelles.

——. 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 Ge-denken an Eberhard Otto*, Wiesbaden, 85-118.

——. 1980. Die Lehre für König Merikare, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 107, 5-41.

——. 1982. Die Prophezeiung des Neferti, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 109, 1-27.

——. 1984. Die Lehre des Königs Amenemhat (Teil I), in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Alter-tumskunde* 111, 85-107.

——. 1985. Die Lehre des Königs Amenemhat (Teil II), in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 112, 104-15

——. 1987. Ptahhotep und der 'Stab des Alters', in: Jürgen Osing & Günter 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, 84-97.

——. 1996. Die literarische Verarbeitung der Übergangszeit zwischen Altem und Mittlerem Reich, in: Antonio Loprieno (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, Probleme der Ägypto-logie 10, Leiden/Boston, 105-35.

Blumenthal, Elke, Ingeborg Müller & Walter Reineke. 1984. *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie. Übersetzung zu den Heften 5-16*. Berlin.

Borghouts, Joris. 1971. *The Magical Texts of Papyrus Leiden I 348*, Oudheidkundige mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden. Nieuwe Reeks 51, Leiden.

——. 1986. Prominence Constructions and Pragmatic Functions, in: Gertie Englund & Paul Frandsen (eds), *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, Copen-hagen, 45-70.

——. 1994. *Ink mr(i)=f*: An elusive pattern in Middle Egyptian, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 4, 13-34.

——. 2000. Indigenous Egyptian Grammar, in: Sylvain Auroux, E. F. K. Koerner, Hans-Josef Niederehe & Kees Versteegh (eds), *History of Language Science: An international handbook on the evolution of the study of language from the beginnings to the present*, Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 18, Berlin, vol. I, 5-14.

——. 2006. Scrambling in Middle Egyptian: The case of *in ir*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 85-95.

——. 2010. *Egyptian. An Introduction to the Writing and Language of the Middle Kingdom*, Egyptologische Uitgaven 24, Leuven/Leiden.

Brose, Marc. 2009. Die mittelägyptische *nfr-pw*-Negation, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 136, 1-7.

Brunner, Helmut. 1986[2]. *Die Geburt des Gottkönigs. Studien zur Überlieferung eines altägyptischen Mythos*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 10, Wiesbaden.

Buchberger, Hannes. 1991. *Htp* an *Ipw-rs.ti*: Der Brief auf dem Gefäss München ÄS 4313, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 18, 49-87.

——. 1993. *Transformation und Transformat. Sargtextstudien I*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 52, Wiesbaden.

——. 2006. Sesostris I. und die Inschrift von et-Tôd? Eine philologische Anfrage, in: Karola Zibelius-Chen & Hans-Werner Fischer-Elfert (eds), *'Von reichlich ägyptischem Verstande'. Festschrift für Waltraud Guglielmi zum 65. Geburtstag*, Philippika 11, Wiesbaden, 15-21.

Burkard, Günter. 1977. *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu ägyptischen Weisheitslehren des Alten und Mittleren Reiches*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 34, Wiesbaden.

——. 1999. 'Als Gott erschienen spricht er': Die Lehre des Amenemhet als postumes Vermächtnis, in: Jan Assmann & Elke Blumenthal (eds), *Literatur und Politik im pharaonischen und ptolemäischen Ägypten: Vorträge der Tagung zum Gedenken an Georges Posener 5.-10. September 1996 in Leipzig*, Bibliothèque d'étude 127, Cairo, 153-73.

Burkard, Günter & Heinz Thissen. 2012[4]. *Einführung in die altägyptische Literaturgeschichte I. Altes und mittleres Reich*, Einführungen und Quellentexte zur Ägyptologie 1, Münster.

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.

——. 1958. *The Chronicles of Prince Osorkon*, Analecta Orientalia 37, Roma.

——. 1963. Papyrus Berlin 10463, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 49, 29-37.

Cannuyer, Christian. 2002. À propos de l'expression *sḥmḥ-ib* 'se divertir', in: *Acta Orientalia Belgica* 16, 123-4.

——. 2010. *La girafe dans l'Égypte ancienne et le verbe sr: étude de lexicographie et de symbolique animalière*, Acta Orientalia Belgica Subsida IV, Bruxelles.

Collier, Mark. 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. 2006. Un étrange anthroponyme de l'Ancien Empire: 'Il/Elle mourra par le crocodile' (?), in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 209, 33-42.

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.

Coulon, Laurent. 1997. Véracité et rhétorique dans les autobiographies égyptiennes de la Première Période Intermédiaire, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 97, 109-38.

——. 1999. La rhétorique et ses fictions: Pouvoirs et duplicités du discours à travers la littérature égyptienne du Moyen et du Nouvel Empire', in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 99, 103-32.

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. 2000. *Explaining Language Change. An Evolutionary Approach*, Harlow/New York.

Darnell, John. 2002. *Theban Desert Road Survey in the Egyptian Western Desert, Volume 1: Gebel Tjauti Rock Inscriptions 1-45 and Wadi el-Hôl Rock Inscriptions 1-45. With the assistance of D. Darnell and contributions by D. Darnell, R. Friedman, and S. Hendrickx*, Oriental Institute Publications 119, Chicago.

——. 2004. *The Enigmatic Netherworld Books of the Solar-Osirian Unity: Cryptographic Compositions in the Tombs of Tutankhamun, Ramesses VI and Ramesses IX*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 198, Fribourg/Göttingen.

——. 2008. The Eleventh Dynasty Royal Inscription from Deir el-Ballas, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 59, 81-110.

——. 2010. A Pharaonic *de profundis* from the Western Desert Hinterland of Naqada, in: Hermann Knuf, Christian Leitz & Daniel von Recklinghausen, *Honi soit qui mal y pense. Studien zum pharaonischen, griechisch-römischen und spätantiken Ägypten zu Ehren von Heinz-Josef Thissen*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 194, Leuven, 39-47.

Daumas, François. 1952. *Les moyens d'expression du grec et de l'égyptien, comparés dans les décrets de Canope et de Memphis*, Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte, Supplément 16, Cairo.

——. 1975-1976. Quelques aspects de l'expression du distributif, de l'itératif et de l'intensif en égyptien, in: Paul Naster, Herman De Meulenaere & Jan Quaegebeur (eds), *Miscellania in Honorem Josephi Vergote*, Orientalia Lovanensia Periodica 6-7, 109-23.

Davies, Norman de Garis. 1930. *The Tomb of Ken-Amun at Thebes*, Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 5, New York.

——. 1943. *The Tomb of Rekh-mi-Re at Thebes*, Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 11, New York.

de Buck, Adriaan. 1938. The Building Inscription of the Berlin Leather Roll. Studia Aegyptiaca I, in: *Analecta Orientalia* 17, 48-57.

——. 1947. Inhoud en achtergrond van het gesprek van den levensmoede met zijn ziel, in: *Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux* 7, 19-32.

Depuydt, Leo. 1993. *Conjunction, Contiguity, Contingency: On relationships between events in the Egyptian and Coptic verbal systems*, New York.

——. 1999. Analyzing the Use of Idioms Past (With Special Focus on Sovereign Nubia), in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 27, 34-63.

Derchain, Philippe. 1992. Les débuts de l'Histoire [Rouleau de Cuir Berlin 3029], in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 43, 35-57.

Dévaud, Eugène. 1916. *Les maximes de Ptahhotep d'après le Papyrus Prisse, les Papyrus 10371, 10435 et 10509 du British Museum et la tablette Carnarvon*, Fribourg.

Díaz Hernández, Roberto. 2013. *Tradition und 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.

Donnat, Sylvie. 2012. Une éthique de la partialité ou un nouvel exemple de question rhétorique dans deux lettres aux morts?, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 20, 29-49.

Doret, Éric. 1986. *The Narrative Verbal System of Old and Middle Egyptian*, Cahiers d'Orientalisme 12, Genève.

——. 1989. Phrase nominale, indentité et substitution dans les Textes des Sarcophages, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 40, 49-63.

——. 1991. Cleft-sentence, substitutions et contraintes sémantiques en égyptien de la première phase (Ve-XVIIIe Dynasties), in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 57-96.

Dorman, Peter. 1991. *The Tombs of Senenmut. The Architecture and Decoration of Tombs 71 and 353*, Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 24, New York.

Dunham, Dows. 1967. *Second Cataract Forts II. Uronarti, Shalfak, and Mirgissa*, Cambridge.

Dziobek, Eberhard. 1998. *Die Denkmäler des Vezirs User-Amun*, Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens 18, Heidelberg.

Edel, Elmar. 1943. Untersuchungen zur Phraseologie der ägyptischen Inschriften des alten Reiches, in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 13.1.

——. 1955-1964. *Altägyptische Grammatik*, Analecta Orientalia 34/39, Roma.

——. 1959. Die Herkunft des neuägyptisch-koptischen Personalsuffixes der 3. Person Plural *-w*, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 84, 17-38.

——. 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.

Edgerton William. 1951. Early Egyptian Dialect Interrelationships, in: *Bulletin of the American Society of Oriental Research* 122, 9-12.

Eichler, Eckhard. 2001. Zur Datierung und Interpretation der Lehre des Ptahhotep, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 128, 97-107.

Engsheden, Åke. 2003. *La reconstitution du verbe en égyptien de tradition 400-30 avant J.-C.*, Uppsala Studies in Egyptology 3, Uppsala.

Enmarch, Roland. 2005. *The Dialogue of Ipuwer and the Lord of All*, Oxford.

——. 2007. What the Ancestors Foretold: Some references to prediction in Middle Egyptian texts, 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, 74-86.

——. 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 et al. (eds), *Narratives of Egypt and the Ancient Near East. Literary and Linguistic Approaches*, Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 189, Leuven, 97-121.

——. 2012. Mortuary and Literary Laments: A comparison, in: Roland Enmarch & Verena Lepper (eds), *Ancient Egyptian Literature. Theory and Practice*, Oxford, 83-99.

Erman, Adolf. 1889. *Die Sprache des Papyrus Westcar*, Göttingen.

——. 1911. *Hymnen an das Diadem der Pharaonen*, Berlin.

——. 1928[4]. *Ägyptische Grammatik*, Leipzig.

——. 1933[2]. *Neuägyptische Grammatik*, Leipzig.

Eyre, Christopher. 1990. The Semna Stelae: Quotation, genre and functions in literature, in: Sarah Israelit-Groll (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology. Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, Jerusalem, vol. I, 134-65.

Farout, Dominique. 2012. Les déclarations du roi Sahourê, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 63, 103-13.

Faulkner, Raymond. 1951. The Stela of Rudjahau, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 37, 47-52.

——. 1955a. The Installation of the Vizier, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 41, 18-29.

——. 1955b. Ptahhotpe and the Disputants, in: Otto Firchow (ed.), *Ägyptologische Studien. Hermann Grapow zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung 29, Berlin, 81-4.

——. 1956. The Man Who Was Tired of Life, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 42, 21-40.

——. 1969. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts. Translated into English by R. O. Faulkner*, Warminster.

——. 1973-1978. *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts. Translated and Edited by R. O. Faulkner*, 3 vols, Warminster.

Fecht, Gerhard. 1960. *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache*, Ägyptologische Forschungen 21, Glückstadt.

——. 1972. *Der Vorwurf an Gott in den 'Mahnworten des Ipu-wer' (Pap. Leiden I 344 recto, 11, 11-13, 8; 15, 13-17, 3): Zur geistigen Krise der ersten Zwischenzeit und ihrer Bewältigung*, Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 1972.1, Heidelberg.

——. 1978. Schicksalsgöttinnen und König in der 'Lehre eines Mannes für seinen Sohn', in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 105, 14-42.

——. 1981. Ptahhotep und die Disputierer (Lehre des Ptahhotep nach Pap. Prisse, Max. 2-4, Dévaud 60-83), in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 37, 143-50.

——. 1986. Cruces Interpretum in der Lehre des Ptahhotep (Maximen 7, 9, 13, 14) und das Alter der Lehre, in: Antoine Guillaumont (ed.), *Hommages à François Daumas*, Montpellier, 227-51.

Feder, Frank. 2003. Sinuhes Vater: Ein Versuch des Neuen Reiches, Sinuhes Flucht zu erklären, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 195, 45-52.

——. 2004. Das Ende des 'narrativen' Infinitivs im Sinuhe, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 12, 53-74.

Fischer-Elfert, Hans-Werner. 1983. *Die satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi 1*, Kleine Ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden.

——. 1986. *Literarische Ostraka der Ramessidenzeit in Übersetzung*, Kleine Ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden.

——. 1988. Zum bisherigen Textbestand der 'Lehre eines Mannes an seinen Sohn' – eine Zwischenbilanz, in: *Oriens Antiquus* 27, 173-209.

——. 1992. Synchrone und Diachrone Interferenzen in literarischen Werken des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches, in: *Orientalia* 61, 354-72.

——. 1994. Vermischtes III, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 143, 41-9.

——. 1999. *Die Lehre eines Mannes für seinen Sohn: Eine Etappe auf dem 'Gottesweg' des loyalen und solidarischen Beamten des Mittleren Reiches*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 60, Wiesbaden.

——. 2000. Review of Quack, *Studien zur Lehre für Merikare*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 7, 261-7.

——. 2003. Representations of the Past in New Kingdom Literature, in: John Tait (ed.), *'Never had the like occurred': Egypt's View of its Past*, Encounters with Ancient Egypt 6, London, 119-37.

——. 2007. Review of Jäger, *Altägyptische Berufstypologien*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 15, 307-14.

Forstner-Müller, Irene. 2001. Vorbericht der Grabung im Areal A/II in Tell el-Dab'a, in: *Ägypten und Levante* 11, 197-220.

Franke, Detlef. 1994. *Das Heiligtum des Heqaib auf Elephantine: Geschichte eines Provinzheiligtums im Mittleren Reich*, Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens 9, Heidelberg.

——. 1996. Sesostris I. 'König der beiden Länder' und Demiurg in Elephantine, in: Peter der Manuelian (ed.), *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson*, Boston, vol. I, 273-95.

——. 2007a. 'Erinnern – Dauern – Denkmäler'. Restauration und Renaissance im Alten Ägypten, in: *Imago Aegypti* 2, 38-65.

——. 2007b. The Good Shepherd Antef (Stela BM EA 1628), in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 93, 149-74.

Frood, Elizabeth. 2007. *Biographical Texts from Ramessid Egypt*, Society of Biblical Literature, Writings from the Ancient World 26, Atlanta.

Gabra, Gawdat. 1976. Preliminary Report on the Stela of Ḥtpi from El-Kab from the Time of Wahankh Inyôtef II, in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 32, 45-56, pl.14.

Gardiner, Alan. 1909. *The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage from a Hieratic Papyrus in Leiden (Pap. Leiden 344 recto)*, Leipzig.

——. 1910. The Tomb of Amenemhat, High-Priest of Amon, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 47, 87-99.

——. 1914. New Literary Works From Ancient Egypt. II. Pap. Petersburg 1116 B, *recto*, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 1, 100-6.

——. 1916. *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe*, Paris.

——. 1917. The Tomb of a Much Travelled Theban Official, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 4, 28-38.

——. 1925. The Autobiography of Rekhmere^c, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 60, 62-76.

——. 1928. An Egyptian Split Infinitive and the Origin of the Coptic Conjunctive Tense, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 14, 86-96.

——. 1937. *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 7, Bruxelles.

——. 1946a. The Instruction Addressed to Kagemni and His Brethren, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 32, 71-4.

——. 1946b. Davies's Copy of the Great Speos Artemidos Inscription, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 32, 43-56.

——. 1947. *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, Oxford.

Gardiner, Alan, Thomas Peet & Jaroslav Černy. 1952-1955. *The Inscriptions of Sinai*, Egypt Exploration Society, London.

Giewekemeyer, Antonia. 2013. Perspektiven und Grenzen der Nutzung literarischer Texte als historische Quellen. Zu Versuchen, 'Geschichte' aus der Geschichte über die *Vorhersagen des Neferti* herauszulesen, in: Moers et al. (2013), 285-365.

Gilula, Mordechai. 1976. Shipwrecked Sailor, Lines 184-85, in: Janet Johnson & Edward Wente (eds), *Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations 39, Chicago, 75-82.

——. 1991. The King's Egyptian, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 125-7.

Gitton, Michel. 1984. *Les divines épouses de la 18e dynastie*, Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 306, Paris.

Glanville, Stephen. 1928. The Letters of Ahmose of Peniati, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 14, 294-312.

Gnirs, Andrea. 2006. Das Motiv des Bürgerkriegs in Merikare und Neferti. Zur Literatur der 18. Dynastie, in: Gerald Moers, Heike Behlmer, Katja Demuß & Kai Widmaier (eds), *jn.t ḏr.w – Festschrift für Friedrich Junge*, Göttingen, vol. I, 207-65.

——. 2008. Review of Burkard & Thissen, *Einführung in die altägyptische Literaturgeschichte II. Neues Reich*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 16, 355-69.

——. 2013a. Geschichte und Literatur. Wie 'historisch' sind ägyptische literarische Texte?, in: Moers et al. (2013), 367-403.

——. 2013b. Zum Verhältnis von Literatur und Geschichte in der 18. Dynastie, in: Susanne Bickel (ed.), *Vergangenheit und Zukunft. Studien zum historischen Bewusstsein in der Thutmosidenzeit*, Aegyptiaca Helvetica 22, Basel, 127-86.

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.

Gohy, Stéphanie. 2012. *Pour une définition du corpus néo-égyptien. Approche linguistique d'une synchronie dynamique* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Liège).

Goldwasser, Orly. 1990. On the Choice of Registers – Studies in the grammar of papyrus Anastasi I, in: Sarah Israelit-Groll (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology. Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, Jerusalem, vol. I, 120-49.

——. 1991. On Dynamic Canonicity in Late Egyptian: The literary letter and the personal prayer, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 129-41.

——. 1999. 'Low' and 'High' Dialects in Ramesside Egyptian, in: Stefan Grunert & Ingelore Hafemann (eds), *Textcorpus und Wörterbuch. Aspekte zur ägyptischen Lexikographie*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 14, Leiden/Boston, 311-28.

——. 2002. *Prophets, Lovers, and Giraffes: Wor(l)d Classification in Ancient Egypt*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 38.3, Wiesbaden.

Görg, Manfred. 1987. Das Land *Jꜣꜣ* (Sin B 81.238), in: Jürgen Osing & Günter 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, 142-53.

Grajetzki, Wolfram. 2000. *Die höchsten Beamten der ägyptischen Zentralverwaltung zur Zeit des Mittleren Reiches. Prosopographie, Titel und Titelreihen*, Berlin.

——. 2005. Zu einigen Titeln in literarischen Werken des Mittleren Reiches, in: *Chronique d'Égypte* 80, 36-65.

——. 2006. *The Middle Kingdom of Ancient Egypt*, Duckworth Egyptology, London.

——. 2009. *Court Officials of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom*, Duckworth Egyptology, London.

Grapow, Herman. 1935. Zum Gebrauch der alten Pronomina absoluta, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 71, 48-55.

——. 1954. Beiträge zur Untersuchung des Stils ägyptischer Lieder, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 79, 17-27.

Green, Michael. 1987. *The Coptic 'share' Pattern and its Egyptian Ancestors. A Reassessment of the Aorist Pattern in the Egyptian Language*, Warminster.

Griffith, Francis. 1889. *The Inscriptions of Siût and Dêr Rifêh*, London.

Grimal, Nicolas. 1981. *La stèle triomphale de Pi(ꜥankh)y au musée du Caire JE 48862 et 47086-47089, Études sur la propagande royale égyptienne 1*, Mémoires de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale 105, Cairo.

——. 1995. Corégence et association au trône: l'*Enseignement d'Amenemhat Ier*, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 95, 273-80.

Groll, Sarah. 1967. *Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns in Late Egyptian*, London.

Gruen, Stephan. 1973. An Analysis of Urk. IV 1287, 20-1 (Amada Stela), in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 59, 226-7.

Guilhou, Nadine. 1989. *La vieillesse des dieux*, Montpellier.

——. 1998. Un nouveau fragment du livre de la vache céleste, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale au Caire* 98, 197-213.

Guglielmi, Waltraud. 1973. *Reden, Rufe und Lieder auf altägyptischen Darstellungen der Landwirtschaft, Viehzucht, des Fisch- und Vogelfangs vom Mittleren Reich bis zur Spätzeit*, Tübinger Ägyptologische Beiträge 1, Bonn.

Guksch, Heike. 1994. 'Sehnsucht nach der Heimatstadt': ein ramessidisches Thema?, in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 50, 101-6.

Gundacker, Roman. 2010. Eine besondere Form des Substantivsatzes. Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf ihre dialektale und diachrone Bedeutung, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 18, 41-117.

——. 2012. Hypomnemata Naufragea. Die grammatische Struktur von Schiffbrüchiger lin. 183-186, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 20, 51-98.

Gunn, Battiscombe. 2012². *Studies in Egyptian Syntax, 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.

——. 1985a. *The Sanctuary of Heqaib (Elephantine IV)*, Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 33, Mainz.

——. 1985b. Devotions of Thutmosis III to his Predecessors: A propos of a meeting of Sesostris I with his Courtiers, in: Paule Posener-Kriéger (ed.), *Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mokhtar*, Bibliothèque d'étude 97, Cairo, vol. I, 349-59.

Hagen, Fredrik. 2006. Literature, Transmission, and the Late-Egyptian Miscellanies, in: Rachael Dann (ed.), *Current Research in Egyptology 2004*, Oxford, 84-99.

——. 2012a. *An Egyptian Literary Text in Context: The Instruction of Ptahhotep*, Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 218, Leuven.

——. 2012b. Constructing Textual Identity: Framing and self-reference in Egyptian texts, in: Roland Enmarch & Verena Lepper (eds), *Ancient Egyptian Literature. Theory and Practice*, Oxford, 185-209.

——. In press. An Eighteenth Dynasty Writing Board (Ashmolean 1948.91) and *The Hymn to the Nile*, in: *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt*.

el-Hamrawi, Mahmud. 2000. Bemerkungen zu pWestcar 5, 1-7 und Sinuhe B 147, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 7, 141-52.

——. 2003. *Die vorderen Erweiterungen des Satzkerns im Mittelägyptischen*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 43, Wiesbaden.

——. 2004. Alte-Reichs-Sprache und Mittlere-Reichs-Sprache in abydenischen Texten der 11.-12. Dynastie, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 12, 89-122.

——. 2008. Is the preterite *sḏm=f* in Late Egyptian derived from present perfect *iw sḏm.n=f* or historical perfect *sḏm=f* of Old Egyptian?, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 16, 73-94.

Hari, Robert. 1985. *La tombe thébaine du père divin Néferhotep (TT 50)*, Genève.

Harris, Alice & Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Cambridge.

Haspelmath, Martin. 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, 17-44.

el-Hawary, Amr. 2010. *Wortschöpfung. Die Memphitische Theologie und die Siegesstele des Pije – zwei Zeugen kultureller Repräsentation in der 25. Dynastie*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 243, Fribourg/Göttingen.

Hayes, William. 1947. Horemkha'uef of Nekhen and His Trip to It-Towe, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 33, 3-11.

——. 1957. Varia from the Time of Hatshepsut, in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 15, 78-90.

Haykal, Fayza. 1983. Papyrus Boulaq XIII, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 83, 213-48.

Helck, Wolfgang. 1955a. Die Berufung des Vezirs User, in: Otto Firchow (ed.), *Ägyptologische Studien. Hermann Grapow zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung 29, Berlin, 107-17.

——. 1955b. Eine Stele des Vizekönigs *Wsr-st.t*, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 14, 22-31.

——. 1967. Eine kleine Textverbesserung, in: *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux* 19, 464-7.

——. 1970. *Die Lehre des Dwꜣ-Ḫtjj*, 2 vols, Kleine ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden.

——. 1972. *Der Text des 'Nilhymnus'*, Kleine ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden.

——. 1992². *Die Prophezeiung des Neferti*, Kleine ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden.

Heyne, Alice. 2007. The Teaching of Ptahhotep: The London versions, in: Maria Cannata (ed.), *Current Research in Egyptology 2006*, Oxford, 85-98.

Hintze, Fritz. 1950. *Untersuchungen zu Stil und Sprache neuägyptischer Erzählungen*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung 2.6, Berlin.

Hirsch, Eileen. 2008. *Die sakrale Legitimation Sesostris' I. Kontaktphänomene in königsideologischen Texten*, Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen 6, Wiesbaden.

Hoch, James. 1992. The Teaching of Dua-Kheti: A new look at the Satire of the Trades, in: *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 21/22, 88-100.

——. 1994. *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*, Princeton.

Hofmann, Beate. 2004. *Die Königsnovelle: 'Strukturanalyse am Einzelwerk'*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 62, Wiesbaden.

Hopper, Paul & Elisabeth Traugott. 2003². *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge.

Hornung, Erik. 1975. *Das Buch der Anbetung des Re im Westen (Sonnenlitanei). Bd. I: Text*, Aegyptiaca Helvetica 2, Genève.

——. 1982. *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskuh: eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 46, Fribourg/Göttingen.

Hurwitz, Avi. 2000. Can Biblical Texts Be Dated Linguistically? Chronological perspectives in the historical study of Biblical Hebrew, in: André Lemaire & Magne Saebo (eds), *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998*, Vetus Testamentum Supplements 80, Leiden, 143-60.

Jäger, Stephan. 2004. *Altägyptische Berufstypologien*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 4, Göttingen.

Jambon, Emmanuel. 2005. *Troubles et merveilles de la nature dans l'Égypte pharaonique: les mouvements de la terre* (unpublished PhD Thesis, Paris-IV Sorbonne).

James, Thomas. 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. Das Attentat auf Amenemhat I. und die erste ägyptische Koregentschaft, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur*, 214-61.

——. 1995. Diglossie und Zweisprachigkeit, in: *Wiener Zeitschrift zur Kunde des Morgenlandes* 85, 85-115.

——. 1997. Zu den Koregenzen der 12. Dynastie, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 24, 115-35.

——. 2004. Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu den 'Unterweltsbüchern', in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 32, 205-32.

——. 2011. Sprachgeschichte und Textdatierung, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 40, 155-79.

——. 2012. Zu Sprache und Datierung des Amduat, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 98, 87-106.

Jay, Jacqueline. 2008. *The Narrative Structure of Ancient Egyptian Tales: From Sinuhe to Setna* (PhD Dissertation, University of Chicago).

Jakobson, Roman & Linda Waugh. 2002[3]. *The Sound Shape of Language*, Berlin/New York.

Jéquier, Gustave. 1911. *Le Papyrus Prisse et ses variantes: papyrus de la Bibliothèque Nationale (nos. 183 à 194), papyrus 10371 et 10435 du British Museum, Tablette Carnarvon au Musée du Caire*, Paris.

Johnson, Janet. 1994. Ancient Egyptian Linguistics, in: Giulio Lepschy (ed.), *History of Linguistics, vol. I: The Eastern Traditions of Linguistics*, London/New York, 63-76.

Junge, Friedrich. 1982. Phraseologische Gebundenheit, in: *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* IV, Wiesbaden, 1041-3.

——. 1984a. Sprache, in: *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* V, Wiesbaden, 1176-1214.

——. 1984b. Zur 'Sprachwissenschaft' der Ägypter, in: Friedrich Junge (ed.), *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf*, Göttingen, vol. I, 257-72.

——. 1985. Sprachstufen und Sprachgeschichte, in: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft Supplement* VI, 17-34.

——. 1989. *'Emphasis' and Sentential Meaning in Middle Egyptian*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 20, Wiesbaden.

——. 2003. *Die Lehre Ptahhoteps und die Tugenden der ägyptischen Welt*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 193, Fribourg/Göttingen.

——. 2008[3]. *Einführung in die Grammatik des Neuägyptischen*, Wiesbaden.

Kahl, Jochem. 1994. *Das System der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift in der 0.-3. Dynastie*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 29, Wiesbaden.

——. 1998. 'Es ist vom Anfang bis zum Ende gekommen, wie es in der Schrift gefunden worden war': Zur Überlieferung der Erzählung des Sinuhe, in: Manfred Dietrich und Ingo Kottsieper (eds), *'Und Moses schrieb diese Lied auf': Studien zum Alten Testament und zum Alten Orient. Festschrift für Oswald Loretz zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres mit Beiträgen von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen*, Münster, 383-400.

——. 1999. *Siut-Theben. Zur Wertschätzung von Traditionen im alten Ägypten*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 13, Leiden/Boston.

Kammerzell, Frank. 1986. Die Prophezeiung des Neferti, in: Manfred Dietrich et al. (eds), *Deutungen der Zukunft in Briefen, Orakeln und Omina*, Texte zur Umwelt des Alten Testaments II:1, Gütersloh, 102-11.

——. 1988. Norm, Relikt, oder Fiktion. Zweifel an der Existenz einer morphologisch-syntaktischen Kategorie "indikativ-perfektivisches *sḏm=f*" im Mäg., in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 102, 41-57.

——. 1993. Die altägyptische Negation *w*. Versuch einer Annäherung, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 3, 17-32.

——. 1997. Merikare E 30-31: ein Fall von indirekter Rede mit Einaktantenanpassung im Mittelägyptischen, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 161, 97-101.

——. 1999. *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel im Alten Ägypten* (unpubl. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Göttingen).

——. 2000. Das Verspeisen der Götter – Religiöse Vorstellung oder poetische Fiktion?, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 7, 183-218.

——. 2005. Old Egyptian and Pre-Old Egyptian. Tracing linguistic diversity in archaic Egypt and the creation of the Egyptian language, in: Stephan Seidlmayer (ed.), *Texte und Denkmäler des ägyptischen Alten Reiches*, Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae 3, Berlin, 165-247.

Kanawati, Naguib & Mahmud Abd er-Raziq. 1999. *The Teti Cemetery at Saqqara V. The Tomb of Hesi*, The Australian Centre for Egyptology Reports 13, Warminster.

Kaplony-Heckel, Ursula. 1956. Studien zum Eigenschaftsverbum und zum prädikativen Adjektivum im Altägyptischen, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 81, 76-82.

Kees, Hermann. 1928. Textkritische Kleinigkeiten, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 63, 75-8.

Keller, Rudi. 1994. *Language Change. The Invisible Hand in Language*, London.

Kemp, Barry. 2006[2]. *Ancient Egypt. Anatomy of a Civilization*, London/New York.

Klotz, David. 2010. Emhab versus the *tmrhtn*: Monomachy and the expulsion of the Hyksos, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 39, 211-41.

——. 2011. A New Edition of the 'Book of Nut', in: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 68, 479-91.

Klug, Andrea. 2002. *Königliche Stelen in der Zeit von Ahmose bis Amenophis III.*, Monumenta Aegyptiaca 8, Turnhout.

Koch, Roland. 1990. *Die Erzählung des Sinuhe*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 17, Bruxelles.

Köhler, Ines. 2009. Auf ein Neues: die Sinuhe-Geschichte und der narrative Infinitiv, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 221, 49-56.

Konrad, Kirsten. 1999. Wortverzeichnis und lexikostatistische Untersuchung der Lehre Amenemhats I., in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 169, 87-100.

Korostovtzev, Michail. 1960. Egipetski ieratitscheski papirus No 167 gosudarstwennowo museja isobrasitjelnych iskusstw im. A. S. Puschkina w Moskwje, in: Akademija Nauk SSSR, Institut Wostokowedenija (ed.), *Drewni Egipet* (Studies Goleništscheff), Moscow, 119-33.

Kouwenberg, N. J. C. 1997. *Gemination in the Akkadian Verb*, Studia Semitica Neerlandica 33, Assen.

——. 2005. Reflections on the Gt Stem in Akkadian, in: *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 95, 77-103.

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.

——. 2000. Assimilation and Dissimilation at Work in the Late Egyptian Verbal System. The verb forms built by means of the auxiliary *iri* from the second part of the Nineteenth Dynasty until Early Demotic, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 86, 57-65.

——. 2010. Les serments des stèles frontières d'Akhénaton. Origine du Futur III & dynamique de l'apparition de l'auxiliaire *iri*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 18, 131-67.

Kubisch, Sabine. 2008. *Lebensbilder der 2. Zwischenzeit: Biographische Inschriften der 13.-17. Dynastie*, Sonderschriften des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo 34, Berlin.

Kurth, Dieter. 2011. Zur Definition des Ptolemäischen, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 229, 65-79.

Laboury, Dimitri. 2013. Citations et usages de l'art du Moyen Empire à l'époque thoutmoside, in: Susanne Bickel (ed.), *Vergangenheit und Zukunft. Studien zum historischen Bewusstsein in der Thutmosidenzeit*, Aegyptiaca Helvetica 22, Basel, 11-28.

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 Sésostris Ier à Karnak*, Cairo.

——. 1977-1979. *Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout à Karnak*, Cairo.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 71, Cambridge.

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 (BM EA 10477)*, Catalogue of Books of the Dead in the British Museum I, London.

Leahy, Anthony. 1989. A Protective Measure in Abydos in the Thirteenth Dynasty, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 75, 41-60.

Lefebvre, Gustave. 1940. *Grammaire de l'égyptien classique*, Bibliothèque d'étude 12, Cairo.

Leitz, Christian. 1999. *Magical and Medical Papyri of the New Kingdom*, Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum 7, London.

Lepper, Verena. 2008. *Untersuchungen zu pWestcar: Eine philologische und literaturwissenschaftliche (Neu-)Analyse*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 70, Wiesbaden.

——. 2012. Ancient Egyptian Literature: Genre and Style, in: Roland Enmarch & Verena Lepper (eds), *Ancient Egyptian Literature. Theory and Practice*, Oxford, 211-25.

Leprohon, Ronald. 2009. The Stela of Sehetepibre (CG 20538). Borrowings and innovation, in: David Silverman, William Simpson & Josef Wegner (eds), *Archaism and Innovation: Studies in the Culture of Middle Kingdom Egypt*, New Haven/Philadelphia, 277-92.

Lichtheim, Miriam. 2006². *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings. Vol. I: The Old and Middle Kingdoms*, Berkeley.

Loprieno, Antonio. 1995. *Ancient Egyptian. A Linguistic Introduction*, Cambridge.

——. 1996a. The 'King's Novel', in: Antonio Loprieno (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 10, Leiden/Boston, 277-95.

——. 1996b. Linguistic Variety and Egyptian Literature, in: Antonio Loprieno (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 10, Leiden/Boston, 515-530.

——. 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. Foreword to the second edition of Miriam Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings. Vol. I: The Old and Middle Kingdoms*, Berkeley.

Lorand, David. 2011. *Arts et politique sous Sésostris Ier: littérature, sculpture et architecture dans leur contexte historique*, Monumenta Aegyptiaca 13, Turnhout.

Luft, Ulrich. 1992. *Das Archiv von Illahun. Briefe 1*, Hieratische Papyri aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lfg. 1, Berlin.

Maissen, Thomas. 2012⁴. *Geschichte der Schweiz*, Baden.

Malaise, Michel & Jean Winand. 1999. *Grammaire raisonnée de l'égyptien classique*, Aegyptiaca Leodensia 6, Liège.

Manassa, Colleen. 2003. *The Great Karnak Inscription of Merenptah. Grand Strategy in the 13ᵗʰ Century BC*, Yale Egyptological Studies 5, New Haven.

——. 2007. *The Late Egyptian Underworld: Sarcophagi and Related Texts from the Nectanebid Period*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 72, Wiesbaden.

Mathieu, Bernard. 1993. Sur quelques ostraca hiératiques littéraires, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 93, 335-47.

——. 1996. *La poésie amoureuse de l'Égypte ancienne. Recherches sur un genre littéraire au Nouvel Empire*, Bibliothèque d'étude 115, Cairo.

Mauric-Barberio, Florence. 2001. Le premier exemplaire du Livre de l'Amdouat', in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 101, 315-50.

Mayerthaler, Willi. 1981. *Morphologische Natürlichkeit*, Linguistische Forschungen 28, Wiesbaden.

Moers, Gerald. 2000. 'Bei mir wird es Dir gut ergehen, denn Du wirst die Sprache Ägyptens hören!' Verschieden und doch gleich: Sprache als identitätsrelevanter Faktor im pharaonischen Ägypten, in: Ulrike Sander & Fritz Paul (eds), *Muster und Funktionen kultureller Selbst- und Fremdwahrnehmung: Beiträge zur internationalen Geschichte der sprachlichen und literarischen Emanzipation*, Göttingen, 45-99.

——. 2001. *Fingierte Welten in der ägyptischen Literatur des 2. Jahrtausends vor Christus: Grenzüberschreitung, Reisemotiv und Fiktionalität*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 19, Leiden/Boston.

——. 2002. The Interplay of Reenactment and Memory in the *Complaints of Khakheperreseneb*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 10, 293-308.

——. 2008. Zur Relevanz der Namenslisten des pChester Beatty IV für Versuche einer funktionalen Binnendifferenzierung des gemeinhin als 'literarisch' bezeichneten Gattungssystems des Mittleren Reiches, in: Carsten Peust (ed.), *Miscellanea in honorem Wolfhart Westendorf*, Göttinger Miszellen, Beihefte 3, 45-52.

——. 2009. Der 'Autor' und sein 'Werk': Der Beginn der Lehre des Ptahhotep in der Tradition des Neuen Reiches, in: Dieter Kessler et al. (eds), *Texte-Theben-Tonfragmente. Festschrift für Günter Burkard*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 76, Wiesbaden, 319-32.

——. 2011. Broken Icons. The emplotting of master-narratives in the ancient Egyptian *Tale of Sinuhe*, in: Fredrik Hagen et al. (eds), *Narratives of Egypt and the Ancient Near East. Literary and Linguistic Approaches*, Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 189, Leuven, 24-49.

——. In press. Ptahhotep on Communication and Sinuhe's Invisibility, in: Elizabeth Frood & Angela McDonald (eds), Studies in Honour of a Distinguished Colleague.

Moers, Gerald, Kai Widmaier, Antonia Giewekemeyer, Arndt Lümers & Ralf Ernst (eds). 2013. *Dating Egyptian Literary Texts*, "Dating Egyptian Literary Texts" Göttingen, 9–12 June 2010 vol. I, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 11, Hamburg.

Monnier, Franck. 2010. *Les forteresses égyptiennes. Du Prédynastique au Nouvel Empire* Connaissance de l'Égypte ancienne 11, Bruxelles.

Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. Reduplicative Constructions, in: Joseph Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Human Language. Vol. III: 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, Liège.

Morenz, Ludwig. 1996. *Beiträge zur Schriftlichkeitskultur im Mittleren Reich und in der 2. Zwischenzeit*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 29, Wiesbaden.

——. 1997. Ein hathorisches Kultlied und ein königlicher Archetyp des Alten Reiches – Sinuhe B 270f. und eine Stele der späten XI. Dynastie (Louvre C 15), in: *Welt des Orients* 28, 7-17.

——. 1998. Sa-mut/kyky und Menna, zwei reale Leser/Hörer des *Oasenmannes* aus dem Neuen Reich?, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 165, 73-81.

——. 2006. Zweifaches graphisches Spiel: Getreidegott (*npr*) und Gardiner F 35-Zeichen sowie Erntezeit und Sichel-Zeichen. Assoziationsreiche visuelle Poesie im hyksoszeitlichen El-Kab, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 209, 53-7.

——. 2012a. Review of: Adrom, *Die Lehre des Amenemhet*, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 71.1, 139-46.

——. 2012b. Sammeln und Gebrüll – Ägyptisches Sprachbewusstsein und die Konzeption göttlicher wie anti-göttlicher Rede, in: Amr el-Hawary (ed.), *Wenn Götter und Propheten reden – Erzählen für die Ewigkeit*, Narratio Aliena? Studien des Bonner Zentrums für Transkulturelle Narratologie 3, Berlin, 185-208.

Morschauser, Scott. 1991. *Threat-formulae in Ancient Egypt: A Study of the History, Structure, and Use of Threats and Curses in Ancient Egypt*, Baltimore.

——. 1997. Approbation or Disapproval? The conclusion of the letter of Amenophis II to User-Satet, Viceroy of Kush (Urk. IV, 1344.10-20), in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 24, 203-22.

Mufwene, Salikoko. 2008. *Language Evolution: Contact, competition and change*, London/New York.

Müller, Matthias. 2013. Hatschepsut und der Umgang mit der Vergangenheit. Zur angeblichen Mittleren-Reich-Vorlage für Hatschepsuts Darstellung ihrer Erhebung zur Koregentin, in: Susanne Bickel (ed.), *Vergangenheit und Zukunft. Studien zum historischen Bewusstsein in der Thutmosidenzeit*, Aegyptiaca Helvetica 22, Basel, 187-202.

Murnane, William & Charles van Siclen III. 1993. *The Boundary Stelae of Akhenaten*, Studies in Egyptology, London/New York.

Nagai, Masakatsu. 2006. Language Variety in the 19th Dynasty, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 223-32.

Navrátilová, Hana. 2007. *The Visitors' Graffiti of Dynasties XVIII and XIX in Abusir and Northern Saqqara*, The Visitors' Graffiti 1, Prague.

Neveu, François. 2001. *La particule ḫr en néo-égyptien. Étude synchronique*, Études et Mémoires d'Égyptologie 4, Paris.

Newberry, Percy. 1893-1894. *El Bersheh*, London.

Norde, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*, Oxford.

Obsomer, Claude. 1993. La date de Nésou-Montou (Louvre C1), in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 44, 103-40.

——. 1995. *Sésostris Ier: étude chronologique et historique du règne*, Connaissance de l'Égypte ancienne 5, Bruxelles.

Ockinga, Boyo. 1984. *Die Gottebenbildlichkeit im alten Ägypten und im Alten Testament*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 7, Wiesbaden.

Oppenheim, Adela. 2011. The Early Life of Pharaoh: Divine birth and adolescence scenes in the causeway of Senwosret III at Dahshur, in: Mirsolav Bárta, Filip Coppens & Jaromír Krejcí (eds), *Abusir and Saqqara in the Year 2010*, Prague, 171-88.

Oréal, Elsa. 2011. *Les particules en égyptien ancien. De l'ancien égyptien à l'égyptien classique*, Bibliothèque d'étude 152, Cairo.

Osing, Jürgen. 1976. *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*, Mainz.

——. 1992a. Zu zwei literarischen Werken des Mittleren Reiches, in: Jürgen Osing & E. Rand Nielsen (eds), *The Heritage of Ancient Egypt: Studies in Honour of Erik Iversen*, Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 13, Copenhagen, 101-19.

——. 1992b. *Das Grab des Nefersecheru in Zawyet Sultan*, Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 88, Cairo.

——. 1998. Zur 'Poetischen Stele' Thutmosis' III., in: Jan Assmann & Elke Blumenthal (eds), *Literatur und Politik im pharaonischen und ptolemäischen Ägypten: Vorträge der Tagung zum Gedenken an Georges Posener 5.-10. September 1996 in Leipzig*, Bibliothèque d'étude 127, Cairo, 75-86.

Pantalacci, Laure. 1986. Remarques sur les méthodes de travail des décorateurs tentyrites, in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 86, 267-75.

Parkinson, Richard. 1991a. *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant*, Oxford.

——. 1991b. The Date of the 'Eloquent Peasant', in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 42, 169-81.

——. 1991c. *Voices from Ancient Egypt: An Anthology of Middle Kingdom Writings*. London.

——. 1995. 'Homosexual' Desire and Middle Kingdom Literature, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 81, 57-76.

——. 1996. Types of Literature in the Middle Kingdom, in: Antonio Loprieno (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 10, Leiden/Boston, 297-312.

——. 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 Ostracon, 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 ptolemäischen Ägypten: Vorträge der Tagung zum Gedenken an Georges Posener 5.-10. September 1996 in Leipzig*, Bibliothèque d'étude 127, Cairo, 177-96.

——. 2002. *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt: A Dark Side to Perfection*, London/New York.

——. 2004. 'The Discourse of the Fowler': Papyrus Butler verso (P.BM EA 10274), in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 90, 81-111.

——. 2006. Sinuhe's Dreaming(s): The texts and meanings of a simile, in: Kasia Szpakowska (ed.), *Through a Glass Darkly: Magic, Dreams, and Prophecy in Ancient Egypt*, Swansea, 145-75.

——. 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*, British Museum Online Research Catalogues. http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/publications/online_research_catalogues.aspx.

Parkinson, Richard & Lisa Baylis. 2012. *Four 12th Dynasty Literary Papyri (Pap. Berlin P. 3022-5): A Photographic Record*, Berlin.

Peet, Thomas. 1914. *The Stela of Sebek-khu. The Earliest Record of an Egyptian Campaign in Asia*, Manchester.

——. 1926. Two Eighteenth Dynasty Letters. Papyrus Louvre 3230, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 12, 70-4.

Pérez-Accino, Jose-Ramón. 2008. Who is the Sage Talking About? Neferti and the Egyptian sense of history (paper read at *the Xth Congress of the International Association of Egyptologists*, *Rhodos, 2008*).

——. 2011. Text as Territory: Mapping Sinuhe's shifting loyalties', in: Fredrik Hagen et al. (eds), *Narratives of Egypt and the Ancient Near East. Literary and Linguistic Approaches*, Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 189, Leuven, 177-94.

Petrie, William. 1892. *Medum*, London.

Peust, Carsten. 1996. *Indirekte Rede im Neuägyptischen*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 33, Wiesbaden.

——. 1999. *Egyptian Phonology: An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language*, Monographien zur ägyptischen Sprache 2, Göttingen.

——. 2005. Weiteres zur Personenverschiebung in der ägyptischen indirekten Rede, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 13, 77-102.

——. 2006. *Rdj* + Pseudopartizip – eine mögliche Konstruktion, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 211, 67-70.

——. 2012. The Stemma of the Story of Sinuhe, or: How to use an unrooted phylogenetic tree in textual criticism, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 209-20.

Philip, Graham. 2006. *Tell el-Dab'a XV. Metalwork and Metalworking Evidence of the Late Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period*, Untersuchungen der Zweigstelle Kairo des Öster-reichischen Archäologischen Instituts 26, Denkschriften der Gesamtakademie 36, Wien.

Piccato, Aldo. 1997. The Berlin Leather Roll and the Egyptian Sense of History, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 5, 137-59.

Polis, Stéphane. 2005. Les formes 'contingentes' en égyptien ancien: une catégorie en question, in: Christian Cannuyer (ed.), *La langue dans tous ses états. In honorem Michel Malaise*, Acta Orientalia Belgica 18, 301-22.

——. 2009. Interaction entre modalité et subjectivité en néo-égyptien. Autour de la construction *mri + iw*circ. 'souhaiter que', in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 201-29.

——. In press. Linguistic variation in Ancient Egyptian. Genres and registers in the scribal repertoire of Amennakhte son of Ipuy, in: Jennifer Cromwell & Eitan Grossman (eds), *Beyond Free Variation: Scribal Repertoires from Old Kingdom to Early Islamic Egypt*, Oxford.

Polis, Stéphane & Andréas Stauder. In prep. The construction *ib=f r sdm*, in: Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, Andréas Stauder & Jean Winand (eds), *New Directions in Egyptian Syntax. Proceedings of the Conference Liège 12-14.5.2011*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica, Hamburg.

Posener, Georges. 1956. *Littérature et politique dans l'Égypte de la XIIe dynastie*, Bibliothèque de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, Sciences Historiques et Philologiques 307, Paris.

——. 1957. Le Conte de Néferkaré et du Général Sisené (Recherches littéraires, VI), in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 11, 119-37.

——. 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 Prophezeihung des Neferti, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 135, 77-9.

——. 1993b. Ein altägyptisches Sprachtabu, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 3, 59-79.

——. 1994. *Die Lehren des Ani. Ein neuägyptischer Weisheitstext in seinem kulturellen Umfeld*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 141, Fribourg/Göttingen.

——. 1995. Monumentaldemotisch, in: Louise Gestermann & Heike Sternberg el-Hotabi (eds), *Per aspera ad astra. Wolfgang Schenkel zum neunundfünfzigsten Geburtstag*, Kassel, 107-21.

——. 2000a. Review of Fischer-Elfert, *Die Lehre eines Mannes für seinen Sohn*, in: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 57, 534-41.

——. 2000b. Review of Zeidler, *Pfortenbuchstudien*, in: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 57, 541-59.

——. 2001. Ein neuer Versuch zum Moskauer literarischen Brief, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 128, 167-81.

——. 2003. Aus einer spätzeitlichen literarischen Sammelhandschrift (Papyrus Berlin 23045), in: *Zeit-schrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 130, 182-5.

——. 2004. Review of Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture*, in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 124, 357-60.

——. 2005. Ein neuer Zugang zur Lehre des Ptahhotep?, in: *Welt des Orients* 35, 7-21.

——. 2008. Corpus oder Membra disjecta? Zur Sprach- und Redaktionskritik des Papyrus Jumilhac, in: Walter Waitkus (ed.), *Diener des Horus – Festschrift für Dieter Kurth zum 65. Geburtstag*, Aegyptiaca Hamburgensia 1, Gladbeck, 203-28.

——. 2010a. Inhomogenität von ägyptischer Sprache und Schrift in Texten aus dem späten Ägypten, in: Katja Lembke, Martina Minas-Nerpel & Stefan Pfeiffer (eds), *Tradition and Transformation: Egypt under Roman Rule. Proceedings of the International Conference, Hildesheim, Römer- and Pelizaeus-Museum, 3-6 July 2008*, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 41, Leiden/Boston, 313-41.

——. 2010b. Was ist das 'Ptolemäische'?, in: *Welt des Orients* 40, 70-92.

——. 2013. Von der Vielfalt der ägyptischen Sprache in der griechisch-römischen Zeit, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 140, 36-53.

Quirke, Stephen. 1988. State and Labour in the Middle Kingdom: A reconsideration of the term *ḥnrt*, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 39, 83-106.

——. 2004a. *Egyptian Literature 1800 BC: Questions and Readings*, London.

——. 2004b. *Titles and Bureaux of Egypt 1850-1700 BC*, London.

Ragazzoli, Chloé. 2008. *Éloges de la ville en Égypte ancienne: histoire et littérature*, Paris.

——. 2010. Weak Hands and Soft Mouths. Elements of a Scribal Identity in the New Kingdom, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 137, 157-70.

Ranke, Hermann. 1935. *Die altägyptischen Personennamen*, vol. I, Glückstadt.

Ransom, Caroline. 1913. The Stela of Menthu-weser, in: *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* 8, 216-8.

Raue, Dietrich. 2010. Snofru vor Augen, in: Ola el-Aguizy & Mohamed Sherif Ali (eds), *Echoes of Eternity. Studies Presented to Gaballa Aly Gaballa*, Philippika 35, Wiesbaden, 77-90.

Ritter, Thomas. 1995. *Das Verbalsystem der königlichen und privaten Inschriften: XVIII. Dynastie bis einschliesslich Amenophis III.*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 30, Wiesbaden.

Roberson, Joshua. 2010. Observations on the so-called '*sw sḏm=f*', or Middle Egyptian proclitic pronoun construction, in: Zahi Hawass & Jennifer Houser Wegner (eds), *Millions of Jubilees: Studies in Honor of David P. Silverman*, Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte, Supplément 39, Cairo, vol. II, 185-205.

——. 2012. *The Ancient Egyptian Book of the Earth*, Wilbour Studies in Egypt and Ancient Western Asia 1, Atlanta.

——. 2013. *The Awakening of Osiris and the Transit of the Solar Barques. Royal Apotheosis in a Most Concise Book of the Underworld and Sky*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 262, Fribourg/Göttingen.

Ryholt, Kim. 1990. A Reconsideration of some Royal Nomens of the Thirteenth Dynasty, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 119, 101-13.

——. 1997. *The Political Situation in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period c. 1800-1550 B.C.*, Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 20, Copenhagen.

Sadek, Ashraf. 1980. *The Amethyst Mining Inscriptions of Wadi el-Hudi*, vol. I, Warminster.

Schäfer, Heinrich. 1913. *Aegyptische Inschriften aus den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*, vol. I, Leipzig.

Schenkel, Wolfgang. 1964. Eine neue Weisheitslehre?, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 50, 6-12.

——. 1981. Rebus-, Buchstabiersilben- und Konsonantenschrift. Präzisierung zur Gelbschen Interpretation der altägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift als einer Silbenschrift, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 52, 83-95.

——. 1983. *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 13, Wiesbaden.

——. 1984. Sonst-Jetzt: Variationen eines literarischen Formelements, in: *Welt des Orients* 15, 51-61.

——. 1993. Zu den Verschluss- und Reibelauten im Ägyptischen und (Hamito)Semitischen. Ein Versuch zur Synthese der Lehrmeinungen, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 3, 137-49.

——. 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.

——. 2000. Die Endungen des Prospektivs und des Subjunktivs (*sḏm=f*, *sḏm.w=f*, *sḏm.y=f*) nach Befunden der Sargtexte. Mit einem Anhang zum prospektivischen Partizip *sḏm.t(i)=f(i)*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 7, 27-112.

——. 2003. *Die hieroglyphische Schriftlehre und die Realität der hieroglyphischen Graphien*, Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 138.5, Leipzig.

——. 2006. Von der Morphologie zur Syntax und zurück, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 55-82.

——. 2007. *Rdj* + Pseudopartizip – eine nach-klassische Konstruktion?, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 215, 109-12.

——. 2008. Substantiv/Selbständiges Personalpronomen + enklitisches Personalpronomen, eine grammatische Konstruktion des älteren Ägyptisch?, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 217, 97-109.

––––. 2009. Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*, in Gideon Goldenberg & Ariel Shisha-Halevy (eds), *Egyptian, Semitic and General Grammar. Studies in Memory of H. J. Polotsky*, Jerusalem, 40-60.

––––. 2012⁵. *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift*, Tübingen.

––––. In press a. Syntax und Sinnzusammenhang. Emphatische Konstruktion, Rang-V-Erweiterung und anderes mehr, in: Harold Hays, Frank Feder & Ludwig Morenz (eds), *The Alpha and Omega of Sinuhe. Reinterpreting a Classical Middle Egyptian Text. Proceedings of the workshop 27-29 November 2009 at Leiden University*, Egyptologische Uitgaven, Leuven.

––––. In press b. Kontingenter Hintergrund. Beobachtungen zum Gebrauch der *sḏm.in=f* in erzählenden Texten, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 21.

Schipper, Bernd. 1998. Von der 'Lehre des Sehtep-jb-Re' zur 'Loyalistischen Lehre'. Überlegungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte loyalistischer Aussagen, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 125, 161-79.

Schneider, Thomas. 1999a. Zur Herkunft der ägyptischen Bezeichnung *wrry.t* 'Wagen': Ein Indiz für den Lautwert von <*r*> vor Beginn des Neuen Reiches, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 173, 155-8.

––––. 1999b. Eine Vokabel der Tapferkeit: Ägyptisch *tl* – hurritisch *adal*, in: *Ugaritforschungen* 31, 677-723.

––––. 2003. Foreign Egypt: Egyptology and the concept of cultural appropriation, in: *Ägypten und Levante* 13, 155-61.

––––. 2004. Texte über den syrischen Wettergott aus Ägypten, in: *Ugaritforschungen* 35, 605-27.

––––. 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.

––––. 2008. Fremdwörter in der ägyptischen Militärsprache des Neuen Reiches und ein Bravourstück des Elitesoldaten (Papyrus Anastasi I 23, 2–7), in: *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 35, 181-205.

Schott, Siegfried. 1980. Krummschwert, in: *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* III, Wiesbaden, 819-21.

Schrakamp, Ingo. 2011. Sichelaxt, -Schwert, in: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 12, 447-50.

Schweitzer, Simon. 2013. Dating Egyptian Literary Texts. Lexical approaches, in: Moers et al. (2013), 177-90.

Seibert, Peter. 1967. *Die Charakteristik. Untersuchungen zu einer altägyptischen Sprechsitte und ihre Ausprägung in Folklore und Literatur*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 17, Wiesbaden.

Sethe, Kurt. 1928a. *Dramatische Texte zu Altägyptischen Mysterienspielen*, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens 10.1, Leipzig.

––––. 1928²b. *Ägyptische Lesestücke zum Gebrauch im akademischen Unterricht: Texte des Mittleren Reiches*, Leipzig.

Silverman, David. 1991. Texts from the Amarna Period and their Position in the Development of Ancient Egyptian, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 301-14.

Simon, Henrike. 2013. *'Textaufgaben'. Kulturwissenschaftliche Konzepte in Anwendung auf die Literatur der Ramessidenzeit*, Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur, Beihefte 14, Hamburg.

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.

––––. 1963. Studies in the Twelfth Egyptian Dynasty: I-II, in: *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 2, 53-63.

––––. 1965. *Papyrus Reisner II: Accounts of the Dockyard Workshop at This in the Reign of Sesostris I*, Boston.

––––. 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.

––––. 1991. Mentuhotep, Vizier of Sesostris I, Patron of Art and Architecture, in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 47, 331-40.

––––. 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.

Spalinger, Anthony. 1996. Some Times, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 47, 67-77

——. 2000. The Destruction of Mankind. A transitional literary text, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 28, 257-82.

——. 2002. *The Transformation of an Ancient Egyptian Narrative: P. Sallier III and the Battle of Kadesh*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 40, Wiesbaden.

——. 2006. *Five Views on Ancient Egypt*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 6, Göttingen.

——. 2009. *The Great Dedicatory Inscription of Ramesses II. A Solar-Osirian Tractate at Abydos*, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 33, Leiden/Boston.

——. 2010. Two Screen Plays: 'Kamose' and 'Apophis and Seqenenre', in: *Journal of Egyptian History* 3.1, 115-35.

——. 2011. Königsnovelle and Performance, in: Vivienne Gae Callender et al. (eds), *Times, Signs and Pyramids. Studies in Honour of Miroslav Verner on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, Prague, 351-74.

Stadler, Andreas. 2009. *Weiser und Wesir: Studien zu Vorkommen, Rolle und Wesen des Gottes Thot im ägyptischen Totenbuch*, Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 1, Tübingen.

Stauder, Andréas. 2013. 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.

——. In press a. Linguistic Dissonance in *Sinuhe*, in: Harold Hays, Frank Feder & Ludwig Morenz (eds), *The Alpha and Omega of Sinuhe. Reinterpreting a Classical Middle Egyptian Text. Proceedings of the Workshop 27-29 November 2009 at Leiden University*, Egyptologische Uitgaven, Leuven.

——. In press b. A Rare Change: The de-grammaticalization of an inflectional passive marker into an impersonal subject pronoun in Earlier Egyptian, in: Martin Haspelmath, Tonio Sebastian Richter & Eitan Grossman (eds), *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological Perspective*, Trends in Linguistics, Berlin/New York.

——. In press c. Ptahhotep 82 P, in: *Festschrift for a Distinguished Colleague*.

——. In press d. Splitting the *sḏm.n=f*? A discussion of written forms in Coffin Texts, part 1, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 141.1.

——. In press e. Splitting the *sḏm.n=f*? A discussion of written forms in Coffin Texts, part 2, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 141.2.

——. In press f. Interpreting Written Morphology. The *sḏm.n=f* in Pyramid Texts, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 73.

——. In press g. Ancient Near Eastern Linguistic Traditions – II. Egypt, in: Linda Waugh & Monique Burton (eds), *The Cambridge History of Linguistics*, Cambridge.

——. In prep. *Voice and Perspective in Earlier Egyptian*.

Stauder, Andréas & Sami Uljas. In prep. Thetic Construction in Earlier Egyptian.

Stewart, Harry. 1979. *Egyptian Stelae, Reliefs and Paintings from the Petrie Collection. II: Archaic to Second Intermediate Period*, Warminster.

Stolz, Michael. 2013. Early Versions in Medieval Textual Traditions. Wolfram's Parzival as a test case, in: Moers et al. (2013), 561-87.

Suhr-Gordon, Claudia. 2008. Die Attentatsschilderung in der Lehre des Amenemhat an seinen Sohn als dissonante Ich-Erzählung, in: Carsten Peust (ed.), *Miscellanea in honorem Wolfhart Westendorf*, Göttinger Miszellen, Beihefte 3, Göttingen, 109-19.

Sweeney, Deborah. 1985. The Great Dedicatory Inscription of Ramses II at Abydos, in: Sarah Israelit-Groll (ed.), *Papers for Discussion*, Jerusalem, vol. II, 134-327.

——. 2001. *Correspondance and Dialogue. Pragmatic Factors in Late Ramesside Letter-Writing*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 49, Wiesbaden.

——. 2006. Gender and Language in Ramesside Egyptian, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 433-50.

Tallet, Pierre. 2005. Un nouveau témoin des 'Devoirs du vizir' dans la tombe d'Aménémopé (Thèbes TT 29), in: *Chronique d'Égypte* 159, 66-75.

——. 2010. La fin des 'Devoirs du vizir', in: Eugène Warmenbol & Valérie Angenot (eds), *Thèbes aux 101 portes. Mélanges à la mémoire de Roland Tefnin*, Monumenta Aegyptiaca 12, 153-64.

Thériault, Carolyn. 1993. The *Instruction of Amenemhat* as Propaganda, in: *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 30, 151-60.

Toro Rueda, Maria Isabel. 2004. *Das Herz in der Ägyptischen Literatur des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr.: Untersuchungen zur Idiomatik und Metaphorik von Ausdrücken mit jb und ḥ3tj* (PhD Dissertation, Universität Göttingen: http://hdl.handle.net/11858/00-1735-0000-000D-F260-3).

Tylor, John & Francis Griffith. 1894. *The Tomb of Paheri at el-Kab*, The Egypt Exploration Fund, Memoir 11, London.

Uljas, Sami. 2006a. Noun/Personal Pronoun + Personal Pronoun as a Grammatical Construction in Earlier Egyptian, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 92, 245-48.

⸻. 2006b. *Ḫpr.n* and the Genesis of Auxiliaries, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 35, 327-36.

⸻. 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.

⸻. 2013. Linguistic Consciousness, in: Julie Stauder-Porchet, Andréas Stauder & Willeke Wendrich (eds), *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology*, Los Angeles:
http://digital2.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz002dn8xd

van den Boorn, G. P. F. 1988. *The Duties of the Vizier. Civil Administration in the Early New Kingdom*, Studies in Egyptology, London.

van der Plas, Dirk. 1986. *L'Hymne à la crue du Nil*, Egyptologische Uitgaven 4, Leiden.

⸻. 2013. Dating the *Hymn to Hapi*. An Update of the Late Date, in: Moers et al. (2013), 471-82.

Vandier, Jacques. 1950. *Moᶜalla. La tombe d'Ankhtifi et la tombe de Sébekhotep*, Bibliothèque d'étude 18, Cairo.

van Dijk, Jacobus. 1979. The Luxor Building Inscription of Ramses III, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 33, 19-30.

⸻. 1994. The Nocturnal Wanderings of King Neferkare, in: Catherine Berger el-Naggar (ed.), *Varia. Hommages à Jean Leclant,* Bibliothèque d'étude 106/4, Cairo, 387-93

van Seters, John. 1964. A Date for the 'Admonitions' in the Second Intermediate Period, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 50, 13-23.

⸻. 2013. Dating the *Admonitions of Ipuwer* and Biblical Narrative Texts. A comparative study, in: Moers et al. (2013), 589-98.

van Siclen III, Charles. 2010. The Third Stela of Kamose, in: Marcel Marée (ed.), *The Second Intermediate Period (Thirteenth-Seventeenth Dynasties). Current Research, Future Prospects*, Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 192, Leuven, 355-8.

Vergote, Joseph. 1955. La fonction du pseudoparticipe, in: Otto Firchow (ed.), *Ägyptologische Studien. Hermann Grapow zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Orientforschung 29, Berlin, 338-61.

⸻. 1973. *Grammaire copte Ib – Partie diachronique*, Louan.

Verhoeven, Ursula. 1999. Von hieratischen Literaturwerken in der Spätzeit, in: Jan Assmann & Elke Blumenthal (eds), *Literatur und Politik im pharaonischen und ptolemäischen Ägypten: Vorträge der Tagung zum Gedenken an Georges Posener 5.-10. September 1996 in Leipzig*, Bibliothèque d'étude 127, Cairo, 255-66.

⸻. 2005. Literarische Ansichtskarte aus dem Norden versus Sehnsucht nach dem Süden, in: Günter Burkard (ed.), *Kon-Texte. Akten des Symposions 'Spurensuche – Altäypten im Spiegel seiner Texte', München, 2. bis 4. Mai 2003*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 60, Wiesbaden, 65-80.

⸻. 2008. Tomb N13.1: Graffiti, in: Jochem Kahl, Mahmoud el-Khadragy & Ursula Verhoeven, The Asyut Project: Fifth season of fieldwork (2007), *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 37, 201-4.

⸻. 2009. Von der 'Loyalistischen Lehre' zur 'Lehre des Kairsu': eine neue Textquelle in Assiut und deren Auswirkungen, in: *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 136, 87-98.

⸻. 2010. Tomb N13.1: More literary graffiti and the title 'Scribe of the Estate of Jackals', in: Jochem Kahl et al., The Asyut Project: Seventh season of fieldwork (2009), *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 39, 196-8.

⸻. 2012a. Tomb N13.1: The Teaching of Amenemhat (§1-2) on pillar B, in: Jochem Kahl et al., The Asyut Project: Ninth season of fieldwork (2011), *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 41, 206-9.

⸻. 2012b. The New Kingdom Graffiti in Tomb N13.1: An overview, in: Jochem Kahl, Mahmoud el-Khadragy, Ursula Verhoeven & Andrea Kilian (eds), *Seven Seasons at Asyut. First Results of the Egyptian-German Cooperation in Archaeological Fieldwork*, The Asyut Project 2, Wiesbaden, 47-58.

⸻. 2013. Literatur im Grab – der Sonderfall Assiut, in: Moers et al. (2013), 139-58.

Vernus, Pascal. 1970. Quelques exemples du type du 'parvenu' dans l'Égypte ancienne, *Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie* 59, 31-47.

——. 1976. La formule 'le souffle de la bouche' au Moyen Empire, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 28, 139-45.

——. 1978. Litérature et autobiographie: les inscriptions de *sꜣ-mwt* surnommé *kyky*, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 30, 115-46.

——. 1981. Formes 'emphatiques' en fonction non 'emphatique' dans la protase d'un système corrélatif, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 43, 73-88.

——. 1982. Deux particularités de l'égyptien de tradition: *nty iw* + présent 1; *wnn.f ḥr sḏm* narratif, in: Jean Leclant (ed.), *L'Égyptologie en 1979: Axes prioritaires de la recherche*, Colloques internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 595, Paris, vol. I, 81-89.

——. 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. L'instance de la narration dans les phases anciennes de l'égyptien, in: *Discussions in Egyptology* 9, 97-111.

——. 1989. La stèle du pharaon *Mnṯw-ḥtpi* 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.

——. 1990a. *Future at Issue. Tense, Mood and Aspect in Middle Egyptian: Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, Yale Egyptological Studies 4, New Haven.

——. 1990b. La date du Paysan éloquent, in: Sarah Isrealit-Groll (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, Jerusalem, vol. II, 1033-47.

——. 1990c. Les 'espaces de l'écrit' dans l'Égypte pharaonique, in: *Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie* 119, 35-56.

——. 1994. Observations sur la prédication de classe ('Nominal Predicate'), in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 4, 325-48.

——. 1995a. *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.

——. 1995b. L'intertextualité dans la culture pharaonique: l'Enseignement de Ptahhotep et le graffito d'*Jmny* (Ouâdi Hammâmât n. 3042), in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 147, 103-9.

——. 1996a. Langue littéraire et diglossie, in: Antonio Loprieno (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 10, Leiden/Boston, 555-64.

——. 1996b. La position linguistique des Textes des Sarcophages, in: Harco Willems (ed.), *The World of the Coffin Texts*, Egyptologische Uitgaven 9, Leuven, 143-96.

——. 1996c. Réflexions et adaptations de l'idéologie monarchique à la 2ème Période Intermédiaire: la stèle d'Antef le Victorieux, in: Peter der Manuelian (ed.), *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson*, Boston, vol. II, 829-42.

——. 1997. *Les parties du discours en moyen égyptien. Autopsie d'une théorie*, Cahiers de la Société d'Égyptologie de Genève 5, Genève.

——. 2003a. 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.

——. 2003b. Idéogramme et phonogramme à l'épreuve de la figurativité, in: Lucia Morra & Carla Bazzanella (eds), *Philosophers and Hieroglyphs*, Torino, 196-218.

——. 2006. Pronoms interrogatifs en égyptien de la première phase, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 145-78.

——. 2009a. Le préformant *n* et la détransitivité: formation *n*-$C_1C_2C_1C_2$ versus $C_1C_2C_1C_2$. À propos de la racine *gm* 'notion de trituration', in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 291-317.

——. 2009b. Réception linguistique et idéologique d'une nouvelle technologie: le cheval dans la civilisation pharaonique, in: Myriam Wissa (ed.), *The Knowledge Economy and Technological Capabilities; Egypt, the Near East and the Mediterranean, 2nd millennium B.C. - 1st millennium A.D. Proceedings of a conference held at the Maison de la Chimie Paris, France, 9 - 10 December 2005*, Aula Orientalis Supplementa 26, Barcelona, 1-46.

——. 2010a. Du moyen égyptien au néo-égyptien, de *m* à *m-jr*: l'auxiliation de l'impératif négatif à la XVIIIe dynastie, in: Zahi Hawass & Jennifer Wegner (eds), *Millions of Jubilees. Studies in Honor of David P. Silverman*, Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte, Supplément 39, Cairo, vol. II, 315-35.

——. 2010[2]b. *Sagesses de l'Égypte ancienne*, Paris.

——. 2010c. Comment l'élite se donne à voir dans le programme décoratif de ses chapelles funéraires. Stratégie d'épure, stratégie d'appogiature et le frémissement du littéraire, in: Juan Carlos Moreno García (ed.), *Élite et pouvoir en Égypte ancienne. Actes du colloque, Université Charles-de-Gaulle Lille 3, 7 et 8 juillet 2006*, Cahiers de Recherches de l'Institut de Papyrologie et Égyptologie de Lille 28, 67-116.

——. 2011. 'Littérature', 'littéraire' et supports d'écriture. Contribution à une théorie de la littérature dans l'Égypte pharaonique, in: *Egyptian & Egyptological Documents, Libraries & Archives* 2, 19-146.

——. 2013. La datation de L'*Enseignement d'Aménemopé*. Le littéraire et le linguistique, in: Moers et al. (2013), 191-236.

——. In press. 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), *The Alpha and Omega of Sinuhe. Reinterpreting a Classical Middle Egyptian Text. Proceedings of the Workshop 27-29 November 2009 at Leiden University*, Egyptologische Uitgaven, Leuven.

——. In prep. Restricted Circulation in Old Egyptian as Mirrored in Later 'Égyptien de Tradition', in: James Allen, Mark Collier & Andréas Stauder (eds), *Proceedings of the Workshop on Earlier Egyptian, Brown University 3/27-29/2013*, Wilbour Studies in Egyptology and Ancient Western Asia 2, Atlanta.

Vogel, Carola. 2004. *Ägyptische Festungen und Garnisonen bis zum Ende des Mittleren Reiches*, Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beigträge 46, Hildesheim.

——. 2006. Hieb- und stichfest? Überlegungen zur Typologie des Sichelschwertes im Neuen Reich, in: Dirk Bröckelmann & Andrea Klug (eds), *Pharaos Staat. Festschrift für Rolf Gundlach zum 75. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden, 271-86.

von Lieven, Alexandra. 2007. *The Carlsberg Papyri 8. Grundriss des Laufes der Sterne: das sogenannte Nutbuch*, Carsten Niehbur Institute Publications 31, Copenhagen.

——. 2010. Review of Lepper, *Untersuchungen zu pWestcar*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 18, 301-5.

Warnick, Nicholas. 2004. A Khepesh Sword in the University of Liverpool Museum, in: *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 31, 151-4.

Wente, Edward. 1962. Egyptian 'Make Merry' Songs Reconsidered, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 21, 118-28.

——. 1967. *Late Ramesside Letters*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 33, Chicago.

——. 1969. A Late Egyptian Emphatic Tense, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 28, 1-14.

——. 1982. Mysticism in Pharaonic Egypt?, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 41, 161-79.

Werning, Daniel. 2011. *Das Höhlenbuch. Textkritische Edition und Textgrammatik*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 48, Wiesbaden.

——. 2013. Linguistic Dating of the Netherworld Books Attested in the New Kingdom. A critical review, in: Moers et al. (2013), 237-81.

Westendorf, Wolfhart. 1953. Die Wortstellung Nomen + *sdm.f* als grammatische Konstruktion, in: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 1, 337-43.

——. 1962. *Grammatik der medizinischen Texte*, Grundriss der Medizin der Alten Ägypter VIII, Berlin.

——. 1981. Die Menschen als Abbilder Pharaos: Bemerkungen zur 'Lehre des Amenemhet' (Abschnitt V), in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 46, 33-42.

Widmaier, Kai. 2009. *Landschaften und ihre Bilder in ägyptischen Texten des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr.*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 47, Wiesbaden.

——. 2013. Die *Lehre des Cheti* und ihre Kontexte. Zu Berufen und Berufsbildern im Neuen Reich, in: Moers et al. (2013), 483-557.

Wiebach-Koepke, Silvia. 2003. *Phänomenologie der Bewegungsabläufe im Jenseitskonzept der Unterweltsbücher Amduat und Pfortenbuch und der liturgischen 'Sonnenlitanei'*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 55, Wiesbaden.

Wiener, Malcom & James Allen. 1998. Separate Lives: The Ahmose Tempest Stela and the Theran 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.

Wilson, John. 1932. The Descendants of *ḥwny-r-ḥr*, in: *und Altertumskunde für Ägyptische Sprache* 68, 56-7.

Winand, Jean. 1986. Champ sémantique et structure en égyptien ancien, in: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 13, 293-314.

——. 1992. *Études de néo-égyptien, 1. La morphologie verbale*, Aegyptiaca Leodensia 2, Liège.

——. 1995. La grammaire au secours de la datation des textes, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 46, 187-202.

——. 1997. Une grammaire de l'égyptien de la 18e dynastie (review of Ritter 1995), in: *Orientalische Literaturzeitschrift* 92, 293-313.

——. 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.

——. 2001. À la croisée du temps, de l'aspect et du mode – Le conjonctif en néo-égyptien', in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 9, 293-329.

——. 2004. L'ironie dans Ounamon: les emplois de *mk* et de *ptr*, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 200, 105-14.

——. 2006. *Temps et aspect en égyptien. Une approche sémantique*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 25, Leiden/Boston.

——. 2007. Encore Ounamon 2.27-28, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 15, 299-306.

——. 2009. La particule *m-r-ꜥ* en néo-égyptien, in: Wouter Claes, Stan Hendrickx, Herman de Meulenaere (eds), *Elkab and Beyond. Studies in Honour of Luc Limme*, Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 191, Leuven, 521-38.

——. 2011. The Report of Wenamun: A journey in ancient Egyptian literature, in: Mark Collier & Steven Snape (eds), *Ramesside Studies in Honour of K. A. Kitchen*, Bolton, 541-59.

——. 2013. Une note sur Ipouer XII, 13-14, in: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 140, 83-89.

——. In press a. The Tale of Sinuhe. History of a literary text, in: Harold Hays, Frank Feder & Ludwig Morenz (eds), *The Alpha and Omega of Sinuhe. Reinterpreting a Classical Middle Egyptian Text. Proceedings of the workshop 27-29 November 2009 at Leiden University*, Egyptologische Uitgaven, Leuven.

——. In press b. Identifying Semitic Loanwords in Late Egyptian, in: Peter Dils, Eitan Grossman, Tonio Sebastian Richter & Wolfgang Schenkel (eds), *Language Contact and Linguistic Borrowing in Late Antiquity: The Case of Coptic*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica, Hamburg.

——. In press c. Words of Thieves. How to keep the record straight, in: Jennifer Cromwell & Eitan Grossman (eds), *Beyond Free Variation: Scribal Repertoires in Egypt from the Old Kingdom to the Early Islamic Period*, Oxford.

——. In prep. When *And* Meets *With*, in: Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, Andréas Stauder & Jean Winand (eds), *New Directions in Egyptian Syntax. Proceedings of the Workshop Liège 12-14.5.2011*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica, Hamburg.

Winand, Jean & Stéphanie Gohy. 2011. La grammaire du Papyrus Magique Harris, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 19, 175-245.

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.

Zeidler, Jürgen. 1992. Review of Karel Petracek, *Vergleichende Studien*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 2, 189-222.

——. 1999. *Pfortenbuchstudien*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 36, Wiesbaden.

Zonhoven, Louis. 1997. *Studies on the sḏm.t=f verb form in Classical Egyptian*, Göttingen.

Abbreviations beyond the usual ones:

F*CD* = Raymond Faukner. *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, Oxford 1972.

Hann*Lex* 4 = Rainer Hannig. *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch I. Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit*, Hannig Lexika 4, Mainz 2003.

Hann*Lex* 5 = Rainer Hannig. *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch II. Mittleres Reich und Zweite Zwischenzeit*, Hannig Lexika 5, Mainz 2006.

H*HBT* = Wolfgang Helck. *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie*, Kleine ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden 1983².

H*HBT* II = Wolfgang Helck. *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie. Nachträge*, Kleine ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden 1995.

ro 5	**2.7.3.2, (xi)**; 2.7.3.4
ro 6-7	**2.7.3.2, (vi)**; 2.7.3.4
ro 6-7 (*š3ˁ-r ... nfryt-r ...*)	**2.7.3.3, (i)**; 2.7.3.4
ro 7	2.7.2.1, (ii); **2.7.2.2, (ii)**; 2.7.2.3
ro 10	**2.6.2.5, (i)**; °2.7.1.A; 2.7.2.1, (i); **2.7.2.1, (iv)**; °2.7.3.1.B
ro 10 (*nk3*)	**2.7.3.3, (ii)**; 2.7.3.4
ro 11	**2.7.2.2, (i)**; 2.7.2.3; **5.3.5.1, (iv)**
ro 11 (*sny-mnt*)	2.4.2, (i); 5.1.3.3.B
ro 12	**2.6.2.5, (ii)**; °2.7.1.A; 2.7.1.B
ro 13	2.7.2.1, (iii)
ro 13 (*ḥ3p ḫt ḥr*)	2.7.3.4
vso 1	2.7.2.1, (iv); **2.7.3.1, (i)**
vso 1 (*nk3*)	**2.7.3.3, (ii)**; 2.7.3.4
vso 3	**2.7.3.1, (ii)**
vso 4-5	**2.6.2.5, (iii)**; 2.7.1.B
vso 5	°5.1.3.3, (ii); 6.2.2.2.C.NB
vso 5 (*ḫ3bb*)	2.7.2.3

Khentemsemti

discussion: 4.1.3.C

3-4	**4.1.3, (iii)**
4-5	1.2, (v); 2.7.3.1, (iii); **4.1.3, (v)**
14	4.1.3.A; **4.1.3, (i)**; **6.1.3.2, (vi)**

Kheti

discussion: 6.2.2.6

1-2.1	**6.2.2.6.2**
2.1 (*knkn*)	**6.2.2.6.3, (i)**
3.1	2.3.3.C; 2.3.3, (vi)
3.5-6	5.2.3.1; **5.3.2.2**; **5.3.3**; **6.2.2.6.1**
6.3	6.2.2.4, (iv)
7.1	1.2, (vi.γ)
8.1	**2.3.3, (ii)**; **2.3.3.C**
8.2-3	5.3.2.2, (i)
8.3	1.2, (xi.β)
9.3 (*ˁ3gsw*)	**6.2.2.6.3, (ii)**
10.3 (*ˁ3gsw*)	**6.2.2.6.3, (ii)**
12.1	2.3.3, (iii); **2.3.3.B**
14.3	**5.3.2.2, (ii)**; **(iii)**

25.3	**6.2.2.4, (iv)**; **6.2.3.5.B, (b)**
27.2	2.3.3, (i)

Khusobek

C-D	4.6.1.2

Kitchen *Ramesside Inscriptions*

I 68, 1-2	4.5.3.2
I 68, 4	2.7.3.2, (v)
(II 323-36 → *Inscription Dédicatoire*)	
(II 353-60 → *Kuban Stela*)	
IV 5, 15-16	4.6.1.1, (ii)
IV 19, 8	2, n.107
IV 155, 13	2, n.107

Kuban Stela

8	5.6.2, (v)
23	4.6.3.A; 4.7.1.C

Litany of the Sun

6th invocation	2.7.3.2, (xiii)

Loyaliste

discussion: 4.5

1.1-2	4.5.1.B
1-6	**4.5.5.3**
1.3-8	4.5.5.3.A
2-5	**4.5.5.2**
2.2 (*snsn/snsi*)	2.2.2, (vi); 2.3.2.2, (ii); 4.5.5.2, n.a
2.3-4	4.5.5.2
2.7-8	4.5.5.2
3.1-2	4.5.5.2
3.5-6	6.2.1.2, (iii)
3.6	**6.2.1.2, (ii)**
5.1-14	**4.5.5.1**
5.3-6	°4.5.2, (iii)
5.3-8	4.5.5.1
5.5-6	**4.5.2**
5.7	°4.5.5.1.C.NB
5.8	4, n. 245
6	4.5.5.3.A
6.7 (*snsi*)	2.2.2, (vi)
7.4 (*iwnn*)	4.2.4, (ii); 4.5.3.3, (i)
8.2	2.3.4.1, (iii)

157, 6 (*mm*)	2.8.3.7, (b)
161, 4	4.6.3.A; 4.7.1.B-C
164, 5	4.7.1.B
164, 5-6	4.2.1, (vii)
164, 15	°2.8.3.7, (b)
165, 7	4.6.3.A; 4.7.1.B-C
168, 12	4.6.3.A; 4.7.1.B-C

(an inscription of Thutmosis III telling of his rise to kingship)

180, 15-17	5.6.1, (iii)
181, 2	3.4.1.3, (d)
181, 11	4, n.338
181, 17	4, n.338
182, 8	4.6.3.A; 4.7.1.B-C

(Hatshepsut's *Royal Cycle*)

discussion: 4.7

218, 15	**4.7.3, (i)**
218, 17 - 219, 5	**4.7.2, (i)**
219, 4	4.7.1.A, (a); 4.7.1.C
219, 13 - 220, 1	**4.7.3, (ii)**
221, 5	°4.4.4.3, (vi); **4.7.2, (iii)**
221, 9	4.7.1.A, (b); 4.7.1.C
221, 14	4.7.1.A, (b); 4.7.1.A, (c); 4.7.1.C; 6.3.1.2.C
222, 10	4.7.1.A, (b)
228, 1-4	**4.7.2, (ii)**
228, 3	**4.7.2, (iv)**
228, 4	4.7.1.A, (a); 4.7.1.C
228, 9	4.7.1.A, (b); 4.7.2.C.NB
229, 12	4.7.1.A, (b); 4.7.1.C; 6.3.1.2.C;
237, 5	4.6.3.A; 4.7.1.A, (b); 4.7.1.C
243, 7	**4.7.1, (ii)**; **4.7.3, (iii)**
245, 14-17	**3.4.2.3, (ii)**
245, 16	4.7.1.A, (c)
245, 17	4.7.1.A, (c)
256, 17 - 257, 5	4.7.1.C
257, 1	4.7.1.A, (b)
257, 2	4.6.3.A; 4, n.381
257, 5	**4.7.3, (iv)**
257, 7-8	4.2.1, (ix); 4.7.1.A, (b); 4.7.1.C
257, 7-9	**4.7.1, (i)**
257, 9	4.7.1.A, (b) (bis); 4.7.1.C
257, 11	4.7.1.A, (b)

257, 14	4.7.1.A, (b)
257, 15	4.7.1.A, (b)
257, 17	4.7.1.A, (b); 4.7.1.A, (c)
258, 2	4.7.1.A, (b); 4.7.1.A, (c)
259, 14-15	4, n.381
260, 6	4.7.1.A, (a); 4.7.1.A, (c); **4.7.1, (iii)**
260, 17	4.7.1.A, (a)
261, 12	4.7.1.A, (a)
272, 9-11	4.5.2, (ii)

(*Punt Expedition*)

324, 3-7	4.1.2.F; 4.2.1, (vi)
324, 6	4.2.1.B; 4.7.1.B
324, 6-9	**4.3.2.1, (iii)**
324, 8	4.2.1.B
324, 12-14	**4.2.1, (v)**
331, 12	2.7.2.1, (ii)
332, 7-9	**4.1.2, (ix)**
343, 10	4.7.1.B-C
344, 7	2.7.2.1, (ii)
344, 9	3, n.109
346, 9	4.7.1.B
346, 16	4.7.1.B
347, 11	4.7.1.B

(Hatshepsut's Karnak Obelisks)

362, 11 (ꜥ-*rsi*)	°2.8.3.6.B; 2.8.3.7, (c)
363, 7	4, n.369
364, 16-17	2.7.2.1, (iv); 5.1.4.2, (vi)
365, 6-9	°6.2, n. to ex.
367, 6-7	4.7.1.B
370, 1-2	°5.8.2.1

(383-91: → *Speos Artemidos*)

(Senenmut)

410, 5-6	2.8.3.1, (ii)

(Senemiah)

discussion: 6.3.1.1.NB

500, 8	2.7.2.1, (ii)
500, 9-10	6.3.1.1.NB
500, 12	2.7.2.1, (ii)
501, 4-5	6.3.1.1.NB
501, 15-16	6.3.1.1.NB
503, 17	4.7.1.B; **6.3.1.1**
505, 4 (*snktkt*)	6.3.1.1.NB

Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica

Recent Publications and Backlist

ISSN: 0946-8641

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.

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.

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 practises 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.

Contents

Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica
Backlist

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 Andrássy, 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**

Starting with volume 9, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica is published by Widmaier Verlag, Hamburg.

All prices include German VAT (7%).

For orders, subscriptons 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