Coping with Obscurity:

The Brown Workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar

Wilbour Studies in Egyptology and Assyriology

Series Editors
James P. Allen
John M. Steele

Volume 4

COPING WITH OBSCURITY: THE BROWN WORKSHOP ON EARLIER EGYPTIAN GRAMMAR

Coping with Obscurity: The Brown Workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar

Edited by

James P. Allen

Mark A. Collier

Andréas Stauder

LOCKWOOD PRESS

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

Wilbour Studies in Egyptology and Assyriology is a series of the Department of Egyptology and Assyriology at Brown University, Box 1899, Wilbour Hall, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912.

PUBLISHED ON BEHALF OF BROWN UNIVERSITY BY
LOCKWOOD PRESS
PO Box 133289
Atlanta, GA 30333
www.lockwoodpress.com

© 2016 by Brown University
All rights reserved. Published 2016.
Printed in the United States of America

00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 1 2 3 4 5

ISBN: 000-0-000-00000-0 (hardcover)

Library of Congress Control Number: 0000000000

This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

Contents

Preface vii

Workshop Participants ix

Wolfgang Schenkel
Grenzen und Chancen bei der Erschliessung des älteren Ägyptisch 1

Daniel A. Werning
Hypotheses on Glides and *Matres Lectionis* in Earlier Egyptian Orthographies 29

Chris A. Reintges
Marked and Unmarked Word Orders, Verbal Inflection, and the
Cartography of Early Egyptian Sentence Structures 45

Sami Uljas
To See an Invisible Form: Paradigms, Parallels, and Practices Once Again 97

Jean Winand
The Syntax-Semantics Interface in Earlier Egyptian: A Case Study in Verbs of Cognition 109

Julie Stauder-Porchet
Earlier Egyptian Prepositions: Between Grammar and Lexicography 141

Mark A. Collier
Alternatives and the Grammar of Earlier Egyptian:
Negation with Low-End Indefinites and Negation with *n … js* 151

Andréas Stauder
The Earlier Egyptian "Emphatic" Construction: An Alternative Analysis 169

Pascal Vernus
Restricted Circulation in Old Egyptian as Mirrored in Later "*Repristination von Tradition*" and
Revivals: The dependent pronoun *kw*; the *nfr-n* negation; the *n wnt sḏm=f* negative construction 201

Bibliography and Text Sources 225

Index of Texts Cited 257

Preface

James P. Allen, Mark A. Collier, and Andréas Stauder

The papers in this volume were initially presented and discussed at the Brown Workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar, held at Brown University on March 27–29, 2013, under the auspices of the university's Department of Egyptology and Assyriology. The impetus for the workshop came from the conference "New Directions in Egyptian Syntax," held at the University of Liège in May, 2011 (now published as Grossman et al. 2014), at which the three of us were participants. In conversations, we identified a number of desiderata for future research, prompted in part by the presentations and discussions at the conference. First, we felt the need for an extended conversation among those of us struggling to find new models of Egyptian grammar. Second, we realized that the conversation had to be focused on Earlier Egyptian, which still has the greatest degree of opacity in its verbal system and therefore the greatest need for new approaches to grammatical analysis. And third, we determined that the participants in the conversation had to contribute not just whatever interesting subject they might happen to be working on but thoughts about the core problems of working with Old and Middle Egyptian texts—not just the interpretation of written forms but also consideration of the broader, extra-grammatical factors that can influence the production of a written form in a given text.

From the mid-1960s until recently, studies of Egyptian grammar were dominated by the "Standard Theory" model based on the work of H. J. Polotsky. The attractiveness of that approach for the Earlier Egyptian verbal system derived largely from what seemed to be the relative transparency of syntax as opposed to morphology. Earlier Egyptian relies largely on contrasts in synthetic morphology to produce different verb forms, but the nature of the writing system obscures many of these: for example, the difference between the active and passive *sḏm.f*, both of which appear on the surface to be morphologically identical in many cases. Faced with this obscurity, Egyptologists have come to rely on whatever meager clues the writing system might provide to identify distinct forms, such as the different *sḏm.f* forms generally supposed to underlie the distinction between pairs such as *mꜣ.f* ~ *mꜣꜣ.f* "he sees," *mr.f* ~ *mrw.f* "he wants," and *ḏj.f* ~ *rḏj.f* "he gives." The "Standard Theory" afforded apparent confirmation of such distinctions by noting their affinity with certain syntactic environments. In addition, it offered a syntactic explanation for a number of visible but previously puzzling alternants such as non-"emphatic" *sḏm.n.f* versus *jw sḏm.n.f* (analyzed as dependent versus independent). By the late 1980s, however, some scholars had begun to doubt the validity of identifying verb forms as syntactically conditioned, and more recently, the value and genesis of certain written morphological indices have been called into question as well. At the same time, scholars increasingly began to draw attention to the influence of factors such as lexical semantics, pragmatics, and scribal practice on the textual production of verb forms and constructions, features neglected in the "Standard Theory" approach.

At the Liège conference it became evident that many, if not most, of the participants regarded the "Standard Theory" model as no longer productive, in part if not whole, for the analysis of Egyptian grammar, and in particular for its earlier stages, Old and Middle Egyptian. Having cut that anchor, however, we are now faced with the task of developing consensus on productive avenues of approach to Earlier Egyptian grammar, to guide our research in the twenty-first century.

The Brown workshop was intended to address that concern. The editors invited seven colleagues representing the current spectrum of thinking on Earlier Egyptian grammar, to engage in a three-day

discussion. We deliberately chose the term "workshop" rather than "conference" to emphasize the primacy of discussion over the presentation of research. Each participant contributed a preliminary draft of the paper in this volume beforehand and was allotted an hour and forty-five minutes at the workshop, with presentation slated to last no longer than thirty to forty-five minutes so as to allow ample time for discussion.

To focus the contributions and discussion, participants were asked to address three areas of fundamental concern. First is the role of the textual corpus itself, the dataset that forms the basis of all research into the grammar of Earlier Egyptian. The field still lacks good grammatical descriptions of all the genres within this corpus. Fundamental questions need to be addressed. What elements of linguistic form occur in actual texts? What kinds of functions do they perform, in what kinds of texts, in what frequency, and in alternation with what other elements of linguistic form? To what extent can formal features or constructions that are essentially limited to one genre be gerealized to the language as a whole, and if they are not broadly applicable, what determines their appearance in the genre for which they are attested? How do scribal, cultural, and other extra-linguistic factors determine the phenomenology of the diverse types of Earlier Egyptian as they present themselves to the modern interpreter, and how can these factors be taken into account in linguistic analysis of an often highly formal written record? Or, as one of the organizers put it, "what is it, after all, that we call Earlier Egyptian?"

Second is the nature of the written evidence. If not all written criteria can be regarded as grammatically significant and if, as the past three decades of research have shown, syntactic criteria can themselves be illusory, what parameters can we establish to identify verb forms? For example, is the presence or absence of a distributionally limited and highly variable feature such as the ending *–w* formally significant or not in a given form or environment, and how can we tell? If nominal, adverbial, or attributive function is not primary to the existence and use of verb forms and constructions, what governs their use? More broadly, how do the domains of the lexicon, morphology, syntax, and semantics interact with one another in the production of particular forms or constructions?

Third is the role of pragmatics. To what extent are forms and constructions determined by extra-grammatical factors such as the speaker's choice and style? To what degree is it possible to produce a pragmatic analysis of earlier Egyptian language data (and thus to engage ancient Egyptian language data with a more cognitive and indeed rationalist take on the human contribution to the production of meaning in language)? Do the surviving data, and the current understanding of the ancient cultural encyclopedia, provide a sufficient basis for such study or not?

In general, we intended the workshop as an opportunity to address the fundamental question of how we understand forms and constructions in terms of morphology, function, and (contextualized) meaning; to identify the successes and limitations of existing approaches; and to determine what productive new directions are open for future research. Each of the papers in this volume addresses these questions, some more directly than others. In their diversity, the papers demonstrate a common sense of the complexity of the empirical data, of the multiplicity and interrelatedness of relevant dimensions, and of the need for renewed and explicit interpretive strategies. They are illustrative not of a unified paradigm of ongoing research but of a multiplicity of approaches to Earlier Egyptian. To echo the title of the seminal 1986 Copenhagen conference (Englund and Frandsen 1986), the current situation may resemble "Chaos" after the (illusory) certainty of the "Standard Theory" but it is also clear that we stand on the threshold of, if not "A New Paradigm," a new understanding of Earlier Egyptian.

Workshop Participants

James P. Allen, Brown University

Mark A. Collier, University of Liverpool

Chris H. Reintges, Université Paris Diderot and Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique

Wolfgang Schenkel, Universität Tübingen

Andréas Stauder, École Pratique des Hautes Études

Julie Stauder-Porchet, Universität Basel

Sami Uljas, Uppsala Universitet

Pascal Vernus, École Pratique des Hautes Études

Daniel A. Werning, Excellence Cluster "Topoi: The Formation and Transformation of Space and Knowledge in Ancient Civilizations," Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

Jean Winand, Université de Liège

The Earlier Egyptian "Emphatic" Construction: An Alternative Analysis

Andréas Stauder

The Earlier Egyptian "emphatic" construction[1] has been classically analyzed as involving "nominal" or "abstract-relative" forms of the verb, and thereby as a syntactically biclausal, of cleft-like, structure; syntax would thus mirror the articulation of information structure expressed by the construction. In relation to this analysis, it has also been hypothesized that the construction would have been associated with a marking on the verb across the board, that is, with all types of events. In the first part of the present paper, I take critical issue with these analyses. I then propose an alternative analysis by which parameters such as aspect, voice, and event semantics play a crucial role. In the proposed analysis, the "emphatic" construction has a monoclausal syntax and its linguistic form involves a marking on the verb only with certain types of events. In emphasizing the role of verbal semantics, the analysis has further implications as to the functional profile of the construction.

Part I. Classical Analyses

1 "Nominality" and the biclausal, or cleft-like, analysis of the "emphatic" construction

1.1 A classical analysis

In a classical analysis, the distinctive forms of the verb found in the "emphatic" construction—the *mrr=f* in the unaccomplished, the *ỉỉ.n=f* in the accomplished with intransitive events such as *ỉwỉ* "come," and the *sḏm.n.t=f* in the accomplished passive—are analyzed as "nominal" or "abstract-relative."[2] Under this analysis, the "emphatic" construction is analogized to the adverbial predicate construction: the verb, its subject, and its non-adverbial complements are taken to form a nominalized clause; this is understood as the subject to a following broadly adverbial expression, itself interpreted as the syntactic predicate of the overall construction. The "emphatic" construction would thereby consist in two levels of predication, a lower-order one internal to the nominalized clause, and a higher-order one between the nominalized clause and the following adverbial expression. The articulation of information structure is analyzed as bipartite (presupposition–focus) and would be mirrored by the hypothesized higher-order predicative nexus. The overall syntax of the "emphatic" construction would be cleft-like, that is, biclausal. Taking one famous example, in schematic terms:

[1] ("You are the steering-oar of the entire land.")
sḳdd tꜣ ḫft wḏ=k (Peas. B1 298–99)
It is as you command that the land sails.

	[[*sḳdd*	*tꜣ*]	*ḫft wḏ=k*]
Lower-level predic.	$V_{predicate}$ ←Pr.→	$NP_{subject}$	

1 The quotation marks used throughout the present paper indicate that the received label of the construction, which harkens all the way back to Berlin School analyses of the *mrr=f*, is a misnomer under any analysis, the traditional one and the one proposed here alike. These quotation marks are not meant to suggest a challenge to the existence of an "emphatic" construction in Earlier Egyptian, which the present paper is all about. By the expression "the 'emphatic' and related constructions," I refer to the set of three closely related constructions, the "emphatic" construction, the "setting" construction (or "second schème," namely, of the "emphatic" construction), and the "balanced" construction.

2 Gradually developed in a series of studies by Polotsky (1944; 1957; 1965; 1976); considerable discussion since.

Higher-level predic.	*Nominalized_clause*$_{subject}$	←Pr.→	*AP*$_{predicate}$
Information structure	Backgrounded information	⟷	Focus

(Compare the cleft-construction in, e.g., English:

It is	*as you command*	[*that the land sails*]
←Pr.→	"*AP*"	*Nominalized clause*

This biclausal analysis of the "emphatic" construction was proposed based on a series of observations, the most important of which are the following. (a) Both synchronically and historically, constructions with a biclausal structure are not uncommon cross-linguistically to "cleave apart" a constituent which is thereby set under narrow focus. In Egyptian itself, for example, so-called "pseudo-clefts" of the type *A pw B* (with *B* a relative form, a passive participle, or a *nty*-headed relative clause) are of this broad type (leaving the issue of agreement aside). (b) When in the "emphatic" construction the relation between the verb and its subject is negated, this is done by *tm*, a negative word that also finds various uses with clearly nominal categories of the verb, such as the infinitive, participles, and relative forms. (c) The forms used in the Earlier Egyptian "emphatic" construction seem closely related morphologically to relative forms. (d) The forms used in the "emphatic" construction are also found in other environments, such as after prepositions and in complement clauses; these environments are themselves said to be diagnostic of "nominality."

In the above, (a) defines only one possibility among others: narrow-focus constructions with a biclausal, cleft-like structure are not uncommon cross-linguistically but a variety of other construction types are just as common.[3] The negative word *tm* (b) also provides the regular negation of various categories that cannot be analyzed as "nominal," inflectional forms of the verb (*tm.ḫr=f sḏm*, *tm.kꜣ=f sḏm*)[4] and constructions (*iḫ tm=f sḏm* and *kꜣ tm=f sḏm*); *tm* cannot, therefore, be a reliable diagnostic of "nominality."[5] Concerning (c), the relative *mrr(t)=f* and the *mrr=f* used notably in the "emphatic" construction are closely related morphologically: both are finite forms based on the long stem (with *III.inf*, *mrr–*). This, however, does not carry any necessary implication to the effect that the latter should be a specialized use of the former in non-attributive, or "abstract-relative," function: Earlier Egyptian has two finite forms based on the long stem, one in the attributive paradigm, the other in the non-attributive paradigm, with different functions (discussion: § 4.1–2). In the accomplished, a form of the *sḏm.n=f* is used both as a relative form and in the "emphatic" construction: these may even be identical morphologically (leaving aside the issue of agreement with the relative form). Here as well, however, no implication can be derived that the latter should be a specialized use of the former in non-attributive, or "abtract-relative," function: by definition, synthetic relativization makes use of a synthetic form of the verb, and thus, in the accomplished, of the *ỉỉ.n=f*, not of the subject–verb construction *NP PsP*; the latter construction is in fact also found in relativization (thus *nty NP PsP*), if only rarely, and with the additional semantic import more generally associated with subject–verb patterns.[6] In short, (a)–(c) speak neither for, nor for that matter directly against, "nominal" forms and the biclausal analysis of the "emphatic" construction. The issues raised in (d) warrant a separate discussion (§ 1.3).

3 Illustration: Lambrecht 1994, 13–35.

4 Noted by Polotsky 1957, 109, n. 3.

5 On the semantics of *tm*, lastly Uljas 2007a, 210–20.

6 E.g., *pty nꜣ ntt n ỉy.wyn r=s nn ỉrt biꜣyt n nꜣ n ḫrdw* (...) "What have we come here for, without doing a wonder for the children (...)?" (pWestcar 11, 10-12), with an additional emphasis on the Endpoint of the event of directed motion.

1.2 The "setting" construction, or "second schème" of the "emphatic" construction

Related to the "emphatic" construction are the "balanced" construction and the "setting" construction, or "second schème" of the "emphatic" construction.[7] Like the subtype of the "emphatic" construction in which the second part is a circumstantial clause, the "setting" construction consists of two clauses, the first with the same distinctive forms of the verb as the "emphatic" construction. The two constructions only rarely differ formally,[8] but they differ functionally, in terms of the relative prominence of the two clauses, and, as an effect of this, also in the relative temporality of these two clauses in narrative contexts:[9]

"Emph." constr. $Clause_{main}$ – $Clause_{circ.}$

"Setting" constr. $Clause_{backgrounded}$ – $Clause_{main}$[10]

Under the biclausal analysis of the "emphatic" construction, the *mrr=f*, the *ỉỉ.n=f*, and the *sḏm.n.t=f* are analyzed as "nominal" forms of the verb. Pursuing this analysis, the "setting" construction is then analogized with a construction in which a left-dislocated nominal topic precedes the clause ($Clause_{nominalized}$ – $Clause_{main}$, analogized to $NP_{left\text{-}disloc.\ topic}$ – $Clause$[11]). The first clause in the "setting" construction is then analyzed as a "clausal topic."[12]

This analysis faces major difficulties. The notion of "clausal topic" itself is problematic: unlike noun phrases, clauses are not referentially accessible, neither anaphorically nor cataphorically; "topicality," on the other hand, is a category all to do with, and defined precisely per, these notions of (anaphoric and/or cataphoric) referential accessibility.[13] Against an association between "clausal topic" (with this notion then necessarily understood in a somewhat metaphorical fashion) and "nominalization," Earlier Egyptian displays other constructions in which an un-introduced form of the verb in a first backgrounded clause is in the pseudoparticiple[14] or in the subjunctive,[15] neither of which can be analyzed as "nominal."[16] Regarding the

7 Identified by Vernus 1981; intuited by Polotsky 1957, 114–15 (discussing *Sinuhe* B 199–201). The label "second schème (*scil.* of the emphatic construction)" (Vernus) refers only to the history of discovery, expressing that the construction was discovered later than the "emphatic" construction; it does not imply any secondariness of the "second schème" vis-à-vis the "emphatic" construction in either functional or diachronic terms. Other labels include "setting" construction (e.g., Uljas 2007a, 355) and "Rang-V Erweiterung" (Schenkel 1998; 2014).

8 E.g., with the second clause introduced by *ỉw*: *ỉ.sḫ=f ỉw=ỉ sḳ=ỉ ỉ.sḫ=ỉ* "When he reaps, I plow and I reap" (CT V, 375e B9C: Schenkel 2012a, 315); further examples: Stauder 2014a, 216–17.

9 Vernus 1981; subsequently, e.g., Schenkel 2014; Stauder 2014b, 183–88; Schenkel, this volume.

10 E.g., *rmm=sn ỉw=f ḥr sḏm* "Whenever they (*scil.* mankind) weep, he (*scil.* the creator god) is listening" (Merikare E 135; not ?!"They weep only/right when he is listening"; discussion: Stauder 2014b, 187–88, n.72).

11 E.g., the locus classicus [*ḫ.st nbt rwt.n=ỉ r=s*]$_{\text{NP/extraposed topic}}$ [*ỉw ỉr.n=ỉ hd=ỉ ỉm=s* (...)]$_{\text{clause}}$ "Every foreign country I marched against, I made my attack on it (...)" (Sin. B 101–102).

12 Thus Satzinger 1993a, 184; 2014, 306.

13 Givón, 2001: II, 344–45; Uljas 2007a, 233–34 and n. 35.

14 E.g., *ḫnt pḥ.n=f w.wt ḥd pḥ.n=f t.-wr* "Having sailed upstream, he reached Wawat; having sailed downstream, he reached the Thinite nome" (Vandier 1950, 220, IV 14–15; a formula, more common in the first (speaker's) person); *wšd ḥr sḫr ḫ.s[t] ḥ.n ḏd.n=sn n sḏm=n ḫt nbt* (...) "Questioned about the condition of the desert, they said: 'We have not heard anything (...)' " (Smither 1945, pl. V, x+9; discussion: Stauder 2014a, 149).

15 E.g., *mr=ṯn nḫ msḏ=ṯn ḫpt ỉw=ṯn r drp n=ỉ* "Should you love life, should you hate passing away, you will present offerings to me" (Cairo CG 20003, 2–3); *m.=sn pt m.=sn t. m k. ỉb=sn r m.ỉw* "Did they see the sky, did they see land, their hearts were bolder than the ones of lions" (Sh.S. 28–30); *pr prrt nbt m pr-nsw smỉ ø n=f q qt nbt r pr-nsw smỉ ø n=f* "Should whatever leaves the palace leave, it shall be reported to him; should whatever enters the palace enter, it shall be reported to him" (Duties of the Vizier R 2–3: Davies 1943, pl. 26, 2-3).

16 For the subjunctive as certainly not "nominal," § 1.3.

"setting construction" specifically, an analysis of the first clause as a "clausal topic" (metaphorically understood) would predict mostly conditional types of semantics: these are found,[17] but only as a subtype of the overall semantics of the "setting construction"; in narrative contexts for example, the first clause does not express a condition to the second.[18] The "setting" construction therefore poses a very serious challenge to any analysis of the *mrr=f*, the *ỉỉ.n=f*, and the *sḏm.n.t=f* as "nominal" forms of the verb.[19] In doing so, it also poses a very serious challenge to a biclausal, or cleft-like, analysis of the "emphatic" construction itself.

1.3 *"Nominality," and the mrr=f, ỉỉ.n=f, and sḏm.n.t=f in other environments than the "emphatic" and related constructions*

The forms of the verb used in the "emphatic" and related construction—the *mrr=f*, the *ỉỉ.n=f*, and the *sḏm.n.t=f*—are also found in environments such as after prepositions or in complement clauses (to name only the two with the highest text frequency). Under analogy with noun phrases (e.g., *Preposition NP*, analogized to *Preposition mrr=f*), these environments have been presented as being diagnostic of "nominality," and hence as demonstrating the "nominal" character of forms of the verb used in the "emphatic" and related construction.

While the descriptive inventory of distributions—the Distributional Method, as this has been called—remains the basis of empirical syntactic studies,[20] the argument for "nominality" goes much beyond: in interpreting empirically observed distributions further, the argument analogizes different constructions with one another. That such a methodological principle—of "paradigmatic substitution," as it has been called—is not valid in general is demonstrated by the case of "adverbiality," a category that had been derived on just these grounds.[21] As "nominality" relies on similar principles of method as "adverbiality" did, this casts a serious doubt on the former category as well.

By analogy with the constructions *Preposition NP* and *Preposition Verb*$_{\text{infinitive}}$, the construction *Preposition Verb*$_{finite}$ has for example been considered diagnostic of "nominality" for the forms of the verb that occur in it, among which is the *mrr=f*. Introducing noun phrases is the most common, and indeed

17 E.g., *Merikare* E 135, quoted above, n. 10.

18 E.g., *spr.n wḏ pn r=ỉ ꜥḥꜥ.kw m ḥr-ỉb wḥwt=ỉ šd.n.t=f n=ỉ ḏ.n(=ỉ) wỉ ḥr ḫt=ỉ* (...) "When this decree reached me, I was standing in the midst of my tribe. When it was read out to me, I put myself on my belly (...)' (Sin. B 199–201; for the analysis, now Stauder 2014b, 185–88; Schenkel 2014, 105–13). Earlier Egyptian constructions that may perhaps be conceived of as "clausal topics" (under consequent metaphorization of the concept) are *ỉr*-headed ones (*ỉr V* and *ỉr preposition V*). These do not imply a nominalization of the clause. *'Ir V* only superficially resembles nominal topics of the type *ỉr NP*: the form of the verb is in most cases a subjunctive or a prospective, both of which are not "nominal" (§ 1.3 and § 2.3); *ỉr preposition V* can even less be analogized to *ỉr NP*.

19 Alternatively, it has been proposed to view the "setting" construction as a "detached relative form construction," in which the forms of the verb would serve as converbs, that is, here, as less inflected adjectival forms of the verb used adverbially (Werning 2014). This analysis is problematic in its reference to other languages in which inflection is indeed reduced with respect to person (finiteness) and in several cases also to tense-aspect. In Earlier Egyptian, by contrast, the forms of the verb in the first clause of the "setting" construction—the *mrr=f*, the *ỉỉ.n=f*, the *sḏm.n.t=f*—are in no way reduced in their inflection; in particular, they are fully inflected for person and for tense-aspect.

20 E.g., Croft 2001, arguing against deductive approaches to syntax.

21 Collier 1994; also Collier 1992; 1991; 1990. From a different perspective also, e.g., Schenkel 1998. To arguments that have already been voiced, add for example the following: in the unaccomplished *N(P) sḏm=f*, the *sḏm=f* has been analyzed as "adverbial," the construction *N(P) sḏm=f* being analogized to the situational predicate construction (*NP AP*). If this analysis were correct, the T-passive of the same form of the *sḏm=f* should also be "adverbial." However, the passive counterpart to the construction *N(P) sḏm=f* is *sḏm.t NP*, not **N(P) sḏm.t=f* (Stauder 2014a, 223–27). Applying the same principles as for the active *N(P) sḏm=f*, its passive counterpart *sḏm.t NP* would then have to be analogized to a pattern "AP NP."

defining, function of prepositions in general. However, implying that a finite verb after a preposition should necessarily be analyzed as "nominal(ized)" is going one step further. This requires making an assumption about universal grammar.

Concerning the construction *Preposition Verb*$_{finite}$ in the specific language under study, Earlier Egyptian, the following is then observed:

- *The subjunctive sḏm=f*

  The two forms of the verb most commonly used after prepositions and similarly in complement clauses are the *mrr=f* and the subjunctive *sḏm=f*. The latter is also used in (i) main clauses with a modal profile, (ii) in final or consecutive clauses, (iii) in continuation to an imperative, (iv) in continuation to a future construction, (v) after *iḫ* or *ḥꜣ*, and (vi) in clausal left-periphery.[22] None of these environments (i)-(vi) can be analyzed as "nominal," nor can the subjunctive therefore. The subjunctive—not a "nominal" form of the verb—is also commonly used after prepositions and in complement clauses. Neither of these two environments can therefore be diagnostic of "nominality" in the particular language under study, Earlier Egyptian.

- *Alternations of verbal forms*

  In Earlier Egyptian, a great many, and indeed most, synthetic forms of the verb can be found after a preposition (the ones excluded are for obvious semantic reasons, for example the *sḏm.in=f*). Functionally, Earlier Egyptian prepositions do double duty, as preposition or as conjunction, depending on the segment, a noun phrase or a clause, that follows.[23] After certain prepositions, a great variety of forms of the verb alternate to express semantic contrasts or nuances. For example, with *r*, (i) *r ỉr=f*$_{subj.}$ "so that he does" (common); (ii) *r ỉrw=f*$_{prosp.}$ "so that he does (will do)" (rare); (iii) *r ỉrr=f* "according to

22 E.g., (i) *sḏd=ỉ bꜣw=k n ỉty* "I wish to relate your might to the sovereign" (Sh.S. 139); (ii) *ỉỉ.n=ỉ r bw nt ḥnwt=ỉ mꜣ=ỉ nfr=s* "I have come to the place where my mistress is so that I may see her beauty" (CT VI, 53b–c S1C); (iii) *ỉr n=k ỉwt r kmt mꜣ=k ḫnw ḫpr.n=k ỉm=f sn=k tꜣ r rwty wrty ḫnm=k smrw* "Come back to Egypt and you will see the Residence where you grew up, kiss the earth at the Great Double Portal, and join the courtiers" (Sin. B 188–89); (iv) *ỉw dpt r ỉyt m ḫnw (...) šm=k ḥnᶜ=sn r ḫnw mwt=k m nỉwt=k* "A boat will come from the Residence (...) and you will go with them to the Residence and die in your town" (Sh.S. 119–23); (v) *iḫ wšb=k* (...) "So you may answer (...)" (Sh.S. 14); *ḥꜣ ḏ=tn pꜣ ỉt* "May you give this barley" (pWestcar 11, 7); (vi) see above, § 1.2, n. 15.

23 That prepositions regularly function as conjunctions in Middle Egyptian is not unremarkable, particularly in contrast with Standard Average European languages such as the ones in which Egyptological analyses of Earlier Egyptian have mostly been expressed. In many languages, finite forms of the verb are introduced by conjunctions, some of which are the result of a reanalysis of a construction in which a nominalized clause follows a preposition (e.g., [*après*]$_{preposition}$ [*que je suis venu*]$_{nominalized_clause}$ > [*après que*]$_{conjunction}$ [*je suis venu*]$_{clause\ (not\ nominalized)}$. In addition, prepositions not uncommonly themselves have nominal origins: when grammaticalized from nominal expressions, prepositions can display a nominal syntax with respect to the clause they introduce, e.g., in a language in which an only incipient prepositional system is seen emerging, Sumerian *ud*$_{day}$ clause-*a*$_{nominalizer}$ "when ..." (lit. "the day ..."). Even in Standard Average European languages, however, prepositions can occasionally function as conjunctions, if limitedly only (e.g., French *comme je le disais*, *comme il venait*; English *after/before I came*, *as*/*like I said*, *like I said*). Middle Egyptian is remarkable in that the possibility for prepositions to function as conjunctions is not limited to some exponents of the class, but extends to all prepositions that would yield acceptable semantics when used as conjunctions. This may itself be a historically secondary development. In Old Egyptian, finite constructions after a preposition (*preposition V*$_{finite}$) are uncommon, against non-finite ones (*preposition V*$_{infinitive}$) which seem relatively more common in the record (Edel 1955–64: § 712–21). Moreover, the infinitive in this construction often projects arguments in Old Egyptian, as if its syntax were finite (Edel 1955–64: § 700–702). This suggests that the finite constructions common in Middle Egyptian could have developed against the background of the semantically under-specified non-finite constructions that were common in Old Egyptian. More research is required on the topic.

how (much) he does, as he does" (common); (iv) *r ỉr.t=f* "until he has done, does" (a bare expression of completion; common); (v) *r ỉr.n=f* "until he has done (completed doing)" (also an expression of completion, highlighting the culminating point of the event with accomplishments).[24] Other prepositions display distinguished associations with certain forms of the verb in particular (e.g., *ḫft*, often with the *mrr=f*, but hardly ever with the prospective *sḏm=f*). With a given preposition, the form of the verb is therefore selected on semantic grounds: the lexical semantics of the preposition (taken in the temporal and conceptual areas when introducing a clause[25]) interact with the aspectual, temporal, and/or modal profile expressed by the grammatical tense of the verb to yield the meaning of the overall construal. By the same token, certain combinations are overly common while other ones are uncommon. (Similar observations have been made regarding the alternations of forms of the verb in complement clauses, in relation to the semantics of various governing verbs.[26])

- *The mrr=f*

  The *mrr=f* contrasts with other forms of the verb after various prepositions, e.g., (i) *m ỉrr=f* "as he does" (common) vs. *m ỉr=f* "when he does";[27] (ii) *ḏr ỉrr=f* "to the extent that he does, since he does" (causal; uncommon) vs. *ḏr ỉr.t=f* "since he has done" (temporal);[28] (iii) *r ỉrr=f* vs. *r ỉr=f*, etc. (see above). The *mrr=f* after prepositions is thus seen to display a marked semantic profile—in all cases as marked as, or even more marked than, e.g., the subjunctive *sḏm=f* in the same environments. (Similar comments extend to the *mrr=f* in complement clauses.[29]) The subjunctive *sḏm=f*, however, is demonstrably not a "nominal" form of the verb (above). The marked semantic profile of the *mrr=f* then speaks strongly against an analysis by which this form would be syntactically deranked, as a "nominal" form of the verb.

"Nominality" runs into contradiction in other domains of Earlier Egyptian grammar as well. For example, with regard to another form found in the "emphatic" construction and which has also been analyzed as "nominal," the *sḏm.n.t=f*:

- *N sḏm.n.t=f*

  In Middle Egyptian, the *sḏm.n.t=f* is regularly used in the negative unaccomplished construction *n sḏm.n.t=f*.[30] If the *sḏm.n.t=f* is analyzed as a "nominal" form of the verb, the negative *n* in *n sḏm.n.t=f* must be analyzed as being predicative somehow. Negative *n* is also found before the past tense *sḏm=f*

24 E.g., (i) *passim*; (ii) *r mꜣꜣ ṯw s pf* "so that this man will see you" (CT II, 102b var. mss.); (iii) *ỉr ꜥꜣ r ꜥꜣ=f šr r šrr=f* "The great one shall be treated according to how he is great, the small one according to how he is small" (Berlin 1911, pl. 1, 3); (iv) *ḥꜣ ḏ=tn pꜣ ỉt ꜥꜣ m ꜥt ḫmt.tỉ r ỉw.t=n* "Would that you put this grain here in a sealed room until we have come back" (pWestcar 11, 15–16); (v) *wn=ỉ m mnꜥt ḥr ỉꜣty n ỉ nb ỉnḏw r ssnb.n.t=f* "I was a nurse and a caretaker for whoever came afflicted until he had been comforted" (Hatnub 16, 9–10). For the semantic contrast between (iv) and (v), which is subtle, Stauder 2014a, 338–39; against the perfective analysis of the *sḏm.t=f* more generally, Stauder 2014a, 69.

25 Stauder-Porchet 2009, 48–50; this volume.

26 Uljas 2007a.

27 E.g., *ỉrr ḥm=k m mrr=f* "Your Majesty acts only as he wishes" (Sin. B 263).

28 *ʾỈr ḏr mrr=ṯ ỉḫy ỉw ḥḥ n ỉḫy n kꜣ=ṯ* "To the extent that you love music, there is music a million times for your *ka*" (*TPPI* § 15, 11); *ỉnk ỉꜣw nmtwt ḏr mrr=f* "I am one who strides to the limit of my desire" (CT III, 303h G1T, A1C, T3L; T3C *{r} ḏr mrr=s*—this example courtesy of Wolfgang Schenkel).

29 Uljas 2007a; Borghouts 1989.

30 For the rise of *n sḏm.n.t=f*, Stauder 2014b, 304–308.

(*n sḏm=f*). Since the past tense *sḏm=f* cannot be analyzed as "nominal,"[31] the negative *n* is clearly a negative operator in the negative past tense *n sḏm=f*. Unless the negative *n* in the constructions *n sḏm.n.t=f* and *n sḏm=f* is split into two morphemes with altogether different syntactic properties, one predicative, the other a negative operator, the "nominal" analysis of the *sḏm.n.t=f* runs into contradiction.[32] Put differently, the construction *n sḏm.n.t=f* directly demonstrates that the *sḏm.n.t=f* is not a "nominal" form of the verb.

As a result of the above discussion, the *mrr=f* and the *sḏm.n.t=f* cannot be analyzed as "nominal" forms of the verb. It follows that the syntax of the "emphatic" construction does not involve a predicative nexus between a nominalized clause (the verb, its subject, and its complements) and a broadly adverbial expression. Syntactically, the "emphatic" construction cannot be analyzed as a biclausal, or cleft-like, structure. Finally, the syntax of the "emphatic" construction does not simply mirror the articulation of information structure, however this is to described (further, § 4.3).

2 *The hypothesis of a morphological marking on the verb with all types of events, or of symmetrical paradigms*

2.1 *A symmetrical paradigm?*

It has been proposed, and is often assumed, that the "emphatic" and related constructions (the "setting" and the "balanced" constructions) would involve a morphological marking on the verb with all types of events. Under this hypothesis, the forms used in the "emphatic" and related constructions would contrast with the forms used, for example, after *ỉw* across the board: the paradigm would be symmetrical.[33] While no contrast is readily identified in the written forms of the active *sḏm.n=f* of transitive events and of various types of intransitive ones (such as e.g., *mdw* "speak"), it is hypothesized that a contrast existed in the underlying form, on levels such as syllable structure and/or vocalization. The hypothesis is based on the observation that morphological contrasts are observed in several parts of the overall paradigm and that the Egyptian writing system in general represents contrasts in verbal morphology only imperfectly. Thus, for classical Middle Egyptian (from the Twelfth Dynasty on), (a) non-subject-affecting actives (transitives, and intransitives such as *mdw* "speak"); (b) subject-affecting actives (such as *ỉwỉ* "come"); (c) passives):[34]

Written forms

	Unaccomplished			Accomplished		
(a)	*N(P) mr=f*	:	*mrr=f*	←——————*sḏm.n=f*——————→		
(b)	*N(P) ỉỉ=f*	:	*ỉw=f*	*NP PsP*	:	*ỉỉ.n=f*
(c)	*mr.t=f*	:	*mrr.t=f*	*P PsP ~ V-pass non-P*	:	*sḏm.n.t=f*

31 E.g., Doret 1986, 24–27.

32 Problem seen by Polotsky 1957, 116.

33 Explicitly, and with question marks only for the prospective, e.g., Schenkel 2012a, 191–208, 224–29 (among many others).

34 Here and in the following, "P" stands for pronominal subjects, "N" for full noun subjects, "NP" for pronominal and full noun subjects (indifferently); "non-P" for non-pronominal subjects (full noun subjects, clausal subjects, zero subjects, and subjectless constructions; for the distinction between zero-subject and subjectless constructions, which is crucial in the passive, Stauder 2014a, 140–48, 158–78). The tilde "~" (in the accomplished passive) stands for "complementary distribution," here according to the nature of the subject. "V-pass" stands for "V-passive" (improperly "*sḏm(w)*-passive") and "PsP" for "pseudoparticiple"; the "*sḏm.n=f*$_{A}$" and the "*sḏm.n=f*$_{B}$" are the two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f* that are posited under hypotheses of a symmetrical paradigm. The prospective is left out of the table; see below, § 2.3.

The hypothesis of a symmetrical paradigm

(a)	*N(P) mr=f*	:	*mrr=f*	***sḏm.n=f*$_{\mathbf{A}}$**	:	***sḏm.n=f*$_{\mathbf{B}}$**
(b)	*N(P) ỉỉ=f*	:	*ỉw=f*	*NP PsP*	:	*ỉỉ.n=f* [1)]
(c)	*mr.t=f*	:	*mrr.t=f*	*P PsP ~ V-pass non-P*	:	*sḏm.n.t=f* [2)]

1) a *sḏm.n=f*$_{\text{B}}$ of *ỉwỉ*

2) a T-passive of a *sḏm.n=f*$_{\text{B}}$

The argument comes with one very major presupposition, namely that morphological contrasts associated with the "emphatic" and related constructions are uniform regardless of tense-aspect (inference from the unaccomplished to the accomplished), of voice (in the accomplished, inference from the passive (c) to the active (a)), and of event semantics (in the accomplished active, inference from subject-affecting events (b) to non-subject-affecting ones (c)). This is a presupposition: for the overall argument to be valid, the validity of the presupposition on which it is based has to be independently demonstrated first.

A possible morphological connection of the forms of the verb used in the "emphatic" construction with "relative forms" has been evoked in this respect (the "abstract-relative hypothesis");[35] as already noted, the morphological connection is real, but inconsequential as to the nature of the forms used in the "emphatic" construction (§ 1.1). Until relevant contrasts are directly observed in written forms (see discussion below, § 2.2), the basic presupposition on which the hypothesis of a symmetrical paradigm relies is not independently demonstrated.

2.2 *Written forms of the sḏm.n=f*

Reflecting this situation, possible indications of different forms of the *sḏm.n=f* have been sought in written forms.[36] Based on detailed data from the Coffin Texts, Schenkel proposed that the alternations between short and long written stems of *II.red* (<ABn> ~ <ABBn>) would provide evidence in support of the existence of two forms of the *sḏm.n=f* distinguished by the position of stress. The form found notably in the "emphatic" construction (the "abstract-relative" *sḏm.n=f* in the author's terminology) would have been stressed between the penultimate and the last root consonants (C˘C´vCn˘–); the form found notably after *ỉw* (the "predicative" *sḏm.n=f* in the author's terminology) would have been stressed after the last root consonant (C˘CC´vn˘–).[37]

35 Lastly, e.g., Schenkel 2012a, 191; 2009a; with references to Polotsky's earlier formulations of the same hypothesis.

36 Prior to Schenkel's study (discussed below in the main text), it had been observed that a few early Middle Egyptian texts ("petit nombre") make a distinction between a written form *rḏ.n=f* in "nominal" environments and a written form *ḏ.n=f* in "circumstantial" ones (Polotsky 1976, 23, n. 40). However, in most early Middle Egyptian texts, and in all texts from various other periods, the two written forms *rḏ.n=f* and *ḏ.n=f* are observed to freely alternate. Furthermore, the alternation between stems of *rḏỉ* with and without *r*– seem to be at least in part conditioned by prosodic factors such as clause-initiality or the combination with negative *n* (Stauder 2014e, 254, n. 4). It had also been observed that in three instances in Old Kingdom private inscriptions, the written form of the *sḏm.n=f* of *ỉrỉ* in the "emphatic" construction comes with an additional read leaf (Doret 1986, 69, nn. 743–44; 152, n.1 802). However, <*ỉ ỉr*> is more generally a possible spelling for the stem *ỉr*– found in various morphological categories, such as the prospective V-passive or the unmarked (/"perfective") passive participle in the Old Kingdom; that this rare spelling of the stem of the *ỉr.n=f* does not occur after *ỉw* is for epigraphic reasons (Stauder 2014e, 254, n. 4). These written forms of the *sḏm.n=f* of *rḏỉ* and *ỉrỉ* are therefore inconsequential as to whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f* or not (contra Satzinger 2014, 306).

37 Schenkel 2009a; further discussion, Schenkel 2006, 61–67; 2012, 192–97. Critically, already Depuydt 2008a, 116–18; Uljas 2010: 253–61.

The existence of a form of the *sḏm.n=f* morphologically realized as C˘C´vCn˘– is independently established by cuneiform evidence;[38] being uncontroversial, this form is here labeled a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ for the purpose of the argument. Schenkel's proposal therefore amounts to suggesting that the form of the *sḏm.n=f* used, for example, after *ỉw* was different from this *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$; this hypothesized *sḏm.n=f* realized as C˘CC´vn˘– is here labeled a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$. Schenkel's "split *sḏm.n=f*" hypothesis and the alternative "unitary *sḏm.n=f*" hypothesis can then be contrasted as follows:[39]

	after *ỉw*, etc.	"emphatic" constr., etc.
"split *sḏm.n=f*" hyp.	***sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$**	*sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$
"unitary *sḏm.n=f*" hyp.	*sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$	*sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$

As discussed in detail elsewhere, the alternations of written forms of *II.red* in the Coffin Texts turn out to be equally consistent with the "split *sḏm.n=f*" and the "unitary *sḏm.n=f*" hypotheses.[40] Similar comments extend to written forms of the *ult.–n* (*non-II.red*)[41] and to written forms of *wnn*, which afford a special case.[42] The Coffin Text data adduced in support of the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis" thereby turn out to be inherently neutral as to whether Earlier Egyptian had one or two forms of the *sḏm.n=f* distinguished by the position of stress. The hypothesis is at this stage not directly disproved, but it has lost the empirical grounds on which it was submitted.

Pursuing the study of written forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, the case of *2rad* in the Pyramid Texts is of interest.[43] Under Schenkel's "split *sḏm.n=f*" hypothesis, Earlier Egyptian would have had a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$, that is, a form of the *sḏm.n=f* stressed after the last root consonant (ʔC˘CC´v-n˘–). One Earlier Egyptian inflectional category of the verb was stressed in just this way, after the last root consonant, namely the subjunctive *sḏm=f* (C˘CCá–). When accommodated onto *2rad*, this inflectional pattern resulted in an initial consonantal cluster (**CCá–), which could be solved by adding an initial vocalic segment to the form (*/ʲ*CCá–*/). In the Pyramid Texts, a corpus in which written morphology is more explicit than in any other one, this initial vocalic segment is commonly represented by the written mark <*ỉ*> (e.g., *ỉ.ḥm=f*). If Earlier Egyptian had a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$, the inflectional pattern of this form (ʔC˘CC´v-n˘–)would have been subject to similar morpho-phonological phenomena when accommodated onto *2rad* (ʔ**CC´vn˘– → ʔ*/ʲ*CC´vn˘*–/). The "split

38 E.g., Zeidler 1992, 214–15; Osing 1987, 356–57; Gundacker 2011, 59, n. 185.

39 As the reader will have noticed, the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ corresponds to the *sḏm.n=f*$_{A}$ in the previous table (§ 2.1). This is because the two representations operate on different levels. In the table in § 2.1, functional markedness is represented: under the hypothesis of two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, the one used notably in the "emphatic" construction would have been the functionally more marked form, hence the label "*sḏm.n=f*$_{B}$." In the present section, *hypotheses* on morphological distinctiveness are considered: given the Cuneiform *Nebenüberlieferung*, the existence of a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ is secure; the hypothesis bears on the possible existence of the other form, thus labeled a "*sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$." With reference to § 2.1, the question is therefore whether there existed a *sḏm.n=f*$_{A}$ (/a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$) distinct from a *sḏm.n=f*$_{B}$ (/a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$), not the reverse. One logical implication is that demonstrating the existence of a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ (which is a foregone conclusion) does not amount to demonstrating the "split *sḏm.n=f*" hypothesis (Stauder 2014c, 85–86).

40 A variety of issues are at stake (the full mapping out of the implications of the two competing hypotheses; the interpretation of individual written forms; the textual history of individual places in the Coffin Texts; the assignment of individual verbs to inflectional classes; see Stauder 2014c; 2014d, 196–204). In the Pyramid Texts, written forms of *II.red* are similarly inconsequential for the issue at stake (Stauder 2014e, 255). Outside funerary corpora, written forms of *II.red* in Eighteenth Dynasty texts may at first seem to support the "unitary *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis," yet remain associated with interpretive uncertainties on too many levels for any reliable conclusion to be derived (Stauder 2014c, 94–96).

41 Stauder 2014d, 205–207.

42 Stauder 2014d, 207–209.

43 Stauder 2014e, 262–71.

sḏm.n=f" therefore entails that in relevant environments ("predicative" ones in Schenkel's terminology) written forms of the *sḏm.n=f* of *2rad* should in the Pyramid Texts display the same written mark <*i.*> with some regularity, as they do in the subjunctive of *2rad*. They never do.[44] This demonstrates that *2rad* did not have the *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ hypothesized by Schenkel. Based on further considerations bearing on the parameters and conditions of uniform and non-uniform inflection in Earlier Egyptian verbal morphology, the result generalizes to other inflectional classes.[45]

The argument disproves the "split *sḏm.n=f*" hypothesis that Earlier Egyptian had two forms of the *sḏm.n=f* distinguished by the position of stress. Put differently, the Earlier Egyptian *sḏm.n=f* was in all cases of the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ type (C˘C´vCn˘–).[46] In strictly logical terms, this still leaves the possibility that Earlier Egyptian may have had two *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$'s, distinguished by vowel color (thus a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Xa}$ and a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Xb}$, hypothetically distinct). Whether this was actually the case is highly uncertain: there is no evidence in support of the existence of two *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$'s in written forms (this subsection), nor on any other level (the preceding one).

2.3 Future events in "emphatic" contexts

With future tense, the prospective *sḏm=f* (*/irw=f*) is used in "emphatic" contexts and in non-"emphatic" ones alike.[47] Despite thorough empirical studies, no distinction has ever been found in written form between various forms of the prospective active,[48] nor of the prospective passive.[49] Moreover, the written forms of the prospective suggest a reconstruction with a specific syllable structure, both in the active and in the passive.[50] Unless two forms of the prospective active, distinguished only by vowel color, are posited only to keep the paradigm symmetrical, "emphatic" contexts did not involve a morphological marking on the verb with future events, either in the active or in the passive. This illustrates that "emphatic" contexts need not be marked morphologically on the verb.

2.4 *Accomplished passive events in "emphatic" contexts*

In the accomplished passive, major changes occur during the history of Earlier Egyptian (further below, § 3.4–7). The table given above (§ 2.1), with the *sḏm.n.t=f* regularly used in the "emphatic" construction, only concerns classical Middle Egyptian, from the Twelfth Dynasty on. The *sḏm.n.t=f* is already documented in the Pyramid Texts, but occurrences are limited to a mere four in the overall pre-Coffin Text record.[51] In earlier times—in the Pyramid Texts and in Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period

44 Stauder 2014e, 262–67, with the full data and additional considerations on the representativeness of these.

45 Stauder 2014e, 267–70.

46 Incidentally, the argument also disproves Kruchten's proposal to interpret the differential obsolescence of the *sḏm.n=f* in the Eighteenth Dynasty record—first in environments such as after *ỉw*, only later in environments such as the "emphatic" construction—as indicative of two differently stressed forms of the *sḏm.n=f* (Kruchten 1999, 6–22). The above further demonstrates that the differential obsolescence of the *sḏm.n=f*—Kruchten's primary observations in the record remain robust—must be interpreted in constructional terms, that is, in relation to broader changes occurring in the language at the time (for a most provisional sketch, Stauder 2013, 15–16).

47 This situation gradually changed only when *NP r sḏm* lost its originally highly specific semantics to develop into a regular expression of the future, during the Middle Kingdom. With main clauses not dependent on a preceding clause, this led to the rise of a secondary contrast between *NP r sḏm* (in non-"emphatic" contexts) and the prospective (in "emphatic" ones). It is this secondary contrast, from later Middle Egyptian on, that may have formed the basis for older accounts of the prospective *sḏm=f* (*/irw=f*) as an "emphatic," or "nominal," form of the verb.

48 Schenkel 2000a (summary: Schenkel 2012a, 203–208); Allen 1984, § 364–99.

49 Schenkel 2004–2005a (summary: Schenkel 2012a, 226–29); Allen 1984, § 486–562.

50 Schenkel 2000a, 59–60; 2005a, 52–53.

51 Stauder 2014a, 259–60.

inscriptions—the perfective V-passive[52] is the form regularly used in "emphatic" contexts; the *sḏm.n.t=f* can be seen to spread in Coffin Texts corpus and has superseded the perfective V-passive by the Twelfth Dynasty.[53] In a detailed study of the written morphology of the perfective V-passive, it was observed that the written forms in "emphatic" and non-"emphatic" contexts are exactly the same.[54] Unless two morphologically distinct forms of the perfective V-passive, distinguished by vowel color, are posited just to keep the paradigm symmetrical, "emphatic" contexts in the accomplished passive did in general not involve a specific morphological marking on the verb in Old and earlier Middle Egyptian.

As in the case of the active *sḏm.n=f* and of the active and passive prospective *sḏm=f* (/*irw=f*) (§ 2.2 and § 2.3), there is no evidence in support of two morphologically distinct forms of the perfective V-passive. In the present case, additional considerations speak directly against two morphologically distinct forms of the perfective V-passive. In early funerary literature (Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts), the perfective and the prospective V-passive are morphologically distinct from one another.[55] Should morphologically distinct forms of the V-passive in "emphatic" and in non-"emphatic" contexts be posited, this would result in no less than four morphologically distinct forms of the V-passive. Appreciating the likelihood of this option is left to the reader. Another observation is decisive. Throughout Old and Middle Egyptian, the accomplished passive in non-"emphatic" contexts is expressed by the pseudoparticiple with pronominal subjects in complementary distribution to the perfective V-passive with non-pronominal subjects (*P PsP ~ V-pass non-P*).[56] With a pronominal subject, the perfective V-passive (*V-pass P*), used notably in "emphatic" contexts, thereby contrasts with *P PsP*, used notably after *iw*. With non-pronominal subjects, no similar contrast is observed, since the perfective V-passive is used in all contexts alike. As it turns out, the very few pre-Coffin Text instances of the *sḏm.n.t=f* are all with non-pronominal subjects: three are with full noun subjects while the fourth is in a subjectless construction.[57] Thus:

I. Pyramid Texts, Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period Inscriptions

non-"emph.":	*P PsP*	*V-pass non-P*
"emph.":	*V-pass P*	*V-pass non-P*
		(/**incipiently *sḏm.n.t non-P***)

II. Coffin Texts

non-"emph.":	*P PsP*	*V-pass non-P*
"emph.":	*V-pass P* / ***sḏm.n.t P***	*V-pass non-P* / ***sḏm.n.t non-P***

III. Twelfth Dynasty inscriptional texts and Middle Egyptian literature

non-"emph.":	*P PsP*	*V-pass non-P*
"emph.":	***sḏm.n.t P***	***sḏm.n.t non-P***
	(*V-pass* restricted to phraseologically bound formulations)	

52 On this label, § 3.4, § 3.8.A.

53 For the spread of the *sḏm.n.t=f* over the perfective V-passive in "emphatic" contexts in the record, Stauder 2014a, 250–63.

54 Schenkel 2004–2005a; also Stauder 2014a, 38–44.

55 Allen 1984, § 531-37; Schenkel 2004–2005a; Stauder 2014a: 21–44.

56 Stauder 2014a, 235–50.

57 (i) *ms.n.t N pn ḥr ỉs ȝḫtỉ ỉs* "This N was born like Horus, like the One-of-the-Horizon" (Pyr. 934b PAnMN; PT 473); (ii) *nḏ.n.t n(=ỉ) ỉȝt nt ḥqȝ wḥȝt […]w m ḫwn ṯ(ȝ)z mḏḥ m ḫr-ỉb wrw špss.k ḫr ḫm=f r ḫprw m-ḫȝt(=ỉ)* "I was named to the office of Governor of the Oasis [(while still)...] a youth who tied the girdle amongst the great ones, because I was more august with His Majesty than who came into being before me" (Osing et al. 1982, pl. 60, 8–9); (iii) (...) *mr ntt ỉr.n.t ỉs zš pn ḫft ḏd wsr pn [ỉm]* (...) "(...) to the effect that it is according to the words of this User that this piece of writing was made there (...)" (Berlin 1911, pl. 1, 5); (iv) Pyr. 179a WNNt (PT 219), quoted below, § 3.6, (9a).

In "emphatic" contexts, the *sḏm.n.t=f* thus developed first in environments in which the perfective V-passive did not contrast formally with the pseudoparticiple (I); the earliest instances with a pronominal subject are found only later, in the Coffin Texts (II). The pattern of the early spread of the *sḏm.n.t=f* in "emphatic" contexts is best interpreted as pointing to a lack of distinctiveness of verbal morphology in accomplished passive "emphatic" contexts with non-pronominal subjects. This implies the morphological unity of the perfective V-passive.

This morphological unity of the perfective V-passive in turn makes it highly unlikely that the prospective V-passive should have consisted of two forms.

2.5 *"Emphatic" contexts without morphological marking on the verb*

As a result of the above, "emphatic" contexts did not involve a morphological marking on the verb with the following types of events:

- *The accomplished passive in Old Egyptian and earlier Middle Egyptian*
  In the accomplished passive, the perfective V-passive—a single inflected form (§ 2.4)—was regularly used in non-"emphatic" and in "emphatic" contexts alike throughout Old and earlier Middle Egyptian. With non-pronominal subjects, "emphatic" contexts were therefore in most cases non-distinct from non-"emphatic" ones as far as verbal morphology is concerned. Explicit marking by the *sḏm.n.t non-P* remained marginal in all pre-Coffin Text contexts.

- *The future passive in early funerary corpora*
  In those earlier parts of the record in which the prospective passive was a productive category (Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts), this—a single inflected form (§ 2.4 *fine*)—was used in "emphatic" and non-"emphatic" contexts alike.

- *The future (active and passive)*
  There are no empirical grounds in written morphology for distinguishing two forms of the prospective active *sḏm=f* (/*irw=f*) (§ 2.3). In view of the above cases of non-distinctiveness in the passive (§ 2.1), there cannot be any systematic grounds for positing such a distinction either. In all likelihood, the prospective active *sḏm=f* (/*irw=f*) was therefore a single inflected form. The same comment extends to the prospective T-passive (*irw.t=f*), the diachronic successor of the prospective V-passive. With future events, both in the active and in the passive, the same form was in all likelihood used in "emphatic" and non-"emphatic" environments well into the Middle Kingdom.

- *The accomplished active with non-subject-affecting events*
  Should Earlier Egyptian have had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, these could have differed only by vowel color, demonstrably not by the position of stress (§ 2.2). There are no empirical reasons that there should have been any distinction at all, nor can there be systematic ones in view of the above (also § 2.1). In the accomplished active with transitive events and non-subject-affecting intransitive ones (such as *mdw* "speak"), the same form was with high likelihood used in "emphatic" and non-"emphatic" contexts alike. (Observing strict method, this must still be phrased in terms of "high likelihood" only at this stage; a direct demonstration of the unity of the *sḏm.n=f* is possible but requires additional considerations of an altogether different nature: see § 3.3 *fine*.)

In short, "emphatic" contexts were associated with a morphological marking on the verb with certain types of events only, not with all.

Part II. An alternative analysis

3. *Morphological contrasts associated with the accomplished "emphatic" construction*

3.1 *The nature of morphological contrasts in the "emphatic" construction*

A closer consideration of the nature of the morphological contrasts associated with the "emphatic" and related constructions is instructive. Beginning with the classical Middle Egyptian paradigm as established from the Twelfth Dynasty on—(x) unaccomplished; (y) accomplished: (y′) non subject-affecting actives (transitives, and non-subject-affecting intransitives such as *mdw* "speak"), (y′′) subject-affecting actives (such as *ỉwỉ* "come"); (y′′′) passives:

	after *ỉw*, etc.		"emph.," etc.
	P	non-P	
(x)	*N*(*P*) *mr=f*		*mrr=f*
(y′)	← *sḏm.n=f* ('s?) →		
(y′′)	*NP PsP*		*ỉỉ.n=f*
(y′′′)	*P PsP ~ V-pass non-P*		*sḏm.n.t=f*

If Earlier Egyptian had a single form of the *sḏm.n=f* (as has been shown to be likely in the preceding section), the paradigm reads as representing directly the morphological contrasts present in the language. Should Earlier Egyptian have had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, the same paradigm reads, quite literally, as representing those contrasts that are visible in writing. The observation is then that the two hypothesized forms of the *sḏm.n=f* would be instantiations of the same higher-order inflectional category, an accomplished tense marked notably by an inflectional suffix *–n–*. (A *sḏm.n=f*$_{A}$ and a *sḏm.n=f*$_{B}$ would both be *sḏm.n=f*'s.[58]) The contrasts visible in writing, on the other hand, are the ones that involve two, or three, unrelated morphological categories: in the accomplished with subject-affecting intransitives (y′′), (a form of the) *sḏm.n=f* and the pseudoparticiple; in the accomplished passive (y′′′), the T-passive (of a form) of the *sḏm.n=f*, the perfective V-passive, and the pseudoparticiple; in the unaccomplished (x), a form of the *sḏm=f* based on a short stem (*mr–*) and one based on the long stem (*mrr–*). Regardless of whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, therefore, a mere reading of the above paradigm leads to the following simple, yet consequential, observations:

- *Aspect as a parameter*

  The unaccomplished paradigm can be stated in only one line (x); stating the accomplished paradigm requires three lines (y′)–(y′′′). Regardless of whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, aspect is therefore a parameter in analyzing the Earlier Egyptian "emphatic" construction.

- *Voice as a parameter*

  In the accomplished, three morphological categories are involved in the passive (y′′′), while there are only two in the active with subject-affecting intransitives (y′′), and only one (or perhaps two) with non-subject-affecting events (y′). Regardless of whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct

58 More precisely still, both would be *sḏm.n=f*x's, only distinguished by vowel color, if at all (§ 2.2); this precision is not logically required for the following argument.

forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, voice is therefore a parameter in analyzing the Earlier Egyptian "emphatic" construction.

- *Subject affectedness as a parameter*
  In the accomplished active, the contrast is between two unrelated morphological categories with subject-affecting events, the pseudoparticiple and (a form of) the *sḏm.n=f* (y˝). With non-subject-affecting events, there is no contrast at all, or a contrast between two instantiations of the same morphological category (y˙). Regardless of whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, subject affectedness is therefore a parameter in analyzing the Earlier Egyptian "emphatic" construction.

In targeting the nature of morphological contrasts, the above observations are logically independent of whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f* or not: either way, aspect, voice, and subject affectedness—more broadly, therefore, event semantics—are relevant parameters in analyzing the morphology (and semantics: § 4.3, below) of the Earlier Egyptian "emphatic" and related constructions.

As just noted, the classical Middle Egyptian paradigm, from the Twelfth Dynasty on, is asymmetrical in terms of the nature of the morphological contrasts involved. The asymmetry is yet stronger in Old Egyptian and early Middle Egyptian (on the boldfacing of the pseudoparticiple, below; on the morphological unity of the perfective V-passive, § 2.4):

	after *ỉw*, etc.		"emph.," etc.	
	P	non-P	P	non-P
(y˙)	⟵	*sḏm.n=f*('s?)	⟶	
(y˝)	⟵	***NP PsP*** ⟶	⟵	*ỉỉ.n=f* ⟶
(y˝˙)	***P PsP*** ⟵		*V-pass* ⟶	
				(/*sḏm.n.t non-P*)

Regarding the accomplished specifically, one additional observation can be made for both the earlier and the later paradigms. Whenever in the accomplished the contrast is between two unrelated morphological categories—or, equivalently, whenever a contrast is visible in written forms (see above)—one of the forms is the pseudoparticiple (y˝)–(y˝˙). Although this observations concerns the later paradigm as well, it is even more directly apparent in the earlier one. The analysis may thus begin with the pseudoparticiple.

3.2 *Background: a very short note on the semantics of the pseudoparticiple*

The Earlier Egyptian pseudoparticiple has non-dynamic uses as well as dynamic ones. More precisely, the pseudoparticiple can express (a) a primary state (that is, a non-dynamic event that does not imply some previous dynamic event), (b) a secondary state (that is, a non-dynamic event that implies some previous dynamic event from which it results), and (c) a dynamic event implying some resulting state affecting the subject.[59] The use of the pseudoparticiple with dynamic events (c) represents a secondary development, already almost entirely completed in the earliest attested historical periods.[60] When the pseudoparticiple

59 In more detail, Stauder 2014a, 280–81.

60 Stauder 2014a, 110–12 (with a discussion of contrary opinions). This analysis is based on typological evidence, comparison with cognate categories in Afroasiatic (notably the Akkadian stative), and early occurrences of *V-pass P* in environments in which the pseudoparticiple has by and large generalized in historical times (for the last specifically, Stauder 2014a, 246–48).

spread beyond its original domain of use, the expression of non-dynamic events (a)-(b) to dynamic ones (c), it did so with all types of subjects for subject-affecting intransitives such as *ỉwỉ* "come," but only with pronominal subjects in the passive.[61] This results in a paradigm in which the pseudoparticiple stands in complementary distribution to the perfective V-passive according to the nature of the subject:[62]

Dynamic uses of the pseudoparticiple (non-negative)
Subject-affecting intr. (e.g., *ỉwỉ*): ←————*NP PsP*————→
Passive: *P PsP* ~ *V-pass non-P*

When expressing a dynamic event (c), the pseudoparticiple displays certain semantic properties and its use is subject to certain semantic constraints. The following are directly relevant to the present discussion:[63]

- *Rarity of direct negation*
  The pseudoparticiple is only rarely directly negated in Old and Middle Egyptian (*n NP PsP* is highly uncommon[64]). (This restriction extends to non-dynamic uses of the pseudoparticiple (a)-(b).)
- *Telicity of the event and subject affectedness*
  The pseudoparticiple typically requires the event to be telic (that is, to have a semantic representation that includes a salient culminating point by which the event ends). When used with otherwise atelic events, the pseudoparticiple triggers a telic interpretation of these. By the same token, the subject of the pseudoparticiple is typically affected by the event. The subject of the pseudoparticiple is therefore typically highly individuated with respect to that event. (The same constraints, or properties, extend to uses of the pseudoparticiple expressing a secondary state (b).)
- *Aspect*
  When expressing a dynamic event, the pseudoparticiple strongly highlights the Endpoint of the event, the culminating point by which this ends and results in some implied state affecting the subject. (This property is of course directly related to the preceding one.) In this, the pseudoparticiple does not express a mere accomplished, but has perfective aspect.[65]

These semantic properties and constraints are typical of resultative semantics, individually and in their correlation. Semantically, the pseudoparticiple can thus be described as a resultative category.[66]

The active-transitive uses of the pseudoparticiple with events other than the lexical statives *rḫ* "know" and *ḫm* "know not" do not represent traces of an earlier stage of the language in which dynamic uses with non-subject-affecting active transitive events would have been regular, but extended (and in this sense innovative) uses of the pseudoparticiple made possible by the resultative semantics of the form (Stauder 2014a, 112–19).

61 This asymmetry in the paradigm has to do with the non-canonical nature of passive subjects (Stauder 2014a, 248–50), a phenomenon that also finds other reflections in Earlier Egyptian grammar (Stauder 2014a, 224–26, 343–44). In early texts, the spread of the pseudoparticiple to accomplished passive events with pronominal subjects is not yet fully completed: *V-pass P* is still occasionally encountered in environments in which *P PsP* is otherwise regular (Stauder 2014a, 246–48).

62 Stauder 2014a, 235–50.

63 In more detail, Stauder 2014a, 281–87.

64 Occurrences: Stauder 2014a, 287, nn. 122–23.

65 Using a stronger definition of "perfective" aspect than the one in Winand 2006a, where perfective aspect, as a general semantic category, essentially corresponds to the "accomplished," as the particular instantiation of the general semantic category in Earlier Egyptian.

66 For resultative semantics and a cross-linguistic survey of resultative forms and constructions, Nedjalkov 1988. A general characterization of the pseudoparticiple as resultative is not new, see e.g., Winand 2006a, 226–34; Hannig 1991; Vernus 1984a

3.3 *The accomplished "emphatic" construction prior to the spread of the sḏm.n.t=f*

Turning to the accomplished "emphatic" construction, I first discuss the earlier situation, when the perfective V-passive was regularly used in the construction (the second table in § 3.1). The spread of the *sḏm.n.t=f* is addressed in turn (§ 3.4-7). The two issues are separated for expository reasons; as already noted, early occurrences of the *sḏm.n.t=f* are found as early as in the Old Kingdom (§ 3.1).

When expressing a dynamic event, the pseudoparticiple—a resultative category—presents the event from the perspective of its typically affected subject, itself associated with the salient Endpoint of the event (§ 3.2). The "emphatic" construction, for its part, serves to highlight some broadly adverbial expression, and thereby, typically, the circumstances under which the event unfolds, that is, aspects of the event itself. More generally, the "emphatic" construction is not a participant-oriented construction: in particular, the construction presents the event under a perspective that does not revolve primarily around a participant associated with the Endpoint of the event. With events in which the Endpoint would otherwise be salient, the "emphatic" construction thus moves the perspective away from the Endpoint. The pseudoparticiple is avoided in the "emphatic" construction because the resultative, strongly Endpoint-oriented semantics of the form would conflict with the event-oriented semantics of the "emphatic" construction. Just as in negative constructions—another type of construction in which the Endpoint is out of focus, here due to the negative polarity—a form other than the pseudoparticiple is used instead, to avoid the over-determined resultative semantics of the latter. With subject-affecting intransitive events in the active, recourse is made to a form of the *sḏm.n=f*, in negative constructions and in the "emphatic" and related constructions alike.[67] With passive events, recourse is made to the perfective V-passive under similar conditions:

Subject-affecting intransitives

	non-negative		negative
non-"emph.," etc.:	*NP PsP*	→	*n ỉỉ.n=f*
	↓		
"emph.," etc.:	*ỉỉ.n=f*		*n ỉỉ.n=f ỉs*

Passives

	non-negative		negative
non-"emph.," etc.:	*P PsP ~ V-pass non-P*	→	*n V-Pass*
	↓		
"emph.," etc.:	*V-Pass*		*n V-Pass ỉs*

(In an alternative but ultimately equivalent account, the situation in the passive specifically can be described in terms of the parameters of semantic transitivity.[68] Being a resultative category, the pseudoparticiple expressing an accomplished passive can be described as subject to the conditions of

and 1986a (with the label "accompli extensif"); similarly in substance already Gardiner 1957, § 320, and earlier authors. The definition of "resultativity" here adopted differs from the more inclusive definition of the same term in Winand 2006a, 182–84, 188, 202–203, 226–50; see Stauder 2014a, 279–80, n. 103.

67 Concerning the avoidance of the pseudoparticiple in the "emphatic" construction with events such as *ỉwỉ* "come" specifically, observations leading in the same direction are by Allen 2014, 5–6; Winand 2007, § 3.

68 For semantic (as distinct from syntactic) transitivity, see the seminal paper by Hopper and Thompson 1980; further discussion e.g., Lazard 1998; Woods 2008, 55–62. For the issue under discussion, Stauder 2014a, 288–94. The notion of semantic transitivity finds a fruitful application in various other domains of Earlier Egyptian grammar as well, see Stauder 2014a, 112–14, 118–19, 202–204, 284–86, 289–90; Winand 2006a, 34–150; Winand 2000; Collier 1994, 67–72.

high semantic transitivity, most notably: (a) affectedness and individuation of the O argument, here the subject; (b) positive polarity; (c) perfective aspect, punctuality, and assertive modality (compare § 3.2). The perfective V-passive comes into use whenever the semantic transitivity of the event is reduced in one or several parameters, thus with non-pronominal subjects (deviation from (a)), in negative constructions (deviation from (b)), and in the "emphatic" and related constructions (deviation from (c)). The two accounts—in terms of deviations from Endpoint orientation and of deviations from high semantic transitivity—are largely similar because Endpoint orientation is itself a bundle of various parameters associated with high semantic transitivity.[69])

Whenever in the accomplished a contrast in written form is visible, this involves the pseudoparticiple as one term of the contrast (§ 3.1 *fine*). As just discussed, these contrasts all have to do with the resultative, participant-oriented semantics of the pseudoparticiple (be these described in terms of Endpoint orientation or, alternatively, in terms of high semantic transitivity), and of how these conflict with the event-oriented semantics of the "emphatic" and related constructions. Unlike passive events and subject-affecting intransitive ones (such as *ỉwỉ* "come"), non-subject-affecting active events (transitives and intransitive ones such as *mdw* "speak") are not oriented on a participant associated with the Endpoint of the event. Accordingly, the Endpoint is not salient with the latter type of events, in any environments. In "emphatic" contexts, there is no issue, therefore, in moving the focus away from a non-salient Endpoint so as to express a more event-oriented perspective against a more participant-oriented one; similar comments extend to negative constructions. As a consequence, should Earlier Egyptian have had two morphologically distinct form of the *sḏm.n=f*, these would have had the exact same semantic profile. Syntax not being an issue here either (§ 1), the analysis demonstrates that "emphatic" and related contexts, like negative ones, did not involve a distinctive morphological marking on the verb with non-subject-affecting active events: the *sḏm.n=f* was a single inflected form.

3.4 *V- and T-passives in contrast*

In the classical Middle Egyptian paradigm from the Twelfth Dynasty on, the *sḏm.n.t=f* is regularly used in the "emphatic" and related constructions, contrasting with *P PsP* and *V-pass non-P* in environments such as after *ỉw* (the first table in § 3.1). This paradigm is the result of an historical process of spread by which T-passives gradually superseded the perfective V-passive in various other environments as well. In analyzing the classical Middle Egyptian paradigm, broader consideration on how V- and T-passives contrast with one another as two different types of inflectional passives are therefore relevant (this subsection). The spread of the *sḏm.n.t=f* is analyzed in turn as a historical process in the record, also taking account of the other environments in which T-passives superseded the perfective V-passive (§ 3.5–8.A).

Both V- and T-passives are inflectional passives, and both are found in the same passive construction, with the exact same properties and under the exact same conditions.[70] V- and T-passives differ from one another on a variety of other levels. Morphologically,[71] the perfective V-passive is based on a stem of its own, not derivable from any other stem; related to this, V-passive morphology cannot be accommodated on any other inflectional stem (for example, V-passive morphology cannot be accommodated on the stems

69 The two accounts are not redundant because of their slightly different scope of application. The account in terms of Endpoint orientation permits the inclusion of subject-affecting events such as *ỉwỉ*. The account in terms of high semantic transitivity permits inclusion of the complementary distribution *P PsP ~ V-pass non-P*.

70 Stauder 2014a, 127–29.

71 Fuller discussion: Stauder 2014a, 9–44, 309–10. Preliminary observations by Reintges 1997, ch. 5.

sḏm.n– or *mrr–*). In contrast, T-passive morphology combines with any active stem (provided the event is passivizable); {t} is appended to the outer edge of the form (after any inflectional marks of tense-aspect-mood there may be, e.g., *mrr–* → *mrr.t–*; *sḏm.n–* → *sḏm.n.t–*). While perfective V-passive morphology synthesizes—simultaneously expresses—voice and aspect, T-passive morphology has singular exponence ({t} codes passive voice only) and is inherently neutral as to tense-aspect-mood (in T-passives, tense, aspect, and/or mood is expressed by the inflectional stem, including possible affixes, to which {t} is appended; e.g., *mrr.t=f* as *mrr–* + {t} + subject clitic; *ỉrw.t=f* as *ỉrw–*$_{\text{(prospective)}}$ + {t}$_{\text{(passive)}}$ + subject clitic; *sḏm.n.t=f* as *sḏm.n–*$_{\text{(accomplished)}}$ + {t}$_{\text{(passive)}}$ + subject clitic): unlike V-passives, T-passives are morphologically compositional. For the present purpose, the perfective V-passive cannot be reconciled morphologically to any active form, and the expressions of voice and aspect are synthesized with one another. By contrast, the *sḏm.n.t=f* is, quite literally, a T-passive of the *sḏm.n=f*, that is, a direct morphological pendant to the active *sḏm.n=f*, only additionally marked by the tense-aspect neutral passive marker {t}. In short, the temporal-aspectual profile of the perfective V-passive is inherent to the passive nature of the form, unlike T-passives (among which the *sḏm.n.t=f*), which are compositional.

The perfective V-passive is used in the paradigm of the accomplished, but its semantics go beyond a mere expression of the accomplished, as, for example, with the *sḏm.n=f*. To begin with, the form is used in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticiple in environments such as after *ỉw* (1a-b) or *ꜥḥꜥ.n* (2a-b) or in dependent clauses of various sorts (3).[72] This complementary distribution with the pseudoparticiple, a form inherently marked for resultative aspect, illustrates the strong Endpoint orientation of the perfective V-passive in these constructions. E.g.:

[1] a *ỉw* ***rḏ*** *n=ỉ ḥw* (...) (CT III, 26c)
Nourishment has been given to me (...)

b *ỉw=f* ***rḏ*** *n=s* (...) (CT VI, 167a–b B4C)
He (*scil.* her opponent) has been given to her (...)

[2] a *ꜥḥꜥ.n* ***ỉn*** *n=f smn* (...) (pWestcar 8, 17–18)
Then a goose was brought to him (...)

b *ꜥḥꜥ.n=f* ***ỉn*** (...) (Peas. B2 135)
Then he was brought (...)

[3] *ꜥḥꜥ.n ꜥ3g.n[=f] ḥr [ꜥ]t=f nbt ỉm=s*
nḫm *[ꜥ3w]=f*
sꜥḳ *[r sp3t=f]* (Peas. R 11, 3–4)
Then he thrashed his every limb with it
and his donkeys were taken
and entered into his estate.

The Endpoint orientation of the perfective V-passive is also seen in the common sequence *sḏm.n=f – V-passive*.[73] The sequence—always in this order, never in the reverse—runs from a mere expression of the accomplished (the active) to one that derives its closing force from its highlighting of the Endpoint of the event (the passive). E.g.:

72 Stauder 2014a, 235–50.
73 Stauder 2014a, 149–53.

[4] *ỉw mꜣ.n st ḥm=ỉ nn m ỉw-ms ḥꜣḳ.n=ỉ ḥmwt=sn ỉn.n=ỉ ḫrw=sn*
pr *r ḫnmwt=sn* ***ḥw*** *kꜣw=sn* ***wḥꜣ*** *ỉt=sn* ***rḏ*** *ḫt ỉm* (Sethe 1928b, 84, 8–11)
My Majesty has seen it—no untruth—I have captured their wives, I have brought their dependents; their wells have been gone to, their cattle have been stricken, their wheat has been pulled out, it has been set on fire.

That the semantics of the perfective V-passive go beyond a mere expression of the accomplished is also seen in uses of the form that support, or even invite, a resultative reading, both in narrative and in non-narrative contexts (Ex. 5a–b). These are possible by virtue of, and therefore reflect, the often Endpoint-oriented semantics of the form. The perfective V-passive can also be used for events yet to come, carrying strong assertive force (Ex. 6a–b).[74] The speaker thereby presents the event in such a way as to leave no room for it not to occur.[75] This is yet another effect made possible by the strong Endpoint orientation of the form. E.g.:

[5] a *ʿḥʿ.n skꜣ.n=ỉ ꜣḫwt nbt nt mꜣ-ḥḏ r tꜣš=f rst mḥt*
sʿnḫ *ḫrw=f* ***ỉr*** *šbw=f* (Urk. VII, 16, 9–10)
Then I plowed all the fields of the Oryx-Nome up to its southern and northern boundary, *and* (/*so that*) its people were nourished and its food was made.

b *spp s m-ḫt mnỉt* ***rḏw*** *spw=f r-gs=f m ʿḥʿw* (Merikare E 55)
Whenever a man remains after mooring, his deeds *are put* (*scil.* have been put) to his side in a heap.

[6] a *ỉr ḥm-kꜣ nb ḏt(=ỉ) šn.t=f ḫt r sn-nw=f* (...)
nḫm *<m>-ʿ=f ꜣḫt rmṯ ḫt nb* (…) (Urk. I, 13, 3–7)
As regards any funerary priest of my domain who will go to trial against his fellow (...), all fields, people, and things (...) *shall be taken* from him.

b *ỉr ỉr.t=sn ỉm ḫft ḏdt.n(=ỉ)* [...]
ỉw ***ỉr*** *ḫft mrrt=sn* (Urk. I, 224, 4–6)
As regards those who will act on it according to what I have said [...], *there shall be acted* according to what they wish.

The *sḏm.n=f* is not used in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticiple with the same type of events.[76] Nor is the *sḏm.n=f* ever used in contexts that invite or support resultative readings like the ones in (Ex. 5a–b). Nor is the *sḏm.n=f* ever used for events yet to come (other than, of course, as a relative tense). Similar comments extend to the passive *sḏm.n.t=f*: unlike the perfective V-passive, the *sḏm.n.t=f* is not found in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticiple (compare Exx. 1–3); it is not used as the second, closing member of a sequence *active – passive* (compare Ex. 4); it is not used in environments that support or invite a resultative reading (compare Ex. 5); and it is not used for events yet to come (compare Ex. 6). In terms of its semantic profile, the *sḏm.n.t=f* aligns with the *sḏm.n=f*, against the perfective V-passive.

74 Stauder 2014a, 31–33.

75 As Ex. 6b illustrates, assertive force can be underscored further by *ỉw*: the construction is thus the only synthetic verb–subject construction with a future or modal reading to accommodate *ỉw* (neither the prospective, nor the subjunctive, nor the *mrr=f* can).

76 The *sḏm.n=f* is used *in contrast to* the pseudoparticiple with the same type of events, e.g., with *ỉwỉ* "come," *NP PsP* (for example after *ỉw*) vs. *ỉỉ.n=f* (for example in the "emphatic" construction). The *sḏm.n=f* is used in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticiple *with different events*, e.g., *NP PsP* with *ỉwỉ* "come" (a subject-affecting intransitive) ~ *sḏm.n=f* with *mdw* "speak" (a non-subject-affecting intransitive).

On the grounds given above, the form here termed a "perfective V-passive" (until this point a mere label) can be described as perfective in substance in the sense that it often presents the event under a perspective in which the Endpoint is salient.[77] The *sḏm.n.t=f*, by contrast, is a mere expression of the accomplished—like the active *sḏm.n=f*, to which it is a direct pendant not only morphologically but also semantically.[78]

3.5 *The spread of T-passives over the perfective V-passive*

A. Environments

The spread of the *sḏm.n.t=f* in the "emphatic" and related constructions is part of a broader process of linguistic change by which the perfective V-passive was gradually replaced by T-passives in various constructions from the Old Kingdom on and through the early Middle Kingdom.[79] Among these changes, one concerns innovative uses of the *sḏm.n.t=f* itself in another environment, the negative unaccomplished (*n V-pass* → *n sḏm.n.t=f*). The spread of the *sḏm.n.t=f* in the "emphatic" and related constructions must be analyzed not in isolation but in this broader context of change.

In the relevant processes of change, T-passives are occasionally documented in the Old Kingdom already, but are then still uncommon relative to the perfective V-passive. Leaving individual details aside, T-passives become more common only in the Coffin Texts and generalize by the Twelfth Dynasty:[80]

(a) Neg. accomplished:[81]	*n V-pass*	→	*n sḏm.t=f*
(b) Neg. unaccomplished:[82]	*n V-pass*	→	*n sḏm.n.t=f*
(c) "Emph." constr.:	*V-pass*	→	*sḏm.n.t=f*

With a view to what makes the semantics of passive voice in the accomplished specific, and different from the active, these environments are related to one another. In expressing that the event did (/does) not occur, and thereby did (/does) not go to completion, negative constructions (a)–(b) de-emphasize the Endpoint otherwise salient in the passive. In the unaccomplished, and particularly in a construction that invites a habitual or general interpretation (b), the Endpoint, if any, is naturally marginalized even further. The "emphatic" construction, for its parts, is semantically an event-oriented construction, and thereby one that similarly de-emphasizes the Endpoint otherwise salient in the passive. In all three cases, therefore, T-passives superseded the perfective V-passive in environments in which the Endpoint is less in focus than is the case with a prototypical passive of the accomplished. (Here as well, a broadly similar account can be given in terms of semantic transitivity: T-passives spread over the perfective V-passives in those environments in which the event scores relatively lower in semantic transitivity.[83])

77 This is what justifies the label (further, § 3.8.A). The Endpoint is of course not always strongly in focus: it is not, for example, when the perfective V-passive is used in "emphatic" contexts in earlier periods (§ 3.3), and more generally when the form is used in other environments into which T-passives would later spread (§ 3.5–8.A).

78 How morphology and semantics here mirror one another can be thought of as an illustration of the principle of "diagrammatic iconicity in stem-inflection relationships," for which see Bybee 1985, 11–12.

79 Beyond what concerns the present discussion, the spread of T-passives also includes the change by which the prospective V-passive (*ỉrw=f*) was gradually superseded by a T-passive of the prospective (*ỉrw.t=f*), a process well on its way in the Coffin Texts (Stauder 2014a, 26–31, 300–301).

80 For other, relatively more minor environments in which *sḏm.n.t=f* spread over the perfective V-passive, Stauder 2014a 334–39.

81 Stauder 2014a, 301–304.

82 Stauder 2014a, 304–308.

83 Stauder 2014a, 314–15.

3.6 *The spread of T-passives over the perfective V-passive*

B. The role of subjectless passives in early stages of the process

As just discussed, the *sḏm.n.t=f* spread over the perfective V-passive not only in the "emphatic" and related constructions, but also in the negative unaccomplished (*n V-pass* → *n sḏm.n.t=f*). There are only a handful of Old Kingdom and First Intermediate period occurrences of the *sḏm.n.t=f* in the construction *n sḏm.n.t=f*. All are subjectless (that is, passives of events that are either intransitive (Ex. 7b) or used intransitively (Ex. 7a):

[7] a *dmḏ.n=f kw* ***n ḫn.n.ti*** *im=k* (Pyr. 617b TAnMNJp; PT 364)[84]
He has put you together: there can be no disturbing on you.

b ***n pr.n.t*** *n snḏ=f* (Vandier 1950, 202, II.ɳ.2)[85]
There was no going out for fear of them (*scil.* of the troops).

At the same time, the perfective V-passive is always used in the negative unaccomplished for passives with pronominal, full noun, or clausal subjects;[86] it is never found with subjectless passives.

Subjectless passives are also over-represented among early occurrences of the past tense *sḏm.t=f* in the negative accomplished (Ex. 8a; one of two Old Kingdom occurrences[87]) and of the *sḏm.n.t=f* in the "emphatic" construction (Ex. 9a; one of four pre-Coffin Text occurrences[88]). At the same time, the V-passive is regularly used in both constructions with all types of subjects (Exx. 8b and 9b);[89] with only one exception, it is not found in subjectless constructions:[90]

[8] a ***n fḫ.ti*** *n=k*
n iȝb.t *n=k* (Pyr. 204b WNNt; PT 222)[91]
There has been no loss for you,
there has been no cessation for you.

[8] b (...) *ḏr-ntt n ḫpr mỉt(=i) nn sw r ḫpr*
n ms *mỉt(=i) n ms[.t]=f* (Vandier 1950, 185, II.α.2)[92]
(...) for someone like me has not come into being, nor is he to come into being,
someone like me has not been born, nor will he be born.

[9] a *nwt zȝ=t pw pw-nn ḏd.n=t ỉr=f*
ms.n.t *n(=i)*
ỉ.t tn (Pyr. 179a WNNt; PT 219)
Nut, this one here is your son of whom you have said:
"There was birth for me"
—so you said.

84 Sim. Pyr. 635b TPMNNt (PT 367); Pyr. 1610b MNNt (PT 590); possibly Pyr. 1831c N (PT 649), lacunous.

85 Sim. Vandier 1950, 203, II.θ.2.

86 Occurrences: Stauder 2014a, 304–305.

87 The other early occurrence is with a full noun subject, *n mȝ.tỉ ns* "the tongue has not been seen" (Pyr. 243b W; PT 239).

88 For the other three (with full noun subjects), § 2.4, n. 57.

89 Occurrences of *n V-pass* expressing the negative accomplished: Stauder 2014a, 301–302. Occurrences of the perfective V-passive in "emphatic" contexts: Stauder 2014a, 250–59.

90 Below, n. 94.

91 Sim. Pyr. 206b WNNt.

92 On this much discussed passage, Stauder 2013, 371, n. 140, with references to the discussion.

b ***ỉwr*** *N n ḏ𓂻mw* ***ms*** *N n ḏ𓂻mw*
ỉn ḏ𓂻mw z n mwt=f ỉm=f (Pyr. 693c–d T; PT 398)
N was conceived to Djaamu, N was born to Djaamu,
it is Djaamu who has gone to his mother with him.

Semantically, subjectless passives differ from prototypical passives, and particularly accomplished ones, because the event is not oriented on a subject, here lacking (by definition). Rather than on a participant associated with the Endpoint of the event, the perspective is then often set on the event itself, as can also be seen in the thetic readings subjectless passives not uncommonly invite.[93] Subjectless passives thereby often have the effect of de-emphasizing the Endpoint of the event. As noted in the preceding subsection, the *sḏm.n.t=f*, more generally T-passives, spread over the perfective V-passive in constructions in which the Endpoint of the event is de-emphasized. In the early stages of process, subjectless passive—those passive in which the Endpoint is least in focus—played a distinguished role.[94]

3.7 *Two inflectional passives in the accomplished: the "emphatic" and related constructions*

Earlier Egyptian is remarkable in having two inflectional passives in the accomplished, the perfective V-passive and the *sḏm.n.t=f*, the second spreading over the first diachronically. As observed, the spread of the *sḏm.n.t=f* in the "emphatic" and related constructions is part of a broader process which also saw the same form spreading in the negative unaccomplished, and another T-passive spreading in the negative accomplished, in all three cases gradually displacing the perfective V-passive (§ 3.5). As also noted, the environments in which T-passives spread over the perfective V-passive have in common that they depart from the Endpoint orientation generally characteristic of accomplished passives. Significantly, subjectless passives are over-represented in early stages of the process (§ 3.6): rather than on a participant associated with the Endpoint of the event, subjectless passives often set the perspective on the event itself.

The passive views the event from the vantage point of the participant that is associated with the Endpoint of that event: a prototypical accomplished passive is perfective.[95] In Earlier Egyptian, the form here labeled a "perfective V-passive" is perfective in the sense that it often presents the event under a perspective in which the Endpoint is salient (§ 3.4). The *sḏm.n.t=f*, by contrast, is a mere expression of the accomplished, like the active *sḏm.n=f*, to which it is a direct pendant not only morphologically but also semantically (§ 3.4). In the "emphatic" and related constructions, the *sḏm.n.t=f* serves to present the event as merely accomplished, under a perspective that de-emphasizes the Endpoint orientation and perfective aspect otherwise characteristic of accomplished passives. Against the earlier situation in which the perfective V-passive was regularly used in "emphatic" contexts (§ 3.3), the *sḏm.n.t=f* spread to provide a distinctive expression to the fact that an accomplished event—even though passive—is merely

93 On the semantics of subjectless passives in Earlier Egyptian, Stauder 2014a, 158–78. Subjectless passives are not to be confused with zero-subject constructions of the passive, where the lack of an overt expression of the subject is a strategy of inter-clausal integration, possible under certain semantic conditions (Stauder 2014a, 140–8).

94 The only occurrence of a subjectless perfective V-passive in an "emphatic" context is itself significant as it concerns an event of directed motion, with the Goal of the motion (here the highly topical speaker himself) providing a salient Endpoint: (...) *gm.n(=i) wꜣst gbtỉw mỉ-qd=s[n ...]=sn ỉtḥw ỉwn m sgꜣ smḫ=sn spr r(=i) r=s* "(...) and I found that Thebes and Coptos in their entirety had [...] the strongholds of Ermant in the hills of Semekhsen. It was about this that one had reached out to me" (Vandier 1950, 198, II.ε.2-3). Across constructions, contrast with, e.g., (3b), also with an event of motion but with no Goal expressed (*n pr.n.t n snḏ=f* "There was no going out for fear of them (*scil.* of the troops)" (Vandier 1950, 202, II.η.2).

95 E.g., Comrie 1982; Woods 2008, 66–68, 285–89; Stauder 2014a, 310–11.

accomplished. It did so in the "emphatic" and related constructions like it did in the negative unaccomplished, *n sḏm.n.t=f*, a construction that departs even further from the semantics of perfective passives in not even being accomplished.

3.8 *Two inflectional passives in the accomplished: some broader considerations*

A. The *sḏm.n.t=f* also spread over the perfective V-passive in other environments not discussed so far: in the *pw*-marked glossing construction, in *ỉr*-introduced conditional clauses, in clauses dependent on an expression of time, and after prepositions.[96] While the issue warrants further research, these environments have in common that the clause is embedded into a higher syntactic node. (Pending further research, the exact nature of this embedding is here left open; for the *pw*-marked glossing construction specifically, § 4.2). Being embedded in a higher syntactic node, such clauses are not asserted like main clauses can be. This seems relevant, because in the accomplished passive, perfective aspect (or equivalently here, Endpoint orientation) correlates with assertive modality: in particular, an assertive modality is one parameter associated with high semantic transitivity,[97] from which the *sḏm.n.t=f* in its other uses also serves to depart.

The *sḏm.n.t=f* did not spread over the perfective V-passive in main clauses such as introduced by, e.g., *ỉw* or *ꜥḥꜥ.n*, and in various types of dependent clauses asyndetically linked to a preceding clause. Clauses introduced by, e.g., *ỉw* and *ꜥḥꜥ.n* are fully asserted and well grounded.[98] Asyndetically linked dependent clauses are also well grounded, to the preceding clause to which they are linked. In such environments, an accomplished passive event has perfective aspect: the *sḏm.n.t=f*, which developed and spread precisely to express that an accomplished event—even though passive—is not perfective, does not come into play. This account extends to the distribution of the *sḏm.n=f* of subject-affecting intransitives such as *ỉwỉ* "come": as discussed (§ 3.3), this is used to indicate that an accomplished event—even though subject-affecting—is not Endpoint-oriented; after, e.g., *ỉw*, *ꜥḥꜥ.n*, and in dependent clauses asyndetically linked to a preceding clause, the event is well grounded and the Endpoint orientation accordingly strong.

The overall result is the distribution in classical Middle Egyptian, in which the perfective V-passive has become limited to a few uses, only with non-pronominal subjects, and only after, e.g., *ỉw*, *ꜥḥꜥ.n*, or in asyndetically linked dependency—that is, to uses in which the forms stands in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticiple. As the ultimate outcome of the spread of the *sḏm.n.t=f* to all environments that are not strictly perfective, the perfective V-passive (now a "perfective" form in a yet stronger sense than the one introduced above, § 3.4) has lost all functional autonomy vis-à-vis the pseudoparticiple, an inherently resultative category.

B. Broadening the perspective to some more general correlations, Earlier Egyptian is illustrative of how in the accomplished, passive voice is semantically more complex than active voice.[99] Voice concerns the perspective under which an event is viewed. So does aspect. The two dimensions can therefore interact with one another, in various ways and more or less strongly in individual languages. The unaccomplished views the event from the perspective of its Initiator, as does the active. The accomplished is concerned with the completion of the event (by definition); passive voice, for its part, views the event from the vantage point of the participant that is associated with Endpoint of the event. Cross-linguistically, this is manifest for

96 Stauder 2014a, 334–39.

97 Hopper and Thompson 1980, 252; Stauder 2014a, 293–94.

98 On the grounding functions of *ỉw* and *ꜥḥꜥ.n*, e.g., Collier 1994.

99 Stauder 2014a, 344–47.

example in what has been called a "perfect(ive) skew" of passives.[100] Unaccomplished passives are thereby less prototypical than accomplished ones; for example, some languages that have morphological passives have them only in the accomplished, while the reverse situation is apparently not documented. Among accomplished passives, non-perfective ones (such as in the Earlier Egyptian "emphatic" construction, an event-oriented, rather than participant-oriented, construction), are themselves less prototypical. And subjectless passives (which by definition are not participant-oriented) are non-prototypical in all cases. In Earlier Egyptian, these correlations are manifest in how active and passive paradigms are not symmetrical to one another:

Unaccomplished

	unmarked	progressive
active:	*N(P) sḏm=f*	*NP ḥr sḏm*
passive:	←——————*sḏm.t=f*——————→	

Accomplished

	after *ỉw*, etc.	"emph.," etc.
non-subject-affecting:	←——————*sḏm.n=f*——————→	
subject-affecting intr.:	←———*NP PsP*———→	*ỉỉ.n=f*
passive, EEg.I:	*P PsP* ←——————*V-pass*——————→ (/*sḏm.n.t non-P*)	
EEg.II:	*P PsP ~ V-pass non-P*	*sḏm.n.t=f*

In the unaccomplished, the passive has a lesser semantic resolution than the active. In particular, the passive does not provide a formally distinct expression to events interpreted as progressive until the late Second Intermediate Period.[101] In most succinct terms, this reflects the fact that progressive aspect tends to emphasize the Initiator, even more strongly than the unaccomplished in general; the passive, for its part, is among other things an Agent-backgrounding construction.[102] In the accomplished, by contrast, the passive has a higher semantic resolution than the active (with subject-affecting actives representing an intermediate stage in complexity). Much more than active ones can, passive subjects deviate from the prototypical correlations between subjecthood, agentivity, individuation, and topicality. Moreover, the passive (here along with subject-affecting intransitives) is oriented on a participant associated with the Endpoint of the event. The active is not. The latter therefore has no issue in providing an expression to the fact that the Endpoint of the event is out of focus, as is the case in the event-oriented "emphatic" construction. In the accomplished, the active is simpler than the passive.

100 E.g., Comrie 1982; Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988, 45–49 ; Haspelmath 1990; Stauder 2014a, 310–11. For the associated cognitive dimensions, Woods 2008, 66–68, 285–89, providing access to the relevant literature.

101 For the rise of *(X.)tw ḥr sḏm*, Stauder 2014a, 360–65, and more broadly 349–403; Stauder 2013, 376–98.

102 Further, Stauder 2014a, 227–30. There is of course a historical dimension to the above asymmetry: when first grammaticalizing, *NP ḥr sḏm* did so with positive and active events. The diachronic stability of the resulting paradigm over a near-millennium is sufficient witness to the semantic issues here at stake.

4. *The "emphatic" construction more broadly*

4.1 *The unaccomplished "emphatic" construction*

In attempting to accommodate Polotsky's seminal discovery of Coptic second tenses, including their implications for the study of earlier stages of Egyptian,[103] with his own essentially aspectual analysis of the Middle Egyptian verbal system, Gardiner made the following proposal:

> It is agreed that one of the grounds for the use of the "Imperfective *sḏm.f*" was the desire to lay a predicative stress on an adverbial predicate. This result would naturally be best achieved by removing the stress from the verb-form in the sentence. It was thus important for the Egyptian to avoid saying positively that such and such an action happened or would actually happen. Now this avoidance of direct assertion may be effected by giving the verb-form a general or non-committal character.[104]

This proposal of an aspectual basis to the "emphatic" construction did not win acceptance, and was largely forgotten in subsequent decades, notably because it did not extend beyond the *mrr=f* and the unaccomplished to the accomplished "emphatic" construction subsequently identified by Polotsky.[105] In the preceding section, I discussed how the accomplished "emphatic" construction is in fact based on aspectual contrasts, in relation to the parameters of voice and subject affectedness (§ 3). Against this background, and given the very major problems syntactically oriented analyses face (§ 1), Gardiner's proposal merits revisiting.

The *mrr=f* displays a versatile functional profile. This is best described as the sum of the constructions in which the form occurs (the "emphatic" and related constructions, *nfr-n mrr=f*,[106] the *pw*-marked glossing construction (below), etc.), and, additionally for those constructions in which the *mrr=f* contrasts with other forms, in terms of the semantic contrasts thereby expressed (for example after prepositions or in complement clauses). While these uses of the *mrr=f* relate to each other in various ways, the overall functional profile of the *mrr=f* is too complex to be captured by any single denominator: functions of the form are defined in relation to actual constructions, in part differently in different constructions (hence also the purely formal label here adopted, as a "*mrr=f*"). In particular, a direct characterization of the *mrr=f* as "imperfective *sḏm=f*," as once in Gardinerian grammar, would fall well short of accounting for the variety of uses of the form (thus in the construction *nfr-n mrr=f*) or for its semantics in individual occurrences in text (for example, in occurrences in the unaccomplished "emphatic" construction). Furthermore, another construction, *N(P) mr=f*, is regularly used from early historical times on to express such typically imperfective semantics as habitual or general aspect.

This being made clear, imperfective semantics for the *mrr=f* not uncommonly shimmer through, more or less strongly depending on various environments in which the form occurs. A general association of the long stem (*mrr–*) with imperfective aspect is observed in participles, a paradigm in which forms based on the long

103 Polotsky 1944.

104 Gardiner 1947b, 100; quoted by Uljas 2007a, 356.

105 A milestone is Polotsky 1957.

106 Note that the construction *nfr-n V* certainly does not define a "nominal" slot: in addition to the major problems a "nominal" analysis of the *mrr=f* faces in general (§ 1.2–3), such analysis would fail to account for why the *mrr=f* is regularly used in *nfr-n V*, but the subjunctive (alternating with the infinitive) in *nfr pw V*, even though both slots would be similarly "nominal" in substitutional terms. Synchronically, *nfr-n mrr=f* is a grammaticalized construction (to wit, e.g., spellings such as *nfr-NEG or nfr-ꜣ*). Why the grammaticalizing construction selected the *mrr=f*, rather than, for example, the subjunctive as occurs in *nfr pw V*, is presumably for semantic reasons that are yet to be studied further. Provisionally, Uljas 2007a, 210–20.

stem provide the aspectually marked counterpart to forms based on the short stem (*mr–*).[107] Turning to the non-attributive finite form based on the same stem, the *mrr=f* itself, imperfective shades of meaning are clearly manifest in the distribution of the form after prepositions: in how the *mrr=f* contrasts semantically with other forms of the verb after certain prepositions, notably in expressing non-temporal meanings; and in how the *mrr=f* combines commonly with certain prepositions, but not with others.[108] Imperfective shades of meaning have also long been noted in complement clauses.[109] These have been analyzed further as to how they relate to a non-assertive modality of the *mrr=f* in these environments,[110] very much along lines intuited by Gardiner for the unaccomplished "emphatic" construction itself.

Gardiner has described how the semantics of the unaccomplished "emphatic" construction can be derived from the imperfective semantics also otherwise often observed to be associated with the *mrr=f*: "(...) this avoidance of direct assertion may be effected by giving the verb form a general or non-committal character."[111] This relation is most directly observed in the "setting" and "balanced" constructions, where imperfective semantics are not uncommonly fairly salient (10)–(11):

[10] *rmm=sn ỉw=f ḥr sḏm* (Merikare E 135)
When (/when*ever*) they cry, he is listening.

[11] *ꜣd.t r=f ḏḏ=f sꜣ=f* (Sethe 1928b, 84, 6–7)
When (/when*ever*) one acts aggressively against him, he shows his back.

With the "emphatic" construction itself, imperfective semantics are also occasionally observed to shimmer through:

[12] *ỉnn.t n=f r-ṯnw dbḥ=f*
sʿr.t n=f r-ṯnw ỉbb=f (CT V, 11c-d T1L)
"One brings to him *every time* he asks;
one presents to him *every time* he is thirsty.

107 Schenkel 1965a; Allen 1984, § 607–10, § 638–43; Jansen-Winkeln 1997; disputed by Depuydt 2008b. Schenkel 2011 questions the validity of the methodological assumptions underlying the initial analysis in Schenkel 1965a, without, however, implying that the overall sequence of subsequent interpretations must be wrong. Relative forms, among which is the relative *mrr(t)=f*, form a different paradigm, organized around relative tense (anterior *mr(t).n=f* vs. simultaneous *mrr(t)=f*). Relative forms thereby align closely with non-attributive paradigms, in which the primary contrast also revolves around relative tense. (Another dimension of this alignment is the rise of the relative *sḏm.n=f*, superseding Clère's *mr=f* for the expression of anterior tense; for the latter form, see now Schenkel 2010.) Relative forms are functionally attributive (like participles) and morphologically finite (like non-attributive forms). In occupying an intermediate position on the continuum of actor nominalization, relative forms display a strong cross-linguistic tendency to align with non-attributive forms more closely than participles do (Haspelmath 1994); Earlier Egyptian is a case in point.

108 Provisionally above, § 1.3. E.g., with *r, ỉr ʿꜣ r ʿꜣ=f šr r šrr=f* "The great one shall be treated according to how he is great, the small one according to how he is small" (Berlin 1911, pl. 1, 3); *sbn dpt r mrr=s* "The boat drifts as it pleases" (Peas. B1 157–58); contrasting with temporal meanings (*r sḏm.t=f; r sḏm.n=f*) and final/temporal ones: *r ỉr=f*$_{(subj.)}$ "so that he does" (common); *r ỉrw=f*$_{(prosp.)}$ "so that he does (will do)" (rare). Noteworthy is also, for example, the apparently exclusive association of the *mrr=f* with expressions such as *r-ṯnw(-sp)* "whenever" or *n-ʿꜣt-n* "on account of how much," which display clearly imperfective semantics: e.g., *r-ṯnw ỉbb=f* "whenever he thirsts" (CT V, 11c; full quotation below, Ex. 12); *mk swt nꜣ pw ḏdy=ỉ r-ṯnw-sp gmm sw bꜣk ỉm ḥr ỉỉt* "Look, this is what I will say each time this humble servant finds him coming" (Collier and Quirke 2002, pUC 32213, ro. 23–vo. 2); *n-ʿꜣt-n ḥzz w ḥm=f* "on account of how much His Majesty praises me" (*passim*; an autobiographical topos).

109 Borghouts 1989.

110 Uljas 2007a.

111 Fuller quotation above; further, Uljas 2007a, 355–59.

[13] *ḏḏ=ṯn pȝ ꜥqw n rmṯ=i ỉw=sn ḥr ỉrt kȝt* (Heqanakht II, ro. 29–30)
You should give these rations to my people only when they are working.
(Along Gardinerian lines, with a possible paraphrasis as: "*Should you give* these rations to my people (...)" (lesser assertive modality), itself related to: "When*ever* you give these rations to my people (...)".)

On the other hand, there are also a great many other occurrences of the unaccomplished "emphatic" construction in which this original aspectual basis is further remote. The point cannot be, therefore, to argue that the unaccomplished "emphatic" construction can be synchronically described in solely aspectual terms. Rather, it is proposed that the unaccomplished "emphatic" construction developed out of an aspectual contrast, with the originally imperfective semantics of the *mrr=f* developing specialized functions in this construction, like they developed specialized functions—different ones—in the other constructional environments in which the *mrr=f* is used.

4.2 *Unaccomplished and accomplished*

In terms of the bare set of constructions in which it occurs (that is, leaving aside the all-important issue of semantic contrasts with other forms of the verb in some of these environments, most notably in complement clauses and after prepositions), the *mrr=f* displays an overall distribution very similar to that of the *sḏm.n.t=f* in classical Middle Egyptian.

For example, both the *mrr=f* and the *sḏm.n.t=f* (in classical Middle Egyptian) are used in the the *pw*-marked glossing construction.[112] The construction serves to express a relation between a state of affairs expressed in the embedded clause and a preceding segment of discourse, indexed by *pw*.[113] The categorial information structure in the embedded clause is thereby backgrounded with respect to the higher-order level of assertion, the one relating the state of affairs expressed in the embedded clause to the preceding segment of discourse via the anaphoric index *pw*.[114] In the unaccomplished, the use of the *mrr=f* is illustrative of the general relationship between a lesser assertive modality and (originally) imperfective semantics, as in the "emphatic" construction (other things being of course different). In the accomplished, fully asserted accomplished passives have strongly Endpoint-oriented semantics; in the *pw*-marked glossing construction, as in other environments, the *sḏm.n.t=f* spread to express that an accomplished event—even though passive—is not perfective, that is, that the Endpoint is out of focus.

Conversely, the *mrr=f* is not found after, for example, *ỉw* or in asyndetically linked dependent clauses, just as the *sḏm.n.t=f* is not.[115] In these environments, assertion is well grounded; as a form notably serving to express a lesser assertive modality, the *mrr=f* does not come into use. The *sḏm.n.t=f*, for its part, did not spread to these environments because after *ỉw* or in asyndetic dependency the Endpoint of an accomplished

112 E.g., *ỉr ỉb=f mḥ mhh ỉb=f pw* "As for 'his heart is flooded,' this means that his heart is oblivious" (pEbers 102, 15–16); *ỉr sȝwt sbỉw ḫtm.n.tw smȝyt swty pw* "As for 'guarding the rebels,' this means that the cronies of Seth have been annihilated" (BD Nu 18, 5–6).

113 Uljas 2007a, 298–99. The construction is to be distinguished from an altogether different *pw*-marked construction, *NP pw ḥr sḏm (NP pw PsP, NP pw sḏm.n=f)*, in which *pw* lacks referential content (Uljas 2007a, 300–302). The latter construction is not "explicative" (*pace* Polotsky 1976, 41–42), nor topic-presentative (*pace* Loprieno 1995, 111; Uljas 2007a, 195–96, 303), but thetic (study by Stauder and Uljas in preparation; intuited by Gardiner 1957, § 190.1).

114 Given the presence of the anaphoric index *pw*, the overall construction cannot be described as thetic (as suggested by Uljas, 2007, 298–300), hence also the label here adopted, as a "glossing" construction. With this precision being made, I concur with Uljas's general analysis that the selection of the *mrr=f* reflects not syntax but the fact that the *pw*-marked glossing construction is not primarily about asserting something about the subject of the embedded clause, thus the lesser assertive modality.

115 As a rule; for the exceedingly rare occurrences of *ỉw mrr=f*, *ỉw V-pass P*, and *ỉw sḏm.n.t=f*, see Stauder 2014a, 319–22.

passive is fully in focus (§ 3.8.A). (As already discussed, broadly similar comments extend to the *sḏm.n=f* of subject-affecting intransitives.)

The configuration observed in classical Middle Egyptian, in which the *sḏm.n.t=f* (and the *ỉỉ.n=f*) largely aligns with the *mrr=f*, represents the overall outcome of a diachronic process of spread, not the earlier state of affairs: for the reasons sketched above, the *sḏm.n.t=f* superseded the perfective V-passive in a series of environments in which in the unaccomplished *mrr=f* was already used, and did not spread further to environments in which in the unaccomplished *mrr=f* was not used. Rather than syntax,[116] this diachronically secondary configuration reflects how the various environments discussed—for example the *pw*-marked glossing construction or *ỉw*-headed clauses—are associated with different degrees of assertive modality, and how these in turn interact with verbal semantics. This interaction concerns both the unaccomplished and the accomplished (in the latter for passive events and subject-affecting intransitive ones only)—if in altogether different ways.

Turning back to the "emphatic" construction, it was argued that both the unaccomplished and the accomplished varieties of this construction have an aspectual basis, and a different one in each case. In the unaccomplished, the *mrr=f* developed specialized uses expressing a lesser assertive modality from an originally imperfective profile (§ 4.1). In the accomplished, the distinctive forms used in the "emphatic" construction express that the Endpoint is out of focus: for example, in the case of the *sḏm.n.t=f*, that an accomplished event—even though passive—is not perfective (§ 3.4-7). This aspectual basis in the unaccomplished and accomplished varieties of the "emphatic" is not only different in nature, it also differs in salience in each case. In the accomplished, the aspectual basis is directly manifest in the construction as this can be synchronically described and analyzed. In the unaccomplished, imperfective semantics only shimmer through, fairly strongly in the related "setting" and "balanced" constructions, less so in the "emphatic" construction itself (§ 4.1, (10)-(13)).

A further difference between the unaccomplished and the accomplished constructions lies with the semantic markedness of the forms in either domain. In the unaccomplished, the *mrr=f* is used in the "emphatic" and related constructions, contrasting with the *mr=f*. The former is inherently more marked semantically than the latter. In the accomplished (in the classical paradigm), the *ỉỉ.n=f* and the *sḏm.n.t=f* are used, contrasting with the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive. While the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive have a strong semantic profile (§ 3.2; § 3.4), a *ỉỉ.n=f* is a mere *sḏm.n=f* of *ỉwỉ*, as a *sḏm.n.t=f* is a mere T-passive of the *sḏm.n=f*, itself is a mere expression of the accomplished (§ 3.4): in the accomplished, semantically less marked forms are used in the "emphatic" and related constructions. While the "emphatic" construction is a functionally marked construction in all cases, the forms used in this construction display a reverse relation of semantic markedness in the unaccomplished and the accomplished.

This accords with the fact that, in the unaccomplished, distinctive forms of the verb are used with all types of events, while in the accomplished distinctive forms of the verb are only used with some types of events, when de-emphasizing an otherwise salient Endpoint of the event is an issue. In succinct terms, the unaccomplished "emphatic" construction involves a form that developed specialized uses out of an erstwhile imperfective profile. The accomplished "emphatic" construction, when implying a morphological contrast on the verb, is all about de-emphasizing an otherwise salient Endpoint, that is, de-perfectivizing. The former characterization is a positive one, the latter a negative one.

116 Against syntax as the relevant parameter in the present context, § 1.2–3.

4.3 *Forms and functions of the "emphatic" construction*

Descriptively, the "emphatic" construction involves various elements of linguistic form, all contributing to make the construction distinctive. The division of labor differs depending on various parameters such as tense, voice, event semantics, or polarity:

- *Verbal morphology*

  The "emphatic" and related constructions involve a morphological marking on the verb in the unaccomplished with all types of events; in the accomplished with subject-affecting intransitives; in the accomplished passive in the later paradigm; and in the accomplished passive in the earlier paradigm with pronominal subjects (*P PsP* vs. *V-pass P*), also optionally with non-pronominal ones (*sḏm.n.t non-P*, uncommon). The "emphatic" and related constructions do not involve a morphological marking on the verb in the accomplished active with transitives and non-subject-affecting intransitives; in the accomplished passive in the earlier paradigm with non-pronominal subjects; and in the future.

- *The absence of ỉw, in environments in which ỉw might otherwise have been used*

  By definition, this level of marking concerns only those environments in which the absence of *ỉw* is formally contrastive. Not included are, therefore, for example: future clauses with the prospective *ỉrw=f*; *mk*-headed main clauses; non-initial clauses in a narrative sequence; subordinate clauses introduced by *ntt*; negative constructions; and much of the Pyramid Texts, in which *ỉw* is generally rare, due to the specific, ritual-performative temporality of these texts.

- *'Is, in certain environments*[117]

  Environments concerned are notably negative constructions and clauses introduced by *ntt*. (In both, the presence of *ỉs* thus complements the fact that the absence of *ỉw* is not distinctive.)

- *Possibly prosodics (only in spoken form)*

  Focused-upon constituents display a cross-linguistically very strong, and possibly universal, tendency to be marked by a peak in intonational contour.[118] Assuming this was the case in Earlier Egyptian as well—the reverse would be surprising—contour contributes to marking the construction. It remains, of course, invisible in written form, to the present-day reader and to the ancient one alike.

The functions of the "emphatic" construction have been described mainly in terms of the construction setting some broadly adverbial expression under narrow focus, the verbal event being downgraded to the status of presupposed information. Occurrences of the "emphatic" construction that support a narrow-focus reading are common in text, thus in word-questions and in answers to these, or in otherwise clear contexts;[119] in the accomplished, such readings are common notably with passive events of creation or

117 On *ỉs* discussed in a broader perspective, see now Oréal 2011, 103–70.

118 The iconic nature of this type of marking is evident: e.g., Bolinger 1985; also Lambrecht 1994, *passim*.

119 The latter include, for example, cases when a narrow-focus reading is implied (a) by a contrast in participants, (b) by the general context of an argument, (c) by the previous cotextual expression of the same event, or (d) when the event is of such a nature that it naturally reads as presupposed. E.g., with loci classici, respectively: (a) *m dgỉ r nty m-bỉḥ=f dgg=k r nty m-bỉḥ=k* "Do not look at what is in front of him: you should look only at what is in front of you!" (Ptahhotep 122–23 L2); (b) *ḏḏ=tn pỉ ʿqw n rmṯ=ỉ ỉw=sn ḥr ỉrt kỉt* "You should give these rations to my people only when they are working" (Heqanakht II, ro. 29–30); (c) *ʿḥʿ.n(=ỉ) pr.kw m gbtỉw (...) pr.n(=ỉ) m mšʿ n s 3000* (...) "I went out from Coptos (...) It is with an army of 3000 men that I went out (...)' (Hammamat 114, 10–12); (d) *sḳdd tỉ ḫft wḏ=k* "It is as you command that the land sails" (Peas. B1 298–99).

installation that are presupposed by the very speech situation.[120] However, these classically described functions of the "emphatic" construction are only the ones most easily identified in text. As has been noted on occasion by others, beginning with Polotsky himself, these are only part of a broader functional profile of the construction, yet to be defined in more precise terms. In the common uses with *gmi* + *clause* "find out that," for example, the event of "finding" is semantically incomplete in context, yet remains part of the scope of assertion, which is extended so as to include the whole following segment. In the accomplished, the "emphatic" construction often serves as a strategy for tightening inter-clausal cohesion, without the first clause being necessarily demoted to the rank of presupposed information.[121] Yet another situation is afforded by the following example, in which the construction, with a subjectless passive, invites a thetic reading, not a narrow-focus one:

[14] *nwt z3=t pw pw-nn ḏd.n=t ỉr=f*
***ms.n.t** n(=ỉ)*
ỉ.t tn (Pyr. 179a WNNt; PT 219)
Nut, this one here is your son of whom you have said:
"There was birth for me"
—so you said.
(Not: ?!"It is for me that someone was born.")

It was argued in the present paper that the Earlier Egyptian "emphatic" construction does not present a bi-clausal, or cleft-like, syntactic structure (§ 1). It was argued further that the "emphatic" construction does not involve a morphological marking on the verb with all types of events, but only with some (§ 2–3); that when there is a morphological marking on the verb, this has an aspectual basis; and that this aspectual basis is different in the unaccomplished and in the accomplished (§ 3, § 4.1–2). These combined syntactic, morphological, and semantic observations also suggest that the functional profile of the "emphatic" construction is more broadly about expressing that the verbal event requires some further elaboration for it to be semantically complete, and that the scope of assertion is thereby extended to include some broadly adverbial, and most commonly adjunctal, expression.[122] The narrow-focus interpretation, by which the verbal event is downgraded to the status of a mere presupposition, is only a special reading of the "emphatic" construction, if a highly common and salient one in text.

120 E.g., *ỉwr N m grḥ ms N (/ms=f* TMN) *m grḥ* "N was conceived at night, N was born at night" (Pyr. 132a WTMN; PT 211); *mr ntt ỉr.n.t ỉs zš pn ḫft ḏd wsr pn [ỉm]* "to the effect that it is according to the words of this User that this piece of writing was made there" (Berlin 1911, pl. 1, 5); *ỉs pn ḳd.n.tw=k n ḥb snṯ.n.tw=k n bw nfr* "O this tomb, you have been built for celebration, you have been founded for happiness!" (Boeser 1909, pl. 33, a.9–11); *srw ỉr.n.tw ø r ḫsf r ỉyt ... srw ỉr.n.tw ø r ḫsf r grg* "Officials—they were appointed to outlaw evil ... Officials—they were appointed to outlaw falsehood" (Peas. B1 327–29). Further illustration and discussion: Stauder 2014a, 251–61.

121 E.g., *rḏ ỉ3w n nsw ʿ3 dw3 nṯr nb n s3ḫw-rʿ sk sw rḫ ḥnʿ šms r-ḏr=f ỉr ỉs pry ḫt nb m r3 n ḥm=f ḫpr ø ḥr-ʿ sk rḏ.n n=f nṯr si3 ḫt m ḫt n-ʿ3t špss=f r nṯr nb* "The king was greatly adored and the god was praised for Sahure because he (*scil.* Niankhsekhmet) knew and the whole retinue as well that if anything comes out of His Majesty's mouth, it occurs immediately, and because the god caused him to be perceptive in his body, and because he was more august than any god" (Urk. I, 39, 10–6).

122 This analysis also permits a fairly direct description of how the "emphatic," the "setting," and the "balanced" constructions relate to each other. In each case, the verbal event requires some further elaboration to be semantically complete. In the case of the "emphatic" construction, this is provided by some broadly adverbial expression; in the case of the "setting" construction, this is provided by a subsequent main clause, resulting in an interpretation by which the first clause is backgrounded with respect to the second; in the "balanced" construction, this is provided by another clause in which the event is semantically incomplete like in the first: the two clauses are thereby made to lean on one another, as it were.

The discussion of morphology and verbal aspect further suggests that the semantic profile of the "emphatic" construction, rather than uniform across the board, may have been in part different in the unaccomplished and accomplished varieties of the construction, and for the latter, have been sensitive to voice and subject affectedness. For example, narrow-focus readings seem to be relatively more common in the unaccomplished than in the accomplished, possibly in relation to the particular verbal morphology associated with the former variety of the "emphatic" construction. In the accomplished, narrow-focus readings seem most common with passive events of creation or installation such as mentioned above, possibly reflecting the Endpoint-de-emphasizing semantics of this specific variety of the "emphatic" construction. The issues at stake are complex because they involve the parameters of aspect, voice, and subject affectedness, and beyond, the lexical semantics of individual events. They must be attended to further through detailed empirical investigations in the texts.

Bibliography and Text Sources

Adamson, Sylvia, and Wendy Ayre-Bennett

2011 "Linguistics and Philology in the Twenty-First Century: Introduction," *Transactions of the Philological Society* 109.3, 201–206.

Allen, James P.

1984 *The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts*. Bibliotheca Aegyptia 2. Malibu.

1991 "Form, Function and Meaning in the Early Egyptian Verb," *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 1–32.

1994 "Pronominal Rhematization," in David P. Silverman, ed., *For His Ka*: *Essays Offered in Memory of Klaus Baer* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 55; Chicago), 1–13.

2000 *Middle Egyptian: an Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*. Cambridge.

2002 *The Heqanakht Papyri*. Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 27. New York.

2004 "Traits dialectaux dans les Textes des Pyramides du Moyen Empire," in Susanne Bickel and Bernard Mathieu, ed., *D'un monde à l'autre: Textes des Pyramides et Textes des Sarcophages, actes de la table ronde internationale "Textes des Pyramides versus Textes des Sarcophages," IFAO 24–26 septembre 2001* (Bibliothèque d'étude 139; Cairo), 1–14.

2005 *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, ed. by Peter Der Manuelian. Writings from the Ancient World 23. Atlanta and Boston.

2006 "Some Aspects of the Non-royal Afterlife in the Old Kingdom," in Miroslav Bárta, ed., *The Old Kingdom Art and Archaeology. Proceedings of the Conference Held in Prague, May 31 – June 4, 2004* (Prague), 9–18.

2010 *Middle Egyptian: an Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*, 2nd ed. Cambridge.

2011a "Rethinking the *sḏm.f*," *Lingua Aegyptia* 19, 1–16.

2011b *The Debate Between a Man and his Soul: a Masterpiece of Ancient Egyptian Literature*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 44. Leiden.

2013 *The Ancient Egyptian Language, an Historical Study*. Cambridge.

2014 "Emphatic Sentences and Nominal/Relative Forms in Earlier Egyptian," *Lingua Aegyptia* 21, 1–7.

2015 *Middle Egyptian Literature: Eight Literary Works of the Middle Kingdom*. Cambridge.

Altenmüller, Hartwig

1998 *Die Wanddarstellungen im Grab des Mehu in Saqqara*. Archäologische Veröffentlichungen, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Kairo 42. Mainz.

2011 "Reden und Rufe auf zwei Gräberbilddern des Alten Reiches," in Frank Feder et al., ed., *Von Theben nach Giza: Festmiszellen für Stefan Grunert zum 65. Geburtstag* (Göttinger Miszellen, Beihefte 10; Göttingen), 19–22.

Amenemhet Wolfgang Helck. *Der Text der "Lehre Amenemhets I. für seinen Sohn."* Kleine Ägyptische Texte 1. Wiesbaden, 1969.

Anthes, Rudolf

1930 Eine Polizeistreife des Mittleren Reiches in die westliche Oase," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 65, 108–14.

Arnott, D. W.

1970 *The Nominal and Verbal System of Fula*. Oxford.

Assmann, Jan

1997 *Das Kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich.

(Assmann, Jan)
2002 *Altägyptische Totenliturgien* I: *Totenliturgien in den Sargtexten des Mittleren Reiches*. Supplemente zu den Schriften der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 14. Heidelberg.

Badawy, Alexander
1976 *The Tombs of Iteti, Sekhemʿankh-Ptah and Kaemnofert at Giza*. University of California Publications: Occasional Papers 9: Archaeology. Los Angeles.

Baer, Klaus
1966 "A deed of endowment in a letter of the time of *Ppjj* I?," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 93, 1–9.

Baerman, Matthew
2004 "Directionality and (Un)natural Classes in Syncretism," *Language* 80, 807–27.

Baerman, Matthew, Dunstan Brown, and Greville G. Corbett
2005 *The Morphology-Syntax Interface*: *A Study of Syncretism*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 109. Cambridge.

Baker, Mark
1985 "The Mirror Principle and Morphosyntactic Explanation," *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 373–415.

Bakir, Abd el-Mohsen
1970 *Egyptian Epistolography from the Eighteenth to the Twenty-first Dynasty*. Bibliothèque d'étude 48. Cairo.

Barbash, Yekaterina
2011 *The Mortuary Papyrus of Padikakem. Walters Art Museum 551*. Yale Egyptological Studies 8. New Haven.

Barber, Peter J.
2013 *Sievers' Law and the History of Semivowel Syllabicity in Indo-European and Ancient Greek*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford.

Barns, John W. B.
1956 *Five Ramesseum Papyri*. Oxford.

Baud, Michel and Dominique Farout
2001 "Trois biographies d'Ancien Empire revisitées," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 101, 43–57.

Bauer see Peas.

BD Nu Günther Lapp, *Catalogue of Books of the Dead in the British Museum*, I. *The Papyrus of Nu (BM EA 10477)*. London, 1997.

Beaver, David, and Cleo Condoravdi
2003 "A Uniform Analysis of *before* and *after*," in Robert B. Young and Yuping Zhou, ed., *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistics Theory 13 (SALT)* (Ithaca), 37–57.

Bendjaballah, Sabrina and Chris H. Reintges
2009 "Ancient Egyptian Verbal Reduplication: Typology, Diachrony, and the Morphology-Syntax Interface," in Bernhard Hurch and Veronika Mattes, ed., S*pecial Issue on Reduplication: Diachrony and Productivity* (*Morphology* 19), 135–57.

Beni Hasan Percy E. Newberry, *Beni Hasan*. 4 vols. Egypt Exploration Fund 1–2, 5, 7. London, 1893–1900.

Berlin
1911 *Hieratische Papyrus aus dem Königlichen Museen zu Berlin* III: *Schriftstücke der VI. Dynastie aus Elephantine; Zaubersprüche für Mutter und Kind; Ostraka*. Leipzig, 1911.

Boeser, Pieter
1909 *Beschrijving van de Egyptische Verzameling in het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden*, II. Den Haag.

Bolinger, Dwight
1977 *The Form of Language*. London.
1985 "The Inherent Iconism of Intonation," in John Haiman, ed., *Iconicity in Syntax* (Typological Studies in Language 6; Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 97–108.

Borghouts, Joris
1989 "Aspectual Values of the Second Tenses in Middle Egyptian," in Silvia Schoske et al., ed., *Linguistik, Philologie, Religion. Akten des vierten Internationalen Ägyptologen-Kongresses, München 1985* (Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur, Beihefte 3; Hamburg), 29–42.
2010 *Egyptian, an Introduction to the Writing and Language of the Middle Kingdom* 1: *Grammar, Syntax and Indexes*. Egyptologische Uitgaven 24. Leuven and Leiden.

Bresnan, Joan, and Sam A. Mchombo
1987 "Topic, Pronoun, and Agreement in Chichewa," *Language* 63, 741–82.

Brose, Marc
2014 *Grammatik der dokumentarischen Texte des Mittleren Reiches*. Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 13. Hamburg.

Brovarski, Edward J.
2001 *Giza Mastabas*, 7. *The Senedjemib Complex*, I: *The Mastabas of Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), Khnumenti (G 2374), and Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378)*, 2 vols. Boston.

Buchberger, Hannes
1995 "Das Harfnerlied im Grab *kȝ(=i)-m-ꜥnḫ* oder 'Die Riten des *sn nṯrw*'," in Dieter Kessler and Regine Schulz, ed., *Gedenkschrift für Winfried Barta: ḥtp dj n ḥzj* (Münchener Ägyptologische Untersuchungen 4; Frankfurt am Main), 93–123.

Butt, John, and Carmen Benjamin
2011 *A New Reference Grammar of Modern Spanish*, 4th ed. London.

Bybee, Joan L.
1985 "Diagrammatic iconicity in stem-inflection relations," in John Haiman, ed., *Iconicity in Syntax* (Typological Studies in Language 6; Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 11–48.
2010 *Language, Usage, and Cognition*. Cambridge.

Cairo CG 1–1294: Ludwig Borchardt, *Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten im Museum zu Kairo, Nr. 1-1294*. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Berlin, 1911–36.
20001–20780: Hans O. Lange and Heinrich Schaefer, *Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reichs*, 4 vols. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire 51–54. Berlin, 1902–25.

Cannuyer, Christian
1990 "Recherches sur l'onomasiologie du feu," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 117, 103–11.

Carnarvon, George E. S. M. H., Earl of, and Howard E. Carter
1912 *Five Years' Exploration at Thebes: a Record of Work Done 1907–1911*. London and New York.

Chafe, Wallace
1994 *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*: *the Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*. Chicago.
1995 "The Realis-Irrealis Distinction in Caddo, the Northern Iroquoian Languages, and English," in Joan L. Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman, ed., *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. (Typological Studies in Language 32; Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 349–65.

Cherpion, Nadine, Jean-Pierre Corteggiani, and Jean-François Gout
2007 *Le tombeau de Pétosiris à Touna el-Gebel*. Bibliothèque générale 27. Cairo.

Chierchia, Gennaro
2013 *Logic in Grammar. Polarity, Free Choice, and Intervention*. Oxford Studies in Semantics and Pragmatics 2. Oxford.
Chomsky, Noam
1981 *Lectures on Government and Binding*: *The Pisa Lectures*. Studies in Generative Grammar 9. Dordrecht.
1995 *The Minimalist Program*. Current Studies in Linguistics 28. Cambridge, MA.
2001 "Derivation by Phase," in Michael Kenstowicz, ed., *Ken Hale: a Life in Linguistics* (Current Studies in Linguistics 36; Cambridge, MA), 1–52.
Cinque, Guglielmo
1999 *Adverbs and Functional Heads, a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford.
Clère, Jacques Jean
1995 *Les chauves d'Hathor*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 63. Louvain.
Collier, Mark A.
1990 "The Circumstantial *sḏm(.f)/sḏm.n(.f)* as Verbal Verb-Forms in Middle Egyptian," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 76, 73–85.
1991 "Circumstantially Adverbial? The Circumstantial *sḏm(.f)/sḏm.n(.f)* Reconsidered," in Stephen Quirke, ed., *Middle Kingdom Studies* (New Malden), 21–50.
1992 "Predication and the Circumstantial *sḏm(.f)/sḏm.n(.f)*," *Lingua Aegyptia* 2, 17–65.
1994 "Grounding, Cognition and Metaphor in the Grammar of Middle Egyptian: the Role of Human Experience in Grammar as an Alternative to the Standard Theory Notion of Paradigmatic Substitution," *Lingua Aegyptia* 4, 57–87.
Collier, Mark A., and Stephen Quirke
2002 *The UCL Lahun Papyri: Letters*. BAR International Series 1083. London.
Collombert, Philippe, and Laurent Coulon
2000 "Les dieux contre la mer: le début du 'papyrus d'Astarté' (pBN 202)," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 100, 193–242.
Comrie, Bernard
1976 *Aspect: an Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge.
1977 *Tense*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge.
1982 "Aspect and Voice: Some Reflections on Perfect and Passive," in Philip Tedeschi and Annie Zaenen, ed., *Tense and Aspect* (Syntax and Semantics 14; New York), 65–78.
Corbett, Greville G.
2006 *Agreement*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge.
Croft, William
1996 "What's a Head?," in Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring, ed., *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 33; Dordrecht), 35–75.
2001 *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford.
CT
I–VII Adriaan de Buck, *The Egyptian Coffin Texts*, 7 vols. Oriental Institute Publication 34, 49, 64, 67, 72, 81, 87. Chicago, 1935–61.
VIII James P. Allen, *The Egyptian Coffin Texts*, VIII: *Middle Kingdom Copies of Pyramid Texts*. Oriental Institute Publications 132. Chicago, 2006.
Cysouw, Michael
2003 *The Paradigmatic Structure of Person Marking*. Oxford.

2010 "Semantic Maps as Metrics on Meaning," *Linguistic Discovery* 8, 70–95.

Czerwik, Dorota

1999 "Some Remarks on the Letters to the Dead from the First Intermediate Period," *Göttinger Miszellen* 173, 61–66.

Dahl, Östen

1979 "Typology of Sentence Negation," *Linguistics* 17, 79–106.

1985 *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford.

David, Arlette

2006 *Syntactic and Lexico-Semantic Aspects of the Legal Register in Ramesside Royal Decrees*. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, 38. Wiesbaden.

Davies, Norman de Garis

1943 *The Tomb of Rekh-mi-Re' at Thebes*, 2 vols. Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 11. New York.

Depuydt, Leo

1986 "The Emphatic Nominal Sentence in Egyptian and Coptic," in Gerie Englund and Paul J. Frandsen, ed., *Crossroad: Chaos or the Beginning of a New Paradigm. Papers from the Conference on Egyptian Grammar, Helsingør 28–30 May 1986* (Copenhagen), 91–117.

1988 "New Horizons in Coptic and Egyptian Linguistics," in *Chronique d'Égypte* 63 (126), 391–406.

1991 "On Distinctive and Isolating Emphasis in Egyptian and in General," *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 33–56.

2008a *The Other Mathematics: Language and Logic in Egyptian and in General.* Piscataway, NJ.

2008b "Zum Nebeneinander von An- und Abwesenheit der Gemination in der Wendung *mrjj jt.f mrrw snw.f,*" *Lingua Aegyptia* 16, 27–38.

2011 "Zu Lehr- und Lernbarkeit des ägyptischen Verbs: Wie viele typisch mittelägyptische *sḏm.f*-Formen gibt es eigentlich? Neun!," in Alexandra Verbovsek et al., ed., *Methodik und Didaktik in der Ägyptologie*: *Herausforderungen eines kulturwissenschaftlichen Paradigmenwechsels in den Altertumswissenschaften*. (Ägyptologie und Kulturwissenschaft 4; München), 481–508.

Derchain-Urtel, Maria-Theresa

1973 "Das *n*-Präfix im Ägyptischen," *Göttinger Miszellen* 6, 39–54.

Desclaux, Vanessa

2014 "Les appels aux passants en Égypte ancienne: approche historique d'un genre littéraire," 2 vols. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Lyon II.

Di Biase Dyson, Camilla

2012 "A Diachronic Approach to the Syntax and Semantics of Egyptian Spatio-temporal Expressions with *ḫ3-t* 'front': Implications for Cognition and Metaphor," in Eitan Grossman et al., ed., *Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian* (Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 9; Hamburg), 247–92.

Di Biase Dyson, Camilla, Frank Kammerzell, and Daniel Werning

2009 "Glossing Ancient Egyptian: Suggestions for Adapting the Leipzig Glossing Rules," *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 343–66.

Díaz Hernández, Roberto A.

2013 *Tradition und Innovation in der offiziellen Sprache des Mittleren Reiches: ein strukturalistischer Vergleich der historisch-biographischen mit den literarischen Texten in der 1. Zwischenzeit und der 12. Dynastie*. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, 56. Wiesbaden.

Dixon, Robert M. W.

2004 "Adjective Classes in Typological Perspective," in Robert M. W. Dixon und Alexandra Y. Aikhenwald, ed., *Adjective Classes: a Cross-Linguistic Typology* (Oxford), 1–49.

Donnat Beauquier, Sylvie

2009 "Le rite comme seul référent dans les lettres aux mort," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 109, 61–93.

2014 *Écrire à ses morts: enquête sur un usage rituel de l'écrit dans l'Égypte pharaonique*. Grenoble.

Doret, Éric

1986 *The Narrative Verbal System of Old and Middle Egyptian*. Cahiers d'Orientalisme 12. Genève.

1994 "Ankhtifi and the Description of his Tomb in Moʿalla," in David P. Silverman, ed., *For His Ka: Essays Offered in Memory of Klaus Baer* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 55; Chicago), 79–86.

Doron, Edit

1988 "On the Complementarity of Subject and Subject-Verb Agreement," in Michael Barlow and Charles A. Ferguson, ed., *Agreement in Natural Language*: *Approaches, Theories, Descriptions*: *Papers Presented at a Conference held at Stanford University in October 1984* (Stanford), 201–18.

1999 "V-Movement and VP Ellipsis," in Shalom Lappin and Elabbas Benmamoun, ed., *Fragments*: *Studies in Ellipsis and Gapping* (Oxford), 124–40.

Doron, Edit, and Caroline Heycock

2010 "In Support of Broad Subjects in Hebrew," *Lingua* 120, 1764–76.

Drioton, Étienne

1943 "Description sommaire des chapelles funéraires de la VIe dynastie récemment découvertes derrrière le mastaba de Mérérouka à Sakkarah," *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 43, 487–513.

Drioton, Étienne, and Jean-Philippe Lauer

1958 "Un groupe de tombes à Saqqarah: Icheti, Nefer-khouou-Ptah, Sébek-em-khent et Ankhi," *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 55, 207–51.

Dryer, Matthew S.

2013 "Position of Tense-Aspect Affixes," in Mathew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath, ed., *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online* (Leipzig), http://wals.info/chapter/69 (accessed 05/09/2014).

Dubinsky, Stanley, and Silvester R. Simango

1996 "Passive and Stative in Chichewa: Evidence for Modular Distinctions in Grammar," *Language* 72, 749–81.

Dunham, Dows

1937 *The Naga-ed-Dêr Stelae of the First Intermediate Period*. London.

DZA See TLA

Edel, Elmar

1955–64 *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Analecta Orientalia 34/39. Roma.

1959 "Beiträge zur ägyptischen Grammatik," *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 84, 105–13.

1973 "Unsere Kenntnis des altägyptischen," in Serge Sauneron, ed., *Textee et langages de l'Égypte pharaonique: cent cinquante années de recherches 1822–1972. Hommages à Jean-François Champollion*, 3 vols. (Bibliothèque d'étude 64; Cairo), I, 119–23.

1980 *Neue Deutungen keilschriftlicher Umschreibungen ägyptischer Wörter und Personennamen*. Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 375. Wien.

1981 *Hieroglyphische Inschriften des Alten Reiches*. Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 67. Opladen.

1984a "Neue Belege für die aktivische *sḏmw.f*-Form," in Friedrich Junge, ed., *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern* (Göttingen), 25–39.

1984b *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. Opladen.

1994 "Der vollständige Architrav vom Grab des *mḥj* in Saqqara," in Betsy M. Bryan and David Lorton, ed., *Essays in Egyptology in Honor of Hans Goedicke* (San Antonio), 61–67.

Eichler, Eckhard

1991 "Untersuchungen zu den Königsbriefen des Alten Reiches," in *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 18, 141–71.

el-Aguizy, Ola

2010 "Une nouvelle 'tombe-sarcophage à puits' à Saqqara," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 110, 13–34.

el-Awady, Tarek

2009 *Abusir*, XVI. *Sahure – the Pyramid Causeway: History and Decoration Program in the Old Kingdom*. Prague.

el-Hamrawi, Mahmoud

2004a "Alte-Reichs-Sprache und Mittlere-Reichs-Sprache in abydenischen Texten der 11.-12. Dynastie," *Lingua Aegyptia* 12, 89–122.

2004b "Subtantiv + *i̯ś* im Altägyptichen," in Jean-Claude Goyon and Christine Cardin, ed., *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Egyptologists: Grenoble, 6–12 septembre 2004* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 150; Leuven), I, 545–65.

el-Khouli, Ali, and Naguib Kanawati

1988 *Excavations at Saqqara, North-West of Teti's Pyramid* II. Sydney.

Elliott, Jennifer R.

2000 "Realis and Irrealis: Forms and Concepts of the Grammaticalisation of Reality," *Linguistic Typology* 4, 55–90.

Embick, David

2004 "On the Structure of Resultative Participles in English," *Linguistic Inquiry* 35, 355–92.

Emonds, Joseph

1978 "The verbal complex V'–V in French," *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 151–75.

Englund, Gertie, und Paul John Frandsen

1986 ed., *Crossroad: Chaos or the Beginning of a New Paradigm. Papers from the Conference on Egyptian Grammar. Helsingør 28-30 May 1986*. Copenhagen.

Engsheden, Åke

2003 *La reconstitution du verbe en égyptien de tradition 400–30 avant J.-C*. Uppsala Studies in Egyptology 3. Uppsala.

Erman, Adolf

1889 *Die Sprache des Papyrus Westcar*. Mittheilungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Göttingen.

1894 *Ägyptische Grammatik mit Schrifttafel, Litteratur, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis*, 1st ed. Porta Linguarum Orientalium 15. Berlin.

1919 *Reden, Rufe und Lieder auf Gräberbildern des alten Reiches*. Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 15. Berlin.

1928 *Ägyptische Grammatik, mit Schrifttafel, Paradigmen und Übungstücken zum Selbststudium und zum Gebrauch in Vorlesungen*. Porta Linguarum Orientalium 15. Berlin.

Eyre, Christopher J.

2013 *The Use of Documents in Pharaonic Egypt*. Oxford Studies in Ancient Documents. Oxford.

Fălăuş, Anamaria
2013 "Introduction: Alternatives in Semantics and Pragmatics," in Anamaria Fălăuş, ed., *Alternatives in Semantics* (Palgrave Studies in Pragmatics, Language and Cognition; Basingstoke), 1–35.
Farout, Dominique
2012 "Les déclarations du roi Sahourê," *Revue d'Égyptologie* 63, 103–14.
2013 "Naissance du dialogue de cour sur les monuments d'Ancien Empire," *Revue d'Égyptologie* 64, 15–23.
Faulkner, Raymond O.
1969 *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts Translated into English*, 2 vols. Oxford.
1973-78 *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*, 3 vols. Warminster.
1976 "The Enclitic Negation *w*," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 62, 176.
1982 "A Coffin Text Miscellany," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 68, 27–30.
Fecht, Gerhard
1960 *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache*. Ägyptologische Forschungen 21. Glückstadt-Hamburg-New York.
Firchow, Otto
1954 "Zu den Wortverbindungen mit *ś.t*," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 79, 91–94.
Fischer, Henry G.
1977 *Egyptian Studies* II. *The Orientation of Hieroglyphs, Part 1: Reversals*. New York.
1991 "Marginalia," *Göttinger Miszellen* 122, 12–30.
1996 *Egyptian Studies* III: *Varia Nova*. New York.
Fischer-Elfert, Hans-Werner, and Alfred Grimm
2003 "Autobiographie und Apotheose: Die Statue des *Zš(š)n Z3-Ḥw.t-Ḥrw* im Staatlichen Museum Ägyptischer Kunst München," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 130, 60–80.
Fowler Richard B. Parkinson, "The Discourse of the Fowler: Papyrus Butler verso (P. BM EA 10274)," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 90 (2004), 81–111.
François, Alexandre
2008 "Semantic Maps and the Typology of Colexification: Intertwining Polysemous Networks across Languages," in Martine Vanhove, ed., *From Polysemy to Semantic Change: Towards a Typology of Lexical Semantic Associations* (Amsterdam), 163–215.
Freed, Rita E.
1996 "Stela Workshops of Early Dynasty 12," in Peter Der Manuelian, ed., *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson* (2 vols.; Boston), I, 297–336.
Frood, Elizabeth
2007 *Biographical texts from Ramessid Egypt*. Writings from the Ancient World 26. Atlanta, 2007.
Fukui, Naoki
1993 "Parameters and Optionality," *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 399–420.
Fukui, Naoki, and Margaret Speas
1986 "Specifiers and Projection," in Naoki Fukui et al., ed., *Papers in Theoretical Linguistics* (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 8; Cambridge, MA), 128–72.
Gardiner, Alan H.
1909 *The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage from a Hieratic Papyrus in Leiden (Pap. Leiden 344 Recto)*. Leipzig.
1927 *Egyptian Grammar. Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*. Oxford.
1930 "A New Letter to the Dead," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 16, 19–22.
1932 *The Theory of Speach and Language*. Oxford.
1935 *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, Third Series, Chester Beatty Gift*, 2 vols. London.

1947a *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, 3 vols. Oxford.
1947b Review of *Études de syntaxe copte* by H. J. Polotsky, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 33, 95–101.
1948 "The First Two Pages of the 'Wörterbuch'," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 34, 12–18.
1950 *Egyptian Grammar. Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
1957 *Egyptian Grammar. Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*. 3rd ed. Oxford.
1962 *My Working Years*. Private printing.

Gardiner, Alan H., and Kurt Sethe
1928 *Egyptian Letters to the Dead, Mainly from the Old and Middle Kingdoms*. London.

Gemnikai Friedrich Wilhelm von Bissing, *Die Mastaba des Gem-ni-kai*, 2 vols. Berlin.

Gestermann, Louise
1994 "'Neue' Texte in spätzeitlichen Grabenanlagen von Saqqara und Heliopolis," in Martina Minas and Jürgen Zeidler, ed., *Aspekte spätägyptischen Kultur: Festschrift für Erich Winter zum 65. Geburtstag* (Aegyptiaca Treverensia 7; Mainz), 89–95.

Gilula, Mordechai
1970 Review of H. Satzinger, *Die negativen Konstruktionen im Alt- und Mittelägyptischen* (Münchner Ägyptologische Studien 12; Berlin, 1968), *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56, 205–14.

Givón, Talmy
2001 *Syntax. An Introduction*, 2nd ed. 2 vols. Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

Glanville, Stephen R. K.
1928 "The Letters of Aaḥmōse of Peniati," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 14, 294–312.

Goddard, Cliff
2002 "The Search for the Shared Semantic Core of all Languages," in Cliff Goddard and Anna Wierzbicka, ed., *Meaning and Universal Grammar – Theory and Empirical Findings* (Amsterdam), I, 5–40.

Goedicke, Hans
1955 "The Egyptian Idea of Passing from Life to Death," *Orientalia* 24, 225–39.
1967 *Königliche Dokumente aus dem alten Reich*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 14. Wiesbaden.
1972 "The Letter to the Dead Naga ed-Deir N 3500," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 58, 95–98.
1990 "About an Early Use of the Emphatic Possessive Expression," *Varia Aegyptiaca* 6, 139–60.

Goelet, Ogden, Jr.
1986 "The Term *śtp-sȝ* in the Old Kingdom and Its Later Development," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 23, 85–98.

Goldwasser, Orly
1999 "'Low' and 'High' Dialects in Ramesside Egyptian," in Stefan Grunert and Ingelore Hafemann, ed., *Textcorpus und Wörterbuch: Aspekte zur ägyptischen Lexicographie* (Probleme der Ägyptologie 14; Leiden), 311–28.
2002 *Prophets, Lovers and Giraffes: Wor(l)d Classification in Ancient Egypt*. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, 38. Wiesbaden.

Goyon, Jean-Claude
2012 *Le recueil de prophylaxie contre les agressions des animaux venimeux du Musée de Brooklyn Papyrus Wilbour 47.2118.138*. Studien zur spätägyptischen Religion 5. Wiesbaden 2012.

Gozzoli, Roberto E.
2006 *The Writing of History in Ancient Egypt during the First Millennium BC (ca. 1070–180 BC): Trends and Perspectives*. Golden House Publications: Egyptology 5. London.

Gracia Zamacona, Carlos
2008 *Les verbes de mouvement dans les textes des sarcophages: étude sémantique*, PhD dissertation, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris (unpublished).

(Gracia Zamacona, Carlos)
2010 "Space, Time, and Abstract Relations in the Coffin Texts." *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 137, 13–26.
Grandet, Pierre
1998 *Contes de l'Égypte ancienne*. Paris.
Grandet, Pierre, and Bernard Mathieu
2003 *Cours d'égyptien hiéroglyphique*, Paris.
Grapow, Hermann
1914 "Über die Wortbildungen mit einem Präfix *m-* im Altägyptischen," *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 5. Berlin.
Greenberg, Joseph H.
1963 "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements," in Joseph H. Greenberg, ed., *Universals of Language* (Cambridge), 73–113.
Griffith, Francis Ll.
1898 *The Petrie Papyri: Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob (Principally of the Middle Kingdom)*, 2 vols. London.
Grossman, Eitan
to appear "Grammatical Variation and Language Change: the Case of Greek Loan-verbs in Coptic," in Jennifer Cromwell and Eitan Grossman, ed., *Beyond Free Variation: Scribal Repertoires in Egypt from the Old Kingdom to the Early Islamic Period*, *Oxford, 14–16 September 2009*.
Grossman, Eitan, and Stéphane Polis
2012 "Navigating Polyfunctionality in the Lexicon: Semantic Maps and Ancient Egyptian Lexical Semantics," in Eitan Grossman et al., ed., *Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian* (Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 9; Hamburg), 175–225.
Grossman, Eitan, Stéphane Polis, Andréas Stauder, and Jean Winand
2014 ed., *On Forms and Functions: Studies in Ancient Egyptian Grammar*. Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 15. Hamburg.
Grossman, Eitan, Stéphane Polis, and Jean Winand
2012 ed., *Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian*. Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica, 9. Hamburg.
Grunert, Stefan
2005 "Kulturelle Vergesslichkeit? Zu obsoleten Wörtern aus Texten des Alten Reiches," in Stephan J. Seidelmayer, ed., *Texte und Denkmäler des ägyptischen Alten Reiches* (Thesaurus Linguae Agyptiae 3; Berlin), 125–42.
2011 "Danse macabre: ein altägyptischer 'Totentanz' aus Saqqara," *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 40, 113–36.
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.
Gundacker, Roman
2011 "On the Etymology of the Egyptian Crown Name *mrsw.t*: an 'Irregular' Subgroup of *m*-prefix Formations," *Lingua Aegyptia* 19, 37–86.
Gunn, Battiscombe
1924 *Studies in Egyptian Syntax*. Paris.
1948 "A Negative Word in Old Egyptian," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 34, 27–30.
Gyuris, Beáta
2009 "Quantificational Contrastive Topic with Verum/Falsum Focus," *Lingua* 119, 625–49.

Hafemann, Ingelore

2002 "Zum Zusammenspiel von Semantik und Syntax ägyptischer Verben," *Lingua Aegyptia* 10, 151–210.

2005 "Textsorten und Textfunktion: Gebrauchstexte im monumentalen Diskurs des ägyptischen Alten Reiches," in Stephan J. Seidelmayer, ed., *Texte und Denkmäler des ägyptischen Alten Reiches* (Thesaurus Linguae Agyptiae 3; Berlin), 143–64.

Hale, Kenneth, and Samuel J. Keyser

1993 "On Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Relations," in Kenneth Hale and Samuel J. Keyser, ed., *The View from Building 20*: *Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Boxberger* (Current Studies in Linguistics 24; Cambridge, Massachusetts), 53–109.

Hammamat Jean Couyat and Pierre Montet. *Les Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât*. Mémoires de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale 34. Cairo, 1912.

Hannig, Rainer

1982 "Zum mittelägyptischen Tempussystem," *Göttinger Miszellen* 56, 35–52.

1986 "Der Kernbereich des mittelägyptischen Verbalsystems, I: Die Infinitivtempora," *Journal of Ancient Civilizations*, 1, 21–125.

1991 *Pseudopartizip und sḏm.n=f: Der Kernbereich des mittelägyptischen Verbalsystems 2*. Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge 32. Hildesheim.

1995 *Großes Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch, die Sprache der Pharaonen (2800–950 v. Chr.)*. Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt 64. Mainz.

2003 *Hannig-Lexica*, IV. *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch* I: *Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit*. Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt 98. Mainz.

2006 *Hannig-Lexica*, V. *Ägyptische Wörterbuch* II: *Mittleres Reich und Zweite Zwischenzeit*, 2 vols. Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt 112. Mainz.

Hardy, Heather K., and Lynn Gordon

1980 "Types of Adverbial and Modal Constructions in Tolkapaya," *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46:3, 183–96.

Harley, Heidi, and Elizabeth Ritter

2002 "Person and Number in Pronouns: a Feature-geometric Analysis," *Language* 78, 482–526.

Haspelmath, Martin

1990 "The Grammaticalization of Passive Morphology," *Studies in Language* 14, 25–72.

1994 "Passive Participles across Languages," in Barbara Fox and Paul Hopper, ed., *Voice*: *Form and Function* (Typological Studies in Language 27; Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 151–77.

1997 *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory. Oxford.

2003 "The Geometry of Grammatical Meaning: Semantic Maps and Cross-Linguistic Comparison," in Michael Tomasello, ed., *The New Psychology of Language* (Mahwah, NJ), II, 211–42.

2006 "Against Markedness (and What to Replace It with)," *Journal of Linguistics* 42:1, 25–70.

Hassan, Selim

1936 *Excavations at Gîza 1930–1931*. Cairo.

1975 *Excavations at Saqqara 1937–1938*, ed. by Zaky Iskander. 3 vols. Cairo.

Hatnub Rudolf Anthes, *Die Felsinschriften von Hatnub*. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens 9. Leipzig, 1928.

Haviland, Susan E., and Herbert H. Clark

1974 "What's New? Acquiring New Information as a Process in Comprehension," *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 13, 512–21.

Hays, Harold M.
2012 *The Organization of the Pyramid Texts, Typology and Disposition*, 2 vols. Probleme der Ägyptologie 31. Leiden and Boston.
Hb. See Werning 2011, II.
Helck, Wolfgang
1972 "Zur Frage der Entstehung der ägyptischen Literatur," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 63/64, 6–26.
1975 *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie*. Kleine Ägyptische Texte 6. Wiesbaden.
Heqanakht See Allen 2002.
Höhle, Tilman N
1992 "Über Verum-Fokus im Deutschen," in Joachim Jacobs, ed., *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik* (Linguistische Berichte Sonderhefte 10; Wiesbaden), 112–41.
Hodge, Carleton T.
1954 "An Outline of Middle Egyptian Grammar," *Studies in Linguistics* 12, 8–23.
Hoekstra, Teun
1988 "Small Clause Results," *Lingua* 74, 101–39.
Holmberg, Anders, and Ian Roberts
2010 "Introduction: Parameters in Minimalist Theory," in Theresa Biberauer et al., ed., *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory* (Cambridge, MA), 1–57.
Hopper, Paul, and Sandra Thompson
1980 "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse," *Language* 56, 251–99.
Horn, Laurence R.
2001 *A Natural History of Negation*. The David Hume Series: Philosophy and Cognitive Science Reissues. Stanford (originally published 1989).
Huang, Yan
2007 *Pragmatics*. Oxford Textbooks in Linguistics. Oxford.
Ipuwer Roland Enmarch, *The Dialogue of Ipuwer and the Lord of All*. Griffith Institute Publications. Oxford, 2005.
Israel, Michael
2011 *The Grammar of Polarity: Pragmatics, Sensitivity, and the Logic of Scales*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 127. Cambridge.
Jaeggli, Osvaldo A., and Kenneth J. Safir
1989 "The Null Subject Parameter and Parametric Theory," in Osvaldo A. Jaeggli and Kenneth J. Safir, ed., *The Null Subject Parameter* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 15; Dordrecht), 1–44.
James, T. G. H.
1962 The *Ḥeḳanakhte Papers and Other Early Middle Kingdom* Documents. Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 19. New York.
Jansen-Winkeln, Karl
1997 "Intensivformen und 'verbale Pluralität' im Ägyptischen," *Lingua Aegyptia* 5, 123–36.
2004 "Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu den 'Unterweltsbüchern'," *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 32, 205–32.
Jéquier, Gustave
1933 *Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, Fouilles à Saqqarah. Les pyramides des reines Neit et Apouit*. Cairo.
1935 *Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, Fouilles à Saqqarah. La pyramide d'Aba*. Cairo.
1936 *Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, Fouilles à Saqqarah. Le monument funéraire de Pepi II*, vol. I: *Le tombeau royal*. Cairo.

Jespersen, Karl

1917 *Negation in English and Other Languages* (Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk–filologiske Meddelelser I, 5). Copenhagen.

Jucker, Andreas H.

2006 "Historical pragmatics," in Keith Brown, ed., *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd ed. (Oxford), 329–32.

Julien, Marit

2002 *Syntactic Heads and Word Formation*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford.

Junge, Friedrich

1978 *Syntax der mittelägyptischen Literatursprache: Grundlagen einer Strukturtheorie.* Mainz.

1979 "Der Gebrauch von *jw* im mittelägyptischen Satz," in Manfred Görg und Edgar Pusch, ed., *Festschrift Elmar Edel, 12. März 1979* (Ägypten und Altes Testament 1; Bamberg), 263–71.

1985 "Sprache," *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* 5, 1176–1211.

1989 *"Emphasis" and Sentential Meaning in Middle Egyptian*. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, 20. Göttingen.

Junker, Hermann

1940 *Gîza* IV. *Die Maṣṭaba des kꜣjmʿnḫ (Kai-em-anch)*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Denkschriften der Philosophisch-historische Klasse 71, 1. Vienna and Leipzig.

1943 *Gîza* VI. *Die Maṣṭabas des Nfr (Nefer), Ḳdfjj (Kedfi), Kꜣḥjf (Kaḥjef) und die westlich anschließenden Grabanlagen*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 72, 1. Vienna.

1953 *Gîza* XI. *Der Friedhof südlich der Cheopspyramide, Ostteil*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschafter, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 74, 2. Vienna.

Kahl, Jochem, Nicole Kloth, and Ursula Zimmermann

1995 *Die Inschriften der 3. Dynastie: eine Bestandsaufnahme*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 56.Wiesbaden.

Kammerzell, Frank

1990 "Funktion und Form: zur Opposition von Perfekt und Pseudopartizip im Alt- und Mittelägyptischen," *Göttinger Miszellen* 117/119, 181–202.

1991a "Personalpronomina und Personalendungen im Altägyptischen," in Daniela Mendel and Ulrike Claudi, ed., *Ägypten im afro-orientalischen Kontext: Aufsätze zur Archäologie, Geschichte und Sprache eines unbegrenzten Raumes, Gedenkschrift Peter Behrens* (Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere, Sondernummer; Köln), 177–203.

1991b "Augment, Stamm und Endung: Zur morphologischen Entwicklung der Stativkonjugation," *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 165–99.

1993 "Die altägyptische Negation *w*: Versuch einer Annäherung," *Lingua Aegyptia* 3, 17–32.

1998 "Sprachkontakte und Sprachwandel im Alten Ägypten." Habilitation thesis, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (unpublished).

2005 "Old Egyptian and Pre-Old Egyptian: Tracing linguistic Diversity in Archaic Egypt and the Creation of the Egyptian Language," in Stephan J. Seidelmayer, ed., *Texte und Denkmäler des ägyptischen Alten Reiches* (Thesaurus Linguae Agyptiae 3; Berlin), 165–229.

Kanawati, Naguib

2007 *Deir el-Gebrawi*, II: *The Southern Cliff*. The Australian Centre for Egyptology: Reports 25. Oxford.

Kanawati, Naguib, and Ali Hassan

1996 *The Teti Cemetery at Saqqara,* I: *The Tomb of Nedjet-em-pet, Ka-aper and Others*. The Australian Centre for Egyptology: Reports 8. Sydney.

(Kanawati, Naguib, and Ali Hassan)
1997 *The Teti Cemetery at Saqqara*, II: *The Tomb of Ankhmahor*. The Australian Centre for Egyptology: Reports 9. Warminster.

Kanawati, Naguib, and Mohamed A. Abdel Razeq
1999 *The Teti Cemetery at Saqqara* V: *The Tomb of Hesi*. The Australian Centre for Egyptology: Reports 13. Warminster.

Kaplony, Peter
1973 "Die altesten Texte," in Serge Sauneron, ed., *Textes et langages de l'Égypte pharaonique: cent cinquante années de recherches 1822–1972. Hommages à Jean-François Champollion*, 3 vols. (Bibliothèque d'étude 64; Cairo), II, 3–13.

Kay, Paul
1997 "Even," in Paul Kay, *Words and the Grammar of Context* (CSL Lecture Notes 40. Stanford), 49–98 (originally published 1990).

Kayne, Richard
1994 *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 25. Cambridge.

Kheti Wolfgang Helck, *Die Lehre des Dwꜣ-Ḫtjj*, 2 vols. Kleine Ägyptische Texte 3–4. Wiesbaden, 1970.

Kiss, Katalin É.
1995 "Discourse Configurational Languages: Introduction," in Katalin É. Kiss, ed., *Discourse Configurational Languages* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax; Oxford), 3–27.

Klebs, Luise
1922 *Material zur ägyptischen Kulturgeschichte*, II. *Die Reliefs und Malereien des mittleren Reiches (VII.–XVII. Dynastie ca 2475–1580 v. Chr.)*. Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 3. Heidelberg.

Kloth, Nicole
2002 *Die (auto-)biographischen Inschriften des ägyptischen Alten Reiches: Untersuchungen zu Phraseologie und Entwicklung*. Hamburg.

Klotz, David
2010 "Two Studies on the Late Period Temples at Abydos," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 110, 127–63.
2013 "The Mortuary Texts on Statue JE 38001 (K. 603)," *Göttinger Miszellen* 236, 43–49.

Knauf, Axel
1986 "Bemerkungen zum ägyptisch-semitischen Sprachvergleich," *Göttinger Miszellen* 94, 45-58.

König, Ekkehard
1997 "Zur Bedeutung der Modalpartikeln im Deutschen, ein Neuansatz im Rahmen der Relevanztheorie," *Germanistische Linguistik* 136, 57–75.

Koopman, Hilda, and Dominique Sportiche
1991 "The Position of Subjects," *Lingua* 85, 211–58.

Kouwenberg, N. J. C.
2010 *The Akkadian Verb and Its Semitic Background*. Winona Lake, IN.

Kramer, Ruth
2009 "VSO and SVO Order in Middle Egyptian," in Charles G. Häberl, ed., *Afroasiatic Studies in Memory of Robert Hetzron*: *Proceedings of the Proceedings of the 35th Annual North American Conference on Afroasiatic Linguistics* (NACAL 35; Cambridge, MA), 31–75.

Kratzer, Angelika
1996 "Severing the External Argument from Its Verb," in Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring, ed., *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 33; Dordrecht), 109–37.

2000 "Building Statives," in Lisa J. Conathan et al., ed., *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* (BLS 26; Berkeley), 385–99.

K*RI* Kenneth A. Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions, Historical and Biographical*, 8 vols. Monumenta Hannah Sheen Dedicata 1 and 3–5 (vols. 4–8). Oxford, 1975–90.

Kruchten, Jean-Marie

1982 "Convention et innovation dans un texte royal du début de l'époque ramesside: la stèle de l'an 1 de Séthi ler découverte à Beith-Shan (Musée archéologique de Jérusalem, no. 5.884)," *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 26, 21–62.

1999 "From Middle to Late Egyptian," *Lingua Aegyptia* 6, 1–97.

Kubisch, Sabine

2008 *Lebensbilder der 2. Zwischenzeit. Biographische Inschriften der 13.–17. Dynastie*. Sonderschrift des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Kairo 34. Berlin and New York.

Lacau, Pierre, and Henri Chevrier

1956–69 *Une chapelle de Sésostris Ier à Karnak*, 2 vols. Cairo.

Lambdin, Thomas O.

1958 "The Bivalence of Coptic 'Eta' and Related Problems in the Vocalization of Egyptian," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 17, 177–93.

Lambrecht, Knud

1994 *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 71. Cambridge.

Langacker, Ronald W.

1995 "Possession and possessive constructions," in John R. Taylor and Robert E. MacLaury, ed., *Language and Cognitive Construal of the World* (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 82; Oxford), 51–79.

Lapp, Günther

1997 *Catalogue of Books of the Dead in the British Museum*, I. *The Papyrus of Nu (BM EA 10477)*. London.

2004 *Catalogue of the Books of the Dead in the British Museum*, III. *The Papyrus of Nebseni (BM EA 9900)*. London.

Larson, Richard K.

1988 "On the Double Object Construction," *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335–91.

Lazard, Gilbert

1998 "De la transitivité restreinte à la transitivité généralisée," in André Rousseau, ed., *La transitivité* (Paris), 55–84.

LD Richard Lepsius, *Denkmaeler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien*, 6 vols. Berlin, 1849–59.

Leclant, Jean

1961 *Montouemhat: quatrième prophète d'Amon, Prince de la ville*. Bibliothèque d'étude 35. Cairo.

1974 "Les textes des pyramides," in Serge Sauneron, ed., *Textes et langages de l'Égypte pharaonique: cent cinquante années de recherches 1822–1972. Hommages à Jean-François Champollion*, 3 vols. (Bibliothèque d'étude 64; Cairo), II, 37–52.

Leclant, Jean, and Catherine Berger el-Naggar

2001 ed., *Les textes de la pyramide de Pépy Ier*, 2 vols. Mémoires de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale 118. Cairo.

Lefebvre, Gustave

1924 *Le tombeau de Pétosiris*. Cairo.

LES Alan H. Gardiner, *Late-Egyptian Stories*. Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 1. Brussels, 1932.

Levin, Beth, and Malka Rappaport Hovav

1995 *Unaccusativity: at the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 26. Cambridge, MA.

Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson

1976 "Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language," in Charles N. Li, ed., *Subject and Topic* (New York), 457–89.

Lichtheim, Miriam

1973 *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, I: *The Old and Middle Kingdoms*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.

Lipiński, Edward

2001 *Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar*, 2nd ed. Orientalia Lovaniensa Analecta 80. Leuven.

Longacre, Robert E.

1996 *The Grammar of Discourse*, 2nd ed. Topics in Language and Linguistics. New York.

López, Jesús

2005 *Cuentos y fabulas del Antiguo Egipto*. Pliegos de Oriente 9. Mandrid and Barcelona.

Loprieno, Antonio

1980 "Osservazioni sullo sviluppo dell'articolo propositivo in egiziano e nelle lingue semitiche," *Oriens Antiquus* 19, 1–27.

1984 "Aspekt und Diathese im Ägyptischen," in F. Junge, ed., *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*. vol. 1: *Sprache* (Göttingen), 87–102.

1986 *Das Verbalsystem im Ägyptischen und im Semitischen: zur Grundlegung einer Aspekttheorie*. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, 17. Wiesbaden.

1991 "Topics in Egyptian Negations," in Daniela Mendel and Ulrike Claudi, ed., *Ägypten im Afro-Orientalischen Kontext, Aufsätze zur Archäologie, Geschichte und Sprache eines unbegrenzten Raumes: Gedenkschrift Peter Behrens* (Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere; Cologne), 213–35.

1995 *Ancient Egyptian. A Linguistic Introduction*, Cambridge.

2006 "On fuzzy boundaries in Egyptian syntax," in Gerald Moers et al, ed., *jn.t ḏr.w: Festschrift für Friedrich Junge* (Göttingen), 429–41.

Luft, Ulrich

1992 *Das Archiv von Illahun: Briefe* I. Hieratische Papyri aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, I. Berlin.

Luraghi, Silvia

2000 "Synkretismus," in Geert E. Booij et al., ed., *Morphologie: ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung*, vol. 1 (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 17:1; Berlin and New York), 638–47.

Lutz, Henry

1927 *Egyptian Tomb Steles and Offering Stones of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnology of the University of California*. University of California Publications, Egyptian Archaeology. Leipzig.

Malaise, Michel, and Jean Winand

1999 *Grammaire raisonnée de l'égyptien classique*. Aegyptiaca Leodiensia 6. Liège.

Manassa, Colleen

2006 "The Crimes of Count Sabni Reconsidered," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 133, 151–63.

Manuelian, Peter Der
1986 "An Essay in Document Transmission: *Nj-kȝ-ʿnḫ* and the earliest *ḥrjw rnpt*," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45, 1–18.
1994 *Living in the Past: Studies in Archaism of the Egyptian Twenty-sixth Dynasty*. London and New York,
Marette, Auguste
1889 *Les mastabas de l'Ancien Empire. Fragment du dernier ouvrage d'Auguste Mariette, publié d'après le manuscrit de l'auteur par Gaston Maspero*. Paris.
Mathieu, Bernard
2004 "La distinction entre Textes des Pyramides et Textes des Sarcophages est-elle légitime?," in Susanne Bickel and Bernard Mathieu, ed., *D'un monde à l'autre: Textes des Pyramides et Textes des Sarcophages, actes de la table ronde internationale "Textes des Pyramides versus Textes des Sarcophages," IFAO 24–26 septembre 2001* (Bibliothèque d'étude 139; Cairo), 247–62.
McCloskey, James
1991 "Clause Structure, Ellipsis and Proper Government in Irish," *Lingua* 85, 259–302.
McCloskey, James, and Ken Hale
1983 "On the Syntax of Person-Number Inflection in Modern Irish," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1, 487–534.
2001 "The Distribution of Subject Properties in Irish," in William D. Davis and Stanley Dubinsky, ed., *Objects and Other Subjects: Grammatical Functions, Functional Categories, and Configurationality* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 52; Dordrecht), 157–92.
McGregor, William B., and Tamsin Wagner
2006 "The Semantics and Pragmatics of Irrealis Mood in Nyulnyulan Languages," *Oceanic Linguistics* 4:2, 339–79.
Mehuakhti Elmar Edel, Elmar. "Inschriften des Alten Reiches III: die Stele des *Mḥw-ȝḫtj* (Reisner G 2375)," *Mitteilung des Instituts für Orientforschung* 1 (1953), 327–33.
Mereruka Sakkarah Expedition. *The Mastaba of Mereruka*, 2 vols. Oriental Institute Publications 31 and 39. Chicago, 1938.
Merikare Wolfgang Helck. *Die Lehre für König Merikare*. 2 vols. Kleine Ägyptische Texte 7. Wiesbaden, 1977.
Mink, Gerd
1978 "Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft und Koptologie," in Robert McL. Wilson, ed., *The Future of Coptic Studies* (Coptic Studies I; Leiden), 71–103.
Mithun, Marianne
1995 "On the Relativity of Irreality," in Joan L. Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman, ed., *Modality in Grammar and Discourse* (Typological Studies in Language 32; Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 367–88.
Monaghan, James
1996 "Gardiner, Sir Alan Henderson," in Harro Stammerjohann, ed., *Lexicon Grammaticorum: Who's Who in the History of World Linguistics* (Tübingen), 325–27.
Montet, Pierre
1936 Les tombeaux dits de Kasr-el-Sayad," *Kêmi* 6, 81–129.
MOR Eberhard Otto, *Das ägyptische Mundöffnungsritual*, 2 vols. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 3. Wiesbaden, 1960.
Morenz, Ludwig D.
1996 *Beiträge zur Schriftlichkeitskultur im Mittleren Reich und in der 2. Zwischenzeit*. Ägypten und Altes Testament 29. Wiesbaden.
2004 *Bild-Buchstaben und symbolische Zeichen*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 205. Fribourg and Göttingen.

Moret, Alexandre
1931 "La légende d'Osiris à l'époque thébaine d'après l'hymne à Osiris du Louvre," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 30, 725–50.
Mostafa, Maha F.
1987 "Kom el-Koffar. Teil II: Datierung und historischen Interpretation des Textes B," *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 71, 170–84.
Moussa, Ahmed M., and Hartwig Altenmüller
1977 *Das Grab des Nianchchnum und Chnumhotep*. Archäologische Veröffentlichungen, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Kairo 21. Mainz.
Müller, Dieter
1972 "An Early Egyptian Guide to the Hereafter," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 58, 99–125.
Müller, Matthias
2012 Review of Borghouts, *Egyptian: an Introduction*, *Lingua Aegyptia* 20, 303–10.
Naville, Édouard
1898 *The Temple of Deir el Bahari, Part III*. Egypt Exploration Fund Memoir 16. London.
Nedjalkov, Vladimir
1988 ed., *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Translation ed. by Bernard Comrie. Typological Studies in Language 12. Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
Nedjalkov, Vladimir P., and Sergej J. Jaxontov
1988 "The Typology of Resultative Constructions," in Vladimir P. Nedjalkov, ed., *Typology of Resultative Constructions* (Typological Studies in Language 12; Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 3–62.
Neferti Wolfgang Helck, *Die Prophezeiung des Nfr.tj*, 2nd ed. Kleine Ägyptische Texte 10. Wiesbaden, 1992.
Nyord, Rune
2010 "The Radial Structure of Some Middle Egyptian Prepositions," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 137, 27–44.
Ockinga, Boyo, and Yahia el-Masry
1988 *Two Ramesside Tombs at el Mashayikh*, I: *The Tomb of Anhurmose – The Outer Room*. Sydney.
Oréal, Elsa
2005 "Diachronie protoégyptienne et comparaison afroasiatique: la particule *js* de déictique à focalisateur," in Alessandro Mengozzi, ed., *Studi afroasiatici: IX incontro italiano di linguistica camitosemitica* (Bergamo), 69–82.
2007 "Fracture d'actance et dynamique morphosyntaxique: le renouvellement du perfectif en Ancien égyptien," *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 102, 367–97.
2009 "Same Source, Different Outcomes: A Reassessment of the Parallel between Ancient Egyptian and Akkadian 'Stative' Conjugations," *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 183–200.
2010 "Traces of a Stative-Eventive Opposition in Ancient Egyptian: Rethinking Pseudoparticiple as Old Perfective," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 137, 145–56.
2011 *Les particules en égyptien ancien: de l'ancien égyptien à l'égyptien classique*. Bibliothèque d'Étude 152. Cairo.
2012 "Discourse Markers between Grammar and Lexicon: Two Ancient Egyptian Case for (De)grammaticialization," in Eitan Grossman et al., ed., *Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian* (Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 9; Hamburg), 227–45.
Osing, Jürgen
1976a *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*, 2 vols. Mainz.
1976b *Der spätägyptische Papyrus BM 10808*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 33. Wiesbaden.

1987 "Die Partizipien im Ägyptischen und in den Semitischen Sprachen," in Jürgen Osing and Günter Dreyer, ed., *Form und Mass: Beiträge zur Literatur, Sprache und Kunst des alten Ägyptens; Festschrift für Gerhard Fecht zum 65. Geburtstag am 6. Februar 1987* (Ägypten und Altes Testatement 12; Wiesbaden), 337–60.

Osing, Jürgen, et al.

1982 *Denkmäler der Oase Dachla: aus dem Nachlass von Ahmed Fakhry*. Archäologische Veröffentlichungen, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Kairo 28. Mainz.

Palmer, Frank R.

2000 *Mood and Modality*, 2nd ed. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge.

Pantalacci, Laure

1998 "La documentation épistolaire du palais des gouverneurs à Balat-'Ayn Asil," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 98, 303–15.

Parkinson, Richard B.

1991 *Voices from Ancient Egypt. An Anthology of Middle Kingdom Writings*. London.

1997 *The Tale of Sinuhe and Other Ancient Egyptian Poems 1940–1640 BC*. Oxford.

2002 *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt: a Dark Side to Perfection*. London and New York.

Peas. Richard B. Parkinson, *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant*. Oxford, 1991.

pEbers Hermann Grapow, *Grundriss der Medizin der Alten Ägypter*, V. *Die medizinische Texte in hieroglyphischer Umschreibung autographiert*. Berlin, 1958.

Perrin, Loïc-Michel

2010 "Polysemous Qualities and Universal Networks, Invariance and Diversity," *Linguistic Discovery* 8/1, 259–80.

Peters, Stanley, and Dag Westerståhl

2006 *Quantifiers in Language and Logic*. Oxford.

Petosiris Gustave Lefebvre, *Le tombeau de Pétosiris*. Cairo, 1924.

Petrie, William M. F.

1900 *Dendereh 1898*. Egypt Exploration Fund Memoir 17. London.

Peust, Carsten

1999 *Egyptian Phonology, an Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language*. Monographien zur ägyptischen Sprache 2. Göttingen.

2008 "Adjektiv und Adjektivverb im Mittelägyptischen," in Carsten Peust, ed., *Miscellanea in Honorem Wolfhart Westendorf* (Göttinger Miszellen, Beihefte 3; Göttingen), 58–82.

Pinker, Stephen

1989 *Learnability and Cognition*: *the Acquisition of Argument Structure*. Cambridge, MA.

Polis, Stéphane

2009 "Interaction entre modalité et subjectivité en néo-égyptien: autour de la construction *mrỉ* + *jw* circ. 'souhaiter que'," in Matthias Müller and Sami Uljas, ed., *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Egyptian Grammar (Crossroads IV): Basel, March 19–22, 2009* (*Lingua Aegyptia* 17; Göttingen), 201–19.

Pollock, Jean-Yves

1989 "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20, 365–424.

Polotsky, Hans J.

1929 *Zu den Inschriften der 11. Dynastie*. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens 11. Leipzig.

1944 *Études de syntaxe copte*, Cairo.

1957 "The Emphatic *sḏm.n=f* Form," *Revue d'Égyptologie* 11, 109–17.

(Polotsky, Hans J.)
1965 *Egyptian Tenses*. The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Proceedings II 5. Jerusalem.
1976 "Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique," *Israel Oriental Studies* 6, 1–50.
Posener, Georges
1978 *Catalogue des ostraca hiératiques littéraires de Deir el-Médineh*, III. Documents de Fouilles 20. Cairo.
Posener-Kriéger, Paule, and Jean-Louis de Cénival
1968 *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*, V. *The Abu Sir Papyri*. London.
Pressl, Diana A.
1993 "Zur Königsideologie der 26. Dynastie: Untersuchungen anhand der Phraseologie der Königsinschriften," *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 20, 223–54.
Pries, Andreas H.
2011 *Die Stundenwachen im Osiriskult, eine Studie zur Tradition und späten Rezeption von Ritualen im Alten Ägypten*. Studien zur spätägyptischen Religion 2. Wiesbaden.
pSmith Hermann Grapow, *Grundriss der Medizin der Alten Ägypter*, V. *Die medizinische Texte in hieroglyphischer Umschreibung autographiert*. Berlin, 1958.
PT see Pyr.
Ptahhotep Zbyněk Žába, *Les maximes de Ptaḥḥotep*. Prague, 1956.
pWestcar Aylward M. Blackman, *The Story of King Kheops and the Magicians Transcribed from Papyrus Westcar (Berlin Papyrus 3033)*, ed. by W.V. Davies. Reading, 1988.
Pyr. Kurt Sethe, *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte nach den Papierabdrücken und Photographien des Berliner Museums*, 4 vols. Leipzig, 1908–22.
Quack, Joachim F.
1996 "ꜥ*w* 'Größe' und ꜥ 'Zustand, Art': zwei verwechselbare demotische Wörter," *Enchoria* 23, 62–75.
2003 "Zum Charakter der 'zweiradikaligen' Verben des Ägyptischen," in M. Lionel Bender et al., ed., *Selected Comparative-Historical Afrasian Linguistic Studies in Memory of Igor M. Diakonoff* (LINCOM Studies in Afroasiatic Linguistics 14; Munich), 167–74.
2013 "Irrungen, Wirrungen? Forscherische Ansätze zur Datierung der älteren ägyptischen Literatur." in Gerald Moers et al., ed., *Dating Egyptian Literary Texts.* "*Dating Egyptian Literary Texts," Göttingen, 9–12 June 2010*, vol. I (Lingua Aegyptia, Studia Monographica 11; Hamburg), 405–69.
Quibell, James Edward, et al.
1898 *The Ramesseum and the Tomb of Ptah-hetep*. Egyptian Research Account 2. London.
Reiner, Erica
1966 *A Linguistic Analysis of Akkadian*. Janua Linguarum Series Practica 21. London, The Hague, and Paris.
Reinhart, Tanya
1981 "Pragmatics and Linguistics: an Analysis of Sentence Topics," *Philosophica* 27, 53–94.
Reintges, Chris H.
1993 "A Functional Reexamination of Hammamat Inscription 191:6," in Silvio Curto et al, ed., *Atti di Sesto Congresso Internazionale di Egittologia* (2 vols.; Turin), II, 437–45.
1994 "Egyptian Root-and-Pattern Morphology," *Lingua Aegyptia* 4, 213–44.
1995 "Verbal tenses in Older Egyptian: a Reichenbachian Approach," *Göttinger Miszellen* 149, 83–97.
1996 "The *sḏm–tw=f* as a Morphological Passive," *Göttinger Miszellen* 153, 79–99.
1997 *Passive Voice in Older Egyptian: a Morpho-Syntactic Study*. Holland Institute of Linguistics Dissertations 28. Den Haag.
1998 "Mapping Information Structure to Syntactic Structure: One Syntax for *jn*," *Revue d'Égyptologie* 49, 195–220.

2000 "The Licensing of Gaps and Resumptive Pronouns in Older Egyptian Relatives," in Jacqueline Lecarme et al., ed., *Research in Afroasiatic Grammar*: *Papers from the Third Conference on Afroasiatic Languages, Sophia Antipolis, France 1996* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 202; Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 243–62.

2004a *Coptic Egyptian (Sahidic Dialect): A Learner's Grammar*. (Africanist Studybooks 15). Cologne.

2004b "The Older Egyptian *śḏm(.w)=f* Passive Revisited," *Folia Orientalia* 40, 51–70.

2005a "The Correlation between Word Order Alternations, Grammatical Agreement and Event Semantics in Older Egyptian," in Katalin É. Kiss, ed., *Universal Grammar in the Reconstruction of Ancient Languages* (Studies in Generative Grammar 83; Berlin), 31–103.

2005b "On Passive Participles and Relative Forms," *Lingua Aegyptia* 13, 103–39.

2006 "The Older Egyptian Stative Revisited," *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 115–34.

2009 "Spontaneous Syntactic Change," in Paola Crisma and Giuseppe Longobardi, ed., *Historical Syntax and Linguistic Theory* (Oxford), 41–57.

2011a "The Evolution of the Ancient Egyptian Stative: Diachronic Stability besides Inflectional Change," *Folia Orientalia* 48, 7–97.

2011b "The Oral-Compositional Form of Pyramid Text Discourse," in Fredrik N. Hagen et al., ed., *Narratives of Egypt and the Ancient Near East*: *Literary and Linguistic Approaches* (Orientalia Lovaniensa Analecta 189; Louvain), 3–54.

2012 "Macroparametric Change and the Synthetic-Analytic Continuum: The Case of Ancient Egyptian," in Charlotte Galves et al., ed., *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change* (Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics 2; Oxford), 144–69.

2013 "Sapirian 'Drift' towards Analyticity and Long-term Morphosyntactic Change in Ancient Egyptian," in Ritsuko Kikusawa and Laurence A. Reid, ed., *Historical Linguistics 2011: Selected Papers from the 20th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Osaka, 25–30 July 2011* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 326; Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 289–328.

2015 "The Old and Early Middle Egyptian Stative: Morphosyntax • Semantics • Typology," in Eitan Grossman et al., ed., *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological Perspective* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 55; Berlin), 387–454.

Ritter, Elisabeth

1995 "On the Syntactic Category of Pronouns and Agreement," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13, 405–43.

Ritter, Thomas

1995 *Das Verbalsystem der königlichen und privaten Inschriften XVIII. Dynastie bis einschließlich Amenophis III*. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, 30. Wiesbaden.

Rizzi, Luigi

1982 *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Studies in Generative Grammar 11. Dordrecht.

1986 "Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *Pro*," *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 501–57.

1997 "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery," in Liliane Haegeman, ed., *Elements of Grammar*: *Handbook of Generative Syntax* (Kluwer International Handbooks of Linguistics 1; Dordrecht), 281–337.

Roberts, Ian G.

1993 *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax*: *A Comparative History of English and French*. Studies in Natural Languages and Linguistic Theory 28. Dordrecht.

Rothe, Russell D., William K. Miller, and George Rapp

2008 *Pharaonic Inscriptions from the Southeastern Desert of Egypt*. Winona Lake, IN.

Russo, Barbara
2102 "Funerary Spells at Saqqara South: Some Considerations about the Inscriptions of Anu's Coffin (Sq20X) and Their Date," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 139, 80–92.
Sandman, Maj
1938 *Texts from the Time of Akhenaten*. Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 8. Brussels.
Satzinger, Helmut
1986 "Syntax der Präpositionsadjective ('Präpositionsnisben')," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 113, 141–53.
1987 "On Tense and Aspect in Middle Egyptian," in Gertie Englund and Paul J. Frandsen, ed., *Crossroad: Chaos or the Beginning of a New Paradigm. Papers from the Conference on Egyptian grammar, Helsingør 28–30 May 1986* (Copenhagen), 297–313.
1988 "Towards Reconstructing the Tense System of Old Egyptian," in John D. Ray, ed., *Lingua sapientissima: a Seminar in Honour of H. J. Polotsky Organised by the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge and the Faculty of Oriental Studies in 1984* (Cambridge), 72–79.
1993a "'Emphase' oder die Rhematisierung eines adverbialen Komplements im Ägyptischen," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 83, 189–206.
1993b "Die Protasis *jr sḏm.f* im älteren Ägyptisch," *Lingua Aegyptia* 3, 121–35.
1999a "Koptische Vokalphoneme und ägyptische Pluralformation," in Stephen Emmel, ed., *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit: Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses Münster 20. - 26. Juli 1996* (Sprachen und Kulturen des christlichen Orients 6; Wiesbaden), II, 365–74.
1999b "Observations in the Field of the Afroasiatic Suffix Conjugation," in Marcello Lamberti and Livia Tonelli, ed., *Afroasiatica Tergestina: Papers from the 9th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics, Trieste, April 23–24, 1998* (Contributi presentati al 9^0 Incontro di linguistica afroasiatica (camito-semitica), Trieste, 23–24 aprile 1998; Padova), 23–33.
2007 "Anmerkungen zu semitischen Suffixkonjugation," in Rainer M. Voigt, ed., *"From beyond the Mediterranean:" Akten des 7. Internationalen Semitohamitistenkongresses (VII. ISHaK), Berlin 13. bis 15. September 2004* (Aachen), 493–500.
2012 "On Egyptian Participles and Nomina Agentis." *Folia Orientalia* 49, 467–76.
2013 Review of Wolfgang Schenkel, *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift* (2012), *Lingua Aegyptia* 21, 303–309.
to appear "Semitic Suffix Conjugation and Egyptian Stative: A Hypothetic Morpho-Syntactic Scenario of its Origin" (manuscript available at http://homepage.univie.ac.at/helmut.satzinger/ Texte/Stative_Sem.pdf; accessed: 20 Jan. 2013).
Säve-Söderbergh, Torgny
1994 *The Old Kingdom Cemetery at Hamra Dom (el-Qasr wa es-Saiyad)*. Stockholm.
Scharff, Alexander
1924 "Briefe aus Illahun," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 59, 20–51.
Schenkel, Wolfgang
1965a "'Singularisches' und 'pluralisches' Partizip," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 20, 110–14.
1965b *Memphis – Herakleopolis - Theben: die epigraphische Zeugnisse der 7.–11. Dynastie Ägyptens*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 12. Wiesbaden.
1965c "Beiträge zur mittelägyptischen Syntax III: Sätze mit Pseudopartizip," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 92, 47–68.
1968 "Syntagmen mit infiniten Verbalformen als Transformate von Sätzen," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 23, 167–81.

1971 "Das altägyptische Pseudopartizip und das indogermanische Medium/Perfekt," *Orientalia* 40, 301–16.

1981 "*sḏm=f* und *sḏm.w=f* als Prospektivformen," in Dwight W. Young, ed., *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky*. (East Gloucester, MA), 506–17.

1983a *Aus der Arbeit an einer Konkordanz zu den altägyptischen Sargtexten*. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, 12. Wiesbaden.

1983b *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, 13. Wiesbaden.

1985 "Zur Verbalflexion der Pyramidentexte," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 42, 481–94.

1990 *Einführung in die altägyptische Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt.

1994a "*śḏm.t*-Perfekt und *śḏm.tj*-Stativ: die beiden Pseudopartizipien des Ägyptischen nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte," in Heike Behlmer, ed., *... quaerentes Scientiam: Festgabe für Wolfhart Westendorf zu seinem 70. Geburtstag, überreicht von seinem Schülern* (Göttingen), 157–82.

1994b "Zur Formenbilding des Verbs im Neuägyptischen," *Orientalia* 63, 10–15.

1996 "Eine Konkordanz zu den Sargtexten und die Graphien der 1. Person Singular," in Harco Willems, ed., *The World of the Coffin Texts* (Egyptologische Uitgaven 9; Leuven), 115–27.

1997 *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift*. Tübingen.

1998 "Standardtheorie und invertierte Standardtheorie." *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 125, 140–60.

1999 "*ś*-Kausativa, t-Kausativa und 'innere' Kausativa: die *ś*-Kausativa der Verben I.*ś* in den Sargtexten," *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 27, 313–52.

2000a "Die Endungen des Prospektivs und des Subjunktivs (*śḏm=f*, *śḏm.w=f*, *śḏm.y=f*) nach Befunden der Sargtexte," *Lingua Aegyptia* 7, 27–112.

2000b "Die Endungen des Negativkomplements im Spiegel der Befund der Sargtexte," *Lingua Aegyptia* 7, 1–27.

2002 "Zur Formenbildung des prädikativen *sḏm=f* der Verben II.gem., vornehmlich nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte," *Göttinger Miszellen* 189, 89–98.

2004 "Das *śḏm(.w)=f*-Passiv, Perfekt vs. Futur, nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte, 1. Teil," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 131, 173–88.

2005a "Das *śḏm(.w)=f*-Passiv, Perfekt vs. Futur, nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte, 2. Teil," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 132, 40–54.

2005b "'(Sich) fernhalten' und dergleichen in den Sargtexte," in Heinz Felber, ed., *Feinde und Aufrüher Konzept von Gegnerschaft in ägyptischen Texten besonders des Mittleren Reiches* (Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Klasse 78, 5; Leipzig), 111–41.

2005c *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift*, 4th ed. Tübingen.

2006 "Von der Morphologie zur Syntax und zurück," *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 55–82.

2007a "Die Partikel *ỉw* und die Intuition des Interpreten: Randbemerkungen zu Antonio Loprieno, 'On fuzzy boundaries in Egyptian syntax'," *Lingua Aegyptia* 15, 161–201.

2007b "Zur Formenbildung des Perfekts *sḏm=f*/*rḏỉ=f* der Verben II.gem., vornehmlich nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte," *Lingua Aegyptia* 15, 203–16.

2008a "Substantiv / Selbständiges Personalpronomen + enklitisches Personalpronomen, eine grammatische Konstruktion des älteren Ägyptisch?," *Göttinger Miszellen* 217, 97–109.

2008b "Die ägyptische Nominalbildungslehre und die Realität der hieroglyphischen Graphien der Sargtexte, II: Weitere Nominalbildungsklassen mit einer Endung *-w/y/ỉ* (A II 5–10, A III 4–6 und A I 7/8/10)," *Lingua Aegyptia* 16, 153–70.

(Schenkel, Wolfgang)
2009a "Predikativisches und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*: Beobachtungen an den Verben II.gem und ult. *n* im Korpus der Sargtexte," in Gideon Goldenberg and Ariel Shisha-Halevy, ed., *Egyptian, Semitic and General Grammar: Studies in Memory of H. J. Polotsky* (Jerusalem), 40–60.
2009b "Zur Silbenstruktur des Ägyptischen," *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 259–76.
2010 "Die Clèresche Relativform," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 137, 66–90.
2011 "Merkmalloses versus pluralisches/distributives/intensives Partizip: Kritik der Ausgangsbeobachtungen," *Zeitschrift* für *Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 138, 63–78.
2012a *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift*, 5th ed. Tübingen.
2012b "Mittelägyptische Grammatik: Von den Texten zu den Texten," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 69, 13–42.
2012c "*m=k + ỉnḫ.tw=f*?," *Göttinger Miszellen* 234, 11–13.
2014 "Syntax und Sinnzusammenhang: emphatische Konstruktion, Rang-V-Erweiterung und anderes mehr," in Harold Hays et al., ed., *Interpretations of Sinuhe, Inspired by Two Passages (Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Leiden University, 27–29 November 2009)* (Egyptologische Uitgaven 27; Leuven), 81–172.
im Druck "Die Farben aus der Sicht der Alten Ägypter."
Schneider, Thomas
2007 "Contextualising the Tale of the Herdsman," in Thomas Schneider and Kasia Szpakowska, ed., *Egyptian Stories: a British Egyptological Tribute to A. B. Lloyd at the Occasion of his Retirement* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 347; Münster), 309–18.
Schultheiß, Alexander
2014 "Studien zur Semantik und Formenbildung der Nisbe im Älteren Ägyptischen." PhD dissertation, Philosophische Fakultät III, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (unpublished).
Schweitzer, Simon D.
2000 "Untersuchungen zum Wortschatz des Papyrus Westcar und Erstellung einer Liste noch im koptischen belegter Wortformen." Magister Artium thesis, Universität Münster (unpublished).
2005 *Schrift und Sprache der 4. Dynastie*. MENES 3. Wiesbaden.
Sethe, Kurt
1899 *Das aegyptische Verbum im Altaegyptischen, Neuaegyptischen und Koptischen*, 2 vols. Leipzig.
1923 "Die Vokalisation des Ägyptischen," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 77.2, 145–207.
1924 "Eine bisher unbekannte enklitische Negation im Altägyptischen," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 59, 63–64.
1928a *Dramatische Texte zu altaegyptischen Mysterienspielen*. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens 10. Leipzig.
1928b *Ägyptische Lesestücke zum Gebrauch im akademischen Unterricht*. 2nd ed. Leipzig.
1936–62 *Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den altägyptischen Pyramidentexten*, 6 vols. Hamburg.
Sh.S. Aylward M. Blackman, "The Story of the Shipwrecked Sailor," in Aylward M. Blackman, ed., *Middle Egyptian Stories* (Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 2. Brussels, 1932), 40–48.
Shisha-Halevy, Ariel
1986 "*(i)rf* in the Coffin Texts: a Functional Tableau," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 106, 641–58.
Shlonsky, Ur
1997 *Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic*: *an Essay in Comparative Semitic Syntax*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax 11. Oxford.
Siewierska, Anna
2004 *Person*. Cambridge Textbook in Linguistics. Cambridge.

Silverman, David P.
1980 *Interrogative Constructions with jn and jn-jw in Old and Middle Egyptian*. Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 1. Malibu.
1981 "Plural Demonstrative Constructions in Ancient Egyptian," *Revue d'Égyptologie* 33, 59–65.
1985 "Verbal Nominal Clauses in Middle Egyptian," in Paule Posener-Kriéger, ed., *Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mokhtar*, 2 vols. (Bibliothèque d'étude 47; Cairo), II, 269–85.
2000 "The Threat-Formula and Biographical Texts in the Tomb of Hezi at Saqqara," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 37, 1–13.
Simpson, William K.
1966 "The Letter to the Dead from the Tom of Meru (N 3737) at Nagʿ ed-Deir," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 52 (1966), 39–50.
1970 "A Late Old Kingdom Letter to the Dead from Nag' ed-Deir N 3500," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56, 58–64.
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 and Philadelphia.
1980 *Giza Mastabas*, IV. *Mastabas of the Western Cemetery, Part I: Sehemka (G 1029); Tjetu I (G 2001); Iasen (G 2196); Penmeru (G 2197); Hagy, Nefertjentet, and Herunefer (G 2352/53); Djaty, Tjetu II, and Nimesti (G 2337X, 2343, 2366)*. Boston.
Sin. Roland Koch, *Die Erzählung des Sinuhe*. Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 17. Brussels, 1990.
Sinai Alan H. Gardiner and T. Eric Peet, *The Inscriptions of Sinai*, ed. by Jaroslav Černý, 2 vols. 2nd ed. Egypt Exploration Society 45. London, 1955.
Siut Francis Ll. Griffith, *The Inscriptions of Siût and Dêr Rîfeh*. London, 1889.
Smith, Carlotta S.
1997 *The Parameter of Aspect*. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 43. Dordrecht.
Smither, Paul C.
1942 "An Old Kingdom Letter Concerning the Crimes of Count Sabni," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 28, 16–19.
1945 "The Semnah Dispatches," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 31, 3–10.
Spencer, Patricia
1984 *The Egyptian Temple: a Lexicographical Study*. London.
Sperveslage, Gunnar
2010 "Das Kongruenzverhalten von Adjektiven im Altägyptischen," *Lingua Aegyptia* 18, 217–51.
Spiegelberg, Wilhelm
1909 "Egyptian Texts," in James E. Quibell, ed., *Excavations at Saqqara (1907–1908)* (2 vols., Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 5; Cairo), I, 79–83.
Stauder, Andréas
2010 "Earlier Egyptian Verbal Morphology," unpublished MS.
2013 *Linguistic Dating of Middle Egyptian Literary Texts*. Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 12. Hamburg.
2014a *The Earlier Egyptian Passive: Voice and Perspective*. Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monogaphica 14. Hamburg.
2014b "Linguistic Dissonance in *Sinuhe*," in Harold Hays et al., ed., *Interpretations of Sinuhe, Inspired by Two Passages (Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Leiden University, 27-29 November 2009)* (Egyptologische Uitgaven 27; Leuven), 173–88.
2014c "Splitting the *sḏm.n=f*? A discussion of written forms in Coffin Texts, Part 1," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 141, 83–96.
2014d "Splitting the *sḏm.n=f*? A discussion of written forms in Coffin Texts, Part 2," *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 141, 196–209.

(Stauder, Andréas)
2014e "Interpreting written morphology: the *sḏm.n=f* in the Pyramid Texts," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 73, 253–71.
2014f "L'émulation du passé à l'ère thoutmoside: la dimension linguistique," in Susanne Bickel, ed., *Vergangenheit und Zukunft: Studien zum historischen Bewusstsein in der Thutmosidenzeit* (Aegyptiaca Helvetica 22; Basel), 77–125.
Stauder-Porchet, Julie
2008 "Une formule de la biographie éthique: traduction et commentaire," *Revue d'Égyptologie* 58, 369–80.
2009 *La préposition en égyptien de la première phase: approche sémantique*. Aegyptiaca Helvetica 21. Basel.
2011 "Les autobiographies événementielles de la Ve dynastie: premier ensemble de textes continus en Égypte," in Miroslav Bárta et al., ed., *Abusir and Saqqara in the Year 2010* (2 vols.; Prague), II, 747–66.
to appear *Les autobiographies de l'Ancien Empire égyptien: étude sur la naissance d'un genre.*
Stowell, Tim
1993 "Subject across Categories," *The Linguistic Review* 2, 285–312.
Strudwick, Nigel
2005 *Texts from the Pyramid Age*. Writings from the Ancient World 16. Atlanta.
Sybesma, Rint P. E.
2007 "Whether We Tense-agree Overtly or Not," *Linguistic Inquiry* 38, 580–87.
Tacke, Nikolaus
2013 *Das Opferritual des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches*, 2 vols. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 222. Leuven, Paris and Walpole.
Tenny, Carol
1994 *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht.
Thacker, Thomas W.
1954 *The Relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian Verbal Systems*. Oxford.
Thompson, Sandra A., Robert E. Longacre, and Shin Hwang
2007 "Adverbial clauses," in Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. II*: Complex Constructions* (Cambridge), 237–300.
TLA *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* and *Das digitalisierte Zettelarchiv* (DZA), ed. by Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin): http://aaew2.bbaw.de/tla/.
Toivonen, Ida
2000 "The Morphosyntax of Finish Possessives," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18, 579–609.
TPPI Jacques J. Clère and Jacques Vandier, *Textes de la Première Période Intermédiaire et de la XIème dynastie*. Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 10. Brussels, 1948.
Uljas, Sami
2004 "Cairo Bowl Lines 7–8," *Göttinger Miszellen,* 201, 95–104.
2007a *The Modal System of Earlier Egyptian Complement Clauses: a Study in Pragmatics in a Dead Language*. Probleme der Ägyptologie 26. Leiden and Boston.
2007b "The Earlier Egyptian Adjective Reconsidered," *Lingua Aegyptia* 15, 231–50.
2008 "Methodological Remarks on Defining 'Verb Forms' in Earlier Egyptian, with Specific Reference to the *sḏm=f* Formation," *Lingua Aegyptia* 16, 197–212.
2010 "Formally speaking. Observations on a Recent Theory of the Earlier Egyptian *sḏm.n=f*," *Lingua Aegyptia* 18, 253–61.
2011 "Syncretism and the Earlier Egyptian *sḏm=f*: Speculations on Morphological Interconnections across Paradigms," *Lingua Aegyptia* 19, 155–74.

2013 "Some Remarks on a Negated Earlier Egyptian Nominal Sentence and Related Constructions," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 99, 241–51.

Urk.

I Kurt Sethe, *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*, I. *Urkunden des Alten Reichs*. 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1933.

IV Kurt Sethe and Wolfgang Helck, *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*, IV. *Urkunden der XVIII. Dynastie*. Leipzig and Berlin, 1906–1958.

VII Kurt Sethe, *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*, VII. *Historisch-biographische Urkunden des Mittleren Reiches*, ed. by W. Erichsen. Leipzig, 1933.

van den Boorn, G. P. F.

1982 "On the Date of 'The Duties of the Vizier'," *Orientalia* 51, 369–81.

Vandekerckhove, Hans, and Renate Müller-Wollermann

2001 *Elkab* VI: *Die Felsinschriften des Wadi Hilâl*, 2 vols. Brussels.

Vandier, Jacques

1950 *Moʿalla: la tombe d'Ankhtifi et la tomb de Sébekhotep*. Bibliothèque d'étude 18. Cairo.

van Valin, Robert D., Jr.

2006 *Exploring the Syntax-Semantic Interface*. Cambridge.

Varille, Alexandre

1968 *Inscriptions concernant l'architecte Amenhotep fils de Hapou*. Bibliothèque d'étude 44. Cairo.

Vercoutter, Jean

1958 "Une épitaphe royale inédite du Sérapéum (contribution à l'histoire des Apis et Sérapéum de Memphis)," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 16, 333–45.

Vergote, Jozef

1969 "The Plural of Nouns in Egyptian and Coptic," *Orientalia* 38, 77–96.

Verhagen, Arie

2005 *Constructions of Intersubjectivity. Discourse, Syntax, and Cognition*. Oxford.

Vernus, Pascal

1978 "Littérature et autobiographie: les inscriptions de *sꜣ-mwt* surnommé *Kyky*," *Revue d'Égyptologie* 30, 115–46.

1981 "Formes 'emphatiques' en fonction non 'emphatique' dans la protase d'un système corrélatif," *Göttinger Miszellen* 43, 73–88.

1984a "Sujet + *sḏm.f* et sujet + pseudoparticipe avec les verbes de qualité: dialectique de l'aspect et de l'Aktionsart," in Friedrich Junge, ed., *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf, überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern* (2 vols.; Göttingen), I, 197–212.

1984b "Le *sḏm.n.f* des verbes de qualité: dialectique de l'aspect et de l'Aktionsart," *Revue d'Égyptologie* 35, 171–84.

1985 "Etudes de philologie et de linguistique IV: non-existence et définition du sujet: *bn* prédicatif en néo-égyptien," *Revue d'Égyptologie* 36, 153–68.

1986a "Aspect and Morphosyntactic Patterns in Middle Egyptian," in Gertie Englund and 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.

1986b "Études de Philologie et de linguistique (V)," *Revue d'Égyptologie* 37, 141–44.

1988 "L'Egypto-copte," in Jean Perrot, ed., *Les langues dans le monde ancien et moderne, troisième partie: Les langues chamito-sémitiques* (Paris), 161–206.

1990a "La structure ternaire du système des déictiques dans les Textes des Sarcophages," *Studi di Egittologia e di Antichità Puniche* 7, 27–45.

(Vernus, Pascal)

1990b *Future at Issue. Tense, Mood and Aspect in Middle Egyptian: Studies in Syntax and Semantics*. Yale Egyptological Studies 4. New Haven.

1994 "Un emploi particulier du démonstratif *nw* dans les Textes des Sarcophages," in Catherine Berger et al., ed., *Hommages à Jean Leclant* (4 vols; *Bibliothèque d'étude* 106; Cairo), IV, 411–15.

1996a "Langue littéraire et diglossie," in Antonio Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature, History and Forms* (Probleme der Ägyptologie 10; Leiden and New York), 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.

1997 *Les parties du discours: autopsie d'une théorie*. Cahiers de la Société d'égyptologie de Genève 5. Genève.

1998 "La grammaticalisation en égyptien ancien: phrase nominale et morphogenèse de l'inaccompli et du futur," *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 5, 63–83.

2000 "Situation de l'égyptien dans les langues du monde," in François-Xavier W. Fauvelle-Aymar et al., ed., *Afrocentrisme: l'histoire des Africains entre Égypte et Amérique* (Paris), 169–208.

2001 "Le nom d'action et étymologique comme modificateur du verbe: une construction égyptienne proche du *maf'ūl muṭlaq*," in Josep Cervelló Autuori and Alberto J. Quevedo Álvarez, ed., *Ir a buscar leña: estudios dedicados al Prof. Jesús López* (Aula Aegyptiaca Studia 2; Barcelona), 193–202.

2003 "La piété personnelle à Deir el-Médineh: la construction de l'idée de pardon," in Guillemette Andreu, ed., *Deir el-Médineh et la Vallée des Rois: la vie en Egypte au temps des pharaons du Nouvel Empire. Actes du colloque organisé par le Musée du Louvre, les 3 et 4 mai 2002* (Paris), 309–47.

2004 "Le syntagme de quantification en égyptien de la première phase: sur les relations entre Textes des Pyramides et Textes des Sarcophages," in Susanne Bickel and Bernard Mathieu, ed., *D'un monde à l'autre: Textes des Pyramides et Textes des Sarcophages, actes de la table ronde internationale "Textes des Pyramides versus Textes des Sarcophages," IFAO 24–26 septembre 2001* (Bibliothèque d'étude 139; Cairo), 279–311.

2006 "Pronoms interrogatifs en égyptien de la première phase," *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 145–78.

2009 "Le préformant *n* et la détransitivité Formation $nC_1C_2C_1C_2$ versus $C_1C_2C_1C_2$: à propos de la racine √*gm* 'notion de trituration'," *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 291–317

2009–10 "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 C. Moreno García, ed., *Élites et pouvoir en Égypte ancienne: actes du colloque Université Charles-de-Gaulle – Lille 3, 7 et 8 juillet 2006* (*Cahier de Recherches de l'Institut de Papyrologie et d'Égyptologie de Lille* 28; Lille), 67–116.

2010a "Du moyen égyptien au néo-égyptien, de *m* à *m-jr*: l'auxiliation de l'impératif négatif à la dix-huitième dynastie," in Zahi Hawass and Jennifer H. Wegner, ed., *Million of Jubilees: Studies in Honor of David P. Silverman* (2 vols.; Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, Supplément 39; Cairo), II, 315–35.

2010b *Sagesses de l'Égypte pharaonique*, 2nd ed. Paris.

2010–11 "'Littérature,' 'littéraire' et supports d'écriture: contribution à une théorie de la littérature dans l'Égypte pharaonique," *Egyptian and Egyptological Documents, Archives, Libraries* 2, 19–145.

2012 "Le verbe *gm(j)*: essai de sémantique lexicale," in Stéphane Polis and Jean Winand, ed., *Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian* (Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 9; Hamburg), 387–438.

2013a "The 'Royal Command' (*wḏ-nsw*): a Basic Deed of Executive Power," in Juan C. Moreno García, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Administration* (Handbuch der Orientalistik I, 104; Leiden and Boston), 259–340.

2013b "L'acte fondamental du pouvoir dans l'Égypte pharaonique: l''ordre royal' (*oudj nesou*)," in Silvia Bussi, ed., *Egitto dai Faraoni agli Arabi: atti del convegno Egitto: amministrazione, economia, società, cultura dai faraoni agli arabi, Milano, Università degli studi, 7–9 gennaio 2013* (Pisa and Rome), 21–35.

2013c "La datation de l'*Enseignement d'Aménemopé*: le littéraire et le linguistique," in Gerald Moers et al., ed., *Dating Egyptian Literary Texts*. "*Dating Egyptian Literary Texts," Göttingen, 9–12 June 2010*, vol. I (Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 11; Hamburg), 191–236.

2014 "Élaboration littéraire et affectation archaïsante: comment Sinohé sait se mettre en avant en se mettant à l'écart," in Harold M. Hays et al., ed., *Interpretations of Sinuhe: Inspired by Two Passages (Proceedings of a Workshop held at Leiden University, 27–29 November 2009)* (Egyptologische Uitgaven 27; Louvain), 189–213.

to appear a "Autobiographie et scènes dites 'de la vie quotidienne': de la parodie à la fiction du paysan prototypique," in Philippe Collombert, ed., *Cinquantenaire de la Mission Archéologique Française de Saqqara*.

to appear b "Modelling the Relationship between Reproduction and Production of 'Sacralized' Texts in Pharaonic Egypt," in Todd Gillen, ed., *Tradition and Innovation*.

von Deines, Hildegard

1954 "Die Demonstrativa im Wundenbuch des Pap. Edwin Smith," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 2, 1–29.

Vycichl, Werner

1955 "Gab es eine Pluralendung -*w* im Ägyptischen?," *Zeitschriften der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 105 = NF 30, 261–70.

1990 *La vocalisation de la langue égyptienne*, I: *La phonétique*. Bibliothèque d'étude 16. Cairo.

Wälchli, Bernhard, and Michael Cysouw

2012 "Lexical Typology through Similarity Semantics: Toward a Semantic Map of Motion Verbs," *Linguistics* 50, 671–710.

Wb. Adolf Erman and Hermann Grapow, ed. *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache im Auftrage der deutschen Akademien*, 9 vols. Berlin, 1971.

Walenta, Edeltraud

1998 "Das Pseudopartizip der Sargtexte als Perfekt und Stativ." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Vienna (unpublished).

Wente, Edward F.

1975–76 "A Misplaced Letter to the Dead," *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 6–7, 595–600.

1990 *Letters from Ancient Egypt*. Writings from the Ancient World 1. Atlanta.

Werning, Daniel

2007 Table "Transkriptionssysteme wichtiger ägyptologischer Werke" in "Ägyptische Hieroglyphen," "Wikipedia, Die freie Enzyklopädie" http://de.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Ägyptische_Hieroglyphen &oldid=33311049 (18. June 2007, 14:00 UTC; accessed: 27 Jan. 2013).

2008a "Aenigmatische Schreibungen in Unterweltsbüchern des Neuen Reiches: gesicherte Entsprechungen und Ersetzungsprinzipien," in Carsten Peust, ed., *Miscellanea in honorem Wolfhart Westendorf* (Göttingen), 124–52.

2008b "Aspect vs. Relative Tense, and the Typological Classification of the Ancient Egyptian *sḏm.n=f*," *Lingua Aegyptia* 16, 261–92.

2011 *Das Höhlenbuch: textkritische Edition und Textgrammatik*, 2 vols. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, 48. Wiesbaden.

2012 "Ancient Egyptian Prepositions for the Expression of Spatial Relations and Their Translations, a Typological Approach," in Eitan Grossman et al., ed., *Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian* (Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 9; Hamburg), 293–346.

(Werning, Daniel)
2013 "Linguistic Dating of the Netherworld Books Attested in the New Kingdom," in Gerald Moers et al., ed., *Dating Egyptian Literary Texts*. "*Dating Egyptian Literary Texts," Göttingen, 9–12 June 2010*, vol. I (Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 11; Hamburg), 237–81.
2014 "Uninflected Relative Verb Forms as Converbs and Verbal Rhemes: the Two Schemes of the Emphatic Construction as a Detached Adjectival Phrase Construction and as a Truncated Balanced Sentence," in Eitan Grossman et al., ed., *On Forms and Functions in Ancient Egyptian: Studies in Ancient Egyptian Grammar* (Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 15; Hamburg), 309–38.
Westendorf, Wolfhart
1953 "Dynamischer Gebrauch des passivisch-intransitiven Pseudopartizips," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 1, 38–56.
Wierzbicka, Anna
1996 *Semantics. Primes and Universals*. Oxford.
Wild, Henri
1953 *Le tombeau de Ti*, II: *la chapelle (première partie)*. Mémoires de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale 65, 2. Cairo.
Willems, Harco
1990 "Crime, Cult and Capital Punishment (Moʿalla Inscription 8)," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 76, 27–54.
Willis, David, Christopher Lucas, and Anne Breitbarth
2013 "Comparing Diachronies of Negation," in David Willis et al., ed., *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*, I: *Case Studies* (Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics 5; Oxford), 1–50.
Winand, Jean
1991 "'*Iy* et *ỉw*: unité morphologique et sémantique," *Lingua Aegyptia* 1, 357–88.
1992 *Études de néo-égyptien* 1: *La morphologie verbale*. Ægyptiaca Leodiensia 2. Liege.
1998 "Prolégomènes à une théorie unifiée de la temporalité en égyptien," in Christopher J. Eyre, ed., *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Egyptologists* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 82; Leuven), 1235–45.
1999 "Un dictionnaire des verbes néo-égyptiens," in Stefan Grunert and Ingelore Hagemann, ed., *Textcorpus und Wörterbuch: Aspekte zur ägyptischen Lexikographie* (Probleme der Ägyptologie 14; Leiden, Boston, and Köln, 1999), 136–49.
2000 "La progression au sein de la narration en égyptien: éléments d'une grammaire du texte," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 100, 403–35.
2003 "A Dictionary between Lexicon and Grammar: Interplay of Verbal Aktionsart and Grammatical Aspects," in Ingelore Hafemann, ed., *Wege zu einem digitalem Corpus Ägyptischer Texte: Akten der Tagung 'Datenbanken im Verbund' (Berlin, 30. September – 2. Oktober 1999)* (Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae 2; Berlin), 252–70.
2004 "La non-expression de l'objet direct en égyptien ancien: études valentielles, I," *Lingua Aegyptia*, 12, 205-234.
2006a *Temps et aspect: une approche sémantique*. Probleme der Ägyptologie 25. Leiden and Boston.
2006b "A Semantic Approach to the Egyptian Language: the Case of Time and Aspect. Towards a New Paradigm," *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 451–472.
2007 "Les formes nominalisées en égyptien ancien," *Faits de langue* 30, 69–82.
2013 *Les hiéroglyphes égyptiens*. Que sais-je? Paris.
2015 "Direct Object Marking (DOM) in Ancient Egyptian," in Eitan Grossman et al., ed., *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological Perspective* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 55; Berlin), 533–60.

Woods, Christopher
2008 *The Grammar of Perspective: the Sumerian Conjugation Prefixes as a System of Voice*. Cuneiform Monographs 32. Leiden and Boston.
Wright, William
1967 *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, 3rd ed. Cambridge.
Wüthrich, Annik
2009 "Abracadabras méroïtiques dans le Livre des Morts?," in Burkhard Backes et al., ed., *Ausgestattet mit den Schriften des Thot: Festschrift für Irmtraut Munro zu ihrem 65. Geburtstag* (Studien zum Altägyptischen Totenbuch 14;Wiesbaden), 267–82.
Zakrzewska, Ewa D
1990 "Syntactic Characteristics of the Old Perfective in the Coffin Texts," *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 47, 123–45.
Zanuttini, Raffaella
1997 *Negation and Clausal Structure*: *a Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford.
Zeidler, Jürgen
1992 Review of Karel Petráček, *Vergleichende Studien*, *Lingua Aegyptia* 2, 189–222.
1999 *Pfortenbuchstudien*, 2 vols. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, 36. Wiesbaden.
Zonhoven, Louis
1996 "Studies on the *sḏm.t=f* Verb Form in Classical Egyptian I: the Construction *ḏr sḏm.t=f*," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 3, 614–43.
1997a "Studies on the *sḏm.t=f* Verb Form in Classical Egyptian II: the Active *r sḏm.t=f* Construction," *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 28, 5–31.
1997b "Studies on the *sḏm.t=f* Verb Form in Classical Egyptian III: the Active *n sḏm.t=f* Construction," in Jcabus van Dijk, ed., *Essays on Ancient Egypt in Honour of Herman Te Velde* (Egyptological Memoirs 1; Groeningen), 383–400.