



## Review: Papyrus Vandier Recto: An Early Demotic Literary Text?

Reviewed Work(s):

*Le Papyrus Vandier* by Georges Posener  
Ariel Shisha-Halevy

*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 109, No. 3. (Jul. - Sep., 1989), pp. 421-435.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0279%28198907%2F09%29109%3A3%3C421%3APVRAED%3E2.0.CO%3B2-G>

*Journal of the American Oriental Society* is currently published by American Oriental Society.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/aos.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEW ARTICLE

# PAPYRUS VANDIER *RECTO*: AN EARLY DEMOTIC LITERARY TEXT?\*

ARIEL SHISHA-HALEVY

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM

In a review article of the first edition of the Hieratic text in *P. Vandier*, an attempt is made to locate the linguistic usage of the story on the *recto* in Egyptian diachrony. Taken as a corpus consistently and coherently representing an *état de langue*, the text is systematically scanned for grammatical features and feature clusters as cumulative indications of affinity with Late Egyptian or alternatively Demotic. The Hieratic script notwithstanding, the linguistic picture observed—remarkably rich and varied—is that of an Early Demotic linguistic system, strikingly similar to that of P. Rylands IX. The evidence points insistently to Demotic (or post-LE) typology, while presenting virtually no unambiguous evidence of Late Egyptian grammatical associations.

The narrative and dialogue tense systems are discussed, structurally and contrastively. In the former, the quintessentially LE text-grammatical opposition between the perfectic-reporting *sdm.f* and narrating *iw.f (hr) sdm* is drastically reduced in *P. Vandier*, the narrative *sdm.f* being (as in Demotic) functionally extended, as the main-narrative-carrying tense, to intransitive as well as transitive verb lexemes. Also studied below in some detail are the conversion systems (the Second Tense, functioning as converter, probably differentiated into durative [present] and non-durative); features of noun and pronoun syntax (in particular determination system, inclusion and nominalization, nominal sentence patterning). Lexical and phraseological phenomena are briefly observed.

The syntax of *ptr s* in our text is examined, with a suggested homonymy of presentative “*ptr s* + circumstantial” with interrogative “*ptr s* + Second Tense,” a rhetorical-question boundary marking (the latter combining the old *ptr sw* “what is it?,” with *sw* the grammatical theme, and the later presentative *ptr sw* “behold (it),” with *s* formal cataphoric object).

*For Dinah and Edward Ullendorff, dear friends*

### 0. Preliminary

#### 0.1 The edition of *P. Vandier*

FOLLOWING AN INTRODUCTION (pp. 1–3), we find a palaeographical and papyrological description (4–12), a brief account of language, orthography and style (12–15), a rather more leisurely historical and literary-textual analysis (15–38). The text itself (39–97) is subdivided, each section followed by textual notes, a transliteration, translation and a philological commentary. A concordance (of proper names and lexical items) concludes the treatment of the *recto*; a trans-

literation of the *verso*—yet another instance of the Book of the Dead, chapter 17—closes the book. Students of Egyptian will stand in the author’s debt for an elegant and thoughtful definitive *editio princeps* of a fascinating text, the importance of which for Egyptian grammar will grow on us as we know more about the linguistic usage of what is probably the most complicated period in its history. This edition is a splendid palaeographical and philological achievement: rich in suggestions, admirably lucid, comprehensively documented, offering illuminating detail. It is now happily no longer true that “la basse époque pré-ptolémaïque ne nous a livré aucune oeuvre littéraire au sens stricte du mot” (de Meulenaere, in *Textes et langages de l’Égypte pharaonique: Hommage . . . Champollion*, cinquième partie [IFAO, 1973], 142). In the present age of metalinguistic models, generative and glottogonic fashions in Egyptology, one is thankful to be handed a delicious *testo di lingua* such as *P. Vandier*, granting a comprehensive (if concise) view

\* Review article of *Le Papyrus Vandier*. By GEORGES POSENER. Cairo: INSTITUT FRANÇAIS D’ARCHÉOLOGIE ORIENTALE, 1985. Pp. v + 105, 20 pls. Abbreviated throughout as *P. Vandier*.

of a language system which is otherwise scantily documented. One may wistfully reflect on the data lost in the lost parts of the MS (from p. 6 on, it becomes extremely fragmentary), or guess at its original extent; but even so, it is remarkably rich and varied.

While Posener's observations on grammar are by and large *obiter dicta*, a linguist may find reason to complain that the index ignores important grammemes such as the *nota relationis*, the article and personal pronouns (while including possessive pronouns and articles and demonstrative pronouns), *iw-* (while including *nty-*), uncompound prepositions, etc.; or to regret some inaccuracies in it, e.g., under *iry* "dans *iry.f*" (5.13), emphatic *i.ir-* (not 1.8, not fgt. 17); *nb* "adj." (not 10xy, 15), *di* "dans *dy.f*" (not 4.17). Certain renderings and textual or grammatical interpretations seem objectionable: several of them are challenged below.

## 0.2 Problemstellung

(a) As I have a special interest in the theory of diachronic delimitation, both in general linguistic theory and in the particular evolution of Egyptian, I propose here to scan and to evaluate grammatical highlights of this text, subsystems and isolated phenomena, both as a "Spezialgrammatik" sketch and as support for a decision to define the text as "LE" or "Demotic." This, I admit, is in a sense a non-problem, or will at least take on a new meaning once we transcend the implicit equations, based on an almost subconscious yet unwarranted assumption of the primacy of the written over the spoken language, of "Demotic" = "written in the Demotic Script," "LE" = "written in the Hieratic script." I mean to subject phenomena of its grammar to a first examination, relating them to comparabilia in bordering phases of Egyptian and appraising the overall impression gained on this basis. True, this is still done in a binary model: "LE" vs. "Demotic-Coptic," yet with reference to diasystems, not to divisions in any reality. This question is more urgent and less straightforward than it seems. The arbitrariness of absolute abstractions (paradoxically, like the very synchronic concept of "language" as absolute in space) is even more unsound in diachrony, where the synchronic social-norm definition is absent; the Saussurean dualities must be replaced by the diasystemic reality. The more microscopic and clear our insight into the grammatical systems, the greater the assurance we gain that there is no deep cleft (diachronic models and evolution scenarios notwithstanding), either between ME and LE (see Junge 1981), or between LE and Demotic.

Demotic itself has a documentation depth of a millennium and many diasystems, progressing towards that degree of analytic morphological categorization which Griffith considered the acme of expressive "precision" in the whole history of Egyptian (*Encycl. Britannica*<sup>11</sup> [1910], IX: 61b: "the best stage of Egyptian speech was that which immediately preceded Coptic." Many of the failings Griffith attributes to Coptic stem, I believe, from the primacy given in typological considerations to the verbal system, from the mainly Sahidic impression he had of this language and probably from an imperfect understanding of its workings): not unjustifiably, if one considers both the oppositions regularly expressed—preterite vs. perfect, present-based vs. "third" future and the analytic causative (*my iiri.f sdm*), to consider but the tense system—and the complexity of the combined (double and even triple) conversion system, unparalleled before in Demotic or thereafter in Coptic. Indeed, the typological differentiation (between the two "edges") of Demotic is, if anything, more striking than within the evolution of LE (see Griffith 1909, 181f.), although the diglossia of synchronic diasystems is (at least in the present state of our knowledge) less pronounced in Demotic. Moreover, the early limit of Demotic is obscure, the evidence for Early Demotic being as yet very patchy (Vleeming 1981; on the history of Demotic, see also Quecke 1979, 440f.). In addition to the relatively very poor documentation of "Early Demotic" (P. Rylands IX in Griffith's awe-inspiring treatment is virtually the only extensive source we have, in comparison with the copious literature in Roman Demotic), we have the system attested in texts of the "Abnormal (transitional) Hieratic" script (some impressions of grammatical difference between Abn. Hier. and Demotic sources: the retention in the former of topicalizing *ir-*, of passive-marking *.tw*; sporadic omission of the post-negation *. . in*). Needless to say, LE too must be scanned for "Demoticisms" in a manner similar to and with consideration of Kroeber's study of LE features in ME (Kroeber 1970: it is here, after all, that we witness the earliest traces of the *m/n* morphophonemic /graphemic variation, of the circumstantial converter, preterital *sdm.f*, analytical morphology, and so on).

While our aim, then, is not "dating" the text (as in Groll 1982, where "synchronic irregularity is used in the framework of diachronic grammar for the purpose of dating undated texts"), but rather the confronting of contrastively phrased, synchronic, corpus-based grammars to achieve a relative chronology picture; and although, as suggested, the construction of a diachronic model is surely less pressing than the

confronting of synchronic systems, it is nonetheless obvious that at least a component of the problem still lies in the "seam" (or comparable multi-dimensional node of tension) between ad- or conjoining linguistic systems. In the period under discussion, this is fraught with special difficulty, the situation complicated by the very problematic interrelationship and interdependence models of spoken vs. written language, and of course the existence of "Abn. Hieratic" and what Stricker called "Klassiek-egyptische Schrijftaal."

(b) According to Posener (pp. 12, 13), the language of *P. Vandier* is "néo-égyptien évolué," "proche du démotique," yet belongs to "un stade qui le précède. Elle occupe une position intermédiaire entre le néo-égyptien et le démotique." I would take issue with this view, and believe our text is Early Demotic, with a grammatical system close to that of Rylands IX. (It is significant that Posener himself draws heavily on Demotic-Coptic, much more than on LE, for his commentaries.) Although without a precise and comprehensive contrastive set of LE: Dem. grammatical statements, no real validity can be claimed for the diachronic identification of our text, the evidence in the aggregate points insistently to a Demotic system, and one is hard put to refer to any feature in *P. Vandier* that is not shared by Early Demotic, while many or most are exclusively Demotic. (Thematically, many motives in our story [which could aptly be called "Merire's Adventures in the Netherworld"], while familiar in general folk literature, connect our story with Demotic "Magician's Adventures." To name a few: the Dantesque "guided tourism" of the Underworld, the magician's ordeal as condition for re-ascending to the world of the living [cf. the game of draughts episode in the story of Setne], the magician shaping a helping-messenger "Golem" and giving it life [see Smith-Tait 1983, Text 4 & p. 150f.], the grateful creature granted life by the imprisoned magician helping him in his plight (cf. perhaps the birds, "dī.k ḥḥ.w," in the Jar-text fragments; also *P. Heidelberg* 736).

## 1. The tense system

### 1.1 Tenses in narrative

In the narrative and report tense system I see the most important typologically distinctive significant syndrome for phasing Egyptian diachrony. In this respect, our corpus presents a picture that is not LE but Demotic-Coptic:

main-narrative carrier:	affirmative	<i>sdm.f</i>
	negative	<i>bn-p.f sdm</i>

("festive") framing-in act: (god/king/protagonist actors)	affirmative	<i>sdm.in.f</i>
	negative	(wanting)

subnarrative carrier:	affirmative	<i>iw.f sdm</i>
	negative	(unattested)

background & framework		
information carrier:	affirmative	(wanting)
	negative	<i>bw-ir.f sdm</i>
	affirmative	"Adjective Verbs"
	negative	(wanting?)

narrative opening (backgrounding): circ. present

(a) One cannot but agree with Stricker (1944, 35) who sees the *sdm.f* as the "core question" of Demotic—it is of course the "core issue" of any phase of Egyptian—in the special sense that the narrative *sdm.f* is a major, if not the main diachronically distinctive trait of the language, the keynote or natural centerpiece in the tense system. In *P. Vandier*, the narrative (and, significantly, reporting [4.16]) *sdm.f* is of a value altogether different from that of the LE reporting one. It is in *P. Vandier* free of the very old (Early ME: Doret 1986, 22, 24ff., 117) restriction to transitive verbs; the lexeme constituency in *P. Vandier* includes *dī, dd, šm, ḥc, ph, rmi, hpr, mdw, nw, iri*. The early ME version of this differentiation—*iw sdm.n.i* vs. *iw.i pr.kwi*—is a "present perfect" temporal category; in LE the connection with the present was lost. In Demotic, through Coptic, we still find this sensitivity retained by the opposition in the present tense of infinitive vs. stative, which is neutralized for intransitives. (Unfortunately, we have no way of checking in *P. Vandier* the alternation properties of *iy* "come": in Early and Ptolemaic Dem. narrative/report, it occurs in the present as a stative (Griffith 1909, 218 n. 6, 221 n. 14, Ryl. IX 1/1, 2/5), Thompson 1934, Vo 4/4, Setne 4/19, 5/35; but in Roman Dem. graffiti, we encounter reporting *iw.i* (Griffith 1937, Ph. 416); cf. Wente 1959, 117ff., 142. The "flatness" of our narrative (Posener, 15) is, I believe, nothing but its post-LE, early Demotic nature; we see lost the junctural refinement of the narrative texture due to the drastic restriction of the narrative *iw.f (hr) sdm*; the opposition of reporting vs. narrative past is cancelled; that of the morphologically regular "perfect" (i.e., present-situation-relevant past tense) and "(narrative) preterite" was to emerge relatively late in Demotic (*wḥ.f sdm* vs. *sdm.f*). No narrative-texture imperfect (*wn.f sdm*), slow-shifting the narrative pacing or

backgrounding is as yet in evidence, although in our text it is possibly the aorist that is so used.

(b) The “narrative” *iw.f hr sdm* is restricted in *P. Vandier* to a subnarrative role, in which it is sublinked to a *sdm.f* main-narrative carrier in a textologically close juncture that recalls the Coptic “*afsôtm afsôtm . . .*” texture (1.12 *dît Pr-<sup>3</sup> <sup>3</sup>s.w r Mri-R<sup>c</sup> iw.f iw r-hry*, 4.14 *h<sup>c</sup>.s . . . iw.s iy r-hry*). This role is paralleled in Demotic, in a non-durative non-future *iw.f sdm* form, hitherto unnoticed or underappreciated. Consider at least some of Parker’s Ryl. IX exx. (Parker 1961, 185)—3/3f. *i.îr.i r r w<sup>c</sup> tgs . . . iw(.i) iy*, 3/5f. *S. p<sup>3</sup>-î.îr-swn-n iw(.i) d<sup>d</sup> n.f n<sup>3</sup>-mdt . . .*, perhaps also 24/12f. (p. 187); or Griffith 1937 Ph. 416.10 *wh.n dît s grt r-d<sup>d</sup>.w iw.n îr.w n-w<sup>c</sup> kbh n-nb* “We added another to them, and made them into a golden ewer”; *ibid.*, line 15f. *in.f ky-wšb 1.t n-nb iw.f îr n-lytrt 3.t îrm ky-lytrt 3.t iw.f îr.w n-shipt n-nb* “He brought also one golden cup constituting 3 pounds and another 3 pounds and made them into a golden censer.” (Note in the last example the circumstantial *iw.f îr n-* with a masculine resumption of a zero article determining a “feminine” noun, a phenomenon well attested in Coptic; also the contrast of the narrative tenses: *wšh.n* in 1st-person report, *sdm.f* in third-person narrative, *iw.f sdm* in subnarrative); Lichtheim 1952, No. 156 (DM 1456) *šp.i d<sup>r</sup>t P<sup>3</sup>-šr-Mn s<sup>3</sup> P<sup>3</sup>-Hr p<sup>3</sup>y.k sn hr h<sup>d</sup> 23 iw.w in n.i p<sup>3</sup>-sb<sup>3</sup> n-t<sup>3</sup>-šbt n-îm.f* “I have been surety for P., the son of P., your brother, for 23 silver pieces, and they brought me the door in payment thereof.”

(c) The aorist, negative, is never independent in our text: it is always either circumstantial (adnominal, adverbial) or connected by means of *hr-* to the preceding context (see below, on the circ. neg. aorist). In function, it seems to resemble the imperfect in later Demotic and in Coptic: it supplies extra-narrative background information. This role is attested in Demotic (Ryl. IX 3/7 circ., Setne 4/3, 4/21, Canop. 3/10, Myth. 16/17 conv.; Spiegelberg parr. 132, 206).

In 4.5 and 4.6 we have verb forms (*hw-*, *šy-*) which Posener takes to be “aoristic” or “present” *sdm.f*. I doubt this; the references he quotes from LE and Demotic (Groll, *Israel Oriental Studies* 4:12f., O. Gardiner 25; Spiegelberg, par. 122) are inconclusive or irrelevant, since all are open to a prospective, perfect or preterito-present interpretation (so for instance *mr.f* in Demotic, or *kb n.f t<sup>3</sup>-pt* in O. Gard. 25).

(d) *d<sup>d</sup>. in.f* with a limited (Merire, Hathor and “The Great God”) actor constituency (similar in ME, Doret 1986, 113) but also a remarkable text distribution: all seven occurrences between 3.8 and 4.12; I cannot

correlate this stretch to any episodal peculiarity. This very old paragraph boundary marker is well attested in Ptolemaic (Junker, *Grammatik der Denderatexte*, 105f., characterizes it as “feierlich”), in the “Stelae” of Ryl. IX, in *P. Louvre* 3129 and elsewhere.

(e) The Adjective Verbs (1.1.3) are an unmistakable symptom of post-LE Egyptian. They all occur in *P. Vandier* in the adnominal circumstantial, in the background texture; this again calls for comparison with the text *P. Louvre* 3129, in which we find the three Adjective Verbs *n<sup>3</sup>-<sup>c</sup>n-*, *n<sup>3</sup>-š<sup>3</sup>-*, *n<sup>3</sup>-<sup>c</sup>z-*, in their determined relative conversion (*p<sup>3</sup>-nty-*, translating ME adjectives: I 39.45, J 43). *P. Louvre* 3129 recalls our text in more than one respect, for instance the Demotic-type narrative *sdm.f* coexisting with the “traditional” *sdm.in.f* (B36) and with the “continuative” *iw.f sdm* restricted to subnarrative (J9); *ptr s* + Second Tense in a rhetorical question (B6); the “Demotic” orthography (*bn-p.f sdm*, *r-* for the circumstantial and relative prefix, etc.).

## 1.2 Tenses in dialogue

### 1.2.1 The tense forms occurring in *P. Vandier* in dialogue:

	affirmative	negative
Present	[" <i>twi-INF.</i> "] [" <i>twi-STATIVE</i> "] (2.4) [" <i>twi-ADV.</i> "]	(unattested) (unattested) (unattested)
	(conversions: circumstantial, 1.9f., 2.12, 3.8; relative, 1.12, 2.4.5.7; 15, 3.1.8.9; Second Tense, see below; preterite, 1.2.11, 2.12)	
Future	" <i>iw.i (r)- INF.</i> " " <i>iw rh N - INF.</i> "	" <i>bn-iw.i-INF.</i> "
	(conversions: circumstantial, 1.9f., 2.12:3.8; relative, 1.12, 2.4.5.7.15, 3.1.8.9; preterite, 1.2.11, 2.12)	
Past (+ Pres. Perfect)	[" <i>sdm.i</i> "]	[" <i>bn-p.i sdm</i> "]
	(conversions: circumstantial, 1.8.9, 2.2)	
Modal-con- secutive ("prospective")	"(. . .) <i>sdm.i</i> "	(wanting)
Aorist	[" <i>hr sdm.t</i> "]	(unattested)
	(conversion: circumstantial, 4.10)	
"Until"	" <i>št.f sdm</i> " (5.9)	(unattested)
Conjunctive	" <i>mtw.f sdm</i> "	" <i>mtw.f tm sdm</i> "

## (a) Present:

(1) The one occurrence of unconverted present (stative predicate) in *P. Vandier*, 2.4 *twk n'ti r-* "you are about to . . .", is in fact an early instance of the present-based future fully developed only in Roman Demotic (Johnson 1976, 94ff.).

(2) The "-k suffix" stative is, in *P. Vandier* as in Ryl. IX Demotic (5/20, 10/13.17, 13/13, etc.) restricted to the 1st person singular—not so in later Demotic (Spiegelberg, par. 96ff., Johnson 1976, 21f.).

(3) The "Stern-Jernstedt-Parker rule" (Johnson 1976, 55ff.) obtains in *P. Vandier*: 2.9, 3.5, 9xy.16 (Posener, pp. 53, 86) in the very verb (*wh<sup>3</sup>*) exempt from this rule in Coptic (cf. Ryl. IX 12/15.19; *mr* is the Demotic structural correspondent in this regard: Parker 1961, 184). In 7x.11 the mediate direct object apparently occurs in the Second Present: *i.īr.i k̄d n t<sup>3</sup>-hryt*.

## (b) Future:

(1) In the affirmative future, the infixed -r- varies with -nil- (at least, I have not been able to establish the environmental conditions of an allomorphic alternation). This situation obtains in Demotic. (I cannot confirm Hughes's impression of a tendency for -r- in the relative future, Hughes 1952, 42 kk).

(2) The relative, circumstantial and preterite (even circ. preterite) future conversion forms are well attested in Demotic (Johnson 1976, 153ff.); see below on the circumstantial *iw-* zeroed before the future.

(3) On the prenominal placement of -rh- "be able" see below, 3.3.2.

(c) Past: only circumstantial (adnominal and adclausal, "not having . . ."); the relative and Second Tense conversions are, as in Demotic, supplied by the analytic *i.īr-*, on which see below.

(d) The modal ("prospective") *s̄dm.f* form occurs frequently in our text, expressing wish ("optative": 3rd person, 1.12.13.14, 3.14, 4.14.15), deliberation (1st person, 4.13) or the desirable-result post-imperative "apodosis" (1st person, 2.9, 3.5.12); the last role is precisely that of the *dī.i/ta-* component of the post-LE "*tarefsōtm*" category (Johnson 1976, 227ff.). The form (neither convertible nor negated) and these roles are firmly established in Demotic (Johnson 1976, 218ff.; 270ff.), with Quecke's observations (Quecke 1979, 443f.).

(e) The circumstantial aorist: see below, under the circumstantial conversion.

(f) "Until" has in *P. Vandier* the historically early "original" Demotic form, that occurring in Ryl. IX: *š'et.f s̄dm* (also a rarer variant in LE, e.g., Wen. 2.66), without the secondary, i.e., non-historical nasal and

the supposed association with the conjunctive. (Incidentally, *šatef-* is the Bohairic form in Coptic, vs. the conjunctive *ntef-*, and, as a matter of fact, in no Coptic dialect is the "until . . ." base morphologically associated with the conjunctive.)

(g) The conjunctive (2.8, in prophetic prediction; 10xy left 16).

## 1.3 The imperative

(a) We encounter in *P. Vandier* the *i*-prefix vs.  $\emptyset$ -marking morphology in a verb constituency no different from, and not exceeding that, documented in Demotic-Coptic: *iḏd* (3.8, 4.2.4), *inw* (9xy.16), but *w<sup>3</sup>* (3.14); neg. *m-īr* . . . (3.14) is LE as well as Demotic-Coptic. The particle *my* marks a request for a tone of familiarity, characterizing an imperative addressed to an inferior (or within a class of peers); *iḏd my p<sup>3</sup>-gy-n-* (3.8, 4.2.4 *p<sup>3</sup> k̄d-n-*: "tell me, please, how . . .") is exactly matched in Early Demotic (Ryl. IX 1/11, 6/12, 10/3, 11/3; Griffith 1909, 220 n. 4).

(b) The first-person post-imperative slot is filled in *P. Vandier* by the prospective *s̄dm.i* (2.9, 3.5); this role is in later Demotic filled by the conjunctive (Copt. *ta-*), but well attested in Ryl. IX (3/9, 4/16, 5/10, 17/7.16, etc.).

## 1.4 The causative

The causative system in *P. Vandier* is highly developed, closely matching that of early Demotic (the non-occurrence of *tref-/maref-*, i.e., *dīt/imī iri.f s̄dm*, but of *dīt/imī s̄dm.f* places it diachronically fairly accurately). Here *dīt* is the causative exponent (itself narrative, prospective, infinitive or imperative), the prospective *s̄dm.f* the caused lexeme with its actants. (The generic person -w [not -tw!] is important, again to the same degree as in Demotic.) The morphology of "*rdi*" is regulated by the actant, as follows: narrative and prospective presuffixal *dī=* (1.5, 213f.10, 3.12, etc.), narrative and prospective prenominal *dīt-* (1.12, 2.15, 3.7.12); the only instance of tense overruling the actantial parameter is the opposition *dī.s* (prospective) vs. *dīt.s* (narrative) 4.14 and 4.1, respectively.

Of special interest is the causative imperative, where the actor of the *s̄dm.f* governed by *imī* is either the first or the generic person (2.10, 3.16, 4.18?) or a noun (2.14); the 2nd sgl. (4.10) is conjectural. The first person, *imī s̄dm.i*, is well attested (Coptic: Polotsky 1950, 81f. = *Collected Papers* 216f.). I have no example for *marek-* from Classic Coptic, but *marok* is

quoted by Crum, *Dict.* 182b: Stern even entered *marek-* in the “optative” paradigm, *Kopt. Grammatik* par. 383, without illustration; LE *imy* *ṛnh.k* is of course formulaic in LE epistography. Similarly in Demotic, Setne 3/3f., 4/12, 5/18, Mag. 18/19, 19/16, Smith-Tait 2 back x+1/26 (see Johnson 1976, 220 n. 189). This combination is indicative of the semantic attrition, typical of post-LE Egyptian, of the address component of *imy*, and of the divergence of the (diachronically secondary?) “optative” from the jussive.

### 1.5 Protatic forms: *ī.īr.f-* vs. *īw-*

Our (1.3) *ī.īr w<sup>c</sup> grh hpr, w<sup>3</sup>h Pr-<sup>3</sup> k . . .* is unmistakably a case of a temporal Second Tense protasis: see Vernus 1981, 80ff. (81 ex. 15), Posener, p. 41. The account of the functional opposition between *īw.f sdm/in-īw N sdm* and *ī.īr.f sdm* is too complex to be adequately described here other than very briefly (I hope to treat this issue elsewhere). In *P. Vandier*, we also find an instance of the disjunctive protasis-apodosis complex: (3.12f.) *īw.ī mt, īw.ī h<sup>3</sup>c.f | īw.ī ṛnh, īw.ī int.f . . .*, which, to judge from cases of Demotic disjunctive conditions compared with Abnormal Hieratic spelling, could be the protatic circumstantial rather than the special *īw.f (tm) sdm* “Conditional” (< *īw.f* in Abn. Hier.); but this could equally well be this important Demotic form, which, I believe, ceded to *ī.īr.f tm sdm/ī.īr tm N sdm* to give Coptic *eftm-* (Sah., rare) /*afštem-* (Boh., neg. regular; Oxyrh., affirm. and neg., full member in a double conditional system: *are-/af-, arešan-/afšan-*), *ī.īr.f-hr-sdm* to give *afšasōtme* (Akhm.), *ī.īr.f-š<sup>c</sup>n-* (?) to give *efšan-* (the Sah.-Boh. Coptic “Conditional”). In the latter case, the absence in our text of *īr-* is significant, again placing it within the same system as Early Demotic (cf. Lueddeckens 1960, 268; Johnson 1976, 254). Synchronically, conditional/temporal protatic *ī.īr.f-* (Second Tense) is well established in Demotic, in opposition and paradigm with the Conditional: the semantic distinctive feature of the former (not, like the Conditional, necessarily initial in the conditional complex, preceding its apodosis) appears to be its specificity (“if/when, in a given case,” also “as soon as”—event protasis), as against the genericity of the *īw= /in-n<sup>3</sup>-* condition (“if/when ever”—case protasis)—although there are inevitably contexts of overlap or of less sharp semantic resolution. (Some clear exx. of the Second Tense protasis: Ins. 3/17, 11/3.11.12, Ankhsh. 25/5.18, Thompson 1934, 10591 ro 1/17; Thompson 1913, D9, D111; Mattha-Hughes 1975, 2/12, 6/14). (“On occasion, the second tense, although used mainly

to stress a following adverbial adjunct, was used secondarily with conditional meaning” [Johnson 1976, 248]; “secondary use” of “true second tense clauses [ibid., 113]. When no adverb is present, J. takes it to be a case of “analogy” [250]. Following Hughes [e.g., in Mattha-Hughes 1975], she translates all instances of conditional *ī.īr.f sdm* as “Cleft Sentence in protasis” [e.g., 248ff., 263ff.]. This rendering is usually forced: see for instance E210, Ankhsh. 25/20, and unacceptable, both in terms of context compatibility and of gramm. theory; *īw.f hpr [īw-]* is the protatic marker of Cleft Sentences, e.g., Mattha-Hughes 1975, 3/9, 8/10.14, 9/9; acc. to Hughes and Johnson, the Cleft Sentence must be “virtually” [i.e., not formally marked as] protatic, whereas it is not its focalizing *glose* role, but its “that”-form status that is operative in expressing supposition: Shisha-Halevy 1974, 375f.; it can be either a Cleft Sentence topic or a protasis marker, not simultaneously both.)

The superficial formal conflation of interrogative and protatic clause marking under *in-* (1.8, 2.4, 4.13 vs. 2.9, 3.5, respectively) is typically post-LE (Demotic and Coptic). (Incidentally, our 1.10 *in wn-īw p<sup>3</sup>y-rm<sup>1</sup> nfr dy* should be rendered “Est-ce que cet homme excellent était ici?” not [Posener] “Est-ce possible qu’il y avait ici cet homme remarquable . . .?”: cf. Copt. *ene nere-peirōme . . . tai*.)

## 2. Conversion

All four converters known in Demotic-Coptic (functionally most developed in Roman Demotic) are attested in *P. Vandier*; on the other hand, all Dem.-Coptic converters are in *P. Vandier* already fully functional as converters, even the relative and Second Tense exponents.

### 2.1 Circumstantial

(a) I understand the circumstantial in the absolute text-initial (narrative opening) slot (1.1) as backgrounding (Weinrich’s “low relief”), yet cannot quote an exact parallel: in LE and Demotic a background-informing circumstantial follows date specification (LE: *Apophis & Sekenenre* 1.1f., Anastasi VI 1.1ff., cf. d’Orbiney 12.7f., 19.2f.; Demotic: Mattha-Hughes 1975, 2/13, 3/24, see Hughes’s note, p. 75; cf. perhaps the existential preterite circumstantial [?] *r-hwn-n<sup>3</sup>w-* in Myth. 2/7f.8f., Gloss. 101f., a “main clause” yet text-grammatically subordinate), and to my knowledge does not occur in the existential protagonist-presenting narrative-opening (or rather prenarrative) role of the

topicalizing (LE *īr ntf hr.tw* . . .) or presentative Cleft Sentence-like constructions (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1987, par. 5e) idiomatic throughout Egyptian from ME to Coptic. (In an earlier phase of Egyptian, the role of *īst-* as a background-information converter, in syntactically complementary distribution to the adjunctal circumstantial *īw-* in the Kadesh inscription comes to mind: Bull. 1ff., 75f.; Poem 7ff., 25, 41, 56, 65, 67, 87ff., 143, etc.)

(b) The formal (governed or conditioned, non-pertinent) circumstantial cataphorically heralded by the neutric *s* (object) or *f* (actor), in complementary distribution, cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986, ch. 5): *ptr s īw-* (see below); *gm s īw-* (4.10), (Dem., e.g., Matthaeus 1975, 8/29, + *īw-wn-īr-*, exactly so also Erichsen 1956, 3/10), Copt. *cnts e-*. (In [1.7] *ī.īr.w gmt.f. īw* . . ., the pronoun is not cataphoric-neutric but personal-anaphoric, even if proleptic, and refers back to Djedkare, literally “they found him, that . . .”); *hpr.f īw-* (see below; Dem. and Coptic parallels). Note that *s* as object of *rḥ* is complemented by *dd-*, not the circumstantial (as in Demotic; see below, 3.3.4).

(c) While the adverbial circumstantial negative aorist (common in *P. Vandier*) holds its place up to and including Coptic, the affirmative aorist is but rarely adverbially circumstantial; the inverse is true for the Second Tense conversion. Indeed, the symmetry of the two forms designated as “aorist” is largely a matter of a grammarian’s convenient model. This situation is internally reconstructable in Coptic: see Shisha-Halevy 1986, 64ff. In Demotic, the circumstantial affirmative aorist seems virtually restricted to the “formal” conditioned circumstantial (e.g., following *īw.f hpr*, *gm s*, *tys* “behold,” *hmy* “would that . . .!”; consider Ryl. IX 19/2, Setne 6/2, Ankhsh. 10/25, Myth. 14/16).

(d) A zero circumstantial converter before the *ī-* future base occurs in the 1st person singular and 2nd singular feminine (2.12, 4.12). This seems to match Demotic usage (Johnson 1976, 157: 1st singular and pronominal).

(e) In *ptr s īw-* + (neg.) aorist (4.10) and *ptr s ∅-* + future (4.12), we have a case of the formal circumstantial heralded by the neutric *s*. It is conceivable that we have here the same construction as Demotic *tws/tys* + circumstantial (Griffith 1909, 403), e.g., in Bresciani 1963, 20 (D), 21 (E II), 23 (G) *tys īw.ī hpr.k m-ḳd* . . . “Behold me (being) hidden as . . .”; *tys īw-hr-sh.k.*, Ryl. IX 19/2 “Behold, you are used to writing.” This calls perhaps for the etymological relation of *ptr s* with Dem. *tys*. Spiegelberg’s etymology (Myth. Gloss. 293, P. Libbey 11/2), apparently shared

by Thompson, “*tyw st*” “ich gebe es, naemlich . . .,” at least isolates the neutric pronoun; Griffith’s suggestion (1909, 219 n. 8), identifying *tys* with LE *is(t)* and Copt. *eis*, cannot be upheld.

(f) *hpr* occurs governing the (formal) circumstantial in two distinct constructions. First, the narrative *hpr.f īw-*, an episodic narrative boundary signal (1.8, 4.9, 6.14), with the pronoun uncommutable (“impersonal”), neutric. Second, in dialogue (2.5, a sole instance), *hpr īw ntk-p<sup>3</sup>-nty-* . . . in which I take *hpr* to be causal, “it being that . . .” (cf. ME *wn[n]t*, LE *p<sup>3</sup>-wn*, Dem. *p-hpr* “that” and *hpr* causal, “it being that . . .”: Myth. 6/18, 7/1.15; Dem. Chronik 4/12; Ray 1976, 3 ro 11ff., Smith-Tait 1983, 1 9/21), *pace* Posener “Il se fait”; in (1.5) *hpr.f īw.f m-ḳd* . . ., *hpr.f* is evidently “personal”: “he became . . .” (formally = Copt. *afšōpe efo n-the*, the ingressive term corresponding to the complexive or neutral *afr-the*; however, in the New Testament we have only Sah. *šōpe nihe*, Boh. *ermphrēti*: while *m-ḳd* needs *īw.f* to be predicated, *n-the* is marked as predicative by *n-*. For Dem. circ. *īw.f m-ḳd*, cf. Petub. 23/4). This is the suppletive *hpr*, mediating between non-durative conjugation forms and durative predicates.

## 2.2 Relative

PRESENT/FUTURE: the allomorphs *nty-/nty-īw*, in a neat complementary distribution, as follows:

*nty-*: present, predicate infinitive/stative, *nty-* in actor position (1.5.6.7, 2.10, 3.3.11)

*nty-*: affirmative future, *īw.f(r) sdm* (1.12, 2.5.7.15, 3.1.8.9)

*nty-*: neg. future, *bn-īw-* (2.4)

*nty-īw-*: nominal actor in the present (5.13, 9xy 16.17).

No example of a pronominal actor (not coreferent with antecedent) in the present. (Vernus 1982, 82ff. examines the *nty-īw* allomorph of the relative for diachronic perspective, syntagmatic and genre distributions, on the whole in agreement with the above and with Demotic; also the value of *nty-īw-* for corpus dating. For *nty-īw* in Demotic, see Spiegelberg par. 531Anm.; Sethe-Partsch 1920, 81 par. 31b; Johnson 1976, 37f. and cf. Quecke 1979, 439f.)

PAST: *ī-* prefix relative forms: *ī.īr.w* (2.11), *īdd-* (2.9, 9xy.14), *īwn-/rwn* (relative of preterite converter, Copt. *ene-*, 1.12, 2.12, etc.); *ī-*prefix participles (active only—in contradistinction to LE): *ī.īr* (2.1, 5.1 in *glose* of Cleft Sentence—a form-and-function well attested up to Coptic, Shisha-Halevy 1983, 315f.;



Incidentally, *î.îr-* in 5.15 is not a relative form, *pace* Posener, index). In 3.13 we may have *nty-mr.k*; Dem., Ins. 3/9, 18/21; Spiegelberg par. 535.

In our 1.8 *î.îr dbh* we have a generic present role of *î.îr-* (Posener: "qui aurait su demander"), observable in Demotic (Lichtheim 1981) and even Coptic (Shisha-Halevy 1983, 316), as a suppletive aorist participle. Alternatively, this could be the futuric role ("who will request . . .") well attested in Early Demotic and Abnormal Hieratic documents (Griffith 1909, 203 n. 27, Ryl. I 5, Ryl. VIII 5, etc.). On the whole, this system of relative markers is identical with that of Early Demotic (the extension of *nty-* to the past tense is a late Demotic development).

## 2.3 Second Tense

(a) *î.îr-* is a converter (3.9.10, almost exactly = Ryl. IX 4/18 *î.îr.k n<sup>c</sup>y r-*), not an "emphatic conjugation form" in *P. Vandier* (see Johnson 1976, 118f., for Roman Demotic); historically speaking, this is still the "last" converter in the sequence (*wn-*, *îw-*, relative, Second Tense), a diachronic fact with no inconsiderable synchronic consequences: cf. Quecke 1979, 438.

(b) There may be evidence in *P. Vandier* for the differentiation of *î.îr.f sdm* into durative (present) and non-durative, as symptomized by the validity or, respectively, invalidity of the Stern-Jernstedt-Parker rule: durative (i.e., Second Present, *î.îr-* conversion of the basic present, paradigmatically related to *î.îr.î + stative*, 3.9.10f.): (7x.11) *î.îr.î kḏ n t3-hryt . . .*; non-durative (i.e., Second Past), with an *infinitive* verb of movement (3.15, 4.2): (1.7) *î.îr.w gmt.f*; sim. 9xy.16. In Ryl. IX Demotic (Parker 1961, 181, 186), durative: 4/18, 6/15, 12/19f., 13/12f., 17/14, 25/4f.; non-durative: 1/14f., 2/13, 10/11, 13/11f. For Roman Demotic, cf. Johnson 1976, 104ff., 106ff., 107, de Cenival 1980, 93f.

(c) *î.îr.f sdm* focalizing adverb phrases:

(1) Prominence is marked by a rubric in our text (1.17.15, 4.15, 7x 1, 3).

(2) In 2.2 . . . *nty*[[*î.îr.w* *ṣ.f r w<sup>c</sup> hrw*], Posener reconstructs a relative negative aorist: . . . *nty-îw bw-î.îr.w*. I would suggest . . . *nty-îw î.îr.w ṣ.f r w<sup>c</sup> hrw* "who is summoned (only) ON A CERTAIN DAY," a {relative Second Tense + adv. focus} construction. This rare double conversion is paralleled in Demotic: see Johnson 1976, 103 E 165–66; in LE, cf. Wenamun 1, x+8 *nn ntk p3-nty-î.îr.f nw iy n.î m-mnt r-ḏd . . .* Groll 1970, 195f. recognizes here a relative emphatic in a Cleft Sentence with pronominal focus, but strangely identifies this with Coptic *ntaf-* (presumably Second Perfect), which would functionally correspond

to *î.îr.f*, not *nty-î.îr.f*; *nty* is not a "tense marker" but (with *p3-*) a syntactical topic marker, including the emphatic construction in the "nominal" Cleft Sentence. (The Coptic Second Tense converter is incompatible with the relative; the functionally equivalent construction is *e-ntaf-*, circumstantial Second Perfect: Shisha-Halevy 1986, 66f.).

(3) In 1.7 *î.îr.w gmt.f îw 7 hrw p3-nty n p3y.f<sup>c</sup> h<sup>c</sup>*, P. inaccurately states that *îw-* is "doublement mis en valeur." A circumstantial Cleft Sentence is here focalized by *î.îr.w gmt.f* (the Second Tense with "find [. . .] in a certain state," a descendent of the ME emph. *gm.n.f*, further continued by Demotic [e.g., Ryl. IX 4/13]). Not, however, in Coptic; the "verbs of incomplete predication" do not condition the Second Tense—this is indeed a significant difference between the functional *valeur* structuring of the Second Tense in Coptic and in pre-Coptic Egyptian.

(4) In 2.2 *ptr s înk î*[[*îw h3<sup>c</sup> 7 r mt.î îw bn-p.w dît . . .*], P. completes a form which may be either a relative—in which case *înk* would be focalized in a Cleft Sentence with a relative past *glose* ("it is I . . .")—or a Second Tense (see below, on *ptr s* + Second Tense rhetorical questions); in the latter case, *înk* would be topicalized ("as for me, . . ."), which would no doubt suit the context better.

(d) For the protatic *î.îr.f sdm* (conditional/temporal protases 1.3f., 9xy 16) see above, 1.4.

(e) The Second Tense seems to focalize its actor in 1.10 *irh Mry-R<sup>c</sup> dbh . . .* (*pace* Posener, 45, who interprets *î-* here as a future-marking prefix (why not here the *îw-* future, as so often elsewhere?). The regular cases in Demotic of *î-* prefix (with biradicals), analyzable as actant-focalizing (*î.in-*, *î.wt-* in receipts; perhaps also in the occasional *î.sh-*, introducing the scribal signature) come to mind; I would similarly interpret the lease clause *î.îr n3-ssw pr-Imn hy . . .* "It is the scribes of Pr-Imn that are to measure . . .," although the alternative analysis, of a pronominal future, is certainly not ruled out (Hughes 1952, 40 hh).

### 2.3.1 *ptr s* + Second Tense.

Whereas an initial Second Tense in *P. Vandier* invariably focalizes a subsequent element in a non-polemic assertion (1., 3.7, 3.15f., 4.2), *ptr-s(w)* with the Second Tense (1.11, 2.2.12, 3.9.10) in our text is an initial boundary mark of coinciding Second-Tense marked rhetorical questions and polemic focalization (an allocutive near-exclamatory "Gieb die Antwort nicht mir, sondern Dir; stelle Dir die Frage, so wirst Du urtheilen wie ich," von der Gabelentz 1901, 119), rather than locutive self-posed question, Jones 1977, 1980. Rhetorical questions ("direct attention to theme,"

Jones 1977, 180: “theme” defined as “referential prominence,” *ibid.*, 6). Essential issues relevant to our Second-Tense marked rhetorical questions and the cataphoric *s(w)* in *ptr s(w)*, topics which I hope to treat in some detail elsewhere, are the relation between sub-clause focalization and clause rhematization in rhetorical questions, their text-grammatical (cohesive) function and the formal affinities with exclamatory constructions.

*Ptr s(w)* is thus equivalent to ME, LE, Dem. and Copt. particles: ME *in-* with emphatic *sdm.f* and *sdm.n.f* (see the exx. in Silverman 1980, 2ff., 20ff.; in his study Silverman surprisingly ignores the functional opposition of rhetorical vs. non-rhetorical questions, neatly expressed with the formal one of *in-* vs. *in-īw*). LE *ist, is bn-*, often with *ī.īr.f sdm*: Erman par. 734ff., e.g., *Horus and Seth*, 7.9, 8.5, Anastasi IX 5; *is bn ptr + ī.īr-*, Anastasi IX 7.

The Second Tense occurs in rhetorical questions in Demotic (e.g., Ryl. IX 12/12 where the negation ‘*n bn . . . in*’ is that of the *nonne*-type question, not of the Second Tense (*pace* Griffith 1909, 235 n. 2); see Williams 1948, 224; no discussion in Johnson 1976, 99ff.). In the Abnormal Hieratic text, Tabl. Leid. I 4311 ro 23, *ptr s* may introduce a rhetorical question with a Second Tense as a special kind of “rhetorical response” (*pace* Černý, *Studies . . . Griffith* 48f.): *hr ptr sw, in īw.w īy . . . īw.k dīt hr.w r dmi 3b . . . ī.īr.k īr s p3-dīt hr.w . . .* “When they come . . . , will you (not = will you please) draw their attention to the town of Elephantine? You will indeed do so, (namely) draw their attention . . .” Incidentally, like other text/paragraph boundary marks in our text, this *ptr s* (and not *ptr s* “behold,” Dem. *tws/tys*) is a rubric (in narrative, we have the main- or framing-action carrier *sdm.f* forms rubricated). I suspect that this *ptr s*, the “sight” determinative notwithstanding, has as much to do with the old *ptr/pty sw* “what is it?” sporadically attested in 26th dynasty and later magical and ritual texts (Klasens, *Magical Statue Base*, e3, e7 “what is the matter”). In P. Louvre 3129 B3 (Schott’s *Urk. mythologischen Inhalts*, 9) we have *ptr s* + Second Tense in a rhetorical question; cf. also H6. In phonetic shape, “behold!” and “what is . . .” seem to be merged, at least if my suggested etymology Hier. *ptr-s/pty s* > Dem. *tys* is valid (see above).

## 2.4 Preterite

*wn-/wn-īw-*: the first converter to emerge and evolve in Egyptian, this is attested in the remaining parts of our corpus in dialogue only, not as a narrative-texture tense. It ought to be kept carefully apart from *wn-* introducing existential statements, which always pre-

cedes a non-*p3*-defined noun (zero-determined or preceded by the quantifier *gr-*), and is commutable with the negative *mn-* (2.11). The morphosyntactic distribution of this converter is: *wn-* before the *īw-* of the future, *wn-īw-* before a definite nominal actor in the present (1.10). Note that the relative (2.12) has in P. *Vandier* (2.12) an *r-* prefix, as in Ryl. IX (and see Johnson 1976, 41, Table 6).

## 3. Pronoun/noun syntax

### 3.1 Determination, possession marking in the noun phrase, proper-name appositive syntax

3.1.1 The nominal determination in P. *Vandier* seems to match closely the Demotic system, in which, although it is a three-determinator system, the indefinite (*w<sup>c</sup>-*) is SPECIFIC (“a certain . . .”), and not generic (“some . . .”) as in Coptic (*ou-orgê* “wrath,” *ou-matoi* “a(ny) soldier”: the range of zero determination is narrower in Coptic); on the other hand, zero determination in Dem. (and P. *Vandier*) covers also non-specific indefiniteness:

	Demotic	P. <i>Vandier</i>	Copt. (Sah.)
def. specific	{ <i>p3-</i> }	{ <i>p3-</i> }	{ <i>p-</i> }
def. generic			
(“genus name”)	{ <i>p3-</i> }	{ <i>p3-</i> }	{ <i>p-</i> }
indef. specific	<i>w<sup>c</sup>-</i>	<i>w<sup>c</sup>-</i>	<i>ou-</i>
indef. generic	∅-	∅-	<i>ou-</i>
notion (“ab-			
stract”) generic	∅-	∅-	∅-

(a) The DEFINITE determinator: definite-specific; syntagmatic—cataphoric: *p3-N n-/nty-* (1.5.11, 2.8.11.13f., 3.6.7.12); paradigmatic (“exophoric”): properizing (“unique entities”: *p3-t3, p3-ītr, p3-ītn, p3-R<sup>c</sup>, p3-ntr-3*, 1.5.15, 2.16, 4.1, fgt. 3), collective-generic (1.4, 4.6); with infinitives, def. determination has a different value (as the indef. grade is excluded): (1) *r-p3-+INF*. (2.10.11; cf. the Coptic modifier type “*epsôtm*,” Shisha-Halevy 1986, 50f.; it is esp. developed in Bohairic. I do not find it used in quite the same way in Demotic). (2) the def. infinitive appositive to a personal pronoun (4.17). Demonstratives too are syntagmatic-cataphoric (1.6, 2.11) or paradigmatic (“hic-et-nunc deictic,” 7x.1); the possessive articles (see below), definiteness is here automatic, i.e., non-pertinent.

(b) The INDEFINITE determinator—indefinite specific, “a certain-,” denoting a “specific individual representative of a class” (as well as the quantifier “one-”). We find it in *affirmative* existential statements (1.1.3), “on a certain day” (2.2) “in an (individual) coffin, in a

(certain) temple" (6.11). Even in Demotic, the "indefinite plural" *hyn* (not attested in our corpus) does not yet seem to exist as such, commensurably with the singular. (It is uncommon even in Rom. Demotic, occurring only once in Myth., and seems equally specific: "he said *hyn md*," 'certain words', *P. Berl.* 13544/15, 15516/22.)

(c) The ZERO determinator (unquantified noun): indefinite non-specific (generic): existent in affirmative or negative statements of existence (1.8.9, 2.9.10f.: here opposed to the indef. determinator, "there was a certain . . ."); following the *nota relationis* (1.1.2.3.11); generic-notional (abstract, material, etc.), esp. "N *iw[f]* . . ." "such N as . . .": 2.1, 2.4, etc. *mw*, *mdt*, *h<sup>c</sup>* "(full) lifetime" (not "une prolongation de la durée de vie," *pace* Posener, but simply "full lifetime"; again opposed to the def. article in *p<sup>3</sup>-h<sup>c</sup> n-*, 3.15f.); the grammaticalized generic pronominal *rm<sub>L</sub>* ("one"), quintessentially Demotic-Coptic (1.5, 3.1f., 4.5.6, 5.13.14.15). For the indefinite-generic zero, cf. Demotic: *ink-b<sup>3</sup>k mn<sub>h</sub>* (Theb. Graff. 3446.7); *hrw irm p<sup>3</sup>y.f gy-n-<sup>c</sup>nh p<sup>3</sup>-nty-*iw rm-r<sub>h</sub> tb<sub>h</sub>.f* (Ins. 17/7).*

*Obs.* (1) As in Dem.-Coptic, zero determination is in our text of different value with infinitives, for which indef. determination is ruled out (1.11.12, 3.8; see [a] above).

*Obs.* (2) For the pronominal *rm<sub>L</sub>*, compare the "proper name" (really "genus name" *rm<sub>L</sub>* in Myth. 17/14ff.), indeterminated even in syntactical positions in which non-zero determination is conditioned, e.g., in extraposition ("*rm<sub>L</sub> n<sup>3</sup>-sw<sub>h</sub>.f*") and as mediate possessor of inalienables, ("*drt.f rm<sub>L</sub>*").

*Obs.* (3) For a zero-determined praenomen prefixed to an "appositive" proper name, see below.

*Obs.* (4) The plural strokes (part of the Hieratic graphematic "package," thus not necessarily morphematic!) are no longer a primary exponent of "number": consider *p<sup>3</sup>-k<sup>p</sup>l*, 1.3., or the "fixed" or non-pertinent plural determinative with *rm<sub>L</sub>*, *m<sup>s</sup>*. With a plural definite (most typically, possessive) article, the plural strokes are either conditioned (e.g., 1.15, 2.10, 3.11.13f., etc., etc.) or individualizing. (Cf. in Coptic, oppositions such as *hen-hôb/n-hôb*: *hen-hbêue/ne-hbêue*, the latter concretized, individualized, often quantified, see Stern, *Kopt. Grammatik*, par. 225; contrast the Sah. I Cor 6:4, Heb. 5:7, 12:7, I Ti. 6:15 with Luc. 7:38, Eph. 6:9, Apoc. 16:15. I have no data for Demotic.) However, with zero determination, the plural grapheme marks the noun (usually inanimate: stuff or abstract concept) as generic: food, rites, gold, clothing (1.3, 2.15.16, 4.3, etc.). In view of the above, I doubt the reconstruction of plur. strokes in 2.9 (*0-mdt*///); 3.1f.

*rm<sub>L</sub> nfr*, *rm<sub>L</sub> bin* is generic: "un homme . . ." or "l'homme . . ." (cf. Ins. 14/22, 21/11).

**3.1.2** Possession is expressed in the noun phrase by the possessive articles (1.3.4f.5.6.7.8.11.14, 2.6.7, etc., very common in the plur. with the plur. determinative), except for a small constituency of inalienable nouns inherently possessed by a suffix pronoun, which does not exceed the analogous class in Dem.-Coptic: *rn* "name," *r<sup>3</sup>* "mouth," *h<sup>3</sup>t* (2.15.16, in compound preposition).

**3.1.3** Proper-name appositive syntax: "*mr-m<sup>s</sup><sup>c</sup> Mry-R<sup>c</sup>*" (3.2f.7 and *passim*).

*P. Vandier* exhibits here the construction, familiar from Demotic, of a zero-determined "titular" or cognominal "praenomen," prefixed to a proper name (see Posener, p. 39; Griffith 1909, 258 n. 11). Ryl. IX 16/12 *p-mr-m<sup>s</sup><sup>c</sup> M.*, is an apparent exception, but may really be instructive: this is the first (and only) mention of this personage; or is the def. article "attracted" by the preceding proper-name-less *p-mr-y<sub>h</sub>*? An examination of the praenomen constituency in the texts compiled in Zauzich 1968 reveals the following subheadings: professional, military or priestly rank and status titles (*w<sup>3</sup>h-mw*, *rm<sub>L</sub>-*iw*.f-šp-<sup>c</sup>k*; *gl-šr*; *hry-hb*, *it-ntr*, *w<sup>c</sup>b*, *wn* (Pastphore)—"*p<sup>3</sup>-w<sup>c</sup>b X*" is genitive: *pe-w<sup>c</sup>b šlgsntrws*, not different from *n<sup>3</sup>-hrt.w Ptwlms irm Glwptr*); ethnic affiliation (*wjnn*, *igš*); social description (?) (*shmt*). Note that in our text the praenomen may on its own represent the whole name (3.16, 4.10).

## 3.2 The sentence

**3.2.1** Nominal Sentence patterns all match the Demotic set.

(a) Delocutive-pronoun-subject pattern: (2.12) *t<sup>3</sup>y.k šbw n<sup>3</sup>w* "These are your hostages" (see Posener's obs., p. 55, on Demotic *n<sup>3</sup>w*; incidentally, subject . . . *n<sup>3</sup>w* and determinator *n<sup>3</sup>y-* ought to have had different entries in the index). Whereas *n<sup>3</sup>w* here is anaphoric, it is the endophoric delocutive pattern (Shisha-Halevy 1987, par. 4b) that is the kernel of the Cleft Sentence (. . . *n<sup>3</sup>+ relative*, 5.1).

(b) The pronoun-less rheme-initial pattern # RHEME-THEME #:

(1) Naming pattern: "*X rn.f*" (1.1); well attested in Dem., e.g., Ryl. IX 5/17.20, Ankhsh. 2/17f., Myth. 7/15, Mag. 9/5. (Other naming patterns in Demotic are theme-initial: the type "*p<sup>3</sup>y.f rn X*," Rhind II 1, 2; the documentary formulary "*mw<sub>L</sub>.f x*.")

(2) The generic # 0-N—0-N #: *mdt iw-bn-p.s hpr n rm̄ iw.f*... “It is a thing which has not yet happened, a person who...” (2.4). (In Dem., cf. the gnomic Ankhsh. 20/22–25 or Ins. 5/16, 8/22, 9/23; Sethe 1916, 27 [Setne 6/20]. The analysis of our 2.4 is corroborated by Amasis [a] 8 *in mdt iw.s rh hpr t̄y*, the magistrates’ amazed exclamation at the Pharaoh’s hangover, with a pronominal theme where our text has a nominal one—not a “deletion” of the pronoun but its commutation.)

The interlocutive pattern is not represented in *P. Vandier*. Note the total absence of the peculiarly LE patterns, #*ir*-[theme]—THEME # (Groll 1967, 12ff.) and # adjectival RHEME—theme # (ibid., 34ff.).

### 3.2.2 The Cleft Sentence (pron./nom. focus).

(a) Polemic: only allocutive pronoun: *ntk* (2.4.5); topic: *p̄3-nty-* (+future).

The variation (alternation? the data are insufficient) of interlocutive/delocutive pronominal representant in the topic, (2.4) *p-nty-bn-iw.k-* vs. (2.5) *p̄3-nty-iw.f-*, is typical to Demotic (and Coptic): Ryl. IX 13/2f., 14/12; Sethe 1916, 51 (P. Berl. 3047/9), while in LE the rule seems to be interlocutive representation (LRL 1, 14f., 33, 46, 66; see the exx. in Borghouts 1972). Wen. 1, x+8 *p̄3-nty īir.f-* is an exception, but also a complicated case apart, as the topic of the Cleft Sentence is also thematic in a Second Tense construction. (In 1.13 *ink* [///] *mt*, Posener translates “C’est moi qui mourrai,” but reconstructs the lacuna, I believe correctly, “[*iw.i*],” that is, “Quant à moi, je mourrai,” with *ink* topicalized [“prominent topic”].)

(b) Non-polemic, apocritic (answering a WH-question); nominal focus: ... # # *n̄3 hryw-tp.w n̄3 īir* ... (5.1). Note the absence in *P. Vandier* of the *in-/m-* marked focalizing “participial statement” (Groll 1967, 47ff.).

## 3.3 Miscellaneous

### 3.3.1 Adjectival attributes.

The meager corpus of attributive adjectives in *P. Vandier* does not exceed that of Coptic, in contradistinction to ME-LE; that is to say, these are numbered among the only “true” adjectives of late Egyptian—“true” in the syntactic sense, of attributes expanding a noun by following it unmediated by the “nota relationis” (albeit the second term in juncturally various syntagms, from a junct. open noun phrase to “i.f.c.” slot of a compound) which survived to the end of the Egyptian language: *-b̄in* “bad” (Copt. *-bôôn*), *-nfr* “good” (Copt. *-noufe*), *-3* “great” (Copt. *-o*).

### 3.3.2 The nominal actor, topicalization.

(a) In the future forms predicating *rh-* “be able to” (+ infinitive), this element follows the pronominal actor (*iw.f rh-*), but precedes the nominal one (*iw-rh N-*). This “pronominal syntax” characterizes infixed grammemes, usually pre-infinitival ones (conjugation characteristics, e.g., *-r-* [future], the negativer *-im-* in Demotic and Coptic, *-san-* [conditional] in Coptic); I believe it is, above all, indicative of the analogous junctural contour and articulation in grammeme-actor (“base+pronoun+infix | verb lexeme”) vs. lexeme-actor (“base+infix | [noun] lexeme + [verb] lexeme”) verb clause patterning. Thus, besides reflecting on the formalization (“grammaticalization”) of *rh* into a pro-verb (“base”) or part thereof, this construction probably heralds the turn of the evolutionary tide from analysis (LE) to (re-)agglutination (Dem.-Copt.). (The phenomenon, sporadically attested for LE, e.g., *Horus and Seth* 4.5, is the rule in the Demotic future: Griffith 1909, 203 n. 1, 236 n. 6, 367, Sethe-Partsch 1920, 271, Spiegelberg, parr. 464, 475 Anm.)

(b) I find significant the total absence in our text (e.g., in 2.2) of the *ir*-marked (segmentation) topicalization that is one of the most striking traits of LE (Satzinger 1976). This mark, occurring (in extra-position or cond. protases) in Abn. Hieratic texts (BM 10113 ro 1, 3f.; P. Turin 146 [2118 ro] 33, 248 [2121] 9; P. Louvre E 3228e 8f.) is distinctively absent in Demotic-Coptic (for some questionable residues, see Mattha-Hughes 1975, 2/1, Hughes 1952, 37 z, 59 s).

### 3.3.3 Coordination, “also.”

(a) The coexistence in the same text of *hn̄c* and *irm* as coordinators, with the latter predominating, (2.1.10.13, 3.6(?).7.8) is Demotic. Neither the grammars (Erman parr. 196, 620, 627; Černý-Groll 104ff. for LE; Spiegelberg parr. 299–301 for Demotic) nor the dictionaries are informative where it comes to distribution. A summary check of Sethe-Partsch 1920 reveals the stylistically marked use of *hn̄c* in coordinated pairs, in formular coordination, in enumerative totalled lists (e.g., 4/16, 10/28f., 13/6, 13bis 3); on the other hand, *irm* is either stylistically neutral, or is typical of component-parts lists (6/10, 15/21).

(b) *in wn-grt mdt* (2.9, 3.5) is an early instance of the Demotic-(Sahidic) Coptic quantifier (distinct from the homonymic particle) *gr-/ce-*, apparently an alternant of *ky-* especially prevalent as existent (following *oun-/mn-*): see Griffith 1909, 240 n. 9, 251 n. 12, Sethe-Partsch 1920, 57, 192f. (*mn-mtw.n gr-hd*, 13bis 2/7). This alternant (attested also in Abnormal

Hieratic) seems to be a dependent (esp. post-nasal) sandhi-form, while *ky* is in certain Dem. texts unmarked and "absolute," i.e., used for the pronominal "another (one)," e.g., Mattha-Hughes 1975, 2/2, 23. In Sahidic Coptic, *ce-* seems both combinatory and absolute (I Cor. 1:16, Gal. 1:19) and its distribution unclear.

**3.3.4 Inclusion:** "that." Verb nominalizations; the infinitive in analytical constructions.

(a) Whereas the use of *qd* to introduce a content-clause is of course well attested in LE, the use of the cataphoric object pronoun to herald a content clause after *verba dicendi/sentiendi* (2.3, *rh s*) is essentially Demotic-Coptic (Ryl. IX 15/2, 16/20); so is the causal *qd* "since" (1.2: cf. Ryl. IX 4/7).

(b) We do not find in *P. Vandier* such quintessentially LE turns of phrase as (*Horus and Seth* 15/4) *p3-i.irk . . . p3 gm*, or (DM 321 ro 1f.) *p3 shr bin p3i.i dit*, or (LEM 46) *p3y.k b3 3 i.irk p3 dit*. On the other hand, such periphrastic nominalizations as there are in our text are more typically Demotic than LE. However, one special nominalization construction which survived into Demotic and is indeed typical of that phase of Egyptian combines a nominal expression of time with a periphrastic infinitive + relative of "do": "[the time] of hearing which [he did]," functioning as a temporal-conjunctive subordinated clause (in Coptic eventually regularized as "temporal/modal noun + relative [no resumption].") Most common of these formal "antecedents" are *ssw*, *hrw* and *wnwt*, the last used for "as soon as . . .," "the very moment that . . .": Ryl. IX 19/11 *t3-wnwt n ph.k n t3y-3c*, .....). The tense of the relative *ir* is past or future. (Sethe-Partsch 1920 23/6, 7 33c *p3-ssw n w3h.f nty-iw.tn r ir.f . . . hn-hrw X n w3h.f nty-iw.k (r) ir.f*; *p3-ssw h3c.t n-hmt nty-iw.i (r) ir.f*, in marriage contracts [Lueddeckens 1960, 273]; also Thompson 1934, 593/4, P. Berlin 3113a, etc., etc.). This construction is well attested in *P. Vandier*: *p3-ssw n-* + infinitive + rel. *ir* (future, fut. past) (1.11.12, 23.12) and *hrw n-* + inf., unfortunately broken by a lacuna (4.10).

(c) *qy-n-* (def., with rel. *ir* or *hpr*: "the . . . ing which . . . will do/will take place") is a regular nominalization of the verb in direct object status (1.5, 2.13, 3.8), a distribution closely paralleled in Early Demotic (*idd my n.i p3-gy-n . . .* Ryl. IX 1/10, 6/12, exactly = our 3.8; see Griffith 1909, 397), indicative of the grammaticalized function of this derivation (in Coptic, this is characteristically Bohairic usage).

(d) For *hpr* "it being that . . .," see above, 2.1(f).

**3.3.5 Pronominals, augentia.**

(a) As in Demotic and Coptic, both masc. and fem. pronouns (in a gramm. regulated complementary distribution) express in *P. Vandier* the gender term that is neither feminine nor masculine, the "neuter," in a cataphoric text-grammatical role (*pace* Posener, p. 12; see 2.1 above, and cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986, ch. 5): this is a striking Demotic-Coptic situation.

(b) 2.8 *h<sup>c</sup>* (Copt. *hō*), not "myself" but "for my part," is of course the zero alternant of *h<sup>c</sup>.i*, and the emendation *h<sup>c</sup>.i* is unnecessary.

(c) In (3.13) *t3-mdt nty . . . nbt*, the compatibility of *nb* with the definite article and the final position of "all of it" in its phrase are remarkable, but paralleled in Demotic (Griffith 1937, Ph. 244 *p3-sh nb p3-t*, Sethe-Partsch 1920, 271 parr. 33, 33a; *rm nb nty-mtw.f dr.w*, Griffith 1937, Dak. 1, 7, 10, 18, 28, Ph. 49; *p3-3y nty-hry dr.f*, Botti 1967, 25B[6077] 14). For *p- . . . nim* in Coptic, see Shisha-Halevy 1986, 144ff.; for the final placement of *augentia* in Bohairic, Shisha-Halevy 1981, 319f.

#### 4. Lexicon, phraseology, orthography

**4.1** Although one must here tread warily, as the LEXICON is a notoriously shaky basis for diachronic location of a system, not least because of the low probative value of non-attestation (by no means equal/paramount with non-occurrence) and the danger of unstructural semantic definition of such lexemes as do occur in a corpus, I would not hesitate to say that the lexicon of *P. Vandier* is distinctively post-LE (what can "le vocabulaire néo-égyptien est largement représenté" [Posener, p. 13] possibly mean, in default of contrastive LE:Dem. lexical statements regarding documentation and, much more importantly, semantic structuring?). The attestation of Dem.-Coptic lexemes (e.g., *rwš*, *lwḥ*) and the importance of late-flourishing ones, such as *ssw* "time, occasion," *3y* "house," are clear. On the other hand, the occurrence of "earlier" items attested late (*m-kd*, *hn<sup>c</sup>*, *m-b3h*) is hardly proof of the ling. system. The lexicon of early Demotic is barely known; and what can the existence in our text of *ptr* "see," documented throughout Egyptian up to Ptolemaic, prove? A few lexical and phraseological notes on items selected at random:

(a) A specimen check of *rh* (semantic-componential "spectrum" test for diachronic location) yields the following spectrum of ranges (graded by frequency): (1) the "cognition" component of the compound causative "inform" (*dit rh-*, "let know, make known, inform"); (2) "be able to," prefixed to infinitive, usually

in the future tense (Copt. -eš/-š-). Incidentally, the special relationship of *rḥ* "be able" with the future is metanalytically manifested in Oxyrhynchite Coptic *neš-*, compatible with the future, aorist and perfect; (3) "know" only in the neg. aorist (Copt. *meša=*). This is a distinctly Demotic-Coptic, not LE spectrum.

(b) The prepositions *r-ḥn-r-* (2.15) "in, up to": cf. Ryl. IX 21/14f.21; Copt. *ehn-*; *r-ḥry/hry* *r-* up/down to, with place designations (5.14).

(c) *ī.īr-ḥr-* with the verb *šll* "cry out pleadingly": cf. Erichsen-Schott, 2/30; note *rmy ī.īr-ḥr-*, Ryl. IX 4/11, 14/1f.5, Smith-Tait 1983, 1 9/19; cf. Copt. *asrime ehoun ehraf* (Delilah and Samson, Jud. 14:16f.; note the addition of *enoun*, one of the spatial directional post-verbal phrases so typical of Coptic).

(d) The post-LE opposition of *ḥmt* "wife" to *šḥmt* "woman" seems to apply in our text, although the attestation of the latter is somewhat questionable.

(e) The generalizing phrase . . . *n p3-t3* "on earth," ". . . ever" (*n-* adnominal preposition, "*m*," not the *nota relationis*; consequently, not "[*tous les hommes*] *du pays*," Posener's translation) occurs frequently in *P. Vandier* (3.4, 7x.1, 10xy.15, fgts. 1, 3) as an adnominal modifier, directly strengthening *nb* "all," indirectly strengthening the absolute validity of a negation: "whatever." It is of course ubiquitous in Demotic, documented from the earliest up to the very latest; I have listed the following nouns in their respective relative frequency: pronominal—*rm* (*nb*), *mdt* (*nb*), *nty* (*nb*), interrogative *ih* (Smith-Tait 1983, 25); lexical—*nk3* (*nb*), interrogative *ih* (Smith-Tait 1983, 25); lexical—*nk3* (*nb*), *ī3wt*, *knbt*, *sh*, *w3b*, *ypt*, *m3c*; *rm-n-p3-t n-* (Ryl. IX 11/14) proves both the categorial difference of the two *n-* morphs (the first not a *nota relationis*) and the close compound-like status of *n-p3-t*.

(f) A post-LE interpretation of lexemes and phrases in *P. Vandier* often improves their sense context. Some examples:

(1) Although *šll* in 1.6 includes a "vocal" ("cry out") semantic component (Posener: "poussèrent force cris"), its "supplication" component (which later became predominant: Coptic "pray," Demotic "plaint," "plea," etc.) ought to have been brought out: Griffith's "cry unto" (Griffith 1937, Ph. 251, 255, 257) seems best. (The *P. Vandier* context brings sharply to mind the reaction of the *knbt* when Pharaoh Amasis cannot get up in the morning because of his hangover: Amasis [a] 8.)

(2) In *ḥc īrm- 3n* (4.14.15), both the phrasal verb and the adverb are illuminated by their post-LE value: Dem.—(Bohairic) Copt. *ôhe mn-* "converse,

pass the time with" (Crum, *Dict.* 537a; so Dem., Ryl. IX 11/20, 16/17); *3n* with non-punctual verbs means "further, still, yet" and not "again"; "converse/stay with us further" seems to make better sense than "être avec nous de nouveau."

(3) *ī3y . . . gns* (4.5.6): not "enlever brutalement," but "do violence/wrong to."

(4) *ḥpr.f īw.f m-kd mw īw.f šcd* (2.1): not (I believe) "It happened that he was as water, he being cut off," but "He became as water that is cut off."

(5) 2.11 *mn-nki īm.w ḏr.w p3-dīt.w r p3-mt ī.īr.w m-s3 t3y-mdt bīn ī.īr.w* "They all have had no punishment, namely the execution (lit., the putting them to death) which they have brought upon themselves (lit., 'caused') following the evil thing which they did" (pace Posener, p. 53); I take *nki* as related to Copt. *nece*, attested to my knowledge only in Manichaean Subakhmimic (Kephalaia 210.17.27, 212.5, translated by Boehlig as "Streit(?)," yet in collocation with "anger" and "hatred"); *nki* is here inalienably possessed (*wn-/mn- N n-/m-īm=*) and must therefore be passive.

**4.2 Considerations of ORTHOGRAPHY** must of course distinguish between morphophonologically significant (e.g., *n-* for earlier *m*) or non-significant (*ī/r flotte-ment*) orthographical usage of the text (a distinction obliterated in Posener's "graphie"). However, the consistent "Demotic" slant of the Hieratic is unmistakable. Some further examples: *bn-p.f sdm* for the neg. main narrative tense; *sw* for the obj. pronoun *s* (masc./fem./plur.). In 1/6, *ī.īr-ḥr=* may (as normally in Demotic) be a spelling of the presuffixal preposition *r-ir=*.

**5. Conclusion; a survey of diachronically distinctive features.**

An examination of *P. Vandier* using Stricker's compilation of diachronically distinctive criteria (1945, 33ff.), leaving out those for which no evidence is at hand (e.g., the spelling *īw.f*, etc., for the prefix *f-*, a consecutive-final negative aorist, *m-ir* for the neg. imperative of *rdi*) confirms the impression gained in our systematic scanning, and reveals that our text satisfies almost all of the "very late" features of Egyptian, cumulatively defining it diachronically (while single specific features may sporadically occur or be seen to emerge earlier, it is the combined weight of this "typological syndrome" that defines the linguistic phase): the Stern-Jernstedt-Parker rule (p. 33, 35 no. 5); the Adjective Verbs (pp. 33 no. 2, 34 no. 13), the

special interlocutive object-pronoun series (-*tk*) (p. 33 no. 2, p. 34 no. 1; for the delocutive, *P. Vandier* has a general form, *s(w)*, for masc., fem. and plural, beside plural *st*; advanced analyticity (p. 33 no. 3); *nty-îw* (p. 33 no. 6), 3rd person plur. for the "impersonal" (p. 34 no. 4); preterital narrative *sdm.f* (p. 34; we know that *af-* in Coptic *afsôtm*, too, is such, *pace* Stricker, p. 35); *my sdm.f* jussive ("optative," p. 34 no. 1); *hr sdm.f* aorist (p. 34 no. 10); the Participial Statement replaced by the Cleft Sentence (p. 35 no. 14); absence of *mk-*, of topicalizing *îr-*, of protatic *îr-* (p. 33 no. 4; p. 34 no. 9); reduction of the participle system to the active terms alone (p. 34 no. 6); the three deictic pronouns are kept formally distinct (p. 34

no. 3: article *p3-*, demonstrative *p3y-*, theme in Nominal Sentence -*n3w*).

Conclusively LE traits are absent from *P. Vandier* (although the non-occurrence of the post-negation . . . *în* is inconclusive: the text includes no negated present).

In concluding, let me express again my appreciation of this outstanding edition and treatment of a text which, I am convinced, will in time prove to be, more than a refreshing addition to the classroom Egyptian repertory or yet another milestone in the record of Egyptian literature, a new and essential data-base for the study of Egyptian grammar.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

(The basic textual sources are referred to in the paper by their conventional abbreviations)

- Borghouts, J. F. 1971. A Special Use of the Emphatic *sdm.f* in Late Egyptian, *BiOr* 29:271–76.
- Botti, G. 1967. *L'archivio demotico da Deir-el-Medineh*. Firenze.
- Bresciani, E. 1963. *Testi demotici della collezione Michaelidis*. Roma.
- Černý, J. and Groll, S. I. 1975. *A Late Egyptian Grammar*. Rome ("Cerny-Groll").
- de Cenival, F. 1980. Le système verbal démotique. *Chr. d'Eg.* 55:87–101.
- Doret, E. 1986. *The Narrative Verbal System of Old and Middle Egyptian*. Geneva.
- Erichsen, W. 1956. *Eine neue demotische Erzählung*. Wiesbaden.
- Erichsen, W. and Schott, S. 1954. *Fragmente memphitischer Theologie in dem. Schrift*. Mainz (Abh.Akad.d.Wiss.Lit. Mainz, 1954/7).
- Erman, 1933. *Neuägyptische Grammatik*. Leipzig ("Erman").
- Frandsen, P. J. 1974. *An Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System*. Copenhagen.
- von der Gabelentz, G. 1901. *Die Sprachwissenschaft*<sup>2</sup>. Leipzig.
- Griffith, F. Ll. 1909. *Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*. Manchester-London.
- . 1937. *Catalogue of the Demotic Graffiti of the Dodecaschoenus*. Oxford.
- Groll, S. I. 1967. *Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns in Late Egyptian*. London.
- . 1970. *The Negative Verbal System of Late Egyptian*. London.

- . 1982. Diachronic Grammar as a Means of Dating Undated Texts. *Egyptological Studies: Scripta Hierosolymitana* 28:11–104.
- Grunert, S. 1981. *Thebanische Kaufverträge des 3 und 2 Jahrhunderts*. Berlin.
- Hughes, G. R. 1952. *Saite Demotic Land Leases*. Chicago.
- Johnson, J. H. 1976. *The Demotic Verbal System*. Chicago.
- . 1981. Demotic Nominal Sentences, in *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky*, ed. D. W. Young. Pp. 414–30. Beacon Hill.
- Jones, L. K. 1977. *Theme in English Expository Discourse*. Lake Bluff.
- Junge, F. 1981. Ueber die Entwicklung des ägyptischen Konjugationssystems. *SÄK* 9:201–11 + *GM* 60 (1982): 93–96.
- Klasens, A. 1952. *A Magical Statue Base*. Leiden.
- Kroeber, B. 1970. *Die Neuägyptizismen der Amarnazeit*. Tübingen.
- Lichtheim, M. 1957. *Demotic Ostraca from Medinet Habu*.
- . 1981. On the Participle *i.ir* in Demotic, in *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky*, ed. D. W. Young. Pp. 463–71. Beacon Hill.
- Lüddeckens, E. 1961. *Ägyptische Eheverträge*. Wiesbaden.
- Mattha, G. and Hughes, G. R. 1975. *The Demotic Legal Code of Hermopolis West*. Cairo.
- Parker, R. A. 1961. The Durative Tenses in P. Rylands IX, *JNES* 20:180–87.
- Pestman, P. W. 1981. *L'archivio di Amenotes Figlio di Horos* (P.Tor.Amenotes). Milano.
- Polotsky, H. J. 1950. Modes grecs en copte?
- . 1973. Notre connaissance du néo-égyptien. In *Textes et Langages de l'Égypte Pharaonique*. Pp. 133–41. Le Caire.
- Quecke, H. 1979. Review of Johnson 1976. *Or* n.s. 48:435–47.

- Ray, J. D. 1976. *The Archive of Hor*. London.
- Satzinger, H. 1976. *Neuägyptische Studien*. Vienna.
- Sethe, K. 1916. *Der Nominalsatz im Ägyptischen und Koptischen*. Leipzig.
- Sethe, K. and Partsch, J. 1920. *Demotische Urkunden zum ägyptischen Bürgschaftsrechte*. Leipzig.
- Shisha-Halevy, A. 1974. Protatic *efsôtm*: a Hitherto Unnoticed Coptic Tripartite Conjugation-Form and its Diachronic Connections. *Or* n.s. 43:369–81.
- . 1983. Middle Egyptian Gleanings. *Chr.d'Eg.* 58:311–29.
- . 1986. *Coptic Grammatical Categories*. Rome.
- . 1987. Grammatical Discovery Procedure and the Egyptian-Coptic Nominal Sentence. *Or* n.s. 56:147–75.
- Silverman, D. P. 1980. *Interrogative Constructions with ʾIN and ʾIN-IW in Old and Middle Egyptian*. Malibu.
- Smith, H. S. and Tait, W. J. 1983. *Saqqara Demotic Papyri, I*. London.
- Spiegelberg, W. 1925. *Demotische Grammatik*. Heidelberg ("Spiegelberg").
- Stricker, B. H. 1944. De indeeling der Egyptische Taalgeschiedenis. *OMRO* 25:12–51.
- Thompson, H. 1913. *Theban Ostraca*. London.
- . 1934. *A Family Archive from Siut from Papyri in the British Museum*. Oxford.
- Vernus, P. 1982. Deux particularités de l'Égyptien de tradition, in *L'égyptologie en 1979: Axes prioritaires de recherche*. I: 81–89. Paris.
- Vleeming, S. P. 1981. La phase initiale du démotique ancien. *Chr. d'Eg.* 56:31–48.
- Wente, E. F. 1959. *The Syntax of Verbs of Motion in Egyptian*. Chicago.
- Williams, R. J. 1948. On Certain Verbal Forms in Demotic. *JNES* 7:223–29.
- Zauzich, K. Th. 1968. *Die ägyptische Schreibertradition in Aufbau, Sprache und Schrift der demotischen Kaufverträge aus ptolemäischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden.