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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 lw.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.
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), *hw-* (while including *nty-*), uncompound prepositions, etc.; or to regret some inaccuracies in it, e.g., under *iry* “dans *iry.f*” (5.13), emphatic *i.ri-* (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 [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 *iri.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, 440ff.). 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 prédéède. 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: Demotic 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 reascending 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, "d.l.k ʿnh.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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Tense System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>main-narrative carrier</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act:</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(god/king/protagonist actors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subnarrative carrier:</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background &amp; framework information carrier:</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative opening (backgrounding):</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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 *di, ḍd, ṣm, ḫ*, *ph, rml, hpr, mdw, nw, ʾrі*.

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 (*wšr.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” lw.f hr sdm is restricted in P. Vandier to a subnarrative role, in which it is sub-linked to a sdm.f main-narrative carrier in a textologically close juncture that recalls the Coptic “əfəstəm afəstəm . . .” texture (1.12 dit Pr-ř3 ŋ.w r Mr3-R3 lw.f lw r-hry, 4.14 ḫf.s . . . lws ly r-hry). This role is paralleled in Demotic, in a non-durative non-future lw.f sdm form, hitherto unnoticed or underappreciated. Consider at least some of Parker’s Ryl. IX exx. (Parker 1961, 185)—3/3f. iš.i ʁ r wṣ tgs . . . lw.(i) ly, 3/5f S. p3-i.i-r swn-n lw.(i) qd n.f n3-mdt . . ., perhaps also 24/12f. (p. 187); or Griffith 1937 Ph. 416.10 wh.n dit s gtr r-dd.w lw.n ir.w n-wṣ kḥn n-nb “We added another to them, and made them into a golden censer”; ibid., line 15f. inš.ky-wšb 1.t n-nb lw.f īr n-lītr 3.t īrm ky-lītrt 3.t lw.f ir.w n-shupt 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 lw.f īr 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: wḥ.n in 1st-person report, sdm.f in third-person narrative, lw.f sdm in subnarrative); Lichtheim 1952, No. 156 (DM 1456) ṣ.p.i gtr P3-šr-Mn s3 P3-Hr pṣy.k sn hr hd 23 lw.w in n.1 p3-sb3 n-tš-sbt n-lm.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 par. 132, 206). In 4.5 and 4.6 we have verb forms (ḥw-., ḫw-.) 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 kḥ n.f tš-it in O. Gard. 25).

d) qd. ḫn.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 nš-šn, nš-šn, nš-šn, in their determined relative conversion (pš-nty-), translating ME adjectives: 1.39.45, 1.43). 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” lw.f sdm restricted to subnarrative (39); prš 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>[&quot;lw-\textsc{-inf.}&quot;]</td>
<td>[&quot;lw-\textsc{-r-}\textsc{-inf.}&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(unattested)</td>
<td>(unattested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&quot;lw-\textsc{-stative}&quot;]</td>
<td>[&quot;lw-\textsc{-n}\textsc{-inf.}&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(unattested)</td>
<td>(unattested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&quot;lw-\textsc{-adv.}&quot;]</td>
<td>[&quot;lw-\textsc{-v}\textsc{-inf.}&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(unattested)</td>
<td>(unattested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&quot;sdm.i&quot;]</td>
<td>[&quot;bn-p.i sdm&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(unattested)</td>
<td>(+ Pres. Perfect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&quot;sdm.i&quot;]</td>
<td>(unattested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(conversion: circumstantial, 1.8.9, 2.2)</td>
<td>(conversion: circumstantial, 4.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&quot;(\ldots) sdm.i&quot;]</td>
<td>[&quot;Until sdm.f&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(unattested)</td>
<td>(unattested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&quot;mtw.f sdm&quot;]</td>
<td>[&quot;mtw.f tm sdm&quot;]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(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, 21ff.).

(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 (whys) 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.ir.1 kd n tS-hyrt.

(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 -rj- “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.lr., on which see below.

(d) The modal (“prospective”) sdm.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-imperatival “apodosis” (1st person, 2.9, 3.5.12); the last role is precisely that of the dl.i/ta- component of the post-LE “tarefsom” 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, 443ff.).

(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'f sdm (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. 0-marking morphology in a verb constituency no different from, and not exceeding that, documented in Demotic-Coptic: ġdd (3.8, 4.2.4), inw (9xy.16), but w3 (3.14); neg. m-ir . . . (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); ġdd my p3-gy-n- (3.8, 4.2.4 3.14 ) “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 sdm.f (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./marenj-, i.e., dl/i/imi f sdm, but of dl/imi sdm.f places it diachronically fairly accurately). Here dl is the causative exponent (itself narrative, prospective, infinitive or imperative), the prospective sdm.f the causated lexeme with its actants. (The generic person -w [not -rw!] is important, again to the same degree as in Demotic.) The morphology of “rdl” is regulated by the actant, as follows: narrative and prospective presuffixal dl= (1.5, 213f.10, 3.12, etc.), narrative and prospective prenominal dlj- (1.12, 2.15, 3.7.12); the only instance of tense overruling the actantial parameter is the opposition dl.s (prospective) vs. dl.j.s (narrative) 4.14 and 4.1, respectively.

Of special interest is the causative imperative, where the actor of the sdm.f governed by imi 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, imi sdm.f, is well attested (Coptic: Polotsky 1950, 81ff. = 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 *imi* ‘nḥ.k of is course formulary in LE epigraphy. 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 *imi*, and of the divergence of the (diachronically secondary?) “optative” from the jussive.

1.5 Protatic forms: *i(ir.f- vs. iw-

Our (1.3) *i.ir w6 grḥ hpr, w3ḥ Pr-3 ʾk... 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 *iw.f sdm/in-iw N sdm* and *i.ir.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.) *iw.i mi, iw.i ḫ2f f* \*iw.i ʾnh, *iw. i 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 *iw.f (tm) sdm “Conditional” (< *iw.f in Abn. Hier.); but this could equally well be this important Demotic form, which, I believe, ceded to *i.ir.f tm sdm/i.ir tm N sdm* to give Coptic *eftm-* (Sah., rare) ʿafšim-[ (Boh., neg. regular; Oxyrh., affirm. and neg., full member in a double conditional system: *are-fa-f, areš-an-afšan-*, *i.ir.f-hr-sdm* to give *afšasôme* (Akhm.), *i.ir-f-š$n$- (?) to give *efšâ-* (the Sah.-Boh. Coptic “Conditional”). In the latter case, the absence in our text of *ir-* is significant, again placing it within the same system as Early Demotic (cf. Lueddecevens 1960, 268; Johnson 1976, 254). Synchronically, conditional/temporal protatic *i.ir-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 *iw=1/in-n2* 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 *i.ir.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; *iw.f hpr [iw-]* 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 gloss role, but its “that”-form status that is operative in expressing supposition: Shisha-Halevy 1974, 375ff.; 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-iw p3y-rmt 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-peirôme... 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 & Sekenre* 1.1ff., Anastasi VI 1.1ff., cf. d’Orbiney 12.7ff., 19.2f.; Demotic: Mattha-Hughes 1975, 2/13, 3/24, see Hughes's note, p. 75; cf. perhaps the existential preterite circumstantial [*] * r-hwn-nîw* 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 ir 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 ist- as a background-information converter, in syntactically complementary distribution to the adjunctal circumstantial bw- in the Kadesh inscription comes to mind: Bull. lff., 75ff.; 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 bw- (see below); gm s bw- (4.10), (Dem., e.g., Matthae-Hughes 1975, 8/9, + bw-wn-l.r., exactly so also Erichsen 1956, 3/10), Copt. cnts e- (In [1.7] l.r.w gm.t.f. bw . . ., the pronoun is not cataphoric-neutric but personal-anaphoric, even if proleptic, and refers back to Djedkare, literally “they found him, that . . .”); hpr bw- (see below; Dem. and Coptic parallels). Note that s as object of rh is complemented by d×, not the circumstantial (as in Demotic; see below, 3.3.4).

(c) While the adversal circumstantial negative aorist (common in P. Vandier) holds its place up to and including Coptic, the affirmative aorist is but rarely adversally 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 bw.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 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 bw-+ (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 Brescian 1963, 20 (D), 21 (E II), 23 (G) tys bw.i hp.k m-kd . . . “Behold me (being) hidden as . . .”; tys bw-hr-sb.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, “twy 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. ets, cannot be upheld.

(f) hpr occurs governing the (formal) circumstantial in two distinct constructions. First, the narrative hpr bw-, 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 bw ntk-pë-nty- . . . in which I take hpr to be causal, “it being that . . .” (cf. ME wn[r]t, LE pë-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 bw.f m-kd . . ., hpr.f is evidently “personal”; “he became . . .” (formally = Copt. afsöpe efo n-the, the ingressive term corresponding to the complexive or neutral afr-the; however, in the New Testament we have only Sah. sòpe nthe, Boh. emphrêiti: while m-kd needs bw.f to be predicated, n-the is marked as predicative by n-. For Dem. circ. bw.m-kd, 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-bw, 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, bw.f (r) sdm (1.12, 2.5.7.15, 3.1.8.9)
nty-: neg. future, bn-bw (2.4)
nty-bw-: 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-bw 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-bw- for corpus dating. For nty-bw in Demotic, see Spiegelberg par. 531Anm.; Sethe-Partsch 1920, 81 par. 31b; Johnson 1976, 37f. and cf. Quecke 1979, 439f.)

PAST: i- prefix relative forms: i.r.w (2.11), idd-i (2.9, 9xy.14), iw-n (relative of preterite converter, Copt. ene-, 1.12, 2.12, etc.); i-prefix participles (active only—in contradistinction to LE): i.r (2.1, 5.1 in glose of Cleft Sentence—a form-and-function value attested up to Coptic, Shisha-Halevy 1983, 315f;
Incidentally, i.i.r.- 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 i.ir dbh we have a generic present role of i.ir- (Posener: “qui aurait su demander”), observable in Demotic (Lichtheim 1981) and even Coptic (Shishashaley 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) i.ir- is a converter (3.9.10, almost exactly = Ryl. IX 4/18 i.ir.k n’y r-), not an “emphatic conjugation form” in P. Vandier (see Johnson 1976, 118ff., for Roman Demotic); historically speaking, this is still the “last” converter in the sequence (wn-, iw-, 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 i.ir.f sgm into durative (present) and non-durative, as conditioned by the validity or, respectively, invalidity of the Stern-Jernstedt-Parker rule: durative (i.e., Second Present, i.ir- conversion of the basic present, paradigmatically related to i.ir.i + stative, 3.9.10f.): (7x.11) i.ir.i kd n ’z-hrty . . . ; nondurative (i.e., Second Past), with an infinitive verb of movement (3.15, 4.2): (1.7) i.ir.w gmt.f.; sim. 9xy.16. In Ryl. IX Demotic (Parker 1961, 181, 186), durative: 4/18, 6/15, 12/19ff., 13/12f., 17/14, 25/’c; nondurative: 1/14f., 2/13, 10/11, 13/11f. For Roman Demotic, cf. Johnson 1976, 104ff., 106ff., 107, de Cenival 1980, 93f.

(c) i.ir.f sgm 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[///]ir.w ’s.f r wè hrw, Posener reconstructs a relative negative aorist: . . . nty-iw bw-i.ir.w. I would suggest . . . nty-iw l.ir.w ’s.f r wè 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 p’z-nty-l.ir.f nw iy n.i m-mnt r-qd . . . 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 i.ir.f, not nty-i.ir.f.; nty is not a “tense marker” but (with p’z-) 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: Shishashaley 1986, 66f.).

(3) In 1.7 i.ir.w gmt.f lw 7 hrw p’z-nty n p’sy.f’h’, P. inaccurately states that lw- is “doublement mis en valeur.” A circumstantial Cleft Sentence is here focalized by i.ir.w gmt.f (the Second Tense with “find [. . .] in a certain state,” a descendent of the ME emph. gm.nf, 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 ink i.///]w h’z 7 r mt.i lw bn-iw dlt . . ., P. completes a form which may be either a relative—in which case ink would be focalized in a Cleft Sentence with a relative past close (“it is I . . .”)—or a Second Tense (see below, on ptr s + Second Tense rhetorical questions); in the latter case, ink would be topicalized (“as for me, . . .”), which would no doubt suit the context better.

(d) For the protatic i.ir.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’ dbh . . . (pace Posener, 45, who interprets i- here as a future-marking prefix (why not here the lw- future, as so often elsewhere)?). The regular cases in Demotic of i-prefix (with biradicals), analyzable as actant focalizing (i.in-, i.wt- in receipts; perhaps also in the occasional l.sh-, introducing the scribal signature) come to mind; I would similarly interpret the lease clause i.ir n’z-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-polaric 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-iw). LE ist, is bn-, often with i.ir.f sdm: Erman par. 734ff., e.g., *Horus and Seth*, 7.9, 8.5, Anastasi IX 5; is bn ptr + i.ir-, 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* 48ff.): hr ptr sw, in iw.w ly. . . iw.k dit ḫr.w r dmi 3b . . . i.ir.k ir s p3-dit ḫr.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. iws/tyς) 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. tyς is valid (see above).

### 2.4 Preterite

wn-/wn-iw-: 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 preceeds a non-p3-defined noun (zero-determinated 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 iw- of the future, wn-iw- 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 (wC-) is SPECIFIC (“a certain . . .”), and not generic (“some . . .”) as in Coptic (ou-orgē “wrath,” ou-matoi “at(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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demotic</th>
<th><em>P. Vandier</em> Copt. (Sah.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>def. specific</td>
<td>{p3-}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>def. generic</td>
<td>(&quot;genus name&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indef. specific</td>
<td>w&lt;sup&gt;%C&lt;/sup&gt;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indef. generic</td>
<td>ō-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) The **definite determinator**: definite-specific; syntagmatic-cataphoric: p3-n/nty- (1.5.11, 2.8.11.13f., 3.6.7.12); paradigmatic ("exophoric"): properizing (“unique entities”: p3-t,</p3-i,tr, p3-ltn, p3-R, p3-mtr<sup>–</sup>-2, 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 “epsōtm,” 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 definit. 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* (full) lifetime" (not "une prolongation de la durée generic-notional (abstract, material, etc.), esp. "N *iw*", "name," *r3* "mouth, *hêt* (2.15.16, in compound preposition).

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," *r3* "mouth, *hêt* (2.15.16, in compound preposition).

3.1.3 Proper-name appositive syntax: "*mr-mš* Mry- *R*" (3.2f.7 and passim).

P. Vandier exhibits here the construction, familiar from Demotic, of a zero-determinated "titular" or cognominal "praenomen," prefixed to a proper name (see Posener, p. 39; Griffith 1909, 258 n. 11). Ryl. IX 16/12 *p-mr-mš* *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-yh?* 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*šh-mw, rmt-İw-f-jsp-Šk; gl-šr, hry-hb, it-nr, w*cb, wn (Pastphore)—*p-žw*b X) is genitival: *pe-w*c ʒlngtrws, not different from n*žhrt.w Ptwlmjs irm Glwptr); ethnic affiliation (wjnn, igš); social description (?) (šmt). 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) *tiy.k šbw nšw* "These are your hostages" (see Posener's obs., p. 55, on Demotic *nšw*; incidentally, subject ... *nšw* and determinator *nšy-* ought to have had different entries in the index). Whereas *nšw* here is anaphoric, it is the endophoric delocutive pattern (Shisha-Halevy 1987, par. 4b) that is the kernel of the Cleft Sentence (... *nš*-+ relative, 5.1).

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

(1) Naming pattern: "*X rnf*" (1.1); well attested in Dem., e.g., Ryl. IX 5/17.20, Ankshh. 2/17f., Myth. 7/15, Mag. 9/5. (Other naming patterns in Demotic are theme-initial: the type "*p-žw*b *rn X*, Rhind II 1, 2; the documentary formulary "*mwt.f x*".)
(2) The generic # 0-N—0-N #: mdt iw-bn-p.s hpr 'n rmf iw.f. . . . “It is a thing which has not yet happened, a person who . . .” (2.4). (In Dem., cf. the gnomic Anksh. 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 r ty, 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: p-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) p-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 p-nty- l.ir.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.f],” that is, “Quant à moi, je mourrai,” with ink topicalized (“prominent topic”).

(b) Non-polemic, aporic (answering a WH-question); nominal focus: . . . # # n2 l.hryw-tp.w n2- l.ir . . . .” (5.1). Note the absence in P. Vandier of the in-/im- 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 junctorially 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: -bn “bad” (Copt. -bōdn), -nfr “good” (Copt. -noufe), -2 “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 -tm- in Demotic and Coptic, -sān- [conditional] in Coptic); I believe it is, above all, indicative of the analogous juncutral 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 pre-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., Horsus 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 Annm.)

(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 hnc 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 hnc 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 alternative of ky- especially prevalent as existential (following own-/mm-): see Griffith 1909, 240 n. 9, 251 n. 12, Sethe-Partsch 1920, 57, 192f. (mn-mtw.n gr-hd, 13bis 2/7). This alternate (attested also in Abnormal
Hieratic) seems to be a dependent (esp. post-nasal) sandhi-form, while ky 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 combinatorial and absolute (1 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 ḍd 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, ṛḥ s) is essentially Demotic-Coptic (Ryl. IX 15/2, 16/20); so is the causal ḍd “since” (1.2: cf. Ryl. IX 4/7).

(b) We do not find in P. Vandier such quint-essentially LE turns of phrase as (Horus and Seth 15/4) p3-i.irk . . . p3 gm, or (DM 321 ro 1f.) p3 sbr bin p3.i dit, or (LEM 46) p3.y.k bīt 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 which 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 conjunctional subordinated clause (in Coptic eventually regularized as “temporal/modal noun + relative [no resumption].” Most common of these formal “antecedents” are ssw, ḫrw and ṭwnt, the last used for “as soon as . . . ,” “the very moment that . . . .” Ryl. IX 19/11 ṭw-ṭwnt n ḫk n t3-y-3 , . . . .). The tense of the relative ḫ is past or future. (Sethe-Partisch 1920 23/6, 7 ḫ3 ḫ3 p3/ssw n ḫf ḫtw-t n r ḫf . . . ḫhrw N ḫf ḫtw-t ḫf (r) ḫf f; p3/ssw ḫ3 n/hmt ḫtw-t ḫf (r) ḫf 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 ḫn+ infinitive + rel. ḫ (future, fut. past) (1.11.12, 23.12) and ḫrw ḫn+ infn., unfortunately broken by a lacuna (4.10).

(c) ṣy- (def., with rel. ḫ or ḫpr: “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 (bd ḫy 3 n.l 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 ḫpr “it being that . . . . ,” see above, 2.1(f).

3.3.5 Pronominals, augmentia.

(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 ḫ+i (Copt. ḫ+i), not “myself” but “for my part,” is of course the zero alternant of ḫ+i, and the emendation ḫ+i is unnecessary.

(c) In (3.13) ḫ-s-mdt ṭw . . . ḫbt, the compatibility of ḫb 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-sb nb p3-i, Sethe-Partisch 1920, 271 parrr. 33, 33a; rm nb ṭw/myt ḫtw-t ḫf dr.f, Griffith 1937, Dak. 1, 7, 10, 18, 28, Ph. 49; p3-y ṭw-hrh ḫtw-t ḫf, Botti 1967, 25B[6077] 14). For ḫ-s . . . ṭw in Coptic, see Shisha-Halevy 1986, 144ff.; for the final placement of augmentia 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., ṭwš, lwḥ) and the importance of late-flourishing ones, such as ssw “time, occasion,” iy “house,” are clear. On the other hand, the occurrence of “earlier” items attested late (m-kd, ḫn’, m-bḥ), hardly proof of the ling. system. The lexicon of early Demotic is barely known; and what can the existence in our text of pr ṭw “see,” documented throughout Egyptian up to Ptolemaic, prove? A few lexical and phraseological notes on items selected at random:

(a) A specimen check of ṭf (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” (ḥt ṭf, “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 rή “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/ḥry r- up/down to, with place designations (5.14).

(c) i.ir-ḥr- with the verb ẓll “cry out pleadingly”: cf. Erichsen-Schott, 2/30; note rmy i.ir-ḥr-, Ryl. IX 4/11, 14/1f.5, Smith-Tait 1983, 1 9/19; cf. Copt. asrime ehoun ehraf (Dellilah 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 ẓḥmt “woman” seems to apply in our text, although the attestation of the latter is somewhat questionable.

(e) The generalizing phrase . . . n p3-t “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, 10x.y.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; we have listed the following nouns in their respective relative frequency: pronominal—rm (nb), mdt (nb), nty (nb), interrogative lh (Smith-Tait 1983, 25); lexical—nk2 (nb), interrogative lh (Smith-Tait 1983, 25); lexical—nk3 (nb), ḫwṭ, knbt, sl, wẖ, ypt, mẖ; 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 ẓll in 1.6 includes a “vocal” (“cry out”) semantic component (Posener: “pousseront force cri”), 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 ḥn ḫm- ‘n (4.14.15), both the phrasal verb and the adverb are illuminated by their post-LE value: Dem.—(Bohairic) Copt. ḏhe mn- “converse, pass the time with” (Crum, Dict. 537a; so Dem., Ryl. IX 11/20, 16/17); ‘n 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) ẓy . . . gns (4.5.6): not “enlever brutalement,” but “do violence/wrong to.”

(4) ḫrpt iw.f m-kd mw iw.f ʃ’d (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 nn-nk1 im.w dr.w p3-dlt.w r p3-mt i.ir.w m-s2 ḥy-mdt bln i.ir.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 nkš 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”); nkš is here inalienably possessed (wn- mw) 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 (i/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 sjm for the neg. main narrative tense; sw for the obj. pronoun s (masc./ fem./plur.). In 1/6, i.ir-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 iw.f, etc., for the prefix f-, a consecutive-final negative aorist, m-ir for the neg. imperative of rdl) 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 sr; advanced analyticity (p. 33 no. 3); nty-iw (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 afsbtm, 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 ir-, of protatic ir- (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 p:-, demonstrative p3y-, theme in Nominal Sentence -n3w).

Conclusively LE traits are absent from P. Vandier (although the non-occurrence of the post-negation ... in is inconclusive: the text includes no negatived 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.
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