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Work-Notes on Demotic Syntax, I

Ariel Shisha-Halevy

This series of notes is meant to suggest and define relevant issues and systemic implications, reflecting on certain not unimportant grammatical phenomena of Demotic. They constitute annotated documentation or record, combining the time-honoured categories of “Miszellen”, “Lesefrüchte”, and “Vermischte Beiträge” (in the spirit of A. Tobler’s [1886-1912], on Old French and Romance syntax). Often, they suggest diachronic “tie-ins” between comparable Demotic and Coptic facts, and almost always they have direct bearing on locus interpretation. The evidence adduced is predominantly local or incidental and lays no claim to exhaustiveness, the discussion suggestive and not definitive; its chief justification is in putting the discussed phenomena in systemic perspective and “opening pigeonholes” for further documentation and consideration.

The remarkable flourishing of Demotic philology (esp. text editions in collections and individual publications, with palaeographic, lexical, literary-analytical and contentual commentaries) in the last two decades has not been matched by grammatical and especially syntactic attention. Although the honourable tradition of in-edition grammar and grammatical-philological comments on previously published texts (Griffith, Sethe, Spiegelberg, Thompson) has found worthy representants in our own days (Parker, Hughes; De Cenival, Johnson, Tait, Smith), it is significant that in the years since Spiegelberg’s Grammatik (1925) we note only a single attempt at a comprehensive presentation of grammatical issues (arguably distinct from a working grammar), viz. Janet H. Johnson’s Demotic Verbal System (1976, before Johnson embraced the generative model of grammatical exposition). More significant still is the absence of any grammatical report in the Berlin Demotistic Colloquium of 1977; while E. Lüdeckens’ paper delivered there (“Stand und Aufgaben der Demotistik”, Enchoria 8:15-23) justly refers to the desiderability of “Ergänzung und Vertiefung unserer Kenntnis der Sprache”, I beg to differ vehemently with his view that what is needed is less “a general structural theoretical orientation” and more “practical paradigms of grammatical research and presentation”; on the contrary: only a precise, theory conscious and scrupulous structuralist ap-
proach will refine the description and enrich our understanding of Demotic at least to the same degree as that of Late Egyptian and Coptic. "Refinement of description" must of course be understood not only in terms of synchronic-descriptive, but also diachronic sensitivity, and not just for the flanking phases, Late Egyptian and Coptic: in the millennium of Demotic documentation, there is a well-felt imbalance of research, due partly — but only partly — to the objective factors of attestation and basic earlier work, between the study of Roman phase — the data base for Johnson's work — and the preceding ones.

Moreover, Coptic today, for all synchronic as well as diachronic purposes, not longer means Sahidic "as depicted in Till's Kopt. Grammatik", or even Sahidic and Bohairic. Following the linguistic digestion of the Nag Hammadi codices and the ever-increasing data base and ensuing understanding of the Oxyrhynchite dialect ("M"), the whole system dialectal of assignment and balance is changing before our eyes, and morphosyntactic as well as functional features acquire new significance and must be re-evaluated in terms of their diachronic relevance. Let us never forget that diachronic linguistics, like any other comparative linguistic study, can be meaningful only if the compared systems are understood in an equal or comparable degree of complexity and sophistication. This condition is hardly fulfilled in the exploitation of Coptic information by modern scholars specializing in pre-Coptic grammar, and the currently widening chasm between "Coptology" and "Egyptology" is detrimental to the understanding of Egyptian and Demotic no less than to that of Coptic. (Indeed, I would suggest that in the present state of knowledge, Coptic is more important than Late Egyptian to a proper analysis of the Demotic system of grammar.)

1. The infinitive (I): the infinitive possessed in an analytical future tense
2. The infinitive (II): the infinitive focalized: relative-topic, Second-Tense-topic Cleft Sentence: verb-lexeme focussing
3. The infinitive (III): the infinitive expanded by a relative auxiliary in a periphrastic-analytical "conjunctural" construction. "That"-forms
4. Zero determination: masculine reference to a zero-determinated feminine noun; neuter gender. Miscellaneous
5. The circumstantial converter (I): circumstantial *glose* in a Cleft Sentence pattern
6. The circumstantial converter (II): adnexal or "rhematic" circumstantial
7. The circumstantial converter (III): circumstantial and preterite "second-power" conversion
8. The circumstantial converter (IV): formal or conditioned circumstantial
9. Nominal Sentence Patterns (I): the “endophoric” Nominal Sentence
10. Nominal Sentence Patterns (II): “Wechselsatz” (1)
11. Nominal Sentence Patterns (III): “Wechselsatz” (2)
12. Nominal Sentence Patterns (IV): “Wechselsatz” (3)
13. Nominal Sentence Patterns (V): “Unbalanced” binominal patterns
14. Nominal Sentence Patterns (VI): non-polemic function of the Cleft Sentence
15. Juncture symptoms: the circumstantial and relative converters; the augens. Miscellaneous
16. The Second Tense (I): the protatic Second Tense and the Conditional
17. The Second Tense (II): Second Tense in rhetorical questions. Foci
18. Aspects of proper-name syntax
19. The conjunctive

Abbreviated References to Demotic Textual Sources


1. The infinitive, I: the infinitive possessed in an analytical future tense

   *Deir el-Medineh 29* (6083): *wn-mtw.i ks.f, wn-mtw.i htp.f n ti-ḥt, iw-bn-p.i šnt.t ḥty.f-pš ḫḏ nty m-st.t “(It is agreed that) I am to bury him, I am to put him to rest in the tomb, without demanding your share of the money which you (would) be owing”; pace Botti “io l’ho fatto seppellire, io ho procurato che egli riposasse nella tomba”. This is a periphrastic future tense in function not far from the “obligative” *shall*, and the Bohairic subjective *eie-*.. In this periphrastic-analytical tense the possession verboid with possessor supply the present-basis obligational temporal constituent and actor, and the infinitive the prospective seme. It is curious that this has escaped Botti of all people, as it formally recalls the evolution of the Romance future (“amare habeo”; indeed, in line 9 *wn-mtw.i dit ky-krkr 5 Botti translates “io darò”). This is confirmed by the non-possessive, if still periphrastic expression of the same undertaking in 32 (6071) l. 8, where we have the prospective *sdm.f* with the basic and circumstantial negative future: *di.i ks.f iw.i ks.f iw.bn-iw.i hpr m-st.t “I shall have him buried; and I will bury him without having a claim on you” (again, Botti’s “io lo feci seppellire, e avendo fatto seppellire, non posso più essere dietro di te” reveals a misunderstanding of the correct time sequence in this case: the burial did not yet take place at the time of the undertaking). In this last example, an “und zwar” Second Tense construction (“...and it is without... that I shall do it”) would seem called for as more idiomatic. A negative counterpart is attested in Botti’s 42
ro 4: mtw.k r ḫd 143 mn–mtw.i ḫ s m–st.k “yours is the amount of 143 silver debens; I shall not be able to reclaim (it) from you”, while the relative conversion of our obligational future occurs in Urk. 4/9 (p. 79) ssw dit nty–ḥry nty–mtw.i dit dit.w–s n.k “At the time of giving, in which I shall make them give it to you”.

As so often, it is in Bohairic on the one hand and non-literary Sahidic on the other that we encounter Coptic comparables: Gen.18:31 ouomtei esajj (Lagarde. Paris copte 1, Vat. copto 1; Gk. ἐκήο lalēsai); in the Sahidic (Ciasca, Wessely) ountais mmaw ewaje the cataphoric “neutric” pronoun, not the infinitive is the possessum: “I have it to speak”. (So are Seth’s exx., Urk. p. 79. In the Sahidic text of Prov. 22:27 [Worrell] esōpe emntak etaa, v.l. ekšantmctou, is not, I believe, a case in point: rhamtic here is the negative possession, and the infinitive a mere complement.) Cf. also NHC II 81.20 ountaf mmaw etrefipo.

However, the true fully grammaticalized descendant of this Theban Demotic construction in Coptic is, I suggest, the non-literary (Theban) Sahidic documentary future oua–i–sōtm: Crum, Dict. 470a; Winlock–Crum, Epiphanius I 251 (e.g. 177/22, 260/13; Crum, Varia Coptica 112; also in Crum, Short Texts and other more recent collections). This form is especially common in the first and second persons and is restricted to approximately the same genre as our Demotic source. The etymology suggested for this conjugation base by Breasted (PSBA 23:239-243, 1901), viz. the periphrastic wîy r– “begin, be about to”, although phonetically convincing, is hard to accept on both functional and distributional counts: his pre-Coptic exx. are all narrative, and the 1st person is not attested; in Coptic, the 1st person predominates, occurring in more than 90% of the attestations; the form is strikingly non-narrative; its meaning is not of an “imminent” but of an “undertaking” or “obligation” future. The formal negative counterpart of ouai–sōtm is, I believe, mnt(a)i–sōtm (not mmntai–!), of the same personal, dialectal and genre distribution. Crum (Dict. 167f) gives as its meaning “negative conditional” (“if not”, “unless…”), but one finds neg. main-clause future instances well attested (Crum, Short Texts 243, 384, perh. 447; Till, Kopt. Ostraka 181, 411 — true semantic correspondents to ouai–); the conditional role may indicate an unmarked circumstantial (our negative Demotic example may also be interpreted as “I not being able…”). Apparently these forms constitute a (Theban dialectal) marginal feature in the history of the Egyptian future, which evolved in a constant range of functional tension between a subjective mode and present-based imminent tense (“tempus instans”).

The classic non-Egyptian parallel to this phenomenon is of course the Romance evolution of “habeo amare” to “j’aime” — traceable in literary sources from the potential/ability modality of about the 1st century B.C.
(Cicero, Horace), through obligation (1st-2nd cent. A.D.) to a modality-neutral future tense in the 2nd century. Cf. also the rather complicated history of Greek ekho with infinitive (again, potentiality in Ancient Greek and later, a "shall" future in early Byzantine Greek: see Mayser, Gramm. d. griech. Papyri II/1 317, 339; Aerts, Periphrastica [1965] 179, n.1, but already in the NT koine: Blass–Debrunner–Rehkopf § 392.2).

2. The infinitive, II: the infinitive focalized: relative-topic, Second-Tense-topic Cleft Sentence: verb focussing

I have here in mind the syntagm(s) of the auxiliary iri with the infinitive:

(a) In DIALOGUE: verb phrase focus, non-interrogative:
1. Leg. Code VII 7 ink s, int.f r–hry n p–yr p–l.ir.i “It is mine, I have brought it up from the canal” (Hughes’s note, p. 107: “I built it myself”); cf. (5).
2. Ryl. 9 1/5f. wh r ms r dit r… p–nty–iw.n r ir.f n–nty–n p–hrw “From this day on we shall (have to) seek (a loan) at interest to give to the….”
3. (Abnormal Hieratic) Tabl. Leid. I 431 ro 23ff. iw.k dit hr.w r dmy śb i.ir.k ir.s p–dit hr p–dziy bdt r śb “When they come to bring me the spelt for Elephantine to No., you are to draw their attention to the town of Elephantine — you will really do it, (namely) draw their attention (to) ferrying spelt to Elephantine”.
4. Ibid. vo 8 p–wmmi dd ḫḥl.k p–pr ‘Ir–Hr i.ir.(i) ḫḥf grt “As for that which was said, that I destroyed Inaros’s house: I did indeed destroy it”.
5. Leg. Code VII 8 mtk s i.ir.k int.f r–hry n p–yr “(Prove that) it is yours, and that you have brought it up from the canal”. Cf. (1).
6. Setne II 4/17ff i.ir.tn 5m r hry r Kmy, i.ir.tn in Pr–’t n Kmy r–hry… “You shall go up to Egypt; you shall bring the King of Egypt down”.

(b) In DIALOGUE, rhetorical question:
7. Ryl. 9 2/15f. in ḫhb rmt m–mtry p–nty–iw.tn r ir.f “Will you really murder a man at high noon?”
8. Ryl. 9 4/10f. in dit ḫm.w m–stw ‘n p–nty–iw.f r ir.f “(The governor dismissed them:) Will he send for them again?” — a num-type rhetorical question: “He will not, will he?”
9. Petub. 7/6 (P. Krall 5/12) in tm gm ḫlybs p–ir.f ḫn–nty.k ‘wy.w “Did you not find an armour in your abode?”
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(c) In *narrative*:
11. Ryl. 9 10/11 *iw-w3h hd bd ir.f hr rnpt p3-nty-iw.w ir.f* “(It did not diminish, for silver would be added to it yearly”.
12. Ryl. 9 21/6f. *dit-iw rmt m-s3 pty.f-nk3 p3-iwm-n.t.f ir.f r-hn-r h3-sp 44* “(He did not come himself, but) used to send for his things until the 44th year”.
13. Myth. 12/6 *ir-ḥbry p3-i.ir-p3-tr3* “Then the kites became befriended”.

*Formal-functional specification:*

The binary structure is striking: # infinitive + object + complements | *p3-i.ir-/p3-nty-iw- #*; as a rule, this structural sequence is matched in the syntagmatic one (one Rom. Demotic contrary example: ex. 9 above). The nexus is affirmative only, by which test this pattern is distinct from a “true” Cleft Sentence. The infinitive is negated in rhetorical questions. Note that, outside the conjugation bases (“pro-verbs”, incl. the causative conjugation and the relative *i.ir-, where it is an analyzing *outil grammatical*) *ir-* is rare in Demotic as the grammatical constituent of a compound verb form with an infinitive as its lexical complement; it is of course used derivatively with nouns, and (infrequently) as a derivational factivity-diathesis and Aktionsart marker with infinitives (*ir-by, ir-h3b, ir-shy; ir-rḥ* is a cause apart, and must be connected with the advanced grammaticalization and reduced material weight of *rḥ*: Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests* 106f.). In Coptic, *er-* with infinitive is (uncommonly) attested in Bohairic, and seems to constitute a valency opposition with the infinitive alone: *er-jinior* with the river crossed; as object, *jinior* with the person ferried as object (Gen. 32:10), *er-mkah nhēt* (Gen. 27:28).

*Functional evaluation:*

**Dialogue.** The affinity of the rhetorical-exclamative (rather than truly interrogative) role “autofocal” verb focalization patterns with the “heterofocal” ones is well discernible in the functional spectrum of the Coptic Second Tense (the present writer’s *Coptic Grammatical Categories*, Rome 1986, 76f.). What is remarkable here, apart from the use of the relativetopic Cleft Sentence for the same purpose (cases a-b) is the fact that not
the verb lexeme alone is focalized, but the entire verb phrase as a unit, and within this we sometimes still isolate, even in the rhetorical question (all of which is rhematic, in macrosyntactic analysis!) and the relative-topic Cleft Sentence, a relatively higher-rhematicity adverbial phrase (“at noon” in ex. 4, “from the river” in exx. 1-2, “at noon” in ex. 4, “in your houses” in ex. 9; for the last mentioned, compare the rhetorical Second Tense in the Coptic [Sahidic] Judges 14:3 estate mnšēere šoop ebol hn-nekšnu auo ebol hm-plaos tērε). Note the clear differentiation between verb-phrase componential modifiers (contained in the first constituent of our construction) and clause modifiers.

In its historical and comparative perspectives, this construction is of special interest. It appears that the so-called “tautological infinitive” construction fills a similar or related function in Old/Middle Egyptian and Scripture Coptic: irdk ird (Coffin Texts VI 392q) “You shall act”, lit. “It is (in) acting that you (shall) act”; Sah. Coptic, 2 Sam. 18:2 hnowe anok tinēu “I shall come”. The unconjigated element, known as “complement infinitive”, syntactically seen as “object” (in the case of transitives; “cognate accusative”, Gardiner) or “subject” (intransitives) is revealed to be of adverbial syntactic status, in a “ghost” slot open after any verb in a certain adverbial paradigm, “shadowing” it while representing its lexemic “name”, functionally resulting in self-focussing. Late Egyptian uses this verb-focalizing construction in dialogue, to mark disjunctive-alternative and rhetorical questions:

P. BM 10052 10/8 (“You are an old fool”:) ird pš-ird “What you have done is theft”;

Late Ramesside Letters 64.12ff. t’m dit.w n.k pš-ird “They must have failed to give them to you” (also P. Anast. IV 7.10f.);

ibid. 15.6ff. n k pš-ird “(Do you still have it) or has it been lost?”;

P. Anast. IX 7l. is-bn pš-ird pš-šr. “Did not the child see?”.

In Middle Egyptian (and to a degree later phases) this construction is of course used in narrative for intransitives and most notably verbs of movement and posture as a sub-textual “paragraph”-initial boundary mark: Hammamat 110.7 hbt pw in.šf m htp “Then it descended safely”; not, however, in rhetorical questions.

Outside Egyptian, Celtic supplies us with a striking parallel (Mabinogi Middle Welsh). Narrative: (a) “Seif a wnaeth, [INFINITIVE]” (“that is what he did, [INFINITIVE]”) — background information; (b) “[INFINITIVE] a wnaeth” (“[INFINITIVE] is what he did”) — episode-seam delimitation, flanking narrative highlights. Dialogue: “[INFINITIVE] a wnaeth” (“[INFINITIVE] is what he did”) — enhanced verb rhematicity (“He really [INFINITIVE], “He did [INFINITIVE]”).
3. The infinitive, III: the infinitive expanded by a relative in a periphrastic-analytical “conjunctional” construction. “That”-forms

(Selected representative examples):

(a) “Preposition (esp. meaning “time since”) + infinitive”:
1. Ryl. 9 1/3 n-t3y-n ir-hm-ntr i.ir p3•-• “Since the... became priest”.
2. Leg. Code IX 3 m-s$ 3 mw i.ir p3y.f-yt “Following his father’s death” (see Hughes’ note, p.117; also IX 4; the same infinitive is definite in Family Archive B ii 5 t p3•-mw i.ir-p3y.f-yt).
3. Myth. 10/29 m-s$ p3•-wy i.ir.t “After you went afar”.
4. Ibid. 4/3f. m-s$ p3•-tm ntf.f i.ir.k “After you did not release it”.
5. Graffiti Dak. 33 m-s$ hb i.ir.f “After he sent a letter”.
6. Myth. 15/13 m-kd p3•-nw r-hr.t nty-iw.f ir.f “As he will look at you (fem.)”.

(b) Preposition/zero adverbial-status marker + noun expressing time or place. Note the special sense of “as soon as...” in the zero-marked temporal case:
7. P. Loeb 11/7fl. t3y-n p3•-hrw n hm-s i.ir p3•-hm-ntr Wsir “Since the day the priest of Osiris so ordered”.
8. Urk. 23/6.7 s’ p3•-ssw n w3y.f nty-iw.3n r-ir.f “Until the time you will want it” (see Sethe, pp. 30, 136f.).
9. p3•-ssw b3’.t n hmt nty-iw.i (r) ir.f “When I leave you as wife” — matrimonial contract clause (Eheverträge 273).
10. Family Archive 593/4 p3•-ss w3y p3•-hd 113 nty-hry mtw.1 nty-i.1r.t ir.f “As soon as you (fem.) require of me the 113 pieces of silver”.
11. Setne 5/1 t3•-wnt w n w3y-S. r-ir.s “As soon as Setne saw her,...” (sim. 3/20, Setne II 3/18, 4/8f., 6.12, Petub. 7/33, 9/3.7 etc. etc.). Cf. the non-verbal finitizing in Ryl. 9 19/11 t3•-wnt w p3k n t3y-s’).
12. Urk. 5/4, 8/4 (etc.) p3•-hrw dd n.i wdt-s nty-iw.3n (r) ir.f “at the day when you tell me to pay it”; similarly, the formulaic (De Cenival, Cautionnements) hrw 2 dd n.i w t3 nty-iw-ir.3n ir.f.
13. Setne 5/32 p3•-m3’ n int.f i.ir.k “Whence you have brought it”, sim. 4/13.
14. Amenraetes 42 [DATE] p3•-hrw mwt i.ir NN/ms i.ir.w NN/ms NN “the day NN died/was born”: note the signalization of passive diathesis of ms by means of the non-personal w or neutral infinitive-actant dependence.
15. Recueil 6 ro 22 sw nb md irm.i d3y.w nty-iw.k ir.f “at any time you shall speak with me about it”: note the hierarchical relative order of the two adverbials, the first rectional (actant), the second complementational and cotextually binding.
(a) Remarkable and significant from the formal point of view are here (a) the relative (not adnominal circumstantial) expansion of the zero-article infinitive (*Urk.* pp. 96f., 136f., Spiegelberg *Grammatik* p. 108). The definite infinitives in Myth. (exx. 3, 4, 6) are remarkable, and perhaps due to the “you”-deixis in dialogue. (The nouns in group [b] are either cataphorically definite or indefinite.) (b) The absence of resumption (and ensuing neutralization of precise spatial relationships: see esp. ex. 13); (γ) the “wrapping”, in a reasoned order hierarchy, of the various actants and complements constituting the verb phrase around the lexical element (see above).

(b) Formally/functionally and synchronically, we face here one of the most difficult and intriguing phenomena of syntax, viz. the junction and interdependence of noun and unattributive clause, that is (at least in languages with which I have a degree of familiarity) resolvable into the dichotomy of adnexal (“nexus-adjoining”) and “conjunctual” roles. On the former, see *Categories* 190f.; the latter “extrinsic” term is very unsatisfactory, but I am at a loss to find another. This construction is *exocentric*, and the nouns, grammaticalized, are not antecedent nuclei at all, nor the clauses attributive expansions: indeed, these are cases of government, of a “determination” dependence (in Hjelmslev’s classification: “determination unilatérale”), not different in principle from that of “preposition + noun” (our nouns are no less grammaticalized than a preposition); formally, it is the absence of resumption that distinguishes it from the true attributive expansion of a nominal nucleus (compare Bohairic Coptic [Lev. 23:51] *piehoou etetnaini ehoun*; *Categories* 163); the circumstantial expansion of the temporal nucleus, with no resumption, is uncommon in Demotic, but very important in Coptic — in a sense this is the “conjunctual” clause-form *par excellence: Family Archive B iii 5 pt-hrw iw.w wi6.f “the day they ask for it...”; cf. ex. 8 above.*

(c) Note the *narrative role* of the construction (ex. 11). Restricted to verbs like *sdm, nw, dd*, it constitutes a “secondary” narrative tense and sub-paragraph boundary signal: the mainstream event invariably follows it with a *sdm.f* form.

(d) Diachronically, one can interpret this syntax as manifesting one of the last traces of the characteristic LE analytical “nominal syntax”, the use of the auxiliary *iri* to separate the lexical from the grammatical-categorial components of the verb phrase and “isolate” the latter in a “parcel” of “pro-verbal” grammeme with pronominal antensional expression. Diachronically and systemically, however, this phenomenon is relatable to the shifting, in the later phases of Egyptian from LE on, of the “that”-form (grammaticalized finite verbal nominalization) role from the “emphatic” (“Second Tense”) to other, analytical means of expression; in
Demotic, the infinitive (with the relative auxiliary supplying the finitizing exponent) shares the “that”-form spectrum with (pî-)hpr (recalling to a degree the LE pî–wn?), as direct object actant, rectum of prepositions and even causal “that”: ḥr-(pî-)hpr– Ryl. 9 13/11f., 15/3; gm.f pî–hpr iw– Nominal Sentence, Setne II 5/15; m–st–hpr, r–db3 hpr Ryl. 9 6/6.10, 15/4, 18/7; hpr– “it being that...” (P. Vandier 2/5, Mattha, Ostr. 129, 15 vs. r–db3 hpr in 66; see De Cenival, “Notes de grammaire et de lexicographie...”, in Festschrift Westendorf [Göttingen 1984] 215ff., p. 218), and with the conjunctive and Westemtalet other, more specialized, syntagmatic sectors. (It seems that pî–gy n– serves as a more “concrete” “manner nominalization” form in object status and as a thematic constituent of a Nominal Sentence: consider Ryl. 9 1/7ff., Setne 5/17.33, Krugtexte B 17 etc. etc.; in Bohairic Coptic, of course, pjîn–thref– is a fully grammaticalized “that”-form.)

4. Zero determination: Masculine pronominal reference to a zero-determined feminine noun; neuter gender

(a) To the best of my knowledge, the special cohesion pattern here discussed is best attested in Roman Demotic, although the evidence possibly goes back to Abnormal Hieratic. It is well known in Coptic (Categories Chapter 5, esp. 147ff.), with correspondents for all its grammatical implications: the full and unmistakably morphemic value of the zero article; its nuclearity in the noun syntagm (it is the article that is the referate of the resumptive pronoun); the overrule of the motion suffix .t (it is conceivable that in Demotic, as in Coptic, the oppositions šr/šrt, sn/snt are no less lexical and no more grammatical [“morphological”] than yt/mwt; it is the determinator that characterizes gender in the noun syntagm, as does the cataphoric article in Family Archive vo vii 11 pî–šr ti–šrt pî–sn ti–snt pî–rmt nb pî–t3 nty–iw.f iy...). The constituency of the “neuter” term in the complex category of gender/number. The masculine is in Demotic as in Coptic (comparably with many languages of a binary gender category, Semitic and Romance) the unmarked term. The masculine referent varies with the “normal” plural pronoun (so in Coptic, Categories loc. cit.): Graffiti Philae 421 mt–rm–n–ntr iw–wšh.n ir.w, or the regular plural reference to the contractual swn ḥd “the money’s worth”, e.g. Recueil 5 ro 11-13 and II p. 55 note k; and of course with the feminine, e.g. Ins. 16/11f., 26/11. The resumption (actor or direct object) is mostly included in a circumstantial expansion of the feminine noun; the tenses represented are the present, future or periphrastic perfect.
1. P. Loeb 21 13ff. mn-mtw.i šnd m-imw... iw.w ṭh ir m-im.f m-si ti-šnd 2 r-hb.i “I do not have any clothes that can be made, except for the two clothes I have written (about)” (Spiegelberg “sic”’s the pronoun, and points out the “change of gender” in his notes, p. 54 n. 5, with no further comment). Šnd is feminine (Erichsen, Glossar 516).

2. Graffiti Dak. 30/5 ...iw-nī’-n-hrwt iw-wih.n ir.f bh-Hrtyt n-pī-b śr dr.f “... festivals we have made in the presence of the Mistress of the Whole World being good”. Hrwt (= Greek heortē) is feminine, Griffith p. 29, Stories of the High Priests 84, Erichsen, Glossar 279.

3. Ibid. Philae 416/15f. ky-wšb 1t n-nb iw-wih Tkrrmn dit in-w-s r ḫt-ntr n-isf ir n-lytr 3½ “Another golden cup which T. sent to the Temple of Isis, constituting 3½ pounds”. For the fem. lexeme, see Griffith p. 118 (Erichsen, Glossar p. 102).

4. Ins. 8/14 wn-pī-nty-ibh r-shm.t iw.f ḫl “there is one who ignores (or forgets) young women”; the Carlsberg version II 4/14 reads here iw.s. My analysis goes against the usual interpretation (Lexa: “Il y a des gens qui, étant jeunes, oublient (leur) femmes”; similarly Lichtheim, Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature 204: “who forgets a wife when he is young”; sim. Volten, Weisheitsbuch), but I believe it improves the sense of the passage and reduces its banality: the man, being in love, ignores other attractions. For the neutric masculine reference to the generic “woman” (overrule of sex by grammatical gender), cf. in Coptic Sir. 36:29 oun-shime de enanouf eshime.

5. Mag. 6/5 i.ir.k (i/iw.k) dit ‘lbwnt r pī-ḥ iw.f w’b “You shall put pure frankincense in the oven”.

6. (Abnormal Hieratic) Tabl. Leid. I 431 ro 18 ʾs’ iw.f wn “Open letter”. I believe Černý’s observation (52 n. 29) “[...] the old ʾs’ ‘document’ which must have been revived at this late period” is unnecessary. For the feminine ʾs’, see Griffith, Ryl. 392; Urk. p. 417 (occurring also in the Loeb papyri).

7. Ins. 28/1 ypt sbk ḫrt sbk ni-ʾn.f r sy iw.k wy “A little work, a little food are better than satiety when you are far away”. This is perhaps a case apart, as the pronoun here may be, not a prime anaphoric but a paradigmatic “it”. Compare Dem. O. Colon. Inv. 219 3ff. (ed. Thissen, Enchoria 6:68, 1976) ni-ʾn.f iw.k ir.f “It is well if you do it”, sim. Urk. 13/12 (with Coptic: nanouf/nanous ek(šan–), Categories 148ff.).

(b) A puzzling case of neutric masculine occurs in a formula recurring in the contracts for days of liturgical service (Deir el-Medineh; see also Grunert, ÄZ 106:60ff., 1979): ḫr ibd nb ḫpr.f ḫr ɾnpt nb ḫpr.f (Botti “per/di ogni mese/tutto l’anno che verrà [che è, che sarà stato]”, e.g. in
Nos. 1 [6069], 2 [6075], 12 [6068], once, 24 [6090], 13, we find a variant \textit{hpr}: participle? also in 37 [6085] ro 11.15.

As I see it, the alternatives are (1) seeing this masculine pronoun as a paradigmatic neuter and \textit{hpr.f} as protatic: “should this happen” (Spiegelberg \textit{Grammatik} §507), (2) seeing \textit{hpr.f} as adnominal-circumstantial (\textit{hr rnpt nb hpr.f nty−hry} in 25 [6077] 13 would support this analysis, which seems the most naturally plausible), with the pronoun directly anaphoric to \textit{ibd}, \textit{rnpt}: the masculine resuming \textit{rnpt nb} (and \textit{ibd nb}), and the clause meaning “when it takes place” or similar. (\textit{hpr.f} can hardly resume the quantified [\textit{pr}−\textit{hrw n s’nb}] [+number], which is as a rule treated as plural.)

(c) Likewise relevant to the \textit{flottement} anaphoric expression of the neuter term of gender in Demotic are cases of non-anaphoric (cataphoric, paradigmatic or non-specifically resuming) neuter, Copt. masculine/feminine:

(1) Actor actant: masculine: P. Loeb 17/38 in \textit{nt}−’\textit{n.f} (rhetorical) “Is it good?”; iw.f \textit{hpr}, \textit{hpr.f}, mtw.f \textit{hpr} passim. Feminine: the neutric pron. exponent cataphoric to a \textit{dđ}–content clause or infinitive: \textit{hpr.s dđ} Ryl. 9 3/1. Exceptions are found in the backgrounding (not narrative!) Second Tense \textit{i.ir.s hpr}… (ibid. 3/13, 6/1, 2/20); the phrase –’\textit{k.s n h̄ôte}… Ryl. 9 14/22f., 15/19, 20/12, which however is governed by \textit{dit} and might be objective (see below; yet cf. Boh. Coptic \textit{shen-tetenpsukhē} with \textit{hōste} + infinitive, Gen. 23:8); cases of durative-pattern (“Bipartite”) actor: \textit{my hpr.f iw.s rh.t n t̄n, pi−w’b nty−iw.s ph n ir.f}… P. Berlin 13540, iw.s mtw.k ’wy.i P. Loeb 52/2).

(2) Adverbial direct object or prepositional \textit{rectum}, object actant: feminine. The “dependent” or “objective pronoun” –s is of course neutric in its being formally unmarked (“indifferent”) for gender, historically merging masc. \textit{sw}, fem. \textit{sy} and ntr. \textit{st}. However, the suffix =s (following prepositions or the pronominal state of the infinitive) is feminine in form, expressing neuter or feminine gender (P. Loeb 1/5 \textit{m−st.s}; ibid. 21/28 [imperative] \textit{hb n.i m−ims}; Krugtexte B 17 twi \textit{dbh m−ims} iw.f \textit{hpr} iw.s \textit{hs ir.k h̄n−s dit in.w n.i}…; P. Loeb 1/12 iw.f \textit{hpr} iw−mr.w−s). The neutric object of finite verb forms and verb lexemes is s, variously spelt, structurally distinct (in valency status) from the fem. suffix but often morphologically merging with it: \textit{Urk. 16/2.4 hr šn.i−s rmt nbt} (see pp. 414, 417 for other verbs-lexeme governing this construction). Note cases of “tension” between the necessarily discrete masculine or feminine pronominal formal antecedent of a relative form and the “syncrete” resumptive s (obj. pronoun + suffix pronoun class):
Feminine determinator nucleus of relative (to my knowledge, not in Coptic):
Ryl. 9 10/16f. ti-nty- iw... dd m-im.s;
O. Med. Habu 153 (MH 2834) 9f. ti-nty- iw.k wḥ.s;
P. Loeb 6/37.40 ti-nty- iw.i ir.s nbt, ti-nty- iw ir W. ddt.s i.ir.s;
Setne 5/18 ti- iw.n r-b-nty r- ḏbt.s.

Masculine nucleus of the relative:
Ins. 18/15, Setne 5/23 pi-nty- mr.f-s (20/3 pi-ṣḥny nty-mr.f-s);
Setne 4/18 pi-nty- iw.i ddt.s;
Erzählung 2/2 pi-nty- iw.f dd m-im.f;
Recueil 8 A 7 pi-nty- iw.i mi’.k m-im.w.

Plural nucleus:
P. Berlin 13565 n3-nty- iw.w ḫn m-im.s (so Spiegelberg. Read ti-?; sim.
P. Loeb 6/38ff.).

Compare the following Coptic combinations: nenta- nṣoos joos (Luc. 2:18 Quecke); pentanjoof je-, Shenoute, ed. Chassinat 29, anaphoric overruling cataphoric; Eccl. 8:14 oun- oupetsoueit eauaas (Gk éstin ma-
taiōtēs hē pepoiēsetai. ...), pima etaphnouti jos naf (Boh. consensus for Gen.
22:3). Coptic seems to prefer the plural neutric formal antecedent, at least
will certain verbs (nṭśoop: Rom. 8:38, I Cor. 3:22, Heb. 13:5), although
the masculine is generally well attested.

(d) The structural, système de valeur aspect of zero determination in
Demotic pertains to its relationship to definite and indefinite determination
(Johnson’s observation, p. 9, n. 25, to the effect that “An undefined
noun is a simple noun, without any article, demonstrative or the like. An
indefinite noun is either an undefined noun or a noun the indefinite article”
rather muddles up the issue, and hardly does justice to the comp lex-
ity of noun syntax). It seems that, while indefinite determination is in
Demotic (unlike Coptic) indefinite-specific (“a certain...”, plur. “cer-
tain...s”, denoting one or an indefinite number of specific individual(s)
of a class — Myth. 17/9 wnn1w-wn- w’- miy hr-pī- ḏw r- wnn1w- nī- nḥt.f, zero determination denotes both indefinite non-specific (“some, any...”) or a generic reference to a class. As in Coptic, the Demotic indefinite article also belongs to the quantifier paradigm (w’- and other numbers; ky-; the distributive -nb). Several important syntagmatic compatibility
features are here instructive (representative illustration):

(1) Statement of existence (wn-). The plural “indefinite” ḥyn- does
not entail in the durative pattern (circumstantial) an existential
construction (Setne II 2/16 twice; while it is of course compatible with wn-, ibid.
2/1; consider also Setne 4/39, 5/12.16.37.38.). A neat, clear-cut opposition
between the non-definite determination grades as existants is evident in Thompson, *Family Archive*:

\[ wn\- \quad w\-: \text{"one (quantifier) or "a certain..."} \]
\[ (B\ i\ 9, \ iv\ 4, \ vi\ 12f.16f., \ ix\ 13) \]
\[ quantifiers (iii\ 23, \ iv\ 20) \]
\[ zero: \text{abstracts: notion name (B\ ii\ 15.24)} \]
\[ zero: \text{non-abstracts: non-specific indefinite:} \]
\[ "\text{some...}, \text{"any..." (B\ v\ 3, \ vi\ 11,} \]
\[ vo\ ii\ 16, \text{Ryl.\ 9 7/9, P. Loeb 1/10} \]
\[ (\text{NOUN + nb, Setne 5/9)} \]

(2) Statements of non-existence (*mn*-*) have different compatibilities. We find as (non-)existants the following determination grades: zero- (generic only: Ryl. 9 1/4f., 2/20, Setne 5/30, Petub. 4/19f.); *pi*-nty- (Setne 5/17; not immediately comparable to Coptic *mn*-pet-, in which pet- is the generic, determinable "lexicalized" rather than the definite relative; see below, note 6); *ni*-rmt- with a catapphoric determination (P. Loeb 1/7); structurally relevant is *pi*-rmt nb, *pi*-nkt nb (Family Archive B viii 21, ix 1, vo xvii 11, 592/10; Cairo 50041, 50100 [Spiegelberg, *Catalogue* 12, 74]. See *Urk.* 271), in which it is the def. article that is modified by nb, and which is paralleled in Coptic (Categories 144 n.16). The non-existant determination in Coptic (the Sah. NT) includes the generic zero and its "verbal" alternant, viz. pet-; and the quantifiers: ke-, hah n- (I Cor. 1:26), numbers (Joh. 6:7, 11:9), with ou-... nouot supplying the term for “one” (Act. 27:22.34); as in Demotic, the indefinite article is conspicuous by its absence (for reasons of logico-semantic incompatibility?).

NB: (a) The generic zero-determinated existant with *wn-* is typical of rhetorical questions (Ryl. 9 8/15f., Setne 6/3, Harpist 1/7 etc.), in which texteme it is nothing else but the rhetorical dialogue alternants of the non-existent (contrast Ryl. 9 8/15f. in-*wn mdt-nfrt [mntnofre] iw.k dd my ir.w-s n.i with the narrative 10/16 mn-mdt-nfrt iw-bn-p-Pr'-; dii ir.w-s n.i; (b) the verboids of possession *wn-*/mn-mtw- are formally distinct from statements of (non-)existence by the determination properties of their possessa (strikingly different from the determination of (non-)existants) no less than by internal structure or the order of constituents.

(3) Non-zero objective resumption of zero determination: Setne II 2/18 . . . iw-b-ir.w gn t r wm.s.; contrast with Boh. Coptic ntefti n-ouoeik neî eouôm (Gen. 28:20), Sah. anaš men mpouiere (Shenoute, ed. Leip. III 18): see Categories 112f.

(4) Note that in the endophoric Nominal Sentence pattern (below,
note 9), zero-determination of the abstract rheme corresponds to indefinite article in Coptic: mdt—... tyy with oumetatemi te (Num. 15:25, Boh.)

(5) Zero vs. non-zero coordinated determination: the coordinators irm– (hn’–) are compatible with definite and indefinite grades, while zero coordinates zero determination: Setne 5/8 ih ipd irp yb hbn, Setne II 2/18 grh mtry, Amenothes 2 ro 6 mtw.t swr wnm hbs sgr ir..., also bracketed by a definite determinator or the nota relationis: pīr–[sh-nfr rmt-rf] Setne II 2/32, tyy.w–[hrt mw t] ibid. 2/1.16.19, w’–glg n–[ybl bbn] Setne 5/28f.

(6) The normal abnominal construction following a noun syntagm containing nb “all, every/any” in Demotic is the relative clause form with a plural reference (sh nb nty–iw.i mtv.k m–im.w, ’y nb nty–iw.w m–im.w Recueil 8, ms nb nty–iw.s mst.w Ryl. 8/3, nty–nb nty–n’–n.w Setne 3/5). This would imply that nb is a (post-)determinator commuting with zero, not a distributive quantifier modifying a zero-determined noun, and really expresses class totality. Still, the sporadic, very rare and often variant attestation of an “indefinite nucleus” abnominal syntax, with singular resumption (Family Archive B iv 25, vi 26 nty–nb nkt nb mtw– vs. nty–mtw– in B iv 12, ix 20, etc.; 59/4/6 knbt nb mdt nb pī tī irm.t) may be an indication that the non-defining, distributive nb which quantifies a zero determinator in Coptic (“any”, “every”: Categories 143f.) may not be unknown to Demotic. Obviously, this needs further study, in Coptic as well as Demotic. (In Setne 3/20 bn–p.f gm mtv’ nb n pī–tī iwf m–im.f the singular resumption is a case in point, while the circumstantial, which is the adnexal complement to gm, is not.)

(7) As in Bohairic Coptic, the possessive adjunct with a pronominal possessor (mtw=, “of mine”, “of yours” etc. — I find the first person sgl. predominates in my examples) expands in Demotic not only generic and indefinite but also high-specificity nuclei:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>zero</th>
<th>mtw.i (Ryl. 9 5/9, 20/1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N nb</td>
<td>mtw.w (Ryl. 1; mtw.i Schreibertradition 5 [Louvre 2429bis])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number + N</td>
<td>mtw.i (Ryl. 9 2/6f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w’– (“a certain...”)</td>
<td>mtw.i (Mag. 3/8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pī–sīr</td>
<td>mtw.i nty–iw.f r ḫpr dy (Ryl. 9 13/14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This construction is therefore not useful for resolving the finer oppositions of low-specificity reference.

(8) The Demotic predecessor of Coptic “intransitive” or copular r–, alternating with o n– in the durative pattern and predicating a noun incidentally (as against the inherent predication of the Nominal Sentence: see Categories 106 n. 4, Or 56:159, 1987) is not clear. We do find r– used in
this way, in the aorist (Ryl. 9 14/21), and cases of ir which may be the incomplete-predication stative: Recueil 3 ro 5 š-nht nty-ir n.f (n?) rsy “the building which forms its south”; the formulaic r- “amounting to”, which Sethe takes to be an abbreviated code for ivery n– (Sethe Urk. 9/14, p. 178f). The relevance of this construction for low-specificity determination lies in the determination grading of the predicative noun introduced by the morpheme n–, which occurs of course also as predicative complement of other verbs: ...iw.t mtw.i n hmt (Ryl. 20/8), n–nty–iw.w mtw.w n w′b (Can. T 68). Whereas Bohairic Coptic seems to differentiate between –oi n-Ø– and –šopi (etc.) e/n-ou-/han– (e.g. Gen. 10:9, 14:10, 17:8 and 2:25, 1:14f. respectively), Demotic seems never to use the indefinite grade in the predicative noun; an incompatibility evidently due to the specificity seme in the Demotic indefinite grade, absent in Coptic.

5. The circumstantial converter, I: circumstantial glose (topic) in a Cleft Sentence pattern

1. P. Or. Inst. (Chicago) 19422 (ed. Hughes, JNES 17:1ff., 1958) n–tšy hšt–sp 11 ibd 2 prt r–hn–pt–hrw iw.(i) ir š–wpy.t n pš–Hb “It is since the eleventh year, second winter month that I have been doing the work of the Ibis”. The circumstantial marking quantifies time duration as focus. Compare in Late Egyptian Doomed Prince 8.11f.; Horus and Seth 13.12, 14.1. In Coptic, ouaprêše de ere-tootk olk Prov. 6:10 (Sah., Akhm.) is immediately comparable, while the following constructions are formally more evolved but functionally corresponding: Ex. 23:10 Boh. (sim. 23:12, etc.): 6 nrompi petekesiti mpekiohi mmoou, but Gen. 31:38 Boh. nai 20 nrompe ne eikhê... nemak (Sah. eix–...tišoop) or II Cor. 13:1 Boh. phai 3 nsop pe eínêou, with the endophoric pattern expanded by the thematic circumstantial. Consider also (Wessely, Texte V, 30) peßmehmèt nsop pe jin-tašôpe.

2. Petub. 3/8 iw gm.k–s tš? “Where was it that you found it (them)?” (Johnson’s E 204, differently interpreted).

3. Ryl. 9 15/4 iw.f tš pty.f–šr “Where is it that he is, his son”. The circumstantial marking its own rhyme as focus (Categories 76ff.). Griffith p. 405 compares Copt. (Boh.) afthôn, which is however immediately comparable to i.ir.f tš. (The syntax of tš “where” furnishes an interesting study in diachronic as well as synchronic syntax: it is worth noting, that this is not on a par with other autofocal roles of the Second Tense, which are virtually non-existent in Scripture Bohairic.)

4. Ins. 7/23 pš–hš nty–nw r shmt iw.f m–kd ‘f irm snf “The fool who
looks at a woman, he is like a fly with (i.e. looking at) blood” (“It is like... that he is”).
5. Ibid. 26/19 tiy.f-wyt iw.s m-drt.w “(A wise man whom people trust,) it is in their hands that his pledge is”.
6. Ibid. 29/13 hfr iw.f nyfr iw-tiy.f-mtwrt rt.f rmt-hm tiy.f-mtwt iw.s hft.f “A spitting snake, its venom is in its mouth; a mean man, his venom is in his heart”.

While it is of course true that in cases like exx. 4, 5, 6 (second half), iw- may be but the graphic characteristic of the prefix pronoun (in a form which neutralizes the opposition of the basic durative tense and its circumstantial conversion), it is nevertheless my impression that this orthographic neutralization is resolved by the distinctive syntactic Functional Sentence Perspective configurations of focal vs. non-focal rhemes.
7. Mag. 19/12ff. (Johnson p. 117f, E 203) (syntactically text-initial, following the address): iw-sw frst Wsir Pri-sly-3 n-hlt.k iw swr.w p'-3 ntrw iw-swri m-st.w hlt dd iwn.k-dt ir.i thy n.k-dt ir.i byk n.k-dt ir.i hty r-bl n.k-dit ir.3 hbrbr n.k-dit ir.i thy n hlt... “It is out of you that Isis, Osiris and Pshoi-o have drunk, and it is in order that you may cause me not to get drunk, not to be shipwrecked, not to perish, not to be thrown down, not to be hurt in heart... that they drank, the three gods, and I too, after them”: a striking case of “und zwar”, gradual information-accumulating progression; the catalogue of negative final clauses is indubitably rhematic.
8. Setne II 3/16ff. (Why do you laugh?) iw.i shy dd iir.k kti iw-hlt.k thr r-dbt p'-smt n tiy-mdt hm “It is because you lie down while your heart is troubled because of this kind of small matter that I laugh” (in Demotic, a “chinese box” double Cleft Sentence: “It is because [it is while your heart is troubled because of this kind of small matter that you lie down] that I laugh”).

Finally, certain formulaic legal phrases, with iw- theme and an adversarial or statival rhyme (a distinctively spelled “prefix pronoun” interpretation — which would anyway mean the neutralization of basic tense and circumstantial conversion — is ruled out in most of these cases):
9. The contractual clause formula “iw.k m-st.i” “You have a claim on me” (Urk. 1/17, p. 41; Family Archive p. 30 n. 161; iir- in abnormal Hieratic, P. BM 10113 1/5, ed. Malinine, BIFAO 46:116f., 1947; Recueil II 18).
10. “iw.s mtw.tn ’wy.i” “I owe you” (lit. “it is with you against me”) (Urk. 1/10).
11. The “iw.t n-hn, iw.t n-hn irm.w; iw.t n-bl, iw.t n-bl irm.w” in marriage settlements: “If you are inside, it is with them you are inside; if you are outside, it is with them you are outside”.

WORK-NOTES ON DEMOTIC SYNTAX I
An alternative interpretation which cannot be ruled out for cases 9-11 is the veteran Egyptian prospective-modal \( \text{"iw- + adv./stative"} \) form (Erman, *Neuägypt. Grammatik* § 470; Satzinger, *Neuägyptische Studien* 198ff.; for instance, the oath “apodosis” in P. BM 10053).

12. \( \text{"iw.w šp"} \) in receipts: “they are (hereby) received” (O. Med. Habu, 83, 91; compare \( \text{st šp} \) in 118). This may be compared with the performative (“Koinzidenzfäll”) role of the autofocal Second Tense (*Categories* 79f., n. 92).

Historical antecedents and follow-up. Late Egyptian: the present writer, *OLP* 9 (1978) 56ff. Coptic: *Categories* 85ff. Coptic \( \text{eaf-} \) in Sah. and Akhmimic (Clem. 61 \( \text{eashei nêne name pneumatikôs etbêf} \)), which in these two dialects is clearly circumstantial, must perhaps be considered separately, in view of such important dialectal forms as \( \text{a-af-} \) and \( \text{a-haf-} \); however, the case of dialect M (\( \text{e-haf-} \)) points to the full systematization in this dialect of the circumstantial as “glose”-form.

6. The circumstantial converter, II: adnexal or “rhematic” circumstantial

The functional distinction of adnominal/adverbal status (at least as resolved in a traditional Coptic-oriented grammatical bias, in a misleadingly simple correlation with nucleus determination) is revealed in certain syntagms as inapplicable or inessential. The prime function of the circumstantial is \( \text{adnexal} \) (*Categories* 190f.), which is not coextensive with either adnominal-attributive or adverbal-“adverbial”, although it is opposed to the former in adnominal placement.

(a) The case of a circumstantial statement of (non)-existence (\( \text{iw-wn-}/\text{iw-mn-} \)):

In this construction, recurring in and typical of P. Insinger, the placement opposition adnominal vs. adverbal is irrelevant; it is the resumption (vs. ‘no resumption’) that carries the semantic opposition of (adnominal) “who../whom...”, vs. (“adverbial”, really adnexal or nexus-adjoining) “with”/“without”, or rather triggers this distinction in translation into English; \( \text{iw-mn-} \) is final in its immediate syntactic unit; and, while the unit as a whole is topical or thematic in relation to its following “sentential” context, \( \text{iw-mn-} \) is its rheme and carries the main information. The affirmative \( \text{iw-wn} \) is much rarer than its neg. counterpart.

(1) Adnominal placement, no pronominal resumption:

Abstract nouns, infinitives:

\( 5/16 \text{ sk iw-mn-‘f’... “Saving without greed”;} \)
7/18 šft iw–mn–hy. “Poverty without spending”;
8/8 rnt iw–mn–isw. “Wealth without income”;
15/8 dsft iw–wn–‘f’ “Mortgage with greed”;
23/8 mhl iw–wn–sgrḥ. “Combat with rest” (Volten Weisheitsbuch 24ff. and Lichtheim Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature 221 emend this to “without”, iw–mn–; I think this is unnecessary, as the affirmative makes good sense: the army will not fail — wsf, “cease”, “be brought to naught” — if it can take a rest occasionally).

Generic nouns:
23/7 rmt–rḥ iw–wn sgrḥ “a wise person with calm”;
10/5 rmt–swg iw–wn–nḥt “a fool with power” (“ends up in prison”; emended again, this time to iw–mn by Volten [loc. cit.] and Lichtheim, 206; I believe it is the potentially criminal combination of senselessness and power that is here cautioned against).

Contrasted with (2) Adnominal placement, pronominal resumption of noun:
14/6 lh iw–mn–šḥt ḥt.f “A fool before whom there is no stick”;
25/16 dmi iw–mn–mtw.k mhwt m–im.f “A town in which you have no family”;
26/12 tm ir–ḥn irm ky iw–wn–mst n ḥḥt.f “Be not close to another in whose heart there is hatred”

and with (3) non-adnominal placement: “definite relative generic present + iw–wn–/iw–mn–”, theme constituent in a special binominal Nominal Sentence pattern the rheme of which is another definite relative present. Here too, iw–wn–/iw–mn–, in final position, is rhematic in the theme unit:

Note that the non-actual or generic present is here marked by the invalidity or suspension of the Jernstedt–Parker rule for direct-object attachment, which is not in the case of a pronominal object a mere orthographic omission of the object marker n–. This genericity is correlated to the non-specific reference role of the determinator ḫt– with nty– (“anyone that”, “such [a person] as”), which is nonetheless definite. Compare, for Coptic, Categories 118f., 202f.

While …iw–mn–ḥt–nty is strikingly paralleled in Coptic emn–pet–/mmon pet– (Shenoute ed. Leip. III 121, 126, 220, IV 2.23, ed. Chassinat 134, 197; Lev. 26:17), emn– + abstract is less prevalent, but occurs
in gnomic texts, Sir. 21:4, 32:22, Job 14:4, 16:13). Incidentally, this ṣnty-/pet- following wn-/mn-, oun-/mn- is generic in Coptic too (non-specific: “such as…” , “anyone that…” : cf. Johnson 85f.; Sir. 20:3f. 9f. 20ff., Prov. 12:17, 13:7 etc.), while the specific pet- (“the one who…” , “a certain one who…” ) enters the ḥsoop nci- form of existence (e.g. Joh. 5:45 ḥsoop nci-petnakategorei mmōtn).

Obs. We conventionally read the Demotic group expressing non-existence as mn-, ignoring the diachronic fact that in Coptic, a form with syllabic labial nasal (mmn-/mmn-) is primary. In Bohairic, this implies the total and constant neutralization of the opposition between basic and circumstantial in this case, as in all others of a clause beginning with a syllabic nasal (mpatf-, mpaf-, n...an). I have not come upon Demotic examples where such neutralization is certain, but two loci where it is plausible are Deir el-Medineh 42 ro 4, quoted above (p. 32), and Family Archive B x 10 bn-p.s smy “without her having complained”; needless to say, to arrive at solid conclusions regarding this matter, one needs to review all instances of nasal-initial clauses and try to isolate formal cotextual patterns as a basis for formal statements of subordination.

(b) Circumstantial conversion of the Cleft Sentence, expanding a definite (demonstrative) noun:
Setne 3/12 pty-ḏm’... iw-Thwt i.ir sh.f n qrt.f h’.f “This book... which Thot wrote in his own hands”.

I suspect that what we have here is, on one hand, a formally motivated neutralization favouring the circumstantial of the adnominal circumstantial vs. relative adnominal opposition (functionally: adnexal vs. attributive, respectively), this time not conditioned by nucleus determination (as in the case of the indefinite nucleus) but by the incompatibility of the relative Cleft Sentence with the relative converter. On the other hand, the verbal expansion of high-specificity nuclei, demonstrative or proper name, is characteristically non-restrictive, which calls for the adnexal circumstantial rather than the attributive relative. Compare, in Late Egyptian, Late Ramesside Letters 47.7f. ir-pty-šš ỉwn dy ḥst.tn iw-ntf pi-nty dit... “...it being he who was appointed”. (Pace Groll, Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns 80: “The fact that the ‘iw’ precedes the independent pronoun indicates that the extraposition and the main sentence do not constitute a single syntactic unit: ‘with regard to this scribe... since it is he who was appointed’”. See Erman, Neuägypt. Grammatik § 832, on the proper-name nucleus expanded by the circumstantial.) In Coptic, as far as I know, the only case of relative Cleft Sentence is that of the conditioned or formal (‘conjunctival’) relative: Shenoute ed. Amél. I 232 nthe on ete-amnte petnaklēronomei... Otherwise, the circumstantial marks the satellital sta-
tus of the Cleft Sentence, adnominal or not (cf. Till, Kopt. Grammatik § 472): Wessely, Texte IX 143 c 10ff. pkata-maththaios pkata-markos pkata-loukas pkata-iōhannēs enai netrouoein epkosmos tērf Ἐπιφανιαν 283) or pijōm ere-hōb nim shēout erof (De Vis, Homélies coptes II 153) call for comparison with the Demotic syntax here discussed.

(c) Erzählung 3/2 m-si pīrُ iv.f in-n"y.k r nty.f 'yw n htp n rhy "after the sun has departed to his abode in peace... in the evening", lit. "after the sun departing..."; the circumstantial is both adnominal and rhematic. This is a clear case of the adnexit "atmospheric" construction, well attested in Coptic (and Greek): mpnau mprē efnapire Shenoute ed. Leip. III 87; hmrē efnahōt Budge, Miscell. 142; cf. also Gen. 15:12, De Morte Jos. 23.9.

(d) The placement of the adnexit or rhematic circumstantial tends to be final even in the case of a long and involved clause sequence: Leases 5/14f. i pī-. . . nbyt n 'hwty nty-īw.i r gm.f hr-ht n nty-īhw nty hry, i.ir(i) r ṭy r 's nī-dnywt n it-nfr Rry sē Dir-Imn'-w-Ḥnsw n tny.k-dnyt n pī-nty'-h' mn iv.f nfr "As for the farmer's damage which I shall find upon these aforementioned lands, I shall take in excess of the portions of the god's-father R. from your portion of whatever stands remaining, that which is good". Both the final position and the antecedent-less (Hughes's emendation of ʿpty.f-smw) after ṭy is I believe unnecessary) syntax of this circumstantial recall the Coptic ḫĢōt in this role (the present writer, JEA 62:134-7, 1976), and especially Bohairic ḫĢōtī “round about”, (from such instances — all non-adnominal! — as [Lev. 14:41] evēhāḥ saḥoun mpiē ḫĢōtī, to [Ex. 38:31] nem-nibasis nte-tiskunē ḫĢōtī nem-nibasis nte-tiaulē nem-nišmou nte-tiaulē ḫĢōtī).

7. The circumstantial converter, III: circumstantial and preterite “second-power” conversion.

Converter (and converted-clause) compatibilities and incompatibilities are of descriptive and theoretical interest both diachronically (as sensitive indicants of an earlier homo-paradigmatic standing or other structural affinity; witness in Coptic the incompatibility of the negative aorist, not shared by the affirmative, with the Second Tense converter) and especially
synchronously-structurally: incompatibility ("mutual exclusion") effectively meaning mutual paradigmatic affinity, compatibility hetero-paradigmatic status. In Coptic, two converter sub-groups are resolvable by this test:

(I) RELATIVE, CIRCUMSTANTIAL: microsyntactically operative and commutable — attributive and adnaxal satellite markers, respectively — in interdependence with an adjacent textual segment. Characterized by e-vocalism in dialects A, B, F, M. Converting the negated clause (i.e. preceding the negator in syntagmatic sequence);

(II) "SECOND TENSE", "PRETERITE": macrosyntactically operative and commutable: "high" and "low relief", respectively, focalization and back-grounding/pace-shifting in narrative. (In Demotic, the Second Tense seems to have this role in narrative: consider i.ir.s hpr... in Ryl. 9 3/13, 6/1, 2/20.) Characterized by a-vocalism in dialects A, B, F, M. Negated, converting an unnegated clause, i.e. preceded by the negator in syntagmatic sequence: Mt. 1:19 in dialect M, ed. Schenke. (See Funk, "Koptische Isoglossen im oberägyptischen Raum, 2: die Satellitenparadigmen des Prä-senssystems", ÄZ 113:103-114, 1986, for converter morphology; Categories, Chapter 2, for the Second Tense function.)

Polotsky's grouping of 1960 ("The Coptic Conjugation System", Or 29:391ff., §10ff.) left the Second Tense as the odd converter out; his current "transpositional" model leaves the preterite, which does not correspond to any primary part-of-speech transformation, outside the main group. I must stress the point, that converter compatibility is not due to main-clause status of the converted converter (Johnson 34), but the other way around.

From the data I have for Demotic converter compatibilities, it would appear that the Demotic subgrouping is different: the preterite converter is not yet in paradigm with the Second Tense — this is in keeping with the fact that it is not yet a "relief" back-grounding tense and with its pre-negator placement (Ryl. 9 11/9), shared by the relative and circumstancial (Johnson 86ff.). However, it is compatible with the relative and perhaps with the circumstancial (see Quecke, Or 48:45ff., 1979), and therefore appears to be in a transitional stage, diachronically speaking, and in two paradigms synchronically.

The syntagmatic sequence (arrangement) of the compatible converters is also diachronically significant: the circumstancial and preterite, the first converters (arguably already part of the Middle Egyptian system) convert the Second Tense, the last of the converters to emerge (Demotic).

(a) Circumstancial conversion of a Second Tense Cleft Sentence: It is the nexus or clause as a whole that is converted, not the Second Tense
form as thematic clause constituent; only the negative Second Tense construction is compatible with the formal (conditioned) circumstantial:

1. Ryl. 9 10/10f (Johnson’s E 164, p. 103) ḫpr Pš-dit-ist st-‘Irτ-wrw iw.f ir n pš-tš rsy n wpy iw-i.ιr.w pty.f-ip irm.f hr rnp.t; pace Griffith (232 n. 2), this is not eau- but e-ntau-.

2. Leg. Code VIII 14 iw.f ḫpr r-bn i.ιr pš-tš y n pš-dmy nty-iw-nš-wpwy m-im.f in “If it is not in the town where the judges are that the house is,...” (see Hughes’s note, p. 112); cf. in Coptic (I Cor. 9:26) hoš e-n-ei-...an, and contrast with the zero in iw.f ḫpr i.ιr- (Sec. Tense) (Leg. Code III 9; see below for the conditioned circumstantial).

For Coptic, see Categories 66ff.; for Late Egyptian, Frandsen, Late Egyptian Verbal System 218ff.

(b) “Second-power” preterite and governed-circumstantial + preterite conversion of the Second Tense Cleft Sentence (cf. Johnson 102f.); here once again it is the nexus, the whole # Second Tense + adv. rHEME # construction that is converted, not the Second-Tense theme alone.

3. Leg. Code VIII 28 (Hughes’ note 114f.) wn-nw,i.ιr.f hms.k n pš-tš y r-hn pš-hrw “It is up until the day (of his eviction) that he was dwelling in the house”. In the next line we have

4. iw.f ḫpr r-hw.s r-[wn-nw]-i.ιr.f hms.k n pš-tš y r-hn pš-hrw “Should they find out that it was until the present day that he used to live in this house...”, with the preterite Second Tense construction preceded by the formal (conditioned) circumstantial; I tend to accept provisionally Hughes’s emendation (his note, p. 115), in view of line 28 and especially since I do not have additional evidence for the affirmative Second Tense preceded by the formal r-.. Similar are:

5. Erzählung 3/10 my gm.n-s [r]-wn-nw,i.ιr-Pr-’; in-sn n.k pš-itn iw.f n pty.k hrr (the lacuna seems to accommodate r- rather than the iw- supplied by the editor) “Let us find out whether it was as it (the Sun) was in your rest that the Pharaoh passed (by) the Sun-Disk for you”. On the verb in-sn and the sense of this difficult and finally still obscure passage. see p. 73 (hrr would mean either “delay” or “rest from moving”, if it is close in sense to Coptic hrre and hrow).

(c) As for relative “second-power” conversions: the very common relative preterite hardly needs illustrating (Johnson’s Table 6). The relative Second Tense is not attested beyond doubt (Johnson’s E 165 may be a simple prenominal relative future; E 166 is conjectural; so is P. Vandier 2.2).
8. The circumstantial converter, IV: formal or conditioned circumstantial

In the complicated *système de valeur* of the circumstantial (in many respects the most important and interesting of all converters), a distinction I consider essential is that between the *pertinent* circumstantial conversion, which marks the syntactical status of its clause in (neutralizable) opposition (i.e. to other conversion forms, esp. to "zero" — unconverted or basic form of the clause — and the relative) and *non-pertinent*, conditioned or "formal" one, in which case it is not adnexal (a role resolved in the circumstance of opposition to the relative) nor opposed to zero (i.e. main-clause status), but an essential part of a preceding syntactic-status-marking element, and (so to speak) its representative in the marked clause. This then is not a "converter" in the strict sense of the word, since it does not convert the clause syntactically; it is very much like a governed case (the accusative suffix in e.g. *Romam amo*, where it is in fact part of the transitive verb, in contradistinction to the pertinent accusative in *Romam eo*). Formally, I seem to detect a tendency in several Ptolemaic and and Roman Demotic texts to spell this governed prefix as *r*-, not *iw*- , although there are exceptions (e.g. in the case of Nominal Sentences and the Bipartite Pattern), and a precise corpus-based study is needed to confirm this impression (see *Urk.* 296f.; also Leg. Code, but not Petub., which seems to generalize *r*-; the Loeb papyri seem to be heterogenous in this respect); I shall therefore use *r* to indicate it in the following cases, which I take to be the most important ones of this government or "determination". As a matter of synchronic grammatical theory, of course, this question is central in a structural grammar, which is in principle nothing but a compilation of statements of oppositions and their neutralization. But this is of special interest for evolutionary grammar: the progressive analysis of Egyptian, with lexemes (or grammeme + lexeme combinations) being progressively grammaticalized, i.e. "taking over" from grammemes as exponents of grammatical categories, leaving the "relieved" grammemes as mere combinatory relics of an erstwhile functionality.

Note that in the most important of the following constructions the determinand or governing syntagm contains a cataphoric neutric feminine/masculine/"neuter" object pronoun *s*, in several also a "verb of incomplete predication" which the circumstantial clause originally complemented as a "co-rheme". The constructions in point all seem to have a [*present*] semantic component in the governed clause (present, Adjective Verbs, Nominal Sentence, "present perfect" *s*/*f* tense of special verb lexeme lists, "praeterito-praesentia" etc.).
Work-Notes on Demotic Syntax, I

(a) \textit{iw.f} hpr, hpr.f, \textit{m-3-hpr}, pi-hpr (r-)+


\textit{wn-nw} (P. Loeb 1/10, \textit{Urk.} 16/8.12f., Leg. Code IX 3.10);
\textit{mn-(mtw=)} (Ryl. 9 10/2, Setne 1/1, 4/38);
Nominal Sentence (Mag. 3/19f., Leg. Code IX 9.19);
Cleft Sentence (Mag. 6/27, Leg. Code IX 9, Setne II 6/17);
\textit{neg. Nom. Sentence} (Petub. 15/10f.);
\textit{neg. Sec. Tense Cleft Sentence} (Leg. Code VIII 14);
perf. \textit{sdm.f} (esp. verbs of movement, \textit{rb, dd} and “praeterito-praesentia”: “they wish”, “it is agreeable”: P. Loeb 1/12, 7/35; Leg. Code VI 1, VI 1, VIII 29);
future (P. Loeb 21/40);
\textit{neg. future} (\textit{Urk.} 13/13, see below).

NB: 0- + \textit{i.ir-} (Sec. Tense Cleft Sentence) (Leg. Code III 9, Petub. 8/18f.).

Even in cases of a seemingly past-tense \textit{iw.f} hpr protasis, this, like Coptic \textit{esje-}, is not a condition but a present-based argumentative-topicalizing “supposition”: “If it is true/given that...”. In a unique example of neg. future on my files, the complicated (\textit{Urk.} 13/13, p. 313f.) \textit{hpr.f r-iw.f hpr r-bn.w} (Sethe: “for \textit{bn-iw.w}”) \textit{gm.n} I see \textit{hpr.f} as prospective-modal (“optative”), not protatic, and \textit{r-...r-} the \textit{repeated circumstantial convertor}, really governing the future; \textit{iw.f hpr} is the protasis on its own: “Should it happen, let us not be damaged” (translating the Greek \textit{toútou de genoménou, esómetha ouk édi̇kēmenoi}).

The Coptic paradigm following \textit{eš̄op(e)} resembles the Demotic one very closely (e- + present, perfect, \textit{mn-/oun-}, Nom. Sentence and Cleft Sentence, Adjective Verbs). In Demotic and in Bohairic Coptic, the conjunctive shares the protatic paradigm, posing in either phase the question of its functional opposition to the Conditional.

(b) \textit{tys} r- “behold” (etym. \textit{ptv-s} [<\textit{ptr-st}] + \textit{iw-}?)+

Bipartite: O. Michaelides p. 20D, 21G, 23E (Tab. IX): \textit{tys iw.i hp.kwi m-kd...}; Ryl. 9 3/18, 9/9;
Nom. Sentence: Ryl. 9 1/4 (0- + NS: \textit{ibid.} 8/9, 9/12);
Adj. Verb: Ryl. 9 6/12 (neg.);
perf. \textit{sdm.f} (esp. verbs of motion): Ryl. 9 3/19, 6/17, Myth. 14/19f.;
(c) $gm/rh \; s + r$—“find out that” +
aorist (Setne 6/2);
neg. perfect (Setne 6/10);
Adjective-Verb (Setne II 2/13);
$wn-n\bar{w}-i\.ir$—(Leg. Code VIII 29, Hughes’s note, p. 114f.: preterite
Second Tense Cleft Sentence, cf. line 28)

(d) $'rw \; r$—“perhaps” +
Neg. aorist (Myth. 5/34f.);
present (Oracle 5/9);
perf. $sdm.f$ (Setne II 4/27);
Cleft Sentence (Setne 6/14).

This construction may perhaps help to resolve cases of $ar\acute{e}u \, ef$— in Coptic
(such as Shenoute ed. Leip. III 19, 26, 184) as circumstantial.

(e) Final “conjunctival” construction + $r$—: Urk. 13bis 2,9 $n-d\bar{u}$
$r-bn-iw-md \; nb \; \bar{s}k \ldots$ so that nothing should perish”. This seems to be
the analytic (and truly final) counterpart of “$(r) \; tm \; d\bar{u} \; sdm.f$” (17/7 and
p. 443), which is the usual negation of the properly speaking causative (and
only partly final) “$r \; d\bar{u} \; sdm.f$” (3/13, 6/5 etc.). Incidentally, $r-bn-n\bar{w}$—
(Johnson’s E 301, E 492c) are cases of consecutive circumstantial future
rather than the preposition $r$— governing a verb-form (see Quecke, Or

In Sahidic Coptic $jekaas \; e\,-\,n\acute{e}e$— seems to continue the “governing
final conjunctival” construction; see Polotsky, review of Till’s Grammatik

(f) the content of dreams:
1. Spiegelberg, $\ddot{A}Z$ 50:32 (1912) $i\.ir\,-\,Pr\,-\,'; \; pri \; r-i\.r,f \; rsw \; iw-w' \; rmt \; ' ; \; md \; irm.f$ “Pharaon saw a dream: a great man talking to him”.
2. Petub. 19/27f. $i\.ir.i \; pri \; r-w't \; rsw \; wn-w't \; hs \; n \; mdt\,-\,ntr \; irm.i$ “I saw a
dream: a song of divine speech came unto (lit. “was with”) me”.
3. Setne II 5/10 $i\.ir.f \; pri \; r-i\.r,f \; rsw \; n \; p^3-gr\acute{h} \; iw-p^3-s\acute{s}\acute{t} \; n \; p^3-ntr\,-\,'; \; Thwt \; md \; irm.f$ “He saw a dream at night: the secret form of the great god Thot
talking to him”.

Although the circumstantial is possibly the focus of the thematic
(“non-predicative”) Second Tense form, it is nevertheless formal and gov-
erned by $rsw$. Compare in Coptic several constructions, often (but not
invariably) beginning with $afnau \; e\,-\,ouhorama$ (horoma)/ourasou, and
introducing the content of the dream by the circumstantial, introduced by
$h\bar{o}s\,-\,h\bar{o}s \; e\acute{s}je\,-\,e\acute{s}je$— (Boh. $i\acute{e}jek$—, not $i\acute{e}je$): Shenoute ed. Leip. IV 125
ainau ourasou ere-nim mn-nim $\bar{s}$ol $mmoou$; Junker, Poesie 240 ainau eroi
etuešē etmmau erekabriel šaje nmmai closely matching the Demotic ex. (3)
above; cf. also Gen. 41:4.17f.22, Crum, Macarius 55, 148; Acta Martyrum
4, 175; Crum Dict. 234a top.

9. Nominal Sentence Patterns, I: the endophoric Nominal Sentence

Such sentence patterns as contain a postpositive deictic theme pro-
noun (−pīy, −ṭy, −nīw) which however is not anaphoric (resuming a topi-
calized noun or pronoun) or cataphoric (heralding an appositive noun or
pronoun; see Or 56:164f., 1987). For the anaphoric theme, see Spiegelberg
§ 461, e.g. Ryl. 9 5/15f., Setne 4/24; the cataphoric is rarer, and attested
relatively late (Spiegelberg Grammatik § 459: e.g. Petub. 23/11 bn−īw−ḥy
in pīy pi−rmt, but already Family Archive B 3/22) and is not coextensive
with the seemingly comparable Cleft Sentence. The pronominal element
in the endophoric pattern does not refer, externally, to a nominal or prono-
mal element in the immediate or remote context, but internally, to the
RHEME; the theme is a formal constituent — mark of the preceding’s ele-
ment’s rhematic status; it is functionally comparable to the Indo-European
“impersonal” constructions.

This pattern, which I see as being (in Coptic at least) the core of cer-
tain of the Cleft Sentence patterns with pronominal/nominal focus (includ-
ing, in all probability, the peculiar Oxyrhynchite focalized nominal predi-
cation pattern “ntak ete-pekhristos”: see CdE 58:319ff., 1983), of the
“...ete N pe” hermeneutical “glossing” construction, is important, not
only for understanding the diachrony of the Egyptian Nominal Sentence
set of patterns, and not only for NS patterning, but for noun syntagmatics:
in Demotic the zero article/indef. article relationship differs from the one
obtaining in Coptic: in Coptic, zero-determined rhemes do not occur in
this pattern. The following examples are representative of the main issues
involved in isolating this pattern and defining its syntactical properties and
those of its constituents:

1. Schreibertradition No. 20 (P. Louvre 2415,5) mtwk−s nty.k−mt’w
nty−ḥry nīw “They are yours; they are (lit. “it is”) your places, specified
above”. The formal (“grammatical”) subject or theme concords with the
definite (def. article, demonstrative, possessive) determinator. This pattern
is attested, affirmative and negated, from Early Demotic on:

2. Ryl. 8 3-5 mtwk−s ṣty.k−ḥṯ ṣty: “She is yours; it’s your cow”. Note
the compatibility (in a formulaic collocation) of the two possession-predic-
cating constructions: this is no tautology, but legalistic precision of expres-
sion, first a general declaration of ownership, then enumeration of posses-
sa.
3. Ryl. 2 3f. mtws tiy.tn-st tiy... bn tiy.tn-st in tiy “This (lit. “she”), your place it is; it’s your place”. The first pattern is the topological anaphoric theme; the second, negativated one is the endophoric.

4. (P. Mainz ε, Schreibertradition No. 30): pty.t-šš ky nty-ir-sti 35 hn’ pty.w-‘w n ḥy ḥn’ nty nb ji r-ir.f ḥn’.... n̄w “It is your high land, measuring 35 arouras, with its excess of measurement, with everything belonging thereto”. The formal theme concords collectively with several coordinated definite rhymes. Note here the final placement of the formal theme, not occurring in the case of an expanded rhyme (ex. 15 below). So too in:

5. Recueil 8 B 8 mtw.t st tiy.t-ryt ḥn’ p̄i-½ t3-ḥyt nty-ḥr-r̄.s nty-ḥry n̄w “They are yours; they’re your floor and ½ of the entry-court situated at its entry, as specified above”.

6. Setne II 2/10 pty-rmt ḥm i.nw.k r-ir.f i.w.w in m-ɪm.f r-bl ḥn Mn-nfr i.w-mn-rmt mš’ m-s3.f i.w.f gl’ n w̄-tmw p̄y “It’s this man whom you saw being brought out of Memphis, no one following behind him, being rolled up in a mat”.

7. Deir-el-Medineh 7 (6074) ro A 8f. mtw.t-st tiy.t-ryt nty-ḥd ḡbst ḥn’ ṭiy.t-ḥnh ḥn’ ṭiy.t-psṭ n p̄i-wrḥ ḥn’ ṭiy.t-ḥrw-s’nḥ 1 n p̄i-r-pr n Ḩt-Ḥr-Ḥnw.t-’Imnṭt ḡr ibd nb ṭḥr.f ḥn’ ṭiy.t-ḥrw-s’nḥ 12 n t3-ḥyt ’Ir̄t-hms-nfr ḡr ibd nb ṭḥr.f ɪrm n̄i-nty-m-s3.w nty-ḥry n̄w “It is yours; it’s your floor, built and covered, your court, your share of the grounds, your one day-of-alimentation in the temple of Hathor-Lady-of-the-West for every month that should occur, your 12 days-of-alimentation in the temple-room of Arsenouphis for every month that should occur, with anything following them as specified above”. However, the next example illustrates the resumption of a singular, though extensively coordinated, rhyme as p̄y:

8. Ibid. 8 (6079) ro A 5f. (= ro B 6f.) mtw-t-s p̄iy.t-ḥrw n s’nḥ 3 ḥn’ 1/s t̄iy.w-p̄sṭ 1 1½ 1/10 r ḥrw-s’nḥ 3 ḥn’ 1/s ḥr ṭnt nb ṭḥr.f ḥn’ n̄iy.w-r̄w n̄i-ḥrw 5 ḥbw n ḥm-nṭr w’b wn gwtv ɪmy-wnwtn ḡntb nb ṣḥn nb n p̄i-r-pr Ḩt-Ḥr-Ḥnw.t-’Imnṭt n ḏmį ḡr p̄i-ḏw n ḏmį ḥn’ n̄iy.w-styw nty.w-ḥiyw nty nb ṭnt-gy r-ir.w ḥn’ nty nb ṭnt-ṣp r-ir.w ṭn’ nty-ŋb nty-pr m-ɪm.w ḥn’ n̄i-nty-iw.w r ṭḥr r-ir.w n sḥt ḣt-nṭr p̄i-tmy ḥn’ n̄iy.w-ṣmsw nty.w-‘r̄sw nty-ḥry p̄y “It is yours; it’s your three-and-one-fifth days-of-alimentation, the half of which is one, one-half and one-tenth, making three-and-one-fifth still, for every year that should occur, and their stores of the five days of feast, as prophet, priest, pastophore, porter, gatekeeper, any formal agreement and any contract of the temple of Hathor-Lady-of-the-West in Djeme on the hill of Djeme, with their remunerations, incomes, everything pertaining to them, everything received with reference to them, everything produced from them, everything added to them, in
field, temple or in town, with their services and above-specified rites”. Botti seems to have misinterpreted the theme (here and in the preceding example) as “così è”, “le cose stanno così”.

9. Erzählung 2/4.16 mdt-m3’t tiy “It’s true” (mdt-m3’t = Coptic mnt-me). In the Demotic pattern, the formal theme refers back to, and concords with the rhematic lexeme, when this is zero-determined; the case here illustrated is that of abstract nouns. Contrast this with (Myth. 17/10ff.: Tait, Acta Or. 36:27, 1974) .iw mdt-m3’t dr.w ntw “(They found that) all were true”; this is legal phraseology: see Family Archive 5/26 nty...mt-n-*d dr.w ntw.


\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{pty-dd i.r.s: [...] } & \text{pty/nty-} & \text{mdt(n)'d} & \text{idd.s} & \text{pty/ntyw} \\
\text{ (topic) } & \text{ (top. resumption) } & \text{ (rHEME) } & \text{ (nom.-lex.) } & \text{ (verb.-auxil.) } \\
\text{ (a) } & \text{ (b) } & \text{ (c) } & \text{ (d) } & \text{ (e) } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

The formal anaphoric representant constituents (b) and (e) are alternately “dispensable” i.e. realizable as zero. Element (d), the equally anaphoric verbal-auxiliary component of the denominal derivational syntagm or compound verb ḥd-mdtn’d “speak falsehood, lie” = Coptic je-mdtnouj, is always zeroed simultaneously with (e), but also independently (ḥd-’d) is a compound verb in Late Egyptian; cf. P. BM 10052 5/5, 12/13; 3/18 ’d ḥd pḥ-dd.k). This agrees well with the Late Egyptian zero-theme pattern following topicalization (Groll, Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns 13ff.; see also p. 40 exx. 41-2, p. 45, XII).

10. Setne II 5/15 gm.f ṣḥ-npr iw mdt-ntr ntw “He found that this was a divine matter...” (or: “that these matters were divine”). The endophoric pattern converted (circumstantial). Here, as in the next two examples, the zero-determined abstract effectively predicates a quality — carrying on the Egyptian “Sentence with Adjectival Predicate”. For Coptic (either ou- or zero-determined abstracts), see “Notes on Some Nominal Sentence Patterns”, Festschrift Westendorf (Göttingen 1984) 178ff.; Categories 142f.

11. Ryl. 9 8/13 tys ḥpr n ’y pty ’y n w’b pty “Look, it is a wonderful house; it is a house for a priest”. The affinity of this pattern with the
denominal derivation r- + abstract noun is brought home here (contrast *ir-hpry n rmt*, “being a wondrous person” Ryl. 9 6/4, 10/5, with *hpr n rmt pty*, *ibid.* 10/4.6. In Coptic, compare “*pnau pe*” with “*mpatfrnau*”, see *Categories* 152 n. 41.

12. Ankhsh. 9/16 šm pty “It is summer”. In Coptic, *pšom pe* . . . *teprô te* (Shenoute ed. Leip. IV 110f.): the endophoric pattern used truly “impersonally”, to predicate a “natural world”, “atmospheric” or calendrical circumstance rHEME (zero article in Demotic, the “properizing” definite article in Coptic). It is converted in:

13. Ryl. 9 1/4 . . . iw *ibd 3 prt pty* “It being the third winter month”.

14. Setne 6/2 mdt *iw-dd.i-s n.k tš-hšt tỹ* “It’s what (lit. “a thing”) I told you at first”.

15. *Deir el-Medineh* 36 (6085) ro 23 *bn-iw.i ṛh dd šhn pty iw-wtb.f rnpt* “I shall not be able to say ‘This is a rent that has been extended for a year’”; not, as Botti translates “. . . che tale affitto sia prorogato” but “che sia stato prorogato”. Note in this contract clause the placement of the formal theme, which occupies the post-rHEME position but precedes the adnexual-adnominal expansion of the rHEME.

16. P. Loeb 10/4f. *w'-msh n ds nḥt pty* “It concerns (“Es handelt sich um . . .”) a certain crocodile of hard stone”. The formal theme is anaphoric to and concords with the indefinite article (specific-indefinite: “a certain . . .”).

17. Mag. 6/8 iw.f *hpr iw-gr-'ššhn pty* “Should it be another matter, . . .”; *pty* anaphoric to the quantifier *gr- (ky-).*

18. Rhind I 5/6 *pt-nfr nty-iw-Wsir pty* “The Beautiful, that is Wsīr”: our pattern in the relative conversion, as a hermeneutical or glossing construction (esp. used for name-specifying or its opposite, name-glossing) which becomes very important and even formally distinct as a special kind of relative adjunction in Coptic (*pšere šem ete-abēsalom pe*, II Reg. 14:21; *ouei ebol nhētou . . . ete-maria tmagdalinen te*, Campagnano, *Omelie copte* 186). A name-glossing instance:

19. Oracle 143 *Mḥyt nty-iw-tl-'r'yty tỹ* “M., that is the Uraeus” (Coptic: *maria nte-iaκhobos ete-titheotokos te*, Lagarde, *Catena* 221).

20. Setne II 4/9ff. *nm m-im tn pt-i.ir gd . . . # Hr pt-šr Tš-ryr pty* “Which of you was he that said . . . ? # It’s Hor, Tryr’s son”; prob. similar is (*Erzählung* 1/11) *mi-i.ir sp r-ir.k nīw* “It’s what was left for you”. The endophoric pattern as the apocritic construction resuming an interrogative Cleft Sentence; the formal theme anaphoric to the definite rHEME, here proper name and determinated relative, respectively. Similarly apocritic, not to a WH-question but to an more general inquiry (as to the cause of the Pharao’s maltreated back), is also Setne II 5/4 *mi-hksw n mi-igšw nīw* “It was the Ethiopians’ sorcerers”. It seems, then, that in Demotic too
this pattern is the one used in the resumptive sequence of a Cleft Sentence (cf. in Coptic Shenoute ed. Chassinat 103 ...jene–mmonakhos... netēp er–nēsteia jn–ntok pe; see Or 56:169f., 1987). The endophoric pattern predicating a personal pronoun is probably the non-verbal constituent of the pronoun-focussing Cleft Sentence itself, although here one must distinguish between three formal types of theme:

21. Ryl. 9 13/6 mtw–w nī–nty–iw.tn r dit–s n.i “It is these you shall give me”, with a mutable theme concording with the pronoun;

22. Recueil 8 ro A 7 mtwt pî–nty–iw.i mʾ.t.k m–im.w rn.t “It is you in whose name I have legal rights”, with the theme immutable (‐pīy), a post-rheumatic mark (or focuser);

23. ibid. 7 ro 7 mtwt nty–nht m–im.w “It is you who are entrusted therewith”, no formal theme (the post-pronoun relative being only analyzable as topic).

This pattern must yet be further investigated in Coptic, as well as in Demotic; for example, regarding the alternation of theme commutability: nim ne niskeuos, answered by anon tēren pe (Lagarde, Catena 36; sim. 40, 60, 69), contrasted to nē–etauerothosf ete–ntōou ne nioudai (ibid. 64). See Or 56:166f. (1987).

10. Nominal Sentence Patterns, II: “Wechselsatz” (1)

By “Wechselsatz” I mean a correlative or “balanced” nominal-predication pattern, in which it is difficult or impossible to isolate unambiguously a thematic or rheumatic term (see “Notes on Some Nominal Sentence Patterns”, 184ff.).

A legal phrase recurring in P. BM 10591 4/7, 5/11f., 9/24, 10/1 (Family Archive): nīy.i mtdw nīy.i mtdw ’n (once paraphrased in Myth. 8/4, Spiegelberg, Gloss. 88 as pīy–qd pīy–qd ’n pīy) expresses the reaffirmation of previous pleading (“my case stands”). Translated by Thompson as “My words are my words again” (so too Johnson, “Demotic Nominal Sentences” 418; Spiegelberg “‘Mein Reden ist noch mein Reden’, i.e. ‘Es bleibt bei meinem Wort’”), the pattern analysis centers on two issues: first, the identification of the formal grammatical dependence between the two identical noun phrases; second, the status and role of the adverbial ’n. I believe both questions are largely settled to an extent by the contrastive examination of a strikingly comparable Coptic construction (“Notes on Some Nominal Sentence Patterns”, 186; also Or 56:166f., 1987), viz. pekhrb pekhrb on pe (Shenoute ed. Chassinat 21) “Your form is immutable”. Indeed, neither is the Demotic pattern “archaic” in the sense of residual or unproductive (pace Johnson, loc. cit.) nor is the juxta-
position between its terms “simple”. What this pattern predicates is the immutability of its noun; its rheme is the noun reiterated, its theme a “situational” zero (corresponding to the Coptic immutable pe “It is...”). As in Coptic, the adverb ‘n is here not a sentence modifier but a pattern constituent, meaning “still” (not “again”). Similarly, the reiterated noun in Ankhsh. 11/20 bn i.ir.w ms k3 k3 in is, I believe, an adverbial complement, focalized by the Second Tense; thus meaning, not “A bull is not born of a bull” (supplying a preposition; so Volten, also Lichtheim, Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature 76) but “It is not a bull that a bull is born” (“but a calf”. Stricker: “Een stier wordt niet als stier geboren”). This suits much better in sense the preceding sentence, “Do not laugh at a son in front of his mother; you do not know the size of his father”.

The meaning “still” of ‘n is attested more commonly than is the general impression; for instance, in the ubiquitous monetary or calendary conversion construction e.g. “ḥd 3 r str 15 r ḥd 3 ‘n”: not “again”, “wiederholt”, “wiederum” but “unchanged”; or in another formula, that of marriage settlements (Urk. p. 381) “iw.t n–ḥnw, iw.t n–ḥnw irm.w; iw.t n–bl, iw.t n–bl irm.w ‘n”. Also Setne 4/19, 5/37; Recueil 9 ro 7, II 98 n. z (“nevertheless”)

(To be continued)
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