

ORIENTALIA

VOL. 58 - FASC. 1 - 1989

S U M M A R I U M

Commentationes

L. DEPUYDT, The Contingent Tenses of Egyptian	1-27
A. SHISHA-HALEVY, Work-Notes on Demotic Syntax, I	28-60
H.-P. MÜLLER, Eine neue babylonische Menschenschöpfungserzählung im Licht keilschriftlicher und biblischer Parallelen: Zur Wirklichkeits- auffassung im Mythos	61-85
W. FARBER, Vorzeichen aus der Waschschüssel: Zu den akkadischen Bade-Omina (<i>Šumma ālu</i> , 43. <i>nishu</i>)	86-101
F. ROCHBERG-HALTON, Babylonian Horoscopes and their Sources	102-123

Animadversiones

A. ARCHI, Integrazioni a testi eblaiti	124-127
--	---------

Recensiones

J.-C. GOYON, Les dieux-gardiens et la genèse des temples (L. KÁKOSY) .	128-130
D. COLLON, First Impressions: Cylinder Seals in the Ancient Near East (S. MAZZONI)	130-134
G. E. MENDENHALL, The Syllabic Inscriptions from Byblos (E. PUECH) .	134-138
M. ALRAM, Nomina propria iranica in nummis (H. KOCH)	138-140
Libri ad Directionem missi	141-144

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”, “Lese-früchte”, 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. Lüddeckens’ 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 “conjunctive” construction. “That”-forms
4. Zero determination: masculine reference to a zero-determined 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

- Amenothès*: P. W. Pestman, *L'archivio di Amenothès figlio di Horos* (P. Tor. Amenothès), 1981.
- Deir el-Medineh*: G. Botti, *L'archivio demotico da Deir el-Medineh*, 1967.
- Eheverträge*: E. Lüddeckens, *Ägyptische Eheverträge*, 1960.
- Erzählung*: W. Erichsen, *Eine neue demotische Erzählung*, 1956.
- Family Archive*: H. Thompson, *A Family Archive from Siut*, 1934.
- Graffiti*: F. Ll. Griffith, *Catalogue of the Demotic Graffiti of the Dodecaschoenus*, 1937.
- Ins.*: F. Lexa, *Papyrus Insinger*, 1926.
- Krugtexte*: W. Spiegelberg, *Demotische Texte auf Krügen*, 1912.
- Leases*: G. R. Hughes, *Saite Demotic Land Leases*, 1952.
- Leg. Code*: G. Mattha, *The Demotic Legal Code of Hermopolis West*, 1975.
- P. Loeb*: W. Spiegelberg, *Die demotischen Papyri Loeb*, 1931.
- Mag.*: F. Ll. Griffith – H. Thompson, *The Demotic Magical Papyrus of London and Leiden*, 1909.
- O. Med. Habu*: M. Lichtheim, *Demotic Ostraca from Medinet Habu*, 1957.
- O. Michaelidis*: E. Bresciani, *Testi demotici nella Collezione Michaelidis*, 1963.
- Myth.*: W. Spiegelberg, *Der ägyptische Mythos vom Sonnenauge*, 1917.
- Oracle*: W. Spiegelberg, *Die sogenannte demotische Chronik*, 1914.

- Petub.: W. Spiegelberg, *Der Sagenkreis des Königs Petubastis*, 1910, and E. Bresciani, *Der Kampf um den Panzer des Inaros (Papyrus Krall)*, 1964.
- Recueil: P. W. Pestman, *Recueil de textes démotiques et bilingues*, 1977.
- Rhind: G. Möller, *Die beiden Totenpapyrus Rhind*, 1913.
- Ryl.: F. Ll. Griffith, *Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, vol. II, 1900.
- Schreibertradition: K.-Th. Zauzich, *Die ägyptische Schreibertradition in Aufbau, Sprache und Schrift der demotischen Kaufverträge aus ptolemäischer Zeit*, 1968.
- Setne: F. L. Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*, 1900.
- Tabl. Leid. I 431: J. Černý, “The Abnormal-Hieratic Tablet Leiden I 431”, in: *Studies Presented to F. L. Griffith*, 1932, 46-56.
- Urk.: K. Sethe, *Demotische Urkunden zum ägyptischen Bürgerrechtsrechte*, 1920.
- P. Vandier: G. Posener, *Le Papyrus Vandier*, 1985.

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 t3-ht, iw-bn-p.i šnt.t t3y.f-pš ḥd nty m-s3.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-s3.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

(6097) ro 4: *mtw.k r ḥḏ 143 mn-mtw.i 'š m-sḏ.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 dīt nty-ḥry nty-mtw.i dīt dīt.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 *ouontēi esaji* (Lagarde. Paris copte 1, Vat. copto 1; Gk. *ékhô lalēsai*); in the Sahidic (Ciasca, Wessely) *ountais mmau ešaje* the cataphoric “neutric” pronoun, not the infinitive is the possessum: “I have it to speak”. (So are Sethe’s exx., *Urk.* p. 79. In the Sahidic text of Prov. 22:27 [Worrell] *ešôpe emntak etaau*, v.l. *ekšantmcntou*, is not, I believe, a case in point: rhematic here is the negative possession, and the infinitive a mere complement.) Cf. also NHC II 81.20 *ountaf mmau etrefpo*.

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-sôtm*: 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 *wṣy 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-sôtm* is, I believe, *mnt(a)i-sôtm* (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’aimerai”, 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 *ekhō* 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 p3-yr p3-i.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... p3-nty-iw.n r ir.f n-t3y-n p3-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 3b i.ir.k ir.s p3-dit hr p3-d3y bdt r 3b* “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 *p3-wnn3 dd hft.k p3-pr 'Irt-Hr i.ir.(i) hft grt* “As for that which was said, that I destroyed Inaros’s house: I did indeed destroy it”.
5. Leg. Code VII 8 *mtwk s i.ir.k int.f r-hry n p3-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 sm r hry r Kmy, i.ir.tn in Pr-’3 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 htb rmt m-mtry p3-nty-iw.tn r ir.f* “Will you really murder a man at high noon?”
8. Ryl. 9 4/10f. *in dit sm.w m-s3.w 'n p3-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 hlybs p3-ir.f hn-n3y.k 'wy.w* “Did you not find an armour in your abode?”

10. Louvre E3229 5/7 (ed. Johnson, *Enchoria* 7:63, 1977) *in tm iry s p3-nty-iw.k r ir.f* (Mag. 6/14f., 6/32) “Will you not do it?”

(c) In NARRATIVE:

11. Ryl. 9 10/11 *iw-w3h h4 bd ir.f hr rnpt p3-nty-iw.w ir.f* “(It did not diminish,) for silver and spelt would be added to it yearly”.

12. Ryl. 9 21/6f. *dit-iw rmt m-s3 p3y.f-nk3 p3-iwn-n3.f ir.f r-hn-r ht-sp 44* “(He did not come himself, but) used to send for his things until the 44th year”.

13. Myth. 12/6 *ir-hbry 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 factitivity-dia-thesis and Aktionsart marker with infinitives (*ir-t3y*, *ir-htb*, *ir-shy*; *ir-rh* is a cause apart, and must be connected with the advanced grammaticalization and reduced material weight of *rh*: 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 nhêt* (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 relative-topic 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 *ete-mnšēere šoop ebol hn-neksnēu auô ebol hm-plaos tērf*). 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: *irr.k irt* (Coffin Texts VI 392q) “You shall act”, lit. “It is (in) acting that you (shall) act”; Sah. Coptic, 2 Sam. 18:2 *hnouei anok tinēu* “I shall come”. The unconjugated 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”:) *iṭ p̣-i.ir.k* “What you have done is theft”;

Late Ramesside Letters 64.12ff. *tm dit.w n.k p̣-i.ir.w* “They must have failed to give them to you” (also P. Anast. IV 7.10f.);

ibid. 15/6f. *n 3k p̣-i.ir.f* “(Do you still have it) or has it been lost?”;

P. Anast. IX 7f. *is-bn ptr p̣-i.ir p̣-šri...* “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 *h3t pw ir.n.f 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) “*Sef 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 “conjunctive” construction. “That”-forms

(Selected representative examples):

(a) “Preposition (esp. meaning “time since”) + infinitive”:

1. Ryl. 9 1/3 *n-tȳ-n ir-ḥm-ntr i.ir pȳ-...* “Since the... became priest”.
2. Leg. Code IX 3 *m-sȳ mw i.ir pȳy.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 pȳ-mw i.ir-pȳy.f-yt*).
3. Myth. 10/29 *m-sȳ pȳ-wy i.ir.t* “After you went afar”.
4. *Ibid.* 4/3f. *m-sȳ pȳ-tm ntff i.ir.k* “After you did not release it”.
5. *Graffiti Dak.* 33 *m-sȳ hb i.ir.f* “After he sent a letter”.
6. Myth. 15/13 *m-kd pȳ-nw r-ḥr.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 11/7f. *tȳ-n pȳ-hrw n ḥn-s i.ir pȳ-ḥm-ntr Wsir* “Since the day the priest of Osiris so ordered”.
8. *Urk.* 23/6.7 *š' pȳ-ssw n wȳh.f nty-iw.tn r-ir.f* “Until the time you will want it” (see Sethe, pp. 30, 136f.).
9. *pȳ-ssw ḥȳ'.t n ḥmt nty-iw.i (r) ir.f* “When I leave you as wife” — matrimonial contract clause (*Eheverträge* 273).
10. *Family Archive* 593/4 *pȳ-ss wȳh pȳ-ḥd 113 nty-hry mtw.i nty-i.ir.t ir.f* “As soon as you (fem.) require of me the 113 pieces of silver”.
11. Setne 5/1 *tȳ-wnwt n nw i.ir-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 *tȳ-wnwt n pȳ-k n tȳ-š'*.
12. *Urk.* 5/4, 8/4 (etc.) *pȳ-hrw dd n.i wdt-s nty-iw.tn (r) ir.f* “at the day when you tell me to pay it”; similarly, the formulaic (De Cenival, *Cautiounnements*) *hrw 2 dd n.i wt st nty-iw-ir.tn ir.f*.
13. Setne 5/32 *pȳ-mȳ' n int.f i.ir.k* “Whence you have brought it”, sim. 4/13.
14. *Amenothés* 42 [DATE] *pȳ-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 dbȳ.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 (α) 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.) (β) 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 “conjunctive” 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: “détermination 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 “conjunctive” clause-form *par excellence*: *Family Archive* B iii 5 *p3-hrw iw.w w3h.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 *sḏm*, *nw*, *ḏd*, it constitutes a “secondary” narrative tense and sub-paragraph boundary signal: the mainstream event invariably follows it with a *sḏm.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-categorical components of the verb phrase and “isolate” the latter in a “parcel” of “pro-verbal” grammeme with pronominal actantial 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 (*pʒ-*)*hpr* (recalling to a degree the LE *pʒ-wn?*), as direct object actant, *rectum* of prepositions and even causal “that”: *rh-(pʒ-)hpr-* Ryl. 9 13/11f., 15/3; *gm.f pʒ-hpr iw-* + Nominal Sentence, Setne II 5/15; *m-sʒ-hpr*, *r-dbʒ hpr* Ryl. 9 6/6.10, 15/4, 18/7; *hpr-* “it being that...” (P. Vandier 2/5, Mattha, *Ostr.* 129, 15 vs. *r-dbʒ 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 circumstantial in other, more specialized, syntagmatic sectors. (It seems that *pʒ-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, *pjin-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 *pʒ-šr tʒ-šrt pʒ-sn tʒ-snt pʒ-rmt nb pʒ-tʒ 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-wʒh.n ir.w*, or the regular plural reference to the contractual *swn hḏ* “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 rh ir m-im.f m-s; t3-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-n3-‘n-hrwt iw-w3h.n ir.f bh-Hryt n-p3-t3 dr.f* “... festivals we have made in the presence of the Mistress of the Whole World being good”. *Hrwt* (= Greek *heortê*) is feminine, Griffith p. 29, *Stories of the High Priests* 84, Erichsen, *Glossar* 279.
3. *Ibid.* Philae 416/15f. *ky-wšb 1.t n-nb iw-w3h Tkrrmn dit in.w-s r ht-ntr n-3st iw.f ir n-lytrt 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-p3-nty-3bh r-šhm.t iw.f hl* “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 (/iw.k) dit ‘lbwnt r p3-‘h iw.f w‘b* “You shall put pure frankincense in the oven”.
6. (Abnormal Hieratic) Tabl. Leid. I 431 ro 18 *š‘ iw.f wn* “Open letter”. I believe Černý’s observation (52 n. 29) “[...] the old *š‘* ‘document’ which must have been revived at this late period” is unnecessary. For the feminine *š‘*, see Griffith, Ryl. 392; *Urk.* p. 417 (occurring also in the Loeb papyri).
7. Ins. 28/1 *ypt sbk hrt sbk n3-‘n.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) *n3-‘n.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): *hr ibd nb hpr.f hr rnpt nb hpr.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 [6068ro]. Once, 24 [6090] 13, we find a variant *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 *hpr.f* as protatic: “should this happen” (Spiegelberg *Grammatik* § 507), (2) seeing *hpr.f* as adnominal-circumstantial (*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 *ibd*, *rnpt*: the masculine resuming *rnpt nb* (and *ibd nb*), and the clause meaning “when it takes place” or similar. (*hpr.f* can hardly resume the quantified [*pʒ*]-*hrw n s'nh* [+number], which is as a rule treated as plural.)

(c) Likewise relevant to the *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 nʒ-ʿn.f* (rhetorical) “Is it good?”; *iw.f hpr*, *hpr.f*, *mtw.f hpr* passim. Feminine: the neutric pron. exponent cataphoric to a *dd*- content clause or infinitive: *hpr.s dd* Ryl. 9 3/1. Exceptions are found in the backgrounding (not narrative!) Second Tense *i.ir.s hpr...* (*ibid.* 3/13, 6/1, 2/20); the phrase *-ʿk.s n ht...* Ryl. 9 14/22f., 15/19, 20/12, which however is governed by *dit* and might be objective (see below; yet cf. Boh. Coptic *shen-tetenpsukhê* with *hôte* + infinitive, Gen. 23:8); cases of durative-pattern (“Bipartite”) actor: *my hpr.f iw.s rh.t n.tn, pʒ-wʿb 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 *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. *sw*, fem. *sy* and ntr. *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 *m-sʒ.s*; *ibid.* 21/28 [imperative] *hb n.i m-im.s*; *Krugtexte* B 17 *twi dbh m-im.s iw.f hpr iw.s hs ir.k hn-s dit in.w n.i...*; P. Loeb 1/12 *iw.f 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: *Urk.* 16/2.4 *hr sn.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 “syncretic” resumptive *s* (obj. pronoun + suffix pronoun class):

Feminine determinator nucleus of relative (to my knowledge, not in Coptic):

Ryl. 9 10/16f. *t3-nty-iw... dd m-im.s*;

O. Med. Habu 153 (MH 2834) 9f. *t3-nty-iw.k w3h.s*;

P. Loeb 6/37.40 *t3-nty-iw.i ir.s nbt, t3-nty-iw ir W. ddt.s i.ir.s*;

Setne 5/18 *t3-iw.n r-b-n3y r-dbt.s*.

Masculine nucleus of the relative:

Ins. 18/15, Setne 5/23 *p3-nty-mr.f-s* (20/3 *p3-shny nty-mr.f-s*);

Setne 4/18 *p3-nty-iw.i ddt.s*;

Erzählung 2/2 *p3-nty-iw.f dd m-im.f*;

Recueil 8 A 7 *p3-nty-iw.i m3'.k m-im.w*.

Plural nucleus:

P. Berlin 13565 *n3-nty-iw.w hn m-im.s* (so Spiegelberg. Read *t3-?*; sim. P. Loeb 6/38ff.).

Compare the following Coptic combinations: *nenta-nšoos joos* (Luc. 2:18 Quecke); *pentanjoof je-*, Shenoute, ed. Chassinat 29, anaphoric overruling cataphoric; Eccl. 8:14 *oun-oupetsoueit eauaas* (Gk *éstin mataiótês hê pepoiésetai...*), *pima etaphnouti jos naf* (Boh. consensus for Gen. 22:3). Coptic seems to prefer the *plural* neutric formal antecedent, at least will certain verbs (*netšoop*: 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 complexity of noun syntax). It seems that, while indefinite determination is in Demotic (unlike Coptic) indefinite-specific ("a certain...", plur. "certain...s", denoting one or an indefinite number of specific individual(s) of a class — Myth. 17/9 *wnn3w-wn-w'-m3y hr-p3-dw r-wnn3w-n3-nht.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" *hyn-* 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*:

<i>wn-</i>		<i>w'-</i> : “one (quantifier) or “a certain...”
		(B i 9, iv 4, vi 12f.16f., ix 13)
		<i>quantifiers</i> (iii 23, iv 20)
		<i>zero</i> : abstracts: notion name (B ii 15.24)
		<i>zero</i> : non-abstracts: non-specific indefinite:
		“some...”, “any...” (B v 3, vi 11,
		vo ii 16, Ryl. 9 7/9, P. Loeb 1/10
		(NOUN + <i>nb</i> , 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.); *p3-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); *n3-rmt-* with a cataphoric determination (P. Loeb 1/7); structurally relevant is *p3-rmt nb*, *p3-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-... nouôt* 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-determined 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-existant (contrast Ryl. 9 8/15f. *in-wn mdt-nfrit* [*mntnofre*] *iw.k dd my ir.w-s n.i* with the narrative 10/16 *mn-mdt-nfrit iw-bn-p-Pr-’3 dit 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 gm t r wm.s*; contrast with Boh. Coptic *ntefti n-ouoeik nêi eouôm* (Gen. 28:20), Sah. *anaš men mpoueire* (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*... *tʒy* 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 *iḥ ipd irp yb hbn*, Setne II 2/18 *grḥ mtry*, *Amenothēs* 2 ro 6 *mtw.t swr wnm ḥbs sdr ir*..., also bracketed by a definite determinator or the *nota relationis*: *pʒ*-[*sh-nfr rmt-rḥ*] Setne II 2/32, *tʒy.w*-[*hrt mw t*] *ibid.* 2/1.16.19, *w*'-*glg n*-[*yb hbn*] Setne 5/28f.

(6) The normal adnominal 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 mʒ'.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-nʒ-'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” adnominal 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.; 594/6 *knbt nb mdt nb pʒ tʒ 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 mʒ' nb n pʒ-tʒ iw.f 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:

zero		<i>mtw.i</i> (Ryl. 9 5/9, 20/1)
<i>N nb</i>		<i>mtw.w</i> (Ryl. 1; <i>mtw.i Schreibertradition</i> 5 [Louvre 2429bis])
number + <i>N</i>		<i>mtw.i</i> (Ryl. 9 2/6f.)
<i>w</i> '- (“a certain...”)		<i>mtw.i</i> (Mag. 3/8)
<i>pʒ-šr</i>		<i>mtw.i nty-iw.f r ḥpr dy</i> (Ryl. 9 13/14)

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 *t3-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 *iry 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), *n3-ntr nty-iw.w mtw.w n w'b* (Can. T 68). Whereas Bohairic Coptic seems to differentiate between *-oi n-Ø-* and *-šôpi* (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-t3y h3t-sp 11 ibd 2 prt r-hn-p3-hrw iw(i) ir t3-wpy.t n p3-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, *ouaprête 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. *eis-...tišoop*) or II Cor. 13:1 Boh. *phai 3 nsop pe einêou*, with the endophoric pattern expanded by the thematic circumstantial. Consider also (Wessely, *Texte* V, 30) *pefmehmêt nsop pe jinfatšôpe*.

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

3. Ryl. 9 15/4 *iw.f tn p3y.f-šr* “Where is it that he is, his son”. The circumstantial marking its own rheme as focus (*Categories* 76ff.). Griffith p. 405 compares Copt. (Boh.) *afthôn*, which is however immediately comparable to *i.ir.f tn*. (The syntax of *tn* “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 *p3-lh 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 *tȝy.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 *hf iw.f nyf iw-tȝy.f-mtw tȝy.f rmt-hm tȝy.f-mtw iw.s hȝt.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-swr ȝst Wsir Pȝ-š‘y-‘ȝ n-hȝt.k iw swr.w pȝ-ȝ ntrw iw-swr.i m-sȝ.w hȝt dd iw-n.k-dit ir.i th n.k-dit ir.i byk n.k-dit ir.i hȝy r-bl n.k-dit ir.ȝ hbrbr n.k-dit ir.i thy n hȝt...* “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 3/16f. (Why do you laugh?) *iw.i sby dd i.ir.k kt iw-hȝt.k thr r-dbȝ pȝ-smt n tȝy-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 adverbial or statival rheme (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-sȝ.i*” “You have a claim on me” (*Urk.* 1/17, p. 41; *Family Archive* p. 30 n. 161; *i.ir-* 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”.

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

12. “*iw.w šp*” in receipts: “they are (hereby) received” (O. Med. Habu, 83, 91; compare *st šp* in 118). This may be compared with the performative (“Koinzidenzfall”) 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 *eaf-* in Sah. and Akhmimic (Clem. 61 *eafhei nêtnē name pneumatikôs etbêtf*), which in these two dialects is clearly circumstantial, must perhaps be considered separately, in view of such important dialectal forms as *a-af-* and *a-haf-*; however, the case of dialect M (*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/adverbial 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 *adnexal* (*Categories* 190f.), which is not coextensive with either adnominal-attributive or adverbial-“adverbial”, although it is opposed to the former in adnominal placement.

(a) The case of a circumstantial statement of (non)-existence (*iw-wn-/iw-mn-*):

In this construction, recurring in and typical of P. Insinger, the placement opposition adnominal vs. adverbial is irrelevant; it is the resumption (vs. ‘no resumption’) that carries the semantic opposition of (adnominal) “who.../whom...”, vs. (“adverbial”, really adnexal or nexus-adjointing) “with”/“without”, or rather triggers this distinction in translation into English; *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” cotext, *iw-mn-* is its rheme and carries the main information. The affirmative *iw-wn* is much rarer than its neg. counterpart.

(1) *Adnominal placement, no pronominal resumption:*

Abstract nouns, infinitives:

5/16 *sk iw-mn-‘f’...* “Saving without greed”;

7/17 *wtb iw-mn-isw.* . . “Provisions without income”;
 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-sgrh.* . . “Combat with rest” (Volten *Weisheitsbuch* 24f. 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-rh iw-wn sgrh* “a wise person with calm”;
 10/5 *rmt-swg iw-wn-nht* “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-šbt ht.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-hn irm ky iw-wn-mst n ht.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:

6/12 *p3-nty-šn iw-wn-th.* . . “He who becomes ill, with suffering”;
 6/24 *p3-nty-ir h iw-mn-isw.* . . “He who spends without an income”;
 17/16 *p3-nty-ir.w iw-mn-šrl.* . . “He who indulges in them (i.e. wine, women and song) without (anyone) complaining”.

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 *p3-* with *nty-* (“anyone that”, “such [a person] as”), which is nonetheless definite. Compare, for Coptic, *Categories* 118f., 202f.

While . . . *-iw-mn-p3-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 *pʒ-nty-/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 *fšoop nci-* form of existence (e.g. Joh. 5:45 *fšoop nci-petnakategorei mmôtn*).

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-/mmon-*) 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 (*mpatef-*, *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 contextual patterns as a basis for formal statements of subordination.

(b) Circumstantial conversion of the Cleft Sentence, expanding a *definite* (demonstrative) noun:

Setne 3/12 *pʒy-dm'... iw-Thwt i.ir sh.f n drt.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-pʒy-šs iwn dy hʒt.tn iw-ntf pʒ-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 (“conjunctive”) relative: Shenoute ed. Amél. I 232 *nthe on ete-amnte petnaklêronomei...* 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-iôhannês enai netrouoein epkosmos têrf* “(Four Gospels:) Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, which illuminate the whole world”. In non-literary Sahidic and Nitrian Bohairic, the role of the adnominal circumstantial is more extensive; yet such cases as *peirôme epôî pe* (Crum-Winlock-White, *Epiphanius* 283) or *pjôm ere-hôb nim shêout erof* (De Vis, *Homélie coptes* II 153) call for comparison with the Demotic syntax here discussed.

(c) *Erzählung* 3/2 *m-sʒ pʒ-rʼ iw.f in-nʼ ʼy.k r nʒy.f ʼyw 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 adnexal “atmospheric” construction, well attested in Coptic (and Greek): *mpnau mprê efnapire* Shenoute ed. Leip. III 87; *hmprê efnahôtp* Budge, *Miscell.* 142; cf. also Gen. 15:12, De Morte Jos. 23.9.

(d) The placement of the adnexal or rhematic circumstantial tends to be final even in the case of a long and involved clause sequence: *Leases* 5/14f. *î pʒ-...nbyt n ʼhwti nty-iw.î r gm.f hr-ht n nʒy-ʒhw nty hry, î.îr(î) r tʒy r ʼʒ nʒ-dnywt n it-ntr Rry sʒ Dît-ʼImn-ʼw-Hnsw n tʒy.k-dnyt n pʒ-nty-ʼhʼ mn iw.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 $\langle pʒy.f-smw \rangle$ after *tʒy* is I believe unnecessary) syntax of this circumstantial recall the Coptic *efsôtm* in this role (the present writer, *JEA* 62:134-7, 1976), and especially Bohairic *efkôti* “round about”, (from such instances — all non-adnominal! — as [Lev. 14:41] *euehah sahou n mpiêi efkôti*, to [Ex. 38:31] *nem-nibasis nte-tiskunê efkôti nem-nibasis nte-tiaulê nem-nišmou nte-tiskênê nem-nišmou nte-tiaulê efkôti*).

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

synchronically-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 adnexal 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 backgrounding/pace-shifting in narrative. (In Demotic, the Second Tense seems to have this role in narrative: consider *i.īr.s ḥpr...* 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 Präsenssystems”, *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” backgrounding tense and with its pre-negator placement (Ryl. 9 11/9), shared by the relative and circumstantial (Johnson 86ff.). However, it is compatible with the relative and perhaps with the circumstantial (see Quecke, *Or* 48:45f., 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 circumstantial 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) Circumstantial 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) *hpr P3-dit-3st s3-'Irt-wrw iw.f ir n p3-t3 rsy n wpy iw-i.ir.w p3y.f-ip irm.f hr rnpt*; pace Griffith (232 n. 2), this is not *eau-* but *e-ntau-*.
2. Leg. Code VIII 14 *iw.f hpr r-bn i.ir p3-'y n p3-dmy nty-iw-n3-wpwtym-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) *hōs e-n-ei-. . .an*, and contrast with the zero in *iw.f hpr i.ir-* (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-n3w-i.ir.f hms.k n p3-'y r-hn p3-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 hpr r-rh.w-s r-[wn-n3w-i.ir.f hms.k n p3-'y r-hn p3-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-n3w-i.ir-Pr-'3 in-sn n.k p3-itn iw.f n p3y.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 *hroure*).

(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 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” *sdm.f* tense of special verb lexeme lists, “praeterito-praesentia” etc.).

(a) *iw.f hpr, hpr.f, m-s3-hpr, p3-hpr (r-) +*

Bipartite Pattern (rhemes: inf., Setne 5/19, 23, 25; stative, Leg. Code IX 28f.; adv., Leg. Code VII 7, VIII 10f.);

wn-n3w (P. Loeb 1/10, *Urk.* 16/8.12f., Leg. Code IX 3.10);

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);

neg. Nom. Sentence (Petub. 15/10f.);

neg. Sec. Tense Cleft Sentence (Leg. Code VIII 14);

perf. *s3m.f* (esp. verbs of movement, *rh*, *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);

neg. future (*Urk.* 13/13, see below).

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

Even in cases of a seemingly past-tense *iw.f hpr* protasis, this, like Coptic *ešje-*, 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 (*Urk.* 13/13, p. 313f.) *hpr.f r-iw.f hpr r-bn.w* (Sethe: “for *bn-iw.w*”) *gm'.n* I see *hpr.f* as prospective-modal (“optative”), not protatic, and *r-. . . r-* the *repeated circumstantial converter*, really governing the future; *iw.f hpr* is the protasis on its own: “Should it happen, let us not be damaged” (translating the Greek *toútou de geno-ménou, esómetha ouk êdikêmenoî*).

The Coptic paradigm following *ešôp(e)* resembles the Demotic one very closely (*e-* + present, perfect, *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) *tys r-* “behold” (etym. *pty-s* [*<ptr-st*] + *iw-?*) +

Bipartite: *O. Michaelides* p. 20D, 21G, 23E (Tab. IX): *tys iw.i hp.kwi m-kd. . .*; Ryl. 9 3/18, 9/9;

Nom. Sentence: Ryl. 9 1/4 (\emptyset - + NS: *ibid.* 8/9, 9/12);

Adj. Verb: Ryl. 9 6/12 (neg.);

perf. *s3m.f* (esp. verbs of motion): Ryl. 9 3/19, 6/17, Myth. 14/19f.;

aorist: P. Vandier 4/10.

- (c) *gm/rh s + r-* “find out that” +
 aorist (Setne 6/2);
 neg. perfect (Setne 6/10);
 Adjective-Verb (Setne II 2/13);
wn-nʾw-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. *sḏm.f* (Setne II 4/27);
 Cleft Sentence (Setne 6/14).

This construction may perhaps help to resolve cases of *arêu ef-* in Coptic (such as Shenoute ed. Leip. III 19, 26, 184) as circumstantial.

(e) Final “conjunctive” construction + *r-*: *Urk.* 13bis 2,9 *n-dit r-bn-iw-md nb ʾk* “...so that nothing should perish”. This seems to be the analytic (and truly final) counterpart of “(r) *tm dit sḏm.f*” (17/7 and p. 443), which is the usual negation of the properly speaking causative (and only partly final) “*r dit sḏm.f*” (3/13, 6/5 etc.). Incidentally, *r-bn-nʾw-* (Johnson’s E 301, E 492c) are cases of consecutive circumstantial future rather than the preposition *r-* governing a verb-form (see Quecke, *Or* 48:441f., 1979).

In Sahidic Coptic *jekaas e-nne-* seems to continue the “governing final conjunction” construction; see Polotsky, review of Till’s *Grammatik* (1st ed.), *OLZ* 1957 p. 233 (*Collected Papers* 233a).

(f) the content of dreams:

1. Spiegelberg, *ÄZ* 50:32 (1912) *i.ir-Pr-ʾʾ pri r-ir.f rsw iw-wʾ rmt ʾʾ md irm.f* “Pharao saw a dream: a great man talking to him”.
2. Petub. 19/27f. *i.ir.i pri r-wʾt rsw r-wn-wʾt ḥs 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-ir.f rsw n pʾ-grh iw-pʾ-sšt n pʾ-ntr-ʾʾ 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 governed 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 *hôs-/hôs ešje-/ešje-* (Boh. *isjek-*, not *isje*): Shenoute ed. Leip. IV 125 *ainau eurasou ere-nim mn-nim šôl mmoou*; Junker, *Poesie* 240 *ainau eroi*

eteušê etmmau eregabriel 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 pronoun (*-pʒy*, *-tʒy*, *-nʒw*) which however is not anaphoric (resuming a topicalized 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-iw-ʒhy in pʒy pʒ-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 pronominal element in the immediate or remote context, but internally, to the RHEME; the theme is a formal constituent — mark of the preceding's element'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 certain of the Cleft Sentence patterns with pronominal/nominal focus (including, in all probability, the peculiar Oxyrhynchite focalized nominal predication 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 nʒy.k-mʒ'w nty-hry nʒw* “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 tʒy.k-iḥ tʒy*: “She is yours; it's your cow”. Note the compatibility (in a formulaic collocation) of the two possession-predicating constructions: this is no tautology, but legalistic precision of expression, first a general declaration of ownership, then enumeration of *posses-sa*.

3. Ryl. 2 3f. *mtws t3y.tn-st t3y... bn t3y.tn-st in t3y* “This (lit. “she”), your place it is; it’s your place”. The first pattern is the topicalized anaphoric theme; the second, negated one is the endophoric.

4. (P. Mainz ε, *Schreibertradition* No. 30): *p3y.t-3h ky nty-ir-st3 35 hn’ p3y.w-’w n hy hn’ nty nb ti r-ir.f hn’... n3w* “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 rhemes. Note here the final placement of the formal theme, not occurring in the case of an expanded rheme (ex. 15 below). So too in:

5. *Recueil* 8 B 8 *mtw.t st t3y.t-ryt hn’ p3-1/3 t3-hyt nty-hr-r3.s nty-hry n3w* “They are yours; they’re your floor and 1/3 of the entry-court situated at its entry, as specified above”.

6. Setne II 2/10 *p3y-rmt hm i.nw.k r-ir.f iw.w in m-im.f r-bl hn Mn-nfr iw-mn-rmt mš’ m-s3.f iw.f gl’ n w’-tmw p3y* “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 B 8f. *mtwt-s t3y.t-ryt nty-kd hbst hn’ p3y.t-inh hn’ t3y.t-pšt n p3-wr3 hn’ p3y.t-hrw-s’nh 1 n p3-r-pr n Ht-Hr-Hnwt-’Imntt hr ibd nb hpr.f hn’ p3y.t-hrw-s’nh 12 n t3-ryt ’Irt-hms-nfr hr ibd nb hpr.f irm n3-nty-m-s3.w nty-hry n3w* “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, rheme as *p3y*:

8. *Ibid.* 8 (6079) ro A 5f. (= ro B 6f.) *mtwt-s p3y.t-hrw n s’nh 3 hn’ 1/5 t3y.w-pšt 1 1/2 1/10 r hrw-s’nh 3 hn’ 1/5 hr rnpt nb hpr.f hn’ n3y.w-r3w n3-hrw 5 hbw n hm-ntr w’b wn gwt3 imy-wnwtw knbt nb shn nb n p3-r-pr Ht-Hr-Hnwt-’Imntt n Dm3 hr p3-dw n Dm3 hn’ n3y.w-styw n3y.w-ihyw nty nb nty-t3y r-ir.w hn’ nty nb nty-šp r-ir.w hn’ nty-nb nty-pr m-im.w hn’ n3-nty-iw.w r w3h r-ir.w n sh3 ht-ntr p3-tmy hn’ n3y.w-šmsw n3y.w-’ršw nty-hry p3y* “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-mʿt tʿy* “It’s true” (*mdt-mʿt* = Coptic *mnt-me*). In the Demotic pattern, the formal theme *refers back to*, and *concorde 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-mʿt dr.w nʿw* “(They found that) all were true”; this is legal phraseology: see *Family Archive* 5/26 *nʿy...mt-n-ʿd dr.w nʿw*.

Obs. The legal repudiation formula in *Family Archive* (3/6-11.23.26; 4/4-5.21-25, 5/3-6.7f. 22-23, 6/4-5) has several variants (not “defective versions of the tripartite construction”, *pace* J. H. Johnson, “Demotic Nominal Sentences” in: *Studies in Honor of H. J. Polotsky* [1981] 414-430, see p. 425, n. 5) of the following schematic structure:

<i>pʿy-dd i.ir.s: [...]</i>	<i>tʿy/nʿy-</i>	<i>mdt(n)ʿd</i>	<i>idd.s</i>	<i>tʿy/nʿw</i>
(topic)	(top. resumption)	(rheme)		(theme)
		(nom.-lex.)	(verb.-auxil.)	
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)

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 *dd-mdtnʿd* “speak falsehood, lie” = Copt. *je-mntnouj*, is always zeroed simultaneously with (e), but also independently (*dd-ʿdʿ* is a compound verb in Late Egyptian; cf. P. BM 10052 5/5, 12/13; 3/18 *ʿdʿ pʿ-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 pʿ-hpr iw mdt-ntr nʿw* “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 hpr n ʿy pʿy ʿy n wʿb pʿy* “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 pꜣy*, *ibid.* 10/4.6. In Coptic, compare “*pnau pe*” with “*mpatfrnau*”, see *Categories* 152 n. 41.

12. Ankhsh. 9/16 *šm pꜣy* “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 calendary 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 pꜣy* “It being the third winter month”.

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

15. *Deir el-Medineh* 36 (6085) ro 23 *bn-iw.i rh dd šhn pꜣy 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 adnexal-adnominal expansion of the rheme.

16. P. Loeb 10/4f. *w'-msh n ds nht pꜣy* “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-š-šhn pꜣy* “Should it be another matter, ...”; *pꜣy* anaphoric to the quantifier *gr-* (*ky-*).

18. Rhind I 5/6 *pꜣ-nfr nty-iw-Wsir pꜣy* “The Beautiful, that is *Wsir*”: 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 (*pšêre šêm ete-abêsalôm pe*, II Reg. 14:21; *ouei ebol nhêtou...ete-maria tmagdalinê te*, Campagnano, *Omèlie copte* 186). A name-glossing instance:

19. Oracle 143 *Mhyt nty-iw-tꜣ-r'yt tꜣy* “M., that is the Uraeus” (Coptic: *maria nte-iakôbos ete-titheotokos te*, Lagarde, *Catena* 221).

20. Setne II 4/9ff. *nm m-im.tn pꜣ-i.ir dd... # Hr pꜣ-šr Tꜣ-ryr pꜣy* “Which of you was he that said...? # It’s Hor, Tryr’s son”; prob. similar is (*Erzählung* 1/11) *nꜣ-i.ir sp r-ir.k nꜣw* “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 Pharaoh’s maltreated back), is also Setne II 5/4 *nꜣ-hkꜣw n nꜣ-ꜣgšw nꜣw* “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*... *netêp er-nêsteia 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 n3-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 p3-nty-iw.i m3'.k m-im.w rn.t* "It is you in whose name I have legal rights", with the theme immutable (*-p3y*), a post-rhematic mark (or focusser);
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 têren pe* (Lagarde, *Catena* 36; sim. 40, 60, 69), contrasted to *nê-etauerthošf ete-ntôou 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 rhematic 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*): *n3y.i mdtw n3y.i mdtw 'n* (once paraphrased in Myth. 8/4, Spiegelberg, Gloss. 88 as *p3y-dd p3y-dd 'n p3y*) 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. “*ḥḏ 3 r sttr 15 r ḥḏ 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)

The Hebrew University,
Dept. of Linguistics
91905 Jerusalem (ISRAEL)