Determination-Signalling Environment in Old and Middle Egyptian: Work-Notes and Reflections

Ariel Shisha-Halevy, Jerusalem

(**1.1**) Barring the Nominal Sentence, Egyptian grammatical study of the heroic age, from Old Egyptian to Middle Egyptian, from K. Sethe to H. J. Polotsky, was mainly concerned with the verbal system and verb syntax. What has been stated about nominal syntax beyond the very basics would not exceed, all grammarians told, a few pages of print and very little individual variation based on real original research. One cannot help feeling this is due to the absence of "orthodox" affixed articles, as if these are anchoring points for syntactical observation of the noun. (Terminologically, of course, "articulum", Greek ἄρθρον, means a metaphoric "linking joint" — *Gelenk* — revealing no less than a realization of its prime environmental role). And yet, the absence of *bona-fide* definite and indefinite articles in written Old and Middle Egyptian, somewhat like the absence of graphemic notation of vowels, which, in H. J. Polotsky's conception of verbal category, sets us free from *la superstition de la forme* (De Boer) and encourages us to resort to the structural definition of linguistic identity, this "deprivation" too must be taken as a blessing in disguise: it forces our attention off the noun — temptingly "adequately" translatable in isolation into a European-style language — onto its environment, where much signalling information regarding (non-)specificity and (non-)particularity is to be found. The difficulty of seeing clearly in the matter of noun determination stems *inter alia* from looking for a "copy" correlation with what we have grown used to feel as Indo-European (or rather European) articles; but also from the generally implicitly accepted dichotomy of grammar and lexicon, a dichotomy more leaking than most other linguistic models; and especially from our being so to speak mesmerized by the article(s), which impairs our peripheral vision (yet another metaphor) and obscures our view of co-signals of determination. Here, incidentally, the trap of ethnocentricity is particularly ready for the unwary, the more so since it is, by easy terminological transference, the article — where present — that is conceived of as "definite" or "indefinite", and not the noun and its environment.[1] Moreover, in ignoring environmental determination, the typological significance of a definite article (and as a matter of fact, the article is but marginal in the overall phenomenon) can easily be exaggerated.[2]

----

[1] Treating "bouts de phrase", in Golenischeff's words (*Quelques remarques*, see 686ff.) is here all too clearly inadequate, for the study of Egyptian grammar "en elle-même et par elle-même" (he also complains, 685, of the "influence néfaste de l'école égyptologique qui a pris à tâche de démontrer que la langue égyptienne était une langue sémitique").

[2] De la Grasserie *De l'article* 394 "ce petit mot...donne à un langage, suivant l'extension de son emploi, un aspect tout particulier; il se developpe avec la civilisation elle même, domine les langues derivées, est un des plus puissants instruments d'analyse, d'abstraction et

The commonly — indeed conventionally — erroneous synchronic view of article function can also flaw a satisfactory resolution of article-less states. For instance, the proportion of (macro)syntactic — anaphorical or cataphorical — and exophorical or intrinsic functioning of the articles may vary dramatically between narrative, dialogic, expositive, legal or ritual textemes.

Finally, the continuity fallacy, of chronologically successive written phases seen as real succession in linguistic diachrony, distorts our view of article evolution.

(**1.2**) Slavonic is the language family in which noun determination in absence of an article has been most studied: Birkenmaier *Artikelfunktionen*; Chvany *'Definiteness'*; Naylor *'Definiteness'*. Chvany defines (p. 71ff.) the environmental means of determination as a case of a "field" of "lexical and grammatical means having as a rule other functions as well". While Chvany's and Nailor's studies are mainly programmatic, Birkenmaier's (albeit equally contrastive — with German — is rich in descriptive specifics for Russian, mainly focussing on the perfective aspect for marking specificity of actants, the imperfective aspect for non-specificity. Of interest is also Hlavsa *Operators of Reference*, again, studying a Slavic language (Czech): consider especially the discussion of aspect exponents and adverbs (99f.) or of genericity (96).

Another case of article absence is mainly familiar for its status as the incipience term in the classic instance of article evolution, namely Romance: Latin (see Rosén *Definite Article.* The much-studied opposition between the attributive adjective, as in *folia laurea,* and the genitive, as in *lauri folia,* is found to be applicable to marking respectively the indefinite and the definite noun). As in Egyptian, we find here linguistic variety overruling diachrony — instances of the article encountered in very early colloquial-register corpuses. Like Egyptian, it is the Latin delocutive-deixis demonstrative that eventually assumed article status in most Romance languages, following (again, as in Egyptian) a vying phase of other demonstratives.

It is in Osmanli Turkish, with an indefinite and no definite article, that the most sophisticated structuralist discussions of environmental determination are to be found (nominal cases, along with aspectual verbal exponents, are the main environmental markers of determination in Slavonic). Nilsson *Definiteness* adduces the well-known main facts concerning the genitive and the accusative cases as signalling specificity, well compatible with both indefinite *bir* and definite *zero*, as in *güzel kitabı aldım* and *güzel bir kitabı aldım*, respectively "I bought the nice book" and "I bought a (certain) nice book", the last still in need of contextual specification, which is however not necessary in *Bir kitabı arıyorum* "I'm looking for a certain book". However,

---

de clarté tout à la fois"; Hodler *Artikellehre* 15 "Danach wären also die Sprachen, die zu eine Artikelentwicklung nicht gekommen sind, gewißer Maßen als rückständig zu beurteilen, denen bei normalen Geschichtsverlauf diese Entwicklung noch bevorstände"; Snell *Entdeckung* 199f. "Es ist...nicht abzusehen, wie in Griechenland Naturwissenschaft und Philosophie hätten entstehen können, wäre nicht im Griechischen der bestimmte Artikel vorhanden gewesen". Beyond the plainly evident ethnocentrism of such unprovable statements, the juncturally delimitative metaphrastic role of some articles, carried by demonstratives in an article-less language such as Latin and beyond doubt covering only part of the functional range of determination, is shared by other syntactic means. Needless to say, a language does not change its type only on account of developing an article (Krámsky *Category of Determination* 151).

Johansson *Bestimmtheit* points (see 1189ff.) to factors that considerably complicate this state of things, all relevant to Egyptian: the factor of Functional Sentence Perspective and information structure, eminently expressed by word order, as overruling for the signalization of (non-)specificity; also, that formal thematicity and topicality may alone signal specificity; also, that specificity may, almost counter-intuitively, be unaccompanied by familiarity. Thus, *Çocuk çiçeği satıyor* "The boy sells the flower" but *Çocuk çiçeği burada satıyor* "It is here that the boy sells flowers" and *Bir çocuğu itaatsizliği yüzünden dövmek bir suçtur* "It's a crime to whip a child because of disobediance"; *Bugün makbuzlar geldi*, "Today (some) receipts arrived" as against *Makbuzlar bugün geldi* "The receipts arrived today"; *Tüccar, oğlunu İstanbul'a gönderdi* " The merchant sent his son to Istanbul". In *Paranın bugün geldiği* "that it is today that money/the money arrived" specificity is neutralized; so too in *evi* "his house/a house of his" (existential-possessive indefinite in the case of the clausal *Evi var* "He has a house" (so too in Egyptian: see below). See also Krámsky *Category of Determination* 246f. on the oppositions *söyler* vs. *söylen* and *görmüš/gelecek vs. görmüš/the periphrastic gelecek olan* as carrying a determination contrast.

(**1.3**) In this essay, a series of observations on the signalling clustering about a noun that may contribute data on this noun's determination — higher or lower specificity of various kinds, particularity or genericity, or indifference to these — it is important for me, above everything and first of all, to convince my readers that the question of how roles and subtypes of determination are carried by textual segments adjacent to the noun itself or pertinent to it is a legitimate and interesting one.

It is important, I believe, to try and resolve a system of determinators — such as the Bohairic Coptic one, for example, in my opinion rather conservative — in order to tackle an article-less determination system. For by understanding overt and explicit signals of determination, we wax sensitive to covert and implicit ones, which later feed-back data for correcting and refining the articular systems; also, we train our heuristic sensibilities to recognize subtle "new" roles and distinctions. In fact, my main contention here is that the old definite/indefinite (and even specific/non-specific) binomy, simply and alone — more often than not, *a priori* and logic-based — avails us little in trying to clarify Egyptian determination structure: the landscape is often quite different. The following types of determination are recoverable in clusters as operative in the slots scanned:

- highly specific, esp. Proper Names and uniques, also nouns specified by demonstratives;

- specific — by paradigmatic combination;

- specific — by syntagmatic combination;

- generic — as notion name, as extensional presentation of class, as abstract;

- non-specific;

- quantified/indefinite;

- specificity-indifferent (irrelevant).

Four main points are here in theoretical focus. First, the interaction (if any) and tension between environmental determination and intrinsic or inherent (pragmatic,

paradigmatic, Proper-Name) one. Second, the meaning of specificity and particularity, of identifiability and textual "anchoredness" (see below). Third, is unmarkedness, indifference or fuzziness of determination part of the determination categorial syndrome? Fourth and last, a diachronic query: to what extent is the transition into an article phase — the "emergence of articles" — correlated with constructions and configurations that signal determination in article-less systems?

The observations offered here are not corpus-specific, but refer to a mixed "corpus" of differing points along the milennium-plus diachrony of Old and Middle Egyptian, various textemes, and, very probably, various registers and dialects. They are consequently tentative suggestions rather than confident statements. I am well aware of the danger of circularity and subjective judgement run in this kind of quest; the co(n)text is often too pliable and in itself too uncertain (and dependent on judgements of determination) to be a reliable test. This is not a definitive or systematic study of Egyptian noun determination, nor even an adequate bibliographical survey of the topic, but a provisional, often half-baked first discussion in the form of work-notes. For reasons of space, many statements may appear laconic, but I have tried to provide ample illustration. Many questions will be no more than raised here, pending future in-depth study.

(**1.4**) I see determination as a signalling complex, a categorial syndrome, a scatter or orchestrated ensemble of features, of characterizations of a noun (yet not only a noun). It is a cluster or a conglomerate category, not a simple one. But we tend to watch for a formal/functional category *in word scope* (which also accounts for the pseudo-paradigmatic and pseudo-analytic synthesis of allegedly mutually commutable articles: in point of fact, the articles do not always or usually commute, except, as said, in word scope) rather than in the macrosyntactic, cotextual environment (e.g. adjacent verb forms, expansions, constituents in nexal interdependence with the element under scrutiny, negative environment, preceding textual stretches). Like any paradigmatic dependence, all determination gradings (including Proper Names — see below), are only valid in specific slots. In the word extent, the articles and the articular slot command our analytic attention, distracting us from giving due consideration to the environment.

"Definiteness Effects" (as defined in Bentley *Definiteness Effects*), in an article-less language, are to a considerable degree *definiteness* (better: *specificity*) *signals.* Whether or not these are primary or secondary — co-marking, induced or conditioned — cannot be simply decided, without the charting and structuring of the features in point. Even where specificity stems from cotextual or contextual anchoring, "anchoredness" (*prius dicta* or *prius nota*), or from a resulting identifiability (as conceived of in Prince *Given-New Information* and Lambrecht *Information Structure*; consider, for instance, the specifying contrast of indefinites in Sardinian, discussed in Bentley *Definiteness Effects* 64, 74ff.), even then it is the environment that induces specificity, and we are not really dealing with "effects" or a primary "definiteness". Closely observed, therefore, Egyptian does not have a "low coding for definiteness" (so Givón *Definiteness* 306), but its coding is fragmented and spread around, not resident in or even necessarily adjacent to, the noun; the interplay between environmental marking and the noun's sensitivity to such marking are in question (after all, it is the environment that actualizes the noun lexeme, even before we come to determination). Practically speaking, it is as a rule the paradigmatic feature of

nouns "independently" marked for determination (paradigmatically or pragmatically: see below) in their commutability with nouns unmarked *per se* that calls for attention. We apply the compatibility information of the marked to resolving the determination of the unmarked nouns. Moreover, distinctions that are *not* made in given slots — for instance, between non-specificity and cataphoric specificity, or, more generally, between any determination characterization, are no less significant and instructive.

(**1.5**) Very few special studies have so far attempted to structure Egyptian determination; there is no monographic study, beyond the largely routine, very general statements made in the canonical grammars (Johnson *Use of the Articles,* on Demotic, is an exception). Such discussions as we have concern the evolution of the article in Egyptian, but ignore the crucial factor of trigger environments, which would be immediately relevant to our own investigation.[3] Furthermore, these diachronic studies address only the definite article. One such is Kroeber's excellent essay on the *p3-* article in *Neuägyptizismen* 1–30 — he pinpoints the beginning of this process to as early as the 6th Dynasty rather than the usual dating to the 11th Dynasty, as documented in the Heqanahte Papers; the impression is that this is a symptom of a colloquial register. Loprieno *Sviluppo* focusses on *p3-* period-wise, attempting a distinction of types of anaphora: his "anafora immediata" (p. 5f.) takes into account the syntactical environment of the definite noun, especially what we call cataphoric reference. However, it is really impossible to reconstruct the development of the article without fully grasping the structure of environmental article-less determination in OE and ME, as well as the features of non-specificity; also, the full picture, including the dialectal one, of Coptic determination (Loprieno *Ancient Egyptian* 69 takes the less sophisticated, "flattened" Sahidic as representative of Coptic). It is striking, but hardly surprising, how obscure and vague indications of the presence or absence of a synchronic article still are. The details of transition from a two-term to a three-term system are as yet a mystery.[4] In general theoretical perspective, in the formidable scope of the milennia-spanning Egyptian diachrony, the non-cyclical nature of article evolution is remarkable. Unlike definite and indefinite article "emergence", "article death" does probably not occur without linguistic interference; nor apparently does reduction of a three-term to a two-term system. Still in general perspective, there is no sharp theoretically valid demarcation between demonstratives and a demonstrative-origin definite article, but a gradient continuum; a general quality of "grammaticalized-ness" or grammatical regulation belongs to the extreme range on this spectrum, but it is certainly not the case that the article is distinctively conditioned (i.e. non-pertinent — *pace* e.g. Christophersen *Articles* 83). It is rather in the harmony between the articled noun syntagm and its environment that article-hood is discernable, and not in what it alone expresses or signifies. Article diachrony is of immediate relevance to

─────────────────

[3] Loprieno *Ancient Egyptian* does not devote a single line to determination in Egyptian synchrony (beside the evolution of the article) — there is no "determination" entry in the index. Krámsky *Article* 83, 89 "in OE the definite article is pa, pe, and the indef. article ua" — shows the dramatic fall in quality of typological studies since Steinthal, Misteli and Fink in the 19th century, although our knowledge of the actual languages is incomparably deeper.

[4] Talking of a "one-article system" (as e.g. Christophersen *Articles*) is of course a contradiction in terms: such a system operates at least two: *zero* and non-*zero*.

the quest we are engaged in here, for determination roles do not develop with the articles, let alone are created by them: these roles exist in the system, are integral to the system, and are — I almost write "merely" — assumed by the articles as part of a language's progress to the "one segment-one function" isolation of *signifiants*, analytical resolution and assignment of grammatical functions.

(**1.6**) The nuclearity of the article (Barri *Nucleus and Satellite* 75ff., Shisha-Halevy *Categories* 142f.; *Topics*, §3.0.4) — "nucleus" being the grammatically prime segment of the syntagm, the one representing and integrating the whole syntagm in the grammatical structure of the text or subtextual pattern

Indeed, it is the article that occupies a constituential slot in the larger pattern. G. Guillaume, among the first to recognize the *zero* article as such, defined the article simply as: "quelque chose *qui emploie le nom*" (my italics).[5] Foulet's "une sort de simple signe grammatical qui annonce le nom" is also relevant to the issue in point, inasmuch the absence of an article in OE and ME does not imply the absence of an actualizing (suffixed) slot which is nuclear in the noun syntagm.[6] In Egyptian, as in the Coptic determinator slot, this is where gender-number exponence resides and is effected, in a commutation and combination complex (-t/ϕ [gender], -w/ϕ, -y [number, incl. dual]). The structural correspondence of Coptic ⲧ-ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧⲥ (ⲑ︤ⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲓ-) with *mr.t.n.j* "she whom I have loved" is evident and consensual, but the matching, outside the relative verb, of *md.t*, *b3k.t*, or *nfr* with [DET$_m$]ϣⲁϫⲉ, [DET$_f$]ϧⲙϧⲁⲗ or [DET$_m$]ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ is as clear and no less remarkable.

(**2.1**) The importance of demonstrative pronouns or adjectives, the usual ancestors of definite articles, is considerable, since they are beyond-doubt landmarks of higher specificity. In fact, they are synchronic actualizing specifying determinators. The Egyptian demonstratives are either deictic grammemic adjectives in a ternary system of deixis (see Vernus *Structure ternaire*), or, outside this closely-knit system, the nuclear determinator {*p3-*}, which eventually came to replace *pn* as an unmarked term of the opposition and — fully in Late Egyptian, and sporadically in colloquial-register Middle and even old Egyptian — to be further grammaticalized into a definite article. In the context of the present inquiry, one must observe that they are certainly specifying, yet usually combined with further specifying satellites, or with pragmatic specificity; after all, deixis is their primary function:

> *t3 pn n ᶜnḥw ntj-wj jm.f* (CT I 158f., and similarly often) "this land of the living that I'm in".

Note the compatibility of demonstratives with possessed and/or pragmatically specific nouns, e.g. in address, deictically qualified by demonstratives (not always renderable

---

[5] The opposite view, of the article as a marginal or auxiliary segment, is of course more prevalent: from "organe complementaire" (De la Grassserie) to the current "mot accessoire" (Marouzeau). I quote Gardiner *Theory* 47 (of the article in general) "mere useless ballast, a habit or mannerism, accumulation of old rubbish" with no further comment.

[6] "Actualization" — integration of an element in *la parole*, realization or concretization — is one of the article's most famous roles (Bally, following Guillaume *Problème de l'article*, e.g. 21, 25, Chapters IV, V). The inherence of determination in the noun (Krámsky *Category of Determination* 242ff.) is structurally speaking dubious, to say the least.

in English). This compatibility points to the fuzzy specificity of possessedness (below) and the *sui generis*, Proper-Name like specificity of address:

> *j jt.j pf jmj ẖrt-nṯr* (CT I 160f) "O my father who is in the Necropolis"

> *j wr pw* (CT III 393a) "O you Great One"

> *h3 Wsir pn....* (CT, often) "O Osiris".

The demonstrative *pf* is specifically dialogic, often marked as affective; e.g. following imperatives and in address (CT II 336–7a, 338–9d). When shifted into narrative (CT II 340a, 336–7c), it is converted into *pn* or kept on as *Erlebte Rede* or Free Indirect Discourse:

> *skr pf tpy jr.n Stẖ m irt.j* (CT II 341a) "That (horrible) first wound which Seth made in my eye".

Demonstratives may also be exponents of narrative anaphoric cohesion: *sḥtj...sḥtj pn..., Dḥwty-nḫt... Dḥwty-nḫt pn...* (Peasant *passim*) "the said peasant", "the said Dḥwty-nḫt". In other textemes, they carry thenon-anaphoric "situation at hand" paradigmatic deixis (*hrw pn* "today" *rdj.n.tw nn-n-t3w.w n X pn jn nn-n-ḥnwt* (CT II 389a-b, spell opening) "It is to X by these Ladies that these winds have been given.

(**2.2**) The familiar Coptic three-term system is the arguably simplified and reduced Sahidic one (Sahidic usually standing for Coptic, yet with no real intrinsic justification). The Bohairic dialect, in many regards conservative, has a four-term system: {ⲡⲓ-} pl. ⲛⲓ- deictic and phoric; {ⲡ-), plural ⲛⲉⲛ- (the latter never generic, occurring only in ⲛⲉⲛ- ... ⲛ- associative syntagms) expresses "pure actualization" — not deictic or phoric, nor even definite; a naming determinator. It is a "naming generic" (see below), and as such represents the actualized noun in special associative syntagms, where the first term is a representative constituent part of a whole that would be adequately presented by the second, but is enriched by the combination of second and first — the relationship between the two strongly recalls what is very generally known as "inalienable possession": ⲧⲏⲡⲓ ⲛⲛⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ "the number of the days", ⲡⲕⲁϩⲓ ⲛⲭⲏⲙⲓ "the land of Egypt", ⲡⲧⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲥⲓⲛⲁ "Mount Sinai", ⲡⲱⲛϧ ⲛⲁⲃⲣⲁⲁⲙ "the life(-span) of Abraham", ⲧϫⲓϫ ⲛⲛⲓⲣⲉⲙⲛⲭⲏⲙⲓ "the hand of the Egyptians". Then, the indefinite ⲟⲩ-, plural ϩⲁⲛ-, both either particular-indefinite or instantial generic: ⲟⲩϧⲉⲗϣⲓⲣⲓ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧϭⲓ-ⲙⲛⲟⲧ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲟⲩϧⲉⲗⲗⲟ "youth and virgin, suckling and old man". Finally, the true *zero:*, used for the diffuse extensional generic (this is somewhat less important in Bohairic).

(**2.3**) The complex relation between denotative higher- and lower-grade Proper Names, uniques ("the sun", "the land", "the King", "God"), and metaphrastic "denotativizing" roles of determinators (famously enabling the discussion of linguistic entities, forms or concepts and their significance, as in Varro's and Priscianus' "ab hoc amo" and "ille ante canem") on the one hand, and generic (notion) names (see Shisha-Halevy *Proper Name* 140 s.v. and Shisha-Halevy *Topics*, Chapter Three) on the other, is of relevance to our quest; not only since these are all functions — beyond doubt real and essential — difficult to resolve contextually, since non-referent, but especially since *every* case of determination, from generic to unique (which, like a snake biting its tail, is paradoxically also a one-member generic) is located and often gradable on the "properness scale", and such locations (e.g. the naming-generic) are, as already

pointed out above, descriptively much more important than the facile binomy of "definite and indefinite".

Indeed, genericity is perhaps the most striking case of the residence of determination features (also) outside the noun, e.g. in the verb clause, negation, (non-)existence clause.[7] Generic determination in general is rather complicated, with the possible distinction of *zero* (extensive, diffuse) generic, naming (genus name) generic, instantial ("indefinite") generic and closed-set contrastive generic. It is remarkable that high-specificity slots are almost always shared by genericity — not surprising, given the affinity of the generic and the Proper Name. The *metaphorics of genericity* is clear in Bohairic Coptic (above), where even ⲡ- (the naming generic) may be seen as a metaphrastic application of the (notion) name, to express "the name of the kind", and even *zero*, the "diffuse" extensional essence of genericity, is iconically disguised, almost indistinguishable from the bare (*nil*-determinated) lexeme. All this as such does not obtain, of course, for article-less Egyptian. The *zero* article, so eloquent where it is structurally present, and especially the ternary and quaternary systems, is out of our reach in Egyptian. But here other means of genericity come into play. On the morpho-graphemic level, specific determinatives (like the "grain/element unit" over plural strokes" (Gardiner N33, Z2 etc.) and plurality; on the phrase level, totalizing quantifiers like *nb(t)* "all".

(**2.4**) Pragmatic and paradigmatic specificity are two kinds of respectively contextual and Discourse-World systemic overruling of syntactic anchoredness — as it were, ad-hoc Proper Names:

(a) Address Status (Shisha-Halevy *Proper Name* §1.2). Demonstratives do not over-specify the addresseee, but lend the address (which is by no means always of the same kind) specific deictic affective or expressive tones:

j ḥtp wr (or j *Ḥtp Wr*) (CT III 201) "O you Great Restfu!l"

wy ntrw (CT II 211a) "O ye gods!"

j wr pw, j ꜥ3 pw zny pt (CT III 201) "O you great one, who opens the sky!"

nḏs (Sh.S. *passim*) "you puny one"

js pn, qd.n.tw.k n ḥb "O tomb, it is for mourning that you have been constructed".

(b) In the prevalent case of closed-set paradigmatic specificity, the sets are ad-hoc and not "canonical" or *a priori*, and the items real generic notion names (including so-called abstracts):

ḏbꜥ wr, ḏbꜥ šrr (Pyr. 475b, c) "the big finger, the little finger"

pt t3 mw (CT II 180c) "sky, earth and water"

rmṯ — pꜥt "people and nobles"

rmṯw — ntrw — 3ḫw (CT VI 93a) "people, gods, spirits" (and nṯr "God")

3ḥt — rmṯ — ḫt nbt (Urk I 13) "field, people, every thing (possession)";

---

[7] See already Guillaume *Problème de l'article*, Chapter XVII.

jzft (e.g. CT VII 464a) "injustice", *wrrt* "the W. crown", *mryt* "the beach", *t3* "the flatland" (and, of course, *t3wy* "the Two Lands" = "Egypt"), *rᶜ* "the sun", and so on.

t3 ḫr.t r-dr.f (Pyr. 782c) "the entire land is in your control"

jḫ jr.t(w) n.j s3ḫw ḥdt sts.tw.j jn jᶜrwt (Book of the Dead Nu 6–7 [Budge 244, 6–7]) "may there be done to me the glorification of the White Crown, may I be exalted by the Uraeus".

(**2.5**) The syntaxic nature of Proper Names is even more puzzling in a language such as Egyptian. Proper Names are, according to Shisha-Halevy *Proper Names*, not absolute but relative entities (the conventional dichtomy of PN and Appellative is entirely non-analytic, indeed non-grammatical but philosophical or logical). They are not (as is implicitly or explictly assumed and indeed a usually mentioned definitive property) self-actualizing, but environmentally signalled, and, for conventional names, extreme or statistically recurring gradings on a scale of "properness". This makes the PN issue in Egyptian all the more fascinating and consequential, since the basic signalization query valid for all languages — "how does the listener/reader know an element is a PN?" — i.e. the decoding-as PN or PN reading — acquires here a special edge. Here and elsewhere, the PN cannot, contrary to mostly implicit conventional opinion, be simply defined by incompatibility with articles; indeed, it seems to be always well compatible with determinators (although in English this combination is as a rule cataphoric: "the John we were talking about", in German and Italian deictic-affective, and in many languages still not clear):

pty sy t3 Rd-ddt (Westc. 9,8) "who is she, this Rd-ddt?"

In Egyptian, the environment signalling PN grading is all-important, since we cannot assume the scale of properness resembles our western European one; several kinds of personal and divine names, titular names, concept and kind names all play their part; and in fact, genus names are (among other generics) remarkably common. The evident existence of personal-name and toponym repertory does not trivialize the signalization question, especially given the connotative meaningfulness of such PNs as *W3d-Wr* (the "Great Green", the sea) — or *Dḥwty-nḫt* ("Thot is strong", *Dḥwty-nḫt* masculine personal name). Titles (Shisha-Halevy *Proper Names* 76f.) — *prae/post-nomina* — expand or precede PNs and thus mark them: In Egyptian, the absence of articles merges the PN, the "notion name", the extensional generic, the predicative *zero* (below) and all these with the *nil* in slots of the truly bare lexeme: a heady blend indeed.

Ḥr bjk ᶜ3 "Horus, the Great Falcon"

Jnpw Tpj-dw.f "Anubis, who is upon his Mountain"

Nḫt msw n Nfrj "Nḫt ('Strong'), born to Nfrj ('Handsome')"

pt t3 mw (CT II 180c) "sky, earth and water"

ḥm.f/ḥm.j "His/My Majesty"

nswt "the King"

ntr ᶜ3 "(the) Great God"

jmj-r rḫ nswt K3-m-snw (Urk I 175) "Supervisor, King's Confidant K3-m-snw".

The distinctive syntactical environment of Egyptian PNs is still to be charted. One example is the adnexal ("adnominal circumstantial") expansion[8] in:

Ḥrj s3-Snfrw jt.f ḥr snnwt nt d3mw (Kahûn 9, 2) "Ḥrj son of Snfrw, whose father commands the seconds of the troops".

Predicating PNs in Egyptian, including but not limited to naming, is different from Coptic, and effected by various patterns, none of which seems specialized for PNs. In some cases, the predicative PN is probably de-properized (Shisha-Halevy *Proper Names* 140 s.v.) — a medley of exx. from Pyr. and CT:

twt Ḥr (the interlocutive NS is not compatible with a PN in Coptic!) "you are Horus", *snt.f Spdt* "his sister is Spdt", *mwt.f pw Sš3t* "his mother is Sš3t", *Dḥwty pw jt.j* "my father is Thot" ("a Thot"?), *jnk Ssj n Mrwt* "I am Ssj, (son) of Mrwt"; *nds Ddj rn.f* (Westc. 7, 1) "a commoner whose name is Ddj", *R^c pw* (Urk V 10) "it/he is R^c".

(**3.1**) The case of nouns in coordination is instructive as the first construction to be considered for determination signalling. A primary conditioning correlation between determination and coordinator (*ḥn^c, ḥr* or *zero*) is more or less felt intuitively, though never explicitly stated nor to my knowledge studied in depth.[9] However, the difference between *ḥr* and *zero* is fine, and not entirely clear; apparently, *ḥn^c* coordinates also generic nouns; and, diachronically, *ḥr* seems to disappear from sight in our Demotic sources, to be encountered again in Coptic:[10]

msw.j ḥn^c snw.j (Sh.S. 128) "my children and brothers"

jt.f ḥn^c mwt.f (Urk. I 15) "his father and mother"

jw d3bw jm ḥn^c j3rrt (Sin. B 81f) "there are figs and grapes in existence there" (narrative description of an opulent land) — perhaps the categorial intensional generic, as against the diffuse or extensional generic with *zero* coordination in

...gm.n.j d3bw j3rrt jm[11] *ḥn^c nqwt šspt mj jr.tw sy rmw jm ḥn^c 3pdw* (Sh.S. 47f.) "I found there (some?) figs and grapes, all (kinds of) fine

---

[8] The Gunn Papers (at the Griffith Institute, Oxford) V 73, letter to A. H. Gardiner, ad Gardiner *Grammar* §198 (definite nouns + "unintroduced relative clauses": "I think you have here missed the point, which is that names of persons, or expresssions equivalent to names, take unintroduced relative clauses" — another instance of Gunn's syntactic sensitivity and descriptive acumen.

[9] The Gunn Papers (at the Griffith Institute, Oxford) V 75 *ad* Gardiner *Grammar* [1927] 69 §91, also letter to Gardiner 24/11/34 (AHG — the Gardiner Archives, at the Griffith Institute, Oxford — 142.124.102): "Closely connected words may be coupled by means of *ḥr*, lit. 'upon' "I have no doubt that words coupled by *ḥr* are undetermined words... the usage is thus as with Coptic ϩⲓ". This is especially striking in Bohairic, where — unlike Sahidic — ⲛⲉⲙ also coordinates *zero*-article terms, but ϩⲓ highly fused ones.

[10] For Demotic, see Shisha-Halevy *Work-Notes* 43; for Bohairic Coptic, Shisha-Halevy *Topics* §3.3 (h).

[11] It is significant that *jm* "there" alone suffices to signal existence in this cotext.

vegetables; there were sycamore-figs, cucumbers as if tended; there were fish and fowl there", where a transition from the actantial following "I found" to the existential may be associated with the different coordinative construction, but zero may also mark an especially close pairing of coordinated terms, as it does in Bohairic.

nḫt ḥk3w ḥr pḫrt (Ebers 3) "magic and drugs are powerful" (*pace* Westendorf *Grammatik* §132bb "der Zauber mit dem Heilmittel")

ḏ^c ḥr ḥyt (Westc. 11, 14) "wind and rain"

3ḫt rmt ḫt nbt (Urk. I 13) "fields, people, all things (all possessions)"

jtj bdt t ḥnqt (Pyr. 121a) "barley, emmer, bread and beer"

...t3yw ḥmwt (Sin. B 67) "men and women".

(**3.2**) A construction no less promising, albeit enigmatic, for resolving determination signals is the prepositional phrase. Here the combination of formal (preposition) and functional (prepositional meaning) specifics is often associated with noun specificity or non-specificity (cf. the determination-correlated alternation of *en* /*dans* in French, or the correlation of English *by + zero article* and *at + zero article* with special meanings). Note the predicative sense of *r* and *m* with non-specific nouns (discussed below); also the high specificity of the nominal component of collocations like *m njwt* (Sh.S. 144) "in town" or *m sš3* (Sh.S.129) "by chance".

(**3.3.1**) Nuclear noun syntagm — relative expansion (I). The verbal expansion of a noun may specify it. The correlation between nucleus ("antecedent") determination and "relative clause" (better: adnominal clause form) is familiar (cf. Lehmann *Relativsatz* 259ff., 286ff.), but in Egyptian, I believe, the correlation is formally and functionally more complicated than this. First, there are in Egyptian two very different formal types of relative expansions, namely the relative forms and participles, which are special nominal and, in adnominal status, adjectival nexal forms (Polotsky *Transpositions*) — and *ntj*, sometimes called a "relative adjective", but really a pronominal grammemic exponent of adnominal status for the existential-statal adverb-rheme nexus pattern and other verb forms. Second, since, following a nominal nucleus an adnominal *adnexal rhematic* expansion is opposed to an attributive one, the former expressed by the so-called circumstantial paradigm of converbal "adverbial" verb forms, while only the latter is properly speaking formally "relative" (see Shisha-Halevy *Categories* 6 n.14, 44 n.99, 64f., 81). However, while the said adnexal *vs.* attributive opposition obtains in Coptic following a specific as well as non-specific nuclei, practically only specific ones are compatible with the attributive i.e. relative clause-form. Thus, it is plausible to assume in Egyptian nuclear non-specificity, when a noun is expanded by circumstantial converbs, including the stative ("Old Perfective"), or, in some cases, paratactic clauses (e.g. Nominal Sentences or the negation *nn*, especially in clauses of non-existence). The opposition between attributive and adnexal is asymmetrical — not co-terminous nor co-extensive — and should certainly not be confused with the aprioristic ("idealistic"), non-analytic, logic-based semantic one between restrictive and non-restrictive relatives (cf. Lehmann *Relativsatz* 261ff.): the adnexal expansion is, like Greek participles — which, of course, are non-finite — not restricted to adnominal status; nor is the relative clause always

"restrictive" in meaning (cf. Lehmann *Relativsatz*, 259ff., 287ff.).

ntj specifies its nucleus, unless this is otherwise marked as specific, in which case we have *specificity compatibility*. Some statements to that effect are to be found in the grammatical literature.[12] So Westendorf *Grammatik* §131: nouns are determinated by "echte Relativsätze" (accepting here the terminology of "improper" or "virtual" for non-relative or paratactic adnominals, which was applied to Coptic by Till). The merit of Westendorf's formulation is in his important rejection of the binomy or dichotomy of "definite" vs. "indefinite", in favour of a gradience of specification, or at least an in-between grade. W. exemplifies this by a *nisbe* expansion (see below), but I believe the gradience is rather an asymmetry: as pointed out, adnexal (circumstantial, Stative, parataxis) expansion is compatible with any determinator grading, while the relative (*ntj*-) expands high-specificity nuclei or, for nouns otherwise marked for specificity, is a co-marking element, or is itself a specifying factor of cataphoric definiteness.

"Bereits" ("already") in Satzinger's categorical statement (*Attribut* 125), to the effect that the nucleus of *ntj* is "ein determiniertes Substantiv, dessen Gegenstand bereit identifiziert ist, da der ägyptische Relativsatz nicht identifizierend, sondern nur qualifizierend ist" must mean that the noun is specified cotextually or contextually, but not *by* the relative expansion. The evidence in Satzinger *Attribut*, as in texts in general, shows a clear difference between *ntj* and the adjectival relative forms/participles: the former is truly attributive, not appositive, and its antecedent often specified by it cataphorically, while the latter do not effect any specification. This difference stems primarily from the fact that, unlike relative forms and participles, *ntj* stands — as said — in opposition to adnominal circumstantial forms that actively signal lower specificity — despecify — by virtue of their rhematic (predicative) information value (see §3.3.5 below). This constitutes a striking structural lesson.

rmt Kmt ntjw jm ḥnᶜ.f (Sin B 33f.) "the Egyptians that (were) there with him"

srw ntj r-gsw.f (Peasant B1, 43) "the officials who (were) at his side"

bw ntj-st jm (Pyr. 1435b, Westc. 9,3 etc.) "the place (they are) in" (see Satzinger *Attribut* 133f.)

s3 ntj.f ḥr.f (Urk. I 14) "the shift on which he is"

bw pn ntj-wj jm (Urk. I 77) "this place I am in"

jr nsw nb sḫm-jr nb ntj r ḥtp n.f (Koptos 8, 7f.) "as for all (the) kings or potentates that will forgive him, ..."

sšm pn ntj-wj ḥr.f (Sin. B173f.) "this condition I'm in"

ntr pn ntj ḥr.f m ṯsm (Urk. V 67) "this god, whose face is that of a dog"

jrtj.k jpn ntj m33.k jm.sn (Book of the Dead: Gardiner *Grammar* 151.16) "those two eyes of yours wherein you see"

rn.tn pw ntj M. rḫj (Pyr. 1223b) "that name of yours which M. knows"

---

[12] The Gunn Papers (at the Griffith Institute, Oxford) V 73 (ad Gardiner *Grammar* [1927] §203): "The relative noun *nty*, when used adjectivally, defines the noun to which it is in apposition... We should then expect its negative sister *iwty* to have similar force".

p3-t3 ḥnqt [...] *ntj-rdj.n.j n.tn* (Siut I 295) "The bread-and-beer that I have given you".

The antecedent may have a Proper-Name-like pragmatic specificity, as in address status (treated here separately, above):

j ḥwnw ntj ḥr zwr (OK mastaba, quoted Satzinger *Attribut* 129 ex.18) "O, youth who drinks...".

nḏ-ḥr.k ng3 n k3w (Pyr. 547a-548a) "Hail, Bull of the Bulls!".

Apparent exceptions (hardly "many exceptions to the rule of 'determinated *ntj* /indeterminate virtual'", so Edel *Grammatik* §1049) are all genus-name or *categorial generic*, not indefinites or quantified (similarly in Coptic: Shisha-Halevy *Diaglosses* §2.5, p.323, Shisha-Halevy *Topics* §3.1 [9a]):

3ḫ ntj ḫp r ḫrt-ntr (Urk. I 173) "the illuminated person that has gone to the Necropolis"

ḫnr ntj m ḫnrt (Westc. 8/15): is difficult, and conflicts also with the statement in §3.3.6 below, unless it too is, counterintuitively, not indefinite ("[let there be brought to me] a prisoner from prison"), but specific ("the prisoner that is in prison"), or even generic ("any prisoner that is in prison").

This would explain also the grammaticalized formal antecedent *s* "the person" (fem. *st-ḥmt*):

(in a medical texteme) *s ntj n fgn.n.f* (Ebers12/16) "the person who cannot/does not defecate, is constipated".

Or else, a non-specific noun in an especially marked construction (explicative-presentative Cleft-Sentence-like clause), and an adnexal (rhematic, predicative) relative — the noun syntagm is not only the nucleus of the relative, but its theme as well:

st pw ntt ḥr mn.s qsn ms.s (Westc. 10/4) "It's ("the matter is") that a woman is in pain — it is difficult for her to give birth".

When the only nucleus is the one built into *ntj* — that is, without any antecedent — the relative clause itself is generic; a formal nucleus specifies the relative clause:

ntj sḏm.f n.k (quoted Satzinger *Attribut* 130) "anyone who obeys you"

nswt ntjw jm (Book of the Dead, quoted Gardiner *Grammar* 151 ex. 4) "King of those that are yonder".

The formal nucleus may be the neutric feminine, or, for plural categorization, demonstrative:

nw ntj-m r3-jb.f (Ebers 207c) "the things that are in/the contents of his stomach".

See Satzinger *Attribut* for more exx., also for *jwtj* and for relative forms and participles; also Daumas *Proposition relative.*

(**3.3.2**) Nuclear noun syntagm — adnominal expansion (II): appositive clauses. Relative forms, being nexal adjectives (Polotsky *Transpositions*) are appositively adjoined to the nucleus; they do not specify their antecedent or nucleus, nor do they despecify it. Their nucleus may of course be independently specified:

skr pf tpj jr.n-Sth r jrt.j (CT II 341a) "that first wound which Seth inflicted on my eye"

ḫ3st tn ḫmt.n rmt (Sh.S. 175) "this land which no man knows"

s n ᶜq h3bw wr n wr (Ptahhotep 145f.) "a serving man, whom one great person sends to another"

sqdw...rḫ.n.k (Sh.S.121) "sailors...whom you know"

qm3t.n B3w Jwnw nfrw.s (Urk. IV 324) "she, whose beauty the Souls of Heliopolis created": an instance of highly-specific built-in-nucleus determination of relative clause: see next section.

(**3.3.3**) Nuclear noun syntagm — adnominal expansion (III). Determination of the built-in formal nucleus of relative clauses (not their non-formal antecedent) is an issue that is, perhaps understandably, usually ignored in such Eurocentric general reviews of the relative as Lehmann *Relativsatz*,[13] but is of considerable importance and sophistication in Egyptian throughout its diachrony. In Bohairic Coptic, for instance, the following two-member paradigm applies (cf. Shisha-Halevy *Topics* §3.7) — not claiming that Egyptian reflects a similar typology, but suggesting that the built-in nucleus of the relative forms is similarly subject to determination (exemples from the Pentateuch (Paris copte 1).

(a) ⲡ-ⲉⲧ- forms

(1) Determination-basis lexeme-equivalents:

ⲡⲓ-ⲡⲉⲑⲛⲁⲛⲉϥ Gen. 40:14

ϩⲁⲛ-ⲡⲉⲑⲛⲁⲛⲉⲩ Num. 10:30

ⲡⲟⲩ-ⲡⲉⲧϩⲱⲟⲩ Num. 11:10

(2) Non-specific, non-particular: *zero*- determination grade (*zero* generic):

ⲉⲃⲟ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲕⲟⲩⲣ, ⲡⲉⲑⲛⲁⲩ ⲙ̀ⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲃⲉⲗⲗⲉ Ex. 4:11

ⲉⲣ-ⲡⲉⲑⲛⲁⲛⲉϥ Num. 10:29

(3) Non-specific, non-particular: generic "genus-name"

ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲱⲟⲩⲧ ⲓⲉ ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲡⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲟⲩⲟⲙϥ Lev. 11:39

(4) Particular anaphoric. Morphologically restricted:

ⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲉϥⲙⲁϣⲓ .... ⲉⲧⲕⲱϯ ⲉⲡⲉⲑⲙⲁϣⲓ ..ⲛ̀ⲧⲉⲡⲉⲑⲙⲁϣⲓ Deut. 21:1ff.

(b) ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧ-

(1) Thematic protatic-generic *agens* actant (case-raising: initializing a hypothetic "generic scenario", carried on by the Conjunctive) in legal, medical and ritual-instruction textemes:

---

[13] Lehmann even seems to deny, *Relativsatz* 306, that a relative clause has its nucleus. If the Coptic relative is "post-nominal" — see Lehmann *Relativsatz* 394 — it is because the nucleus precedes its expansion in Coptic; but this is not the case in Egyptian, where the nucleus is internal: *mrr.[t/ø] (.n).f)*

ϧⲏ ⲉⲧⲛⲁϯ ⲛⲟⲩϣⲁϣ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲓⲱⲧ ⲓⲉ ⲧⲉϥⲙⲁⲩ ϧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥⲙⲟⲩ Ex. 21:15

ϧⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲉ-ⲑⲏ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲓⲥⲓ Lev. 12:7

(2) "Any (particular) one who..." non-specific but particular

ϧⲏ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲉⲧ-, "anyone who...', e.g. Lev. 15:32, 17:4.

ⲛⲉⲙⲙⲟⲛ-ϧⲏ ⲉⲧⲧⲁⲙⲟ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ Gen. 41:24

(3) Non-specific, non-particular:

ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲓ ϧⲏ ⲉⲧⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ-ⲟⲩⲧⲉⲗⲧⲉⲗ ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲓ ϧⲉⲛⲡⲉϥⲥⲱⲙⲁ Lev. 15:2

(4) Specific and particular:

ϧⲏ ⲉⲧⲁϥϯ ⲙⲡⲓⲉⲣϧⲟⲧ Ex. 21:19

(5) Specific and particular — appositive-anaphoric to a specific and particular nucleus:

ⲡⲓⲕⲁϩⲓ ϧⲏ ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲟ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉⲕⲛⲟⲩϯ ⲛⲁⲧⲏⲓϥ ⲛⲁⲕ Deut. 21:1

(**3.3.4**) Nuclear noun syntagm — adnexal verbal-nexus or non-existence expansion ("circumstantial" or converbal: *sḏm.f*, *sḏm.n.f*, Stative or *jw*-less adverbial-rheme nexus) — non-specific nucleus, with the noun thematically cataphoric to the rhematic expansion.

ḥmt-wᶜb... jwr.tj (Westc. 9,9f) "a priest's wife that is pregnant"

msḏr dj.f mw ḥw3 (Ebers 91.3) "an ear secreting a foul liquid"

ḥᶜ rwd nn wn mnt.f (Turin Stela 159/5, quoted Gunn *Studies* 123) "a healthy body without aches"

nḥḥ nn-ḏrw.f (Sin. B 212) "an eternity without end" (lit. eternity there not being its end"

wsḫt nn-ḥmw.s (Sin B. 13f.) "a boat with no rudder"

m t3 ms.kwj jm.f (Sin. B 159) "in a land where I was born" (probably not "the land", which would be more banal).

Self-specified nuclei are compatible with the converbs (just as the Coptic circumstantial is with specifics, from demonstratives to definite noun syntagms):

psḏt jᶜb.tj "the whole Ennead" — "the Ennead <u>as a whole</u>" (Pyr. *passim*; see Edel *Grammatik* §595).

A common case like *hrw ms.tw.f* (see Westendorf *Grammatik* 302) "the day he was born" is basically different, in that the circumstantial *sḏm.tw.f* form is valentially dependent on the noun ('[the] day when...'), and is, being grammaticalized, non rhematic.

The non-specific nucleus is especially striking when preceding negatived verb clauses or even more so before circumstantial non-existence (so, perceptively, Gunn *Studies* 105 8a, 114ff., 150ff. "nn used attributively to a general (undetermined) noun"):

st wᶜbt nn-wnt js jm n rmt nb (Urk. I 50) "a pure place where there is nobody's tomb" ("there not being...")

wsẖt nn-ḥmw.s (Sin. B 13f.) "a boat withour rudder" ("there not being...")

ḥ͗w rd nn-wn-mnt.f (Turin 159,5) "a healthy body without malady"

nḏs Ḏdj rn.f (Westc. 7,1) "a commoner whose name is Ḏdj" — not strictly speaking (or markedly) circumstantial, but still adnexal.

(**3.3.5**) Nuclear noun syntagm — immediate adnominal-adverbial expansion, which marks the nucleus as non-specific — despecifies it.[14] However, an Augens (structurally of adverbial status) directly expands independently specific nouns:

j3tt m jrt.f (CT II 332d) "a wound in his eye"

͗t jm.f (Ham.113, 9) "a limb in him"

mhrw m jrtt (Urk. I 254) "vessels with milk"

t3 r-ḏr.f (Sh.S. 144) "the entire land"

njwt.j r-ḏr.s (Hatnub 16/8) "my entire town"

Pragmatically specific is the noun *b3k jm* (Sin. B 215 etc.) "yonder servant": the adverb *jm* "there, yonder" marking deprecating deixis (comparable to Coptic ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ — cf. Greek ἐκεῖ-νος), must not be confused with the anaphoric non-specifying *jm* "thereof" as in *rmṯ nb jm, w͗ jm*(.sn) (Urk. IV 84, Urk. I 105 etc.); here the noun may be specific situationally:

mṯn jm (Sin B. 26) "the leader thereof".

(**3.3.6**) Nuclear noun syntagm — adjectival expansion. Like the verbal participial and relative-form expansion, adjectives do not specify, though they actualize a noun by virtue of linking concording gender-number slots:

nn sẖ3.j n.k s3t ktt jnt n.j m sš3 (Sh.S.129) "I won't mention to you a/the small daughter brought to me by fate".

The typically satellital Quantifiers too do not specify; on the contrary, they despecify their nucleus, unless it is otherwise marked:

p3 ẖrd 3 (Westc. 9,14) "the three children"

m st w͗t Urk. I 147 "in one/a single place"

msḏr.f 2 (Ebers 1900,2) "his two ears"

ḥf3w 75 (Sh. S. 127) "75 serpents".

As in Sahidic Coptic, it may be that *nb* is a merger of two homonyms: a quantifying ("every, any") and a totalizing (all) element; the latter is specifying.[15] More study is here necessary.

---

[14] Cf. the differentiation in Turkish of the nucleus-less case ending *-da/de*, apparently expanding non-specifics, and the *ki-* formal adnominal nucleus in *-da/deki,* expanding specifics.

[15] Not unlike French *tout* (Guilllaume *Problème de l'article* 232f.), Sahidic Coptic ⲛⲓⲙ is either quantifier, compatible with *zero* determination, or specifying determinator (in French *tout le-*): see Shisha-Halevy *Categories* 143f.

(**3.3.7**) Nuclear noun syntagm — nominal expansion ("direct/indirect genitive"): associative/determinative syntagms with the *nota relationis*. This set of constructions is important for determination features. The following is a drastically simplified typology, no more than a brief overview of a formidably complicated issue. This is a topic that is especially sensitive to difference in sources, periods and registers, generally in linguistic layering, and no consistent picture can be achieved in a corpus mixture.[16]

(I) Unmediated: mainly compounding (of considerable importance in Egyptian)

(a) *nfr–ḥr* "beautiful-of-face" (Bahuvrîhi-type exocentrics): a restricted *in fine compositi* repertory: *i.f.c.* element is determination-irrelevant (determination indifference) or generic.

(b) Endocentrics

(1) with a grammaticalized restricted *in initio compositi* repertory: *bw-, st-, r3-, nb-*: the *i.f.c.* is generic.

(2) with non-grammaticalized *i.i.c.*: inalienable constituence association (see Shisha-Halevy *Topics* §3.9, and here below): the *i.i.c* segment is specified by a specific *i.f.c.*, typically Proper Names. These syntagms are often, but certainly not always, terminological, phraseologtical or idiomatic:

> *ẖrt-jb nb.f* "his lord's desire", *jmj-r sẖtyw* "overseer of the fowlers", *hrw qsnt* (Lebensmüde 15) "the day of (the) disaster", *s3t-nṯr* "god's daughter", *s3-nswt* "King's son", *dpt mwt* (Sin. R 48) "the taste of death", *r jz* (Sin. B 1 95) "the door of the tomb", *ḥr s3tw W3st* (Urk. IV 27) "on the soil of Thebes", *wpwt itj* (Sh.S. 89ff.) "the Ruler's mission" *mwt mwt.j, mwt jt.j* (Urk. IV 27) "my mother's mother, my father's mother", *ḥmt wᶜb* (Westc. 9,9) "a/the priest's wife" — as opposed to *ḥmwt nt wrw* (Urk. IV 185) "the chiefs' wives", where plurality practically selects the mediated construction, and reduces inalienability (so too in Coptic! See Shisha-Halevy *Topics* §3.9).

Proper Names enter many of these phrases as *i.f.c*,[17] but also (less commonly) as *i.i.c.*: *Ḥwt-Ḥr mfk3t* (Sinai 181, 11) "Hathor of the turquoise".

Here occur fossilized old compounds: *ḥwt-nṯr* "temple" ("god's house"), *ḥm-nṯr* "priest" ("god's servant"); here also belong mythical concepts such as *jrt-Ḥr* "Horus' Eye" and compound toponyms such as *sẖt-j3rw* "Rush-field", *sẖt-ḥm3t* "Natron-Field, Wadî Natrûn". Remarkably, we find here instances of junctural looseness: *ḥknw pw Rᶜ* (CT IV 196a) "this is the Thanksgiving of Re".

(II) Mediated by *nota relationis -n(j)-*: first term specified by the second in non-compound phrases, more complicated in internal structure than the unmediated compounds. Here occur plural nuclei; also nuclei expanded by their own attributes, and generally possessed nominal terms. Two major groups are prominent:

---

[16] An unpublished sketch exists in the Gunn Papers (at the Griffith Institute, Oxford) V 61A.

[17] As they do in Vedic and Sanskrit: *damayantî-sakâše* "in the neighbourhood of D.", *vîrasena-sutaḥ* "Son of V.", *indra-patnî-* "Indra's wife", and of course compounds with *-putra-*.

(a) Inalienable possessive specification by specific second term. In the singular, without *i.i.c.* expansion, and especially with PN *i.f.c.*, the difference between this and the unmediated construction is still obscure:

> *dnḥ n sn.f Stš* (Pyr. 1742a) "his brother Seth's wings", *ḥnw n Mjn* "Min's penis", *ᶜnt nt Wsjr* "Osiris' nail", *dbᶜw nw Gb* "Geb's fingers"

> *nb n jw pn* (ShS 171f.) "the lord of this island"

> *b3 ᶜnḫ n-PN* (Book of the Dead Nu 137a25f.) "the living Ba-soul of PN"

> *gs jmntj n pt* (Pyr. 341a,b) "the western side of the sky"

> *ḥmwt nt wrw* (Urk. IV 185) "the chiefs' wives"

> *z3 n z3.k* (Urk. I 129) "your son's son" (but: *z3 z3t.k* Urk. I 228)

> *ᶜ3w n sḥty pn* (Peas. R42) "this peasant's asses"

> *r3 n s* (ShS 17f.) gnomic — "a man's mouth": non-specific second term, paradigmatically specific first term

> *wpwt nt ḫrdw.s* (Sin. B 167f.) "her children's missive"

> *nswt n Kmt* "King of Egypt".

(b) Non-possessive, non-specifying (with either term specific or non-specific), but characterizing and appurtenative phrases, in a wide range of nuances (cf. "attributive" ⲛ- in Coptic). Often, we get here an impression of the *conditioning* of *n-* — by the possessedness or plurality of the second or first term, when the first term is itself expanded. A second important type is the attributive second term, qualifying the first (cf. Coptic ⲛ- + *zero* article):

> *jb.j n mwt.j* "my heart, of my mother's" (i.e. "my very own heart")

> *mtw n nḥbt.f* (Ebers 103, 9) "the vessels of his neck"

> *mrj n jt.f, ḥzj nj mwt.f* (Urk. I 79) "beloved of his father, praised of his mother"

> *wrw nw 3bḏw* "the Great Ones of Abydos"

> *spw nw wsšt* (Ebers 25,7–8) "medicaments for passing water"

> *tr n ḫ3wy* (Sin. R 19f.) "the time of night"

> *t n- jt ḥḏt/dšrt* (CT III 50h-51a) "bread of white/red barley'

> *nḫ3w n mfk3t* (Westc. 6, 5f.) "jewelry of turquoise"

> *s n nḥḥ* (Peasant. B1 95) "a man of eternity"

> *njwt n nḥḥ* "cities of eternity" ("eternal cities", i.e. cemeteries)

> *ḥr n rmṯ* (Ham. 191, 6) "human-faced"

> *jw pn n k3* (Sh.S. 113f.) "this island of spirit" (i.e. "this mystic island")

> *dpt nt mḥ 120 m 3w.s mḥ 40 m wsḫ.s* (Sh.S. 25f.) "a boat of 120 cubits in length and 40 cubits in breadth"

> *mšᶜ n z 3000* (Ham. 114) "an army of 3000 men'

sd3wt ...nt pr-ḥd (Sin. B 287f.) "valuables...from the treasury": specific second term, non-specific first term *smsw n p3-ḫrd 3* (Westc. 9,14) "the eldest of the (aforementioned) three children".

(**3.4**) Satellital appositive noun syntagm. In apposition to a personal or thematic pronouns, the noun appears to be always highly specific:

wnn rf t3 mj-m m-ḫmt.f ntr pf mnḫ (Sin. B 44f.) "how will the land be without him, so potent a god?"

nfr wy sw t3w pn (Mereruka 140) "how good it is, this wind!"

rḫ m jb.tn nb.tn js pw ntr pn jmj swḥt.f (CT II 214a-b) "know in your hearts that he is your lord, this god who is in his egg".

In other cases, both flanks of the apposition are specific:

ᶜr ntr r 3ḫt.f, Nswt-Bjtj Sḥtp-jb-Rᶜ (Sin. R 6) "the god has flown to his horizon, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Sḥtp-jb-Rᶜ".

jnk jt.k špsy nb ntrw (Urk. IV 620) "I'm your noble father, the lord of the gods"

smr wᶜtj Iḫḫj (Urk. I 205) "the unique Friend, Iḫḫj"

ntr ᶜ3 nb pt (Urk. I 116) "the great god, lord of the sky".

Sub-types of the so-called *Badal* apposition have as a rule either non-specific quantified *apposita* and generic nuclei:

ḥnqt ds 2 (Peasant B1, 84) "beer, two jugs".

Or specific flanks:

ḥm-k3 Tntj...s3t.f (Urk. I 35) "the priest Tntj...his daughter".

In brief, equispecificity is characteristic of the flanks of apposition constructions.

(**4.1**) Information structure functions: topicality, thematicity and specificity. While specificity may mark or co-mark thematicity, the inverse is also true — topicality also signalling specificity (see Givón *Definiteness* 326f.). As for themes and rhemes, it seems that, for some rhemes, full determination opposition (or perhaps unmarkedness for determination) obtains, while for others very low specificity is an index of rhematicity; but for the theme, higher specificity is often an important signal (cf. Birkenmaier *Artikelfunktionen* 42–70, esp. 49ff.). Indeed, the specificity tension between theme and rheme (be it ever so formal, as in the famous "ὡς ὁ Θεαίτητος Σωκράτης καὶ ὁ Σωκράτης Θεαίτητος", displaying, in Gildersleeve's incomparable phrasing, "nothing more serious than the practical need to distinguish between subject and predicate") is a familiar copular device in non-verbal nexus patterns (for Bohairic Coptic, cf. Shisha-Halevy *Topics*, Chapter Two, §2.1,1 patterns III and VI). In nexus, specificity of a term is, almost by default, a thematicity signal, when the other term is non-specific.

(**4.1.1**) The topical noun is an important case of indirect exponence of determination (cf. Givón *Definiteness* 326 "definitizing by marking as topic"), being one of the few where a marked word-order — and, generally speaking, Egyptian word-order is remarkably rigid, that is, a componential feature fundamentally distinctive of the

pattern) can be correlated with determination parameters. The topic is either specific, or generic (again specific, as genus or notion name) — never indefinite or quantified.

(a) *jr*-marked topics, with Nominal Sentence patterns and other constructions, are as a rule specific (cf. for Late Egyptian, where even adverbials are marked by *jr-* for topicality, Satzinger *Studien*; for *jr-* topics in Nominal Sentences, see Sethe *Nominalsatz* 84f.). Generic clauses share this slot:

> *jr-sf Wsjr pw* (Urk. V 11) "As for yesterday, it is Osiris"
>
> *jr-jwfw nw P. nḫnj pw* (Pyr. 548b) "As for P.'s flesh, it is rejuvenated"
>
> *jr-jz pn...* (Urk. I 18 etc.: formulaic) "As for this tomb..."
>
> *jr-ḥm nb r pn, n ꜥq.n.f* (Urk. V 95) "whoever ignores this spell, he cannot enter"
>
> *jr-ḫwd ḥr.f nn msw.f nn jwꜥw.f* (Peasant B 2 100) "whoever is enriched by it has no children and no heirs..."

(b) Topics marked solely by position:

> *ꜥntjw n.j-jm sw* (Sh.S.151) "myrrh, it is mine" — generic topic
>
> *ḫbswt.f wr sy r mḥ 2* (Sh.S.63) "his beard, it was longer than two ells".

(c) #N *sḏm.f/sḏm.n.f* #: noun syntagm extraposed to a suffix conjugation form. The focus of the discussion is on the internal structure of this much-discussed construction, more specifically the morphological nature of the verb form, yet with little attention to the issue of the Topic's determination, or consideration that the segmentative construction may also be motivated by the marking of a noun in any way as highly specific. (See Westendorf *Nomen + sḏm.f*, Doret *NOUN + sḏm.f*, Junge *Anticipation*.)

> *wpwtj ḥdd ḫntj r ḫnw ꜣb.f ḥr.j* (Sin B. 94ff.) "the messenger that sailed downstream and upstream to the Residence, he spent time with me"
>
> *ḥqꜣ pf nḏnd.f ḥnꜥ.j* (Sin. B 113f.) "that prince, he consulted with me"
>
> *bjk ꜥḥ.f ḥnꜥ smsw.f* (Sin.R 21f.) "The Falcon has flown away with his retinue"
>
> *wgꜣ ꜣs.n.f wj* (Sin. B 168ff.) "exhaustion, it has caught up with me": a generic topic.
>
> *mw n jtrw swr.tw.f mr.k* (Sin. B 233) "the water of the river, it is only when you so wish that it is drunk"
>
> *jw r n s nḥm.f sw* (Sh.S.17f.) "a man's mouth saves him".

(d) In a special topicalization subtype, in which a topicalized noun syntagm or an anaphoric pronoun or a Proper Name is pronominally resumed by an inalienably possessed component of the said noun, representing it in thematic status:

> *jw jt.k Jmn-Rꜥ jb.f ḥtp* (Urk. IV 580) "your father Amun-Reꜥ's heart is content"
>
> *jw Ḥr jb.f nḏm jw Wsjr jb.f ꜣw* (CT IV c, d) "Horus' heart being pleasant, Osiris' heart being content" (also CT IV 97d, VI 157 etc.).
>
> *...pr(.j) grg, iwꜥ(.j) ꜥ.f nḫt* (BM 1671, 11f., JEA 16 [1930]) "my house being established, my heir's hand being strong".

Even, in a narrative-boundary alternant of the construction:

wn-jn-ḥm.f jb.f w3w r ḏwt ḥr.s (Westc. 9,12) "Thereupon his Majesty's heart grew heavy (lit. "bad") because of this..."

Also Sh.S. 99f.

(**4.1.2**) The initial noun[18] of the copular (#theme — *pw* — copula — rheme#) Nominal-Sentence pattern, which is important in Old and Middle Egyptian and then again in Roman Demotic and Coptic):

pẖrt pw nt ḥ ͨw.s mrḥt (Ptahhotep 328) "the remedy for her body is oil"

srwẖ.f pw ḥmsj.t (P. Smith 8 [4,9]) "his treatment is sitting"

ẖnmt.t pw nt T. J3t (Pyr. 131d) "T.'s nurse is J.", a specialized naming construction.

(**4.2**) Actant specificity — actor and object actants

(a) Agent-actant specificity is of interest, inasmuch as these actants are often thematic, the theme being typically specific or at least identifiable. However, in negative environment, actants of both types are often, perhaps typically generic ("nulligeneric": Christophersen *Articles* 33ff.) and exclude the indefinite and the quantified.

In the so-called Negative Confession (Book of the Dead, Chapter 125): *n jr.j jsft, n jr.j ͨwn-jb, n sm3.j rmt, n jr.j bw-ḏw, n wḏ.j sm3...* "I have not done wrong; I have not done (deeds of) avarice, I have not killed anyone, I have not done evil, I have not committed murder...".

(b) Placement of object actants in the verb clause.[19] Word order in ME is as a rule rigid. The relative position of "gift" and "partner" (given-to; "dative"; Weinrich's term) is usually as follows, with the pronominal partner-actant enclitic, occupying the first prosodically open position, and the object-actant subsequent:

s3ẖ.j n.k s3t ktt (Sh.S. 128f.) "let me mention to you a small daughter..."

rdj.n.f n.j mw (Sin. B 27) "he gave me water"

rdjt n.sn t3w n ͨnẖ (Urk. IV 1098f.) "giving them spirit of life".

---

[18] Initial position in affirmative verbal sentences in certain languages is reserved for specifics (cf. Bentley *Definiteness Effects* 63ff.).

[19] Polotsky *Verbs with two Objects* describes the correlation in Urmi Neo-Syriac between the specific and non-specific "gift" and its formal pronominal representation in verb clauses featuring "give" type valency. According to Polotsky (213f.) the undergoer morphemes are the "main exponent of definiteness", in a proleptic or epanaleptic link with the noun; the absence of such linkage indicates the indefinite gift. However, the marking of specificity or non-specificity (by article, demonstrative, possessive suffix) is independent of the verb-incorporated object construction. Polotsky's statement (225), that "Nothing is typologically more characteristic of Modern Syriac then the way in which nominal categories like definiteness... and case are pronominally incorporated in the conjugation system" is closer to the actual co-operation of noun-syntagm resident and verb-clause resident determination factors (my reservation here is that determination, let alone definiteness, is not a category but, as said, a cluster or syndrome of categories; it may be *signalled* in the conjugation form.

A demonstrative-pronominal object has the same placement:

rdj.n.f n.j nn (BM 614, 6: Gardiner *Grammar* 392 ex.4, with others), but observe

dj.tw-jt.f pn n.f (Lacau TR 2, 37: Gardiner *Grammar* 375 ex.2) "this his father shall be given unto him"; is *-tw-* here in close juncture with *jt.f pn*, or is the higher specificity of the actant accountable for the placement of non-enclitic *n.f*?

Consider also:

dmḏ 3bt nt s n.f (Lacau TR 5, 1: Gardiner *Grammar* 412 ex.5 with others) "to join the family of a man to him". Obviously, more documentation is needed.

(c) Generic tense-forms: *n/nn sḏm.n.f, jw f sḏm.f* (see Gunn *Studies* Chs. XII, XIV) occur typically with actor (and object) actants that, if not delocutive-pronominal and anaphoric, are generic:

*n/nn sḏm.n.f (*not the narrative *n/nn sḏm.n.f,* which is probably a homonym, Gunn *Studies* 112f.):[20]

n šsp.n jb m3ᶜt (*Lebensmüde* Appendix verso/5) "the heart does not accept truth"

nn km.n-ḫt jw.f z3.f (Prisse 193) "things are not perfect so long as it (the heart) is troubled"

jw dj.tw n.f šns dsy pr-sn (quoted Gardiner *Grammar* 385 ex.8) "bread, beer-jugs and cakes are given to him".

(**4.3**) Noun syntagms in nexus. The Nominal Sentence pattern set constitutes a sophisticated subsystem. Generally speaking, the rich variety of patterns still cannot be satisfactorily harvested for determination signalling, for the reason that, despite the extensive literature, most patterns are (at least for OE and ME) still not adequately understood, even for the resolution of their information structure. This is true, for instance, for pronoun-initial matrices — #*jnk* + NOUN#, which may hide at least two, if not three real, structurally resolute patterns; or # NOUN/PRONOUN *pw* NOUN#, a vexed sequence covering three or four distinct and formally very disparate patterns. (For the determination issues involved in the Bohairic Coptic Nominal Sentence, see Shisha-Halevy *Topics*, Chapter Two: determination plays here a central role, both in the internal nexal interdependence and cohesion of patterns and in their macrosyntactic integration. I see no reason to believe that constituent determination is less consequential in the Old Egyptian and Middle Egyptian systems.)

Some selected cases for which determination statements can already be made:

(a) #theme — copula — rheme# — theme specific: see above.

(b) #pronoun — *pw* — noun#, a sub-case of the expanded delocutive theme;[21] also, any #noun — *pw* — noun# sequence. where the initial term is rhematic (predicative) and the final one thematic, expanding the formal theme *pw* — final term specific:

bwt T. pw ḥqr/jb.t (Pyr. 131a-b) "hunger/thirst are T.'s abomination".

---

[20] In all probability, this is the same form as in the OE performative *sḏm.n.f* (Gunn *Studies,* Ch. VII 69ff.), with a locutive pronominal *agens.*

[21] See Gilula *Nominal Pattern* 162, 170, Schenkel *Struktur*, Westendorf *Nominalsatz.*

(c) The rheme of the endophoric Nominal Sentence theme (Shisha-Halevy *Discovery Procedure* 164f., *Topics* § 2.1.1 IV, IVa) and of the pragmatic-situational, invariable neutric theme *pw*, are typically specific:

ᶜnt tw pw nt Wsir (CT VI 7) "it's that nail of Osiris'".

(d) Binominals (including the *Wechselsatz* kind: see Sethe *Nominalsatz* §24, Edel *Grammatik* §947, Shisha-Halevy *Work-Notes* 51f.) — both first and second term specific:

rn.f nfr X (Urk. I 67, 68 etc.) "his good name is X"

nbw nfrt Ptḥ (Junker Giza VI [226]) "Ptah is Lord of Goodness"

mnᶜt.f Nbt-Ḥwt (Pyr. 1375a) "his wet-nurse is Nephthis"

r3.k r3 n bḫz (Pyr. 27d) "your mouth is a/the calf's mouth"

pḫtj.k pḫtj Ptḥ (Pyr. 1145b) "your force is Ptah's force".

(e) In the non-polemic, presentative Cleft-Sentence-like construction (Shisha-Halevy *Discovery Procedure* 172ff. roles [a]-[b]) — explicative, narrative-initial), the initial noun is typically non-specific:

s pw wn... (Peasant R1) "there (once) was a man"

gm.n.j ḥf3 pw jw.f m jjt (Sh.S 62ff.) "I found that it was a serpent coming" (incidentally, *jw-* is here shown to be distinct as a circumstantial converter).

(**4.3.1**) Rhematic nouns are — in specific Nominal Sentence patterns — not merely non-specific, but specificity-irrelevant, with their quality of rhematicity overruling that of specificity. (It is allso possible to view these nouns as generic.) Strikingly so, following the "*m / r* of predication" (for the Bohairic Coptic correspondents, see Shisha-Halevy *Topics* §§ 2.2.1, 2.3, 3.2c) i.e. in incidental or contingent (non-essential, non-inherent) circumstance-dependent noun predication. This predicative also occurs as actant after *jr* "serve as", also denominal deriving auxiliary, and some other verbs:

mk tw m mnjw (Peasant B1 177) "behold, you are a herdsman"

jw.f r smr (Sin. B 280f.) "he is to be a Friend"

jr.n.f ḫprw.f m š3 km (CT II 342b) "he transformed himself into a black pig"

prr.j jm m m3ᶜ-ḫrw (Urk. IV 77) "it is as a justified that I shall emerge hence"

m-jr sw r tkn jm.k (Ptahhotp 486) "do not make him an intimate for you"

jw jr.s ḥrt mj sšn (Ebers 51, 16) "having flowered like a lotus"

jw-gr jnk jr-tp mḏḥw (Munich 4, 7) "while it was I who acted as head of sandstone-hewers".

(**4.3.2**) Focal nouns in Cleft Sentence, following the *jn-* of the Participial Statement, are usually of high specificity (Proper Names are common)::

jn-drt-Ttj wtz sw (Pyr. 537c) "It is Ttj's hand that shall support him"

jn-Ḥr nḏ.f jrt.n. Stš jr.k (Pyr. 592c) "It is Horus that shall avenge what Seth did to harm you"

jn -wᶜb-n-Rᶜ 3mw.f M. (Pyr. 1141b-c) "It is the priest of Re that shall introduce M."

jn-Rᶜ di.f ᶜ.f n-X jn Skr wᶜb.f X (Pyr. 922c) "it is Re that shall lend a hand to X; it is Sokar that shall purify X"

jn-Ḥk3 ḏd nn (Pyr. 1324a-b) "it is Ḥk3 that has said this".

Cases of seeming exception, on their own non-specific, yet identifiable, with an in-set identity, in internal syntagmatic definition. *Zero* generics is excluded of this focal slot.

(there are four vessels in his nostrils,) *jn 2 djdj nšwt, jn 2 djdj snf* (Ebers 99, 6) "two give mucus, two give blood"

jn-nhw-n-ᶜwnt ḥr.s sḫpr... (Ebers 99, 6: see Gunn *Studies* 62) "it is a little of what is desired that turns (a quarrelsome person into an amicable one)

jn-smsw p3-ḫrd 3 nty m-ẖ.t Rd-ḏdt in.f n.k st (Westc. 9, 6–8) "it is the eldest of the three children in the womb of Rd-ḏdt, that will bring it to you"

jn-ḫt ḥwj n.j sy (Sh.S. 35ff.) "it is the mast (not the indefinite "a tree") that broke it (i.e. the wave) for me".

A rare real exception seems to be:

jn wpt jjt r.f (Pyr. 333a-c) "it's a message that came for him".

(**5**) Existant/Non-existant noun. Presented noun. Possessed noun. These constructions are perhaps the most sensitive to, and diagnostic of, nominal determination.

(**5.1**) The set of existential constructions is more sophisticated, formally and functionally, in Egyptian than it is in Coptic (see Shisha-Halevy *Existential Statements*, Shisha-Halevy *Topics* §3.2b). In Egyptian we have two non-existence forms, both like Bohairic Coptic ⲘⲘⲟⲛ- often circumstantial: *nn-* and *nn-wn-/n-wn-*; two existence forms, viz. *wn-*, a form of the verb *wnn* "be in existence", and *jw-*, hitherto little recognized as an existential element. The former element is followed by a non-specific existants, singular or plural, and even quantified indefinites:

jw d3bw jm ḥnᶜ j3rrt (Sin. B 81f.) "there is figs and grapes there"

nn-m3ᶜtyw (Leb. 122) "there are no righteous"

nn ḏw.t jrjt.k r-sj (Urk. IV 115) "there is no evil pertaining to you, at all"

jw-wn-nḏs (West. 6/16) "now there is a commoner..."

jw wn-wr m 3hw mwt mst ḥtp kt r.s (Ptahhotp 171–2) "there is a great one in trouble, a mother that has given birth, while another is happier than she"

wn-hrw (Sin. R 34) "It is day".

See Bentley *Definition Effects* (e.g. 59) for the constructional signalization of Sardinian specific and non-specific noun syntagms in presentational, especially existential constructions. It is important to realize that, while existants may (at least in certain

languages) be either formally non-specific indefinite or specific,[22] the existence semantics in the two cases are different, and the former case is (as e.g. in Modern Hebrew) distinct in the essential location or location-equivalent of the existant:[23] specific-existant "existence" is either part of enumerative stock-taking, or (as in Turkish or Hebrew) signifying presence or absence.

Affirmative existence and non-existence differ sharply in existant specificity: non-existence generally combines with lower specificity (cf. Shisha-Halevy *Existential Statements* and Shisha-Halevy *Topics* §3.2b).

In a way, the obligatory location operates together with the extensional (diffuse) existence and the non-specificity of the existant to form a *sui generis* complicated blend of the presentation of a "circumstanced" under-specified entity, in which any nexality is marginal.

jw itself seems to be a component of a special kind of located existence (see Satzinger *jw*) in cases like the famous, if admittedly rare *jw d3bw jm.f ḥnᶜ j3rrt* (Sin B 81f.) "there are figs there and grapes", where the existant is generic, and not zero-generic at that.

(**5.2**) Following the inflecting presentative *m.k/m.t̠/m.tn*, it appears that, much like object actant determination, presentate determination is indifferent:

> *m.k nt̠r rdj.n.f ᶜnḫ.k* (Sh.S. 114f.) "look, God/a god has kept you alive"

> *m.k bj3jt ḫprt m rk jt.k* (Westc. 6,15) "here's a miracle that happened at your father's time".

(**5.3**) Intuitively, inalienable or constituental association of a noun — see above, §3.3.8 — involves higher specificity than simple possession. However, the suffixed-pronominal-possessor construction in Old and Middle Egyptian is not *per se* specifying, as are for instance the possessive articles of French or English or German: the possessive suffix of the earlier Egyptian is not a determinator, but rather an actualizer-concretizer and *locator*.[24] This is also made evident by its compatibility with demonstratives and *nb* "all". While *jt.i* "my father" or even *rn.j* "my name" are highly specific, by dint of the high pragmatic particularity of the lexemes concerned, *sn.j* or *ᶜ.j* may also mean "a brother of mine", "one of my hands"; this is very striking when the possessed noun is existant or non-existant in a possession predication (see below). This does not apply to a plural *possessum*, as the plural is one step

---

[22] Cf. Modern Hebrew *yeš* + non-spec *vs. yeš et-* + spec. (*ha-/PN/doda šeli/axoti/ze*). Although non-existence (*eyn-*) is compatible with specific existants (*eyn et-*), this combination is less usual by far, and semantically closer to the existence semantics of non-specific existants (e.g. no compatibility with PNs?).

[23] Like a relative expansion of the existant: *yeš-šlosa dvarim še-ani rotze lomar lexa* "there are three things I want to tell you". Cases like *yeš-raxamim* "there is mercy" have an implicit location, (sc. *ba-olam, ba-šamayim* "in the world, in heaven"), while *yeš-elohim* is both generic (again, scil. *ba-šamayim*) and specific ("God exists", God [Proper Name]).

[24] For Turkish *evi* "a house of his/his house", esp. in *evi var* "he has a house" — "EXIST — + 'a house of his'", see also Johansson *Bestimmtheit* 1197.

higher on the specificity scale:[25] *k3w.f* (Urk. I 189) "his bulls" is specific. The possessedness of such inherently unique names such as *jt.j* — which also enter essentially inalienable relationships is adjoined to their high specificity. (For the relation between these lexeme and another, expressed in Bohairic Coptic by ⲡ-[ⲛⲉⲛ-] ⲛ-, I prefer "Constituence Association" — see Shisha-Halevy *Topics* §3.9 — since cases like ⲡⲕⲁϩⲓ ⲛ̄ⲭⲏⲙⲓ "the land of Egypt" or ⲡⲟⲩⲣⲟ ⲛ̄ⲭⲏⲙⲓ "the King of Egypt" or ⲡⲟⲩⲏⲃ ⲙ̄ⲫ︦ϯ "the priest of God" are neither possessive, nor qualifiable by the essentially legalistic "inalienability").

> *sn d.n.j n jt.j j3m.n.j n mwt.j* (Urk. I 199) "I have feared my father, I was charming to my mother"

> *hrd...mwt.f, n d s... ḥmt.f* (Siut 4/33) "a child... his mother, a commoner...his wife"

> jnk ḥzy snw.f (Urk. I 216) "I am one praised of his brothers"

Predicative possession is expressed by Nominal Sentence and special patterns, including a sub-pattern of the existential statement. The themes (*possessa*) in the following cases are specific or naming-generic (cf. Satzinger *Präpositionsadjektive* 150ff.):

> *nj-Pth ᶜnḫ* (PN 223, 11) "life is Ptah's"

> *nj-Ḥnmw ḥtp* (PN 173, 9) "contentment is Chnum's"

> *nj-ntr m3ᶜt* (Junker Giza III 143) "truth is God's"

> *nj-ntk hrw* (CT I 254f.) "yours is Day (the day)"

> *ntk nbw n.k-jmj ḥd* "yours is gold, to you belongs silver" (Urk. IV 96)

> *n.f-jm k3w* (CT IV 2c) "to him belong the Bulls"

> *ᶜntjw n.j-jm sw* (Sh.S. 151) "to me belongs incense"

> *jw n.s t3w, nts ḫ3swt, n.s-jmj ḥbst nbt pt, šnnt nbt w3d-wr* (Urk. IV 244) — the famous description of Hatshepsut's realm, combining three different expressions of predicative possession with specific *possessum* themes: "Hers are the flatlands, to her belong the highlands; hers is all that the sky envelopes, all that the sea encompasses".

A neat placement opposition appears to distinguish between the usual specific *possessum*:

> *jw n.j r.j* "my mouth belongs to me", "I have my mouth"

> *jw n.k t3w ndm mḥjt* "to you belongs the sweet North Wind",

and the non-specific one:

> *jw tsw n.j jr.n nb-r-dr* (Ebers 1,3) "I have formulae that the Lord of All made".

_____

[25] Loprieno *Ancient Egyptian* 60 "As in the case of the feminine, the development of the definite article... is paralleled by a progressive fall of the plural endings" calls for some qualification, since gender and number categories are not on a diachronic par: Coptic still has morphological plural (Crum *Dictionary* lists around one hundred lexemes with morphological plural, as against less then ten of feminine gender).

The existential predicative possession construction (functional ancestor of the Coptic possessive verboid affirmative Sah. ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁ-ϥ, ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲉ-, Boh.ⲟⲩⲟⲛⲧⲁ-ϥ, ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲉ-, negative (ⲙ)ⲙⲛⲧⲁ-ϥ, ⲙⲙⲟⲛⲧⲁ-ϥ) would appear to have non-specific *possessa*. It is also a striking demonstration of the non-specificity of the suffix-possessed noun, here in the role slot of existant or non-existant. Non-existence is incompatible with quantifiedness, but is compatible with possessedness:

jst wn-ḥmt.f (Peasant R 1, 2) "now (backgrounding) he had a wife"

nn-wn-pḥwy.fy (Leb. 130) "it has no limits"

swt pw wnn t-ḥḏ.f (CT VI 403n) "it is he who has white bread"

ḥꜥw rd nn-wn-mnt.f (Turin 159,5) "a healthy body without malady"

nn-jz n sbj ḥr Ḥm.f (Cairo Stele 20538 II) "He who rebels against His Majesty has no tomb"

nn-jt.k/mwt.k (Pyr. 659c) "you have no father/mother"

nn wn-jb n s rhn.tw ḥr.f (Lebensmüde 121) "there is no heart of a man on whom one can depend"

nn wn-jz n wn-jb (Ptahhotp 315) "there is no tomb for the rapacious"

nḥḥ nn-ḏrw.f (Sin. B 212) "eternity without end" (lit. eternity there not being its end"

wsẖt nn-ḥmw.s (Sin. B. 13f.) "a boat with no rudder".

The nominalized negative possessive is *jwtj* "who has not", again with a non-specific possessum:

jwtj-s3.f, jwtj-mẖnt.f (Urk. I 199) "who has no son", "who has no ferry-boat".

(**6**) The *Preposition-derived Nisbe* adjectival expansion, including the so-called inverse Nisbe — delocutive and interlocutive — are particularizing and specifying (see Satzinger *Präpositionsadjektive*, Schenkel *Nisben* 51f., 54f.):

mtwt ntr imyt.s (Pyr. 532b) "the seed of god that is in it"

njwt jrjt (Pyr. 1387a) "his town" (spec.)

rnpwt jrjwt (Junker Giza VI 110) "her years" (spec.)

ḥwt-k3 iryt (Urk. I 164) "his/her chapel" (spec.)

sn.k jmj (Hier. Papyri III Pl.3 Edel *Grammatik* 594) "your brother" (spec., as against the indifferent sn.k?)

m-b3ḥ ḏ3ḏ3t jmjt Rc jmjt Wsjr (Book of the Dead [Naville] 18.2f.) "before the tribunal in which are Re and Osiris"

dmj jmj.j (CT II 111h) "the place I'm in"

gs jmntj n pt (Pyr. 341a,b) "the western side of the sky"

sḥm.k m prt-ḥrw n.k-jmj (CT III 243f.) "you shall control your own dead-offerings"

mk pr-m-ws pw n.f-jmj (P. Rhind plate 79, 5) "here is [the pyramid's] height".

(**7**) In concluding, I will no more than mention the large class of infinitives (and other verbal nouns), for which the determination nature and structure is different from that of other nouns (generics are distinctive, the indefinite is probably excluded, specificity is sui generis), and even the means of actualization are different and richer: a distinctive trait is the actantial realization of a valential slot by noun or pronoun, which, to judge from the compatibilities and opposition in Coptic between (Sahidic) ⲭⲟⲟⲥ and ⲡ-ⲭⲟⲟⲥ, ⲭⲱ and ⲡ-ⲭⲱ, is not specifying. For the Egyptian infinitive, even grammatical gender has a distinct role (it is apparently conditioned by root structure and constituence). Note the following cases:

(a) *nn* + infinitive, a special circumstantial non-existential construction of the infinitive:

> *nn rdjt mw n.f* (Ebers 110, 8) "without giving him water"

> *wsb.k nn njtjt* (Sh.S. 16f.) "you shall answer without stuttering".

(b) The prepositional infinitive, often grammaticalized into a veritable converb, which may be rhematic (e.g. *ḥr* + inf., *m* + inf.): here we seem to have a true case of *nil*, not *zero* determination.

> *ʿḥʿ pw jr.n.f r wšd.f* (Westc. 7,14) "then he arose to greet him".

> *jj.n.j ḥr-šms.f* (Urk. VII 14) "it is accompanying him that I have come"

> *m-wpt pt r t3* (Pyr. 1208c) "separating earth from heaven".

(c) Object-actantial infinitive, closest to non-verbal noun actants:

> *wḏ.tw n.f db3 st* (Peasant B 1 48f.) "let them order him to return it"

> *pt nbt mrrt.f h3t jm.s* (CT VII 203a) "every heaven he desires to descend into it".

(d) In the Nominal Sentence, the infinitives may be rhematic (with determination unmarked or *nil*) or thematic, with a higher grading of specificity:

> *nḥt.j pw jrt nf st* (Urk. IV 367) "it is my desire to do this for him".

(e) The so-called "Tautological Infinitive", a cross-genetic nexus-focussing construction with old precedents both in Semitic and the oldest Egyptian (see Goldenberg *Tautological Infinitive,* Shisha-Halevy *Tautological Infinitive*). In Egyptian (and conceivably in Semitic, the form we have is probably not infinitival-nominal, but converbal (or adverbial) — in the Septuagint, the Greek rendering is as a rule adverbial — and specificity is irrelevant:

> *n mwt.n js T. mtwt* (Pyr. 350b) "T. will *not* die", lit. "it is not dying that T. will die" (nexal negation focussed).[26]

(f) The caption infinitive:

> *stt mw, wb3 ḥrst* "pouring water", "piercing pearls" (see Edel *Grammatik* 352).

(g) The "log-book" chronicling or recording infinitive:

> *ḫpt.s r jz.s nfr* (Urk. I 157) "her entering her beautiful tomb".

---

[26] An affirmative "living" counterpart in Pyr. 1477b. For the negative focussing, compare an exact parallel Gen. 3:4.

(h) The narrative infinitive, a construction as important in Egyptian as it is in Semitic, may be the most specific of all environments for this form — again, in a sense of specificity that has nothing to do with the *prius notum* or *dictum*, but with functional anchoring in narrative structure and texture; the infinitive apparently marks here an initial episode boundary in narrative:

n^ct m ḫd jn Ḥm.f (Urk. IV 9) "then His Majesty travelled downstrean...".

Bibliographical References

Barri *Nucleus and Satellite* — N. Barri, "Nucleus and Satellite in Nominal Syntag- matics", Linguistics 157 (1975) 67–85.

Bentley *Definiteness Effects* — D. Bentley, "Definiteness Effects: Evidence from Sardinian", *Transactions of the Philological Society* 102:1 (2004) 57–101.

Birkenmaier *Artikelfunktionen* — W. Birkenmaier, *Artikelfunktionen in einer artikel- losen Sprache* (München 1979).

Briegleb *Zusammensetzungen* — O. Briegleb, *Vom Wesen der Zusammensetzungen* (Meiningen 1928).

Christophersen *Articles* — P. Christophersen, *The Articles: a Study of their Theory and Use in English* (Copenhagen /London 1939).

Chvany *'Definiteness'* — C.V. Chvany, "On 'Definiteness' in Bulgarian, English and Russian", *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavist*s *(Kiev, September 1983) Vol. I: Linguistics,* Michael S. Flier (ed.) (Columbus 1983) 71— 92.

Daumas *Proposition relative* — F. Daumas, "La proposition relative égyptienne étudiée à la lumière de la syntaxe structurelle", *Orbis* 11 (1962) 21–32.

Doret *NOUN + sḏm.f,* — É. Doret, "A Note on the Egyptian Construction NOUN + sḏm.f", *JNES* 39 (1980) 37–45.

Edel *Grammatik* — E. Edel, *Altägyptische Grammatik* (Rome 1955/196 =Analecta Orientalia 34/39).

Gardiner *Grammar* — A. H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*[3], (Oxford/London 1957).

Gardiner *Theory* — A. H. Gardiner, *Theory of Speech and Language* (Oxford 1932)

Gilula, *Nominal Pattern* — M. Gilula, "An Unusual Nominal Pattern in Middle Egyptian", *JEA* 62 (1976) 160–175.

Givón *Definiteness* — T. Givón, "Definiteness and Referentiality", J. H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Human Languages*, *IV: Syntax* (Stanford 1978) 293–330.

Goldenberg *Tautological Infinitive* — G. Goldenberg, "Tautological Infinitive", *Israel Oriental Studies* 1 (1971) 35–85.

Golénischeff *Quelques remarques* — V. S. Golénischeff, "Quelques remarques sur la syntaxe égyptienne", *Recueil d'études égyptologiques dédiées à la mémoire de Jean-François Champollion* (Paris 1922) 685–711.

De la Grasserie *De l'article* — R. de la Grasserie, "De l'article", *MSL* IX (1896) 381–394.

Guillaume *Problème de l'article* — F. Guillaume, *Le problème de l'article et sa solution dans la langue française* (Paris 1919).

Gunn *Studies* — B. G. Gunn,1924, *Studies in Egyptian Syntax* (Paris 1924).

Hlavsa *Operators of Reference* — Z. Hlavsa, "On the Operators of Reference", *TLP* 3 (1968) 95–103.

Hodler *Artikellehre* — W. Hodler, *Grundzüge einer germanischen Artikellehre* (Heidelberg 1954).

Johansson *Bestimmtheit* — L. Johansson,"Bestimmtheit und Mitteilungsperspektive im türkischen Satz", *ZDMG* suppl. III, 2 = XIX (Deutscher Orientalistentag, Vorträge, Wiesbaden 1977) 1186–1203.

Johnson *Use of the Articles* — J. H. Johnson, "The Use of the Articles and the Generic in Demotic", S.P. Vleeming (ed.) *Aspects of Demotic Lexicography: Acts of the Second International Conference for Demotic Studies, Leiden, 1921 September 1984* (Leuven 1987) 41–56.

Junge *Anticipation* — Fr. Junge, "'Emphasis by Anticipation' im mittelägyptischen Verbalsatz", *Revue d'Égyptologie* 30 (1978[1979]) 96–100.

Krámsky *Article* — J. Krámsky, *The Article and the Concept of Definiteness in Language* (The Hague 1972).

Krámsky *Category of Determination* — J. Krámsky, "Some Ways of expressing the Category of Determination", *TLP* 3 (1968) 241–253.

Kroeber *Neuägyptizismen* — B. Kroeber, *Die Neuägyptizismen vor der Amarnazeit*, Ph.D. dissertation (Tübingen 1970).

Lambrecht *Information Structure* — K. Lambrecht, *Information Structure and Sentence Form* (Cambridge 1994).

Lehmann *Relativsatz* — Chr. Lehmann, *Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen, Theorie seiner Funktionen, Kompendium seiner Grammatik* (Tübingen 1984).

Lefebvre *Grammaire*— G. Lefebvre, *Grammaire de l'Egyptien classique*[2] (Le Caire 1955).

Loprieno *Ancient Egyptian* — A. Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian: a Linguistic Introduction* (Cambridge 1995).

Loprieno *Sviluppo* — A. Loprieno, "Osservazioni sullo sviluppo dell' articolo prepositivo in egiziano e nelle lingue semitiche", *Oriens Antiquus* 19 (1980) 1–27.

Naylor *'Definiteness'*— K.E. Naylor, "On Expressing 'Definiteness' in the Slavic Languages and English", *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists (Kiev, September 1983) Vol. I: Linguistics,* Michael S. Flier (ed.) (Columbus 1983) 203–220.

Nilsson *Definiteness* — B. Nilsson "Definiteness and Reference", *Or. Suecana* 27–8 (1979) 118–131.

Polotsky *Transpositions* — H. J. Polotsky, "Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique", *Israel Oriental Studies* 5 (1976) 1–50.

Polotsky *Verbs with Two Objects* — H. J. Polotsky, "Verbs with Two Objects in Modern Syriac (Urmi)", *IOS* 9 (1979) 204–227.

Prince *Given-New Information* — E. Prince, "Towards a taxonomy of given-new information", P. Cole (ed.) *Radical Pragmatics*, (New York& London 1981) 223–255.

Rosén *Definite Article* — H. Rosén, "The Definite Article in the Making, Nominal Constituent Order and Related Phenomena", J. Herman (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin* (Amsterdam 1994) 129–150.

Satzinger *Attribut* — H. Satzinger, "Attribut und Relativsatz im älteren Ägyptisch", *Studien zur Sprache und Religion Ägyptens (Festschrift W. Westendorf)* (Göttingen 1984) 125–156.

Satzinger *Präpositionsadjektive* — H. Satzinger, "Syntax der Präpositionsadjektive ('Präpositionsnisben')", *ZÄS* 113/2 (1986) §141–153.

Satzinger *Studien* — H. Satzinger, *Neuägyptische Studien* (Wien: VWGÖ, 1976).

Satzinger *jw* — H. Satzinger, "Some Reflections on *jw* in Middle Egyptian", *Egyptian, Semitic and General Grammar, Workshop in Memory of H. J. Polotsky (Jerusalem, 8-12 July 2001)*, Eds. G. Goldenberg and A. Shisha-Halevy, The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities (Jerusalem). In print.

Schenkel *Antzipation* — W. Schenkel, "Antizipation innerhalb der Wortgruppe und die sog. Badalapposition im Ägyptischen", *JNES* 26 (1967) 113–120.

Schenkel *Nisben* — W. Schenkel, "Die mittelägyptischen Nisben als Nukleus in präpositionaler, limitierender und Genitiv-Relation", *Chronique d'Égypte* 41(81) (1966) 50–59.

Schenkel *Struktur* — W. Schenkel, "Die Struktur des dreigliedrigen Nominalsatzes mit der Satzteilfolge Subjekt — Prädikat im Ägyptischen", *SÄK* 14 (1987) 265–282.

Sethe *Nominalsatz* — K. Sethe, Der *Nominalsatz im Ägyptischen und Koptischen* (Leipzig 1916).

Shisha-Halevy *Categories* — A. Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories*: *Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Coptic* (Rome 1986=Analecta Orientalia 53).

Shisha-Halevy *Diaglosses* — A. Shisha-Halevy, "Bohairic-Late Egyptian Diaglosses", D. W. Young (ed.) *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky* (Beacon Hill, East Gloucester 1981) 413–438.

Shisha-Halevy *Discovery Procedure* — A. Shisha-Halevy, "Grammatical Discovery Procedure and the Nominal Sentence in Egyptian and Coptic", *Orientalia* 56 (1987) 147–175.

Shisha-Halevy *Existential Statements* — A. Shisha-Halevy, "Existential Statements in the Sahidic New Testament: Work Notes", *GM* 77 (1984) 67–79.

Shisha-Halevy *Oppositions*— A. Shisha-Halevy, "Pluridimensional Oppositions: Three Case Studies in Scripture (Pentateuch) Bohairic", *Coptology: Past, Present and Future: Studies in Honour of Rodolphe Kasser,* S. Giversen, M. Krause, P. Nagel (eds.) (Leuven 1994=Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 61) 225–247.

Shisha-Halevy *Proper Name* — A. Shisha-Halevy, *The Proper Name: Structural Prolegomena to Its Syntax — a Case Study in Coptic* (Wien 1989).

Shisha-Halevy *Tautological Infinitive* — A. Shisha-Halevy, "The Tautological Infinitive in Coptic", *Journal of Coptic Studies* 1 (1990, *Festschrift Elanskaja*) 99–127.

Shisha-Halevy *Topics* — A. Shisha-Halevy, *Topics in Bohairic Coptic Syntax* (Leuven Forthcoming).

Shisha-Halevy *Work-Notes* — A. Shisha-Halevy, "Work-Notes on Demotic Syntax, I", *Or* 58 (1989) :28–60.

Snell *Entdeckung des Geistes* — B. Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes: Studien zur Entstehung des europäischen Denkens bei den Griechen*[2] (Hamburg 1948).

Vernus *Structure ternaire* — P. Vernus, "La structure ternaire du système des déictiques dans les Textes des Sarcophages", *SEAP* 7 (1990) 27–45.

Westendorf *Grammatik* — W. Westendorf, *Grammatik der medizinischen Texte* (Berlin 1962).

Westendorf *Nominalsatz* — W. Westendorf, "Der dreigliedrige Nominalsatz Subjekt — pw — Prädikat: konstatierend oder emphatisch?" *GM* 109 (1989) 83–95.

Westendorf *Nomen + sḏm.f* — W. Westendorf, "Die Wortstellung Nomen + sḏm.f als grammatische Konstruktion", *MIO* 1 (1953) 337ff.