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SUMMARY

The Nineteenth Dynasty, which ushered in the Ramesside period in ±1308 B.C.E. is an important period in which to study the development of the Egyptian language, falling as it does between the time of the Middle Egyptian (ME) idiom and the Late Egyptian (LE) language. Regarding the Egyptian language, Gardiner (1982:1) writes "... the idiom in which the public records of the Twentieth Dynasty are couched differs widely from that found, for example in the royal decrees of the Sixth Dynasty". There was a gradual change from a "synthetic" language in ME into an "analytical" one in LE and later Coptic. The synthetic tenses are first supplemented and then gradually replaced by "analytic" forms. And this happened during the time of the Nineteenth Dynasty.

This thesis addresses the Nineteenth Dynasty texts, with respect to grammar, semantics and syntax (mainly verbal forms). It studies the occurrence of Middle Egyptian synthetic forms and Late Egyptian analytic forms in the Nineteenth Dynasty texts and makes observations on forms which appear to be unique to the Nineteenth Dynasty Egyptian (NDE) too.

This study describes and analyses the language, both in a synchronic way - "frozen" in its time (as a type of grammar book), and comparing literary and non-literary uses of the time, - and in a diachronic manner, seeking to show the evolution and development of language forms, their ancestors and their successors.

A study of these texts as shown in this thesis demonstrates that the written language of the Nineteenth Dynasty is a unique blend of grammatical and syntactic forms: pure ME forms, LE literary and non-literary forms, as well as forms peculiar to NDE. Thus NDE is "an independent self-sufficient system, which is neither Middle Egyptian nor Late Egyptian of the Twentieth Dynasty." (Groll 1973:70)
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INTRODUCTION

I. SETTING THE SCENE

The Nineteenth Dynasty followed the collapse of Akhenaten's religious revolution, when his successors, Smenkhare, Tutankhamun, Ay and Horemhab had passed on.1 Ramesses I founded this dynasty, and he was followed in turn by Seti I, (1308-1291), Ramesses II (1290-1224), Merneptah (1224 to 1214) and then Seti II, Amenmesse, Siptah, and the female Pharaoh, Twosre", she "who in Homer is called Polybus, husband of Alcandra and in whose time Troy was taken" (Gardiner 1982:445); the traditional date for this last event is 1183 B.C.E.2

Gardiner (1961:247) writes that after the recovery from Akhenaten's religious revolution, Egypt was a changed world, "It is not easy to define the exact nature of the changes, since there are many exceptions; yet it is impossible not to notice the marked deterioration of the art, the literature, and indeed, the general culture of the people. The language which they wrote approximates more closely to the vernacular, and incorporates many foreign words; the copies of ancient texts are incredibly careless, as if the scribes utterly failed to understand their meaning."

Goldwasser (1985:55), writing of the epistolary formula, suggests that the model normative Nineteenth Dynasty letters show "a synthesis between the new and the

---

1 The conjectural dates of the Nineteenth Dynasty are about 1308 to 1184 B.C.E. Cf. the chapter on the History of Egypt and the chronological tables of the kingdoms and dynasties.

2 The succeeding Twentieth Dynasty - the Late Ramesside Period - began with the reign of Setnakhte and he was followed by the 32-year reign of Ramesses III, and then in turn by eight more relatively unimportant Ramesses. This dynasty came to an end in about 1087 after the brief era called "Repetition of Births" (wsm Rmsg), within which Herihor, the high priest of Amen-Re at Karnak, temporarily arrogated to himself the kingship.
old", and she notes further (Goldwasser 1985:51) that a synchronic grammar of
the Twentieth Dynasty has been well defined, by Cerny and Groll, but that this
has not been done for the Nineteenth Dynasty.

In discussing the Hieratic Ostracon pl. XLVI, 2 recto, 2 verso, a Nineteenth
Dynasty non-literary Late Egyptian (LE) text, Sarah Groll (1973:67) writes, "Our
main source of information for LE is the non-literary texts of the Nineteenth and
Twentieth Dynasties (the Ramesside period). But even in the framework of the
Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties, one can trace a considerable grammatical
development. It seems that Middle Egyptian (ME) elements still exist in the
non-literary texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty. Indeed, since they occur only under
specific conditions, which are peculiar to the Nineteenth Dynasty, one is entitled
to describe the LE of the Nineteenth Dynasty as an independent, self-sufficient
system, which is neither ME nor the LE of the Twentieth Dynasty".

Ophel (1985:153) in discussing the Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh poem writes,
"We note the clear use of the perfect active $d\text{m}.f$s with their negative
counterpart, the $b\text{w}$ $d\text{m}.f$ of the past (a Nineteenth Dynasty formation). These
specific LE formations stand side by side with ME elements, e.g. the emphatic
$h\text{e}.n.j$ formations, and a narrative $h\text{e}.n.j$ (in line 105)."

It has been noted that the written language used at this time combined ME
grammatical elements and formations side-by-side with the newer later LE
forms.

Vernus (1985:311) is of opinion that there is a diachronic shift from a mostly
aspect-oriented system in Old and Middle Egyptian towards a mostly time-
oriented system in Late Egyptian. For example, in the performative statement
dj.$n.j$ became jw.$j$ hr rdjt and then tw.$j$ hr djt - a performative statement
within a time limit. But what about the language used in the time between ME
usage before and during the Eighteenth Dynasty and that of the LE of the Late
Ramesside period of the Twentieth Dynasty? The author has called this the
Nineteenth Dynasty Egyptian language, and has abbreviated it to NDE in the
text.

Regarding the Egyptian language, Gardiner (1982:1-24c) writes "... the idiom in
which the public records of the Twentieth Dynasty are couched differs widely
from that found, for example in the royal decrees of the Sixth Dynasty (about
2420-2294 B.C.E.)". There was a gradual change from a "synthetic" language into
an "analytic" one. The "synthetic" tenses sḏm.f and sḏm.n.f are first supplemented and then gradually replaced by "analytic" forms. There are but few texts however (Gardiner 1982) wherein the vernacular shows itself unmixed with the "classical" idiom of ME.

_Middle Egyptian_ (abbreviated in the text as ME) is the idiom employed in the stories and other literary compositions of the Middle Kingdom (Dynasties IX to XIII; about 2240 to 1740 B.C.E.), as well as in the public and private monumental inscriptions of that period and also far down into the Eighteenth Dynasty (1573-1314).³

_Late Egyptian_ (abbreviated in the text as LE) is the vernacular of Dynasties XVIII to XXIV (about 1573 to 715), and is exhibited chiefly in business documents and letters, but also in stories and other literary compositions, and to some extent also in the official documents from Dynasty XIX onwards.

"The LE non-literary language is the nearest alternative to the spoken language. On the other hand, the literary language is the language of an esoteric group (i.e. the scribes), and is an acquired (second) language, based on the writings of the past. It is of course, the more artificial, sophisticated, and very often shows some inventive professionalism" (Groll 1975/6:245).

The LE literary language included ME elements for a long time side-by-side with the newer LE forms. They therefore used many varied verbal forms. The non-literary texts (and presumably spoken language), however, used mainly the pure well established LE elements, which continued to become Demotic and Coptic in most instances.

Gardiner (1982:1-24c) compared the relationship of LE to ME to that of French and Romance languages to Latin:

(i) There was a substitution of analytic for synthetic forms.

(ii) The possession of an indefinite article derived from the word for one (w in LE).

³ Černý and Groll (1975:iii to vii) write of the following principles - (i). The priority of the spoken language over the written one - but that, unfortunately this is out of the question. (ii) The priority of the non-literary texts over the literary ones. Černý and Groll stress too the priority of synchronic over diachronic description.
(iii) A definite article derived from a demonstrative adjective (p3 in Egyptian).

(iv) Substitution of new words for old words, signifying common things (e.g. "head" - tp in ME, 43q3 in LE), and

(v) The fact that ME survived as the monumental and learned language long after it has perished as the language of everyday life.

Pascal Vernus (1978:139, footnote 136) writes of "Egyptien de tradition" - a language appearing in the non-judicial texts which goes back to the Middle Kingdom, "They remembered". People were still using - during a very long time - Old Egyptian or Middle Egyptian - but only in formal texts.

II. AIMS

The aim of this thesis is to study the Nineteenth Dynasty language by collating and correlating the grammatical, syntactic and semantic (mainly verbal) forms in their contexts in a selected group of writings, both literary and non-literary.

This work attempts to address a universally recognized void in the history of the Egyptian language during the period of the Nineteenth Dynasty - the early Ramesside period. The history of the language (and the language itself) prior to and after this period has attracted much interest and has been well documented. In essence, this thesis serves to bridge a gap and to provide insights into the development of hieroglyphs during the Nineteenth Dynasty in its own right, and also to provide a measure of continuity in understanding the thought and developmental processes of the peoples of ancient Egypt with regard to the way in which they expressed themselves.

The aims of the thesis are, briefly, to study the language in a contextual setting in both a descriptive and an analytical way; and with both a synchronic and diachronic component. (See IV. Method).

i. As far as the synchronic component of the study is concerned, Černý and Groll (1975:iii to vii) write that each stage of a language is entitled to be described in its own terms. It is hoped that this dissertation will achieve this for NDE.
To tentatively suggest a development or evolution of grammatical formulations with their diverse meanings from ME to LE (and even to Coptic) as reflected in the intervening NDE. This diachronic component of this study would then show the development of a time-oriented system from a preceding aspect-oriented grammar (Vernus 1985:311) and the development of absolute tense from earlier taxis (Allen 1986, Callender 1986), and the evolution of an analytic system from a previous synthetic expression (Gardiner 1982:1-24c) in a Hamito-Semitic language.

To show the forms in their contexts. This too would provide a miscellany of charming vignettes, which would show how the peoples of Egypt expressed themselves under very different circumstances.

The discussion will also try to determine certain differences in grammatical usages between literary and non-literary texts in NDE.

III. HYPOTHESIS

The problem is created by the historical development as reflected in the language. Both Groll (1973:67) and Goldwasser (1985:55) have suggested that the language of the Nineteenth Dynasty may be described as "an independent self-sufficient system", "a synthesis between the new and the old".

Goldwasser (1985:55) stresses that a synchronic grammar for the Nineteenth Dynasty has not to date been defined. This thesis hopes to do this to some extent.

Vernus (1985:311) has felt that there are developments - a diachronic shift from an aspect orientated language in ME to a time oriented system in LE. This has not yet been fully studied. This thesis hopes to accomplish this.

This historical period in fact might be the core place to study development of the Egyptian language, and even of the Semitic languages in general. Therefore, the hypothesis of this dissertation is threefold:

i. Egyptian as a synthetic, mostly aspect-oriented Hamito-Semitic language, and one mostly expressing taxis rather than absolute tense (ME) developed or evolved into an analytic, mostly time oriented language (LE).
ii. NDE is a mixture of forms of ME and LE, and, in addition, being a bridge between ME and LE, it undoubtedly has some unique prototypic forms as well as inimitable hybrid forms (even hapax legomenon).

iii. NDE reflects an independent, self-sufficient system, a synthesis between the new and the old.

IV. METHOD

Regarding the methodology and theoretical base, this dissertation has a holistic, comprehensive, contextual approach, both descriptive and analytic with synchronic and diachronic components.

A diachronic study traces a word or grammatical form or language backwards (and possibly forwards) through its stages of usage and development. Since languages are constantly changing, every language, at any given time, represents, in fact, a distinctive grammatical system. Thus, each state of a language is entitled to be described in its own terms. The diachronic component of this study would therefore tend to show too the development of a time-oriented system from a preceding aspect-oriented grammar (Vernus 1985:311), and the development of absolute tense from earlier taxis (Allen 1986, Callender 1986), and the evolution of an analytic system from a previous synthetic expression (Gardiner 1982:1-24c) in a Hamito-Semitic language. The diachronic study dealing with development or evolution is used to outline the basis of the synchronic study.

The synchronic discussion of a language is the grammatical description of that language at some given point in time. By this synchronic study is meant that the word or grammatical form or language is frozen in the course of its historical development and it is analysed right there; i.e. it is studied purely from the immediate contexts in which it occurs.

Dependence on context is unavoidable when dealing with any stage of Egyptian grammar. One has to bear in mind that the "first" grammatical classification of Egyptian was based on intuitive translation. This may lead one to posit whether a sentence or clause seems to reflect an aspect or a state, taxis or absolute tense. Many ME and LE forms are presented side by side in context, showing that
various writers used both (or more) constructions in conjunction with one another.

The dissertation provides examples of various grammatical constructions, known as either ME or LE and examples of hybrid forms or forms unique to the texts studied. In other words this work is presented much in the manner of a grammar textbook of the language of this period, thus attempting to fill the lacuna/hiatus of lack of a synchronic grammar for the Nineteenth Dynasty (Goldwasser 1985:51). Goldwasser (1985:55), writing of the epistolary formula, suggests that the model normative Nineteenth Dynasty letters show "a synthesis between the new and the old", and she notes further (Goldwasser 1985:51) that a synchronic grammar of the Twentieth Dynasty has been well defined, by Černý and Groll (1975), but that this has not been done for the Nineteenth Dynasty.

V. SOURCES

The texts and papyri translated and studied are all Nineteenth Dynasty writings. Some of the examples are, in fact, included as examples of LE in the textbook of Černý and Groll (1975) and in that of Frandsen (1974). However, the author artificially created as it were, a separate NDE language by extracting the Nineteenth Dynasty texts, where so-called developed LE examples may be found. The Nineteenth Dynasty texts and papyri discussed in this dissertation can be found in Addendum I.

There was an attempt too at a synchronic study, comparing extant literary and non-literary texts. The non-literary written documents are those which deal with everyday life and affairs, such as genuine letters, accounts, court reports, oracles. Since the very purpose of their existence is to communicate and inform native speakers about practical matters concerning them, they are the nearest alternative to the spoken language. Literary texts include the LE "novels", songs, wisdom literature, and "documents" serving as exercises for apprentice scribes. Thus, in the literate community of the Egyptian scribes, imbued with a profound knowledge and admiration of the writings of the past, there developed a situation of diaglossia, wherein literary and non-literary languages were learnt and used by educated Egyptian scribes as independent languages, a situation reminiscent of

---

4 This was done essentially according to the method of Černý & Groll (1975).
the peculiar status of Latin in medieval and Renaissance Europe. This is not to say that literary texts have no grammatical system. On the contrary, they constitute a grammatical system of their own, which differs from that of the non-literary language. The literary language contains many specific verbal formations, many ME verbal formations, and also the verbal formations which occur in non-literary texts.

VI. LAYOUT

In this introduction the author has drafted some paradigms, and drawn up some tables in an attempt to show various grammatical forms, and the way they occur in ME, NDE and LE and to tentatively suggest their evolution, and development.

The possible combinations or paradigms are:

I. ME
II. ME NDE
III. ME NDE LE
IV. - NDE LE
V. - NDE LE
VI. - - LE
VII. ME - LE

As all the examples in this thesis are from NDE, paradigms I and VI and VII are not relevant. And paradigm VII is in any case most unlikely or improbable.

So I will number the relevant paradigms as follows:

1. ME NDE -
2. ME NDE LE
3. - NDE -
4. - NDE LE

The work is presented as follows. Each chapter deals with a particular grammatical form or construction, well known to be specific for either ME or LE, and to give examples of these in the NDE texts. This is done as in the textbooks.
of Gardiner (1982) for ME and Cerny and Groll (1975) for LE. In this way, the hybrid, deviant or unique forms will be clearly evident. The conclusions at the end of each chapter describe and clarify the uses of each grammatical form in the Nineteenth Dynasty texts.

In some chapters, however, as there are sometimes no clear morphological difference between the ME and LE forms, although their usages may be very different - I grouped these forms together in a single chapter, and their ME and LE usages are discussed with examples and explanations. For example, the śdm.f, jw, wn(n) and negative forms.

This method was used in the hope that what might emerge would be, in effect, the framework of a grammar-book of the written language of the Nineteenth Dynasty. This was obviously done in a synchronic way, as grammar books are.

NDE though, appears to be a unique, "independent, self-sufficient system, which is neither ME nor LE of the Twentieth Dynasty" (Groll 1973:70), nor just an amalgamation of the two. In addition to evident ME and LE forms, there are archaic forms, hybrid forms, and unique forms, some of which developed or evolved further and others which did not. This therefore necessitated something of a diachronic study, and this is done in certain chapters (e.g. śdm.f and Negative Sentences (in which there is even a discussion and tabulation of Coptic descendants)) and in a final summary of Paradigms and Tables, showing development, evolution or disappearance of grammatical forms.

An alternative to the grammar-book method might have been to study each of the texts in isolation, and review each separately. This is done to some extent in Addendum IV, where some special characteristics and singularities of several texts are highlighted. For example, the special language of a court case, of dream interpretation, a peace treaty, a poem and a bulletin of a battle, Israel stele, tales and myths.

This thesis deals mainly with verbal formations, but it does not entirely neglect nominal forms - Chapter 3 discusses the participial statement or the cleft sentence and Chapter 24 analyzes nominal and adjectival sentences.

The examples in the non-literary and literary texts have been grouped separately for the most part. It was hoped to indicate whether there were any notable omissions of grammatical forms in either the non-literary or literary inscriptions or papyri, and if this appeared significant or not. (See Addendum III).
Abundant examples of NDE in context are shown with ME and LE forms, as well as disparate, motley, inconsistent forms side-by-side interchanging and sometimes expressing the very same thing - to let the Nineteenth Dynasty language shine forth as a living, vibrant language.

The body of the dissertation consists mainly of two sections. Section A provides the two introductory chapters and section B provides the core with twenty seven chapters.

In the first introductory chapter a historical survey of the history of Egypt is given, especially that of the Nineteenth Dynasty to show the sitz im leben of the times. This is done mainly with reference to the literature of the periods. This, then sets the stage for this study of the Nineteenth Dynasty texts.

There is an second introductory chapter on "Tense in Egyptian", in which there are examples in NDE of ME taxis and LE absolute tense, examples showing ME specific situations vs. generalisations (with or without jw) and examples of predicative or emphatic forms.

The dissertation has been structured as follows. As far as possible, the well-known ME grammatical forms are discussed as far as Chapter 12.5

Chapter 1:  \textit{jjt pw jrjw.n.f}
Chapter 2:  The auxiliary verb \textit{c\text{h}c}
Chapter 3:  The \textit{jn} . construction, participial statement or cleft sentence.
Chapter 4:  The so-called pseudoverbal construction.
Chapter 6:  \textit{sdm.n.f}
Chapter 7:  \textit{sdm.f}
Chapter 8:  Noun + \textit{sdm.f}

5 The notation of section headings and sub-headings of necessity vary in each chapter. As an example chapter 12, Egyptian negative forms, have examples of both ME and LE expressions. These have been labelled A and B respectively. There are many types of negative forms in each \textit{e.g} \textit{n, nn, bwpw.f sdm, bn} etc, and these are labelled I, II, III, etc. Their appearance in non-literary and literary works respectively are sub-headed (i) and (ii). The varying uses of say \textit{bw} or \textit{bn} are in turn labelled (a), (b) etc. This was not possible in all chapters, as some refer exclusively to ME forms and others to LE forms, some do not have examples in either non-literary or literary texts. However, the notations, while appearing in different ways throughout the book, are consistent and can easily be followed within each individual chapter.
Chapter 9: The $jr$ conditional clauses
Chapter 10: The imperative forms
Chapter 11: The $sdm.jn.f$
Chapter 12: Negative forms.

Chapter 5 deals with the LE First Present. This follows Chapter 4 - the ME Pseudoverbal construction, as I have reason to believe that the LE First Present derived from the pseudoverbal construction. So they are compared and contrasted side-by-side in these two chapters.

In Chapters 7, 9, 10 and 12, the $sdm.f$, the conditional clauses, the imperatives and the negative forms are discussed respectively, not only in a synchronic NDE way, but in a diachronic way too, following their developments from ME to LE through NDE.

Chapters 13 to 27 address mainly LE forms, and are "analytic" rather than ME "synthetic". However, some chapters discuss forms in a diachronic way too, (e.g. Chapters 16, 18, 19, 22 and 24).

Chapter 13: The LE Third Future
Chapter 14: The LE Conjunctive (and its ME precursor)
Chapter 15: LE Sequential forms (where a comparison with Biblical Hebrew is made)
Chapter 16: The verb $jr$ as an auxiliary to another verb.
Chapter 17: The LE emphatic Second Tense (the "that"-form)
Chapter 18: The temporal $wnn$ in LE and the development of an epistolary formula.
Chapter 19: The various uses of $wn$ and of $wnn$ in ME and in LE.
Chapter 20: The LE pattern $jw.f hr sdm.f$ of the successive future.
Chapter 21: A brief reference to the LE First Future.
Chapter 22: $jw$ in ME and in LE
Chapter 23: The converter $jw$ in LE and its various syntactic uses.
Chapter 24: Nominal and adjectival sentences
Chapter 25: Some indicators of direct speech and greetings
Chapter 26: Participles
Chapter 27: Miscellaneous.

Of course, because of the description in context, the reader will no doubt refer back and forth. For example, when I discuss LE imperatives or Third Futures and mention that at times they are followed by the sequential conjunctive, or that initial *šdm.f* of the past tense in LE is followed by a sequential tense, or that *jr* conditional clauses are followed by various grammatical forms in the apodosis, different examples of each will be found in each relevant chapter. It has not always been possible to place these types of chapters in sequence.

Finally, there is a *Summary and Conclusions* which consist of two sections, the summary being mainly a descriptive and the conclusions mainly an analytic layout, in which the author discusses the NDE texts in both a synchronic and a diachronic way. The synchronic approach is stressed and highlighted in the section of paradigms. The diachronic presentation showing language development is tabulated and summarised in the second set of tables or catalogues, showing the evolution of forms and expressions through Egyptian history.

There are four addenda -

**ADDENDUM I:** The texts and papyri studied.

**ADDENDUM II:** A chronological chart of the Egyptian dynasties.

**ADDENDUM III:** An assessment of literary and non-literary texts.

**ADDENDUM IV:** Afterthoughts on texts in context.
SECTION A
"Egypt is the gift of the Nile" the Greek historian, Herodotus said. Egypt is mainly the Nile valley, irrigated by the annual inundation of the Nile, which would deposit a rich black silt layer over the fields. Because of this black deposit over their lands, the Egyptians called the land "Kmt", "the black one" in contrast with the desert "dīrt" "the red one".

Manetho, an Egyptian priest living under the Ptolemies Soter and Philadelphus, compiled a history of Egypt based on old records and archive lists of kings. History-writing was a concept alien to Egyptian thinking, and although his was a good native name (maneh-to 'horse-groom') and his origins from an important provincial town of Sebennytos in the central Delta were beyond reproach, it was a foreign culture and an un-Egyptian world outlook which inspired the work. Manetho's Aigyptiaka was written in Greek and has come down to us only in the form of excerpts made from it by later chroniclers, but it has exerted a lasting effect on the formal division of the political history of ancient Egypt and the way it is traditionally interpreted.

Following the usage of his time, Manetho divided the kings known to him into thirty dynasties or ruling houses, starting with the legendary Menes and concluding with the last native king, Nektanebos. Some of these divisions followed ancient king-lists, others seem to have resulted from his

---

1 Much of this chapter is based on the following literature: Gardiner, (1961:212-315), Breasted, (1956:399-422), Faulkner, (1975:217-251).

2 This survey refers to and places in context many of the written records of the period. The preceding Eighteenth Dynasty and succeeding Twentieth Dynasty are highlighted too, with special stress on their writings. This is done mainly to show that the Eighteenth Dynasty language used Middle Egyptian forms, while the later Twentieth Dynasty texts were Late Egyptian.
misunderstanding of the sources, or their imperfection, and several may have been introduced by him simply for convenience. Nevertheless, Manetho's dynastic division is still generally used and its author is deservedly regarded as the first Egyptian historian.

The ancient Egyptians did not record history for its own sake and our knowledge is, therefore, based on history's raw materials and on texts which were composed for other purposes. Yet the Egyptians were not entirely oblivious of their past. A rare insight into their awareness of it is still visible in a large memorial temple built by King Seti I for the perpetuation of his cult in the Upper Egyptian town of Abdju (Abydos) a thousand years before Manetho, around 1300 BCE - the Nineteenth Dynasty studied in this thesis. In the maze of its chapels, columned halls, and vestibules there is a corridor known as "The Gallery of the Lists" (Malek & Forman 1986:7). In the relief carved on its east wall Seti I and his son, the future Ramesses II, are shown symbolically offering libation and incense to a large number of Egyptian deities represented by their names. On the opposite west wall the father and son appear in a similar scene before two long rows of cartouches containing the names of their royal ancestors. The list, by its nature, did not aspire to historical completeness. It included only the groups of rulers regarded by its compiler as the most illustrious and worthy of commemoration, while the kings of the less famous periods of Egyptian history were simply omitted. At its beginning it presents a series of fifty-six names, introduced by that of Meni (Menes of Manetho), and is the most complete record of successive kings of the earliest part of Egyptian history. (Malek and Forman 1986:7).

The history of Egypt can be traced back to about 3000 BCE, but archaeological excavations have revealed a great deal about the various cultures of the prehistoric period, e.g. the Neolithic (Fayyum-Neolithic and Merimda cultures) and the Chalcolithic (Tasian, Badarian, Amratean, Gerzean, Semainian, the latter three known as Naqada I, II and III).

After Akhenaten's dramatic Eighteenth Dynasty religious revolution, during which he claimed the Aten to be the sole god of Egypt, and following the short reigns of Smenkhare, Tutankhamun and Ay, Horemhab, an able organizer and skilful man of affairs gained a position of power and influence. At the great feast of Opet, at which the image of Amun at Karnak was carried to Luxor, Horemhab was now confirmed as the new Pharaoh, and he then married the princess, Mutnezmet, the sister of Akhenaten's queen, making Horemhab's accession quite legal. He was untiring in restoring to the land the orderly organization which it had once enjoyed. He did not forget the temples, which had been closed so long under the Aten regime. "He restored the temples from the pools of the Delta marshes to Nubia. He shaped all their images in number more than before, increasing the beauty in that which he made ... He raised up their temples; he fashioned a hundred images with all their bodies correct and with all splendid costly stones. He sought the precincts of the gods which were in the districts in this land; he furnished them as they had been since the time of the first beginning. He established for them daily offerings every day. All the vessels of their temples were wrought of silver and gold. He equipped them with priests and with ritual priests and with the choicest of the army. He transferred to them lands and cattle, supplied with all equipment."

Thus Amun received again his own endowments and the incomes of all the disinherited temples were restored. The people resumed in public the worship of the innumerable gods which they had practised in secret during the supremacy of Aten. The sculptors reinserted on the monuments defaced by Akhenaten, the names of the gods, whom he had dishonoured and erased.

Horemhab also sent to Akhetaten (El Amarna) (Akhenaten's capital) and carried away the materials of the Aten temple there which were available for his buildings. Every effort was made to annihilate all trace of the reign of such a man.

There were other directions in which the restoration of what Horemhab regarded as normal conditions was not so easy. Gross laxity in the oversight of the local administration had characterized the reign of Akhenaten and his successors, and these abuses had grown to excess. These included extortions, bribery and corruption.

Horemhab dictated to his personal scribe a remarkable series of special and highly particularized laws to suit every case of which he had learned. He warned
against the acceptance of a bribe: "Receive not the reward of another ... How shall those like you judge others while there is one among you committing a crime against justice?" He added "My Majesty is legislating for Egypt to prosper the life of her inhabitants."

These same and philanthropic reforms give Horemhab a high place in the history of humane government.

He did not accomplish much in foreign wars. On the contrary, we should possibly place in his reign the treaty of alliance and friendship with the Hittites, referred to by Ramesses II some fifty years later as having existed before (Kitchen 1971:II, 225). He did put down a revolt in Nubia, and sent an expedition to Punt.

All his powers and all his great ability were necessarily employed exclusively in reorganizing the kingdom after the long period of unparalleled laxity which preceded him. "Behold, his majesty spent the whole time seeking the welfare of Egypt."

He probably reigned for about 27 years. He appointed his vizier, Pramesse to succeed him, and he ascended the throne as Ramesses I, thus inaugurating the Nineteenth Dynasty. He was probably well advanced in years when he became king.

After the recovery from the religious revolution, Egypt was a changed world. It is not easy to define the exact nature of the changes, since there are many exceptions; yet it is impossible not to notice the marked deterioration of the art, the literature and indeed the general culture of the people. The language which they wrote approximates more closely to the vernacular and incorporates many foreign words; the copies of ancient texts are incredibly careless, as if the scribes utterly failed to understand their meaning. At Thebes the tombs no longer display the bright and happy scenes of everyday life which characterized the Eighteenth Dynasty, but concentrate rather upon the perils to be faced in the hereafter; the judgement of the heart before Osiris is a favourite theme, and the Book of Gates illustrates the obstacles to be encountered during the nightly journey through the netherworld. The temples elsewhere depict upon their walls many vivid representations of warfare, but the workmanship is relatively coarse

---

3 K. Kitchen's books consists of several volumes (I, II, III etc.) each commencing with page 1. These have therefore been referred to in the thesis e.g. as above (Kitchen 1971:II, 225).
and the explanatory legends are often more adulatory than informative. In spite of all, Egypt still presents an aspect of wonderful grandeur, which the greater abundance of this period's monuments makes better known to the present-day tourist than the far finer products of earlier times.

Ramesses I was of relatively humble origin, and his statues portray him as a royal scribe squatting upon his haunches with the half-opened papyrus on his lap enumerating the various high offices to which his land had raised him.

He was not destined to enjoy the royal power for long. There was probably a co-regency with his son Sethos (Seti) I, which began in Ramesses I's second year. Manetho, as quoted by Josephus allows him only one year and four months of reign. The sole dated monument we possess is dated Year 2, and records the establishment at Buhen (Wādy Halfa) of a temple and new offerings to Min-Amun. He initiated a stupendous change (near the second pylon at Karnak) from Horemhab's open court with a central double line of giant columns like that at Luxor, to the great Hypostyle Hall, which is among the chief surviving wonders of Pharaonic Egypt.

The great ruler who occupied the throne for the next fifteen or more years was imbued with true affection and loyalty towards his father. Yet for all the recognition which Sethos I was prepared to pay his father, he was not averse to regarding himself as the inaugurator of a new period. This he showed by means of the phrase \textit{wJ:im mfwt} (Repetition of Births). But there may be an additional reason for this. According to the astronomical chronologies, a new Sothic period began about 1317 BCE (Černý 1961:150). The Alexandrian mathematician, Theon, referring to the Sothic period, speaks of it as the era "From Menophres", and an attempt has been made to derive the name from \textit{mrj.n.pth} "Beloved of Ptah", an epithet regularly attached to the personal name of Sethos I. However another theory suggests a derivation of the Greek name from Menpeḥre, the current form of the praenomen of Ramesses I.

As a stranger from the extreme north and with no royal lineage behind him, Sethos was concerned about being viewed as an upstart. So to win popularity, he set about restoring the mutilated inscriptions of his predecessors. He founded a magnificent temple too in Abydos, the reputed home of Osiris, with wall reliefs of perfect craftsmanship. The inherited name of Seti ("the Sethian") attests a devotion to the very god who had been the murderer of Osiris. So he had to placate Osiris and his powerful priesthood. The temple was conceived of as a
national shrine. Chapels were set apart for Osiris, for his wife, Isis, and for his son Horus, the age-old triad of Abydos. There were also important chapels dedicated to Amun-of-Thebes, to Ptah of Memphis and to ReCHarakhti of Heliopolis, and a chapel consecrated to Sethos I himself.

Good fortune has preserved for us part of the charter granted by Sethos I to his great new sanctuary at Abydos, and this, strange to say, is inscribed on a high rock at Nauri, a short distance to the north of the Third Cataract.

Many paragraphs deal with the ways in which the privileges of the temple staff might be infringed; and justice was to be exacted from the offenders by the officials. The entire decree though is very carelessly drafted, and leaves the impression rather of artificial legalistic form than of precise legal enactment. (Kitchen 1971:1, 46; Griffith, F.II 1927:193).

Among the dependents of the Abydos temple mentioned in the Nauri text are the gold-washers who were employed at the mines in the neighbourhood of the Red Sea. The lot of these poor wretches was a hard one. In a long inscription of Year 9 engraved on the walls of a small temple in the Wady Abbâd some thirty five miles east of Edfu, Sethos describes the measures he has taken to remedy their situation. A brief extract will illustrate the style and substance of the narration: "He stopped on the way to take counsel with his heart, and said: How shall travellers fare? Surely their throats will be parched. What will slake their thirst? The homeland is far away, the desert wide. Woe to him, a man thirsty in the wilderness! Come now, I will take thought for their welfare and make for them the means of preserving them alive, so that they may bless my name in years to come, and that future generations may boast of me for my energy, inasmuch as I am one compassionate and regardful of travellers." (Kitchen 1971:1, 46).

Sethos then recounts the digging of a well and the founding of a settlement in this locality. Another inscription in the speos warns later rulers and their subjects not to misappropriate the gold which was to be delivered to the Abydos temple, and ends with a curse:

"As to whosoever shall ignore this decree, Osiris will pursue him, and Isis his wife, and Horus his children; and the Great Ones, the lords of the Sacred Land, will make their reckoning with him."
Warlike scenes are depicted upon the exterior north wall of the great Hypostyle Hall at Karnak, and these combine with the conventional illustrations of the King's personal prowess much information of a genuine historical character. (Kitchen 1975:1, 6).

On the eastern side, the lowest register shows the military road along which Sethos' army had to pass to reach northern Syria; from Tjel (Latin Sile or Selle; Zaru) (Albright 1920:6) across the desert of the Sinai peninsula beyond a small canal through fortified stations built to protect the wells to a town 110 miles from Tjel, which is evidently Raphia. This is the earliest equivalent of a map that the ancient world has to show (Gardiner 1920:99). The map goes 20 miles further to the town of Canaan, which is the Philistine Gaza. The expedition reached as far as Lebanon, but the top register on the east half of the wall is lost. What the accompanying hieroglyphic legend describes as "the ascent which Pharaoh made to destroy the land of Kadesh and the land of the Amor" probably belongs to a later year. A battle against the Libyans is recorded too, and the lowest register shows Sethos at grips with the Hittites, a growing empire in the hands of Suppiluliuma's son, Mursilis II. A stele at Beisan (Beth-Shean) tells of Sethos' exploits, and deals with the 'Apiru people, and another mentions Hamath, Bethshael, Pehel, Rehob, and Yenoam. The capture of Yenoam is depicted in the Karnak reliefs. Mention is made too of the three army corps of Amun, Pre and Sutekh. These reappear later in the Kadesh campaign of Ramesses II, and they seem to imply the presence of really strong forces in the Palestine area. Perhaps in the quarter of a century from the beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty, Egypt possessed as much of an Asian empire as at any other period in her history. The main administration though lay in the hands of the local princes. In Nubia on the other hand, real governors were the King's Son of Kush and his two lieutenants.

Apart from the temples of Kurna and Abydos and the work on the great Hypostyle Hall at Karnak, Sethos I's buildings are relatively unimportant. On the other hand, the sepulchre which he caused to be excavated for himself in the Bibān el-Molūk is the most imposing of the entire necropolis.

If the greatness of an Egyptian Pharaoh be measured by the size and number of the monuments remaining to perpetuate his memory, Sethos' son and successor, Ramesses II would have to be adjudged the equal or even the superior of the proudest pyramid builders. The great Hypostyle Hall at Karnak is in the main
his achievement, and the Ramesseum, his funerary temple of Thebes still retains a large part of its original grandeur. At Abydos his temple stands beside that of his father. There are the remains of a vast temple at Memphis, and there is an amazing temple at Abu Simbel with its four colossal seated statues of Ramesses fronting the river (recently moved because of the Aswan dam.)

Lately, his glamour as a triumphant conqueror has been much dimmed by evidence from the Boghazkoy (Hattusas) records. None the less, the events of his sixty seven years of reign are better known and present more of interest than those of any other equal span of Egyptian history.

There is an inscription occupying an entire wall in the temple of Sethos I at Abydos, and it is in the main a boastful account of Ramesses' virtue in completing his father's splendid sanctuary. It tells us that he came to Thebes to take part in Amun's great festival of Ope, and then set forth by river to his new Delta capital after stopping at Abydos. He arrived at Pi-Raëmesse, thenceforth to be, with Memphis as an alternative, the main royal residence in the north through the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties. This, the Biblical Raamses shows the multitude of the remains from the reign of Ramesses II.

We now have the first mention of the Sherden, and there was a naval battle somewhere near the river mouths. Later they are shown in the Pharaoh's bodyguard, and they were rewarded for their military services. Ramesses used other foreign prisoners of war in the same way, e.g. Libyans, Kehek, Meshwesh and Nubians.

A great trial of strength between Egypt and the Hittites could not be delayed. A story of one of the struggles is told in two separate narratives, which supplement one another, and are illustrated by sculptured reliefs, accompanied by verbal explanations - the "Poem" (previously known as the "Poem of Pentaur") and the "Report" or the "Bulletin" (Kitchen 1969:II, 2-124). There is much in poetic strain before lauding Ramesses' feat of arms, telling how his Majesty routed the foe single-handed, hurling them into the Orontes. The tale of the battle is well known.

What actually happened? Unhappily, the Boghazkoy tablets tell a very different tale. Whatever the exact truth of all these warlike proceedings, everything pointed to the necessity of ending a conflict profitable to neither side, and this necessity was fully realized a few years later.
It is one of the great romances of Near Eastern discovery that the treaty concluded in Year 21 of Ramesses II between him and Hattusil III should have come to light in separate copies found in both the Egyptian capital of Thebes and the Hittite capital of Boghazkoy, cities a thousand miles apart on opposite sides of the Mediterranean. The Egyptian version, written in hieroglyphic, can be read on a stele standing upright against a wall in the temple of Karnak. (Kitchen 1971:II, 225, Spalinger, 1981:299). The Hittite version, a little less complete is given on two clay tablets inscribed in Babylonian cuneiform; it is not an exact duplicate, but to a large extent shows identical clauses and expressions, all the more interesting because they triumphantly confirm the accuracy of the labours of philologists in the two distinct fields of study. An offensive and defensive alliance is concluded between the two monarchs, reaffirming one that had existed in the reign of Suppiluliumas, and this alliance is to hold good in the event of either of the parties' death. Neither is to encroach upon the territory of the other, and each is pledged to render assistance in the case of attack from any other quarter. Provision is made for the extradition of refugees in either direction, but these are not to be treated as criminals on their return. The Egyptian document differs from the Hittite by invoking as witnesses many gods of both countries, and by describing the silver tablets which are to be exchanged; no doubt similar perorations would have been found in the Hittite tablets had these been preserved in their entirety.

A lively correspondence between two Courts followed. Some of the letter writing turns upon a marriage arranged between Ramesses and a daughter of Hattusil. This foreign alliance was long remembered. Ramesses had an extensive progeny, and many Great Wives and concubines. But it was Merneptah, the thirteenth in the Ramesseum list, who survived to succeed his father. Merneptah was probably well over fifty years of age when he succeeded to the throne, and he inherited a difficult situation, for during his father's old age, the vigilance of the frontier patrol had slackened, and the army had fallen into neglect, with the result that, driven by famine in their own land, roving bands of Libyans were raiding into the western Delta and terrorizing the people. With the threat of invasion, Egypt was on the defensive and the king had to reorganize the army. This was not a foray in quest of plunder that had been attempted, but permanent settlement in a new home.
The principal sources for the Libyan war, in which the "Peoples of the Sea" allied themselves with the invading Libyans, are a long inscription at Karnak, and a stele from Athribis, but there is a third inscription which must be mentioned, the so-called Israel Stele (Kitchen 1968:1IV, 12-19). The latter expresses at length the intense relief felt by the Egyptians at the defeat of the invaders. A few sentences will be sufficient to convey the emotion caused by the victory:

"Men come and go with singing, and there is no cry of men in trouble. Towns are populated once again, and he who plants his harvest shall eat it. Rec has turned himself back to Egypt."

Of even greater interest is a passage which has long been familiar to scholars.

"The chieftains are prostrate, saying "Shalom", and no one lifts his head among the Nine Bows. Destruction is for Tjehenu, Khatti is at peace, the Canaan is plundered with every evil. Ashkelon is carried off, Gezer is captured, Yenoam is made non-existent, Israel is waste and has no seed, Khor has become a widow because of Egypt." (Kitchen 1968, IV:12-19) In the first place, we have here clear evidence of the suppression of a revolt in Palestine. The second point that arises is the mention of Israel, the only instance known from any Egyptian text. In the middle of Merneptah's reign, we find Israel already settled in Palestine, so it is unlikely that he was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. A third significant point is the reference to Khatti - "Khatti is at peace." The power of the Hittite kings was diminishing, and they did not wish to embroil themselves with Egypt. The peace made between Egypt and Khatti half a century before still held.

Merneptah reigned for ten years, and did little in the way of erecting new public buildings, though inscriptions including usurpations of older monuments are not rare.

Mining operations in Sinai went on, and journals and papyri have been found. A curious text on papyrus probably dates from this reign. It purports to be a letter from a scribe, Hori to his friend Amenemope, in which he points out that Amenemope is a failure in all he undertakes. (This is Papyrus Anastasi I) (Gardiner 1964:1-40). Among other duties, the latter claims to be a "maher", a scribe accustomed to foreign travel who could be sent on errands abroad, and Hori names a number of places to which such messengers might be sent, including Byblos, Tyre, Beth Shean and Kadesh. It seems that, while Egyptian
suzerainty in Palestine was maintained, there was constant traffic on the roads between Egypt and the Asian principalities.

After the death of Merneptah the Nineteenth Dynasty died out in short reigns and dynastic intrigue and even the order of succession of its kings is not certain. The names in question are those of Amenmesses, Sethos II, Sekhaenre Ramesses-Siptah, Akhenre-setepenre Merneptah-Siptah and Queen Twosre.

The "Great Chancellor of the entire land", Bay was an imposing figure during that time, a king-maker and a man of immense influence. On Siptah's death, Queen Twosre herself ascended the throne, the fourth queen-regent in Egypt's long history, the others being Nitocris, Sobekneferu and the illustrious Hatshepsut. With her the Nineteenth Dynasty came to an end. Not more than about twenty three years can be reckoned for the remaining rulers of the Nineteenth Dynasty after Merneptah's death. There may have been a short interregnum following the death of Twosre before the accession of Setnakhte, the first king of the Twentieth Dynasty.

The period here dealt with showed great activity in the literary field. In addition to the masterpieces of the Middle Kingdom being copied and read, there was no lack of new composition. This was especially the case in the realm of fiction. Here we have historical tales - "The Tale of Two Brothers" (Gardiner 1973:9-30). The Contendings of Horus and Seth (Gardiner 1973:37-60) "The Blinding of Truth by Falsehood" (Gardiner 1973:30-36) and "The Doomed Prince" (Gardiner 1973:1-9). More serious works, intended for the instruction of boys and young men with regard to conduct, the writing of letters, the learning of geography, the adoption of the profession of scribe, etc. include Papyrus Anastasi I, and Papyrus Koller (Gardiner 1964:41-49), and the curious medley known today as Late Egyptian Miscellanies (including "Prayers used as school texts") (Gardiner 1937:99-116). There are magical and medical compilations and a work on the interpretation of dreams (Papyrus Chester Beatty III) (Groll 1985:71-118), while poetry is represented by some charming love songs (Papyrus Chester Beatty I) (Gardiner 1935:27) and possibly the Poem of the Battle of Kadesh (Kitchen 1971:II, 2).

Also a number of lengthy and highly informative writings from the Twentieth Dynasty have survived. The language of these writings are a good representative of the Late Egyptian language.
The written records of the earlier Eighteenth Dynasty on the other hand are examples of the Middle Egyptian written language (see Addendum I).
TENSE IN EGYPTIAN

INTRODUCTION

The chapter on "Tense in Egyptian" was included to precede the chapters with examples of the various grammatical forms in NDE, and the Summary and Conclusions. This is of special worth to an English speaker or to a student of English language and grammar.

It discusses and differentiates between aspect, absolute tense and taxis in ME, and obviously therefore in the ME examples in the NDE texts. It concludes with LE, in which primary verbal tense, easily morphologically recognised now occurs.

For most of the past hundred years, Egyptologists have looked for answers largely in the factors of tense (e.g. past vs. present) and aspect (e.g. perfective vs. imperfective), within the overall framework of broad syntactic categories (e.g. "attributive" vs. "predicative" forms.) (Allen 1986:1). Our appreciation of syntactic values has matured in the past three or four decades, thanks first of all to the work of Polotsky.¹

There was a gradual change from a "synthetic" language into an "analytic" one (Gardiner 1982:1-24c). The "synthetic" tenses $sdm.f$ and $sdm.n.f$ are first supplemented and then gradually replaced by "analytic" forms.

Vernus (1985:311) feels that there is a diachronic shift from a mostly aspect-oriented system in Old and Middle Egyptian towards a mostly time-oriented system in Late Egyptian.

¹ Syntax refers to the arrangement of words in a sentence showing their connection and relation.
Groll (1973:67) is of the opinion that even in the framework of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties, one can trace a considerable grammatical development.

We can now pretend to understand fairly well the grammatical function of the verb in later stages of the language (Late Egyptian through Coptic), where its analytic structure makes it relatively transparent. In other words, we can identify a form such as *jw* *jrj.f* as circumstantial past tense with some confidence that this describes its syntactic and temporal features in opposition to the forms such as *jrj.f* (independent past tense) or *jw.f* (*hrt*) *jrt* (circumstantial present tense). Such an analysis is a comprehensive explanation of the value of these forms - it leaves few loose ends. Moreover, the fact that nearly all Egyptologists would agree with the analysis is some indication of its accuracy.

The situation is relatively less clear for earlier stages of the language. There has been a tendency to regard syntactic motives as primary in the use of particular forms or constructions, while other motives such as tense (and aspect) have been downplayed or disregarded altogether. This leaves a number of loose ends in our understanding of the Middle Egyptian verb. (Allen 1986:1-21).

A.

The best illustration is the ME use of *jw*. Polotsky (1968:75-100) regarded as syntactic the *jw* in compound verbal constructions viz. to enable the circumstantial verb-forms to serve as indicative predicative forms, e.g.

cf.

\[ jw \text{ wg} \text{.n} \text{ hm} \text{.f} \text{ rdjt} \text{ hn} \text{.tw} \]

His Majesty hath commanded that ordinance be made

(Nauri Decree, 51/1)

with

\[ sr \text{.n} \text{.j} \text{ w}^\text{<w} \text{ r} \text{ swg} \text{3} \text{.tm} \]

It is from afar that I have foretold so as to protect you

(Kanais (Wady Mia) 67/9, 10)

and cf.

---

2 All the examples in this chapter are from the NDE texts I studied.
Her son Horus has cut off her head.

(Horus and Seth 50/4, 5)

(Huw 3 r sf ṣpr.j hr mn.s)

(It is) three days to yesterday since I petitioned in her name.

It is for five days that she has gone from me.

(Papyrus Chester-Beatty I. Verso C3/9)

The first of these couplets (with $jw$ - $jw$ wrj hr pšjš ṣr $g3d3š$) would be analysed as syntactic: independent/predicative, and the second of each (without $jw$ - $ṣr.n.j$ and $pr.ṣ$) as dependent (nominal/"emphatic"). The latter use (without $jw$) may be circumstantial/continuative too, e.g.

$bw$ m33j šnt

I cannot visit (see) (my) sister, since an illness got hold of me.

(Papyrus Chester-Beatty I, C4/6-7)

This purely syntactical analysis is not adequate to account for all the uses of $jw$, or for the change in its use throughout history.

Some of its loose ends are the following:

(i) Both verbal and non-verbal predicates can appear with and without $jw$ in Old Egyptian and in ME. If the function of $jw$ is to signal the distinction between independent ("indicative/predicative") and dependent ("nominal" or "circumstantial") use, however, this can be argued consistently only for the (transitive) $ṣdm.n.f$, and generally within ME only. In Old Egyptian, bare initial forms can be used independently, at least for the $ṭm.f$ and the stative (and transitive...
Despite the existence of constructions with *jw*, these uses appear also in ME.

For example:

\[ mk \ jrj.n \ nfr \ sprt.j \]

\[ bs.w.f \ nj \ mw \ hr \ dw.w \]

God has granted my wish. He has made water come forth for me from the mountains.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/12)

(ii) *jw* appears in some environments in which its purpose is apparently not to signal or facilitate independent predication, e.g. after *jn*, e.g.

\[ jn \ jw \ nfr \ p3j.k \ hdb \]

\[ n3j.k \ h3k.w \]

Is it good that you slay your servants?

(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh, 94/7)

Adjectival predicates can be used independently with or without *jw*, e.g.

with *jw*

\[ jw \ nfr \ sw \ r \ p3 \ htp \ r \ p3 \]

\[ snn \ h3wtj \]

\[ wtt \ m \ p3 \ t3 \]

It is better than the former peace and the former brotherhood, which was in the land.

(Hittite Treaty, 227/11)

and without *jw*

\[ ndm \ sw \ r \ sldh \]

It pleases more than pomegranate wine.

(Papyrus Lansing, 100/12, 13)
With adverbial predicate constructions, the use of jw is especially difficult to characterize on syntactic grounds alone. Independent uses occur with and without jw, as in:

with jw

\[ jw.f \text{ nmh} \]
\[ bn \text{ ntf wsr} \]

He is poor,
he is not rich.

(Prayers as School Texts, 17/11, 12)

and without jw

\[ j.\text{štmt jjt m ḫšj} \]

Going and coming are with song.

(Merneptah's Stele 18/13)

(iii) In some cases, jw seems to behave more like the LE "circumstantial converter" jw, e.g.

\[ gm.(wj) \text{ wpt.k} \]
\[ jwj \text{ šnḏm.k(wj) r m p3 šštmt ntj m drt.j} \]

Your messenger found me as I was sitting beside the horse which is in my charge.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 10/2)

(iv) The use of jw is not a general feature of ME grammar. Rather, it appears limited to direct discourse and is rare in contexts where the first person is not involved. (Polotsky 1968:90). This restriction is difficult to explain on purely syntactic grounds.

Unless we are to posit the existence of several different kinds of jw, it seems clear that we cannot hope to create a consistent explanation of the various features of jw in ME (and its diachronic development) on the basis of syntax alone.

Polotsky noted that ME jw has properties other than the purely syntactic. He writes that "it has the effect of relating the statement to the sphere of interest and to the time of the speaker" (Polotsky 1968:91
and footnote 48). This feature is not a mere syntactic curiosity. It may be the basic motivating factor in the use of *jw* in ME.

(v) See later (D); the use of *jw* possibly referring to a specific situation, while omission of the *jw* refers to a general state of affairs. This fits in context there.

B. The expression of tense in general

Tense is a factor that operates between Utterance and Speech. It characterizes the time of a situation or action within the utterance with respect to the speech act. In most languages, the Speech act itself is the reference point for tense: present tense is simultaneous with the moment of speaking, past tense is prior to the moment of speaking and future tense is subsequent to it. But tense can also operate on the level of utterance, to characterize the time of one event or situation with respect to another. And it can do so either with or without reference to the speech act (Allen 1986:6, Callender 1986:8).

Theoretically, therefore, a verb can express three kinds of tense relationship:

(i) time relationship to the Speech act alone. This is generally what is understood by the term "tense"

(ii) time relationship to the Utterance alone. This is often referred to as "relative tense". The term "taxis", introduced by the linguist, Roman Jakobson is preferred (Allen 1986:6). Taxical relationships are the same as those of absolute tense - prior, simultaneous and subsequent - but they are independent of absolute tense. Temporal and taxical relationships may differ - for example, when an action that is characterized as prior to another in the Utterance has yet to occur with respect to the moment of speaking. "He said: 'I will return after doing it'" (the action of doing is prior to that of returning, but subsequent to the moment of speaking).

(iii) time with relationship to both the Speech and the Utterance. This is called "taxical sense" e.g. the English future perfect which characterizes one action as prior to another and also as subsequent to the moment of speaking: "He said: 'By the time I return, I will have done it'".
An appreciation for the difference between these three kinds of relationship is crucial to an understanding of how tense operates. More to the point, it can also help in understanding the verbal system of ME.

C. The expression of tense in ME

The basic verb-forms and constructions of the language, with few exceptions, express taxis rather than absolute tense, insofar as they express temporal relationships at all.

The \textit{sdm.n.f}, for example, characterizes the action of the verb as prior to another action or situation, but not necessarily as past with respect to the moment of speaking. The action of the \textit{sdm.n.f} can be prior to an action that is itself past, present or future with respect to the moment of speaking:

(i) \begin{align*}
\textit{sw3b.n.j} & \textit{ st.j} \textit{ hhw n sp} & \text{I have purified my house millions of times, having privileged those who are in it again.} \\
\textit{hwj.n.j} & \textit{ jmj.w.s} \textit{ m whm} & \text{I have set the serfs, whom I have produced, in my house} \\
\textit{dj.n.j} & \textit{ mrt} & \text{(Nauri Decree, 50/7)} \\
\textit{ntt} \textit{ shpr.n.j} & \textit{ r st.j} & \text{(Nauri Decree, 50/7)}
\end{align*}

(hwj.n.j prior to past \textit{sw3b.n.j} and \textit{shpr.n.j} prior to past \textit{dj.n.j})

\begin{align*}
\textit{3tp} & \textit{ 3tp.n.k} \textit{ r mr.n.k} & \text{You have piled up (words) as you wished} \\
& & \text{(Papyrus Anastasi I, 30/7)}
\end{align*}
(mr.n.k prior to past 3tp.n.k).

(ii)

jr m33š šw m ršwt
dr.n.f n ntr rmj.f

If a man sees himself in a dream after he has driven a god to tears.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III)
(Groll 1985:80 - example 23).

(dr.n.f prior to present m33)

bw m33j šnt
c₆₉₆₉₉₉ h₃j₃t jm.j

I cannot visit (see) (my) sister, since my illness got hold of me.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, C4/6, 7)

(₆₉₆₉₆₉ prior to present bw m33)

(iii)

wpw.br wnn p3 k₃r n j₅w nbw
jrj.n.j r t₃ hw₄t mn.m₃₉₉₉₉₉₉₉ hw₃₉.w
mk.w

In particular, the group of gold-washers, whom I have appointed for the House of Menmare shall be exempted and protected.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 69/12-14)

(jrj.n.j prior to future wnn hw₃₉.w mk.w)

jw wd.n hm.f rdjt hn.tw

His majesty hath commanded that ordinance be made.

(Nauri Decree, 51/1)
(\(wd.n\) prior to future \(rdt\) \(hn.tw\))

In the same way, the \(\bar{\delta}gm.f\) in circumstantial clauses expresses present taxis: the action with which it is concomitant can be itself past, present or future with respect to the moment of speaking:

\[\bar{\delta}km.\bar{s} 3bd.w n m\bar{s}\]
\[ch\bar{c}.n m\bar{s}j w^c n s\bar{3} \bar{t}\bar{3}j\]

A son was born, when she had completed the months of childbearing.

(\(\bar{\delta}km.\bar{s}\) concomitant with \(past\) \(ch\bar{c}.n\))

\[mk \ jrj.n ntr \ spjr.j\]
\[b\bar{s}w.f \ n.j \ mw \ hr \ \varnothing w.w\]

God granted my wish, when he made water come forth for me from the mountains.

(\(b\bar{s}w.f\) concomitant with \(past\) \(jrj.n \ ntr \))

\[mk \ jb.j \ hdn\]
\[\bar{\delta}\bar{3}t\bar{w}.f\]

My heart is in a turmoil when he is remembered.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, Verso C2/1)

(\(\bar{\delta}\bar{3}t\bar{w}.f\) concomitant with a \(present\) \(jb.j \ hdn\))
Leaping is my heart in haste when I recall (my) love for you.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty, Verso C2/9-10 and C3/1-2)

(st3.j concomitant with a present (t)jfd jb.j. It is concomitant too with several consecutive clearly present bw ḥdm.f's)

htp p3 ḥw
jw.j mt.k(wj)

I shall be dead when the sun sets.

(Doomed Prince, 5/14, 15)

(htp.f concomitant with future jw.j mt.k(wj))

jr ptr.k ḥw rwh3 n p3 ḫkw
ḥr ḏd.k 3pd r.f

If/When you were to see him at evening in the darkness, you would fancy him as a passing bird.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 19/7-9)

(ptr.k concomitant with a habitual or present continuing into the future ḫr ḏd.k.)

Callender (1986:8) analyses Middle Egyptian verbal distinctions at ten levels (locutionary standpoint, performative level, phase, transposition, aspect, long-termedness, mood, verb-type, person and time). He gives examples of sentences, in which he analyses events occurring at the moment of speech, the primary point of deictic reference, prior to this (remote or near), and those occurring in the future. He uses two exclamation marks to denote the time of speech and asterisks to the left for events prior to this and to the right for future events. This corresponds to taxis, discussed above.

In the NDE texts I studied, these would be tabulated thus:
"I saw Heria (a) while she was stealing your chisel (b)" So she said (c)

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 5, 6)

Moment of speech

* (a) * (c) !
* (b) 

And she brought the chisel (a) ..., which she had buried (b) ..., after she had stolen (c) ..., although she had taken a great oath (d).

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 13-17)

Moment of speech

* (c) * (b) * (d) * (a) !

The man's face should be rubbed with them (a) so that every bad dream, which he dreamt (b) should be driven away (c)

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III, 83/10.19)
It is in order that you ferry me across to the Island-in-the-Midst (a) that I have come (and am now here (b))

(Horus and Seth, 43/9)

It should be noted that the expression of taxis is primarily a feature of use rather than an essential characteristic of particular forms or constructions. Taxis is merely one of the values that the Egyptian verb can express, along with aspect, mood and voice.

Of the basic verb-forms, there are only a few that may express true and consistent tense. The $\sigma d m . t j . f j$ (26.15) and $\sigma d m . k 3 . f$ (e.g. $k 3 . f$ 25.19) seem always to refer to actions subsequent to the moment of speaking. The imperative, if it expresses tense at all, is consistently future in reference. For the most part, however, the basic verb-forms and constructions of Middle Egyptian either carry no temporal reference or express taxis but not absolute tense.

This characteristic, in turn (Allen 1986:8) lies at the base of the use of $j w$ in ME. $j w \ \sigma d m . f$ refers to an action that holds specifically at the moment of speaking, e.g.

$\omega h m . f \ \delta t . f \ h c t . f$ He does not know what he is about.

(Papyrus Lansing, 108/4)
D.

*jw* with *adverbial.predicate constructions* seems to refer to a specific situation, while omitting the *jw* refers to a general state of affairs, e.g.

with *jw* - a specific situation

\[
\text{wnn } h3mnt \ m \ lwnw \ kwkw}
\]

\[
\text{jw } \ mwn \ m \ lwnw \ h3mnt}
\]

There are kernels in the nuts.

There is water in the kernels.

(Prayers as School Texts, 86/3, 4)

Water is (at present) in the kernels. cf. *wnn* - Kernels exist (are to be found) in the nuts.

\[
\text{jw } jiwn \ c3 \ t3j.f \ st \ stdr}
\]

The river is its resting place.

(Truth and Falsehood, 35/5, 6)

\[
\text{hr } jw \ s3 \ t3 \ bwt \ n \ p3j \ dmjt}
\]

\[
\text{t3wt } m \ jm.f}
\]

And since the greatest abomination of this town is stealing copper in it ...

(Hieratic Ostracon, Verso 7, 8)

Compare

\[
\text{3h} \ k3p}
\]

Hiding is useful

(Stele of Merneptah, 15/12)

and

\[
\text{šftiš} \ pw \ hr \ djt \ n.s}
\]

Its nobility is that which gives it splendour.

(Nauri Decree, 47/9)

No *jw*, - indicating general state of affairs.
The difference between predicate-subject and subject-predicate constructions has to do with the nature of predication (Allen 1986:9), e.g.

When the predicate precedes the subject, an action or quality is predicated with respect to the subject. The action is true with respect to the subject, e.g.

\( htp \ p3 \ sw \) ... When the sun sets ...

(Doomed Prince, 5/14, 15)

and

\( \text{wrj } t3 \) ... When dawn comes ...

(Papyrus Lansing, 105/2)

When the subject is first, a situation is predicated with respect to the subject, e.g.

\( hr \ jr \ p3 \ sw \ hr \ htp \) Now when the sun had set ...

(Two Brothers, 14/6)

These constructions have no inherent tense.

We can trace the historical development of \( jw \) from its original temporal function to its eventual syntactic function in three stages:

(i) Originally, (absolute) tense is not a feature of the basic verbal system. When tense is marked overtly (rather than by implication, through the context) it is marked secondarily, through the addition of \( jw \) (\( wnt/ntt \) in noun-clauses, \( ntj \) in relative clauses). \( jw \) indicates that the content of the clause is specifically relevant to the circumstance in which it is uttered. This productive stage exists through Old into Middle Egyptian.

(ii) In time, the absolute tenses become incorporated into the basic verbal system: tense becomes a primary feature of the system. \( jw \) at this stage is part of the morphology of the primary tenses rather than a separate, productive element - much as English "have" in the perfect tenses has developed from an independent verb to a part of the tense morphology ("I have it done" > "I have done it"). At the same time, \( jw \) retains its own inherent meaning of circumstantiality - much as English "have"
remains a verb in its own right alongside the perfect tenses ('I have it'). In this stage, therefore, \( jw \) is bivalent. In the primary tenses it is - or is becoming - a "frozen" morphological element. Where still productive, however, it signals circumstantiality - now no longer (merely) to the moment of speaking, but more broadly, to the context in which it is used. This is the stage we find in ME, where \( jw \) both marks absolute tenses and is also a mark of specific taxis. Both uses have in common the notion of circumstantiality.

(iii) ME represents a stage in which the language is acquiring tense as a primary feature of the verbal system. The older, nontemporal forms exist alongside the newer tenses. As the language moved towards a system of primary verbal tenses, \( jw \) lost correspondingly more of its inherent temporal value. The final stage is visible in LE, where most of the primary verb-forms do express tense. Here the circumstantial value of \( jw \) is no longer temporal (except as a "frozen" element of the future tense \( jw.f \ r \ \text{andm} \)), but has become instead purely taxical.

Polotsky's syntactic analysis (Polotsky 1968:75) shows that the unmarked sentence comes to imply not merely the absence of a specific temporal reference, but the absence of an essential element of predication - the initial predicative nexus. From that point, the development of the unmarked sentence into an "emphatic" construction is a short - and logical - next step.

In the three-stage development outlined above, the inception of the "emphatic" construction fits logically into the second stage, and the construction emerges as a fully-fledged feature of the verbal system in stage three (LE.)

CONCLUSION

The current syntactic analysis of LE through Coptic, which we owe largely to Polotsky's insight, seems to be a comprehensive and satisfactory model.

There is still disagreement though in our understanding of the earlier stages of Egyptian.
All the examples of ME forms in this chapter, those expressing aspect or taxis rather than absolute tense, and those indicating "present situation" and "general state of affairs", and those pointing to an action or a situation with respect to the subject, as well as those suggesting the "independent" or the "emphatic" - all appear in NDE.
SECTION B
CHAPTER 1

THE MIDDLE EGYPTIAN $jjt\ pw\ jrjw.n.f$

$jjt\ pw\ jrjw.n.f$ indicates the beginning of a new action and it is a mode of narrating events, which is much employed in the Middle Kingdom stories. Here it is the action itself which is the centre of interest, and accordingly the action has to appear as a verbal noun, i.e. infinitive, to which are added the words $pw\ jrjw.n.f$ ($sdmw.n.f$ relative form) "it is ... which he did" (Gardiner 1982:312).

$jjt\ pw\ jrjw.n.f$, which is actually a non-verbal sentence with $pw$ as copula, an infinitive as predicate, and the (always masculine) relative form of $jrj$ as subject, is found almost exclusively with verbs of motion (Brunner 1979:39). No examples are found in the non-literary NDE texts, but are found occasionally in the literary NDE texts, e.g.

1.1

$jjt\ pw\ jrjw.n\ n3\ n \ hwt\ hrt$  
$r\ s3\ n.f\ s3w^2$

Then came the Hathors to determine a fate for him. (Lit. Coming is what the Hathors did.).

(The Tale of the Doomed Prince, 1/5, 6)

---

1 Note $n3$, $n$ for the definite article is still occasionally written in the 19th Dynasty as $n3.n$, thereby retaining the memory of the ME demonstrative pronoun, but by the 20th Dynasty seems to have disappeared (Goldwasser 1985:50).

2 $r +$ infinitive is a purpose clause.
1.2

spr pw jrjw.n.f r p3 šr n n3hm

He reached the Prince of Nahrin (Kingdom of Mitanni on the Upper Euphrates).

(The Tale of the Doomed Prince, 3/3)

1.3

prj pw jrj.n wC n hftjw
m t3.j.f tpt t r psh
p3 šrj

Thereupon a snake came out of its hole to bite the youth.

(The Tale of the Doomed Prince, 7/13-15)

1.4

spr pw jrjw.n.f
r p3.j.f pr
jw.f hr ḫdb t3.j.f hmt³

And he reached his house and he slew his wife.

(Two Brothers, 18/7-9)

1.5

šmt pw jrjw.n hm.f
r nw n ḫ3.f
gm.n.f³ jnh.šw 2500
n C n ḫtr
m t3(j).f w3t ḫnr

His majesty proceeded to look about him, and found 2 500 chariots ringing him on his way out.

(Ramesses II. Battle of Kadesh, 31/3-7)

---

These forms occur in ME and in NDE and not in LE.

---

³ jw.f hr šdm of LE continuative past tense.
⁴ gm.n.f is a ME narrative šdm.n.f.
An interesting ME formation is eg.

1.6
jjt jn h3p

Then came a scout.
( Ramesses II. Battle of Kadesh, 109/8)

A bare infinitive + jn as agent.

CONCLUSION

This form of narrating events is much employed in the Middle Kingdom stories. It persisted into NDE, where, as we can see here, it could be followed by a ME narrative ṣdm.n.f (1.5) or by a LE jw.f hr ṣdm of the continuative past (1.4).

This form is not found in LE, where the perfect active ṣdm.f is now occurring.

The LE cleft sentence pattern Type XII (Černý & Groll 1975:534) may just possibly be a remnant of this ME form (3.43). (Pap. CB I C4/9).

The Middle Egyptian jjt pw jrw.n.f formation is still found in the literary texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty.
CHAPTER 2

THE MIDDLE EGYPTIAN AUXILIARY VERB $c\dot{H}c$

INTRODUCTION

The Middle Egyptian auxiliary verb $c\dot{H}c$ is a common verbal narrative form, which indicates the start of a new action. The finite verb-forms compounded with $c\dot{H}c$ 'stand up', 'arise', occur only in main clauses, and always carry the action which is being described one step further on. Originally, no doubt, the subject of $c\dot{H}c$ was the same as that of the following verb, the form $\hat{\text{I}} \text{C} \text{H} \text{C} \text{N} \text{S} \text{D} \text{M} \text{N} \text{F}$ - to quote only the commonest construction - thus meaning 'he rose up and heard' (two verbs with one subject). But in further developments this original meaning seems to have become obscured; the passive $c\dot{H}c \text{N} \text{S} \text{D} \text{M} \text{N} \text{F}$, for example, can barely have been understood as 'he rose up and was heard'. The verb $c\dot{H}c$ becomes, in fact, less and less literally significant. This may well be the reason that, as an auxiliary, it very often lacks its determinative $\text{I}$. Many and varied examples of the Middle Egyptian $c\dot{H}c$ are found in both the non-literary and literary texts of NDE. They do not occur in Late Egyptian.

---

1 Regarding the use of auxiliary verbs, note that -
1. The use of $jw$ as an auxiliary verb and its other numerous uses in ME, NDE and LE is studied in Chapter 22.
2. $\text{Wn}$ and $\text{Wm}$ as auxiliary verbs and their other uses are described in Chapter 19.
3. $j\eta$ as an auxiliary verb is discussed in Chapter 16.
I. The \( chC.n \, sdm.n.f \) is a common Middle Egyptian narrative form, also found in NDE.

2.1
\[
chC.n \, wd.n \, hm.f \, r \, ct \\
m \, hr \, n \, hrrp \, n \, nsjwtk3wt \\
hmC.f \, m \, hrtj.w \, ntr
\]
His majesty commanded to give directions to the leader of the royal workers, (who were) with him as stone-cutters.
(Kanais (Wady Mia) Inscription, 67/1, 2)

This is a non-literary text.

2.2
\[
chC.n \, dj.n.f \, jwt \, sw \, knw
\]
Then he caused many chiefs to come
(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh 49/14)

\((chC.n.f \, sdm.n.f \, - \, with \, dj \, causative \, - \, common \, narrative \, form \, - \, a \, new \, action)\).

This is a literary text.

II. The auxiliary verb \( chC \) with the verb \( dd \) - "to say, speak" is a specific formation of NDE. It indicates a new phase in the actual trial investigation.

2.3
\[
chC.n \, dd.n \, t3 \, knbt \, n \, hrj3
\]
Then the court said to Heria.
(Hieratic Ostracon, 2 Recto 6)
This is ME or LE of the Nineteenth Dynasty. Although a common ME formation, it can be classified here as a specific formation of the LE of the Nineteenth Dynasty:

(i) it occurs only with the verb \( dd \)

(ii) it indicates a new phase in the actual trial investigation, and a change of personnel.

(iii) the \( ChC.n \) subject \( hr \ dd \) (as in 2 Verso 1, 2 see below) is used to express the last phase of the trial, i.e. the verdict.

i.e. although these are morphologically ME formations, as far as syntactic uses are concerned, they are specific Nineteenth Dynasty formations.\(^2\)

III. The \( ChC.n \) subject \( hr \ dd \) is unusual, perhaps a hybrid form or perhaps a ME pseudoverbal formation. It too is a specific NDE formation used to express the verdict of a trial.

2.4

\( ChC.n \ t3 \ kb\!nt \ hr \ dd \)

Then the court stated:

\( qd3.t \ c3(t) \ cnh \ n \ nj\!wt \ hrj3 \)

"A great wrongdoer is the citizen, Heria"

(Hieratic Ostracon, 2 Verso 1,2)

The Hieratic Ostracon is a non-literary text.

\(^2\) Note: In the Twentieth Dynasty they do not occur. (Groll 1973:69; Brunner 1979:31).
IV. The $c\hat{h}c.n$ with passive $\hat{sd}m(w).f$ corresponds to the active construction $c\hat{h}c.n \hat{sd}m.n.f$ in non-literary (2.5) as well as literary texts (2.6).

2.5
$c\hat{h}c.n \text{ hw}\text{wj} \text{ st tn}$
$\text{hr m wr mnm}3cnc$

Then this place was built, bearing the great name of Menmare.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/11)

2.6
$\hat{sk}m.3b\text{dw n ms}$
$c\hat{h}c.n \text{ m}jw c n s3 \text{ tj}$

When she had completed the months of childbearing, a son was born.

(The Doomed Prince, 4/5)

V. $c\hat{h}c.n.tw \hat{sd}m.f$. Then "one" did something, i.e. something was done.

2.7
$c\hat{h}c.n. tw \text{ j}tj n.f p3 tsm$

Then one brought him a greyhound.

(The Doomed Prince, 2/9, 10)

tw is the indefinite "one" or passive $\hat{sd}m.tw$

The above three examples occur in ME and NDE and not LE

---

$\hat{sk}m.3$ is a circumstantial $\hat{sd}m.f$. 
VI. The $\text{Ch}c.n \text{sd}m.f$ is a rare formation (Gardiner 1982:393).

2.8
$\text{Ch}c.n \text{sd}m \text{n3 n4 mnt}$
$\text{ntj m p3 hrd}$
$\text{wn.jn.sn hr whm.sn}^5$
$n \text{hm.f} \text{chn} w\text{d3 snb}^6$

When the people, who were with the child heard (it), they reported/repeated it to his majesty, l.p.h.

(The Doomed Prince, 1/7-9)

VII. The $\text{Ch}c.f \text{sd}m$ (not $\text{Ch}c.n.f$) is unusual ($\text{Ch}c.f$ or noun + verb).

2.9
$\text{Ch}c \text{3t c3 sgh c3}$
$\text{jw.s rswt r jkr sp sn}$

Then Isis uttered a loud shout, and was overjoyed.

(Horus and Seth, 37/8)

---

$^4 \text{n3 n}$ is a Nineteenth Dynasty definite article (Goldwasser 1985:51).
$^5 \text{wn.jn.sn} + \text{hr} + \text{sd}m.f$ is a ME pseudoverbal construction with $\text{hr}$ + infinitive).
$^6 \text{chn w\text{d3 snb} - "May he live long, be prosperous, be healthy" is a ME formation, the verbs all being pseudoparticiples.}$
VIII. *chc.n.tw jw r.qd* is a rare form (cf. the more common *chc.n.tw sjm* (2.7)).

2.10

*chc.n.tw jw r.qd*

One came to say to his majesty "The vanquished Shasu, they plan rebellion".

(*Northern Wars of Sethos I, 1/9/3, 4*)

The direct speech is an example of NOUN + *sjm.f* of LE (Doret 1980:37).

IX. In the Battle of Kadesh, there is a very unusual formation - perhaps a combination of *chc.n.f + jwf hrck* of the LE continuative past.

2.11

*chc.n.f jw.f hr ck*

His majesty charged into the force of the foe from Khatti.

(*Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh, 121/2*)

A very unusual formation - perhaps a combination of *chc.n.f + jwf hr ck* of the LE continuative past.
X. Finally $\textit{ch}^n$ may be used in a ME pseudoverbal construction with either (i) $\textit{ch}^n + \text{subject} + \text{pseudoparticiple}$ (2.12) or (ii) $\textit{ch}^n + \text{noun} + h_r + \text{infinitive}$ (2.13).

2.12

$\textit{ch}^n\text{n nb r qr gr m j3dt c3t}$

Then the All-Lord was silent for a long moment for he was angry with the Ennead.

(Horus and Seth, 38/1,2)

This is $\textit{ch}^n + \text{subject} + \text{old perfective or pseudoparticiple}$. The subject in this formation always follows $\textit{ch}^n$ (Brunner 1979:31)

2.13

$\textit{ch}^n\text{n 3st h_r jrt}$

Thereupon, Isis changed herself into a kite, flew up, and sat on top of an acacia.

(Horus and Seth, 45/9, 10)

($\textit{ch}^n + \text{Noun} + h_r + \text{infinitive}$)

($d3d3 = \text{head or top - a LE word, replacing } tp$)

(cf. 2.4 with the verb $dd$, which has become a unique NDE formation).

Both the above are ME & NDE forms not found in LE.
CONCLUSION

The use of the Egyptian auxiliary verb $ch^c$ is confined to ME, but is found in NDE too, but not in LE.

The Middle Egyptian $ch^c$ is found in both the non-literary and literary NDE texts.

$ch^c.n \ sdm.n.f$ is found in ME and in NDE, and the passive $ch^c.n \ sdm.w.f$ and $ch^c.n.tw \ sdm$ are too.

$ch^c$ used in a pseudoverbal construction is also confined to ME and NDE only.

$ch^c.n \ sdm.f$, and $ch^c.f \ sdm$ are rare forms, found in ME and in NDE.

$ch^c.n.tw \ jw \ r \ dd$ and $ch^c.n.f \ jw.f \ hr \ sdm$ are very unusual forms, probably hybrid forms confined to NDE.

$ch^c.n \ dd.n.f$ and $ch^c.n.f \ hr \ dd$ are specific formations of NDE, occurring respectively in trial investigation and verdict, and are unique NDE forms.

Polotsky (1968:95) believes that $ch^c.n$ may be a ME emphatic form, and the following verb a circumstantial form. (a $sdm.n.f$) (he stood up, having heard).

The $ch^c$ did not continue or develop in LE. It is possible that the LE perfective $sdm.f$ or the $jw.f \ hr \ sdm.f$ of the successive past was used to express this meaning.
CHAPTER 3

THE MIDDLE EGYPTIAN \textit{jin}-CONSTRUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The Middle Egyptian \textit{jin} construction is a participial statement or cleft sentence (Brunner 1979:39). The emphasis is upon the subject:

1. The subject may be
   i. a noun subject preceded by \textit{jin} or by \textit{m} or
   ii. a pronominal subject, in the form of an independent personal pronoun, and this precedes

2. The predicate, which is for
   . the Past, a Perfective Participle
   . the Present, an Imperfective Participle
   . the Future, a Prospective \textit{sdmf}.

In Late Egyptian, there was a development resulting in many ways of expressing these forms. In Groll (1967:47) the author classifies these into two Groups (A and B), Group A being subdivided into four categories, and Group B into thirteen categories. In Cerný and Groll (1975:525), there is a division into at least 17 types (I - XVII).

Many of the Middle Egyptian forms and of the Late Egyptian groups, types and categories are found in the NDE texts studied in this thesis.
SECTION A

The Middle Egyptian *jn* construction in NDE

I. Examples with a perfective participle for the past.

(i) Non-literary texts

3.1

\[ jn \mathcal{r} \hspace{1mm} m\tilde{s}\tilde{s} \hspace{1mm} \text{hm.f} \]
\[ ntf \ p\mathcal{w} \ k\mathcal{m}3 \ p\mathcal{3} \ nfrw.f \]
\[ sj3.n.f \ \mathcal{sw} \ m \ l\mathcal{nt} \ s3 \ n \ hh\mathcal{w} \ r \ jrt \]
\[ nswt \ bj3t \]

It was Re who formed his majesty, it was he that created his beauties; he recognised him as one to be chosen from a million to be king of Upper and Lower Egypt.

(Nauri Decree, 46/12)

This is a ME formation - two participial statements both with the perfective participle. The second uses *pw* as the copula.

These are followed by a ME *\$\mathcal{d}m.n.f*, which may possibly be emphatic.

3.2

\[ ntt \ jt3 \ p\mathcal{j}3 \ h3 \ n \ nbnfr \]
\[ m \ m\mathcal{3}\mathcal{g}t \ n\mathcal{w} \ m \ bj3t \]
\[ **qd.n \ hrj3 \ m \ bj3t** \]
\[ bn \ jnk \ r \ jt3 \ sw \]

"It was you, who stole this chisel of Nebnufer.

Is it true or is it not?" Then Heria answered:

"No. It was not I who stole it."

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 7,8)

An affirmative and a corresponding negative participial statement. (Cerny & Groll 1975: Type I).
The second has \( r.jt3 \) for \( jjt3 \), a specific formation of the participle for the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. The first has no prothetic yod or \( r \).

\( \pi \, \pi \) is the independent pronoun \( ntt \)

\( m \, m3^{c}t \, n3w \) is negation of a \( nfr \, sw \) adjectival question.

(ii) **Examples in the Literary Texts**

**3.3**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{jw.k} & \, m \, s3 \, mrwt \, n \, \text{fdt} \\
\text{jn} & \, \text{nbw} \, \text{wd} \, s \, n.k \, p3j \, jn3m3
\end{align*}
\]

As you pursue (your) sister's love, it is the Golden One, who has decreed her to you, my friend

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, G III/5)

A perfective participle.

This could possibly also be Late Egyptian Group A, category 1. \((jn \, A.f \, sdm.\text{sw})\) (Groll 1967:48)

**3.4**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lr} \, \text{jw} \, \text{jk} & \, \text{jf} \, \text{jt} \, \text{bd} \, \text{r} \, s3^{c}n3 \, ntrw
\end{align*}
\]

Although it was I who made barley and emmer to nourish the gods.

(Horus and Seth, 57/6/7)

This is Frandsen's (1974) Function D, viz.

a \( jw \) preceded by \( lr \).

The participle \( jrj \) here is not preceded by a prothetic yod.

**3.5**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{jn} & \, j \, n.k \, thnw \, m \, 3bw \\
\text{jw} & \, \text{jk} \, \text{jf} \, \text{ms} \, \text{jnr}
\end{align*}
\]

I brought you obelisks from Elephantine, and it was I, who fetched stones.

(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh, 38/7)
The participle is not preceded by the LE prothetic yod, and \( jrij \) is used as an auxiliary verb to \( ms \).

3.6
\[ jh \ p3j \ jrjm \ ... \]
What is this, which you are doing (here)?
(Doomed Prince, 4/5)

3.7
\[ ntf \ jdp\.wj \]
It is he who brought me up.
(Two Brothers, 12/16 - 13/1)

Cleft sentence Type I.

3.8
\[ m \ n3j.n \ snw \]
\[ ntf \ m \ c3w \ n \ mhwt \ ... \]
It is our brothers, who are chiefs of tribes ...
\[ dj \ jwtn \ n \ hm.f \]
who have sent us to his majesty
(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh, 104/1)

\( ntj \) is the ME relative adjective.
\( dj \ jwtn \) is participle of \( dj = \) to cause \( jwtn = \) us to come.

3.9
\[ jw \ m \ p3 \ hr \ hsj \]
\[ n \ ht3 \]
\[ dj \ jwtn \]
For it was the vile foe from Khatti, who had sent them to observe where his majesty was.
\[ r \ ptr \ p3 \ ntj \ hm.f \ jm \]
(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh, 106/7)
3.10

ntf dj jwtn r ptr  It is he, who sent us to observe where
p3 ntj hm fj jm  his majesty is.

(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh, 110/5)

The above three examples all have the causative dj before the verb.

3.11

mdt m.djt  Who is it that has spoken with you?

(Two Brothers, 14/1,2)

This is the interrogative pronoun m ("who") used in the jn construction, and
fuses with jn to form a new word in ME , Coptic NIM
(Brunner 1979:39).

II. Examples with an imperfective participle for the Present.

3.12

ntk 3h n nb.f (for .k)  It is you who serves your lord, who
šnl šmdt  nourishes your people.

(Papyrus Lansing, 115/4)

Probable imperfective participles.

3.13

m jmn wcf sw m drtf  It is Amun, who curbs him with his
hand.

(Merneptah's stele, 17/12-14)
3.14

\[ mk \ ntk \ \text{wh}3.\text{st} \ n.k. \]

Behold, it is you who are bestirring them for yourself.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 27/14)

This is not a pseudoverbal construction of ME. \textit{mk} here is followed by an independent personal pronoun and not by a dependent personal pronoun.

3.15

\[ ntk \ \text{Sf}3 \ hmsj \ hnw \ rwj.k \]

You are one who sits grandly (exalted) in your house.

(Papyrus Lansing, 115/1)

3.16

\[ dw.\text{o} \ ntr.f \ pw \ \text{Sp} \ r.f \]

Bad, (it can mean that) it is (even) his (own) god who may be blind towards him.

(Dream interpretation Ex. 80 (p. 100) r.8 18.b)

In a nominal cleft sentence \textit{pw} follows the nominal subject immediately.

III. Examples with a Prospective \textit{Sp mf} (not a participle) for the Future.

(i) Non-literary NDE texts:

3.17

\[ m \ ps\text{gt} \ \text{Shn.sn} \ hnC.f \]

It is the Ennead who will deal with him.

(Kanais-Wady Mia, 69/7)
It is the great ones, the lords of the necropolis who will make their reckoning/(judgement) with him.

(Kanais-Wady Mia, 70/4)

(ii) Literary NDE texts

3.19

Sander-Hansen 1933:29, 13-15

As for anyone who will be deaf to this inscription, Osiris will be after him, while Isis will be after his wife, while Horus will be after his children And it is all the noblemen of the necropolis who will dispute with him.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III (Groll 1985:101)

In Literary LE, the *jw* of the Third Future may act as a base for adverbial phrases.

The *jw* of *jṛj wṣjr m.s3.f* takes the form *jṛj* before a nominal subject, although it acts as a base for the adverbial phrase. It is sufficient to maintain that *jw.f r šḥ* of the Third Future and *jṛj wṣjr m.s3.f* are in complementary relationship.

The *jn*-construction is identical to that of Kanais 70/4.

3.20

"It is it (the eye of every god) which will make an end of all its foes". So they say.

(Merneptah's stele, 16/2)

A prospective *šḏm.f.*
SECTION B

The Late Egyptian cleft sentences in NDE.

(i) Non-literary texts:

3.21

\[ ntt \; jjt \; p3j \; h3 \; n \; nbnfr \]
\[ m \; m^3c \; n3w \; m \; bj3t \]
\[ dd.n \; hrj3 \; m \; bj3t \]
\[ bn \; jnk \; r \; jjt \; Sw \]

"It was you, who stole this chisel of Nebnufer.
Is it true or is it not?" Then Heria answered:
"No. It was not I who stole it."
(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 7,8)

An affirmative and a corresponding negative participial statement. (Type I).
The second has \( r.jjt \) for \( j.jjt \), a specific formation of the participle for the eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. The first has no prothetic yod or \( r. \)

\( \bar{\text{?}} \; \bar{\text{?}} \) is the independent pronoun \( ntt \)
\[ m \; m^3c \; n3w \] is negation of a \( nfr \; Sw \) adjectival question.

3.22

\[ hr \; ntt \; pw \; cnh\; .sn \]

For that it is on which they live.
(Nauri Decree, 47/6)

A ME cleft sentence, including \( pw \), corresponding perhaps to LE type VI participial statement. \( cnh \) is an intransitive verb.
3.23

bn jnk r jt3j św  

It was not I who stole it.  

(Hieratic Ostracon Recto 8)

A negative participial statement *r. jt3j = jjt3j*, a specific formation of the participle for the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties (Groll 1973:69).

Note - the time indication of this Type I cleft sentence is identical to *bwpw.f štp.f*. The negative however is *bn jnk* (Černý and Groll 1975:527).

3.24

mtw. tw gmt r ḏd  

jnk jt3 p3j ḥ3  

If it will be found that it is I that am the one who stole this chisel ....  

(Hieratic Ostracon 2 Recto 10-11)

The ḏd jnk šdm św pattern in an oath.

3.25

šḥt. ś pw hr djt n. ś  

mj šḥt ḫ r m wbn.f  

Its nobility is that which gives it splendour, like the horizon of Re at his rising (when he rises).  

(Nauri Decree, 47/9)

Or it could be LE - defined A + hr djt.

Another ME cleft sentence with copula pw for p3j.

---

1 *m wbn.f* is *m* + infinitive, and corresponds to Biblical Hebrew יבּוּבּ "in his coming" - temporal clause "when he comes".
Examples in Literary NDE texts.

3.26

\[ \text{It is your own mouth that has said it.} \]
\[ \text{It is your own wisdom that has judged you.} \]

(Horus and Seth, 45/11,12)

Note - Both \( jn \) + \( m \) here. This is unusual.

3.27

\[ \text{It is (only) sunlight which wakes the watchmen.} \]

(Merneptah's stele, 18/7)

\[ r. nhsj \equiv j. nhsj \text{ (cf. Ostracon Recto 8),} \]

An Eighteenth or Nineteenth Dynasty participle.

3.28

\[ \text{Who was it who quarrelled with you?} \]

(Blinding of Truth by Falsehood, 33/11)

(A \( njm \) \( j.\hat{sd} \) \( sw \) pattern Group A, category (ii).

cf.
3.29

$m njm mdt m.dj.t$  
Who was it who quarrelled with you?  
(Two Brothers, 14/1-2)

3.30

$p3j.j. s\tilde{n} \tilde{s}rt j.k3mn.j$  
It was my young brother that blinded me.  
(Blinding of Truth by Falsehood, 33/11-12)

Note no $jn$ or $m$ precedes the noun.

A $p3j.j A \tilde{s}dm \tilde{sw}$ pattern.

(Group A, category (ii))

3.31

$jw jnk j.\tilde{jrj}.tn m.nht$  
Seeing that it was I who have transformed you into champions, and seeing that it was I only that was capable of creating barley and wheat ($jrj$ + a direct object with a zero article) to nourish the gods .... and no god nor any goddess was able to do it.  
(Horus and Seth, 57/5-8)

Group A, category (iv) (Groll 1967:55)

3.32

$hr p3 c3 r.j$  
As the elder, it is he who reared me.  
(Two Brothers, 12/16 -13/1)
This, of course, is identical to ME _ntf_ + a perfective participle. These forms began in ME, persisted into NDE and some continued into LE.

In LE, this is classified as Group A, category (iv).

3.33

_hr.mk ptr ntk j.wpt.tw qsk_  

Behold, see, it is you, who judged yourself by yourself.

(Horus and Seth, 46/15-16)

Type I (Cerný and Groll 1975:525) or Group A, category (iv). (Groll 1967:56).

3.34

(The _jw ntk j.jrj sdm_ pattern as the commencement of a narrative parallel with the "_ntk sdm_ and the _ntk j.jrj sdm_ + a direct object with a zero article" patterns (Groll 1967:57).

_jw p3j.f sn srj m.dj.f mj thyr n srj_

... And his younger brother was with him like a son,

_jw ntf j.jrj n.f h.bsw_

so that it was he who had to make clothes for him

_jw.f hr smt m.s3 n3j.f j3wt r sh.t_

(j.jrj + a direct object with a zero article, denoting obligation)

_jw ntf j.jrj sk3_

whereas he (the young brother) was going behind his cattle to the field, and it was he who had to plough for him (j.jrj _sdm_).

_ntf cw3j n.f_

It was he who reaped for him (_sdm_), so that it was he who did (actually) every work in the field for him (j.jrj + a direct object followed by _nb_, i.e. a defined direct object).

(Two Brothers, 9/12-16)
Behold, it is the brother of Isis on the mother's side into whom you have bitten.

(Horus and Seth, 49/10,11)

The second member of the pattern is a defined relative form.

You are he who offers counsel to the orphan (one who has no mother).

(Prayers as School Texts, 60/9,10)

The first member is an independent pronoun and the second a defined participle.

What kind of herb is it that Seth eats here with you?

(Horus and Seth, 52/12,13)

The first member is a noun and the second a relative sentence introduced by ntj.

Who is she, who is coming/has come (actually 'is already here')?

(Horus and Seth, 50/2)
The stative, actually the old perfective of a verb of motion describes the state achieved after the movement has been accomplished.

This is Group B, category (vii) (Groll 1967:75) or Type XIV (Cerny and Groll 1975:535).

3.39
\[ jh \ p3j \ jrj.m \ldots \]

What is this, which you are doing (here)?

(Doomed Prince, 4/5)

3.40
\[ jh \ p3 \ ntj \ hr \ jsm \ m.s3 \ p3 \ s <3 \]

What is this that goes behind the big man?

(Doomed Prince, 2/4,5)

(\( jsm \) follows \( hr \) even when denoting present continuous)

Group B, category (vii)

3.41
\[ jh \ j3 \ ntj \ hr \ rmn.k \]
\[ jw.f \ hr \ dd \ n.\$ \]
\[ st \ bdtj \ h3r \ (3) \ jt \ h3r \ (2) \]
\[ gmjg \ (5) \ n3 \ ntj \ hr \ rmn.k \ (for \ .j) \]

How much is it that you have on your shoulder?

And he said to her -

"Three sacks of wheat and two sacks of barley. They are altogether five sacks that are on my shoulder."

(Two Brothers, 12/6-7)

The "A (a numeral) \( n3 \ ntj \ m \ prc\)" pattern as a reply to a question.
Saying to me "Here she is" is what revives my heart

It is (only) her name that can uplift me (my spirits)

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, Love Songs, Verso C4,9-10)

It is (only) the entering in order to go out (again) of her messengers that can revive my heart.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, Love Songs, Verso C4-9-10)

The above two examples are both Group B, category (vii).

What is it that they should do?

(Horus and Seth, 59/15)

This is the pattern, i.e. Third Future, a variation of Type XVI.

It is you that judge between a wicked man and a righteous man.

(Two Brothers, 15/12,13)

- possibly a variant of Type XV, which would have a $rt$ after $ntj$

Group B, category (xi)
CONCLUSION

The ME $jn$-construction was a simple matter in which the emphasised noun subject preceded a predicate, which was:

- A perfective participle for the past
- An imperfective participle for the present
- or A prospective $sdm.f$ for the future.

All these forms are still found in NDE.

In LE, there was an evolution to an analytical language, which could now express the "participal statement" or cleft sentence in many ways. The first member is a noun, independent pronoun, demonstrative or infinitive, and the second member is a relative clause.

These forms occur in LE and in NDE and they are found side by side with the pre-existing ME forms.
CHAPTER 4

THE MIDDLE EGYPTIAN PSEUODOVERBAL CONSTRUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The Middle Egyptian pseudoverbal construction is a term which has been chosen for want of a better, to bring under one common head those sentences or clauses in which either the old perfective (pseudoparticiple) or hr (or m or r) + infinitive serves as predicate to a preceding noun or pronoun. These have the common characteristic that while expressing the meaning of ordinary verbal sentences, they conform to the pattern of the sentence with adverbial predicate.

The ME pseudoverbal constructions, in which the predicate is formed either by a pseudoparticiple or an infinitive following one of the prepositions hr, m, or r can be distinguished from the LE First Present only when the subject is a pronoun. The LE First Present has specific pronominal preformatives, while the pronominal subject appears with a supporting particle in the ME pseudoverbal construction (e.g. jw, mk (with a dependent pronoun), wnn or wn.jn).1

1 jw takes a suffix pronoun, mk a dependent pronoun, i.e. jw.f or mk.sw)

The LE First Present with the pronominal preformatives tw.j, tw.k, tw.t, sw, st, tw.n, tw.m, st and tw.tw (sw and st are proclitic, and not enclitic as the dependent pronouns sw and st are) or with a defined noun, a bare noun or an undefined noun is followed by a non-verbal predicate, a transitive verb (in the stative or the infinitive - preceded by hr or m) or an intransitive verb.
Note that in the Hieratic Ostracon (Černý and Gardiner 1957:Plate XLVI and Groll 1973:69), - Recto 5 we have

4.1

*b₃w nṯr hpr.*

The power of god exists.

Groll calls this a First Present pattern, the second position of which is filled by a stative of the verb *hpr.* It is a specific LE form. Its ME equivalent - a pseudoverbal construction - is either *jw b₃w hpr* or *mk b₃w hpr* (Gardiner 1982:319-334).

So using this as a point of departure, the author has distinguished the ME pseudoverbal formations from the LE First Present forms. The former have pronominal subjects or nominal subjects with supporting particles (e.g. *jw* or *mk*) or with *wnn* or *wn.jn*. The LE First Present forms have their specific pronominal preformatives or unsupported nouns.

**ME pseudoverbal constructions**

I. **Examples in the Non-Literary NDE Texts**

4.2

*jw.k ꝙ nṯr hpr nṯf*  

You are here (?) established on his throne.  

(Nauri Decree, 47/1)

The predicate is a pseudoparticiple with a passive meaning.

4.3

*jw.k t3 nj nṯf*  

You are on earth, organising the two lands and making festive (or adorning) the temples.  

(Nauri Decree, 47/2)

² *t₃* is actually a demonstrative adjective = this, that. Its function here is uncertain.
The predicates are hr + infinitive with transitive verbs having active sense. The action, itself, its course is considered.

4.4

wnn.sn hwj mkj
jw s3 nb jm.sn hr jrt lnt.f
jrt3 t3 hwt ...

They shall be privileged and protected, while each one of them is pursuing his calling, which is carried out in the house ...

(Nauri Decree, 52/9,10)

The first line is a ME pseudoverbal construction in which the predicates are pseudoparticiples with passive sense, the wnn.sn indicating future tense. The second line could be a ME pseudoverbal construction as a main sentence, but is more likely to be a LE circumstantial First Present with hr + infinitive.

4.5

wnn k3w.sn mn
sw3h df3w.sn

Their provisions shall endure, their foods shall last ...

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 68/14 - 69/1)

The first line is ME pseudoverbal construction with the auxiliary wnn indicating future sense (Brunner 1979:30, 34), while the second line is a ME initial prospective ñdm.f

\[^{3}\text{ jrt is a passive participle.}\]
In particular, the chief of the troop of gold washers shall have a free hand in delivering their produce of gold to the House of Menmare.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 70/1)

II. ME pseudoverbal constructions in the Literary NDE Texts

4.7

mk jb.j hdn

My heart is troubled.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, C2/1,2)

The predicate is a pseudoparticiple with an adjective verb, expressing a state of being.

mk . šw m jwj jbf

He is mindless/foolish (lit.) - one who has not his heart

jwj is the ME negative relative adjective, corresponding to the affirmative ntj.

4.8

jr m33 s šw m rsut

If a man sees himself in a dream while his teeth are falling out

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III, 8.12 recto)

(Groll 1985:77, ex. 7)

Nominal actor expression, predicate is stative of an intransitive verb.

4.9

njwtf pbr.tj h3(f)

... while his townsfolk are surrounding him.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III, 2.5 recto and p. 78, ex. 9)
4.10

\( hr \ jr \ mr \ ht \ hrw \ jnw \ m \ s3 \ mn \)  
\( wn.jn \ p3j.f \ k3 \ sjm \ 3bd \ jnw \)  
\( m.dj \ p3 \ mnjw \ k3 \ n \ grg \)  
\( wn.jn \ grg \ hr \ sjm \ r \ sjmj \ r \ ptr \)  
\( n3j.f \ k3w \)

Now many days after this (when) his ox had spent many months with the herdsmen of Falsehood, Falsehood came to the fields to view his cattle.

(Truth and Falsehood, 34/4-7)

This is the verb \( wnn \) appearing in the \( jn \)-form, particularly to indicate a sequence of events.

4.11

\( jw.\#n \ nhj.tj \ wr \ m \ jjrr.k \)  

They are strong and rich through your help (through what you have done - a LE relative form).

(Prayers as School Texts, 60/9)

4.12

\( jw.j \ ckJ.kwj \ m.b3h \ nbw \)  

I enter in before the lords

(Prayers as School Texts, 86/2,3)

The predicate, a pseudoparticiple is a verb of motion, when the result of the action is being considered.

4.13

\( jw.j \ rh.kwj \ phj.f \)  

I know his might.

(Prayers as School Texts, 18/3)

The predicate is a pseudoparticiple of a transitive verb. It usually has passive sense, but \( rh \) "know" is the exception.
Then the servant went and reported it to his majesty, Iph.

(The Doomed Prince, 2/7,8)

I am committed to Fate.

(The Doomed Prince, 2/12,13)

We are here, passing the time in leaping.

(The Doomed Prince, 4/6,7)

So she took fat and grease and made as though she had been cruelly beaten.

(Two Brothers, 13/10,11)

Lo, the swift will catch the swift.

(Merneptah stele, 17/12)

Wait! I come.

(Merneptah stele, 18/13)

An unusual example. No subject attached to mk.
The above two are unusual forms. The author is uncertain whether any similar examples existed in ME, so maybe these are NDE hybrid forms.

4.20

wnn.j hr ʂgb n.sn
bw ʂdm.n n.j wɛ jm.sn
jw.j hr ç§

I keep on shouting for them, but none of them heeds when I call.

(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh, 41/3)

jw.j hr ç§ is LE circumstantial First Present.

4.21

wn.jn.sn hr hpr çɛɛ w3w
hr śn. t3

Thereupon they stood at a distance, touching the ground.

(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh, 88/9)

4.22

wn.jn p3 wr hr ḥṣj n ḥt3
hr h3b hr hr sw3š
hr mn.j

Then the vile chief of Khatti wrote and worshipped/paid honour to my name.

(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh, 89/12 - 90/4)

4.23

jw.š rwd m mnɛt s3.š

She is constant in nursing her son.

(Papyrus Lansing, 101/16)

4.24

jw.k 3dt m phtj
jw.k nnh m ç.t.k nbt
jw.k hwrw m hɛ.k

You are lacking in strength, you are weak in all your limbs, you are poor in body.

(Papyrus Lansing, 106/10,11)
4.25
mk. wj ḫr mtr.k
I instruct you.
(Papyrus Lansing, 107/6)

4.26
jw.k ẖb3.tw m mnḥt
You are dressed in fine clothes
...
jw.k ẖpr.tw m śmšw
You are supplied with attendants.
(Papyrus Lansing, 107/9,10)

4.27
jw.w ḫr ēk prj
They go in and out
m n3jw wšḥt pr.nšwt
in the halls of the palace
chny wḏ3 śnb jw.w
lpḥ⁴ and say
jmj ṯy b3kw
"Get labourers"
(Papyrus Lansing, 108/2,3)

The jw.w followed by the quoted speech is common without a following ḫr dd.

4.28
jw.k nṯj.tj bẖ.tj rḥ nb
You flourish and prosper every day.
(Papyrus Lansing, 112/6,7)

4.29
mk.ṣw jj
Now, here he comes.
(Horus and Seth, 51/8)

4.30
wn wn.ḥwj m wḏ.w n mntjw
I am initiated in the decrees of Mont.
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 39/9,10)

⁴ lpḥ = life, prosperity, health
It is unusual for wn to precede this sentence.

This is unusual. Perhaps it occurs only in NDE.

4.31

\textit{jw kij hr j3d.j} \\
Someone is persecuting me. \\
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 17/1)

4.32

\textit{jw.j lhtt.kwj} \\
I have retreated (still further) \\
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 22/5)

4.33

\textit{mk jj.kwj mh.kwj m j3wt.k} \\
Behold, I am come, full of your office. \\
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 23/7-9)

This is unusual. \textit{mk} usually bears \textit{wj}

This too is unusual. Perhaps it occurs only in NDE.

The ME pseudoverbal construction can be negated:
- with a dependent pronoun

\textit{nn wj \ldots hr \ldots} or

\textit{nn st \ldots}

(cf. LE First Present \textit{bn} \textit{tw.j} etc.)
The idea or concept of the pseudoverbal construction is negated by \( n \ \$dm.n.f \)

- \( r + \) infinitive is negated by \( nn \ \$dm.f \)

i.e. in the latter two, the whole sentence structure is altered, and \( n \) or \( nn \) now precedes finite verbs.

Examples of \( nn \ wj \ldots \) or \( nn \ st \) may be

4.34

\[
\begin{align*}
bn \ . \ tw & jpt.tj \ m \ k3j \ n \ mrw.st \\
& \text{You are not expert in the way of binding it together.}
\end{align*}
\]

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 36/2-4)

This is \( bn \ . \ tw \) rather than \( nn \ tw \ldots \), but a LE First Present would be \( bn \ tw.k \)
+ stative. So this is somewhere between ME and LE.

Note that this is followed immediately by the LE

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bw } \text{st(sic)} & \\
& \text{You do not know how to tie it.}
\end{align*}
\]

4.35

\[
\begin{align*}
bn \ \$w \ nw & n \ t3.w \ nh3.w \\
\text{bw } \text{p3} & \\
hjn & \text{He does not look out for dangerous winds; he does not search for the current.}
\end{align*}
\]

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 43/11-13 (which is really Papyrus Koller))

This is probably negation of LE 1 Praesens followed by a LE \( bw \ \$dm.f \)
4.36

mk nfr.w.k htp mc.k nn kndt

Your gods are pleased with you, not being cross.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 7/5,6)

4.37

nn sw ndm n ndt.f

It is not good for grinding.

(Papyrus Lansing, 108/7,8)

It is not First Present bn sw, it is rather the negation of a pseudoverbal mk . sw + an adjectival verb.

and note

4.38

bw jj. n.j kd m jb.j n hrw

nn sw hr c.j m grh

Sleep does not enter my heart by day, nor is it upon me at night.

(Papyrus Lansing, 109/16)

Here too there is a LE bw sdm.f followed by a nn sw . hr c.j negating a mk sw + a non-verbal sentence.

CONCLUSION

The pseudoverbal construction is a ME verbal formation and occurs in NDE too. This, clearly evolved into the LE First Present, which occurs in both NDE and in LE (and not in ME).

Many examples of the Middle Egyptian pseudoverbal construction are well attested to in both the non-literary and literary NDE texts.

Both the ME pseudoverbal construction and the LE First Present are found together in 4.4, while in 4.5 there is a Middle Egyptian pseudoverbal construction, followed by an initial prospective sdm.f, expressing the same concept.
The particle \textit{mk} in pseudoverbal constructions is usually used with a dependent pronoun directly attached to the supporting particle. (Brunner 1979:33). There are exceptions in these texts e.g. \textit{mk} before a noun (4.18) and \textit{mk} with no subject, either nominal or pronominal (4.19, 4.33).

An interesting example is a hybrid form - negated (4.34).

| So NDE clearly spans both ME and LE, with many examples of both the ME pseudoverbal construction and the later LE First Present. |
CHAPTER 5

LATE EGYPTIAN FIRST PRESENT

INTRODUCTION

This chapter follows the previous one, because the author is of opinion that the Late Egyptian First Present derived from the Middle Egyptian pseudoverbal construction. The latter can be distinguished from the former only when the subject is a pronoun. The Late Egyptian First Present has specific pronominal preformatives, while the pronominal subject appears with a supporting particle in the Middle Egyptian pseudoverbal construction.

Examples will be shown with -

1. Non verbal sentences
2. Transitive verbs
3. Intransitive verbs

Regarding the use of intransitive verbs in this way, it is well to remember that the perfect active šdm.f can only occur with transitive verbs. Intransitive verbs fill the gap usually with the First Present (and occasionally with the emphatic šdm.f). (LE šdm.f's with intransitive verbs must be prospective or emphatic).

1 Note that the preposition hr (or r or m) before an infinitive is almost always written in these texts. This is a feature of NDE (Groll 1982:11ff). Non-occurrence is common in the Twentieth Dynasty, hr occurring in only 0-1% of times, whereas in the Nineteenth Dynasty, it ranges from 60-100%.
The author will provide examples of intransitive verbs and their different meanings when used with the stative, with the hr + infinitive, and rarely, with the m + infinitive with verbs of motion. (Groll 1969(b):184).

I. Non-literary NDE texts -

(i) Non-verbal sentences

5.1
št m.dj.j m.mtr

They are with me in agreement.

(Hittite Treaty, 229/13)

(ii) Transitive verbs

5.2

jst grt ntr hr ššm.f
r ĝt spr mr.n.f

God was guiding him so as to grant the request of one whom he loved.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/8,9)

First Present + hr + infinitive.

5.3
št r šswn hdj šhrw.j

They shall punish him, who spoils my plans.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 69/5)

The r - (unusual) gives it a future sense.
(iii) Intransitive verbs

5.4

\( tw.n \ hr \ ph.n.\$ \ cnh.n \)

If we reach it, we live.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 65/9)

A verb of motion with \( hr \) + infinitive, indicating present time

5.5

\( fr \ m.ht \ hm.f \ m \ tsj \)
\( m \ rhw \ jtw \ cs3w \ ... \)

After his majesty had gone up for many miles ...

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 65/16 - 66/1)

Verb of motion with \( m \) + infinitive usually indicates the continuous present tense.

5.6

\( chc.w.sn \ hr \ tkn \ hr \ pt \)

Their heaps reach the sky

(Nauri decree, 50/4)

A verb of motion + \( hr \) + infinitive indicating present time.

5.7

\( jb \ hrw \ m \ 3bd\)t

The heart is content in Abydos.

(Nauri decree, 52/5)

An adjectival verb in the stative indicating a non-progressive present tense.

5.8

\( h3t \ m \ t\)hlt

Hearts exult

(Nauri decree, 47/8)
A verb expressing an emotional state with $m +$ infinitive.

5.9

$hrdw\ nb\ ntj\ r\ hpr$
$hr\ nht\ nf\ nhh$

All generations yet to be wish him eternity.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 65/10)

A non-conclusive verb $hr +$ infinitive, indicating a non-progressive present tense and cannot take a stative.

5.10

$b3w\ ntr\ hpr$

The power of god exists.

(Hieratic Ostracon Recto 5,)

Stative of the verb $hpr = \text{"to be", \text{"to become".}$

cf.

5.11

$mnj\ hrd\ hpr$

Loss has resulted.

(Nauri Decree, 55/8,9)

$hr +$ infinitive of the verb $hpr$

The stative of $hpr$ appears to indicate a present tense, $hr +$ infinitive indicating a past or present perfect tense. (As with verbs of dying or living. Note that $cnh$ "to live" occurs only in the stative.)

5.12

$dr\ ntrw$
$w3t\ ksn.tj\ snm.tj$
$hft\ nsjw.t.j$

A way that was arduous since (the time of) the gods has been made pleasant in my reign.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/13)
An interesting chiastic sentence pattern (dr ntrw is balanced by hft nsjtwj). (Litchtheim 1976:56, footnote 6). The two verbs following the noun w3r are both stative. They are adjectival verbs probably indicating a non-progressive present tense and not indicating ongoing activity as a hr + infinitive might.

II. Literary NDE texts -

(i) Non-verbal sentences

5.13
ptr št mj šbtt

Behold she is like the star-goddess (Sothis)
(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, C1/1)

5.14
ptr tw.k m.dj.j m šrjt (sic)

Now you are to me as a son.
(Doomed Prince, 6/5,6)

5.15
tw.j dj m.dj.t šrjt nfrt

I am here with you, beautiful girl.
(Horus and Seth, 44/15,16)

5.16
tw.k m nswt nfr nw t3 mrj
tw.k m nb ɛnh wd3 ıntb nfr
n t3.w nbw r 33c ınth knc ɛt

You are the good king of Egypt. You are the good lord, lph of all lands for ever and ever.
(Horus and Seth, 59/11,12)

The m is the m of predication.
5.17

$bn \ tw.k \ m \ ss$

You are no scribe.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 21/2)

The negation of the First Present, and cf.

5.18

$bn \ tw.k \ m \ ss \ jwn3$

In very sooth you are no scribe.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 22/7,9)

negated by $bn \ ... \ jwn3$

5.19

$tw.k \ mj \ hrj.c \ n \ t3w$

$jwf \ ss3 \ m \ p3 \ ch3w$

You are like the mate of a skipper, who is skilled in (managing) the boat.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 43/5-7)

First Present, followed by a circumstantial First Present. The converter $jw$ is used here as a virtual relative following an indefinite noun (Frandsen’s (1974) Function B of the converter $jw$).

5.20

$sw \ m \ b3w \ n \ ntr.w \ nbw \ mn.nfr$

He is in the power of the gods, the lords of Memphis.

(Merneptah’s Stele, 15/1)

5.21

$\frac{\text{(sic)}}{h3\text{ist} \ nb}$

$tw.k \ mj \ mn.tj \ hr$

You are like Montu in every country

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 14/2,3)
5.22

\( hr \, mk \, tw.t \, m.dj.j \, m \, \$hr \, n \, mwt \)
\( hr \, p3j.t \, h3j \, m.dj.j \, m \, \$hr \, n \, jt \)
\( hr \, p3 \, c3 \, r.j \, ntf \, \$hpr.wj \)

Lo, you are to me as a mother, your husband is to me as a father, and as for the elder, it is he, who brought me up.

(Two Brothers, 12/15 - 13/1)

\( mk \, tw.t \) in Line 1, is reminiscent of \( mk \) \( tw \) in ME pseudoverbal constructions but the \( tw.t \) is clearly LE First Present.

Note \( ntf \, \$hpr.wj \) changes the sequence and the emphasis. It is not \( sw \, hr \, \$hpr.j \) but a ME \( jn \) construction.

5.23

\( st \, mj \, p3 \, snhmn \)
\( m.dj \, c\$3w.sn \)

They were like locusts in their multitude.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 19/12)

5.24

\( w3h \, k3 \, n \, jt.j \, jmn \)
\( h3 \, tw.j \, hr \, kmt \)

As the ka of my father, Amun endures, would that I were in Egypt.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 61/2)

A First Present after

\( \)

(ii) Transitive verbs

5.25

\( wrt \, nhb.tw \, hr \, st.\$ \)

The chariot is harnessed in its place.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, G1/3)

Stative verb.
5.26
tw.j wd.kw j n 3 ë3 ë. p3 m3 ë. p3
hftjw p3 jw

I am given over to three fates, the crocodile, the snake, the dog.

(Stative verb.  
(Doomed Prince, 6/11,12)

5.27
hr tw.j šm3 p3 p3 (sic)
hrt n p3.r e m.mnt

For I slay the enemy of Pre every day.

(Horus and Seth, 41/12,13)

5.28
šw hr jrt mh 30 p4 hr jwn

It makes 30 cubits, stretched upon the ground.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 28/8)

5.29
jit.n.f spjt
šw 3k m n3 ntj bjn
šw šbn m n3 mh3jt šššw
jrt.f šw m kšj m çm.mw.

He takes what remains and he joins the ranks of the wicked. He mingles with the people of the Shosu and disguises himself as an Asiatic.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 32/4-6)

Note the changes in sentences. The first is a šdm.n.f, the second and third a First Present, and the fourth, a šdm.f.

5.30
ptr tw.j hr jif.k r šmdt n çnh

Look, I make you into a staff of life:

(Papyrus Lansing, 13/14)
First Present hr + infinitive.

5.31
\[ \text{p3 jrj.j nb hr bpr} \]
\[ \text{tw.j mj mntw} \]
\[ \text{tw.j hr stj hr jmntj.j hr kf^c m smh.j} \]
All I did succeeded, I was like Mont, I shot on my right, grasped with my left.
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 44/8-13)

5.32
\[ \text{wc hr sm3 snw.f} \]
Each one slayed his neighbour.
(Wars of Sethos I, 9/5)

5.33
\[ \text{jmnn hr dj n.f p3 hp^s} \]
Amun gives to him the might.
(Wars of Sethos I, 19/4)

(iii) Intransitive Verbs

Group I: Verbs of Motion

A. \[ \text{tw.j pr.tw - stative Past Tense.} \]

5.34
\[ \text{sw jj.tj hr d^s.st r m33.j} \]
She has come back herself to see me.
(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, C3/6)

5.35
\[ \text{tw.k jj.tj hnw.tw m st3.w c3.w} \]
You have come furnished with great secrets.
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 20/6,7)
You came back today and left no heirs.  
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 95/3)

B. The preposition $hr +$ infinitive = Present Tense

You forsake writing, you depart and flee (repeatedly).  
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 42/6)

Herdsmen do not cross the river’s floods.  
(Merneptah’s Stele, 18/11)

C. The preposition $m +$ infinitive = Present Continuous Tense

The young men bowed/or did obeisance (and continually $do$.)  
(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, C3/8)

This is equivalent to the Coptic qualitative verb of motion.

You are busy, (continually) coming and going.  
(Papyrus Lansing, 102/4,5)
She walked under the trees.

(Horus and Seth, 44/5,6)

Note that hr jr + First Present refers to past time.

Group II: Verbs of dying and of living

You caused Pharaoh to destroy the cedar that I might no longer live. But, behold, I am still alive.

(Two Brothers, 25/11-13)

cnh is always in the stative, when filling the second position of the First Present; never hr + infinitive.

This is present tense.
tmt djt cnh.kwj is a ME negative purpose clause.
cf. r tm djt + non-initial prospective.

He is dead while yet alive.

(Papyrus Lansing, 108/6)

Sw mt is a stative and present tense
jw.f cnh is a circumstantial First Present.

(Frandsen’s Function A) (1974).
Group III: Verbs of Posture

5.44

\[ jst \ jr \ hr \]  
\[ sw \ sdr \ hrj \ wc \ nh3 \ sws3c \]

As for Horus, he was lying under a shenusha-tree.

(Horus and Seth, 50/8)

This is stative, and a present tense.

5.45

\[ tw.tr \ dj \ hmstj. tj \ hr \ jrt \ jlj \ mrc \]

Why are you sitting here again?

(Horus and Seth, 47/9)

This is stative and a present continuous tense.

"dj" - "here" and "jm" - "there" can convey different time indications when used here through the distinctive use of jm or dj (Groll 1969(b):187).

5.46

\[ tw.k \ chc \ ... \ m.3h.st \]
\[ st \ hmstj \ hr \ w3w3 \]

You stand ... before them and they sit, deliberating.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 11/5,6)

Present tense, perhaps continuous.

5.47

\[ sw \ htp \ jmnt \]
\[ jw \ hc.t.f \ wd3 \]

He rests in the Amente (West)

his skin being whole.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 18/2)
This is probably present tense. \( jw \, hCtf \) is a circumstantial First Present with a stative verb.

5.48

\[
tw.n \, cht.wjn \, wc.wjn \, m \, hnw \, p3 \, h\text{rw}
\]

\[
mkh.wjn \, p3 \, mSC \, tn.htr
\]

We stand alone in the midst of battle, abandoned by soldiers and chariotsry

(Horus and Seth, 67/13 - 68/2)

\( cht.wjn \, wc.wjn \) and \( mkh.wjn \) are statives of first person, plural.

This refers to present tense.

**Group IV: Verbs of spending time**

5.49

\[
md3j.w \, Sdr \, n \, kd\text{w}
\]

Medjai (foreign tribes whose members were employed as police) were stretched out asleep.

(Merneptah's Stele, 18/7,9)

This is a stative of \( Sdr \). It seems that \( Sdr \) and \( wr\text{s} \) ("spend the day") are able to fill the second position of the First Present only when taking a stative form (and not a \( hr \) + infinitive). When taking a stative form, these verbs are descriptive of posture, rather than of spending time.

This refers to past tense, and the notion of "spending the day or night" is not permissible within the framework of the First Present.

Note too

5.50

\[
j\text{st} \, jr \, hr \, sw \, Sdr \, hrj \, wc \, nh3 \, sw\text{sc}
\]

As for Horus, he was lying (not "spending the night") under a shenusha tree.

(Horus and Seth, 50/8)
Group V: Adjectival verbs

5.51
*tw.k hwrw.tj*  
You are feeble.  
(Horus and Seth, 40/10)

5.52
*tw.k šwg.tj r A*  
You are more foolish than A  
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 18/3)

5.53
*tw.j jpt.jb m j3wt nb*  
I am experienced in every rank  
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 39/6)

5.54
*ḥ3ṭj.k šmn*  
Your heart is calm.  
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 39/17)

5.55
*šw rwd m ēwnt hr jnm* (יוֹאָש)  
It is overgrown with cypresses and oaks and cedars.  
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 31/3,4)

5.56
*ḥc.t.f g3h*  
Its limbs are weary, terror enters its limbs.  
(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, G1/III/2)

The first sentence is First Present, with an adjectival verb in the stative.  
The second has a verb of motion in the stative, indicating past tense.
The above examples have adjectival verbs in the stative indicating non-progressive present tense.

When ḫr + infinitive of an adjectival verb takes the second position of a First Present, it indicates an activity rather than a state.

5.57
tw.j ḫr t3m.kwj
r ḥ3 mj k3 ṣpd
I was ready to fight like an eager bull.
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 85/8)

"Ready" is an adjectival verb, but here we clearly have preposition ḫr + the stative! This may be a scribal error for ḫr + infinitive, which would possibly indicate that the readiness was an activity rather than a state.

Note that the next two examples show m + infinitive, with the verbs "to be anxious" and "to be joyful" respectively. They probably indicate present continuous tense, and possibly an activity rather than a state.

5.58
jb.f m hrt n ḥdm.w
His heart is anxious to hear it
(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, G1/I/2)

5.59
jb.j m r5wt
šḥḏ.k t3 m jn.k
My heart is joyful that you will brighten the earth with your lustre.
(Horus and Seth, 59/13,14)
Group VI: Verbs of Perception.

These do not take a stative form. They usually indicate present tense, and may denote either progressive or repeated action or ability or inability to perceive something.

5.60
mj.t tw.j hr m33.Ø w3j.Ø jm.j

Behold, I see (you) far away from me

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III - Spell against Nightmares, 10/11,12)

(Groll 1985:81).

mj.t is a ME non-enclitic particle. This First Present pattern with a hr + infinitive of a verb of perception is a typically Ramesside formation.

m33.Ø The pronominal suffix object (t) is expressed by a zero morpheme, a grammatical phenomenon which occurs in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties.

w3j.Ø is a stative form with zero ending, expressed by a zero morpheme.

5.61
hr jri.j kank.k m ht nbt
hr bn tw.k šdm

But though I beat you with every kind of stick, you do not listen.

(Papyrus Lansing, 101/10,11)

5.62
tw.k ptr p3j k3mn
ntj ḫmsj r m p3 šb3j p3j.k jt
p3j

You see the blind man who sits by the door; he is your father.

(Truth and Falsehood, 33/3,4)
5.63

hr h3 n sp n p3j
jwj m3c r.f r c nb
hr jw bn šw nw r.d.d nb t3 pšdt

A thousand times now, I have been in the right against him day after day, although he pays no attention to what the Ennead says.

(Horus and Seth, 55/15,16)

The last line is a negative First Present with a verb of perception. It is preceded by hr jw, making it a concessive clause (Function D of the jw converter of Frandsen) (1974).

**Group VII: Non-conclusive verbs**

(i.e. verbs denoting actions with can neither be initiated nor concluded voluntarily)

e.g. to love, to wish, to understand, to remember.

They may not take a stative form

5.64

hr jr p3 šw hr htp ...

And when the sun set ...

(Two Brothers, 14/15)

(and see Non-literary texts Kanais Wadi Mia 65/10) (5.9).

**Group VIII: Verbs denoting an emotional state**

5.65

p3 w cw hdn.w

The soldier suffers.

(Papyrus Lansing, 109/5)

Stative.
5.66

ptr tw nb m hbj hbj bw nfr

All who see you rejoice in good cheer.

(Papyrus Lansing, 115/2,3)

m + infinitive.

5.67

h3st nb h r jsd d r h3st f

All foreign lands tremble before him.

(Horus and Seth, 59/13)

Group IX: Verbs of speaking

e.g. dd. These may not take a stative form.

5.68

p3 msh hr dd n p3 3rj

The crocodile said to the youth.

(Doomed Prince, 8/15)

5.69

st hr jsd m n3 nht jrf mr np th m tjhnw

They relate the victories which Merneptah achieved over the Tjehenu.

(Stele of Merneptah, 18/1)

Examples of the verb hpr in First Present

(and see Non-literary texts)
5.70
\(p3 \ jrj \ nb \ hr \ hpr\)

\(hr + \) infinitive.

5.71
\(h3rw \ hpwrw \ m \ h3rt \ n \ t3 \ mrj\)

Stative.

5.72
\(hr \ jr \ m.ht \ t3 \ h\d\)
\(sn \ n \ hrw \ hpwrw \ ...\)

Stative.

Examples of the verb \(hr = \) to know

5.73
\(hr \ bn \ tw.tw \ hr \ wdC \ n.n\)

But they don't know how to judge between us.

(Horus and Seth, 55/14,15)

5.74
\(bw \ tmw.j \ (for \ rmw.j) \ n \ rm\)
\(r5w.(j) \ n \ p3j.sn \ c3m3\)
\(r.qd \ tw.k \ rh.wj\)

I would not weep before people, but would rejoice at their understanding that you know me.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, C4/3,4,5)
Probably a stative, with a pronominal suffix .wj

When the state aspect (i.e. the stative) of a certain verb expresses a past tense, the action aspect (i.e. ḫr + infinitive) expresses either a non-progressive or a progressive present tense.

CONCLUSION

There are many fully-developed Late Egyptian First Present forms in the Nineteenth Dynasty (NDE), but also many examples of the earlier Middle Egyptian pseudoverbal construction from which the First Present evolved. The ME pseudoverbal construction developed into the LE (and NDE) First Present.

The first sentence in 5.29 is a Middle Egyptian sd.f.n, the second and third Late Egyptian First Presents, and the fourth a sd.f, demonstrating the interesting appearance in context of Nineteenth Dynasty expression, combining many, varied verbal forms.

There are examples in both literary and non-literary NDE texts with non-verbal sentences, with transitive verbs and with intransitive verbs. Among the intransitive verbs, one find examples of -

verbs of motion,
verbs of dying and of living,
verbs of posture,
verbs of spending time,
adjectival verbs,
verbs of perception,
non-conclusive verbs,
verbs denoting an emotional state,

I have attempted to show the different nuances of meaning when a stative or when a ḫr + infinitive is used, indicating respectively a state or an activity.

r + infinitive is unusual, but probably gives the sentence a future sense (e.g. 5.3), while a verb of motion with m + infinitive usually indicates the continuous
present tense (e.g. 5.5, 5.39, 5.58, 5.59, 5.66) and adjectival verbs + stative probably indicate a non-progressive present tense (e.g. 5.12).

$hr\ jr +$ First Present refers to past time (e.g. 5.41).

Example 5.42 shows $cnj$, which when filling the second position of the First Present is always in the stative, and never $hr +$ infinitive and this is preceded by a Middle Egyptian negative purpose clause.

Example 5.43 has a First Present main clause followed by a Late Egyptian circumstantial First Present clause.

$tw.j + hr +$ stative is found in an unusual example (5.57).

A non-conclusive verb may not take a stative form (5.64).

The verb $gd$ may not take a stative form (5.68).

In conclusion pseudoverbal constructions occur in ME and in NDE while the First Present is found in NDE and in LE.
CHAPTER 6

MIDDLE EGYPTIAN $sdm.n.f$

INTRODUCTION

This common form of the word is constructed as regards its pronominal or nominal subjects, as well as in its mode of expressing the passive, exactly like the $sdm.f$ form. From that form it differs only in the insertion of an inseparable element immediately after the verb stem.

In its origin the $sdm.n.f$ form appears to have resulted from the combination of a passive participle with a dative of possession or agential interest. Thus $pr.n.f$ would mean 'gone out to him', $sdm.n.f$ 'heard to him'.

Since the $sdm.n.f$ form expresses essentially what occurs or happens to someone or by his agency, it was at the start no less indeterminate, as regards time position, than the $sdm.f$ form. With exceptions though, the $sdm.n.f$ form is restricted to past time.

It is thus employed of past time in affirmative sentences (completed action, past, narrative tense), where it may have the meaning of the English past tense ('he heard'), of the English present perfect ('he has heard') or of the English past perfect (pluperfect) ('he had heard') the latter two uses are particularly common in (subordinate) clauses of time.

All types of the Middle Egyptian $sdm.n.f$ are still represented in both non-literary and literary Nineteenth Dynasty (NDE) texts.

---

1 Preceded by the negative word $n$ ('not'), $sdm.n.f$ corresponds to the positive $sdm.f$, and must be translated mostly as present or an action over a more or less extended period. The common meaning is "he can not".
Besides the negative n šdm.n.f and nn šdm.n.f and even the unusual bw (or bn) šdm.n.f and the cḥc.n šdm.n.f, discussed respectively in Chapters 12 and 2, we have the following types of šdm.n.f usage:

These include:

(i) The past, completed action or narrative tense

(ii) The relative šdm.n.f

(iii) The circumstantial šdm.n.f

(iv) The emphatic šdm.n.f and

(v) The synchronic present or perfomative šdm.n.f

These do not occur in the later texts of the Twentieth Dynasty, i.e. LE.

I. Non-literary NDE Texts.

(i) Past, completed action or narrative tense.

6.1

šdm.n.f hmmt m.bḥš

nn sp jrt mjttš

He dug a well, the like of which had never been done before ...

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 65/5)

6.2

mk jrj.n nṯr ṣḥrt.j

bšw.f n.j mw ḫr ḡw.w

God has granted my wish. He has made water come forth for me from the mountains.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/12)

Note - after a šdm.n.f, the next verb is a šdm.f
I have purified my house millions of times, and I have privileged those who are in it again. I have set the serfs, whom I have produced, in my house. I will not separate from them. I began therein from my childhood until my rulership.

(Nauri Decree, 50/7)

Five šdm.n.f's. šhpr.n.j is a relative form, but preceded too by the relative adjective ntt.

nn tš.j is nn šdm.f indicating future time (negative)

Year 6, 3rd month of summer, day 10. This day, the workman Nebnufer, son of Nakhi approached the court of the jury and laid a charge against the citizeness, Heria.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 1,2)

špr jri.n A - lit. - "the arriving which the workman A did".

An infinitive (špr) of a verb of motion, followed by a relative form (šdm.n.f).

Note - the relative form šdm.n.f does not occur in the non-literary texts of the Twentieth Dynasty.

šmj.n.f is the ME narrative šdm.n.f formation. This does not occur in the non-literary texts of the Twentieth Dynasty. (Groll 1973:68).
(ii) **Relative šdm.m.f's**
Hieratic Ostracon Recto 1.
See last example

**6.5**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{jást grt nfr hrt ššm.f} & \\
r \ c\ t \ spr \ mr.n.f & \\
\end{align*}
\]

And god was guiding him so as to grant the request of one whom he loved.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/8,9)

**6.6**

\[
\begin{align*}
w\text{pw.lr \ wnn} \ p3 \ k3r \ n \ j³w \ nbw \\
jr.n.j \ r \ t3 \ hwt \ mun.m3c.r\ c \ hwj.w \\
mk.w & \\
\end{align*}
\]

In particular, the troop of gold washers, whom I have appointed for the House of Menmare shall be exempted and protected.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 69/12-14)

**6.7**

\[
\begin{align*}
mj\ ij \ n \ p3 \ c\ nw \ n \ hd \\
rd.j.n \ wr \ c\ 3 \ n \ hτ3 \ hτ3s3rj \ jnj.tw \ r \\
pr \ c\ 3 \ c\ nh \ w\ d3 \ šnb & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Copy of the tablet of silver, which the great prince of Hatti, Hattusili caused to be brought to Pharaoh, lph.

(Hittite Treaty, 226/9-10)

Just following this, we read

\[
\begin{align*}
p3 \ ntc \ jrr \ wr \ c\ 3 \ n \ hτ3 & \\
\end{align*}
\]

The customary agreement, which the great prince of Hatti made ...

(Hittite Treaty, 226/11)

Not a relative šdm.m.f - rather a relative perhaps imperfective šdm.f
(iii) **Circumstantial $sdm.n.f$**

There are no examples of the circumstantial $sdm.n.f$ in the non-literary NDE texts, but I have used the notation (iii) here to correspond with the (iii) used in the literary NDE texts later.

(iv) **Emphatic $sdm.n.f$**

6.8

$hr\;\ddot{swt}\;jri.n\;hm.f\;tm\;dj\;\ldots$

dj.w\;hr\;tp\;ht

It was for the sake of causing [him that molested them to be cast on the ground] and be put on the end of a stake that his majesty did not cause ...

(Nauri Decree, 57/14,15)

$tm.n.f\;sdm$ is indirectly attested by Nineteenth Dynasty epigraphic $jri.n.f\;tm\;sdm$, a pseudo-archaism for LE $jri.jf\;tm\;sdm$. (Polotsky 1957:117).

6.9

$jri.n.j\;\ddot{chf}.j\;kn\;n.tm$

$r\;\ddot{w}h3\;\ddot{snfr}.j\;m.dj.tm$

It is in action for you that I pass my lifetime, so as to seek my wellbeing from you.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/9,10)

6.10

$\ddot{s}r.n.j\;\ddot{w}e\;w\;r\;\ddot{swd}3.tm$

It is from afar that I foretell so as to protect you.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 68/7)
(v) The synchronic present șdm.n.f used with the first person in ritual texts

The performative (Austin 1980)

6.11

\[ \text{dj.n.(j)} \]
\[ \text{n.k} \]
\[ \text{t3w nbw} \]
\[ \text{h3št nbw} \]

I give to you all foreign lands.

(Hittite Treaty, 225/8)

(vi) Others

6.12

\[ \text{bw.n ntr thj rmt.f} \]

God abhors him who interferes with his people.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 69/12)

șdm.n.f as a sort of ongoing present. A statement.
6.13

\textit{jw w\textsubscript{d}.n jm.f rdjt hn.tw ...}

His Majesty has commanded that ordinance be made.

(Nauri Decree, 51/1)

II Literary NDE texts

(i) Past narrative \textit{sdm.n.f}

6.14

\textit{3tp (sic) 3tp.n.k r mr.n.k}

You have piled up (words) as you wished

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 30/7)

6.15

\textit{jnj.n lm.f hr rdwj.f ds.f}

His majesty carried them before his feet himself.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 14/10)

6.16

\textit{jrn.n n.f r\textsuperscript{c} is.f}
\textit{r q\textsubscript{r} w3t sbwn hq.jtn}

Re made for him his boundary, as far as the limits of that which Aten illuminates.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 17/15)
6.17
kd.n.f šw m sm3 s3tw
He has built it on the border.
(Papyrus Lansing, 110/11,12)

6.18
d3.n.f mšdt nt jmt
He crossed the ford of the Orontes.
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 15/8)

6.19
gm.n.j p3 h3h3 500 n ḫn htr
wn.wj m ḫnw.sn
hpr m ḡgbjt r ḫt ššmt.j
I found the mass (lit. 2 500) of chariots, in whose midst I was, scattering before my horses.
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 45/8-14)

Note ššmt.j (not n3j.j ššmt.)

These forms are ME and NDE and not LE

(ii) Relative šdm.n.f's

6.20
m pr.t ḫr m3.n.k
Do not move, while you are still possessed by what you saw.
(Papyrus Chester Beatty III, 10/11)
(Groll 1985:81) - A spell against nightmares

m pr.t is a negative imperative containing the infinitive pr.t. The infinitive occurs after the negative element m only in the Eighteenth Dynasty.
It is therefore a literary LE construction. In ME, m precedes the negative complement.

ḥr "carrying", may be understood as "possessed by".
$m3.n.k$ is a ME $\dot{s}dm.n.f$ relative form. The neuter gender is not represented by the feminine ending $t$, as in ME, but by the zero morpheme which represents the masculine ending in Ramesside Egyptian.

6.21

$sjn$ $hr.s$ $jm.w$

dr $rswt$ $nbwt$ $qwwt$ $m33.n.f$

The man’s face should be rubbed with them (bread and fresh herbs, dipped in beer and myrrh), so that every bad dream which he dreamt should be driven away.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III, 10.19, p. 85  The Chemical prescription)

$sjn$ $hr.s$ $jm.w$ is an initial prospective passive $\dot{s}dm.f$ formation

dr $rswt$ is a non-initial prospective passive $\dot{s}dm.f$ formation

$m33.n.f$ is a ME $\dot{s}dm.n.f$ relative form.

6.22

$qd$ $jrj.n$ $qhwj$ $n$ $nb$ $r.gr$

Thoth spoke to the All-Lord
(lit. the saying, which Thoth made.)

(Horus and Seth, 56/7)

6.23

$wrw$ $h3swt$ $hm$ $n$ $kmt$

$jinj.n$ $hm.f$ $m$ $sk$ $\dot{c}nhj$

Chiefs of the countries, that knew not Egypt, whom his majesty brought as living captives.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 19/6)

6.24

$h\dot{t}$ $m$ $\dot{s}b3jt$ $\dot{s}\dot{t}$

$jrj.n$ $s\dot{s}$ $nswt$

Beginning of the instruction in letter writing, which the royal scribe made.

(Papyrus Lansing, 99/18)
6.25
bwpw nb jrt n mś.C.f
n3 jřj.n hm.j n jb.m

No lord has done for his soldiers what my majesty did for your sakes.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 58/14)

Preceding the ME relative šdm.n.f is a LE negative perfect of šdm.f i.e. bwpw.f šdm.

6.26
bw thj.j šhr wd.n.k

I have not neglected an order which you gave.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 35/4)

All the above relative šdm.n.f forms are ME and NDE and not LE.

(iii) Circumstantial šdm.n.f's

6.27
bw m33 šnt.j
ckck.n.j h3j.t jm.j

I cannot visit (lit. "see") my sister, since an illness got hold of me.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, C4/6,7)

This is the ME circumstantial šdm.n.f formation.

The circumstantial šdm.n.f is a ME and NDE formation - not LE.
Compare this with

6.28

\( mk \ jb.j \ hdn \ sh3.tw.f \)  
\( jtj.j \ mrwt.f \)

Look, my heart is in a turmoil when recalling him, since my love for him got hold of me.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, Verso C2/1)

This is a circumstantial \( spd.f \) of ME (or of literary LE) indicating the relative past tense. The activity expressed by \( jtj.j \ mrwt.f \) takes place before that expressed by \( mk \ jb.j \ hdn \ sh3.tw.f \).

The only verbal formation in the LE non-literary system which is capable of expressing the relative past tense, when acting as a circumstantial subordinate clause is the perfect active \( spd.f \) preceded by the converter \( jw \) (De Buck 1937:152, Groll 1969(b):184). It seems that since the \( n \) of the ME circumstantial \( spd.n.f \) was dropped from pronunciation in LE, it took the outward form of a \( spd.f \) formation; however the circumstantial \( spd.n.f \) occurs occasionally even in the Twentieth Dynasty.

6.29

\( bn \ n.f \ srf \ hr \ w3t \)  
\( spr.n.f \ r \ pr \ n \ snt \)  
\( jrj \ jb.f \ t\h \)

There is no breathing space for him on the road; and when he reaches his sister's house, his heart jubilates.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, GI(I/4))

6.30

\( jr \ m33.s \ sw \ m \ rswt \)  
\( dr.n.f \ n \ ntr \ rmj.f \)

If a man sees himself in a dream after he has driven a god to tears ...

(Papyrus CB III, 7/12 recto)  
(Groll 1985:80 - Example 23)
(iv) **Emphatic $sdm.n.f$'s**

These are found in an initial syntactic position.

6.31

\[
\text{sw3.n.j m h3w n pr.f} \quad \text{I passed by the neighbourhood of his house.} \\
\text{(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, C3/10)}
\]

Groll 1975/6:244 (example 12) assumes that this is an emphatic $sdm.n.f$ formation because it fills an initial syntactic position. The narrative and the circumstantial $sdm.n.f$ cannot fill initial syntactic positions.

Groll writes (1975/6:239) that the emphatic $sm.n.f$ was still a living form in the literary system of the Nineteenth Dynasty and that this is easily proved in the combination of $js bn sm.n.f$ in the Kadesh inscription.

See the next example.

6.32

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{js bn } & \text{sm.n.j } \text{chc.n.j } \text{hr } r.k & \text{Was it not by your word that I walked} \\
\text{bw } & \text{thj.j } \text{shr } \text{wd.n.k} & \text{and halted? I did not disobey any} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Was it not by your word that I walked and halted? I did not disobey any order that you commanded.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 35/4)

The $bw$ $stp.f$ formation indicates past tense, and is parallel to the emphatic $sm.n.j$ and $chc.n.j$

6.33

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ph.n.j } & \text{n3j } \text{hr } \text{shr } r.k & \text{At the command of your mouth, I} \\
\text{jm} & \text{nn } \text{bw } \text{snj.j } \text{p3j.k } \text{shr} & \text{came here. O Amun, I have not} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(At the command of your mouth, I came here. O Amun, I have not transgressed your command.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 42/9)
This is the same formation as the last example.

(Ophel 1985:148)

§34

\[3dn.n.f \ mt \ hr \ cnh\]

It is in death as in life that he suffers.

(Papyrus Lansing, 109/7)

§35

\[wst.h.n.f \ tsw \ kmt\]

\[pt \ hr \ w3t \ nb\]

It is as far as the heavens on every side that he has extended the boundaries of Egypt.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 6/16 - 7/1)

---

The emphatic \[sdm.n.f\] formations occur in ME and NDE, and not in LE.

v) The performative \[sdm.n.f\] (Austin 1955)

\[dj.n(j) \ n.k \ t3w \ hr\]

I place for you the lands under your fear, bowing down in terror of you.

\[nksw \ n \ hnhmt.k\]

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 15/4)

\[ndw \ dj.n(j) \ n.k \ kn \ nb \ nh$t \ nb\]

Utterance: "I give to you all might and all victory."

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 20/4)

In ritual scenes originating as far back as the Third Dynasty, the caption uttered by a god suggested a special use of \[sdm.n.f\] as a synchronous present. (Vernus
This still occurs later, sometimes modernised to fit in its diachronic successor, "perfective" šdm.f.

But it is more than just a synchronous present.

"The representation may agree with the caption, but so doing it works like a redundant symbol. In the same way, to say "I swear" is sufficient in itself to perform the act of swearing; but one may reinforce it by raising the right hand. The creative power of words is a well-established concept in pharaonic Egypt. Now if a statement like dj.n.j n.k., being free from describing any act, constitutes in itself the act it states, it enters into a special category called "performative statements" (Austin 1962).

A performative statement must be carefully distinguished from "synchronous present". For instance, "I open the door" is a statement which describes an act performed at the same time; this may be called "synchronous present". But when in a meeting the chairman says "I open the meeting", the statement does not state any other act than itself, the act of saying "I open the meeting". This is a performative statement and expressed in Egyptian as dj.n.j. Of course it must be in a direct speech, and he who utters it must be invested, when uttering it, with the right of making an act through a mere statement. "I open the meeting" is performative because when the chairman says it, the situation is such that his speech is felt as an act. Since gods are invested with the power of creating through words, this kind of requirement is fulfilled.

This is similar to the Biblical Hebrew in Genesis "hereby I give you" and I Kings 3:12  

Here the "accompli" kāna cannot carry any time value; it would be a terrible heresy to translate "Allah has been or was omniscient".
Later there was a diachronic change from $sdm.n.f$ to subject + $hr$ + infinitive (i.e. a Present Tense) in expressing performative statements, perhaps because a mostly aspect-oriented system in Old and Middle Egyptian shifted to a mostly time-oriented system in LE.

Vernus (1978:139 and 1985:380) speaks of "Egyptien de tradition" - a language going back to the Middle Kingdom. "They remembered" and were still using during a very long time Old or Middle Egyptian, but only in formal texts.

Polotsky (in Discussion to Vernus 1985:380) feels that the $A$ is definitely non-emphatic, as the emphatic form is $rdj.n.j$, and he speculates on the differences between $dj.(n).j$, $jw dj(n).j$ and between $jw sdm.f$ and $jw.f sdm.f$.

The dedication formula was translated by Greek translators either by $\delta 15 wj\mu.\lambda.1$ or $\delta 5 w\eta\nu\mu.\lambda.1$ depending on whether they felt $dj. n.j$ was a tense or an aspect. The performative statement was conveyed by a present tense in Greek.

(vi) Miscellaneous or unusual forms of $sdm.n.f$

6.38

$hwj h^s pj nwjt ...$

$jjt.n.f j3dt.$

The Nile spreads abroad its flood ...

It takes possession of the meadows.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 14/3,4,5)

A $sdm.n.f$ follows a $sdm.f$ of the simple present, and continues what seems to be a statement in the present tense.

Likewise in

6.39

$jjt.n.f spjt$

$sw 3k m n3 ntj hjn$

He takes what remains and he joins the ranks of the wicked.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 32/4,5)

This time $sdm.n.f$ is followed by a First Present. In fact this continues with a further First Present and then with a $sdm.f$. 


Your heart is denser than a great obelisk.

(Papyrus Lansing, 101/3)

Come dawn, he goes to make a start and does not find it in its place. He spends three days searching for it; he finds it in the bag. He finds no hides on them - the jackals have chewed them.

(Papyrus Lansing, 105/3)

$sw\ prj$ is a First Present, then follows a $bw\ sdm.n.f$ - perhaps this corresponds to ME $n\ sdm.n.f$, which denies the occurrence of an action over a more or less extended period. It is mostly present, less often past, commonly meaning "he cannot" (and $bw\ gm.n.f$ is the same). Then a $sdm.f$ and a $sdm.n.f$.

You are the one who offers/provides the beer-jug and fills the bowl.

(Papyrus Lansing, 115/5)

A $jn$ construction - a participial statement.

Why $hn.n.k$ compared to $mh$?
6.43

$smt$ $t^3$ $tpj$ $n$ $hm.f$

$jmnn$ $hr$ $wd$ $n.f$ $p3$ $knt$

$dd.tw.n.f$ $cntjt$ $hr.tj$

Great first span (of horses) of his majesty "Amon - assigns - to - him - the victory" also called "Anath - is - satisfied"

(The Northern Wars of Sethos I, 7/14)

$jmnn$ $hr$ $wd$ $n.f$ is a First Present with $hr$ + infinitive and $cntjt$ $hr.tj$ is a First Present with a stative.

$dd.tw.n.f$ is a passive $sdm.n.f$

6.44

$phtj$ $hm.f$ $mk.n.s$ $msc.f$

His majesty's strength - it had protected his army.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 99/7)

A noun + $sdm.n.f$

This is unusual (see Doret 1980:37, who discusses mainly NOUN + $sdm.f$ rather than $sdm.n.f$)

All the above unusual $sdm.n.f$ forms are ME and NDE formations, and they do not occur in LE.

Conclusion

ME $sdm.n.f$ forms are still found in NDE, but not in LE.

The past completed action or narrative tense $sdm.n.f$ became $sdm.f$ of the past or the $jw.f$ $hr$ $sdm$ of the continuative past in Late Egyptian.
The relative or circumstantial $sdm.n.f$ became $sdm.f$ or $jw sd m.f$ in Late Egyptian.

The emphatic $sdm.n.f$ became $jjr.f sd m$ in Late Egyptian.

The synchronous $sd m.n.f$ (or rather $sdm.n.j$) became the First Present in Late Egyptian.

NDE has therefore both the ME $sd m.n.f$ forms and the forms which later developed in LE. (See Chapter 7).
CHAPTER 7

THE $\text{sdm.f}$

INTRODUCTION

The $\text{sdm.f}$ form is by far the most important verb form in the Egyptian language. This is the form or tense of the verb in which the subject, sometimes a noun and sometimes a suffix pronoun is added directly to the signs expressing the verbal notion, e.g.

$\text{sdm.f}$ 'he hears'

$\text{sdm ss}$ 'the scribe hears'.

In describing the various parts of the Egyptian verb, it is usual to take the verb $\text{sdm}$ 'hear' as a paradigm or model, and since, following the example of Semitic grammar precedence over the first person singular is given to the third person singular, the verb form to which reference has just been made is known as the $\text{sdm.f}$ form.

The $\text{sdm.f}$ form appears to have originated in a passive participle followed by a genitival suffix pronoun; an original 'heard of him' came to mean 'he hears' or 'he heard'.

To create the passive of the $\text{sdm.f}$ form, an element

$\text{sdm.tw}$ sometimes more briefly written $\text{sdm.}(w)$, is inserted immediately after the verb-stem as in $\text{sdm.tw ss}$ 'this utterance is heard', or $\text{sdm.tw ss}$ 'it (i.e. this utterance) is heard'. The element $\text{tw}$ is really an indefinite pronoun, like our 'one', and is sometimes still so used independently, e.g. $\text{sdm.tw}$ 'one says', 'it is said'; from this use $\text{sdm.tw ss}$ 'he is heard' was doubtless derived on the analogy of the active $\text{sdm.f}$.

This common form is used in both Middle Egyptian and Late Egyptian.
In this chapter detailed examples of the use of *śdm.f* are discussed in Middle Egyptian, in literary and in non-literary Late Egyptian, NDE (by which time there were definite differences) and even the later Coptic derived forms are discussed. So this chapter includes, in addition to synchronic methods a diachronic comparative study too.

*śtp.f* is frequently used (rather than *śdm.f*) in this chapter, as much of the work is based on that of Groll (1975), who uses *śtp.f*.

In ME, there were four forms of *śdm.f* or *śtp.f* (Doret 1980:37).

1. **The indicative form**
   The indicative form (perfect active in narrative or imperfect), sometimes occurring after the negation *n*, and rarely as a "bare initial form".

2. **The circumstantial form**
   When it appears in clauses of time and circumstance, it indicates a concomitant circumstance. It is also used after the conditional particle *jr* "when", and in compound verbs after the auxiliaries *jw* and *CfJC.n*.

3. **The prospective form**
   The prospective form is used in main clauses as an optative, in dependent clauses as a final form and as the object of certain verbs and prepositions. It also appears after the negation *nn*.

4. **The emphatic form**
   The emphatic form is used in cleft-sentences stressing an adverbial adjunct.

Groll (1975/6:237), notes that LE literary texts tend to preserve archaic forms no longer used in the spoken language, while non-literary texts are closer to the spoken language, i.e. literary texts still contain genuine ME verbal formations which do not behave syntactically as non-literary LE verbal formations. Thus, in order to understand these verbal formations one must use ME texts and grammars, i.e. one must use diachronic comparative methods.

One must use synchronic comparative methods too, i.e. comparison of the verbal system of the literary texts with that of the non-literary texts in the same dynasty.
Groll (1975/6:237), gives some interesting examples, e.g.:

1. The $stp.f$ of the relative past in literary LE, which was the successor of ME $stp.n.f$ co-existed with the $stp.n.f$ as well as the $jw$ $stp.f$ (i.e. the converter $jw$ before the perfect active $stp.f$, indicating the pluperfect).

   Only the latter ($jw$ $stp.f$) occurs with this function in non-literary LE, and this is the ancestor of Coptic $€σηρωμ$. 

2. The $stp.f$ of the Simple Present in literary LE, which was the successor of ME $jw$ $stp.f$ co-existed with $hr$ $stp.f$ and with $tw.j$ ($hr$) $stp.f$ ... $rc$ $nb$ (i.e. the LE First Present).

   Only the latter occurs in non-literary LE.

   And the Coptic $ςξοηρωμ$ is a successor of the literary verbal formation $hr$ $stp.f$. This is unusual. Usually Coptic forms are successors of non-literary verbal forms.

3. The literary LE $bw$ $stp.f$ of the Simple Present which was the successor of ME $n$ $stp.n.f$ co-existed with a geminated $bw$ $dd.f$ and with $bw$ $jrj.f$ $stp.f$.

   Only the latter - $bw$ $jrj.f$ $stp.f$ occurs in non-literary LE.

4. The literary LE $bw$ $stp.f$ of the past co-existed with $bw$ $wpw.f$ $stp.f$. The latter was the only form found in non-literary LE.

5. Alongside with the emphatic $jrj.f$ $stp(f)$ formation - the only form found in the non-literary system - there still exists in the literary texts both an emphatic $prj.n.f$ or $prj.f$ formation of the past and an emphatic ungeminated $prj.f$ form of the present tenses.

   In ME $sm.n.f$ was the emphatic form, and in Coptic $νταιρωμ$ evolved from the non-literary LE $jrj.f$ $stp.f$.

It would appear that the Demotic and Coptic are the successors of the non-literary language, whereas the Ptolemaic and Roman hieroglyphic inscriptions are the successors of the literary texts. (Groll 1975/6:245). The non-literary language is the nearest alternative to the spoken language. On the other hand, the literary language is the language of an esoteric group, the scribes and is an acquired or second language, based on the writings of the past. It is the more artificial, sophisticated and very often shows some inventive professionalism.

The non-literary system is an analytical system rather than the earlier synthetic system. Verbal formations in the non-literary system are built by auxiliary
elements. Every verbal formation in the non literary system has either its marked morpheme or its marked mode of negation. On the whole it is much easier to single out LE non-literary verbal formations than those of ME.

However, when one tries to classify verbal formations in the literary system, he finds that there are too many homographs, i.e. many extant verbal formations are completely unmarked, and one must depend on the context to single them out. Dependence on context is unavoidable when dealing with any stage of Egyptian grammar. One has to bear in mind that the 'first' grammatical classification of Egyptian was based on intuitive translations.

The synthetic verbal formations are entirely unmarked although prevailing, in comparison with the non-literary texts, e.g. a set of *stp.f* forms which look outwardly alike, but differ syntactically.

In non-literary LE texts, for example, the synthetic verbal formations are in decline and the analytical ones prevail; e.g. of the *stp.f* forms, only three remain in the non-literary system and two of these are very limited in usage, being almost dictionary data.

These are:

1. The perfect active *stp.f*, the predecessor of Coptic ḥyεςτ.τ.μ.
2. The initial prospective *stp.f*, the predecessor of ṭa in ṭa)yεςτ.τ.μ.

and

3. The non-initial prospective *stp.f*, the predecessor of ṭe in ṭe)yεςτ.τ.μ.

In contradistinction to the above (non-literary texts), there exist too in the literary system the following unmarked *stp.f* forms

a. The circumstantial pluperfect *stp.f*

b. The *stp.f* of the Simple Present
c. The *bw stp.f* of the Simple Present
d. The *bw stp.f* of the past
e. The emphatic *stp.f*.
The non-literary system avoids redundancies of verbal formations, i.e. it is an economical system, a typical feature of a living language.

The literary system seems to accumulate redundancies of verbal formations, a stylistic mean. For purposes of poetical synonymous parallelism and for the avoidance of repetition, accumulative redundancies are ideal.

The literary system sometimes possessed three verbal formations filling the same function, whereas the non-literary (and Coptic) systems possess only one, e.g. the relative past (in non-literary - jw śtp.f); the First Present (in non-literary - tw.j hr śtp); negation of the Simple Present (in non-literary bw jřj.f šdm); and the emphatic (in non-literary Egyptian j.jřj.f śtp.f).

Here follow examples - from the texts I studied - of the various types of šdm.f or śtp.f, their predecessors in the earlier ME, their co-existent forms in literary LE, and their successors in non-literary LE.

I. Perfect active śtp.f in NDE texts

Perfect active śtp.f in non-literary (or literary) LE.
(The negative counterpart of this is bwpw.f śtp(f)).

A. The predecessor is ME jw śtp.f, e.g. in non-literary NDE texts

7.1

jw wd.n hm.f rdjt hn.tw His majesty has commanded that ordinance be made.

(Nauri Decree, 51/1)

This occurs in ME and NDE and not in LE.
B. LE Perfect active štp.f

(i) Perfect active štp.f in non-literary NDE texts, e.g.

7.2

mk₄ jm.f

I grasped hold of it.

(Hittite Treaty, 228/2)

7.3

jr jnk tjms.j wc h₃ jnk

As for me, I buried a chisel of mine.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 2,3)

In this ostracon, genuine LE formations occur basically in the framework of the actual trial investigation and not in the framework of the technical procedure of the trial.

(ii) Example of LE perfect active štp.f in literary NDE texts.

7.4

gm.(w)j wpt.k

Your messenger found me as I was sitting beside the horse which is in my charge.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 10/2)
and
Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh 36/2-12 see later.

II. Initial prospective śtp.f

Initial prospective śtp.f, an LE non-literary (and literary) form persisting from the ME synthetic form.

(i) In non-literary NDE texts, e.g.

7.5
jrj.sn wšb ḫr ūt.w
They shall answer for the sake of their property.
(Kanais (Wady Mia), 69/4)

7.6
dj.sn mn jrt.j rd
May they make my deeds endure (flourish).
(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/1)

(ii) Initial prospective śtp.f in literary NDE texts, e.g.

7.7
mjt jrt.n wnw.t śdr.n
Come, we will take our pleasure and sleep.
(Two Brothers, 14/4,5)

These occur in ME, NDE and LE.
An interesting example, confined to Papyrus Anastasi I

7.8
\[tm.k \text{ dd } hn\dot{k}(wj) \ m \ n \ k3wj\]  
Do not say that I have made (your) name stink before others

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 40/5,6)

7.9
\[bn \ nsfr\]
\[tm.k \ djt \ jnj.tw.s\]  
It is not good. Do not cause it to be brought.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 13/3-5)

tm.k in these examples may be the prospective \(\dot{sdm}.f\) form optatively used, perhaps confined to Anastasi I. (Gardiner 1964:11, footnote 4).

These therefore, occur only in NDE (unique forms), and not in ME or LE.

III. The non-initial prospective \(\dot{stp}.f\)

(i) The non-initial prospective \(\dot{stp}.f\) persists from the ME form, e.g. in non-literary NDE texts.

7.10
\[... \ r \ tm \ djt \ hpr \ hrwj \ r.jwd.\text{sn} \ r \ nhh\]  
... in order not to cause hostility to occur between them for ever.

(Hittite Treaty, 227/6)

hpr is a non-initial prospective \(\dot{sdm}.f\)
(ii) In literary NDE texts, e.g.

7.11

\textit{dj.f kn wrw nw h}3rw \textit{Cb nb n r}c.sn.\hspace{1cm}\text{He causes the chiefs of Kharu to cease every contradiction of their mouths.}

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 7/12)

\textit{kn} is a non-initial prospective \textit{sdm.f}.

---

These occur in ME, NDE and LE.

7.12

Do not move, while you are still possessed by what you saw,

\textit{tm shw.k ht rswt.k} \hspace{1cm}\text{... so that the blockage from your dream may pass.}

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III, 10/12)

(Groll 1985:81, 83).

---

This occurs in ME and in NDE and not in LE.

The LE way of expressing this (a negative purpose clause), would be \textit{r tm djt sdm}, and this occurs in LE and in NDE (e.g. Nauri Decree 54/11 - 55/1 (12.11.1)).

\textit{tm shw.k} is the non-initial prospective \textit{stp.f} used as a clause of purpose (as in Hittite Treaty 227/6 above).

I use the tables which Sarah Groll compiled (1975/6:241), as a guide to the development of the \textit{sdm.f} (or \textit{stp.f}) forms from ME through literary and non-literary LE and Coptic. I use this to show examples in the NDE language in these texts, showing that both ME and (literary and non-literary) LE forms are found in almost all instances in these NDE texts.
Following Table A (iv)

A. refers to examples in NDE of the \textit{stp.n.f} of the relative past found in ME

B. refers to the examples in NDE of \textit{stp.f} form found in literary LE, and

C. refers to the examples in NDE of \textit{jw stp.f} known in non-literary LE.

Following Groll's Table B (v)

A. refers to the examples in NDE of the \textit{jw stp.f} of the simple present of ME

B. refers to the examples in these NDE texts of the \textit{stp.f} of the simple present found in literary LE

C. refers to an example in NDE of the \textit{hr stp.f} found in literary LE, and having the same meaning as the \textit{stp.f} of the simple present (see B above), and

D. refers to examples in NDE in the First Present of LE which evolved from \textit{jw stp.f} of the ME simple present.

Following Groll's Table C (vi)

A. shows examples in the NDE texts of \textit{bw (for n) stp.n.f} of ME, which was the precursor of \textit{bw stp.f} and \textit{bw jrj.f stp.f} of LE, while

B. and

C. show examples in NDE respectively of the above mentioned \textit{bw stp.f} and \textit{bw jrj.f stp.f} of LE.

Following Groll's Table D (vii)

A. shows an example in NDE of the \textit{n stp.f} of the past, the ME predecessor of the \textit{bw stp.f} and \textit{bwpw.f stp.f} found in LE, while

B. and

C. show examples in NDE of \textit{bw stp.f} of the past and \textit{bwpw.f stp.f} found in LE.

Following Groll's Table E (viii)

A. shows examples in NDE of the \textit{sm.n.f} ME emphatic, the precursor of the LE emphatics
B. shows examples in NDE of the LE šm.f or mr.f emphatic forms, while C. shows an example in NDE of the fully evolved jjr.f šdm of LE.

This then shows clearly both the evolution of these early ME forms and later LE successor forms, and the appearance of all of them in the NDE text.

This is Groll's (1975/6) Table A on page 241:

### IV. Table A: the št.p.f of the relative past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>Literary LE</th>
<th>Non-literary LE</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. št.n.f</td>
<td>št.n.f</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. x</td>
<td>št.p.f</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. x</td>
<td>jw št.p.f</td>
<td>jw št.p.f</td>
<td>Εαυγωμ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. No examples of the ME št.n.f of this type were found in the non-literary texts I studied. In the literary texts, an example is:

7.13

bw m33.j šnt

c'k'k n h3jt jm.j

I cannot visit (see) (my) sister, since an illness got hold of me.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, C4/6-7)

The c'k'kn h3jt is the ME circumstantial št.n.f formation.

B. It seems (Groll 1975/6:240) that since the n of the ME circumstantial št.n.f was dropped from pronunciation in the LE times, it took the outward form of a št.p.f formation, e.g.

7.14

mk jb.j hdjn šh3.tw.f

jtj.wj mrrw.t.f

Look, my heart is in a turmoil when recalling him, since my love for him got hold of me.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, Verso C2/1)
Note that the activity expressed by *jtj mrwt.f* takes place before that expressed by *mk jb.j (hr) šḥ3.tw.f*

So both *šṭp.f* and *šṭp.n.f* - circumstantial, expressing the pluperfect - occur in the same text.

These (circumstantial *šṭp.n.f* and *šṭp.f*) are found in ME and in NDE.

C. These correspond to the later LE non-literary circumstantial First Present, i.e. *jw šṭp.f*.

An example of the latter in NDE non-literary texts -

7.15

*jw.s hr jnj p3 h3*  
... And she brought the chisel, (together with a *wšb*), which she had buried ...

*jw tjms.st ...*  
*jw jt3j.s ...*  
*hr jw jrr.s cnh c3*  
... after she had stolen ...

although she had taken a great oath.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 13-17)

An interesting example, showing four different uses of the *jw* in NDE

*jw.s hr jnj* is a *jw.f hr šdm(f)* of the LE continuative past.

The other three are converter *jw's* of LE.

*jw tjms.st* - which she had buried is a LE *jw* + *šdm.f* of the past - Function B of Frandsen, indicating a virtual relative clause. This indicates absolute past time and not relative past time.

This follows an indefinite noun *wC wšb* = a *wšb*. 
This occurs in LE and in NDE, not in ME.

\textit{jw \ jt3j.s} - after she had stolen.

This is \textit{jw + perfect active \ stp.f}, indicating pluperfect (de Buck's law - de Buck 1937:152). This one is the relevant example. (Function A of Frandsen (1974).)

\begin{center}
\textbf{This too occurs in LE and in NDE and not in ME.}
\end{center}

\textit{hr \ jw + perfect active \ stp.f} expresses the notion of "although" in LE (Frandsen (1974) Function D).

An example of the circumstantial First Present referring to the relative present is -

\begin{center}
\textbf{7.16}
\end{center}

\textit{ptr.j \ hrj3 \ jw.s \ hr \ jt3 \ p3f.k \ h3} \\
I saw Heria, while she was stealing your chisel. \\
\hspace{1cm} (Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 5,6)

\textit{j . n.st} - So she said (this refers to preceding direct speech).

An example of the circumstantial First Present, in literary texts indicating pluperfect -

\begin{center}
\textbf{7.17}
\end{center}

\textit{kmj.tw.k} \\
\textit{jw \ dd.k \ mtr} \\
You are recognised having borne witness (against yourself?) \\
\hspace{1cm} (Papyrus Anastasi I, 36/15)
An example, perhaps the only example, in which \textit{jw stp.f} is not pluperfect, but refers to the relative present (Groll 1969(b):184)

7.18

\textit{jw.f hr hd m.s3 jb.f hr h3št} \hfill
He went northward across the desert, following his heart, while he lived upon the best of all the desert game.

\textit{jw c\text{\textit{nh.f}} m tpj n j3wt nb n h3št} \hfill
\textit{(Doomed Prince, 3/2,3)}

This morphological formation may be ME, NDE and LE, but as for expressing the relative present, it may be unique to NDE. In fact this may be the only example.

V. The following is Groll's Table B on page 242:

\textit{stp.f of the Simple Present}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{ME} & \textbf{Literary LE} & \textbf{Non-literary LE} & \textbf{Coptic} \\
\hline
1. \textit{jw stp.f} & x & x & x \\
\hline
2. x & \textit{stp.f} & x & x \\
\hline
3. x & \textit{hr stp.f} & x & \textit{waycwmt} \\
\hline
4. x & \textit{tw.j (hr)} & \textit{tw.j (hr)} & x \\
& \textit{stp.f ...} & \textit{stp.f ...} & \\
& \textit{r< nb} & \textit{r< nb} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

A. There are no examples of the ME \textit{jw stp.f} of the Simple Present in the non-literary NDE works.
Examples in NDE literary texts.

7.19
*jw *jrj.$ hpr.$ m w$c srj nfrt r. hrj*
She has changed herself into a beautiful girl before me.
(Horus and Seth, 46/1)

7.20
*jw nhsj.tw.f jw wn w$c n wnwt.*
He is awakened at any hour.
(Papyrus Lansing, 108/4)

7.21
*jw ljm.f qf.f*
He does not know what he is about.
(Papyrus Lansing, 108/14,15)

B. Literary LE *ql.f* of the Simple Present.

(i) An example in the non-literary NDE texts

7.22
*3h j3dwt n mnjw* Pasture lands profit the herdsman.
(Lichtheim 1976:56, footnote 7.)
(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/13)

(ii) And in the literary NDE texts
7.23

Amun judges the land with his fingers. He speaks to the heart, He judges the guilty, He assigns him to the East, the righteous to the West (the judgment of the dead is meant).

Note that the negative sentences preceding these are clearly negative LE First Present forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bn sw śp hr fkJw n ÇQÇw</th>
<th>He does not take bribes from the guilty, he does not speak to the witness, he does not look at him who promises.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bn sw hr ḡd n jnj.mtr</td>
<td>(Prayers as School Texts, 2/14-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bn sw hr nw r ÇÇÇ ÇC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These forms are LE and found too in NDE, but not in ME.

C. hr śp.f

An example is Papyrus Anastasi I 19/7,9.

7.24

If you were to see him at evening in the darkness, you would fancy (him as) a (passing) bird.

This is a rare hr śp.f which occurs only in literary LE and NDE, not in ME or non-literary LE.
D.

(i) The First Present occurs in non-literary NDE texts, e.g.

7.25

*jśt grt nṯr ḫr ššm.f* And god was guiding him.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/8,9)

(ii) And in literary NDE texts, e.g.

7.26

tw.k ḫr šm ḫr ēr You depart and flee (repeatedly).

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 42/6)

Below is Groll's Table C on page 243:

(Ⅵ) The *bw štp.f* of the Simple Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>Literary LE</th>
<th>Non-literary LE</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><em>n štp.n.f</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td><em>bw štp.f</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td><em>bw dd.f</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td><em>bw jř.f štp.f</em></td>
<td><em>bw jř.f štp.f</em></td>
<td>مشعمت</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. *n štp.n.f* is not found in the non-literary NDE texts I studied. However, *bw* in LE may be equivalent to *n* in ME, and I refer to Davis (1973). Her sentence type 19 is *bw šdm.n.f jm*. This has a generalising function,
and is normally negated in ME by \( n \). Therefore Hittite Treaty 227/14 may be an example of this

(i)

7.27

\[ jw \ bw \ hpr.n \ hrwj \ r.jwd.sn \ r.nlhh \]

And hostility will never occur between them forever.

"The tense of the verbal form is future, although \( bw \ \$dm.n.f \) (archaistic form of LE \( bw \ \$dm.f \ / \ bw \ j.rj.f \ \$dm \) and ME \( n \ \$dm.n.f \) is properly speaking timeless" (Spalinger 1981:319).

(ii) In the literary texts, we find -

7.28

\[ bw \ hnm.f \ dw3w \ p3 \ th3 \ t8f \]

He knows no tomorrow, who attacks his border!

(Stele of Merneptah, 15/14 - 16/1)

and

7.29

\[ n \ d\text{Gr.n.f} \ hh \ m \ h3\text{st} \]

He heeds not the foreign multitude.
followed by ṣdm.f either of the perfect or Simple Present

ptr.f š t mj ḏh3

He regards them as chaff.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 120/14)

B.

(i) bw štp.f of the Simple Present in non-literary NDE texts, e.g.

7.30

bw mn sp n grg

A liar’s deed does not endure.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 68/6)

7.31

bw dj p3 ntr hpr hrwj rjwd.sn m ntc

The god does not permit hostility to occur between them by means of the customary agreement.

(Hittite Treaty, 227/2,3)

bw ṣdm.f as discussed above is equivalent to ME n ṣdm.n.f, and is timeless, and therefore conveys the concept "never permits" (Polotsky 1976:1). (Example 27/9 and 45/6).

(ii) Examples in literary NDE texts

7.32

(t) jfd sw jb.j 3š

Leaping is my heart

dr šh3.j mrt.k

When I recall my love for you.

bw dd.f ṣm mj mṯ

It does not let me walk like a human being.
It jumps out of its place.

`sw tfj m` 

It does not let me put on my garment.

`bw dd.f t3j j mšš` 

I cannot use my fan properly.

`bw wrh p3j j bhn` 

I cannot put paint to my eye

`bw dd šdm r jrt.j` 

I cannot anoint myself at all.

`bw wrh j m.kf3` 

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs Verso C2/9-10 and C3/1-2)

Thus the `bw štp.f` formation when expressing the Simple Present tense takes a specific form when composed of the verb `dj`, i.e. the geminated form `dd.f`. Thus we are dealing here with a form which is different from the `bw štp.f` of the past (Groll 1975/6:242).

7.33

`b(w) w3h.f jwśw jm.sn` 

He leaves not a limb among them.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 9/8)

7.34

`bw nd.k hrt . wj m hšt n šεt.k` 

You do not salute/greet me at the beginning of your letter.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 14/7,8)

All the above five examples (`bw šdm.f`) are found in NDE and LE and not in ME. In fact, they are rare, in LE too (esp. non-literary LE) in which `bw jř.f šdm` is preferred.

C.

(i) An example of `bw jř.f štp(f)` in the NDE non-literary works.
And the great prince of Hatti does not (will not) transgress against the land of Egypt for ever, in order to take anything from it.

(Hittite Treaty, 227/15)

(ii) And in the NDE literary texts

They do not listen.

They do not heed your tales.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 37/10,11)

cf. bw jri.f šdm.f and
bw šdm.f of the Simple Present, and

Where is my ox? I do not see it among your cattle.

(Truth and Falsehood, 34/15,16)

The above examples are NDE and LE and not ME.

Below is Groll’s Table D of page 243:

VII. The bw štp.f of the past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literary LE</th>
<th>Non-literary LE</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. bw štp.f</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. bwpw.f štp.f</td>
<td>bwpw.f štp.f</td>
<td>ꞌmåpicture ꞌt您的孩子</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. The *bw stp.f* of the past is the successor of ME *n stp.f*, e.g. in the literary NDE texts.

7.38

\[ jn \ jw \ nfr \ p3j.k \ hdb \ n3j.k \ b3k.w \]
\[ jw \ hr.k \ h5j \ jm.sn \]
\[ n \ n\c{e}j.k \]

Is it good that you slay your servants, your face savage toward them, and without pity (lit. without you having been lenient)?.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 94/7-13)

---

This is a ME form, \( n\ c{e}j.k \) occurring too in NDE. It does not occur in LE.

And Ramesses II - 35/4 (see later 7.46).

I cannot find any examples in the non-literary NDE texts.

B.

(i) An example of the *bw stp.f* of the past in non-literary NDE works.

7.39

\[ sp \ nb \ wn \ bw \ rh.tw.f \]
\[ dj.w \ ntr \ jrj.tw.f \ hr.j \]

A deed that has been unknown - god let it be done by me.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/14,15)

(ii) And in the literary NDE texts.

7.40

\[ bw \ 3m.k \ r \ t3 \ n \ ht3 \]

You have not gone to the land of Khatti;

\[ bw \ ptr.k \ t3 \ n \ jwp3 \]

You have not seen the land of Upe’.
As for H.d.m., you do not know the nature of it.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 30/13)

bw rḥ.k (like ME n rḥ.k) means "you do not know", "you have not learnt" or "you did not know" (Brunner 1979:44).

These are LE forms, occurring in NDE. They are not found in ME.

C. I could find no examples of bwpw.f štp.f in the non-literary NDE works; examples in the literary NDE texts are -

7.41

jr tw.f rḥ.tw wɛ n nsworth
bwpw.w mšj n.f s3 . tšj

It is said, there once was a king, to whom no son had been born.

(Doomed Prince, 1/1.2)

7.42

bwpw nb jrt n mšɛ.f
n3 jrt.n hnm.j n jh.tn

No lord has done for his soldiers what my majesty did for your sakes.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 58/14)

These are LE forms. They occur too in NDE, and not in ME.

Below is Groll's Table E on page 245:

VIII. The emphatic, "that"-form
### ME Literary LE Non-literary LE Coptic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>Literary LE</th>
<th>Non-literary LE</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>šm.n.f</td>
<td>šm.n.f</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>šm.f</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.| x          | j.jrj.f     | j.jrj.f štp.f   | ⲉⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ芝加�� çarp

### A.

(i) Examples of the ME šm.n.f - in non-literary NDE texts, e.g.

**7.43**

hr šwt jrf.n hm.f tm dj ...  
... n mrwt dj ...  

It was for the sake of causing ....  
that his majesty did not cause ....  

(Nauri Decree, 57/14,15)  

(Polotsky 1957:117.) (See under šdm.n.f's)

(ii) In literary NDE texts.

**7.45**

šw3.n.j m h3w n pr.f  

It was in the neighbourhood of his house that I passed by.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C3/10)

**7.46**

jš bn šm.n.j chc.n.j hr rč.k  

Was it not by your word that I walked and halted?

bw thj.j šr wž.n.k  

I did not disobey any order that you commanded.
The negative verbal form (*bw thj.j* - a *bw šdm.f* formation) indicates the past tense, being also parallel to the emphatic *šm.n.j* and *cḥc.n.j* formations.

Wente (1969:11, 12), draws attention to the L2 variant of the Kadesh poem

\[ jw bn \ šm.j \ cḥc.n.j \ hr \ r.k \]

and to the Sall Variant

\[ js bn \ šm.(j) \ cḥc.(j) \ hr \ r.k \]

and he comments that the close parallel of *šdm.n.f* and *šdm.f* forms in fairly clear Second Tense constructions suggests the basic identity of the two forms in Ramesside texts.

Ophel (1985:146), refers to the above, then quotes some later lines:

7.47

\[ js \ bn \ jrt.j \ n.k \ mnw \ cṣ3w \ wrr \]
\[ mb.j \ t3j.k \ hwt.ntr \ m \ n3j.j \ h3kw \]
\[ kd.j \ n.k \ hwt.j \ n \ hḥ \ m \ rpt \]
\[ dj.j \ n.k \ ḫt.j \ nb \ m \ jmt.pr \]
\[ .... \]
\[ .... \]
\[ bw \ w3ḥ.j \ nfr \ h3 \ drt.j \]
\[ r \ tm \ jrt.w \ m \ p3j.k \ w3b3 \]
\[ .... \]

---

Have I not made for you very many monuments, filled your temple with my captives?

I have built for you my mansion of Millions of Years and I gave you all my wealth as an endowment

I have neglected no good deed beyond my reach, so as not to perform it in your court.

Ophel then concludes that the bare *šdm.j* formations at the beginning of the introductory clauses, being parallel to

(i) the *št.p.j* formation introduced by *js bn*

and to

(ii) the *bw št.p.j* formation,

are initial main clauses, indicating past tense.
Since all the verbs in the introductory clauses (I have not reproduced them all here - the others are hrp.j - I have dedicated, dj.j m3c - I have caused to be sacrificed, kd.j 1 have built, jnj.j - I have brought, and šq3.j - I conducted/conveyed (ships)) are transitive verbs, we can classify them as perfective active šdm.f's, and not emphatic šdm.f's. They are verbal formations which indicate particular specific performances in the past.

See also in the same text -

7.48

plh.n.j n3j hr š3r n r.k
bw snj.j p3.j.k š3r

At the command of your mouth, I came here.
O Amun, I have not transgressed your command.
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 42/9)

Here bw snj.j is a bw šdm.f of the past and is parallel to an emphatic plh.n.j formation.

The šm.n.f formations in all the above six examples are ME forms, occurring too in NDE. They are not found in LE.

The perfect active šdm.f forms with the negative counterpart bw šdm.f of the past are specific LE formations. They stand side by side with ME elements, e.g. emphatic šm.n.f formations. The appearance of specific LE formations within the framework of a royal inscription early in the Nineteenth Dynasty is but another call "to describe the LE of the Nineteenth Dynasty as an independent self-sufficient system" (Groll 1973:70), (Ophel 1985:153).

B. The emphatic šm.f or mrr.f in literary NDE texts
Groll (1975/6:243), writes "Alongside with the emphatic j.jraj.f sdm.f formation, there still exists in the literary texts both an emphatic prj.n.f or prj.f formation of the past, and an emphatic ungeminated, prj.f form of the present tenses".

She writes too "It seems that the ME mrr.f formation still exists in the literary system", and she compares

7.49
wstn.k mhj hr jh

Why are you walking in a dream, My love?

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, Verso C2/7)

with

7.50
m jrj nj p3ajh h3t wh3
j.jraj.k wh3 jn fw hr jh
hmajj kb

Don't act foolishly, O my heart!
Why is it that you are acting as a fool?
Return to your place and calm down.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C3/2-3)

Since a hr jh interrogative phrase necessitates an emphatic sdm.f formation, (j.jraj.k wh3 ... hr jh) it is only reasonable to assume that wstn.k is the ME mrr.f formation.

The non-literary system possesses only the pattern j.jraj.f sdm.f hr jh.

| The emphatic wstn.k is a formation occurring in ME and in NDE, not in LE. |
| The j.jraj.k wh3 is a LE and NDE form, not in ME. |

Groll too quotes Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, Verso C1/7, as indicating that the ME mrr.f formation still occurs in the literary system.
7.51

\textit{ptr.tj prj}.$^+$ \textit{r} \textit{h3} \quad \text{One is aware of her going out.}

\textit{prj}.$^+$ is a \textit{\$dm}.$f$ formation acting as the direct object of a preceding verbal formation, i.e. it fills one of the functions of the \textit{mrr}.$f$ formation, without showing gemination. The \textit{\$dm}.$f$ formations are excluded in the non-literary system, from acting as direct objects or as subjects of \textit{\$dm}.$f$ formations. Instead, the \textit{p3}.$f \textit{\$dm}$ and \textit{p3} \textit{\$dm \ jjr}.$f$ formations are used (Groll 1975/6:244 and Groll 1970).

Further examples of the emphatic \textit{\$dm}.$f$ in the NDE literary texts are:

7.52

\textit{jj.k tnw p3 \$rj nfr} \quad \text{Whence have you come, you good youth?}

(\textit{Doomed Prince, 3/15,16})

The presence of an interrogative adverbial expression is a good means for identifying Second Tense constructions (Wente 1969:5). The above example deriving from the earliest of the LE stories, possibly reflects a stage in the development of LE when \textit{jjr}.$f$ \textit{\$dm}$ had not yet become fully established as the normal means for conveying Second Tense emphasis.

7.53

\textit{htp p3 \$w jw.j mt.k(wj)} \quad \text{As soon as the sun sets, I shall be dead.}

Wente (1969:5, footnote 34), compares this sentence to the normal LE Second Tense construction.
As soon as the sun rises, we shall be in the place where my wife is.

He concludes that, by analogy *htp* should also be a Second Tense.

(Doomed Prince, 5/14,15)

7.54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>srj n · n snnj</th>
<th>He is an officer's son. It is away from the face of his step-mother that he has come in flight from the land of Egypt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jj.f m · r m p3 t3 n kmt r h3t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t3j.f mwt jjt.mśj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jj.k n.j</th>
<th>It is in order to inquire about the giving of rations to the conscript soldiers that you have come.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r ndnad p3 djt spd n n3 mť mś</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hrw 3 r sf ḫr ḫprj ḫr m.s</th>
<th>(It is) three days to yesterday since I petitioned in her name. It is for five days that she has gone from me.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pr.ś mē.j ḫr hrw 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, Verso C3/9)

In the above examples the emphasis is upon a following adverbial phrase.

After *mk* "behold", normally the non-emphatic construction noun (or dependent pronoun) + old perfective or stative of a verb of motion is employed, so that a *ḥwd.f* form of a verb of motion following *mk* might reasonably be expected to function as a Second Tense (Polotsky 1968:95, paragraph 43-45, Wente 1969:6) as in the next example -
7.57

mk jj.s

mrjw m ks j n c3w mrwt.$

Behold, it is because of the intensity of (their) love for her that lovers have come to her in obeisance.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, Verso C3/8)

7.58

jj.k n.j

bdn m tlth 3tp.tw m c3d3w

It is wrapt up in confusion and laden with errors that you have come to me.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 39/11,12)

The emphasis is on a following stative (or old perfective)

7.59

prj.k 3s

r c3h3 hr pg3 r jrt k3t pr.c

It is in order to fight on the battlefield and to perform deeds of the energetic that you go forth quickly.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 38/3)

(See Wente 1969:8 and the discussion.)

7.60

spr.f r h3st.f

jw.f m nhwjw

It was being in laments (mourning) that he reached his country.

(Merneptah's Israel Stele, 14/16)

The emphasis is on a following jw circumstantial clause (Frandsen's Function C).
No definite examples of emphatic šdm.f could be found in the non-literary NDE texts.

C. Regarding the j.jř.j šdm of non-literary LE, no examples could be found in the Nauri Decree, the Hittite Treaty, the Hieratic Ostracon or Kanais (Wady Mia).

In literary NDE texts, an example of this is:

7.61

\[ j.jř.j \ jj \ n.k \]
\[ r.dd \ q3j.k \ r \ p3 \ jw \ hrj \ jb \]

It is in order that you ferry (me) across to the Island-in-the-Midst that I have come to you.

(Horus and Seth, 43/9,10)

IX.

Another form of šdm.f is the oath - an asseverative form or a virtual clause of asseveration. It is an ME form (Gardiner 1982:164) and survived into LE. It occurs in both the non-literary and literary NDE texts I studied, e.g.
7.62

w3h jmn
w3h hk3 cnh w3d s nb p3 ntj
bjn p3j.f b3w r mt
pr c3 cnh w3d s nb
mtw.tw gm.t r 3 d jnk jt3 p3j h3

"As Amun endures, and as the ruler \( lph \) endures, he whose power is worse than death, viz. Pharaoh \( lph \), if it be found that it was I, who stole this chisel ..."

(Hieratic Ostracon, 2 Recto/10,11)

7.63

cnh.j mr.wj r c hšj.wj j.t.j jtm
jr šhr nb dd.n hm.j
jrjšt m m3ct
m.b3h mšc.j nt.htr.j

As I live, as Re loves me, as my father Atum favours me, (as for) everything that my majesty has told, I did it in truth in the presence of my infantry and my chariotry.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 123/14 - 124/2)

dd.n hm.j is a relative šdm.n.f

Note the genitive suffixes hm.j, mšc.j nt.htr.j of ME are used rather than p3j.j etc.

7.64

w3h jmn w3h p3 hk3
mtw.tw gm m3ct jw.f cnh
jw.tw(sic) k3mn.f (for j) t3j.f
(for j) jrt 2
mtw.tw hr djt.f (for j) r jrj.wn
m p3 pr m3ct

As Amun lives, as the ruler lives, if Truth is found alive, I shall be blinded in both eyes and shall be made doorkeeper of the house of Truth.

(Truth and Falsehood, 36/2-5)
The writer used the third person singular rather than the first in the apodosis (f rather than .j)

*jw.f cnh* is a circumstantial First Present.

The *mtw.tw gm m3ct* (lit. "if one finds m3ct alive") is the elliptical conjunctive of an oath in the protasis.

*jw.tw k3mn.f*, beginning the apodosis is a *jw.f hr $dm.f* of the future in a verbal formation which occurs in oaths beginning with the conjunctive.

A conjunctive then follows the sense of the apodosis.

But cf. Doomed Prince 5/10-12 where a Third Future occurs in the apodosis (three Third Futures in fact) following the conjunctive.

7.65

*w3h p3.rC hr3htwj*  
As Pre-Harakhti lives, if he is taken from me,

*mtw.tw nhm.f m.dj.j*  
I shall not eat,

*nn jw.j r wnm*  
I shall not drink,

*nn jw.j r swj*  
I shall die right away

*jw.j r mt m t3 wnwjt*

The negatives are clearly LE Third Futures, and should be *bn* rather *nn*, a ME form

Note too that in ME *nn* could not precede *jw*. This rule fell away in LE.

The *jw.f hr $dm.f* of the future is negated by *tm*, i.e.

*jw.f hr tm $dm.f*

| All these examples of $dm.f of the oath occur in ME, NDE, and LE. |
CONCLUSION

All the myriad \textit{stp.f} forms and their derivatives - in Late Egyptian, both in the non-literary and literary forms of the later dynasties, and their Middle Egyptian precursors are to be found in these Nineteenth Dynasty texts (both non-literary and literary), i.e.

I. \textbf{The perfect active} \textit{stp.f}

The Middle Egyptian predecessor is \textit{jw stp.n.f} (e.g. 7.1).

The perfect active \textit{stp.f} is found in non-literary texts (e.g. 7.2), and in literary texts of NDE (e.g. 7.4).

II. \textbf{The initial prospective} \textit{stp.f}

is a form persisting from the Middle Egyptian and is found in both non-literary texts (e.g. 7.5) and literary texts (e.g. 7.7) of NDE.

III. \textbf{The non-initial prospective} \textit{stp.f}

persists from Middle Egyptian. It is found in non-literary texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty (e.g. 7.10) and in the literary works (e.g. 7.12).

IV. \textbf{The \textit{stp.f} of the relative past}

is a Late Egyptian literary form.

The Middle Egyptian precursor is \textit{stp.n.f} and is found in the NDE texts (e.g. 7.13).

The \textit{stp.f} of the relative past is found in the Nineteenth Dynasty Texts too (e.g. 7.14), while the non-literary Late Egyptian form \textit{jw stp.f} is found here too! (e.g. 7.15).

Example 7.18 is an example of \textit{jw stp.f} referring to the relative present.

V. \textbf{The \textit{stp.f} of the simple present}
The Middle Egyptian predecessor is jw $stp.f$ and is found in the NDE texts (e.g. 7.21).

The literary Late Egyptian $stp.f$ of the simple present is found in both the Nineteenth Dynasty non-literary texts (e.g. 7.22) and in literary texts (e.g. 7.23).

The First Present is another way of expressing this in literary Late Egyptian, and is the only way in non-literary Late Egyptian of the Twentieth Dynasty and later. This too is found in the NDE texts, (e.g. 7.25 non-literary text, and 7.26 literary text).

VI. The $bw \, stp.f$ of the simple present

This evolved from Middle Egyptian $n \, stp.n.f$, found in these texts, e.g. 7.29.

The $bw \, stp.f$ is found in these NDE texts in 7.31 (non-literary) and 7.33 (literary).

$bw \, jrj.f \, stp.f$ is another way of expressing this in literary Late Egyptian and is the only way of expressing it in non-literary Late Egyptian. This is found in these Nineteenth Dynasty NDE texts in non-literary (7.35) and literary (7.36) texts.

VII. The $bw \, stp.f$ of the past

is the successor of the Middle Egyptian $n \, stp.f$. Both are found in these Nineteenth Dynasty texts, $n \, stp.f$ in 7.38, and the former both in the non-literary (e.g. 7.39) and literary (e.g. 7.40) texts. The Late Egyptian non-literary form is $bwpw.f \, stp$, and this too is found in the texts of this thesis (e.g. 7.42).

VIII. The emphatic "that"-form

The Middle Egyptian is $sm.n.f$, and this is found in the Nineteenth Dynasty non-literal (e.g. 7.43) and literary (e.g. 7.46) texts.

The literary Late Egyptian emphatic $sm.f$ or $mrr.f$ is not found in these non-literal works, but is found in the literary texts (e.g. 7.49, 7.52).

In non-literal Late Egyptian (Twentieth Dynasty etc.), the only way to express the "that"-form was $jrj.f \, stp$. While I can find no examples of this in Nineteenth Dynasty non-literal texts, there are examples in the literary texts (e.g. 7.61).
IX

$sdm.f$ can be used in the oath (e.g. 7.62 non-literary, and 7.63 literary text).

$tm.k$ - a prospective $stp.f$ form is optatively used, and is perhaps confined to Papyrus Anastasi I (e.g. 7.9).

(jj.k and $htp$ $p3$ $sw$ in examples 7.52 and 7.53 may be Second Tense forms derived by analogy. They may reflect a stage in the development of Late Egyptian when $jjrf.s$ $sdm$ had not yet become fully established as the normal means for conveying Second Tense emphasis. "The Doomed Prince", in which these examples occur is one of the earliest of the Late Egyptian stories.

This multitude (plethora) of appearance of so many diverse forms certainly makes the Nineteenth Dynasty texts unique, including as it does forms of every type in synchronic and in diachronic contexts, and even forms which had not yet evolved in Middle Egyptian and which were not evident in later Late Egyptian.
Doret (1980:37) distinguished two constructions of Noun + šdm.f.

i. - a "pseudo-verbal" construction in which the noun - emphasized or not - constitutes a unity with an adverbial i.e. circumstantial šdm.f.

He compares this with Gardiner's "pseudoverbal"-constructions, which express duration (durative Aktionsart viz noun + stative (snt jj.tj) and noun + hr + infinitive (snt hr jj.t), and feels that noun + a finite verb form (snt šdm.§) might express duration of an action rather than duration in a state.

ii. - a loose construction in which the extraposed noun is the emphasized subject of the indicative perfect or more like the prospective verb form.

1. Noun + šdm.f in Non-literary NDE texts.

8.1

hm.f šm3n.f h3swt r dw.w
3b.n jb.f m33
jn.w g=kw jm.sn

His majesty inspected the desert lands for his heart desired to see the mines, from which the fine gold is brought.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 65/16)

3b.n jb.f is a ME circumstantial šdm.n.f
jn.w g=kw is a relative šdm.f passive.
156 -

8.2

\(c\text{š}.{p}w\ h\bar{3}j.\bar{s}\)  A swan appears.

(Nauri Decree, 47/15)

II. Noun + șdm.f in Literary NDE texts.

8.3

\(n3\ j\text{š}wt\ mn\text{š} n\ pr\ nb(t)\)
\(\text{šsp.w}\ t\text{j}.\text{šn}\ s\text{bw}\)  The ships crew from every house of commerce receive their loads.

(Papyrus Lansing, 103/14)

\(.w\) is a LE suffix pronoun.

Note the next line though \(w\text{ḏ}.\text{šn}\) an ME suffix pronoun. They depart (and not \(w\text{ḏ}.w\)).

8.4

\(p\text{šj}.k\ j\text{ḏ}t\ k\text{bw}.f\ t\text{š}.k\text{šw}\)  Your herds abound in draft animals.

(Papyrus Lansing, 110/7,8)

8.5

\(n3\ n\ \text{j}rw\ n\ \text{ššw}\ \text{šn}.\text{šn}\ bd\text{š}\)  The vanquished Shasu - they plan rebellion.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 9/3,4)

8.6

\(\text{šs.}w.k\ \text{š}d\text{ž}.w\)  Your sayings do injustice.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 23/1)
8.7
n3j.k šdd.w šhw.w hr nšt.j
mn hr tp špt.j

Your narratives are collected upon my tongue;
established upon my lips.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 40/1,2)

šhw.w is a šdm.f but mn is a stative, i.e. LE First Present, or ME pseudoverbal formation. These different forms are thus interchangeable.

8.8
t3 pšqt jb.sn hwt.w

The hearts of the Ennead exult.

(Horus and Seth, 60/9)

8.9
h3št nbt qmd.sn r.j

All countries are arrayed/or they array (themselves) against me.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 40/8)

8.10
jmn dj.f nhṭ n wsr.m3.c.rč.
stp.n.rč

Amun gives victory to Usermare-sotepenre "may he give victory", (i.e. perhaps prospective).

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 15/12)

This is an example of the extrapoosed noun being the emphasized subject of the prospective verb form.

All these above Noun + šdm.f examples occur in ME, in NDE, and in LE.

In the next two examples the object is expressed before the verb. These are not described by Doret (1980:37).
8.11
\[ t\text{j}.k m\text{s}\text{s} n \$m^{c}\text{w} nfr \$wn.k \text{sw} \]
Your shirt of fine linen of Upper Egypt - you sell it.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 36/16,17)

8.12
\[ \text{wh}^{c}.j n3j.k jtmw \]
\[ \$ksnw \text{jrj}.j \$ngm \]
I solve your riddles; arduous things I make easy.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 20/5,6)

The above two examples are unusual; they occur in ME and NDE.

III. Noun + \$dm.n.f in NDE texts

8.13
\[ phtj \text{hm}.f mk.n.s m\text{s}^{c}.f \]
His majesty's strength had protected his army.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 99/7)

8.14
\[ stwt.j wbd.n.s h^{c}\text{w} n \$bj.w \]
My rays - they burned the rebels' bodies.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 87/2)

Noun + \$dm.n.f is unusual. This occurs in ME and in NDE.
CONCLUSION

Examples of noun + $sdm.f$ are found in both literary and non-literary NDE works. In 8.7, the first line has a noun + finite verb, the second line uses the same noun but has a stative form of the verb, i.e. Late Egyptian First Present or Middle Egyptian pseudoverbal form. These forms are thus interchangeable.

Examples include a noun as object before a finite verb (8.11, 8.12), and examples of a noun + $sdm.n.f$ (8.13, 8.14).
CHAPTER 9

THE \textit{jr} CONDITIONAL CLAUSES

\textit{jr} conditional clauses usually contain a prospective \textit{ṣdmt} in the protasis (the 'if' clause). This is the only form found in Middle Egyptian. In Late Egyptian, the verbal formations which can be preceded by \textit{jr} are many, but \textit{jr} cannot precede a Third Future, a \textit{jw.f hr ṣtp.f} of the past or undefined participles or relative forms. Virtual clauses of condition are rather literary, and clearly a continuation of Middle Egyptian usage. The apodosis (the "then" clause) though may have varied ME forms in ME and LE forms in LE.

1. The \textit{jr} in non-literary NDE texts.

9.1

\begin{align*}
hr & jr jw kj;j hrwj \ldots & \text{And if another enemy should come ...} \\
& & \text{(Hittite Treaty, 228/8)}
\end{align*}

9.2

\begin{align*}
hr & swt & \text{But if there result a loss of any goods} \\
jr & hpr & 3kw m h\text{t} nb & \ldots \\
& & \text{(Nauri Decree, 57/11)}
\end{align*}
II. The jr conditional in literary NDE texts.

9.3
jr jw n.j n3w wr swnw
bw hrw jb.j phrt.sn

When/if the best physicians come to me, my heart rejects ("will not be comforted with") their remedies.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, C4/7)

9.4
jr jrj.k 7 mpt n wh3.f
m . djt fn h3tj.k

If you spend 7 years seeking for it (the cedar), do not grow weary thereof.

(Two Brothers, 17/16 - 18/1)

9.5
jr prj.f m hrj . t3
św gb m ms.c

If he comes out alive, (hrj.t3 is a survivor lit. "as a survivor"), he is worn out from marching.

(Papyrus Lansing, 109/3-4)

9.6
jr ptr.k św m rwh3 n p3 kw w
hr dd.k 3pd r.f

If you were to see him at evening in the darkness, you would fancy him (as) a (passing) bird.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 19/7-9)

hr dd.k is hr šdm.f of the LE literary present. It is the antecedent of the Coptic ḫaḥwšmt.

9.7
jr n3f.k r gs.f jw.f m snn
j.jr.f h3j w3w mj g3b dbw

If you blow beside him as he passes, he will drop down far off like a leaf of foliage.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 19/14-16)
*j.ru.f h3j* is a Second Tense, emphatic or "that"-form.

**9.8**

jr d.d j n.k w3h
p3 n n3 mdwt
jw.k r f3j m nbw n 3 sp.

If I tell you of Wah, him of the cattle-stalls, you will reward (me) with thrice refined gold.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 19/16 - 20/1)

p3 n (he of) is typically Nineteenth Dynasty LE.

The above are all examples of jr + initial prospective 3dm.f. It is the only form found in ME. And I think this example is prospective 3dm.f too (or the wn of existence).

**9.9**

jr wnn jb.k jrj ss

If you have any sense, be a scribe.

(Papyrus Lansing, 106/1)

jrj is ME imperative.

These are all examples of jr + initial prospective 3dm.f. They are found in ME, NDE, and LE.

**Conclusion**

jr conditional clauses are found in both the non-literary and literary NDE texts. The common form is jr + initial prospective 3dm.f in the protasis. Therefore these could be Middle Egyptian forms which survived into NDE and into LE.

The apodosis though may have ME or LE forms, and both are found in NDE.
e.g. ME (a ME imperative) 9.9
LE (a LE bw sdm.f) 9.3
(a LE neg. imperative) 9.4
(a LE First Present) 9.5
(a LE Lit. Present) 9.6
(a LE emphatic Second Tense) 9.7
and (a LE Third Future) 9.8

Therefore the forms of the apodosis ("then" clause) were ME formations in ME and evolved into various LE formations in LE. All of these were found in the intervening NDE.
CHAPTER 10

THE AFFIRMATIVE IMPERATIVE

INTRODUCTION

The imperative expresses a command or exhortation addressed directly to one or more persons. It is thus implicitly in the second person. The dependent pronoun is the object of the imperative.

While the ME and LE forms are clearly distinguishable in the negative forms, the only means of distinguishing the affirmative imperatives may be the presence of a prothetic yod in LE. But it is not always present.

The LE imperative may be preceded by a prothetic yod \( \text{y} \).\(^1\)

( In some cases the prothetic yod interchanges with \( \text{r} \). )

---

\(^1\) The prothetic yod is prefixed to the following LE verbal formations, though not consistently:

- The participle
- The relative form
- The emphatic formations
- The imperative

In some cases the prothetic yod interchanges with \( \text{r} \). )
I. Middle Egyptian imperatives in NDE texts.

(i) Non-literary NDE texts

10.1

\textit{jmj mn n.j mnw.j} \quad Make my monuments endure for me.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/10)

\textit{jmj} is the imperative of \textit{rdj} = cause.

The following verb is a non-initial prospective.

10.2

\textit{jmj nhm.\$w m3\$w m bt3.f} \quad Let one who is free of crime be saved.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 69/6)

10.3

\textit{jmn jmj n.f nh\$ kb n.f gt} \quad Amun, give him eternity, double him everlastingness.

\textit{ntrw jmjw t3 \$nmt dj.tn n.f c\$c.tn} \quad Gods, who are (in) the well, give him your span of life.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 65/7)

\textit{jmj} here is the imperative of \textit{rdj} = "to give" and is not followed by another verb as in "to cause".

\textit{dj.tn} here is the prospective used as an imperative. Or it could be the reinforcement of the imperative by means of the dependent pronoun.
10.4

\[ \text{hr jw } \ddagger \ddagger \ t3 \ bwt \ n \ p3j \ dmtj \ t3wt \ m \ jm.f \]

And since the greatest abomination of this town is stealing copper in it, try this widow!

(Hieratic Ostracon, Verso 7-8)

\[ t3 \ bwt \ldots t3wt \] - is a bimembral nominal sentence, \( t3 \ bwt \), being defined, is the subject, \( t3wt \) being undefined is the predicate.

It seems that \( t3 \), the definite article, here expresses the notion of the superlative. The \( tw \) which follows \( bwt \) indicates that the final \( t \) should be pronounced.

\[ \text{hr jrm } t3 \ h3r.t} \]

\( \text{hr} \) is the imperative of the verb \( \text{hr} \) "to speak". \( \text{hr jrm} \) means "to try", "to put on trial". \( t3 \ h3r.t = \) this widow, i.e. \( t3 \) is not the LE definite article, but the ME anaphoric demonstrative (Groll 1973:70).

(ii) Literary NDE Texts

10.5

\[ mj \ ni \ m33.j \ nfr.k \]

Come to me, that I may see your beauty.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C2/3)

No prothetic yod.

10.6

\[ hmi\j jk \]

Sit still! (lit. cool)

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C3/3)

10.7

\[ \text{smn.tj } r \ tnv \ sh3.k } (\text{sic}) \ sw \ jb.j \]

Stand fast whenever you think of him, my heart.

Do not leap forth.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C3/4)
.tj is the dependent pronoun, reinforcing the imperative, i.e. stand yourself fast. The second line is a ME negative imperative.

10.8

\[jmn jnj mšdr.k n w\text{^{-tj}} m knhn\]

Amun, lend your ear to the lonely in court.

(Prayers as School texts, 17/11)

10.9

\[mj n.j jrj.k n.j šhr\]

Come to me and give me counsel.

(Prayers as School texts, 60/5)

\[jrj.k\] is a prospective šdm.f

10.10

\[mrj šš.w mšdj jhb\]

\[jrj.k šr jkr\]

Love writing, shun dancing,
then you will become a worthy official.

(Papyrus Lansing, 100/9-10)

10.11

\[jrj sš\]

Be a scribe!

(Papyrus Lansing, 106/6)

10.12

\[jn̄ n.k m nfr\]

Win for yourself a good name.

(Papyrus Lansing, 108/14)

10.13

\[jnj jnj.tw n.j wɛ n mj.kdnw.f\]

Have one like it (a greyhound) brought to me.
10.14
\textit{w3h mk jj} \hfill Wait! (I) come.

Should be \textit{mk.wj jj}

10.15
\textit{jmj crk n.j n ntr m.dd} \hfill Swear to me by god, saying: -

\textit{m.dd = m + infinitive (cf. Hebrew \textit{נִכּוֹל}).}

10.16
\textit{s3w r djt drt.j (sic) r šd.j r bnr} \hfill Beware of laying hands on me in order to pull me out.

\textit{(Papyrus Anastasi I, 22/5-7)}

10.17
\textit{wšb 3š} \hfill Answer quickly.

\textit{(Papyrus Anastasi I, 39/3)}

10.18
\textit{jmj h3.w hr htr.k r tmw rnp.t} \hfill Increase your contribution every year.
\textit{s3w d3d.3.k} \hfill Have a care for your head.

\textit{(Papyrus Anastasi I (Really Papyrus Koller), 47/15,16)}

\textit{(d3d.3.k} is LE. ME would be \textit{tp.k}. But note \textit{d3d.3.k} and not \textit{p3j.k d3d.3}).
10.19
mj n.j sp sn mwt 3st

Come to me, come to me, (my) mother, Isis.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III, 10/10)
(Groll 1985:81)

10.20
jmj h3b.tj wh3 n wṣjr

Have a letter sent to Osiris.

(Horus and Seth, 56/7,8)

Note h3b.tj, not h3b.tw

All the above forms were used in ME, and of course in NDE. Some did persist in LE, although the LE imperative was preceded by a prothetic yod. The latter though was not absolutely obligatory.

10.21
j.ṣdm n.j
hrw.pdw t3 mrj
k3 ṣdm n.tn kḥw.w

Listen to me, ye leaders of Egypt.
And may others listen to you.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/14)

The LE imperative (with a prothetic yod) is followed by the non-enclitic particle k3 (= then) before a prospective ṣdm.f (in an imperative or more likely optative sense).

II. The polite request (jḥ ṣdm.k or jḥ ṣdm.tn)

This is ME. (Gardiner 1982:43) and persisted into LE.
(i) Literary NDE texts

10.22
\( jh \, nh.k \, sw \)

Please take note of it.

(Papyrus Lansing, 106/2)

10.23
\( jh \, sm.k \, n \, 3bw.k \)

Go wherever you wish.

(Doomed Prince, 3/1)

10.24
\( jh \, kd.k \, wC \, n \, st.lmnt \, n \, b3t3 \)
\( tm.k \, (\text{for } .f) \, hm\$j \, wC \)

Do you fashion a wife for Bata, that he may not dwell alone

(Two Brothers, 19/7,8)

\( tm.k \, hm\$j \, wC \) is ME

(LE would be \( r \, tm \, hm\$j \))

It corresponds to Hebrew לָבלָב

10.25
\( jh \, h3b.k \, n.n \)
\( p3 \, ntj \, jw.n \, r \, jrr.f \, n \, hr \, hnC \, s\$h \)
\( tm.n \, jrj \, shr \, m \, hym \, n.n \)

Please write us

what we should do about Horus and Seth,

so that we do not take action in ignorance.

(Horus and Seth, 56/16)

\( p3 \, ntj \) + Third Future. \( .f \) is a resumptive pronoun.

\( tm.n \) is ME.
The following two examples are unusual, perhaps hybrid forms of the $\textit{jh \ sdm.k}.$

10.26

$\textit{jh} \textit{jtj \ n.k \ p3 \ 10 \ n \ \textit{ckw}$

Please take for yourself these ten loaves.

(Truth and Falsehood, 34/1-2)

A $\textit{jh \ sdm.k}$ polite request. Should be $\textit{jh \ jti.k \ n.k}$

10.27

$\textit{jh} \textit{jmj.wj \ p3 \ c \ n \ \textit{smt} \ r \ \textit{hmt}$

Please put me on the route to Hammat (HAM)

(Truth and Falsehood, 33/8,9)

There is no .k following jmj.

III. LE imperative with the prothetic yod in NDE texts.

(ii) Non-literary NDE texts

10.28

$\textit{j.sdm} \quad \textit{hrw.pdwt \ t3 \ mrj}$

Listen to me, you leaders of Egypt.

$\textit{n.j}$

And may others listen to you.

$\textit{k3 \ sdm \ n.tn \ kdh.w}$

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/14)
Literary texts

10.29
j.h3c m33.š Leave off seeing her!
(= Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C2/1)

10.30
j.ptr n.k m jrt.k ḏs.k See for yourself with your own eye.
(= Papyrus Lansing, 103/2)

The imperative is reinforced by means of the reflexive dative.

10.31
j.ḏd n.j k3j.k Tell me about yourself.
(= Doomed Prince, 6/5)

10.32
j.šm j.wn p3 ṭbr Go, open the bin (storehouse) (for yourself), and take away for you what you wish.
(= Two Brothers, 12/1,2)

A LE conjunctive continues the sense of LE imperatives.

10.33
j.mḥ.k ḏ3m Take for yourself a sheet of papyrus.
(= Papyrus Anastasi I, 14/2,3)

10.34
j. ms . tw m jṛ jrmj Get you on! Do not weep!
(= Papyrus Anastasi I, 27/18)
III. Some unusual NDE examples.

10.35

\[ \sqrt{wpt_{m3t} hn_{ggr}} \]

Judge between Truth and Falsehood.  
(Truth and Falsehood, 35/16)

This may be an infinitive acting as an imperative.

10.36

\[ \text{sd.wj} \]

Save me!  
(Papyrus Anastasi I (Really Papyrus Koller), 48/7)

Note \( \text{sd.wj} \) not \( \text{wj} \). This could be a scribal error or an infinitive used as an imperative.

10.37

\[ \text{hr tnm3 snw.mn} \]

Beware, take care,  
don't approach him.  
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 87/8)
Let your letters be taken before Onuris, that he may decide for us who is in the right.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 23/3)

This is unusual. More common would be jmjm j3t.tw

Flee from before him.

(Two Brothers, 15/4)

CONCLUSION

There are many examples in both literary and non-literary NDE texts of both Middle Egyptian and Late Egyptian imperative forms.

There are examples of jmjm, the imperative of rdj i.e. "cause", and the following verb is a non-initial prospective (e.g. 10.1); examples with and without a prothetic yod (10.4 and 10.29); examples of polite requests (jm j3tm.k - a Middle Egyptian form which persisted in Late Egyptian (e.g. 10.23), negative imperatives (e.g. 10.7). The Middle and Late Egyptian forms are clearly distinguishable in the negative forms. (See Chapter 12).

The affirmative imperative without a prothetic yod is found in ME, in NDE and in LE.

The affirmative imperative preceded by a prothetic yod is found in NDE and in LE.

The polite request jm j3tm.k is used in ME, NDE and in LE.

Occasionally in NDE, the infinitive acts as an imperative (10.35), rarely the prospective has imperative meaning (10.21).

The imperative may be re-inforced by a dependent pronoun (10.7) or by means of a reflexive dative. (In ME, NDE and LE).

Finally, there are examples of unusual forms, which may be scribal errors, or hybrid forms found in NDE only.
The imperative may be followed by

- a prospective $sdm.f$ (which may occur in ME, NDE or LE) (example 10.21).

- a LE conjunctive (which may occur in NDE or LE) (example 10.32).

- $p3 ntj +$ a Third Future (which may occur in NDE or LE) and then $tm.n sdm$ (which may be found in ME or NDE) (example 10.25).
CHAPTER 11

MIDDLE EGYPTIAN .sd.m.jn.f

In this conjugation, a noun or pronoun subject follows the stem, but also has an infixed "temporal" element (jn). In structure this agrees with the sd.m.n.f form in all respects, except that for n is substituted the formative  jn.

It is one of the ME suffix conjugation sd.m.f synthetic forms with an infix, which in later LE disappeared from usage in favour of the analytic tense-related successive past. However, it is still found in NDE.

The Middle Egyptian sd.m.jn.f indicates a result or sequel, particularly in the past, an outstanding incident in narrative, or "thereupon".

wn.jn.f of course can be used as a Middle Egyptian pseudoverbal construction, as discussed in Chapter 4. This form will not be discussed in this chapter.

There are only a few examples, e.g.:

I. ME sd.m.jn.f in non-literary NDE texts:

11.1

jr m.ht hm.f m tsj m rh jtrw C32.w
jr.jn.f sdn p3 hr w3t
r w3w3 sk hnC jb.f
dd.jn.f
ksn.wj w3t jwtf mw.s

After his majesty had gone up for many miles, he halted on the way in order to take counsel with his heart.

And he said:

"How painful is a way that has no water!"

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 65/16 - 66/2)
\( ksn.wj \) is an adjective with an ME "admirative" (?) in this sense \(.wj\).

\( jwtj \) is ME negative relative adjective.

11.2
\[ \textcircled{a} \text{jw.jn \( hnm.f \) r dw3 \( jt \)} \text{ntrw nbw \ldots} \]

His majesty came to adore his fathers, all the gods ...

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/4,5)

11.3
\[ \text{dbn.jn.f \( hr \) h3jt} \]
\[ hr \text{ wh3 st} \]
\[ \text{jrt bnw} \]

He went about on the desert seeking a place to make a watering station.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/8)

11.4
\[ \text{jrj.jn.tw Sz3d m \( d\)w pn \( hwt \) \( ntr \)} \text{nn n ntrw} \]

By cutting into this stone-mountain, a temple was made (for) these gods.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/2,3)

\( \text{\( \text{s\}g\text{m.jn.tw} \) passive "was made" or "one made"} \)

\( \text{nn n ntrw} \) is typical of Nineteenth Dynasty

These above examples indicate a result or sequel in the past or "thereupon".

They occur in ME and NDE and not in LE.
II. ME šdm.jn.f literary NDE Texts

The šdm.jn.f examples are used only with the word ḏḏ = to say, e.g.

11.5

ḏḏ.jn ṣw ... m3c nb ṭwšt

Then spoke Shu ...

"Right rules might".  
(Horus and Seth, 37/5,6)

11.6

ḏḏ.jn ṭ3ṭj ḫw ḫr jmtn ṳṣwt ...

jrr.tw mj ḏḏ.t nb

Then the fan-bearer at the right of the king ... said:

"It shall be done according to all you have said".  
(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 14/2)

These examples of ḏḏ.jn.f occur in ME and NDE only and not in LE.

ME wn.jn.f + stative or ḫr + infinitive as a pseudoverbal construction is common.

These of course are ME and NDE forms and are not found in LE.

The following is an example of wn.jn.f with a finite verb.

11.7

wn.jn.tw jnj.tw.w m.b3h t3 ṭwšt

So they were brought before the Ennead.

(Horus and Seth, 51/9,10)
CONCLUSION

There are only a few examples of \textit{sdm.jn.f} in the non-literary texts (example 11.1, 11.2). In the literary texts studied here, \textit{sdm.jn.f} examples are used only with the word \textit{4d} = to say (example 11.5).

The Middle Egyptian \textit{wn.jn.f} as a pseudoverbal construction is common, either with a stative (e.g. 4.10) or with \textit{hr} + infinitive (example 4.17). 11.7 is an example of \textit{wn.jn.f} with a finite verb.

The \textit{sdm.jn.f} and \textit{wn.jn.f} forms are found in ME and in NDE and not in LE.
CHAPTER 12

NEGATIVE SENTENCES

INTRODUCTION

After the middle of the Eighteenth Dynasty tended to take the place of n in writing (Gardiner 1982:334) and therefore could represent either mn or n.

In LE mn later became bn and n became bw in most instances. But sometimes in the Nineteenth Dynasty mn was retained for either bn or bw - more commonly bn. Davis (1973) shows for example that in Papyrus Anastasi I 20/16 a variant papyrus has bw for mn and in 30/3, 4, and variant reading has bn.

Davis (1973) classified the LE negative particles bw and bn into twenty-five sentence patterns. (See table at the end of this chapter). She noted that number 10 - bn šw jm is timeless, while number 23 - bn jw.f jm refers to the future and number 24 - bn wn.f jm refers to the past. In a masterly survey, she discusses the probable development of the n, m and b negative. Both n and m negative particles must have been inherited from a proto-language in which there were two contrasting negative particles, probably one containing l (as in Hebrew and Arabic) and one containing m. In Egyptian the l was replaced by n. A b negative probably developed from the m negative.

In Egyptian, the ME mn probably became bn (or bn ... jwn3) in LE, (and n ... an in Coptic), while n became bw in LE (and m in Coptic).
Negation in LE is fully discussed later, and a table there shows the development of the various forms from ME through LE to Coptic.¹

SECTION A: ME NEGATIVE FORMS IN NDE TEXTS

I.

(i) Non-literary NDE texts

12.1

\[\text{sd.n.f hnmt m.b3h.Ê} \quad \text{nn sp jrf mjtt.Ê jr} \]
\[\text{nšt nb wpt.hr ...} \]

He dug a well in front of it, the like of which had never been done by any king, except ...

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 65/5,6)

The pure ME form is \[\text{nn sp sdm.f}\] for expressing "never". ME uses \[n sdm.t.f\] for "not yet" or "before".

LE would express this by \[bwpw.f sdm c.n\], expressing "never" or \[bw jrt.f sdm\], expressing "not yet".

This then, although clearly a ME form is unusual, and perhaps is a unique NDE formation.

12.2

\[\text{nn fÊm.w n.f jn rmt nb}\]

It shall not be approached by anyone.

¹ Summaries are provided after each negative formation
12.3

nn thm.tw.w jm kwj

nn wn tht rs.n

They shall not be comandeered by others and there shall be no interference with them.

(Nauri Decree, 50/6,7)

Note nn wn is for nn jw wn (Gardiner 1982:38, §108).

tht might be a finite verb, but is more likely a noun or an infinitive.

12.4

nn tš{j jm.sn

I will not separate from them.

(Nauri Decree, 50/9)

The above three examples are ME forms which appear in NDE too, but not in LE.

12.5

nn ft.n.j

nn nhn.j m hnw't hr mw hr t3 mn w3h r nḥḥ ḫnÊ dt

I will not tire;

I will not forget any of the ordinances on water or on land, surely and fixedly for ever and eternally.

(Nauri Decree, 50/11,12)
The construction *nn šdm.n.f* is "very rare, scanty, even possibly obscure" (Gardiner 1982:334). It sometimes denies with emphasis that something will (or can) occur.

Gardiner notes in this respect that until better evidence is forthcoming, this construction must be regarded with suspicion, the more so since after the middle of Dynasty XVIII ~~~~ tends to take the place of ~~~~ in writing. (See Davis 1973:163ff. and discussion later.) In LE, it would appear later that *bn* replaced ME *nn* and *bw* replaced ME *n*.

---

**12.6**

... *jw nn rdjt g3j.tw.t3 r.sn jn*

*st nšwt n kš*

... without their being interfered with by any Viceroy of Kush ...

(Nauri Decree, 52/11)

**12.7**

*šm mtr.š mj wd.wr*

*nn rh.tw šnw.f*

The lake in front of it is like the sea, whose circuit is not known.

(Nauri Decree, 47/13,14)

**12.8**

The treasuries are filled with valuables, silver and gold, in heaps on the ground, royal linen and clothing in (different) counts, millions of oil, incense, wine, honey

*nn r¢ m jm c§3.sn*

without limit in counting their abundance.

(Nauri Decree, 48/7-9)

Cf. in
12.9

\( nn \ wn \ f^c.sn \) ... without limit.

(Nauri Decree, 48/12)

The above four examples are characteristically found in both ME and NDE and not in LE.

(ii) \( nn \) ME negatives in literary NDE texts

12.10

\( nn \ rh.j \ shmt \ n.f \) I cannot (or know not how to) go to him.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C1/9)

12.11

\( nn \ rh(j) \ st \ rd.wj \) (I) know not a place for my feet.

\( jh.r \ jh.j \ r \ jkr \) My heart, (you) are very ignorant/foolish.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C2/7)

\( \in \) is ME - to be ignorant of.

12.12

\( sfj \ jkr \ nn \ mjtt.f \) ... Splendid youth, who has no peer ...

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C4/1)
12.13
$nn\ twt.n.f$ ... without his peer.
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 2/11)

12.14
$nn\ wn\ tpj\ m\ n3w\ th3rwt\ jw.f\ jrt\ n\ h3t.f$ There is no chief among the charioteers, who could overtake it (draw level with it).
(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, G1/7,8)

12.15
$nn\ wn.w$ There is none.
(Papyrus Lansing, 105/13)

12.16
$nn\ šw\ ndm\ n\ nd.f$ It (the grain) is not good for grinding.
(Papyrus Lansing, 108/7)

Negation of a sentence with adverbial predicate.
$nn$ before the subject (Gardiner 1982:97), and

12.17
$nn\ wn\ w^c\ r\ šhpr.\ rn.f$ There is none to perpetuate his name.
(Papyrus Lansing, 109/7)

$wn$ is a participle used in a negative universal proposition (Gardiner 1982:313).
The above eight examples are all found in ME and in NDE, but not in LE.

12.18

bw jj nj kd m jb n hrw
nn św hr ēj m grht

Sleep does not enter my heart by day, nor is it upon me at night.

(Papyrus Lansing, 109/16)

The ME nn św is preceded by a LE bw śdm.f of the simple present. (A LE literary form. The pure LE non-literary form would be bw jrj.f śdm).

Side by side and with the same meaning we find a LE bw śdm.f - a form which occurs in NDE and in LE and a nn św, a form found in ME and in NDE. An evolving language.

12.19

nn ft.tw m33.f

One does not tire of looking at it.

(Papyrus Lansing, 110/4)

12.20

nn ḍd.n.f h3.n r nj

No one says - "If only!"

(Papyrus Lansing, 111/13)

12.21

nn jnj.tw phtj.w

One cannot reach the end of them.

(Papyrus Lansing, 112/1)
12.22

She gave birth to a boy, whose like did not exist in the whole land.

(Line 1: is ME pseudoverbal construction, and
Line 2: a relative First Present (for jw bn wn), following an undefined noun (Frandsen’s Function B).

nn has persisted into LE here; as in the following examples from Papyrus Anastasi I (Davis 1973)

12.23

The house of books is hidden; it is not seen.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 20/16)

12.24

This bringing you to beat us: - this is not good.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 30/3,4)
12.25

\[ \text{Run, for I shall tell you his nature,} \]
\[ \text{that you not become impatient(?)} \]

Have you not heard the name of

Amen-wa-se, an old man in (the)

treasury?

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 18/4,5)

\( tm.k \) \( tnhr \) is a ME formation, a negative purpose clause. The Hebrew

\( \text{equivalent is } \text{נכלהי} \). \( tm.k \) is a \( \text{סדמ.פ} \) form of the verb \( tm \) and \( tnhr \) is a

negatival complement.

\( nn + bw \) is unusual, and serves to show that the Nineteenth Dynasty language

has not fully evolved into the LE analytic language yet.

- \( \text{nn} + \text{bw} \) after the middle of the Eighteenth Dynasty tended to take the place

of \( \text{nn} + \text{bw} \) in writing (Gardiner 1982:334), and therefore could represent either.

- \( \text{nn} \) or \( \text{bw} \). In LE \( \text{nn} \) later became \( bn \) and \( \text{bw} \) in most instances. But sometimes in the Nineteenth Dynasty \( \text{nn} \) was

retained for either \( bn \) or \( bw \), - more commonly \( bn \). Davis shows for example

that in Papyrus Anastasi I 20/16 (above), a variant papyrus has \( bw \) for \( nn \) and

in 30/3,4 (above), a variant reading has \( bn \).

\( \text{nn} + \text{bw} \) is unusual; it is a NDE hybrid form.

12.26

\[ \text{You say: } "\text{He does not know} \]
\[ \text{anything}". \]

Will I spend a moment at your side

in coaxing you? ("May I not spend...")

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 16/10-13)
Davis (1973:167) concludes that uses of ~ and ~ provide further confirmation of the conclusion that both are to be read ~ in LE texts. However, texts like the Northern Wars of Sethos I and Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh have almost exclusively $n$ rather than $nn$ (See below.)

12.27
\[nn \text{ hmf} \]

There is nothing he does not know. (Papyrus Anastasi I, 1/5)

12.28
\[mk \text{ ntr.w.k htp} \]
\[mk \text{ nn kndt} \]

Your gods are pleased with you, - not being angry. (Papyrus Anastasi I, 7/5,6)

12.29
\[nn \text{ kjj hn}\text{.j} \]

There was no one else with me. (Papyrus Anastasi I, 13/16)

12.30
\[jw \text{ nn prj p3 hrd r.bl} \]

And the child was not to go outdoors. (The Doomed Prince, 2/1)

The above are all examples used in ME and in NDE and not in LE.
12.31

nn jw.j r wnm  
I will not eat,

nn jw.j r šwj  
I will not drink.

(The Doomed Prince, 5/11)

Here nn clearly precedes LE Third Futures. Later this became bn. Nineteenth Dynasty language still incorporates ME forms together with LE forms.

ME: nn persisting instead of bn with well developed LE Third Futures, i.e. a NDE hybrid form.

12.32

nn jrj.j wnw t ḫnh.kwj m ḥ3w  
I will not live an hour longer than he.

hr r.f  

(The Doomed Prince, 5/16)

12.33

hr nn jw.j r dd.t f n Ṯc  
But I shall tell it to no man, and I will not let it come forth from my mouth to any man.

hr bn jw.j r djt prj.f m rj n  

rmṯ nb  

(Two Brothers, 13/2,3)

Side by side, a nn + LE Third Future and a bn + LE Third Future. The former is a NDE hybrid form, the latter is used in NDE and in LE.

Here, side by side, we find nn + LE Third Future and bn + Third Future.
12.34

\( p^3 \, wn \, nn \, jw \cdot j \, hpr \, m \cdot dj \cdot k \, (dt) \)

For I will nevermore be with you.

(Two Brothers, 16/4,5)

\( p^3 \, wn \) is a typical Nineteenth Dynasty form + \( nn \) + Third Future. The preposition \( r \) is missing. This is common in Nineteenth Dynasty too.

---

This is a NDE hybrid form.

12.35

\( nn \, jw \cdot n \, r \, rh \, p^3 \, gr^3 \)

Do we not know what is wrong?

(Horus and Seth, 38/6)

12.36

\( wn \cdot jn \, 3\cdot st \, \, hr \, jrt \, hpr \cdot s \, m \cdot wc \, n \)

Then Isis changed herself into a statue of flint,

\( rpj\, t \, n \, ds \)

without a head.

(Horus and Seth, 49/16 - 50/1)

\( d3d3 \) is a LE word for head. ME is \( tp \).

---

Summary

\( nn \) \( \) is a ME form, and in the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty could represent either \( \) or \( \) . This continued into NDE, where \( \) could represent \( \) or \( \), and could even be retained for \( bn \) or \( bw \) (e.g. 12.22, 12.31, 12.34, 12.35). (See discussion after example 12.25).
In ME refers to the future "he will not hear" (e.g. 12.2, 12.4). At times it is used as a wish - "may he not" (e.g. 12.26).

nn or wn can express non-existence (e.g. 12.8, 12.14).

nn + infinitive means "without" (e.g. 12.6, 12.13, 12.28)

- A non-verbal sentence with adverbial predicate is negated by an initial nn. A pronominal subject in the form of a dependent pronoun, follows the negative particle (12.16, 12.8).

Unusual examples include:

- nn sp sdm.f (instead of n sp sdm.f (12.1))
- nn sdm.n.f (12.5)
- nn rh.j (instead of n rh.j) (12.10, 12.11)
- nn + bw (12.25)
- nn hm.f (There is nothing he does not know) (12.27) (cf. n hm.n.f (12.38))
- nn (instead of bn) + Third Future (12.31)

and - p3 wn nn jw.j hpr (12.34)

In the construction n sp sdm.f, sp is probably a defective verb "happen" which occurs only in the sdm.f form and whose subject is the following (perfective) sdm.f. The meaning is "it did not occur that he heard" "he never heard"
In addition, we find LE and ME forms side by side in the evolving NDE language, e.g. 12.18, 12.26, 12.33

II.

(i) $n$ in non-literary NDE texts.

There are no examples of $n$ in non-literary texts, bearing in mind, of course (vide supra) than $n$ was often written as $\sim$ from the middle of Eighteenth Dynasty.

(ii) In literary NDE texts

12.37

$dw. n m3c.hrw.f hr ntr.f$

Bad; (it can mean that) he is not justified before his own god.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III - Dream Interpretation, r.8.9b)

(Groll 1985:101)

From the Nineteenth Dynasty until the Coptic period, the negative morpheme $n$ is an indicator of initiality since it may be preceded by the subordinizing converter $jw$ (Coptic $\xi$).

$n m3c.hrw.f$ is a passive $n $sdm.f$ form indicating the simple present. It is a typical Ramesside formation.

12.38

$p3 s\check{s} spd wfhc jb$

O scribe, keen (of wit), understanding of heart,

$\sim$ (sic) $hym n.f r sj$

to whom nothing whatsoever is unknown.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 28/17,18)
12.39

\[ n \text{ hn.tw.f} \]

irresistible.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 6/15)

12.40

\[ n \text{ wn hšj.šw jm.f hrw ts n škj} \]

There is none that approaches him on the day of drawing up the battle line.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 6/15,16)

12.41

\[ n \text{ hšf c.f m t3.w nb.w} \]

His arm is not repulsed in all the lands.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 7/11)

is followed by the perfective \( šd.m.f \). It refers to past or present.

12.42

\[ n \text{ snw.f} \]

without his "second"/his like (i.e. he is unequalled).

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 18/10)

12.43

\[ p3 \text{ hšj nb jm.sn} \]

Whoever fell
did not rise.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 48/3)
12.44
hsj.šw h3t.mn t3;j jnt.htr.w
bn 33w mj. jb jm.mn gr.w
JS n wn wC jm.mn
jw jrr;j n.f sp nfr m p3;j j3
JS bn Chc.n.j m nb jw.mn m
nml;j
dj;j jrr.mn wr m k3j rC nb

How faint are your hearts, O my charioteers,
None among you is worthy of trust!
Is there none among you whom I helped (did something good for) in
my land? Did I not rise as lord
when you were lowly and made you
into chiefs by my will every day?

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 56/14 - 57/7)

The section above is typical of Nineteenth Dynasty. It is a combination of
negative forms.

bn 33w
JS n wn and
JS bn Chc.n.j (bn Chc.n.j)
grw is an adverb, used after negatives.

bn Chc.n.j probably stands for n śdm.n.j(?) which often has present meaning.
If it has past meaning it is usually over a more or less extended period. It can
also negate pseudoverbal constructions.

The n wn (line 3) as in all the examples of n (above and below) are ME
forms, which are used in both ME and NDE and not in LE. The bn
Chc.n.j is probably a unique (or hybrid) NDE form.
I slew them without sparing (them).

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 88/14)

There is no blame in peace when you make it.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 97/13)

Not one of them stood firm to fight with them.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 33/13)

I am among a host of strangers (a host, whom I do not know).

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 40/3)

It is no boast.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 77/8)
Summary

12.50

\textit{jw hnm.f w c n kij hn c.f} \hfill His majesty was alone, none other with him.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 122/9)

12.51

\textit{n qer.n.f hh m h3s t} \hfill He heeded not the foreign multitude.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 120/14)

12.52

\textit{jm jw nfr p3j.k hdb n3j.k b3k.w} \textit{jw hr.k hsj jm.sn} \textit{n n cj.k} \hfill Is it good that you slay your servants, your face savage toward them and without pity (lit. "you not being lenient")?

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 94/7-13)

\textit{n} \textit{sdm.n.f} corresponds to positive \textit{sdm.f} and denies the occurrence of an action over a more or less extended period. The common meaning is "he cannot". It is mostly present, less often past, but in such cases always over a more or less extended period and is rarely future (e.g. 12.47, 12.51).

\textit{n} \textit{sdm.f} corresponds to positive \textit{sdm.n.f}. The \textit{sdm.f} is the perfective, and mostly refers to the past (12.43) and less often present (12.41)

\textit{n rhi} means "I do not know" (actually "I have not learnt"), but can also be "I did not know" (12.48).

\textit{n wn(t)} + subject can express non-existence too. (12.40, 12.44).

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
\textit{n} is a negation form occurring in ME and in NDE, and not in LE. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
III.

is a ME NEGATIVE RELATIVE ADJECTIVE, corresponding to the positive
ntj, ntt, ntjw or nt(jw)t.

The attribute of a defined antecedent, and of an independent relative clause (i.e.
one that is used as a noun) is as a rule expressed by a clause which is introduced
by a relative adjective. The negative jwtj = "one who does not", "one who does
not have".

(i) The jwtj in non-literary NDE texts

12.53

ksn . wj w3t jw t mw.f How painful is a way in which there
is no water.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/2)

and

(ii) The jwtj in literary NDE texts

12.54

jwtj h3t A fool, who has no sense

p3 nj hr šsp.f is he who takes him on.

(Stele of Merneptah, 15/14)
Behold, he is mindless/foolish (lit. one who has not his heart).

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C2/1-2)

without strength
lacking in power

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 17/13,14)

This negative relative adjectival form is used in ME and in NDE and not in LE.

IV. ME Negative Imperative Forms in the NDE texts

The ME (_negative imperative form) negative imperative is a negative wish (m + the negative complement is the usual way of expressing a prohibition).

(i) In the non-literary NDE texts
None in non-literary texts.

(ii) Literary Texts

Do not move, while you are still possessed by what you saw.
m prt is a negative imperative containing the infinitive pr.t. The infinitive occurs after the negative element m only in the Eighteenth Dynasty. It is therefore a literary LE construction. In ME, we find Q (the imperative of the verb f Q ~) + a negatival complement.

\[ m \text{ (negative imperative)} + \text{infinitive is an Eighteenth and NDE form only.} \]

12.58
\[ jntnt \]
Do not dawdle!

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 27/14)

12.59
\[ m.dj t3jt n.k \]
ptr n.k bc
\[ s3w \]
\[ bg3j \]
Do not draw down punishment upon yourself.
Look to it diligently.
Beware -
Do not be remiss.

(Papyrus Koller, 48/13 - 49/1)

Line 1 - is a LE negative imperative
Line 4 - a ME negative imperative.
Don't approach him.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 87/8)

Don't approach him.

Don't approach him.

Don't approach him.

Don't approach him.

Don't approach him.

Don't approach him.

Don't approach him.

Don't approach him.

Don't approach him.
12.62

My lord shall cause to be punished this woman who stole (both) the chisel and the \( wsb \) so that no other woman will repeat doing it likewise.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Verso 12-14)

\( tm \) in a virtual clause of purpose.

12.63

There are many examples of \( r \ tm \ djt \) as negative purpose clauses ("to prevent") e.g. in the Nauri Decree. I think these are LE with \( tm \) negating the infinitive. (See under LE \( tm \)). They could just possibly be ME with the verb \( dj \) as a negative complement (Gardiner 1982:265), but the verb is \( djt \), i.e. infinitive, and LE is more likely.

The negation of the construction \( r + \) infinitive in ME is of course

\[ nn \ s(f,m) \]. It is only in LE Third Future (\( jw.f \ r \ sdm \)) that \( nn \) or \( bn \) can stand before the \( jw.f \). Other infinitives in LE are negated by \( tm \) (e.g. \( r \ tm \ djt, mtw.f \ tm \ sdm \) - the conjunctive; \( jw.f \ hr \ tm \ sdm \) of the past and of the future).

12.64

But his majesty has avoided causing

(Nauri Decree, 57/14)
The above ME uses of $tm$ (negative purpose clauses, participle or virtual relative form and with $jrj.n$ NOUN $tm$ $dj$) are used in ME and in NDE.

On the other hand, the later LE usages, negating all infinitives, isomorphisms groups and as a negative purpose clause $r$ $tm$ $dj$ ( = Hebrew ליבלח) (see later) are used in LE and in NDE, i.e. all forms of $tm$ in both ME and LE usage are found in NDE.

(ii) ME $tm$ form in literary NDE texts

12.65

$bn$ $nfrt$

It is not good.

$tm.k$ $dj$ $jn.jw.$

Do not cause it to be brought

or perhaps - It is not good that you should not cause it to be brought.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 13/5)

$tm.k$ is probably the $sdj.m.f$ form optatively used, a use confined to Papyrus Anastasi I, e.g.

12.66

$tm.k$ $kd$

May you not be angry.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 23/5)

12.67

$tm.k$ $gd$ $hn.j.k$ $mn$ $n$ $k3wj$ $hr$ $nb$

May you not say that I have made your name stink before others.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 40/5,6)
But note too -

12.68

\[\text{You will not flicker like the flame.} \]

(Papyrus Lansing, 106/6,7)

12.69

\[\text{You will not be like a hired ox.} \]

(Papyrus Lansing, 106/13)

This form - \(tm.k\) - the \(sgm.f\) form optatively used is unique to NDE, and in fact to Papyrus Anastasi I and Papyrus Lansing.

12.70

\[\text{Do you fashion a wife for Bata, that he may not dwell/live alone.} \]

(Two Brothers, 19/7,8)

12.71

\[\text{Do not go out, lest the sea carry you away; for I cannot rescue you from it.} \]

(Two Brothers, 19/13,15)

Line 1 - is LE negative imperative.
12.72

\[ jnw^m\textit{ jrj w m. tm wn} \]  \quad Yanoam is made non-existent.  
\quad \text{(Merneptah's Stele IV, 19/5,7)}

and

12.73

\[ ...\textit{ jrj.sn m tm wn} \]  \quad ... making them as that which is not  
\quad \text{(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 18/2)}

12.74

\[ tw.t \textit{ hr cm3 m dr(tj) dj.t} \]  \quad Surely, you know when you caused  
\[ \textit{ jrj.tw sksk p3 c$ n (for jn)} \]  \quad Pharaoh to destroy the cedar at  
\[ pr, c^3 \]  \quad (your?) bidding, that I might no  
\[ cnh wq3 snb shrj st r.j(? t) \]  \quad longer live.  
\[ tmt djt cnh.kwj \]  \quad \text{(Two Brothers, 25/11-13)}

12.75

\[ j\eta h3b.k n.n p3 ntj jw.n r jrr.f \]  \quad Write us what we should do about  
\[ n hr hn$ \textit{ sth} \]  \quad Horus and Seth, so that we do not  
\[ tm.n \textit{ jrj shr m hm n.n} \]  \quad take action in ignorance.  
\quad \text{(Horus and Seth, 56/16 - 57/1)}

The \textit{sdm.f} form of \textit{tm} in a subordinate clause, a virtual clause of purpose (cf.  
\textit{לבלתי}).
SECTION B: NEGATIVE FORMS IN LE

The negative patterns in LE fall into three basic groups (Groll 1970:XIX).

1. **The counterpart group**

   The counterpart group which contains patterns, which are quite different morphologically. But, as far as time and tense indication, syntactic capabilities, and mode of reporting are concerned, they are identical. There is a complete functional identity.

   Examples of this group are:
   
   (a) \( bwpw.f \, \hat{s}dm.f \), the counterpart of the perfect active \( \hat{s}dm.f \)
   
   (b) \( m \, jrj \, \hat{s}dm.f \), the counterpart of the affirmative imperative \( j.\hat{s}dm.\hat{s}w \).
   
   (c) \( mn \, m \, dj.f \, \&.A \), the negation of the existential \( wn \, m.dj.f \, \&.A \) or \( wn \, \&.A \, jm \, m.dj.f \).

2. **The parallels group**

   This group contains patterns which are different both morphologically and as far as the contrast between state and action aspects is concerned. There is only a partial functional identity between affirmative and negative patterns.

   Examples of this group are:

   (a) \( bw \, jrjf \, \hat{s}dm.f \). This negates First Present patterns where the second position is filled by an infinitive, and is used for negating habitual performance of an action, verbs of perception, expressing inability to perform the action, verbs of ceasing or stopping, non-conclusive verbs and can ... could connotations.

   (b) \( bw \, jrt.f \, \hat{s}dm.f \), indicating "not yet" and negating \( \hat{s}dm.f \, c.n \).
3. The isomorphisms group

The isomorphisms group contains patterns in which the affirmative and corresponding negative patterns are identical morphologically, only a $bn$ or a $tm$ being added. If a sentence pattern begins with $bn$, the verbal pattern indeed belongs to the isomorphisms group; the same conclusions may be drawn if the sentence pattern contains $tm$.

(a) $bn$:

- $bn$ + First Present indicating the immediate present
- $bn$ + Third Future (+ $jwn3$)
- $bn$ + non-verbal sentence + $jwn3$
- $bn$ + initial prospective
- $bn$ + emphatic $j.\mathfrak{sd}m.f$ of the future.

(b) $tm$:

As $tm$ negates all infinitives $jw.f$ ($hr$) $tm$ $\mathfrak{sd}m.f$ of past or future, $mtw.f$
$tm$ $\mathfrak{sd}m.f$ of the conjunctive, $tm$ negating the infinitive acting as an imperative,

... $tm$ $\mathfrak{sd}m.f$ of the non-initial prospective.

This classification is a good one, and the clearest common denominator between the three negative categories in LE is the degree of identity between the affirmative and the corresponding negative patterns.

These forms display the first stage towards the wholly analytical verbal system seen in Coptic. The LE patterns are still a mixture of synthetic together with analytic. In Coptic there are two types of negative sentence pattern:

A. The sentence conjugation patterns, i.e. the counterparts and the $\mathfrak{N}$...$\mathfrak{n}$ group, and

B. The clause conjugation patterns, i.e. the $\mathfrak{Tm}$ group.
There are six negative markers in LE:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  bw & bn & \ldots jwn3 \\
  bw\ p\ w & m \\
  bn & \text{and } tm \\
\end{array}
\]

The first five can act as direct indicators of initiality, only \( tm \) cannot. LE also has the negative element \( mn \).

All these forms occur in LE and as shown in the examples in this thesis, in NDE too.

I have tabulated the negative forms in Twentieth Dynasty LE (middle column), flanked by the ancestor ME and the descendent Coptic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( n \text{ p}3.f \text{ šdm or} )</td>
<td>( \text{bwpw.f šdm})</td>
<td>( \text{mππυςωτμ} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n \text{ šdm.f} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n \text{ sp šdm.f} )</td>
<td>( \text{bwpw.f šdm} )</td>
<td>( \text{Επηςωτμ} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( j\text{wtj (šdm.f)} )</td>
<td>( \text{ntj bwpw.f šdm} )</td>
<td>( \text{Επηςωτμ} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m \text{ šdm(w)} )</td>
<td>( \text{m jrj šdm.f} )</td>
<td>( \text{επηςωτμ} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( j\text{mn šdm.f} )</td>
<td>( \text{m djt šdm.f} )</td>
<td>( \text{επηςωτμ} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{m jrj djt šdm.f} )</td>
<td>( \text{επηςωτμ} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n n n \text{ wn or} )</td>
<td>( \text{mn m.dj.fo.A} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n \text{ wnt + subject} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n \text{ rlj.k} )</td>
<td>( \text{bw rlj.k} )</td>
<td>( \text{μεγακ} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n \text{ šdm.n.f} )</td>
<td>( \text{bw jrj.f šdm} )</td>
<td>( \text{μεγςωτμ} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n \text{ šdm.t.f} )</td>
<td>( \text{bw jrj.f šdm} )</td>
<td>( \text{μπατγςωτμ} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps ( n \text{ šdm.n.f} )</td>
<td>( \text{bn tw.j/sw (hr) šdm} )</td>
<td>( \text{μτςωτμ} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{(jwn3)} )</td>
<td>( \text{μτςωτμ} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps ( jw.f n \text{ šdm} )</td>
<td>( \text{jw bn tw.j/sw šdm} )</td>
<td>( \text{Επηςωτμ} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Coptic text is partially obscured and may contain errors or omissions in transcription.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nn šdm.f</td>
<td>bn jw.f(r) šdm¹⁷</td>
<td>ÑNEYCWTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?n šdm.n.f</td>
<td>bn j. jr.f šdm jwn³</td>
<td>NEYCWTM - -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?n šdm.f or</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTAYCWTM - -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ... js</td>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td>EWAYCWTM - -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?n prr.f</td>
<td></td>
<td>EYNA CWTM - -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?nn šdm.f</td>
<td>bn j. šdm¹⁹</td>
<td>ÑNEYMAY - -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nn, nn wn or</td>
<td>bn wn.f + adv. jwn³</td>
<td>(N)NEYMAY - -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n wnt + subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nn šdm.f</td>
<td>bn šdm.f²⁰</td>
<td>MTRP TEREYCWTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or m šdm(w))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Coptic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ḥnC ntf ṣdm</td>
<td>mtw.f ṭm ṣdm(^{22})</td>
<td>ноятмсютм</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(affirmative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps *ḥnC nn swana</td>
<td></td>
<td>? Perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sḏm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Нтепетмсютм</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw ṣdm.f</td>
<td>jw.f(hr) ṭm ṣdm.f</td>
<td>? Еynacютм</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>? Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Тарептмсютм</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>tm dj (sylvania)(^{23})</td>
<td>Тмтрецютм (^{23})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nn + infin.(^{24})</td>
<td>bn (sylvania) jwn(^{24})</td>
<td>? (^{25})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Еимт(е)йсютм</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In ME, *tm* is a negative verb which can be fully conjugated. It is followed by the verb, which contains the action and which has a verb form of its own, the negative complement (the same form follows *m* or *jm*).

In LE, *tm* negates the conjunctive; the *jw.f(hr) sjm.f* of the past and the future; the infinitive; and the non-initial prospective *sjm.f*.

In Coptic, *~ţm~* negates the conjunctive, the temporalis, the potential future, the "until" forms, and the conditional.

This negates 1 praesens, circumstantial praesens, imperfect, 1 Future (with an undefined nominal subject, must be introduced by *ţN*); Future imperfect, non-verbal sentences and all Second Tenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tm(t)</em></td>
<td><em>tm</em></td>
<td><em><del>ţm</del></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In ME, <em>tm</em> is a negative verb which can be fully conjugated. It is followed by the verb, which contains the action and which has a verb form of its own, the negative complement (the same form follows <em>m</em> or <em>jm</em>)</td>
<td>In LE, <em>tm</em> negates the conjunctive; the <em>jw.f(hr) sjm.f</em> of the past and the future; the infinitive; and the non-initial prospective <em>sjm.f</em></td>
<td>In Coptic, <em><del>ţm</del></em> negates the conjunctive, the temporalis, the potential future, the &quot;until&quot; forms, and the conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n ... js</em></td>
<td><em>bn ... jwn3</em></td>
<td><em>N ... QN</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or <em>nn</em></td>
<td>+ non-verbal sentences, 1 praesens, (rarely) 3 Future and Second Tenses. This negates an &quot;is&quot; relationship, and not a performing action.</td>
<td>This negates 1 praesens, circumstantial praesens, imperfect, 1 Future (with an undefined nominal subject, must be introduced by <em>ţN</em>); Future imperfect, non-verbal sentences and all Second Tenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Coptic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nn nfr</em> ...</td>
<td><em>bn nfr p3j ʃdm.f</em></td>
<td>+ adjective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Negation of ʃdm.f of the past or First Present denoting past time.
2. Note: tenses with \(NE-\), i.e. preterite, are negated with \(\tilde{M}(MN)\) or \(M\tilde{N}T\). 
3. Lit.: "it did not occur that he heard", i.e. "he never heard".
4. Never.
5. The negative relative adjective.
6. The relative with negation of the past tense.
7. ʃdm(w) is the negative complement.
8. The negative imperative.
11. Praesens with verb ɳh.
12. 1 praesens denoting habitual action.
13. "Not yet"
14. 1 praesens conveying a synchronous or progressive action or an action in the near future.
15. Circumstantial praesens.
18. Second tenses:  
   18(a) Present;  
   18(b) Perfect;  
   18(c) Habitude

19. Second tense - prospective
20. The initial prospective
21. The optative
22. The conjunctive
23. The causative infinitive
24. Meaning "without"
25. "Unless" rather than "without"

VI.

Examples of $bwph.f$ $sdm$, the negative counterpart of the perfect active $sdm.f$.

(i) Non-literary NDE texts
No examples in the non-literary texts.

(ii) In literary NDE texts

12.76

$hr$ $bwph.j$ $nrj$ $r.h3t.k$  
But I felt no awe before you.  
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 10/16)
You have not/(ever) approached it, nor can you draw near to it.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 22/1-3)

_hn_ occurs several times obscurely before a negative.

We have not (never) seen an ox as big as you say.

(Truth and Falsehood, 35/10,11)

No lord has done for his soldiers what my majesty did for your sakes.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 58/14)

Now the prince of Nahrin had no children, except one daughter.

(The Doomed Prince, 3/4,5)

She did not pour water upon his hands, according to his custom; she did not kindle a light against his return and his house was in darkness.

(Two Brothers, 13/15 - 14/1)
The first sentence is a continuative LE \( jw.f \ hr \ sd\text{m}f \) of the past, negated by \( tm \); the second sentence preceded by \( jw \) converter negates a LE \( sd\text{m}f \) of the past.

12.82
\[
jw.f \ sms \ r \ jrt \ n \ h3t.\$ \quad \text{And he went to meet her, while no one but himself had seen her.}
\]
\[
jw \ bwpw \ wc \ ptr.\$ \ hrj \ jb \ r.f
\]
\( jw \) converter changing \( bwpw.f \ sd\text{m} \) into a subordinate circumstantial clause (Frandsen’s Function A).

12.83
\[
wn.jn \ sth \ hr \ jj \ n.f \quad \text{And Seth came and told Pre Harakti falsely:}
\]
\[
jw.f \ hr \ qd \ n \ p3.\text{r}.hr.3htj \ n \ cd3 \quad "I did not find Horus", although he had found him.
\]
\[
bwpw(j) \ gm \ hr
\]
\[
hr \ jw \ gm.f \ sw
\]
\( wn.jn.f \) ME pseudoverbal construction, followed by a LE continuative past, then a \( bwpw.f \ sd\text{m} \), followed by a \( hr \ jw = \) although - (a concessive clause) followed by a \( sd\text{m}f \) of the past (Frandsen’s Function D).

All these \( bwpw.f \ sd\text{m} \) forms, the negative counterpart of the perfect active \( sd\text{m}f \), are LE forms, found too in NDE and not in ME.
VII.

LE, bw

A.

bw šdm.f (or bw ḍdl.f or bw ṛḥ.f) is a literary LE form, and is not found in LE non-literary texts, where bw ḟrj.f šdm.f occurs when referring to the simple present and bwpw.f šdm when referring to the past. Both forms however are found in NDE.

(i) bw in non-literary NDE texts.

12.84

bw ḏj p3 mt ḫpr ḥrwj r .
jwdšn m ntc

The god has not permitted hostility to occur between them by means of the customary agreement.

(Hittite Treaty, 227/2,3)

LE bw šdm.f = ME n šdm.n.f = timeless and therefore conveys the concept "never permits" (Polotsky 1976:1. Oriental Studies 6).

12.85

r pw ḟr wcr rmṯ 1 r pw rmṯ 2
jw bw ṛḥ.tw.w
r ḟrt b3k.w n kij
bn jw.tw r w3h.w m p3 t3 n ḫt3
jw.tw r jnt.w n R

And if one or two men, who are unknown, flee in order to be servants for another, one will not leave them in the land of Hatti; one will take them to Ramesses.

(Hittite Treaty, 229/5,6)
A conditional sentence following jr + prospective šdmt.f.

*jw bw rḥ.tw.w* is a *bw šdmt.f* (passive) following *jw* after undefined nouns indicating a relative clause (Function B of Frandsen (1974)).

*bn jw.tw* ... is negation of LE Third Future while *jw.tw r jnt.w* is LE Affirmative Third Future.

12.86

*bw mn sp n grg* A liar's deed does not endure.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 68/6)

12.87

*sp nb wn bw rḥ.tw.f* A deed, - that has been unknown -

dj.w nṭr jṛj.tw.f ḫr.j god let it be done by me.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/14,15)

(ii)  Examples of *bw šdmt.f* in literary NDE texts

12.88

*bw šdmt.w n šwnwn* They hearken not to flattery.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 35/5,6)

12.89

*bw km3.f bw šḥšḥ.f* He hasn't moved and hasn't ran

*n ḥr mšṭ.f* since (the day of) his birth.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 17/7)
You do not salute me at the beginning of your letter.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 14/7)

He does not look out for dangerous winds and he does not search for the current.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 43/11-13 (really Papyrus Koller)

A First Present with a verb of perception negated by \textit{bn} precedes a \textit{bw sd\textit{m.f}} of the simple present.

You have not trodden it

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 38/9,10 (really Papyrus Koller)

\textit{m.kf\textit{3w}} is used with a negative for emphasis.

I do not know how to remove myself (from) before him.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C2/6)

I do not put paint upon my eyes, nor oil myself at all.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C3/1,2)
m.kf with a negative for emphasis

12.95

\[
\begin{align*}
\textbf{\textit{b(w) hmr(t) hpr n cfh}}
\end{align*}
\]

They disregard the laws of the palace.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 9/5)

12.96

\[
\begin{align*}
\textbf{\textit{bw w3h,j nfr h3 tp drt.j}} \\
\textbf{\textit{rtm jrt.w}}
\end{align*}
\]

I did not abstain from any good deed, so as to perform it/them.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 37/12)

\textbf{\textit{rtm jrt.w}} is a LE negative purpose clause \texttt{rtm} + infinitive.

12.97

\[
\begin{align*}
\textbf{\textit{tw.k jj.tj m p3 hrw}} \\
\textbf{\textit{bw w3h,k jw cf.w}}
\end{align*}
\]

Today you came back and left no heirs.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 95/3)

A First Present, followed by \texttt{bw sdm.f}

12.98

\[
\begin{align*}
\textbf{\textit{bw dd.f h3cf.tw}} \\
\textbf{\textit{prt r jwn}} \\
\textbf{\textit{jw bw t3j.f hh.s}}
\end{align*}
\]

It (the goose \texttt{smn n wdb}) does not let seed be cast to the ground, without snatching it in its fall.

(Papyrus Lansing, 102/8,9)
A. *bw šdm.f* followed by a circumstantial *jw bw šdm.f*

12.99

*bw jj nj kd m jb n hrw nn šw hr c:j m grh*

Sleep does not enter my heart by day, nor is it upon me by night.

*(Papyrus Lansing, 109/16)*

*nn* here negates a First Present (not *bn*).

12.100

*hn bw hpr.k*

If you had not existed,

*hn bw mš.k*

if you had not been born,

*jw jt bdt hpr m.rč*

barley and emmer would yet exist!

*(Horus and Seth, 57/13,14)*

*hn* refer to irrealis in a conditional sentence.

---

All the *bw šdm.f* forms occur in (literary) LE and in NDF.

---

B. *bw jřj.f šdm(f)*

This is really the counterpart of the ME *n šdm.n.f*. It is the form occurring in non-literary LE texts, and it is the ancestor of the Coptic *mεζωτι* i.e. 1 Habitude. It is not surprising therefore that the frequent performance of an action is negated by *bw jřj.f šdm(f)*. It is Davis' sentence pattern 18, and is one of Groll's Parallels group.
(i)  \textit{bw jrj.f \( \delta m.(f) \)} in non-literary NDE texts

12.101

\[ jw \textit{bw jrj p3 wr n ht3 th(t) r p3 t3 n kmt} \]
\[ r nh3 j3 nkt jm.f \]

And the great prince of Hatti will not transgress against the land of Egypt for ever, in order to take anything from it.

(Hittite Treaty, 227/15)

This is preceded by

12.102

\[ jw \textit{bw hpr.n hrwj r.jwdsn r.nh3} \]

And hostility will never occur between them forever.

(Hittite Treaty, 227/14)

This is an unusual form, a \textit{bw \( \delta m.n.f \)}. The tense is future, although \textit{bw \( \delta m.n.f \)} (an archaistic form of LE \textit{bw \( \delta m.f/bw \ jrj.f \( \delta m \)} and ME \textit{n \( \delta m.n.f \)}) is, properly speaking, timeless.

When the syntax demands \textit{bn} with a following Third Future, the text has \textit{bw} in both instances. Gardiner (1930:220) states that the mistake is serious, as \textit{bw} can never be used to negate a Third Future (\textit{bw jrj NOUN r \( \delta m \)}). He is of opinion that it may be a scribal fault rather than an error in transcribing from the Akkadian \( la + D \) stem of \textit{gerû} (prohibition).

The \textit{bw hpr.n.f} is unusual, and probably occurs only in NDE. (See 18.5). The preceding \textit{bw + Third Future} is unusual, and occurs only here in NDE.

It may be a hybrid NDE form, a scribal fault or a transcription error from the corresponding Hittite Text.
(ii) \textit{bw jrf šdjm.f in literary NDE texts}

12.103
\textit{bw jrf wnm šj m hrrt nb dj m.dj.j hrw.r čbt}
He does not eat any herbs here with me, except lettuce.
(Horus and Seth, 52/14)

12.104
\textit{bw jrf.k hr šdjm}
You do not listen.
(Papyrus Lansing, 106/14)

The \textit{hr} is unusual.

12.105
\textit{bw jř h3t kd hj rmṯ.š}
None who attacks her people will succeed.
(Merneptah's Stele, 16/2)

12.106
\textit{jšt jr šḥ3.k wč n bjn}
\textit{jšt bw jrj.k šḥ3 wč n nfr}
\textit{m.rč pw wč n nkt}
\textit{jw jřj šw n.k jḥ hr}
If you have thought of an evil thing, will you not think of a good thing or of something that I (also) might do for you?
(Two Brothers, 17/7-9)
jw jř{j} is a jw circumstantial/relative clause (Frandsen’s Function B).

12.107

n3j.k wpwt ðθθh
bw jř{j}.w wqC.w
jř{j} hrjw.sf ṣḥj
bw jř{j}.f ṣdm

Your lists are confused and cannot be made right.

Kharof plays the deaf man and will not hearken

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 11/14,15)

Note the "cannot" and "will not" meanings.

All the above bw jř{j}.f ṣdm examples are found in NDE and in LE

(c) Other (perhaps unusual) bw’s

(i) In non-literary NDE texts

Note above bw ṣdm.n.f in the Hittite Treaty 227/14,15.

Note also (bw ṣdm.n.f) in

12.108

nfr jř{j} hr r n ṣmr
p3 wn(n) bw ḫj.n.sn ṣgrw.f

Happy is he who acts on the word of god, for his plans do not fail.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/8,9)

12.109

sp nb wn bw ṣĮ.tw.f ...

A deed that has been unknown ...

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/14)
wn of existence negated by bw ṣḏm.tw.f. This is unusual.

These wn bw examples are unusual; I think they occur rarely in NDE and in LE.

(ii) Unusual forms of bw in literary NDE texts

12.110

wḏ t3 ṣw prj r šb3
bw gm.n.f ṣw hr št.f

As dawn comes, he goes to make a start, and does not find it in its place.

(Papyrus Lansing, 105/3,4)

Another example of bw ṣḏm.n.f

Perhaps a unique NDE form (as in 12.102, 12.112 and 12.113).

12.111

nn bw ṣḏm.k rn n A

You have surely heard the name of A.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 18/5,6)

A double negative here!
nn and bw!

Unusual, perhaps a hybrid NDE form.
12.112
Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh has examples of $bw \, sjm.n.f$ too, e.g.

$wnn.j \, hr \, sgb \, n.sn$
$I keep on shouting for them, but$

$bw \, sjm.n \, n.j \, wC \, jm.sn \, jw.j \, hr$
$none of them heeds my call.$

c$...

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 41/3)

and in

12.113
Doomed Prince, there is a $bw \, sjm.n.f$ too,

$bw \, dj.n \, p3 \, nht \, prj \, p3 \, msh$
The demon did not let the crocodile come out.

(Doomed Prince, 7/5,6)

Further examples of the unique NDE $bw \, sjm.n.f$.

12.114
$bw \, jjf \, r.n \, c^n$
It was never done to us since the
$dr \, p3 \, rC$
time of Re (primordial times)

(Merneptah's Stele, 15/7)

This $bw \, sjm.f \, c^n$ has the connotation of "never before".

This is unusual, perhaps unique to NDE. LE has $bwpf.f \, sjm. \, c^n$. 
12.115

bw $\sim$ h\text{m}.f n.f dw3w

p3 th3 t\text{s}.f

He knows no tomorrow, who attacks his border.

(Merneptah’s Stele, 15/14 - 16/1)

**Conclusion**

bw $\mathcal{S}dm.f$ is a literary LE form which also occurs in NDE. bw $jrj.f \mathcal{S}dm$ is a LE form also occurring in NDE.

Rare examples include bw $\mathcal{S}dm.n.f$, - probably a unique NDE form.

bw + Third Future, perhaps a hybrid NDE form.

bw $jrj.k \ hr \ \mathcal{S}dm$, probably also a NDE hybrid form.

wn bw $\mathcal{S}dm.f$, a rare negation of existence, found in NDE and in LE.

nn + bw, - a hybrid NDE form.

bw $\mathcal{S}dm.f \ ^c_\text{n}$ perhaps unique to NDE too.

**VIII.**

The isomorphisms group contains patterns in which the affirmative and corresponding negative patterns are identical morphologically, only a $bn$ or a $tm$ being added, e.g.

- $bn$ + First Present, indicates the immediate present.
- $bn$ + Third Future ($\pm \ jwn3.$)
- $bn$ + non-verbal sentence + $jwn3$
- $bn$ + initial prospective
- $bn$ + emphatic $j.\mathcal{S}dm.f$ of the future.
(i) Examples of *bn* in non-literary NDE texts

(a) *bn* + non-verbal sentence

12.116

*m.bj3t*

*bn jnk r.jt3 sw*

No. It was not I, who stole it.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 8)

A negative participial statement.

*r.jt3 = j.jt3* is a specific formation of the participle for the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties.

*m.bj3t* is an adverb phrase (preposition *m* + the noun *bj3t* "wonder"). It means "No!"

12.117

*bn nsj hrt.tn*

It does not belong to your requirements.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 68/2)

(b) *bn* + initial prospective *sdm.f*

12.118

*bn mjr.sn sfd3 m hrt*

They do not like misuse of their possessions.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 68/3,4)

12.119

*jw bn m3f n wsr*

... without it being offered to Osiris.

(Nauri Decree, 55/3)
Circumstantial following *jw*

12.120

`hr  jr  jw  bn  jb  n  p3  wr  c3  n  h7t3  šmt  ...`  
And if the wish of the great prince of Hatti is not to come ...

(Hittite Treaty, 228/5,6)

This (- a conditional sentence with *jr*) - is followed by

`jw.f  hr  djt  hnn  p3j.f  mšc`  
then he will send his army, i.e. *jw.f  hr  šdm.f* of the future.

And this is followed by a conjunctive.

(c)  *bn  + a Third Future*

12.121

`bn  jrj  p3  wr  c3  n  h7t3  r  šsp.w`  
The great prince of Hatti will not receive them

(Hittite Treaty, 229/3,4)

*jrj* is for *jw* before a nominal subject (Gardiner 1930:220).

12.122

`bn  jw.tw  r  w3h.w  m  p3  t3  n  h7t3`  
One will not leave them in the land of Hatti

(Hittite Treaty, 229/6)
12.123
jr n3j mdt
ntj hr p3j 3nw n hd ...
jr p3 ntj bn jw.f r s3w.sn ...

As for these words, which are on this tablet of silver
whoever will not keep/observe them ...

(Hittite Treaty, 230/11-13)

(iii) Examples of bn in literary NDE texts

(a) bn + First Present

12.124
hr jri j knkn.k m ht nbt
hr bn tw.k šdm

But though I beat you with every kind of stick, you do not listen.

(Papyrus Lansing, 101/10,11)

12.125
gm(j) bn št m hšwt bn št m šhwřj

(I) found it (your letter) consisted neither of praises nor of insults.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 10/5,6)

12.126
bn tw.k m šš jwn3

In very sooth, you are no scribe.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 22/7-9)

Note bn ..... jwn3 here.
12.127
bn šw šsp ḫr ḫk3. w n ḫd3. w
bn šw ḫr ḫd n jnj. mtr
bn šw ḫr nw ḫ r ḫ3c. r
He does not take bribes from the guilty,
he does not speak to the witness,
he does not look at him who promises.
(Prayers used as school texts, 2/13,14)

12.128
bn ggr ḫ3m n3j. f ḫwn. jbh
The cheat cannot retain his plunder
(Merneptah's Stele, 17/4-6)

12.129
bn mjnjw ḫr ḫd3j mḥt jtrw
No herdsmen cross the river's flood
(Merneptah's Stele, 18/11)

12.130
jw.w ḫr m3c
jw bwh ḫjšn
jw bn št ḫr ḫr ḫ r ḫh3
They attacked the army
as they were marching unaware and
not prepared to fight.
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 27/3)

12.131
bn kjj ḫr ḫn.f
No one turned around.
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 47/14)
And no one knows how to judge between the two men.

(Horus and Seth, 39/14,15)

The land in which I am is full of savage-looking messengers, who fear no god or goddess.

(Horus and Seth, 58/2-4)

This is a negative relative First Present (Frandsen's Function B (1974))

(b)  \textit{bn} + non-verbal sentences

There is no grain.

(Papyrus Lansing, 106/1)

It is not good

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 13/5)

Your path is filled with boulders and pebbles, without a passable crack(?)

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 35/11,12)
12.137

She is not a chatterer

(lit. She has not a word too much)

(Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C1/3)

bn n.s ḫnw m h3w

is speech in LE.

12.138

When the best physicians come to me, my heart will not be comforted with their remedies.

The magicians - there's no help through them.

My sickness is not discerned (diagnosed)

(Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C4/7,8)

jr jw n.j n3w wr swnw

bw hrw jb.j pḥr.šn

n3w grj.bb.w bn w3t jm.šn

bw ᦤ ṭ3j.j ḫ3jt

12.139

It is not mine, I cannot give it to you.

(Truth and Falsehood, 34/10)

bn jnk ṣw

bn jw.j ṭḥ dj.š n.k

12.140

Israel is wasted, bare of seed.

(Merneptah's Stele, 19/7)

jsr3r fkt bn prt.f

12.141

The labours of many people are nothing.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 42/3)

bn k3t n rmt ḫnw
12.142  
bn 33w mh.jb jm.tn grw  
None among you is worthy of trust.  
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 56/14)

12.143  
jš bn  
Is it not so?  
(Two Brothers, 16/12)

12.144  
bn nfr jwn3 p3j gb.tw m.b3h t3 pšdt  
It is not good - your defrauding (me) before the Ennead.  
(Horus and Seth, 42/5,6)

Note bn ... jwn3

12.145  
m jř jrt n3 sp.w c3.w n grg ntj  
bn št r st.w  
Don't do those big misdeeds, that are out of place.  
(Horus and Seth, 40/1,2)

Relative negative First Present is used here. jw bn št hr šdm cannot be used, as the preceding noun is definite. This should be under bn + First Present.

(c)  bn + initial prospective šdm.f

12.146  
bn dj.j dj.f hš hr t3 šnwt  
I will not let the seal be set upon the granary.  
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 12/1-3)
(d) \( bn \) + Third Future

12.147
\[ bn \ jw.k \ rh \ r \ jrf.f \] You will not be able to be one (a peasant).

(Papyrus Lansing, 106/2)

12.148
\[ bn \ jw.j \ r \ shn \ m \ t3 \ knbt \] I shall not contend in court.

(Horus and Seth, 43/1)

(e) \( bn \) + Second Tense emphatic (the "that" form)

12.149
\[ bn \ j.jr.j \ mj. \ kdnw.k \ m.qr \ snj.j \ n.k \] When I invoke you, I do not act as you do.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 14/5,6)

In Second tenses \( bn \) or \( bn \ldots jwn3 \) negates the nexus between the subject (the "that" form) and the predicative adverbial element. The "that" form itself is negated by \( tm \) (see later). (Horus and Seth 59/6).

12.150
\[ jst \ bn \ j.jr.tw \ m \ p3 \ qd \ jtm \] Is it not according to the word of Atum that one should act?

(Horus and Seth, 47/14,15)

All these various uses of \( bn \) are well-known in LE and in NDE.
2. **Unusual is** *bn šdm.n.f*

The *šdm.n.f* is probably an old ME emphatic form, e.g.

12.151

*jš bn cḥfc.n.j m nb jw.tn m nmrhj*

Is it not when you were lowly that I rose as lord?

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 57/7)

12.152

*jš bn šm.n.j cḥfc.n.j hr r.k*

Is it not at your word that I walk and stand?

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 35/4)

(Compare this with 36/2, which is *jš bn šdm.f jš bn jrj.j n.k mnmnwt c33wt wr*. Have I not made for you many great monuments?)

and

12.153

*jš bn jrj.n rmt s3f.m njwtf*

Is it not to be acclaimed in his town that a man acts?

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 79/3)

---

*bn šdm.n.f*, may be an old ME emphatic form, thus found in ME and in NDE.
3. Examples of "bn šḏm.f" with a past meaning are:

12.154
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 36/2) - above, and

12.155
jšt bn ḏḏ.f  n n3 šb3w  ntj ḫnw.št
j.jř.m  htp jmnt  r.tmw  grḥ m
p3 ntj  nswt  wšjr  jm.  
(When Ptah created the sky), he did not say to the stars in it
"You shall go to rest in the West every night in the place where king Osiris is".
(Horus and Seth, 58/9,10,11)

The latter, is of course a Second Tense emphatic.

12.156
jw bn  jnj.šw  hrj  n  nṯr  nfr
And the dread of the good god did not take him away.
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 18/2,3)

\[bn \ šḏm.f\] with a past meaning is unusual, but does occur rarely in NDE and in LE.

IX. The LE negative imperative

\[m \ jřj \ šḏm.f\]  
(and its variants) are the counterpart of the affirmative imperative \[j.šḏm.šw\].
(I) In non-literary NDE texts

12.157

$m$ $jrj$ $ršt$

Do not rejoice!

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 68/5)

12.158

$m$ $dj$ $jrj.tw$ $ʃh^c$ $p3j.f$ $bt3$ $r.f$

$m$ $dj$ $ʃh.tw$ $p3j.f$ $pr$ $n3j.f$ $hmwt$

$n3j.f$ $ḥrdw$

$m$ $dj$ $jrj.tw$ $ḥdb.tw.f$

$m$ $dj$ $th.tw$ $r$ $jrtj.fj$ $jdnwj.fj$ $r$ $r.f$

$r$ $rdwj.fj$

Do not cause that his crime be raised against him.

Do not cause that his house be destroyed, his wives or his children.

Do not cause that he be killed.

Do not cause that one do injury to his eyes, his ears, his mouth and his feet.

(Hittite Treaty, 231/6)

(ii) In literary NDE texts

12.159

$m$ $jrj$ $djt$ $dd.tw.k$

$wn$ $ŋkt$ $m$ $ḥm.k$

Let it not be said of you that there is anything that you do not know

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 26/7)

$m$ $jrj$ $djt$ $ṣdm.f$ is a new LE innovation.

12.160

$j.mš.tw$

$m$ $jrj$ $rmjt$

Get you onwards!

Do not weep!

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 27/18)
Do not make the commander angry!
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 29/16)

"Don't wait, go home"
so he says to me, as often (I) remember him.

Don't act so foolishly, my heart.
Why is it that you must act foolishly?

(Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C3/2,3)

Two LE negative imperatives

/hr.f n.j/ is recorded after spoken speech, and usually refers to the present time.
/j.rj.k wh3/ is a Second Tense, emphatic, which is obligatory with the interrogative.

Do not overwhelm us!
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 93/14)

Do not cause me to leave the dressing of my hair unfinished.
(Two Brothers, 12/2)
12.165

\textit{m j mij prj r bnr}
\textit{tmt p3 jwm hr jij.t}

Do not go out, lest the sea carry you away.

(Two Brothers, 19/13,14)

12.166

\textit{m dj jij.n shr m hnt.n}

Let us not decide in ignorance.

(Horus and Seth, 39/1)

*The LE negative imperative forms \textit{m jij śdm.f}, \textit{m djē śdm.f} and \textit{m jij djē śdm.f} are all LE forms and occur in NDE too.*

X. LE negation of existence

*The negative \textit{mn}* 

or \textit{m(wn)rmf}

(i) Non-literary

There are no examples in the non-literary NDE texts.

(ii) Examples in literary NDE texts

12.167

\textit{p3 wn mn ks n rmf jm.k}

For there is not the bone of a man in you.

(Papyrus Lansing, 106/7,8)
12.168

mn m.dj.k jt

You don't have a father.

(Truth and Falsehood, 32/14)

The *mn* negation of existence is found in NDE and in LE.

XI.

*tm* in LE

*tm* negates all infinitives - *jw.f* (*hr*) *tm* *qdm.f* of past or future *mtw.f* *tm* *qdm.f* of the conjunctive. *jrf.f* *tm* *qdm.f* of the Second Tense, emphatic.

It negates the infinitive acting as an imperative, and it negates the non-initial prospective

... *tm* *qdm.f*.

It belongs to the isomorphisms group, in which the affirmative and corresponding negative patterns are identical morphologically, only a *tm* being added.

(i) Examples of the LE usage of *tm* in non-literary NDE texts

Nauri Decree

There are many examples in this decree of *r* *tm* *dj.t* *qdm* - a negative purpose clause. This is LE (cf. above ME *tm* and Gardiner 1982:265). *tm* is followed by an infinitive *djt* and the *qdm* is a non-initial prospective, e.g.
Likewise his majesty has decreed that ordinance be made (for) (the protection of) the stock of kine, the stock of goats, the stock of asses, the stock of dogs, the stock of geese, (and) the stock of other animals, belonging to the House, "Menmare - "The Heart is Content in Abydos" on water or on land to prevent interference being done to any individual or a herd of them, to prevent interference being done to their herdsman (snjj is a curious third plural suffix pronoun) to prevent the taking of cattle, (or cattle being taken), asses, dogs, goats, any individual or a herd of them by commandeering or by privilege, to prevent any superintendent of cattle, any superintendent of hounds, any herdsman belonging to the House etc. taking ox, ass, dog or goat belonging to the House ...

(Nauri Decree, 54/11 - 55/1)

There are both passive and active verbs following r tm djt. The passives with .tw could be translated as "to prevent one interfering with".
... and they shall not fly.
(Nauri Decree, 58/4)

Negation of a LE conjunctive.

... in order not to cause ... hostility to occur between them for ever.
(Hittite Treaty, 227/6)

Whoever will keep these words ... and will not destroy any of them ...
(Hittite Treaty, 230/13,14)

And the great prince of Hatti will not cause their sin to be raised against them.
(Hittite Treaty, 231/12)

Negation of a conjunctive.  Note that the tm precedes a nominal subject.
244 -

All the above examples of \textit{tm} in the non-literary texts occur in NDE and in LE.

(ii) Examples of the LE usage of \textit{tm} in literary NDE texts

\textbf{12.174}

\begin{verbatim}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
    \textit{rh.\$j \textit{jb n snt}} & How well the sister's heart knows \textit{that he is not far from her.} \\
    \textit{p3j.f tm w3w r snt} & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{verbatim}

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, G1/8 - XXXA1)

\textit{tm} here is negating the \textit{p3j.f \textit{\$dm}} pattern. This pattern is made negative by \textit{p3j.f tm \textit{\$dm}}, and not by the pattern \textit{*p3j.f ntj bwpw.f \textit{\$dm(f)}}.

\textit{w3w} is the infinitive of an adjectival verb. This pattern is indifferent to time indication (as compared to \textit{p3 tm \textit{\$dm jjr.f}}, which is restricted to past time).

(See below, Two Brothers 15/16-16/1)

\textbf{12.175}

\begin{verbatim}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
    \textit{m pr.t} & Do not move ... \\
    \textit{tm \$h.w.k \textit{ht rsw.t.k}} & so that you may not be blocked by something in your dream. \\
\end{tabular}
\end{verbatim}

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III - Dream interpretation, 10/11-10/12)

(Groll 1985:81)

(Groll translates it "so that the blockage from your dream may pass").
This is a non-initial prospective šḏm.f used as a clause of purpose.

12.176

bw w3ḥ.j nfr h3 tp drt.j
r tm jrt.w m p3j.k wb3

I did not abstain from any good deed, so as not to perform it in your court.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 37/12)

12.177

... n jb n tm djt hr.šw p3 mšc
n ḫn.f r ḫh3 ḫn̄ p3 ḫr n ḫt3

... in order to prevent his majesty's army from making ready to fight with the foe from Khatti.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 106/12)

12.178

bt3 c3 p3 jř jn jmj.j h3st
ḫn̄ n3 šrw n pr.c3 cnh y w̄d3
snb
p3 tm djt smt n.sn (r p3 ntj)
p3 ḫr n ḫt3
m p3 ntj nb šw jm

It is a great crime that the governors of foreign countries and the chiefs of Pharaoh have committed in failing to discover for themselves the foe from Khatti, wherever he was

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 116/7-13)

p3 jřj and p3 (tm) djt are the definite article + an infinitive, the latter negated by tm (cf. above Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs G1/8 - XXXA1)

12.179

bw w3ḥ.f h3št
tm jnt n.š

He had not spared a country from being brought

(lit. "so that it was not brought").

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 18/15)
Negation of a LE continuative $jw.f \ hr \ isphere \ nm$ of the past.

$tm$ is written $tm$, i.e. recalling ME infinitive (with a following $isphere$ being the negatival complement).

Then he was afraid and he beat (me), so that I might not report it to you.

Then his elder brother smote twice upon his hand in vexation, because he had not slain him.

This negates $p3 \ isphere \ jfrf$ and refers to past time (lit. "because of the not killing him which he did"
not "the killing which he did not do")

This is LE. The $hdbf$ is clearly infinitive + a suffix pronoun. In ME $tm$ would be the infinitive and $hdb$ the negative complement.
Note though that *tm* is written *tmt* as a writer of ME would do.

This is a LE form and occurs in NDE too.

12.183

*j.jr.k tm djt wgtc.tw.tm hr jh*  
Why have you resisted being judged?  
Lit. "Why is it that you have not let yourself be judged?"

(Horus and Seth, 59/6)

This is negation of an emphatic Second Tense, *tm* negating the "that"-form itself.

Not "Why is it not that you have let yourself be judged?"

cf. *bn* negating the nexus. (See above Horus and Seth 47/14,15).

This is specifically a LE and an NDE form.

All the ME and LE Negative forms are found in NDE.

CONCLUSION

The ME negative forms *nn* and *n* attached to the synthetic suffix conjugations (*sdm.f* and *sgm.n.f*), and the *m* and *tm* with a negative complement evolved into the LE *bn* and *bw*, attached now to the fully analytic First Present, Third Future, the Second Tenses (emphatic) and *bw jrj.f sdm*, the *tm* being attached to the sequential past and future forms and the conjunctive. The LE negative evolved into *m dj jrj.f sdm*. 
All these forms appear in NDE; the ME synthetic forms side by side with the LE analytic and clearly tense-related forms.

Most of the Middle and of the Late Egyptian forms of negative sentences are found in both the non-literary and literary NDE texts studied. Their appearance in situ and their development is reflected in general in the two tables in this chapter, and more specifically in the paradigms and in the tables in the Chapter "Summary and Conclusions". Unique or hybrid forms, not appearing in ME nor evolving in LE, are tabulated too.

All the negative forms (Middle Egyptian, Late Egyptian and even in Coptic) are discussed in detail, tabulated, and examples given of their occurrence in the Nineteenth Dynasty literature. Hence, there is a synchronic description of the negative usages in Nineteenth Dynasty literature, and a diachronic study too, explaining the Middle Egyptian antecedents, the Late Egyptian forms and how they evolved in Coptic.

Interesting hybrid forms are discussed too (e.g. bn $dm.n.f$ and bw $dm.n.f$).

The following table is from Davis (1973).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence type (LE)</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. bn sgm.f</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>bn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. bn jrj.f sgm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. bw sgm.f</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>bw</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. bwswf sgm</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>bw</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. bn nfr sw</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n (js)</td>
<td>bn ... (jwn3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. bn njn nf sw</td>
<td>n ... js</td>
<td>n js</td>
<td>bn ... (jwn3)</td>
<td>(n) ... an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. bn nsf pji</td>
<td>n ... js</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>bn ... (jwn3)</td>
<td>(n) ... an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. bn jnjnf clause</td>
<td>n ... js</td>
<td>n ... js</td>
<td>bn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. bn nsf uff</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>n ... js</td>
<td>bn ... (jwn3)</td>
<td>(n) ... an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. bn sw jm</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>nn</td>
<td>bn ... (jwn3)</td>
<td>(n) ... an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. bn sw m n'ji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bn</td>
<td>(n) ... an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. bn sw hr sgm</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>bn ... (jwn3)</td>
<td>(n) ... an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. bn sw r sgm</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>bn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. bn sw nfrw</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>nn</td>
<td>bn ... (jwn3)</td>
<td>(n) ... an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. bn jsigmwef jm</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>bn ... (jwn3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. bn jjjwef sgm jm</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>bn ... (jwn3)</td>
<td>(n) ... an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. bw sgm.f jm</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>bw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. bw jrj.f sgm jm</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>bw</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. bw sgm.nsf jm</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>bw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. bw jnj.f sgm jm</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>n ... (js)</td>
<td>bw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. bw sgm.f jm</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n ... js</td>
<td>bw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. bw jnf sgm jm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bw</td>
<td>mp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. bn jef jm</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>nn</td>
<td>bn ... (jwn3)</td>
<td>nn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. bn waf jm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bw ... (jwn3)</td>
<td>(n) ... an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. m.(wn) nuf</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>nn</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 13

THE LATE EGYPTIAN THIRD FUTURE

INTRODUCTION

The First Tenses in Egyptian refer to

1. First Present, expressing present, imperfect or incomplete actions or states.
2. First Future, expressing the concept "they are going to do something" $st (m) n^f j r m^g$.

The Second Tenses are the emphatic or "that" forms, $jjrj.f s^dm.f +$ adverb. "It is this that he did".

The Third Tense is confined to the Third Future, and expresses future time, as in the ME prospective sense. $jw.f r s^dm$ is an initial form, unlike the $jw.f hr s^dm.f$ of the continuative future.

The Late Egyptian Third Future is $jw.f (r) s^dm(f)$. It consist of a quadripartite formation.

Part 1: The $jw$ of the future.
Part 2: The actor expression, which is either a pronominal suffix or a noun.
Part 3: The preposition $r$, which precedes the infinitive
Part 4: The infinitive, either of a transitive or an intransitive verb.
The final \( .f \) following the infinitive is the object, which is a pronominal suffix (cf. a dependent personal pronoun follows an imperative).

This form is negated by \( bn \), i.e. \( bn \ jw.f \ r \ sdm(f) \).

Note that in Nineteenth Dynasty language, the preposition \( r \) is sometimes not written.

I. Examples in non-literary NDE texts

13.1
\[
\begin{align*}
jw.j \ r \ kdl \ hnt \ m \ st \ tn \\
h \ r \ wr \ jt.j \ ntrw \\
k3 \ dj.sn \ mn \ jrt.j \ rd \ m.j \\
phr \ hr \ h3\swt
\end{align*}
\]
I will build a sanctuary on this spot, bearing the great name of my fathers, the gods.

Then, may they make my deeds endure and my name flourish throughout the desert lands.

\( (Kanais, 66/16 - 67/1) \)

\( k3 \) is a non-enclitic particle, meaning "so" or "then"

\( dj.sn \) is a prospective \( sdm.f \) = to cause and precedes non-initial prospectives \( mn.f \) and \( rd.f \).

The possessive suffixes \( .j \) are ME, and precede LE \( p3j.j \)

13.2
\[
\begin{align*}
jw.k \ r \ jwC
\end{align*}
\]
You shall inherit.

\( (Nauri Decree, 46/16) \)

13.3
\[
\begin{align*}
bn \ jw.tw \ r \ w3h.w \ m \ p3 \ t3 \ n \ h3t3 \\
jw.tw \ r \ jnt.w \ n \ p3 \ h3k3 \ c3 \ n \ kmt
\end{align*}
\]
One will not leave them in the land of Hatti.

One will take them to the great king of Egypt.

\( (Hittite Treaty, 229/6,7) \)
A negative Third Future negated by \( bn \), and an affirmative Third Future.

These examples are found in LE and in NDE but not in ME.

The ME rule that \( jw \) must not be employed after \( nn \) and \( ntj \) breaks down in LE. Following are some examples of \( ntj \) (the relative adjective) + Third Future.

13.4

\[
\begin{align*}
jn & \quad (\text{for }jr) \quad s3 \quad nswt \quad n \quad kš \quad nb \\
hřj & \quad pdt \quad nb \\
h3tj & \quad nb \\
rwđ & \quad nb \\
rmt & \quad nb \\
ntj & \quad jw.f \quad r \quad jt3 \quad rmṭ \quad nb \\
... & \quad m \quad kfcw \quad ...
\end{align*}
\]

As to any viceroy of Kush, any chief of foreign contingents, any mayor, any inspector, or any person, who shall take any person ...

... by capture ...

\[
\begin{align*}
jř.jw \quad hpw \quad r.f \quad m \quad htf \quad ...
\end{align*}
\]

the law shall be enforced against him (or punishment shall be done to him) by beating him ....

(Nauri Decree, 52/13 - 53/6)
As to any keeper of cattle ... who shall give any head of animals ... by defalcation to another; likewise he who shall cause it to be offered on another direction/list, and not be offered to Osiris ...; punishment shall be done to him.

(Nauri Decree, 55/14 - 56/1)

djt m šb means to give by defalcation = to sell

(jw) bn m3\textsuperscript{c}.f is a negative prospective.
The apodosis jrj.tw hpw r.f is a prospective passive šdm.f

These examples ntj + Third Future are well attested to in LE and NDE, but not in ME.

Compare these with:

But, as to any official who, in the manner of an evil witness, shall suggest to his lord, .... to remove the workmen ...

This is a ME formation, used exactly as the Third Future was used in the previous examples.
Perhaps a First Present with *r* indicating futurity.

| This is an example found in ME and NDE (and not LE) expressing the same thing. |

and with

13.7

*jr nswt nb*

*ntj r hpr*

*šḥnt.f šhrw.j nb*

...

*mk tw.tw r wšb.f m jwnw*

But as to any future king (lit.) (who shall happen), who shall destroy any of my plans ...

He shall receive his answer in Heliopolis (*On*).

(Kanais, 69/2)

and with

13.8

*jr nswt nb*

*ntj r hpr*

*ḥn∭ ntf šw3h jrt.f ...*

As to any future king, who shall make my acts endure ...

(Kanais, 68/11)

This too expresses the same as the above LE Third Futures. This is the ME precursor of the LE conjunctive. As can be seen, these texts express the same idea in various ME and LE ways, and interchange one with another.
The preposition \( r \) is sometimes omitted, e.g.

13.9

\[ n\ jw.t\ (sic)\ \rho h\ jr.t\ \epsilon nh \]

Are you prepared to take a great oath?

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 8)

\( n \) is the interrogative particle \( jn \).

This is a Third Future pattern, built in with the infinitive \( \rho h \) + \( jr.t \), indicating willingness or ability. Note that the marked morpheme of the Third Future, namely the \( r \), which precedes the infinitive is left out. This is a specific LE formation. (Groll 1973:69).

Sometimes too there is an \( r \), but the \( jw.f \) is omitted, e.g.

13.10

\[
\begin{align*}
  jr\ &\ jmj.r\ \bar{h}tm\ \bar{s}bht\ nb \\
  s\ &\ nb\ n\ p3\ \bar{h}tm\ \bar{s}bht \\
  rwd\ &\ nb\ n\ p3\ \bar{h}tm \\
  ntj\ &\ hjj\ r\ dpt \\
\end{align*}
\]

As to any superintendent of the fortress, any scribe of the fortress, or any inspector belonging to the fortress, who shall go on board a boat .......

(Nauri, 56/12,13)
13.11

jr nb ntj r tht wd.tn  

As to anyone, who shall trangress this decree ...

(Nauri, 55/6,7)

This is the same as in the jr nswt nb ntj r hpr examples.

These are found in NDE and LE, not ME.

Examples of Third Future passive following ntj in NDE are -

13.12

hr jr p3 rmτ ntj  
jw . tw r jnt.f  

As for a man, who will be brought, ...

(Hittite Treaty, 231/6)

13.13

hr jr rmτ nb ntj jw.tw  
r gmt.f hr τ3t jîšt nbt  

Now as to any person who will be found stealing any goods ...

(Nauri Decree, 54/7)

In ME jw was not employed after nn, but this broke down in LE.

(e.g.

w3h p3.r  hr.3htwj  
mtw.tw nkm.f m.dj.j  
nn jw.j r wnm  
nn jw.j r ūwj

As Pre-Harakhti lives, if he is taken from me, I shall not eat, I shall not drink)

(The Doomed Prince 5/10,11)
nn ( + jw.f r šdm) sometimes persisted in LE, but bn was the successor of nn and the LE Third Future is now negated by bn, e.g.

13.14

bn jw.tw r w3h.w

One will not leave them in the land of Hatti

(Hittite Treaty, 229/6)

These two are LE and NDE examples, not found in ME.

Two points need to be addressed here. I would first like to draw attention to CB III - The papyrus discussing dream interpretation (Groll 1985:101) and to Sander-Hansen, Historische Inschriften der 19 Dynastie. Bruxelles 1933:29, 13-15.

13.15

jr p3 ntj nb jw.f r šh hr wd tn

jrj wsjr m.s3.f

jw 3št m.s3 hmt.f

jw hr m.s3 hrd.w.f

As for anyone who will be deaf to this inscription, Osiris will be after him, while Isis will be after his wife, while Horus will be after his children.

jw.f r šh is a Third Future. In literary LE, the jw of the Third Future may act as a base for adverbial phrases. The fact that the jw of jrj wsjr m.s3.f takes the form jrj before a nominal subject, although it acts as a base for the adverbial phrase m.s3.f is sufficient to maintain that jw.f r šh and jrj wsjr m.s3 f are in complementary relationship.

So it is possible too it seems that jrj may stand for jw in a Third Future.

Let us refer now to Gardiner 1930:220. He discusses jrj = "to do" or "make" as a LE auxiliary verb. He gives examples, - many from the Hittite treaty - where the infinitive following the jrj has a preceding r, examples without r before the infinitives, an example with hr before the infinitive, and 2 examples from the Nauri Decree where r is written for jrj ( ◊ for ⟳), and without r before the infinitive.
He believes that the auxiliary LE \( jri \) became \( \varepsilon \) in Coptic (see later), e.g. The Hittite Treaty

13.16

\[
hr jri p3 ntj jw.f r s3w n3j mdt \\
mtw.w tm jri fh jw tj r.sn \\
jri h3 n ntr n p3 t3 n hti3 \\
m.ji h3 n ntr n p3 t3 n kmnt \\
r djt sn.b.f r djt cnh.f
\]

Whoever shall keep these words and not destroy any of them, a thousand gods of the land of Khati and a thousand gods of the land of Egypt shall keep him in health and cause him to live.

(Hittite Treaty, 230/13 - 231/1)

While it may be tempting to think that \( jri \) is for \( jw \) of the Third Future, it seems rather that this is \( jri \) - the auxiliary verb preceding \( r + \) infinitive \( djt. \)

The \( jri \) may thus be a prospective \( sdm.f \) (but see later).

Note the suffix pronoun \( .f \) (3 masc. singular) following \( jw \) of the Third Future in line 1 becomes \( .w \) (3 plural) following the conjunctive \( mtw. \)

13.17

\[
bn jri p3 wr c3 n hti3 r ssp.w \\
jri p3 wr c3 n hti3 djt jnj.tw.w n p3 htk3 n kmnt
\]

The great prince of Hatti will not receive them. The great prince of Hatti will cause that they be taken to the great king of Egypt.

(Hittite Treaty, 229/4)

The first sentence is negative, and the auxiliary \( jri \) precedes a \( r + \) infinitive.

The second sentence is affirmative, and the \( jri \) is followed by the infinitive \( djt \) without a preceding \( r. \)

This may be a prospective auxiliary \( jri \) negated by \( bn, \) and is not likely to be a \( jw \) (for \( jri \) ) as a Third Future.
Note that shortly after this, (229/6) we have

\[ bn \textit{jw}-tw r w3h.w m p3 t3 n h\textit{t}3 \] and

\[ jw-tw r jn.t.w n p3 h\textit{k}3 n k\textit{mt} \]

One will not leave them in the land of Hatti. One will take them to the great king of Egypt. These are clearly Third Futures. So this Nineteenth Dynasty text includes and uses many examples interchangeably. The meanings are identical.

13.18

\[ jrj p3 w\textit{r} c3 m\textit{h} jm.sn \]

The great prince of Hatti will seize them.

(Hittite Treaty, 231/4)

Note - No \( r \) before infinitive \( m\textit{h} \)

13.19

\[ jr p3 ntj bn jw.f r s3w.sn \]

\[ jrj h3 n h\textit{t}3 m.dj h\textit{3} n \]

\[ ntr n p3 t3 n k\textit{mt} \]

\[ r f\textit{h} p3j.f pr \]

\[ p3j.f t3 n3j.f b3kw \]

Whoever will not keep them, a thousand of Hatti together with a thousand gods of the land of Egypt will destroy his house, his land and his servants.

(Hittite Treaty, 230/11-13)

\( ntj \) + negative of Third Future in the protasis is followed by auxiliary \( jrj \) in the apodosis and \( r \) precedes the following infinitive \( f\textit{h} \).
13.20

..., 

ntj m njwt

ntj nb (sic) rm₄ nb n t₃ hw₂ ... 

spr r stmj n.f

But as to a member of any court, 

that is in (any) city, to whom any person belonging to the House shall come to complain to him ...

(Nauri Decree, 58/7,8)

This could be r for jw, making it a Third Future unless 

jrj is intended. There is no r before the infinitive spr.

This is probably "shall come" rather than "has come/gone", as it is followed by a conjunctive.

And note:

13.21

jr rm₄ nb ntj m t₃ r.dr.f

ntj jrj rm₄ nb n t₃ hw₂ ...

spr (for tht) r.sn

As for any person who is in the entire land, to whom any people of the house shall come ...

(Nauri Decree, 58/1,2)

This is probably an jrj, but is not clear and may be an r.

13.22

jrj p₃j.j nb

r djt jrj.tw šb₃

n t₃j št.hmt

r jt₃j p₃ h₃ m.mjt p₃ wšb

tm kt št. hmt mj kdnw št wšm jrt m.mjt

My lord shall cause to be punished this woman who stole (both) the chisel and the wšb, so that no other woman will repeat doing it likewise.

(Hieratic Ostracon Verso 12)
LE Third Future with \( jrj \) (for \( jw \)) before a nominal subject

\[ r . \ jrj3j = j . \ jrj3j \] - a LE relative form.

\( tm.f \) is a negative purpose clause corresponding to Hebrew \( לִשָּׁנֶה \).

Gardiner (1930:223) notes that \( jrj \) is used, (either with or without following \( r \) ) when the subject is nominal, but when the subject is pronominal \( jw.f \) takes the place of \( jrj \).

From the examples in the Nauri decree and the Hittite treaty ("an especially old and good LE text") he concludes. "The conclusion seems assured that the (or at least a) LE form of before nominal subject is \( jrj \)."

"so-and-so shall hear" and this conclusion is clinched by the fact that to Coptic, \( .\varepsilon\eta\varepsilon\omega\tau\mu \), corresponds with nominal subject, \( \varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\ .\tau\rho\\omega\\mu\varepsilon\ .\varepsilon\omega\tau\mu \) or \( .\varepsilon\varepsilon\omega\tau\mu \)."

However, Gardiner grants the possibility that might really be the verb \( jrj \) "to do", and that a future tense might be derived from the meaning "X will act so as to hear".

Gardiner also refers to another example of an alternation between \( jrj \) and \( jrj \), which seems to preclude the above meaning of "shall do" or "shall act". These are the so-called curses invoked upon infringers of decrees.

e.g. Sander Hansen (as quoted above) and Nauri Decree

13.23

... \( jrj \ w\bar{s}r \ hnt.jmnt \ p3 \ nb \ n3 \ n \ rmt \)  
\( nb \ n3 \ n \ ht \)  
\( m.s3.f \ m.s3 \ hnt.f \ m.s3 \ hrdw.f \)

As to any person ...

Osiris Khentamenthes, the lord of people and the lord of things will be (lit. "is") after him, after his wife and after his children.

(Nauri Decree, 58/5)

\( hnt.jmnt \) means "The First of the Westerners"

\( n3 \ n \) ... is an LE formation.
II. Examples of LE Third Future in literary NDE texts

13.24 Interpretation of a dream
\[ \text{Bad, (it can mean that) he will be an orphan later on} \]
\[ (\text{CB III (Groll 1985:101, ex. 83)}) \]

13.25
\[ \text{I will not eat, I will not drink.} \]
\[ (\text{Doomed Prince, 5/11}) \]

Third Future negated by ME \( nn \) rather than the LE \( bn \). This though is clearly LE. In ME \( jw \) could not be preceded by \( nn \).

cf.

13.26
\[ \text{I shall not contend in court as long as Isis is in it.} \]
\[ (\text{Horus and Seth, 43/1}) \]

\( jw \ 3st = \text{a LE circumstantial} \ jw \ + \text{non verbal sentence.} \)

13.27
\[ \text{Where shall I come out?} \]
\[ (\text{Horus and Seth, 54/1}) \]
I know your nature, I feel sure that you will answer it (the letter) alone by yourself.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 10/17,18)

The first $rh$ is a bare stative and the second a $sdm.f$
The Third Future is the object of the $rh.f$.

I will charge them as a falcon pounces. I will slaughter, butcher, fling to the ground.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 69/8-13)

The first is a Third Future. The next are 3 $jw.f/hr sdm$ presumably of the future.

We will be servants of Pharaoh, lph, and we will abandon the chief of Khatti.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 104/12)

A Third Future, followed by a conjunctive, continuing the sense of the Third Future.

The $n$ suffix following $rwj$ is not usual at all.

$cnh/wd3 snb$ is the ME formula, all pseudoparticiples - "may he live long, be prosperous, be healthy".
13.31

\textit{jw wnw m šht r šsp drt.k} \quad \text{Those who are in the fields will grasp your hand.}

(Papyrus Lansing, 107/12,13)

13.32

\textit{p3 wn nn jw.f r jrt nkt} \quad \text{"For he will not do anything" (i.e. 'he is good for nothing'). So she said unto him.}

(Two Brothers, 26/4,5)

Another example of the ME negative \textit{nn} preceding a Third Future.

\textit{p3 wn} is a Nineteenth Dynasty form (Goldwasser 1985:51).

\textit{j n.s hr dd n.f} follows reported speech

13.33

\textit{hr jr dj.k ēnh.f} \quad \text{If therefore, you suffer him to live, I will take my own life, for, see, when he comes (home) and I tell this evil tale, he will make it (look) white.}

\textit{jw.j r mt.n.j}

\textit{ptr wnn.f jjt ...}

\textit{wn tw.j šnj p3j šnj bhn}

\textit{wn jw.f r jrf.f m ḫd}

(Two Brothers, 14/8-10)

dj.k following \textit{jr} is a prospective \textit{šdm.f}

\textit{jw.j r mt n.j} is a Third Future.

There is a \textit{wnn.f} clause and this is followed by a \textit{wn} + First Present, and then a \textit{wn} + Third Future.

Sometimes the preposition \textit{r} following the \textit{jw.f} is missing. For example,
13.34

bw dd  w< jm.sn
jw.n ptr kmt gr

Not one of them says "We will see Egypt again ..."

(Papyrus Lansing, 103/15,16)

A negative bw šdm.f of LE simple present (found in Literary LE only in the Nineteenth Dynasty) (Goldwasser 1985:50) is followed by a Third Future with no r.

13.35

jr p3 ntj jw.s dd f
jw.n jraj.f

Whatever she will say, we will do.

(Horus and Seth, 39/2)

13.36

jw.j jt3 p3jjj q+m n 4 500 n nn

I shall take my sceptre of 4 500 pounds.

(Horus and Seth, 42/15,16)

13.37

hr jr hr.s3 ntw
jw p't rhjjt htp m p3 ntj tw.k
jm m.rc

And after the gods, all mankind shall also go to rest where you are.

(Horus and Seth, 58/11)

Note that not all Third Futures have jraj for jw before a nominal subject (as in the Nauri Decree and the Hittite Treaty).
See, if I pass before him, I'll (have to) tell him my troubles. "See, I am yours", I'll say to him and he'll shout out (or boast of) my name.

(Chester Beatty I, C2/7,8)

A jr clause with a prospective šdm.f is followed by a future clause; The last line is a jw.f (r) šdm.f of the future too.

Note the phr.j and m.j ME forms, rather than p3;j.f phr etc.

Examples of Third Future following ntj in NDE are:

13.39
jr p3 ntj jw.f r ph p3 sād n t3;j ššt
jw.š n.f r ḫm.t

He who reaches the window of my daughter - his wife she shall be.

(The Doomed Prince, 3/8,9)

13.40
jḥ h3b.k n.n
p3 ntj jw.n r jṛ;j ŋ
n ḫr ḫun c šḥ
tm.n jṛj šḥr m ḫm

Write us what we should do about Horus and Seth, so that we do not take action in ignorance.

(Horus and Seth, 56/16)
jh₃ h₃b₃.k is a LE polite request
jw₃r r jₙj₃.f after ntj is a Third Future. The suffix .f is a resumptive pronoun.

The Third Futures following ntj are found in LE and in NDE.

An interesting example is

13.41
wn nb r sht₃.f rh phtₙj₃.f

The lord who knows his strength will snare him.

(Stele of Merneptah (The Israel Stele), 17/12)

It is difficult to analyse. Perhaps the wn is for jw of the Third Future.

Possibly a hybrid NDE form.

Another difficult example is

13.42

₄₃jₙ₃.k gₙₙjₙ m d₃wt

Thou bearest the palette wrongfully, without being .... (?)

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 22/9-13)

The only time a jw can precede another jw is the circumstantial jw of the Third Future. Is this a scribal error? Is the ↓ the negative or part of the following verb? It is uncertain.
CONCLUSION

Several examples are found of the Late Egyptian Third Future in both the non-literary and literary NDE texts.

The Middle Egyptian rule that $jw$ must not be employed after $nn$ and $ntj$ breaks down in Late Egyptian. $bn$ (equivalent to the Middle Egyptian $nn$) negating a Third Future occurs in example 13.3 and $nn$ and $ntj$ preceding a Third Future occurs in example 13.25 and 13.4 respectively.

The texts express the same idea in various Middle Egyptian and Late Egyptian ways, and frequently interchange with one another, e.g.

\[ ntj \text{ jw.f } r \text{ dit } \] (Third Future 13.5)
\[ ntj \text{ sw r stkn } \] (13.6)
\[ ntj \text{ r hpr (without a jw.f) } \] (13.7)
\[ \text{slm.t.f (a Middle Egyptian non-initial prospective } \text{sdm.f) } \] (13.7), and
\[ \text{hnc ntj sdm (the Middle Egyptian precursor of the Late Egyptian conjunctive) } \] (13.8).

This occurs only in the Nineteenth Dynasty texts. (See 13.17 and 13.33 too).

Sometimes the preposition $r$ is omitted (e.g. 13.9) and sometimes the $r$ is retained and the $jw.f$ omitted (e.g. 13.10).

$jrj$ in the Late Egyptian Nineteenth Dynasty sometimes stands for the $jw$ of the Third Future, when it acts as a base for an adverbial phrase and has a nominal subject (e.g. 13.15), and in 13.16 where $jrj$ + noun + $r$ $sdm$ appears, it is tempting to think that $jrj$ is for $jw$ of the Third Future, but it seems rather that this is $jrj$, the auxiliary verb, preceding $r$ + infinitive (See Chapter 16).

A Third Future is often followed by a Late Egyptian conjunctive, continuing the sense of the Third Future (e.g. 13.30 and Chapters 14 and 15).

A rare example is 13.29 where a Third Future is followed by three examples of $jw.f$ $hr$ $sdm$ of the future.

Two interesting examples are -
13.41 *wn nb r sht.f rh phf.f* and

13.42 *a jw jw ...*, which can only be a circumstantial of the Third Future, but the writing is incomplete.

| The LE Third Future does not occur in ME, where a prospective *śdm.f* or possibly *śdm.k3.f* or *śdm.hr.f* were used. *wnn* too indicated, as a rule, future time in ME. The LE Third Future is, of course found frequently in NDE. |
CHAPTER 14

THE LATE EGYPTIAN CONJUNCTIVE FORM

INTRODUCTION

The conjunctive is a verbal formation which expresses mere continuation or succession, it does not express any kind of subordination. With regard to this, there are examples of the conjunctive as the apodosis, so that one may assume that it can function as a non-initial main clause.

The conjunctive $mtw.f \ srj,m$ (and its descendant, the Coptic conjunctive$\sim\sim\sim$) derives from an earlier construction $hn^C \ ntf \ sdm = 'together with on his part the hearing', the latter in its turn being derived from $hn^C \ sdm \ ntf = 'with hearing by him'. $sdm$ is the infinitive and $ntf$ the independent pronoun (Gardiner 1928:86, Černý 1949:25, Erman 1933:275, Volten 1964:54). It is unlikely to be derived from $hn^C \ ntt \ jw.f \ hr \ sdm = 'together with the fact that he will hear', as Mattha (1947:43) suggested.

The LE conjunctive $mtw.f \ sdm$ is composed of three elements:

1. $mtw$ is the conjugation base
2. either the pronominal suffix, a defined noun or a bare noun
3. the infinitive of a transitive or intransitive verb.

$mtw$ is etymologically the preposition $hn^C = 'with'.

$mtw.f \ sdm$ is a feature of LE, not being found in ME. It has assumed the function of old suffix conjugation forms (prospective $sdm.f$, optative $sdm.hr.f$ and resultative $sdm.k3.f$), and is used in future and optative contexts. The $hn^C$ or $mtw$ has a conjunctive or sequential meaning, with future-optative sequentiality. It usually follows the imperative, the $jmf \ sdm.f = 'let him hear$, the $jy \ sdm.f =
‘so he will hear’ or $jw.f$ (r) $\text{sdm} = ‘he will hear’. It is negated as $mtw.f$ $tn$ $\text{sdm}$.

I. The precursor $hn^c$ $ntf$ $\text{sdm}$ is found in a few examples of the non-literary texts, e.g.

14.1

$jr$ $nswt$ $nb$
$ntj$ $r$ $hpr$
$shnt.f$ $shrw.j$ $nb$
$hn^c$ $ntf$ $\text{gd}$
$t3w$ $r$ $ht.j$ $jnk.sn$
$ mj$ $wn.sn$ $hr.f$

But as to any future king, who shall destroy any of my plans, and shall say:

"The lands are under my control. They are mine, as they were his"

(Kanais (Wady Mia) Inscription, 69/2,3)

$shnt.f$ is a circumstantial prospective $\text{sdm.f}$

$jnk.sn$ is a LE possessive pronoun + $sn$ (they) cf. קָנָי נֶב in Hebrew. ME would be $nj$ $sn$ $wj$.

$wn.sn$ is LE $wn$ of the past ("they were") with a pronominal suffix. (The $wn$ of existence can precede only bare or undefined nouns). (Cerny and Groll 1975:296).

$shrw.j$ and $ht.j$ are ME forms. Later $p3j.j$, $t3j.j$ and $n3j.j$ (+ noun) became the possessive pronouns.

A similar example occurs in

14.2

$jr$ $nswt$ $nb$ $ntj$ $r$ $hpr$
$hn^c$ $ntf$ $sw3h$ $jnt.j$ ...

As to any future king, who shall make my acts endure ...

(Kanais (Wady Mia) Inscription, 68/11)
And in the Nauri Decree

14.3

jr jmj.r htm nb šbht
sš nb n p3 htm šbht
rwd nb n p3 htm
ntj r hj r dpt n t3 hwt
mmn3cjc jb hrw m 3bd t
hnC ntf jt3 nbw ...
...
jrj.tw hpw r.f ...

As to any superintendent of the fortress, any scribe of the fortress, any inspector belonging to the fortress, who shall go on board a boat, belonging to the House "Menmare, The Heart is at Ease in Abydos" and shall take gold ...

... punishment shall be done to him ...

(Nauri Decree, 56/12-14)

These are examples of the precursor of the LE conjunctive and occur in ME and in NDF, but not in LE.

Compare this with

14.4

jr ntj nb r tht wd in
mtw.f jt3 mjnjw ...
...
jrj.tw hpw r.f

As to anyone who shall trangress this decree and take a herdsman ...

... punishment shall be done to him

(Nauri Decree, 55/6,7,9)

Here clearly the LE conjunctive mtw.f ... replaces the ME hnC ntf šdm. Both occur side by side in these texts.

jrj.tw hpw r.f is a passive šdm.tw.f of ME.
Also compare

14.5

As to any keeper of cattle ... who shall sell any head of animals ... by defalcation to another, likewise he who shall cause it to be offered on another direction/list' and not be offered (or offer (it)) to Osiris ...

(Nauri Decree, 55/14-16)

Here, two Third Futures of LE (jw.f r djt tp and jw.f r djt m3c.f) take the place of hnc ntf sdm and of mtw.f sdm in previous examples.

djt in the first example precedes a noun and means "to give" (djt m šb means "to give by defalcation" or "to sell"), in the second example djt precedes a non-initial prospective verb and means "to cause". Later (jw) bn negates a prospective. This is LE.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{i.e. } hnc ntf sdm \\
\text{mtw.f sdm, and} \\
jw.f hr djt sdm
\end{array}
\]

all occur in NDE. The first occurs too only in ME, the latter two, in addition to NDE occur only in LE.
II. Examples of the LE conjunctive in non-literary NDE texts

14.6

If another enemy comes against the lands of Usimarec-setpenreC, the great ruler of Egypt, and if he should write to the great prince of Hatti, saying "Come to me in strength against him"...

and the great prince of Hatti will kill his enemy.

(The Hittite Treaty, 228/3-6)

The conjunctives, continuations of the protasis in a conditional clause, follow *jr* + a prospective *sqm.f.*

and ff.

14.7

And if the wish of the great prince of Hatti is not to come, then he will send his army and his chariotry, and he will kill his enemy.

After a *lyr jr* conditional clause, there is a *jw.f hr sqm* of the future. This is LE. Unlike *jw.f r sqm* of the Third Future, this is negated by *jw.f hr tm sqm*, while the Third Future is negated by *bn jw.f r sqm*. The *jw.f hr sqm* of the future follows the following -

- *wtn t3j.j §ct (hr) spr r.k* clauses
- *hft spr t3j.j §ct r.k* clauses
- oaths beginning with the conjunctive
and
- *jr* temporal clauses or protasis of a condition, as here.

Then follows a conjunctive. This is the apodosis.

14.8

Whoever will keep these words

... and will not destroy any of them, 1000 gods of the land of Hatti together with 1000 gods of the land of Egypt will cause him to be healthy and to live together with his household and with his land and his servants.

(The Hittite Treaty, 230/13 - 231/1)

An example of a negative conjunctive as a continuation of the protasis.

The apodosis is constructed with the auxiliary verb *jr* followed by the preposition *r* + an infinitive (twice). (Gardiner 1930:221).

There are several more examples of the conjunctive following this, both as continuations of the protasis and of the apodosis, actives, passives, affirmatives and negatives. An interesting negative is in

14.9

And the great prince of Hatti will not cause their sin to be raised against them.

(The Hittite Treaty, 231/12)

The *tm* occurs before the noun.
14.10

hr jrs3 nswt nb

As to any viceroy ... who shall stop any boat

... 

jwfr snc jmn nb ...

and he moor it for even only one single day ...

mtwfr mnjf m wc n hrw wc twj

(The Nauri Decree, 53/10)

A Third Future followed by a conjunctive

14.11

w3h jmn w3h hkh3

As Amun endures and as the ruler endures, he whose power is worse than death, viz Pharaoh lph, if it be found that it was I who stole this chisel ...

p3 nty bijn

(Hieratic Ostracon, 2 Recto 10)

p3jf bsw r mt

mtwfr gmt r dd

jnk jtc p3j b3 ...

An elliptical conjunctive in an oath - protasis -

The above six examples all occur in NDE and LE and not in ME.
III. Examples of LE Conjunctives in Literary NDE texts

14.12

$\text{jmj\ t3\ j3t\ n\ wjr\ n\ s3.f\ hr}$

$\text{m\ jrr\ jrt\ n3\ sp.w\ 3jw\ n\ grg\ ntj}$

$\text{bn\ st\ r\ st.w}$

$\text{m\ r\ pw\ jw.j\ kndt}$

$\text{mtw\ t3\ pt\ thj\ n\ p3\ jw(tn)}$

Give the office of Osiris to his son, Horus. And don’t do those big misdeeds, that are out of place. Or I shall get angry and the sky will crash to the ground.

(Horus and Seth, 40/1-3)

An imperative, a negative imperative, and a Third Future followed by the conjunctive.

14.13

$\text{jmj\ n.f\ cntjt\ cstrijt\ t3j.k\ 3rj\ 2}$

$\text{mtw.k\ djt\ hr\ r\ t3\ st\ n\ jt.f}$

Give him Anat and Astarte, your two daughters

And place Horus on the seat of his father.

(Horus and Seth, 40/4,5)

A conjunctive following an imperative, continuing the sense and meaning of the imperative.

14.14

$\text{nhm.f\ mn$\ n\ hr}$

$\text{mtw.tw\ djt\ hgt\ hr\ tp.f}$

He (Thoth) shall take the royal name-ring (cartouche) to Horus, and the White Crown shall be placed on his head.

(Horus and Seth, 37/13 - 38/1)

A conjunctive following an initial prospective.
14.15

It is not good to defraud me before the Ennead, and to take the office of Osiris, my father, away from me.

(Horus and Seth, 42/5-7)

A non-verbal sentence negated by $bn$ ... $jwn3$ (LE) followed by a conjunctive.

14.16

I shall beat you,
I shall take your father's cattle and I shall throw you out.

(Horus and Seth, 45/5,6)

Two conjunctives following a LE Third Future, without the preposition $r$ (common in LE) and continuing the sense of this.

Note $p3j.k$ $jt$ - the LE possessive pronoun here and cf. $jtj$, the suffix acting as the possessive in ME usage.

The $mtw.f$ šdm's are all examples, which are found in LE and in NDE and not in ME.

14.17

When my letter reaches you, you shall place the White Crown on the head of Horus, son of Isis, and appoint him to the position of his father, Osiris.

(Horus and Seth, 47/11-13)
This is an epistolary formula encountered only in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. (Goldwasser 1985:50). It is a specific temporal construction specifying the sequence between two events, i.e. the arrival of a letter and the execution of certain instructions upon its arrival. In the Nineteenth Dynasty too, another construction became popular. This was the \textit{wnn.f hr sdm} in the protasis, which is described by Polotsky as the nominalised \textit{jw.f hr sdm}. (Goldwasser 1985:54).

This was used in a free usage form (see below Two Brothers 16/3) and later in the Twentieth Dynasty, a new fixed or "frozen" formula was adopted by the scribes and became dominant. This was the \textit{wnn t3j.j s\textsuperscript{f} (hr) spr r.k, jw.k hr + infinitive}. The latter is the \textit{jw.f hr sdm} of the continuative future, and this is usually followed by a conjunctive (Baer 1965:137).

The example used here is Eighteenth or Nineteenth Dynasty. (See other examples under the discussion of the Temporal \textit{wnn}).

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
This epistolary formula, although using the \textit{jw.f hr sdm} of the LE Continuative Future and the LE Conjunctive, is found only in the 18th and 19th Dynasties (i.e. ME and NDE, and not in later LE). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

14.18

\textbf{jlh shf.k n.j p3 wh3 3s sp.sn n wsjr}
\textbf{mtw.k dd n.f ...}

Please answer this letter of Osiris for me quickly
and tell him …

(Horus and Seth, 57/11,12)

A conjunctive following a polite request - the \textit{jlh s\textit{dm}.k}

14.19

\textbf{j.sm j.wn p3 mhr\textit{t}}
\textbf{mtw.k inj.n.k p3 ntj m jb.k}

Go, open the bin and take away for you what you wish.

(Two Brothers, 12/1)
Conjunctive, following two LE imperatives, both clearly preceded by a prothetic yod

14.20

wnn p3 jm hr wbn
jw.j hr wpt hnC.k m .b3h.f
mtw.f hr dtj p3 Cd3 n p3 m3C.t

When the sun rises, I will be judged with you in his presence, and he will give the wrongdoer to the righteous (i.e. he will let the righteous triumph).

(Two Brothers, 16/3,4)

The temporal wnn of the Nineteenth Dynasty - free form, followed by jw.f hr sjdm of the Future, and then a conjunctive.

14.21

hr jw.k Cm3 r.dd
wn nkt r.j
mtw.tw hr dtj n.k wC n
tbt n hjkt hr drt.k
mtw.f hr stj

Hereby, you will learn that something/(mischief) has befallen me, in that one gives to you a vase of beer in your hand, and it ferments.

(Two Brothers, 18/3,4)

A Third Future (without the preposition r) followed by two conjunctives.

The wn nkt r.j is a wn of existence preceding an undefined noun, a LE formation.

The above LE conjunctive examples occur only in NDE and LE.
Have these two persea trees cut down, and make them into goodly furniture.

(Two Brothers, 27/16 - 28/2)

This is unusual. The conjunctive follows a causative imperative, but the *mtw.tw* is followed by *j.jrj.w* i.e. a verb form + a pronominal pronoun preceded by a prothetic yod, i.e. a LE imperative!

---

This is an unusual example, perhaps a hybrid form found in NDE only.

---

This is not good. Let Mose hear (of it), and he will send to destroy you.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 30/4)

A negation of a non-verbal sentence (ME), followed by NOUN + prospective *šdm.f* (see Doret 1980:37) and a conjunctive.

A conjunctive following *jh šdm.k* polite request
j.jrt etc. is LE "until", and not a second tense emphatic "that" form.

14.25

jw.n r jrt b3kw n pr$3 Cnhl wd3
šnb

mtw.n rwj.n m.dj p3 wr n ht3

We will be servants of Pharaoh lph, and we will abandon the chief of Hatti.

(Battle of Kadesh, 104/12)

A conjunctive following a Third Future, but this is unusual, for following the mtw.n, we have a finite $d m.f form, i.e. rwj.n, and not an infinitive.

The above examples show that the mtw has a conjunctive or sequential meaning, with future-optative sequentiality. It usually follows the imperative, the jmj $d m.f = 'let him hear', the jfl $d m.k or jw.f (r) $d m, and corresponds to the waqātaltā (i.e. wāw-consecutive and suffix conjugation) in Biblical Hebrew. (Loprieno 1980:144).

However, the conjunctive can be used as the protasis of an oath (see above Ostracon 2 Recto 10) or as the apodosis of a conditional or temporal sentence. And it is used rarely following a past or a present tense, and it then seems to indicate habitual or past custom (Wente 1962:304) or to have a 'final' meaning (i.e. 'in order that' or 'so that') (Černý 1949:30).

(i) Examples of the oath in NDE are:

14.26

w3h p3r$3 hr3htwj

mtw.tw nhm.f m.dj.j

nn jwj r wnm

nn jwj r ūwj

jwj r mt m t3 wnwt

As Pre-Harakhti lives, if he is taken from me, I shall not eat, I shall not drink, I shall die right away!
Conjunctive as protasis of an oath following \( w3h \ p3.r^c \). The Third Future tenses are negated by the ME \( nn \) rather than the LE \( bn \).

14.27

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{As Amun lives, as the ruler lives, if} \\
\text{Truth is found alive, I shall be} \\
\text{blinded in both eyes and shall be} \\
\text{made doorkeeper of the House of} \\
\text{Truth.}
\end{align*}
\]

(ii) The following appear to be examples of regular custom NDE

14.28

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{"Where is your father?"} \\
\text{So they say to me. And they mock} \\
\text{me.}
\end{align*}
\]

\( hr.w \) - reports and follows direct speech. It occurs in both LE and earlier in ME.
O scribe, keen (of wit), understanding of heart, to whom nothing whatsoever is unknown, flame in the darkness before the soldiers, giving light to them.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 28/17 - 29/1)

spd and whj jb are ME active participles, and the negative clause is a ME formation too.

So also a cow is brought this year and it ploughs the following year.

(Papyrus Lansing, 101/6,7)

He does not know my wish to embrace him, or he would send to my mother

(Papyrus Chester-Beatty I - Love Songs, C2/2)

A bw rh.f of the LE negative simple present is followed by a conjunctive. Perhaps this could be considered as an apodosis of an implied conditional clause. The writer is saying "If he knew ..., he would send ..."

In The Tale of Two Brothers, there are a series of LE conjunctives used as past continuatives with the meaning of habitual or past custom (Wente 1962:304). These seem to set the scene before the actual story, i.e. "he used to do". Examples of this are

And he would come home to his house every evening
And he would set them down
And he would drink and eat
And he would give him bread for the fields
And he would drive out his cattle in order to pasture them in the field.

(Two Brothers, 10/4-14)

These examples of the Conjunctive used as past Continuatives with the meaning of habitual or past custom appear in NDE and LE, and not in ME.

In the narrative proper following this, the activities on that particular day are conveyed in bona fide narrative form, especially LE jw.f (hr)šdm of the continuative past. Occasionally as in Nineteenth Dynasty texts, the prepositions hr or r are omitted (as in this example).

14.33

hr jr p3 šw hr htp
jw.f 3tp.f m smw nb n ššwt m
p3j.f šhr ntj r< nb

Now when the sun set, he loaded himself with all the vegetables of the fields, according to his daily custom.

(Two Brothers, 14/6)

The sentence begins with a First Present with a hr + infinitive preceded by hr jr, which makes it past tense. The verb is an intransitive verb - a non-conclusive verb, i.e. denoting an action which can neither be initiated nor concluded (Group IV of Groll, 1969(b):185). These verbs cannot take a stative.

The text continues with another jw.f hr šdm of the LE continuative past, and this time the preposition hr is written jw.f hr jjt. He returned

This last example is a narrative form, cf. the LE conjunctives above. It occurs only in NDE and LE, and not in ME.
CONCLUSION

The Late Egyptian conjunctive form, \textit{mtw.f (tm) sdm} is thought to have derived from the Middle Egyptian \textit{hnC ntf sdm}.

And, as expected in Nineteenth Dynasty writings, both the Middle Egyptian forerunner (example 14.1) and the Late Egyptian fully developed form (example 14.4) are found in the non-literary texts, side by side.

And, in fact (example 14.5) two Late Egyptian Third Futures take the place of \textit{hnC ntf sdm} and of \textit{mtw.f sdm} in identical examples. The language was evolving indeed! The above are all found in the Kanais or Wadi Mia inscription.

The Late Egyptian conjunctive is found in both non-literary and literary texts, and follows:

- a prospective \textit{sdm.f} (example 14.6)
- a \textit{jw.f hr sdm} of the future (example 14.7). This in turn follows the \textit{jr} protasis of a condition.
- a Third Future protasis of a condition (example 14.8)
- a Third Future (example 14.10)
- an imperative (example 14.13)
- a causative imperative (example 14.22)
- a polite request (example 14.18)

The conjunctive form can also occur as:

- the protasis of an oath (example 14.11), or
- the apodosis of an oath (example 14.27).

It can also occur as the third member of an epistolary formula encountered only in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties, following a temporal construction and a \textit{jw.f hr sdm} of the continuative future (example 14.17).

Example 14.22 is unusual. A conjunctive follows a causative imperative, but the former is \textit{mtw.tw j.jf.w} i.e. \textit{mtw.tw} + a verb form with a pronominal pronoun preceded by a prothetic yod, i.e. a Late Egyptian imperative!
Example 14.23 is interesting. A negative non-verbal sentence is followed by a noun + prospective šdm.f followed in turn by a conjunctive.

Example 14.25 has mtw.n + a finite verb form, and not the infinitive.

And rarely mtw.f šdm can occur with the meaning of regular or habitual custom, (example 14.28, 14.32). The latter is from "The Tale of Two Brothers", and seem to set the scene before the actual story, with the meaning - "he used to do."

| The LE Conjunctive form mtw.f hr šdm is found in LE and in NDE. The ME precursor was hntf šdm, and this form too is found in NDE. |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
CHAPTER 15

THE LATE EGYPTIAN SEQUENTIAL FORMS

The Late Egyptian sequential forms, i.e. the conjunctive \textit{mtw.f s\textcircled{m}} and the sequential past \textit{jw.f hr s\textcircled{m}} are presented and discussed in Chapter 14 and Chapter 22 respectively.

The conjunctive appears to correspond to the \textit{waqātaltā} (i.e. \textit{waw-consecutive and suffix conjugation}) in Biblical Hebrew (\textit{= 'and you will kill'}) (Loprieno 1980:144). The sequential past in LE \textit{(jw.f hr s\textcircled{m})} has a parallel with the \textit{waw-consecutive + prefix conjugation} of Biblical Hebrew.

The LE conjunctive verbal formation is \textit{mtw.f s\textcircled{m}} (a conjugation base \textit{(mtw)}, a pronominal suffix or a noun and the infinitive of a verb).

As the sentences or clauses with the conjunctive mostly follow sentences with imperatives, prospectives and Third Futures, they usually continue a future sense, and the conjunctive is used in future - optative contexts and often has the force of another imperative.

It corresponds closely to the Biblical Hebrew \textit{wāw + suffix conjugation}; not in structure, but in function and usage. (Loprieno 1980:144).

Although the conjunctive is neutral with regard to time, and capable only of denoting an action, it usually refers to the future, normally with optative or consecutive meaning. And so does the \textit{wāw + suffix conjugation} in Biblical Hebrew.

\textit{e.g.}

15.1

\textit{לָכֶם אֶמֶר לַבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}

\textit{אַלּוּ הַלֶּחֶם הַזֶּה אָכֵלוּ...}
Therefore, say unto the children of Israel,
I am the Lord and I will bring you out ...
and I will release you ...
and I will redeem you ...
and I will take you ...
and I will be to you for a God

(Exodus 6:6,7)

And Aaron your brother shall speak unto Pharaoh,
and he will send away the children of Israel out of his land.

(Exodus 7:2,3)

These follow: qum - "rise" - Imperative
yàqum - "he will rise" - Future
yàqom - "may he rise" - Optative...

It is interesting to note on the other hand that the jw.f (hr) śdm, i.e. the sequential past in LE, has a parallel with the wàw-consecutive + prefix conjugation of Biblical Hebrew e.g.
And the man knew Eve, his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain, and she said
"I have gotten a man with the help of the Lord".
And again she bore his brother, Abel. And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground.

(Genesis 4:1,2)

In addition to the above, Polotsky (1985:158) speculated on the relationship of $\text{jw.f hr $\text{sdm}$}$ of the narrative past to $\text{sdm.f}$, the retrospective tense and to the Hebrew $\text{i$\text{am}$}$.

"The change", he wrote, "from a link in the narrative chain into a piece of direct speech involves the replacement of the sequential narrative form by a retrospective tense, a perfect: $\text{wayelak}$ loses its $\text{wa}$ and must be replaced by $\text{halaq}$." 

Note this in the last example - $\text{jwam}$ is replaced by $\text{y$\text{am}$}$ in direct speech, and the same occurs in e.g.
He leapt and he reached the window of the daughter of the Prince of Nahrin.

and (some) one told him:

"One man has reached the window of your daughter".

(The Doomed Prince, 4/15 - 5/3)

The \textit{jw.f hr ph} of the narrative past changes to \textit{ph.f} - the retrospective tense in direct speech: - the very same sentence.

In the discussion on his presentation, Polotsky (1985:362) is asked by Oikawa if he has examples in LE of the two verbs one after the other; - one in sequential past form and then in direct speech in \textit{sdm.f}.

Polotsky says he has no examples, and Groll says that there is one in Wenamun.

The above example is clearly an example of this.

And Polotsky thinks that "it would be pleasant if the replacement of the sequential narrative form by a retrospective tense could be paralleled by the replacement of the conjunctive by something prospective."

He cannot quote such an example, he says "doubtless through sheer ignorance" (!?)

I think this is an example of what Polotsky is discussing, and couldn't find an example -
15.5

\( ^{15.5} \)

\( h' \ jr \ ... \ rmt \ nb \ ... \)

\( ntj \ jw.f \ r \ sn^c \ jm \ nb \ n \ t3.hwt \)

... 

\( mtw.f \ mnj.f \ m \ w^c \ n \ hrw \ w^c.t.wj \)

\( r.qd \)

\( jw.j \ r \ jt3.f \ ... \)

\( jrt.tw \ hpw \ r.f \)

As to anyone ...

who shall stop anyone belonging to the house, and he moor it for only a single day,

saying "I will take it ..."

- punishment shall be done to him.

(Nauri Decree, 53/10-14)

Following the conjunctive \((mtw.f \ mnj.f)\), we have direct speech, in which the speaker now uses a Third Future.

This, in turn is followed by a passive prospective.

As to the \( ntj \ jw.f \ r \ sn^c \), in the same paper (Discussion p. 362ff, Polotsky says "Well, this development of the Third Future occurs in the Eighteenth Dynasty. In real ME, it would not be correct to speak of ME jw.f r sdm. It is just one of the possibilities of the so-called pseudoverbal construction. Unfortunately, the grammars fail to show clearly that jw.f hr sdm, mk.sw hr sdm, ntj jw.f hr sdm is exactly paralleled by jw.f r sdm, mk.sw r sdm, ntj r sdm. The latter \((ntj \ r \ sdm)\) disappears gradually in ME of the Eighteenth Dynasty and there you find ntj jw.f r sdm. This shows that jw has become the fixed element of this construction. The different kinds of jw, he ends "are going to occupy to some degree ourselves, to a greater part our successors, for some time to come".(!) See later Discussion.

The agreement between Egyptian and Biblical Hebrew concerns only the meaning; the morphology is different and is peculiar to either language.

A peculiarity of Hebrew is e.g. that the sequential verb-forms cannot be used with the negative \( l \theta \): - the negation of wayelak can only be \( w^\epsilon l \theta \ halak \).
CONCLUSION

Loprieno (1980:2) draws attention to an interesting syntactic parallelism, namely the evolution towards a new verbal system in Egyptian as it was written in the colloquial texts of the New Kingdom - commonly called Late Egyptian - and in Biblical Hebrew, one of the most representative Central Semitic languages. He suggests that the creation of sequential forms is a common pattern of Egyptian and Biblical Hebrew in a specific period of their historical evolution, in which they respond in a parallel way to a few syntactic changes in their verbal systems; afterwards each of these languages adopted original devices for the expression of the tense indication.

In this chapter the Late Egyptian sequential forms, the conjunctive and the sequential past, are discussed, and their close agreement in meaning with Biblical Hebrew $w\text{aw}$ + suffix conjugation and $w\text{aw}$ + prefix conjugation - the morphology is different and is peculiar to either language.

Many examples of these sequences occur in these Nineteenth Dynasty writings.

I discuss too the change from the $jw.f \ hr \ sgm$ of the past in a narrative chain to a perfect tense, when direct speech is inserted (example 15.4), and I report too an interesting, perhaps unique example of "replacement of the conjunctive by something prospective in direct speech" (example 15.5).

All these examples of sequential forms, of course, occur only in LE and in NDE and not in ME.
CHAPTER 16

jrj AS AN AUXILIARY TO ANOTHER VERB

INTRODUCTION

The Egyptian verb - jrj - means "make", "do", when used as the only verb in a sentence. It is a very common verb, and is used in all stages of the Egyptian language, ME through NDE to LE. However, it is often used as an auxiliary to another verb which is the infinitive object of the auxiliary. The meaning of the infinitive object of jrj is not altered. Perhaps the original meaning was something like "he does hear" or even "he acts so as to hear".

This may occur under the following circumstances - (See Gardiner 1930:220), where the uses and evolution in ME, NDE and LE will be shown.

I. jrj jb.f tlJIj

16.1 jrj jb.f thbj

His heart jubilates.

(Papyrus CB I, G1/4,5)

16.2 m n3 šr.w nbw t3.dsr

jrj.sn wpw.sn lnC.f

It is all the noblemen of the necropolis who will dispute with him.
Now though I prayed in the distant land, my voice resounded in Southern On (Heliopolis), i.e. Thebes.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 42/14)

You shrink from its ascent.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 31/10)

They have made away with your things.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 32/8,9)

It smashes your chariot.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 37/5,6)

They supply your yoke.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 37/17,18)

These forms are found in ME, NDE, and LE.

II.

+ nominal subject +

(no examples with suffix occurring)
These Gardiner showed to be a LE Third Future with jrj for jw when a nominal subject, not a pronoun is used. (See under "The LE Third Future"). For example,

16.8

bn jrj p3 wr c3 n ht3 r šsp.w
jrj p3 wr c3 n ht3
(r) djt jnj.tw.w n p3 hk3 n kmt

The great prince of Hatti will not receive them. The great prince of Hatti will cause that they be taken to the great king of Egypt.

(Hittite Treaty, 229/4)

This is found in NDE and in LE and not in ME.

III.

j.rj.f šdm  i.e. The LE Second Tense, Emphatic Form or "that" form (not the Future form, which is simply j.dj.f). This is not a relative form.

For example -

16.9

j.rj.j jjt
r cₜₙ n.f wšbt

It is to avenge him that I have come.

(Truth and Falsehood, 36/1,2)

16.10

j. jrj.k whj3
jn jw hr jh

Why is it that you must act foolishly?

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, C3/2,3)

16.11

j.rj.j jj n.k
r dd d3j.k r p3 jw hrj jb

It is in order that you ferry me across to the Island-in-the-Midst that I have come to you.
IV.

bw jrj.f $dm

Although bw $dm.f is used as negation of the simple present in LE Literary texts, bw jrj.f $dm occurs too. In non-literary texts, the pure form is bw jrj.f $dm., e.g.

16.12

bw jrj.w $dm

They do not listen.

bw hn.w n3j.k $d$d.w

They do not heed your tales.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 37/10,11)

The first is a bw jrj.f $dm, the second a simple bw $dm.f

16.13

jr ph.j r hh jm.sn

When I attacked their multitudes, their feet were infirm and they fled.

bw jrj rdwj.w $mn

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 65/2)

ทร. $rn hr

16.14

jw bw jrj p3 wr £3 n h$t3

And the great prince of Hatti will not transgress against the land of Egypt for ever, in order to take anything from it.

tht r p3 t3 n kmt

(Hittite Treaty, 227/15)

r nh$t

r j$t nkt jm.f
The LE negative imperative

\[ m \text{ } dj + jrf + \text{verb or} \]
\[ m \text{ } jrf + \text{verb, e.g.} \]

16.15

\[ m \text{ } dj \text{ } jrf \text{.tw } \varepsilon^c \varepsilon^c \text{ } p\text{j}\text{.f } bt3 \text{ } r.f \]

Do not cause that his crime be raised against him.

(Hittite Treaty, 231/6,8)

16.16

\[ m \text{ } jrf \text{ } s\text{ym} \text{ } jm.n \]

Do not overwhelm us.

(Ramesses II - Battle of Kadesh, 93/14)

VI.

Besides the above, note the verb \( jrf \) in the so called curses, invoked upon infringers of decrees. These are used before an adverbial phrase, and without another verb, e.g.

16.17

\[ jrf \text{ } wsjr \text{ ... } m\text{.}s3.f \]

Osiris will be after him, etc.

(Nauri Decree, 58/5 and Kanais, 70/3)
VII. A final note about auxiliary verbs other than *jrj*

16.18

*(j)n jw.t rh jrt cnh c3 ...*  
Are you prepared to take a great oath?

(Hieratic Ostracon Recto 8)

*rh jrt* = willingness or ability

16.19

*sp.r k r wh c m rwh3*  
You proceed to stop in the evening.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 31/13,14)

*sp.r* is an auxiliary verb here.

The above two interesting examples may occur in ME, NDE and LE.

**CONCLUSION**

The examples of *jrj* as an auxiliary to another verb (which is the infinitive object of the auxiliary) are found in both literary and non-literary NDE texts, e.g.

(i) *jrj.f șdm* - due to a growing prejudice against forming *șdm.f* forms of their own from verbs with four or more radicals, from compound verbs or those of foreign origin (example 16.1, 16.7)

(ii) The Late Egyptian Third Future with *jrj* for *jw*, when a nominal subject and not a pronoun is used (example 16.8 and Chapter 13).

(iii) *j.jrj.f șdm* (The Late Egyptian Second Tense (example 16.9)).

(iv) *bw jrj.f șdm*. The Late Egyptian Negation of the simple present (example 16.13).
(v) The Late Egyptian negative imperative (m dj jrj + verb or m jrj + verb) (example 16.16).

(i) occurs in ME, NDE, and LE, while (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) are found in NDE and LE only, where all continued in regular usage.

The use of jrj in the curses is found in NDE and in LE (16.17), and the last two examples (rh jrt and spr.k) (16.18, 16.19) are found in ME, NDE, and LE.

It is probable (Gardiner 1930:220) that the auxiliary jrj (especially as used in the curses and in the Third Future instead of jw with a nominal subject) is the origin of the Coptic Third Future ἐγίωτην or rather when used with a nominal subject ἐρε ἔποιεῖν ἔωτην.
CHAPTER 17

THE LATE EGYPTIAN SECOND TENSE

In 1944, Polotsky published "Études de syntaxe copte", in which he stated his conclusions that the Second Tenses in Coptic emphasized an adverbial adjunct. He pointed out that the Coptic Second Present derived from the LE $j.jr.f$ $\&m$, and that this form was without time designation.

He first recognised the true nature of the $j.jr.f$ $\&m(f)$ + adverb formation, and he suggested that this was not a relative form, but an emphatic formation; an adverbial adjunct is emphasized, and the $j.jr.f$ $\&m(f)$ is a "that"-form (i.e. a noun equivalent). The $j.jr.f$ $\&m(f)$ functions as a nominal subject in a sentence in which the following stressed adverb (or adverb equivalent, such as a prepositional phrase or a circumstantial sentence) is the predicate (Nims 1968:161, Černý and Groll 1975:366, Erman 1972:126, Frandsen 1974:153)

The emphatic, or "that"-forms are:

- $j. j jr.j$ $\&m$ (neutral in respect of time) or
- $j. d j.f$ (with future sense)

Polotsky used the cleft sentence to show the emphasis on the adverbial adjunct (Polotsky 1944:60). This emphasized adjunct gives new meanings to many accounts.

I. Non-literary NDE texts

There are no examples in the non-literary NDE texts used for discussion in this thesis.
II. Literary NDE texts

17.1

\[ jst\ jjr\ djt\ t3\ j3t\ n\ wsjr\ n\ sth\ j\ s3f\ hrc_hc \]

Is it while his son Horus is there that one shall give the Office of Osiris to Seth?

(Horus and Seth, 38/6,7)

There is no *f* or subject attached to *jjrj* (zero morpheme).

The *jw s3f* ... is a circumstantial First Present, fulfilling function C (Frandsen 1974:194).

But cf.

17.2

\[ jjrj.tw\ djt\ t3\ j3t\ n\ sn\ n\ mwt\ jw\ s3\ n\ ht\ chc \]

Shall one give the office of the brother to the uncle, while the bodily son is there?

(Horus and Seth, 41/16 - 42/1)

Here a *jjrj.tw* is found.

17.3

\[ jjrj.tw\ wp.tw\ m\ sp\ tpj\ m\ t3\ wshlt\ wc\ m3c \]

It is once already in the hall "Way of Truth" that they have been judged.

(Horus and Seth, 39/3,4)

17.4

\[ jjrj.j\ jj\ n.k\ r.dd\ d3j.k\ r\ r\ p3\ jw\ hrt\ jb\ p3\ wn\ jjrj.j\ jh\ p3\ tbt\ n\ bjt\ n\ p3\ cdd\ srj \]

It is in order that you ferry (me) across to the Island-in-the-Midst that I have come. For it is with this bowl of flour/emmer for the young boy that I have come.

(Horus and Seth, 43/9)
17.5

Why is it that my son Horus is being defrauded when it was I who made you strong, ... although it was I who made barley and emmer to nourish the gods.

(Horus and Seth, 57/5,6)

A question sometimes has the interrogative particle (hr jh here) as the adverbial phrase in an obligatory Second Tense formation.

j.jrj.tn is a LE relative form
jw jnk is a circumstantial jw (Function A)
hr jw acts as Function D in a jw converter clause.

17.6

Is it not according to the word of Atum that one should act?

(Horus and Seth, 47/14,15)

bn negates the nexus between the subject (the "that"-form) and the predicative adverbial element. Černý and Groll (1975:388) feel that when the sentence as a whole expresses an affirmative idea, the jwn3 is omitted, and Frandsen (1974:168) suggests that it is impossible to decide whether or not the omission is accidental.

17.7

Why is it that you have not caused yourself to be judged?

(Horus and Seth, 59/6)

tm negates the "that"-form itself (being a noun equivalent), i.e. j.jrj.f tm šdm, and not the nexus, which remains affirmative.
It is not as you do that I act when I invoke you.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 14/5,6)

\textit{bn} here negates the nexus between the subject (the "that"-form) and the predicative adverbial element ...

Note \textit{jrj} is the only verb in \textit{jrjrj}. When \textit{jrj} is the verb, it is not duplicated.

If you blow beside him as he passes, it is far off like a leaf of foliage that he will drop down.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 19/14 - 20/1)

\textit{jr jrj\textsubscript{f}} is \textit{jr} + prospective \textsubscript{sm}\textsubscript{m}.

\textit{jw} \textsubscript{f} \textit{m} \textsubscript{snn} is a circumstantial First Present.

It is as a slave serves his master that I serve my lord.

(Papyrus Lansing, 110/1)

It is with those greater than he that he makes friends.

(Papyrus Lansing, 100/4)

For it is for fear of a beating that they do their utmost.

(Papyrus Lansing, 101/9,10)
j.jrj.f $dm$ can be preceded by the dependent $jw$ - acting as a non-prepositional initial main clause; the undefined relative form cannot.

17.13

j.jrj.f $smw$ $m$ $3kw$ $bnr$
prt $m$ $3kw$ $mjmj$
j.jrj.f $p3j.f$ $wS3$ $n$ $mpt$
m.$s3$ $n3$ $jhwfj.w$

It is in destroying the dates that it (the goose of the shore - $smn$ $n$ $wdb$) spends the summer, and the winter destroying the seed-grain.

It is in pursuit of the cultivators that it spends his (the) rest of the year.

(Papyrus Lansing, 102/6-8)

17.14

j.dj.f $b3kw.f$ $n$ $sf$
m $p3$ $hrw$
wgg $r$ $ct.f$

If it is today that he will give the output of yesterday, woe to his limbs!

(Papyrus Lansing, 104/1,2)

This is the $j.dj.f$ emphatic of the future.

17.15

j.jrj.$s$ $mt$ $dmt$

It is a violent death that she will die.

(Two Brothers, 19/11)

17.16

j.$sm.tw$ $m$ $wstn$ $hr$ $wst$
jw $bn$ $snd$ $nb$ $m$ $jb$ $n$ $rmt$

It is free-striding on the road that one walks, for there is no fear in people's hearts.

(Merneptah's Stele, 18/5)

$jw$ $bn$ $snd$ is a LE converter.

$jw$ with a non-verbal sentence.
There is no ... jwn3.

17.17

jn jw j.dj.j t3j.j šrjt n p3 wr n kmt

Is it to this fugitive from Egypt that I am to give my daughter?

(Doomed Prince, 5/7,8)

An j.dj.j of the future.

17.18

j.jr.j jjt r ēn n.f wšbt

It is to avenge him that I have come.

(Truth and Falsehood, 36/1,2)

17.19

j.jr.k wh₃ jn jw hr jh

Why is it that you must act foolishly?

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I, 1/2,3)

17.20

j.jr.k špr r t3j.š nṛj

It is in the kissing of your hand four times that you will reach her hiding-place.

(Papyrus Chester-Beatty I, GI III/4)

CONCLUSION

There are examples of the Late Egyptian Second Tense (emphatic or "that"-form) in the literary NDE texts comprising this thesis. This form was therefore fully developed by the Nineteenth Dynasty, but there are still many examples of Middle Egyptian emphatic šdm.f's and šdm.n.f's too, as shown in chapters 6 and 7.

There are examples of the j.jr.f šdm (neutral in respect of time (e.g. 17.2), in one of which there is no .f or subject attached to the jrj.∅ (zero morpheme (17.1).))
Perhaps this should be translated as passive ("shall the office be given?") This would be analogous to the example in the much later "Late Ramesside Letters" (jwn gm r.dd bwypw.w ft (18/15-16) "And we found that they had not become erased" (Blumsohn 1988:95).

There are examples too of j.dj.f with future sense (e.g. 17.14).

There are questions, e.g. hr jh with the interrogative particle as the adverbial phrase in an obligatory Second Tense formation (e.g. 17.15), and there are examples of bn negating the nexus between the subject (the "that"-form) and the predicative adverbial element (e.g. 17.6), and of tm negating the "that"-form itself. (e.g. 17.7).

j.jj.f sdm can be preceded by the dependent jw - acting as a non-prepositional initial main clause; the undefined relative form cannot (e.g. 17.12).

These forms, of course occur in LE and in NDE.

and persisted into Coptic as ἡγεσώμαι, ἢταγεσώμαι, ἡγαγεσώμαι and ἡγαναγεσώμαι respectively for the Second Tense Present, Perfect, Habitude and Future, i.e. it has now become a fully analytical and tense related form.

The emphatic forms in earlier ME (and in NDE too) were sm.n.f, sm.f (sdm.f) or mrr.f.

as discussed and shown in Chapters 6 and 7.
CHAPTER 18

THE TEMPORAL \textit{wnn} IN LATE EGYPTIAN

In this chapter, the LE temporal \textit{wnn} construction is discussed, leading to and giving special emphasis to the common LE epistolary formula and how it developed.

The main clause with \textit{wnn} is usually followed by the continuative \textit{jw.f hr sd\textit{m}} of the future in the first instance, and the conjunctive thereafter.

The \textit{wnn} clause is usually future, but it is not "an explicit form to express future" in LE. It is one of the LE semantic equivalents of an English temporal clause, or more rarely, a conditional clause Baer (1965:137).

e.g.

18.1

\textit{wnn} \textit{p3 jtn hr wbn}
\textit{jw.j hr wpt \textit{hn\textit{c.k m.b3h.f}}}
\textit{mtw.f hr djt p3 \textit{c\textit{d3 n p3 m3\textit{ct}}}}

When the sun rises, I will be judged with you in his presence, and he will give the wrong-doer to the righteous (i.e. let the righteous triumph).

(Two Brothers, 16/3)

The particle \textit{hr} before \textit{wnn} creates with it a "closed prosodic unit" and the construction then refers to the past, e.g.

\footnotesize

1 Note that in the \textit{wnn\textit{f hr sd\textit{m}}} and the \textit{jw.f hr sd\textit{m}} of the Future, the preposition \textit{hr} is almost always written. (Groll 1982:11ff). In the Nineteenth Dynasty texts, the total occurrence ranges from 50 - 100\%, while the figure is 11 - 50 \% in later Twentieth Dynasty texts.
As soon as the sun rose ... (they) stood and fought each other every day for three months now.

And when more days had passed, the youth sat down to a feast day in his house.

(Doomed Prince, 7/7-9)

This hr jr m.h.t formula is another way used to express a temporal clause in the past (in the Nineteenth Dynasty) and this is followed by a pseudoverbal construction.

Groll (in a discussion (on page 347) to Goldwasser's presentation 1985:50) suggests that hr wnn.f is probably the beginning of the Coptic ḫwN of ḫwN. (This is a circumstantial or Second Present + ḫwN and is used in conditional sentences.)

hr jr is a time converter or changer. A First Present sentence indicates present time; when preceded by hr jr it indicates past time. Perhaps hr wnn has similar properties.

Groll suggests too that "wnn.f hr is a ME pseudoverbal construction where the first position is filled by wnn.f - a "that" form, a noun, and because it occupies first position in a pseudoverbal construction, the whole construction is circumstantial. And this is retained in LE."

The temporal wnn.f hr szęm in these examples has the form of a ME pseudoverbal construction, and this is found too in NDE, and retained in LE. However the complete construction including the apodosis, which in the first example includes jw.f hr szęm of the LE continuative future, and then a LE conjunctive. This does not occur in ME, but is found in LE and in NDE.
18.3

Papyrus Anastasi I 18/16 may be similar to this suggestion

\[ jw.f \ m \ ss \ m \ pr.f \]
\[ wnn.k \ dj \ m \ p3 \ jh.pr \ r.\sw \]

He prospers in his house while you will be here in the stable forever.

18.4

\[ ptr \ wnn.f \ jjt \]
\[ wn \ tw.j \ \$nj \]

Look, when he comes back

[? you shall kill him]

[? [do] not [listen unto him]

for I am suffering ....

(Two Brothers, 14/9,10)

There is an \textit{m} in the damaged passage, which could either be the beginning of a conjunctive (Baer 1965:142) or a negative imperative (Blackman 1936:44). The former is more likely as temporal \textit{wnn} is usually followed by a continuative \textit{jw.f hr $\delta m} of the future or a conjunctive.

18.5

\[ wnn.j \ hr \ sbh \ n.\$n \]
\[ bw \ $\delta m.n \ n.j \ wc \ jm.sn \ jw.j \ hr \]

While/whenever I keep on shouting for them, none of them heeds my call.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 41/3)

\textit{bw $\delta m.n.f} is unusual. It is equivalent to ME \textit{n $\delta m.n.f} and has a generalising function (Davis 1973: Sentence type 19).

\textit{jw.j hr $\delta$} - “while I call” is a circumstantial First Present.

The \textit{wnn.j} clause is a ME pseudoverbal construction; the \textit{bw $\delta m.n.f} is rare, probably a unique NDE formation, (see also 12.102); the \textit{jw.j} clause a LE circumstantial First Present. The entire clause could probably occur only in NDE.
Now while his majesty sat speaking with the chiefs, the vile foe from Khatti came with his infantry and his chariots.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 117/12)

`wnn.f` in this context is unusual. This is `wnn.f`, but it is past tense, although not preceded by `hr`.

`jst` precedes the `wnn`.

When he is pulling the rope, he catches birds.

(Papyrus Anastasi I (Really Papyrus Koller), 44/1-3)

Although I have translated this with present meaning, perhaps it could be future too, with `jw.f` being a `jw.f hr šdm.f` of the future.

The common LE epistolary formula `wnn t3j.j št (hr) spr r.k jw.k (hr)` + infinitive has been interpreted as a (subordinate) temporal clause with `wnn` followed by a main clause exemplifying `jw.f hr šdm.f` as a future tense. The meaning is essentially - "When my letter reaches you, you shall ... ."

Goldwasser (1985:55) in an article entitled "A late Egyptian epistolary formula as an aid to dating Ramesside texts" summarises by noting that in the 18th Dynasty (Amenophis III), there was a temporal formula

- `hst spr sš pn (n).tn
  jw.tn hr tm rdj.t sdr`,

These two examples in context could probably only be either NDE or LE.
and in the Nineteenth Dynasty, there was both

\[ hft \ spr \ t3j.j \ 3 c.t \ r.k \]

\[ jw.k \ hr + \ \text{infinitive (a "frozen" formula), and} \]

\[ wnn.f \ hr \ \$dm \]

\[ jw.f \ hr \ \$dm \ (\text{free usage}) \]

It is this that is discussed above.

In the Twentieth Dynasty, there was

\[ wnn \ t3j.j \ 3c.t \ (hr) \ spr \ r.k \ jw.k \ (hr) + \ \text{infinitive ("frozen" formula), (well known, e.g. in the Late Ramesside Letters), and} \]

\[ wnn.f \ hr \ \$dm \]

\[ jw.f \ hr \ \$dm \ (\text{free usage}) \]

In "Model Letters" (Normative texts; Nineteenth Dynasty Miscellanies) Goldwasser finds side by side two frozen formulae, viz.

(i) \[ hft \ spr \ t3j.j \ 3c.t \ r.k \]

\[ jw.k \ hr + \ \text{infinitive, e.g.} \]

LEM 28/3 and 66/5

(ii) \[ wnn \ t3j.j \ 3c.t \ hr \ spr \ r.k \]

\[ jw.k \ hr + \ \text{infinitive, e.g.} \]

LEM 6/3 and 68/9.

The above are Nineteenth Dynasty.
In Papyrus Anastasi I (Really Papyrus Koller) 46/5-7 the "frozen" formula occurs -

\[
\text{When my letter reaches you, you shall cause the tribute to be made ready in all its items.}
\]

A hft šqm.f followed by jw.f hr šdm.f of the future.

The same (but p3j.j wb3, not t3j.j šc.t) is found in

When my letter reaches you, you shall place the White Crown on the head of Horus, son of Isis, and appoint him to the position of his father Osiris.

(Horus and Seth, 47/11-13)

bft šdm.f followed by a jw.f hr šdm of the future and then a conjunctive.

Another topic:

Your letter reached me in a hour of leisure (lit. of resting for a while)

(Papyrus Anastasi I 10/1)
CONCLUSION

The different epistolary formulae are discussed in this chapter. Several occur in the Nineteenth Dynasty texts under review, showing once again that the language at this time was a heterogeneous one.

An example similar to the well-known Late Egyptian epistolary formula \textit{wnn t3j.j 3Ct (hr) spr r.k jw.k (hr) + infinitive} occurs here (example 18.1). So does \textit{hr wnn} with a similar sentence, referring to past tense (example 18.2). Similar temporal \textit{wnn}'s occur in 18.3 and 18.4 (future tense), 18.5 (present continuous tense, perhaps) and 18.6 (past time, although the \textit{wnn} is not preceded by \textit{hr}.)

There is a Nineteenth Dynasty "frozen" formula \textit{hft spr t3j.j 3Ct r.k - jw.k hr + infinitive} too (example 18.8). and a similar one in example 18.9 followed by a \textit{jw.f hr sdm} of the future and then a conjunctive.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{The \textit{hft} "frozen" formula appears in ME and in NDE. This is interesting as the \textit{jw.f hr (tn) sdm} of LE appears as the second clause of the sentence.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{The \textit{wnn.f} formulae appear in NDE and in LE. This too is interesting as the first clause (\textit{wnn.f}) is actually a ME form (pseudoverbal construction), but it persists into LE.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Eighteenth Dynasty Administrative Texts (i.e. ME)

\begin{itemize}
\item[A.] \textit{hft spr s\(\bar{s}\) pn (n.)tn jw.tn hr tm rdjt sdr} (Amenophis III).
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item[A.] \textit{nineteenth Dynasty (i.e. NDE)}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item[A.] \textit{hft spr t3j.j 3Ct r.k jw.k hr + infinitive (frozen formula)}
\item[B.] \textit{wnn.f hr sdm jw.f hr sdm} (free usage)
\end{itemize}

Twentieth Dynasty (i.e. LE)

\begin{itemize}
\item[A.] \textit{wnn t3j.j 3Ct (hr)spr r.k jw.k (hr) + infinitive ("frozen" formula)}
\item[B.] \textit{wnn.f hr sdm jw.f hr sdm} (free usage)
\end{itemize}
Model Letters. (Normative Texts) - Nineteenth Dynasty (i.e. NDE)

A1. hft spr t3j.j s3.t r.k jw.k hr + infinitive ("frozen" formula)

A2. wnn t3j.j s3.t hr spr r.k jw.k + infinitive ("frozen" formula).

Goldwasser (1985:51) showed that both epistolary formulae occur side by side in the Nineteenth Dynasty "Model Letters" - Normative Texts, i.e. in Late Egyptian Miscellanies 28/3 (Anastasi III) - hft spr t3j.j s3t ... and in 6/3 (Bol. 1094) - wnn t3j.j s3t spr r.k. She thinks that these model letters may well be the missing link between the suspension of the hft formula, and its replacement by the new "frozen" formula with wnn in the Twentieth Dynasty administrative texts, and that these letters may be a synthesis of the new and the old.
CHAPTER 19

THE \( \text{wn} \) AND \( \text{wnn} \)

INTRODUCTION

In ME, to express existence, whether absolute or as relative to some situation, i.e. presence, the verb \( \text{wnn} \) "exist", "be" is used. When used in the \( \text{sdr}m.f \) form \( \text{wnn.f} \) refers to future or durative tenses, while \( \text{wn.f} \) tends to have past reference and lays no stress on duration (Gardiner 1982:82).

\( jw \ \text{wn} \) (\( \text{wn} \) is the \( \text{sdr}m.f \) form) = there is, there was.

Since \( jw \) is avoided after words like \( jst, \text{nn} \) and \( ntj \) in ME, here \( \text{wn} \) occurs alone with the meaning of \( jw \ \text{wn} \).

\( \text{nn} \ \text{wn} \) = non-existence or absence. \( \text{wn} \) stands for \( jw \ \text{wn} \) with \( jw \) suppressed (Gardiner 1982:83).

The participle of \( \text{wnn} \) (\( \text{wn} \)) can be used as equivalents of the relative adjective (e.g. Papyrus Lansing 107/12,13 see below). (Gardiner 1982:313).

\( \text{wn} \) or \( \text{wn} \text{t} \) is occasionally used for "that" after verbs of seeing, knowing or saying (Gardiner 1982:141), (e.g. Papyrus Anastasi I 26/7).

\( \text{wn} \) and \( \text{wnn} \) in the ME pseudoverbal construction has been discussed in Chapter 4, and the temporal \( \text{wnn} \) of the epistolary formula in NDE has been analysed in Chapter 18. These uses will therefore not be reviewed again here.

In LE \( \text{wn} \) of the past can be followed by either a pronominal suffix or a defined noun (Černý & Groll 1975:296), while the \( \text{wn} \) of existence can precede only bare or undefined nouns.
A. MIDDLE EGYPTIAN USAGE

I. The wn and wnn in Non-literary NDE texts

19.1

\[ w3t \]

\[ wn.k \ 3\tj \ 5 \ hr.n \]

(a way)

that had been blocked before us.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 65/8)

19.2

\[ sp \ nb \ wn \ bw \ 3\t.f \]

a deed, that has been unknown.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/14,15)

II. The wn and wnn in literary NDE texts

19.3

... \( jrj.sn \ m \ tm \ wn \)

... making them as that which is not.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 18/2)

19.4

\[ jw \ wnw \ m \ 3ht \ r \ 3sp \ drt.k \]

Those who are in the fields will grasp your hand.

(Papyrus Lansing, 107/12,13)

wnw is the participle of wn

The participle is used as an equivalent of the relative adjective.

\( jw \ + \) noun equivalent \( r \ 3sp \) is a Third Future.

19.5

\[ m \ jrj \ dt \ dd.tw.k \]

\[ wn \ nkt \ m \ hm.k \]

Let it not be said of you that there is anything that you do not know.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 26/7)
The *wn* here stands for "that" after *ḥd*, and for the *wn* of existence.

19.6

šw kf šnC

*wn hr kmt* ...

Shu, who uncovered the cloud, that was over Egypt ...  
(Stele of Merneptah, 13/10)

19.7

Memphis' gates

*wn ḥb3* (or *dbh*) ...

that were barred ...  
(Stele of Merneptah, 13/14)

19.8

*wn nb r šḥt.f ṭḥ pḥtj.f*

The lord who knows his strength will snare him.  
(Stele of Merneptah, 17/12)

The *wn* here is for *jw* of the Third Future.

This is unusual, and may be found in  LE infrequently and in  NDE, as here.

19.9

*wn.f šbt hr šb3jt.f thj m wšḥt.f*

One is laughing at its door, and drunk in its halls.  
(Papyrus Lansing, 110/14,15)

More commonly one would use *jw.f*, I think.
An interesting example -

$wn \ldots m\text{sn}\text{h}$ is a non-initial prospective (with a stative) following $dj$

$m\text{sn}\text{h} = \text{to rotate, turn away, and being in the stative, refers to a durative state.}$

Negation of $wn$. i.e. non-existence in ME.

19.11

$w^c \text{srjt } nfrt \ n \ h^c t.\$  
$a \text{beautiful young girl}$

$jw \ nn \ wn \ mj \ kdnw.\$  
$\text{the like of which did not exist.}$

(Horus and Seth, 44/10,11)

19.12

$nn \ wn \ tpj \ m \ n\text{3}w \ th\text{3}\text{rwt}$  
There is no chief among the charioteers.

(Perhaps a Syrian word)

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, G1/7)

The above two examples of $nn \ wn$ reflecting non-existence can occur in ME and in NDE.
B. LATE EGYPTIAN

WN of the past can be followed by either a pronominal suffix or a defined noun (Černý & Groll 1975:296), as in the next two examples

19.13

*jr jnk wn.j m hmt m.dj w* mjnjw

As for me, I was the wife of a herdsman.

(Horus and Seth, 45/1)

19.14

*t3.w r h.t.j

jnk.sn mj wn.sn hr.f

The lands are under my control;

They are mine, as they were his.

(Kanais Wady Mia, 69/2,3)

*jnk* is a LE possessive pronoun.

The above two examples are found in NDE and in LE.

WN of existence can precede only bare or undefined nouns, e.g.

19.15

*jst wn k3 mj c3 p3 dd.k n.j

Does there exist an ox as big as you say?

(Truth and Falsehood, 35/7)

WN alone stands for *jw wn* after *jst*. 

and
19.16

*jst wn hmt mj c3 p3 j.dd tn*  
Is there a dagger as big as you said?  
*(Truth and Falsehood, 35/12,13)*

19.17

*wn phtj c3 jm.k*  
You have great strength  
*("there is great strength with you")*  
*(Two Brothers, 12/8)*

19.18

*wn nkt r.j*  
Something is befalling me  
*("there is something against me")*  
*(Two Brothers, 18/3)*

19.19

*wnn h3nnt m bnw kwkw*  
There are kernels in the nuts.  

*jw mw m bnw h3nnt*  
There is water in the kernels.  
*(Prayers as School Texts, 86/3, 4)*

(See 22.1 for a discussion of the use and meaning of *jw* in the second sentence, as complementary to *wnn* in the first.)

---

The above examples - *wn* of existence preceding bare or undefined nouns are found in LE and in NDE.
CONCLUSION

Both Middle Egyptian and Late Egyptian uses of \textit{wn} and \textit{wnn} are found in both the non-literary and literary NDE texts studied here. Middle Egyptian examples include:

- \textit{sdm.f} form (\textit{wn.f}) (auxiliary verb) with past reference (example 19.1)
- \textit{wn bw rj.tw.f} (19.2)
- \textit{m tm wn} (19.3)
- participle of \textit{wn} as the equivalent of a relative adjective (19.4)
- \textit{wn} standing for "that" after \textit{dj} (19.5)
- \textit{wn ... mšnh}, a non-initial prospective following \textit{dj.š} (19.10)
- \textit{nn wn}, indicating non-existence (19.12)

and there are examples of the Late Egyptian

- \textit{wn} of the past (e.g. 19.13)
- \textit{wn} of the existence, preceding only bare or undefined nouns (19.15). In Coptic, this is \textit{qcy} - "there is".

Of course, \textit{wn(n)} is used in the Middle Egyptian pseudoverbal construction (Chapter 4), and as the temporal \textit{wnn} of the epistolary formula (Chapter 18).
CHAPTER 20

LATE EGYPTIAN *jw.f hr ṣdm.f* OF THE FUTURE

INTRODUCTION

The *jw.f r ṣdm* of the Third Future is a primary, independent sentence, referring to the future or prospective time.

The *jw.f hr ṣdm* of the future¹, on the other hand, is a sequential clause referring to the future. It is morphologically and structurally similar to the successive *jw.f hr ṣdm* of the past, and therefore it is recognised in context.

It is negated by *tm*, and it occurs only in certain circumstances or contexts, from which it is recognised, namely:

1. Following a temporal *wnn.f* or *ḥft* clause.
2. Following a *jr* conditional clause, and
3. It is rarely used independently or following a *jw.f r ṣdm* of the Third Future, where a further Third Future or a conjunctive might be more commonly expected.

---

¹ The preposition *ḥr* is almost always written in this formation in the Nineteenth Dynasty, whereas it is usually absent in the later Twentieth Dynasty (Goldwasser 1985:51; Groll 1982:11ff.)
I. Following a temporal \textit{wnu.f} or \textit{hft}.

20.1

\textit{wnu} p3 jm hr wbn
\textit{jw.j hr wpt hn\textasciicircum{c}.k} \\
When the sun rises, I will be judged with you.

(Two Brothers, 16/3)

20.2

\textit{hft spr t3.j} 3gi r.k
\textit{jw.k hr djt grg p3 jnj.w m ht.f nb.} \\
When my letter reaches you, you shall cause the tribute to be made ready in all its items.

(Papyrus Anastasi I (Really Papyrus Koller), 46/5-7)

II. Preceded by \textit{jr}

(Note - \textit{jw} after \textit{hr jr} is the dependent or circumstantial \textit{jw} (Černý and Groll 1975:259), e.g.

20.3

\textit{hr jr jw.k gm.f} ... \\
And if you find it ...

(Two Brothers ( Literary), 18/1,2)

\textit{hr jr} + circumstantial First Present.

20.4

\textit{hr jr jw bn jb n p3 wr n ht3 r smt}
\textit{jw.f hr djt lnn p3j.f m3c ...} \\
And if the wish of the great prince of Hatti is not to come, then he will send his army.

(Hittite Treaty (Non-literary), 228/5,6)
The Late Egyptian *jwr* (tm) *sdt* of the sequential future occurs in both the non-literary and literary NDE texts in this study. This tense can follow:
- a temporal *wnn.f* or *hft* clause (e.g. 20.1, 20.2)
- a *jwr* conditional clause (example 20.4)
- rarely a *jwr* *sdt* of the Third Future (e.g. 20.6)

Or it may be used independently (20.5)
This is a unique form, morphologically similar to the \textit{jw.f hr sdm} of the successive past, and is recognised by its position and the context in which it is seen.

It is a new development in NDE - a clear example of an analytical form compared to the earlier ME synthetic \textit{sdm.f} and it continued into LE.

\begin{center}
\textbf{All these various examples occur only in LE and in NDE, not in ME.}
\end{center}
CHAPTER 21

LATE EGYPTIAN FIRST FUTURE

INTRODUCTION

The Late Egyptian First Future has an element (and meaning) of the immediate present with an aspect of futurity. This construction is:

\[ \text{st m nGj} \]

immediate present

\[ r m3c \]

futurity

They are going to travel.

It is a formation which occurs only rarely.

There are no typical examples of this in the NDE texts of this thesis. However, there are some formations, which seem to hint at the later development of, and thus antedate this construction, e.g.

21.1

\[ \text{hr jr sw m nGj hrj n3 snw} \]

As she was walking under the trees,

...  

(Horus and Seth, 44/5,6)

But there is no \( r m3c \).
It is First Present - immediate present tense, and

21.2

mrjw m ksj \( \) The young men were bowing (or doing obeisance).

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs)

These are equivalent to the Coptic qualitative verb of motion.

These two examples are found in LE and in NDE and not in ME.

21.3

\( \text{st} \ r \ s\text{swn} \ h\text{dj} \ s\text{hrw.j} \) They shall punish him, who spoils my plans.

(Kanais 69/5)

This interesting example is neither LE Third Future \( (jw.w \ r \ s\text{swn}) \) or First Present \( (\text{st} \ h\text{r} \ s\text{swn}) \), nor is it ME pseudoverbal construction

\( (m\text{k}.\text{s}w \ r \ s\text{swn}) \) or

\( (jw.f \ r \ s\text{swn}) \).

Neither is it the full LE First Future.

This example is probably a unique or more likely hybrid NDE form.

There are no examples of \( \text{st} \ m \ n\text{fj} \ r \ m\text{dc} \), but there are some interesting examples, referring to the immediate present without the futurity element of \( r \ m\text{dc} \).

Example 21.3 is an interesting puzzling example, perhaps a NDE hybrid form.
CONCLUSION

Although no fully developed LE First Future examples could be found, there are some interesting formations - the LE First Present, expressing the immediate present (21.1), equivalent to what would later be the Coptic qualitative verb of motion (21.2) and a probable NDE hybrid form, which is neither the ME pseudoverbal construction, or the LE First Present or Third Future (21.3). It may have later evolved into the LE First Future.
CHAPTER 22

Η郤 jw IN ME AND IN LE

INTRODUCTION

In the Old Kingdom the beginnings of a process are seen that ended in the complete disappearance of the suffix conjugation, save for some fossilized relics of the $sdm.f$ form, and its replacement by a set of tenses based upon the pseudooverbal construction. This final result was attained only in Coptic, where the tenses resemble those of French or English in the precision with which they mark distinctions of time. The first step in the process appears to have been the employment of $jw$ to introduce the pseudooverbal construction and to produce compound verb-forms like $jw$ $sdm.n.f$ involving the suffix conjugation.

The origin of the auxiliary $郤 jw$ is uncertain. It may be connected with Hebrew $שָׁמַע$ or $שָׁמַע ‘fall out’, ‘be’, but it is more likely that it is merely the Egyptian verb $郤 jw ‘come$, specialised for use as the copula (Gardiner 1982:384).

The etymology of $jw$ is uncertain. Perhaps it is a particle. $jw$ does not have any inherent temporal or modal force. It precedes independent clauses or clauses of time and circumstance, only rarely does it introduce other dependent clauses.

A. It is used in Middle Egyptian as follows:

(i) Independent statements or assertions made with a certain detachment.

(ii) jw preceding $sdm.f$, imperfective and indicating sayings, reiteration, custom or continuity.

(iii) $jw.f$ $sdm.f$
(iv) \textit{jw} \textit{sdm.n.f} as a common narrative tense.

(v) \textit{jw} in a pseudoverbal construction.

(vi) \textit{jw} + \textit{jn} - construction or participial statement.

(vii) Virtual relative clause after a noun with indefinite or zero article.

\textbf{B. It is used in Late Egyptian:}

(i) Third Future

(ii) Successive independent \textit{jw} of the past

(iii) Successive independent \textit{jw} of the future

(iv) The dependent \textit{jw} (\textit{jw} converter)

There are three distinct \textit{jw.f hr sdm} patterns:

(i) Past

(ii) Future

(iii) Relative present.

\textbf{A. MIDDLE EGYPTIAN}

I. \textit{jw} in NDE texts

(i) \textbf{Independent statements or assertions made with a certain detachment.}

\textbf{22.1}

\begin{align*}
\textit{wnn h3nnt m hnw kwkw} & \quad \text{There are kernels in the nuts.} \\
\textit{jw mw m hnw h3nnt} & \quad \text{There is water in the kernels.}
\end{align*}

(Prayers as School Texts, 86/3,4)

\textit{jw} + noun in a non-verbal sentence with adverbial predicate.

The first sentence has a \textit{wnn}, the second a \textit{jw}. 

With *wnn.f*, duration is stressed; it refers to future or continuous tense (Gardiner 1982:82), *wnn* is commoner than *jw*. *jw* occurs almost only in main clauses and has a very restricted range of employment (Gardiner 1982:95).

These are independent statements or assertions made with a certain detachment -

22.2

*jw jtrw c3 t3j.f št 5dr*  
The river is its resting place.  
(Truth and Falsehood, 35/5,6)

Similar to the previous example.

and

22.3

*jw.f nnh*  
He is poor.  
(Prayers used as School Texts, 17/11,12)

A main clause; an independent statement.

The above three examples are main clauses, independent statements or assertions, perhaps made with a certain detachment.

(ii) In ME *jw* can precede *sdm.f*, imperfective, and indicating sayings, reiteration or custom or continuity (Gardiner 1982:384), e.g.

22.4

*jw hm.f dt.f hít.f*  
He does not know what he is about.  
(Papyrus Lansing, 108/4)

and
Her son Horus has cut off her head.

(Horus and Seth, 50/4,5)

These two examples (above) are also found in ME and in NDE.

\(jw\ \text{sdm.f}\) can occur as a passive. e.g.

He is awakened at any hour.

(Papyrus Lansing, 108/4)

\(jw\ \text{wn}\) is ME too.

\(\text{wn}\) is in \(\text{sdm.f}\) form = there was/is (Coptic \(\text{য} \text{ন}\)) (Gardiner 1982:82).

This too is found in ME and in NDE.

The meaning of \(jw.f\ \text{sdm.f}\) may be identical to \(jw\ \text{sdm.f}\), occurring in a characterisation or a statement of habit or custom, referring vaguely to present or future time. In some instances there may be an anticipatory emphasis.

In Pharaonic Egypt (Groll (ed.) 1985:380) in a discussion to the paper by Vernus, Polotsky mentions that \(jw\) before a sentence makes it a case of "non-ego-
In Pharaonic Egypt (Groll (ed.) 1985:380) in a discussion to the paper by Vernus, Polotsky mentions that *jw* before a sentence makes it a case of "non-egocentrisme" (i.e. a certain detachment). "It is rather difficult to distinguish between *jw* šdm.f and *jw.f šdm.f." He quotes an example in Vernus' presentation (example, 10, note 3) *jw dj.n ...* which involves a repeated action - "we (unceasingly) give ..."

Polotsky ends with "It needs a good deal of additional thinking about".

\[ jw.f šdm.f \text{ too is a form found in ME and in NDE.} \]

(iv) *jw* can also occur in ME with a *šdm.n.f* as a common narrative tense in the present perfect or past, e.g.

22.8

*jw wš.n hm.f rdjt hkn.tw t3 št nt hhw m mpt*  
His majesty has commanded to cause that the House of Millions of Years be protected.

(Nauri Decree, 51/1)

\[ \text{This too is a ME and NDE form.} \]

In all the above eight examples - ME (or NDE) forms *jw* is used as an auxiliary verb.

(v) *jw* can occur in a pseudoverbal construction, e.g.

22.9

*jwj c.kwj m.b3h nb.w*  
I enter in before the lords.

(Prayers as School Texts, 86/2)
(vi) An unusual example is \textit{jw} preceding a \textit{jn}-construction or participial statement

22.10 \textit{jw jnk jrj ms jnr} \hspace{1cm} \textit{It was I, who fetched stones.} \\
\hspace{1cm} \text{(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 38/7)}

The auxiliary \textit{jrj} is a perfective participle.

(vii) \textit{jw} can also occur in ME as a virtual relative clause after a noun with indefinite or zero article (as in later LE), e.g.

22.11 \textit{jrj.j} (for \textit{ptrj} perhaps) \textit{knw} \hspace{1cm} \text{I have seen many, whom you have helped.} \\
\textit{jw \ jrj.k n.sn} \hspace{1cm} \text{(Prayers as School Texts, 60/8)}

The ME rule that \textit{jw} must not be employed after \textit{nn} (= \textit{bn}) and \textit{ntj} breaks down in LE, e.g. before the Third Future.
B. In LE (and Coptic) jw becomes increasingly common as the mark of a clause of time or circumstance.

There are four distinctive jw's in LE:

i) The initial independent jw of the future - the Third Future

\( jw.f \ (r) \ \$d m.f \)

ii) The successive independent jw of the past.

\( jw.f \ (hr) \ (tm) \ \$d m.f \ of the narrative past \)

iii) The successive independent jw of the future:

\( jw.f \ (hr) \ (tm) \ \$d m.f \ of the future. \)

iv) The dependent jw (the jw "converter")

All these jw patterns are found in LE and in NDE.

Using time conveyance as the criterion of classification (Groll 1969(a):89), three distinct \( jw.f \ (hr) \ \$d m \) patterns are obtained, referring to:

(i). The jw of the past in NDE texts (Pattern I)

22.12

\begin{align*}
hr & \ jr \ m.h.t \ p3 \ hrd \ c3jt \\
jw.f & \ hr \ tsj \ r \ t3jf \ tp.hwt \\
jw.f & \ hr \ gmH \ wC \ n \ tsm \\
jw.f & \ m.s3 \ wC \ n \ s \ c3 \\
jw.f & \ hr \ smt \ hr \ t3 \ mt \\
\end{align*}

Now when the boy had grown, he went up to his roof, and he saw a greyhound, following a man (lit. "big man" = adult), who was walking on the road.

(Doomed Prince, 2/1-3)

Lines 2 and 3 are \( jw.f \ hr \ \$d m.f \) = of the narrative past

Line 4 is a relative present (non-verbal) and
As for me, I buried a chisel of mine in my house after the war, and it was stolen and I caused all the people, who are in the town to bind themselves by an oath concerning my chisel.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 2-4)

\( \text{jw.tw hr jt3.f and jw.j hr djt are } jw.f (hr) \text{ of the continuative past. They continue or follow } \text{tjmš.j, a LE perfect active } \text{šdm.f. It is a specific LE formation equivalent to ME } jw \text{ stp.n.f } \) (See above Nauri Decree 51/1) (22.8).

(ii). The jw of the future in NDE texts (Pattern II)

When my letter reaches you, you shall place the White Crown on the head of Horus, son of Isis.

and you shall ....

(Horus and Seth, 47/11,12)

(iii) The jw of the relative present in NDE texts (Pattern III)

I saw Heria, stealing your chisel.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 5,6)
Isis came and approached Nemty, the ferryman as he was sitting near his boat.

(Horus and Seth, 43/6,7)

But rather that they shall be privileged and protected while each one of them is pursuing his calling.

(Nauri Decree, 52/9,10)

You do not listen, while I speak.

(Papyrus Lansing, 101/2)

You are like the mate of a skipper, who is skilled in (managing) the boat.

When he is/(will be) skipper in the boat, he stands/(will stand) at the prow (?)

(Papyrus Anastasi I (Really Papyrus Koller), 43/5-7)

Line 2 is the relative present jw.f (hr) šdm.f.

Line 4 is jw.f (hr) šdm.f of the future following a wnn.f clause.

The preposition hr is missing from both examples.

Patterns I and II are both made negative by placing the morpheme tm immediately before the infinitive when the actor-expression is a pronominal suffix, i.e. jw.f hr tm šdm; e.g.
22.20

\[ j.n.f \ hr \ \_d\_ n.j \]
\[ jw.j \ hr.\_m \ \_d\_m \ n.f \]

So he spoke unto me; but I heeded him not.

(Two Brothers, 14/5,6)

In contrast, Pattern III is negatived by placing the morphemes \( jw \ bn \) immediately before the pronominal preformatives of the First Present, i.e. \( jw \ bn \ sw \ (hr) \ \_d\_m \), e.g.

22.21

\( ... \ (wpwtjw) \ jw \ bn \ \_t \ \_n \ n \_n r \ nb \ n\_rt \)

... messengers, who are not afraid of any god or goddess.

(Horus and Seth, 58/3,4)

Cf. the next two examples -

22.22

\( m \ jrj \ jrt \ n3 \ sp.w \ c3j.w \ n \ grg \)
\( ntj \ bn \ \_t \ r \ st.w \)

Don't do those big misdeeds, that are out of place.

(Horus and Seth, 40/1,2)

and

22.23

\( jh \ n3 \ mdwt \ j.\_d.k \)
\( ntj \ bn \ \_3w \ \_d.m.tw \)

What are these words you spoke, which are not worthy of being heard?

(Horus and Seth, 42/4,5)

The above two examples have \( ntj \) in place of \( jw \), as the preceding nouns are definite, i.e. "those misdeeds" and "these words".

Another example of \( jw \ bn \ sw \ (hr) \ \_d\_m \) - negation of a relative (or circumstantial) First Present, is
I have been in the right against him day after day, while he pays no attention to what the Ennead says.

(Horus and Seth, 55/15,16)

The *jw bn* can follow the conjunction *hr*, functioning as a clause.

*hr* *sdm* in Pattern III is interchangeable with adverbial phrases. (See above Horus and Seth 40/1,2) or with the stative (See above Horus and Seth 42/4,5), i.e. it belongs to the category of durative tenses.

This is not so in *jw.f hr (tm) sdm* of the past or the future, which are therefore non-durative tenses.

Since the pronominal suffix cannot fill the initial position of a conjugation pattern - ... *f hr sdm* not being morphologically a self-sufficient conjugation pattern - we may classify the *jw* in *jw.f hr tm sdm* as a conjugation carrier, i.e. a mandatory element enabling the pronominal suffix to function as the actor of a conjugation pattern.

In contrast, since *bn sw hr sdm* is morphologically a self-sufficient unit, the *jw* preceding it in *jw bn sw hr sdm* is found to be morphologically a facultative element, i.e. a converter. (Groll 1969(a):90).

So, in LE, three distinct *jw* morphemes are to be distinguished:

i) That capable of preceding any sentence pattern (including non-verbal) - permitting it to function as a non-initial clause (converter *jw*)

ii) That filling the first position of *jw.f hr sdm* of past or future (i.e. a conjugation carrier) - permitting the patterns to function as non-initial main sentences

iii) That filling the first position of the Third Future, permitting it to function as an initial main sentence.

The preposition *hr* in the circumstantial First Present *jw.f hr sdm* is almost always written in Nineteenth Dynasty texts (as here), while it is infrequent in Twentieth Dynasty texts (Groll 1982:11ff)
In conclusion, regarding $\textit{g}$, I quote Groll (1985:362ff). "There is in ME a $\textit{jw}$ which is independent, as in $\textit{jw} \textit{sjm.n.j}$ and a $\textit{jw}$, which is circumstantial, as in the $\textit{jw.f} \textit{hr} \textit{sjm}$, (although this form can also represent a main and initial sentence). Now the $\textit{jw}$ which disappears is only the $\textit{jw}$ of the past, and a new $\textit{jw}$ appears, which is the $\textit{jw}$ of the Third Future, which is initial, but it has this type of future element."

"But there is no doubt that the $\textit{jw.f} \textit{hr} \textit{sjm}$ of the past disappeared in the Twenty-first Dynasty. It had a very extensive life, but a very short one in Egyptian." She asks "Does this not indicate the possibility of a borrowed concept?"

| All the above examples and patterns - The past (Pattern I), The Future (Pattern II), The relative present (Pattern III), as well as the subordinate forms (Chapter 23) and the three distinct $\textit{jw}$ morphemes (above) are found in LE and in NDE. |

**CONCLUSION**

$\textit{jw}$ as used in both Middle Egyptian and in Late Egyptian occur frequently in both the non-literary and literary Nineteenth Dynasty texts, again showing the heterogeneity of this language.

While $\textit{jw}$ was used in ME in many different (perhaps synthetic) ways, expressing perhaps taxis rather than tense and a general situation rather than a particular one occurring at a specific time, (as explained in the chapter "Tense in Egyptian"), the function of $\textit{jw}$ developed or evolved in LE (and in fact really began in earlier NDE) in specific analytical constructions, viz.:

(i) The initial independent $\textit{jw}$ of the future - The Third Future (bn) $\textit{jw.f} \textit{r} \textit{sjm}$ (See Chapter 13).

(ii) The successive independent $\textit{jw}$ of the past $\textit{jw.f} \textit{hr} \textit{tm} \textit{sjm}$ (example 22.12 and Chapter 15).

(iii) The successive independent $\textit{jw}$ of the future (Chapter 20).

(iv) The dependent $\textit{jw}$ (The $\textit{jw}$ "converter"). (See Chapter 23).
Using time conveyance as the criterion of classification, three distinct \( jw.f \) (hr) \( \$qm \) patterns are obtained.

(i) The past (Pattern I) (example 22.13).
(ii) The future (Pattern II) (example 22.14), and
(iii) The relative present (Pattern III) (example 22.15).

Patterns I and II are negated by \( tm \) (example 22.15).

Pattern III though is negated by placing \( jw \) \( bn \) immediately before the pronominal preformatives of the First Present, i.e. \( jw \) \( bn \) \( \#w \) (hr) \( \$qm \) (22.21).

(Note the affirmative First Present with a pronoun is \( \#w \) \( hr \) \( \$qm \), and with a dependent \( jw \), this becomes \( jw.f \) \( hr \) \( \$qm \).)

Pattern III is a durative tense, while I and II are non durative. (See the discussion in this chapter).

This chapter should be read in conjunction with "Tense in Egyptian".

The ME forms of use of \( jw \) persisted into NDE, where they are found side by side with LE forms of usage. They are no longer found in LE.

All the "LE usages" of \( jw \) first occur in NDE and continue into LE.
CHAPTER 23

THE CONVERTER jw IN LATE EGYPTIAN

INTRODUCTION

The jw in LE, besides being an integral part of the Third Future and the successive past and future tenses, has a further important function, that of a converter.

The converter jw in LE (Frandsen 1974:194), converts the sentence patterns into non-initial subordinate clauses capable of fulfilling one or all of four syntactic functions:

A. as an adverb, i.e. an adverb clause;
B. as a "virtual" relative clause, i.e. as a relative clause after nouns with indefinite or zero article;
C. as an emphasized adverbial predicate having an initial "that"-form as its subject (i.e. Second Tenses);
D. as a concessive clause, when preceded by hfr.
A. The jw converter as an adverb

I. In a non-literary NDE text

23.1

\[ \text{wpt.hr wnn.sn hywj m\text{ckj}} \]
\[ \text{jw s3 nb jm.sn hr jrt hnt.f} \]

But rather that they shall be privileged and protected, while each one of them pursues his calling.

(Nauri Decree, 52/9, 10)

(A jw circumstantial with a First Present form).

II. The jw converter as adverb in a literary NDE text

23.2

\[ \text{dmd.k j\text{t} n\text{sm}t} \]
\[ \text{nn \text{snc} jw \text{wcr.k}} \]

May you join the crew of the Neshmet-bark without having been (being) turned back

(lit. not turning, while you had fled).

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 8/3)

This is a jw circumstantial with a \( \text{sdm.f} \), i.e. pluperfect.

23.3

\[ \text{w3h n dd dhwj} \]
\[ \text{jr.n.j hr.tp} \]
\[ \text{jw bw c\text{s} n ss r djt mtrt.f} \]

By the might of Thoth, I made it by myself, without summoning any scribe that he might help.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 13/16,17)

\[ \text{jw with a bw sdm.f} \]
23.4

jw.f šmt r jrt n h3t.š
jw bwpw w̄ ptr.š hrj.jb r.f

And he went to meet her, while no one but himself had seen her.

(Horus and Seth, 44/13,14)

jw + bwpw.f šdm.f

B. An example of Function B is:

I. In a non-literary NDE text

23.5

r pw jr w̄r rmuppies r.pw rmuppies 2
jw bw r̄tw.w ...

And if one or two men, who are unknown, flee ...

(Hittite Treaty, 229/5,6)

This is a "virtual" relative clause after an indefinite noun, and

II. In a literary NDE text

23.6

jst bw jrj.k šh3 w̄ n nfr
m.r̄ pw w̄ n nkt
jw jrj.j šw n.k jyt hr

Will you not think of a good thing or of something that I might do for you?

(Two Brothers, 17/8,9)

w̄ A ... jw šdm.f is in complementary relationship with
p3 A ... j̄šdm.f (i.e. a relative form and not jw, after a defined noun), e.g. in the following three examples.
(i) **Literary texts**

*Example text*:

**23.7**

\[ p3j \textit{bt}3 \ jrrj.k \ c3 \ r \ jkr \]

This crime, which you have committed is very great.

(Horus and Seth, 41/3,4)

(ii) **Non-literary text**

**23.8**

\[ bn \ jnk \ r.jt3 \ (\text{for} \ j.jt3) \ šw \]

It was not I who stole it.

"This crime" and "I" are defined nouns.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 8)

and note

**23.9**

\[ jlb \ n3 \ mdwt \]
\[ j.\dd.k \]
\[ ntj \ bn \ š3w \ šgm.tw.w \]

What are these words, which you spoke, which are not worthy of being heard?

(Horus and Seth, 42/4,5)

\[ n3 \ mdwt \] is a defined noun, and \[ ntj \ bn \ š3w \] is negation of a relative First Present (usually \[ jw \ bn \ št hr \ šgm \]).
23.10

\[ w\mathcal{C} n j3w t m\mathcal{F} \]
\[ jw j.\mathfrak{m}.\mathfrak{s} m k\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{k}\mathfrak{s}j \]

An old woman who went along bowed down
(lit. with a stoop)

(Horus and Seth, 43/7,8)

This is an interesting example.

The \( jw \) reflects Function B, i.e. a relative form following an indefinite noun, while \( j.\mathfrak{m}.\mathfrak{s} \) is a Second Tense (emphatic). This usually refers to future time, unlike in this example. (Groll 1969(b):189).

\( jw \) \&dgr; \( jw \) refers to absolute past when functioning as a virtual relative clause.

\( jw + \) the perfect active \&dgr; \( jw \) refers to relative present time in -

(i) \( jw.f hr jj, "to come" \ldots jw jn\mathfrak{j}.f "to bring" \)
(ii) \( jw.f hr \mathfrak{sm}, "to go" \ldots jw t3j, "to take" \)
(iii) \( ptr.f, "to see" \ldots jw jn\mathfrak{j}.f "to bring" or jw t3j "to take" \)

I cannot find any examples of the above. However, Hieratic Ostracon Recto 5/6 uses a circumstantial First Present to mean the same thing.

23.11

\[ ptr.j hrj3 \]
\[ jw.\mathfrak{s} hr jt3 p3j.k h3 \]

I saw Heria, while she was stealing your chisel.

(Hieratic Ostracon Recto 5/6)

C. An example of Function C, i.e. an emphasized adverbial predicate having an initial "that"-form as its subject.

23.12

\[ j.jrj.tw djt t3 j3w t n sn n mwt \]
\[ jw s3 n \mathfrak{h}t ch\mathfrak{C} \]

Is it while the bodily son is there that one shall give the office to the uncle?

(Horus and Seth, 41/16 - 42/1)
D. An example of Function D

23.13

... hr jw grn.f św ... although he had found him.

(Horus and Seth, 50/15)

CONCLUSION

Syntactic function B, i.e. \textit{jw} as a relative clause after nouns with indefinite or zero article is in fact found sometimes in ME, and continues into NDE and into LE (and into Coptic as $\xi$). (Polotsky 1960:392).

The other syntactic usages of \textit{jw} are new clear-cut analytical formations well established as grammatical forms in LE, appearing at first in NDE.

There are examples of this interesting subordinate Late Egyptian form in all four of its syntactic functions in both the non-literary and literary texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty.
CHAPTER 24

NON VERBAL SENTENCES

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, non-verbal sentences are discussed. It is divided into two sections, which have the common denominator of being non-verbal statements. They are:

I. Nominal Sentences

II. Adjectival Sentences

The sections are separate and each has its own introduction and conclusion.

I. NOMINAL SENTENCES

Introduction

A nominal sentence pattern is an identity pattern composed of two nominal members either nouns or noun equivalents.

Although there has been some disagreement (notably by Erman and by Sethe (Groll 1967:1)) regarding the subject and predicate in the bimembral nominal sentence, it would appear that the nominal sentences of ME and of LE are

---

1 Reference is sometimes made in this section to sentences with adverbial predicate.
essentially the same in morphology and syntax. These forms are commonly used
and frequently reflected in Nineteenth Dynasty texts too, as shown in this
chapter. Groll (1967) and Černý and Groll (1975) have shown and
differentiated clearly which is the subject and which the predicate.

In the "p3-A p3j" pattern, p3-A is the predicate.
In "ntf is p3-B", the elements are equally defined.
In "ntf is φ-B", φ-B is the predicate.
In "ntf is p3j", ntf is the predicate.
In "p3 + infinitive + relative form is p3j", the p3 + infinitive is the predicate.
In "p3w is φ-A ( + infinitive)", the demonstrative p3w is the predicate,
and in "jḥ is p3-A", the interrogative jḥ is the predicate.

A. In Middle Egyptian

(i) Non-verbal sentences with adverbial predicate have the order Subject-
Predicate as in NDE

24.1

j.šmt jjt m ḫḥ

Going and coming are with song.
(Merneptah's Stele, 18/13)

The infinitives (undefined) are used as nouns + adverb.
(ii) *jw* still precedes a non-verbal sentence with adverbial (or adjectival) predicate as in

24.2

*jw. f nmrh*

*bn ntf wsr*

He is poor, he is not rich.

(Prayers as School Texts, 17/11, 12)

This is not found in LE, except as in the First Present, when it is a circumstantial clause, and not an independent statement. So this is found in ME and in NDE, and not in LE.

However, the *bn ntf wsr* is negation of the bimembral nominal sentence.

This is LE, and of course NDE.

ME would be *nn šw wsr* and LE First Present would be *bn šw wsr*.

(iii) In the non-verbal sentence with nominal predicate, the copula *pw* is often used, either invariably or as a new sentence - Predicate - *pw* - Subject.

Examples of the use of *pw* include:

24.3

*nttn pw mj ntrw*  
You are like divinities.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/15)

*ntf* is empty nominal sentence pattern, including *pw*, the demonstrative pronoun in a ME nominal sentence (Gardiner 1982:104).
"pw" came to be employed as logical subject after logical predicates consisting of a noun, not however with its own proper meaning of "this" or "that", but as an equivalent for "he", "she", "it" or "they" invariable in number and gender.

24.4

bn rmত pw p3 ntj m hnw.n Not a man is he who is among us.
štj c3 ptįj hcr m h.c.f (It is) Seth, great of strength, Baal in person.
bn jřj.w n rmత m n3 jrr.f Not deeds of man are these his doings.
n3 pw n w< w<.tj They are of one who is unique.
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 53/3-7)

A mixture of ME and LE and note its use in a cleft sentence.

24.5

dw. ntr.f pw šp r.f Bad, (it can mean that) it is (even) his (own) god who may be blind towards him.

(Dream Interpretation)
(Groll 1985:100 Ex. 80 r.8 18.b)

B. Here are examples of the principal patterns of nominal sentences appearing in the texts studied in this thesis, which could be ME or LE.

1. (p3)A p3j

In this pattern (p3)A is the predicate and p3j the subject.
What is it that is going behind the big man, who is coming along the road?
And he said to him: "It is a greyhound."

(Doomed Prince 1/4, 5)

Who is she who is come? (Who is already here)...

She is Isis, the mighty, the mother of god.

(Horus and Seth 50/2-4)

Behold, (my) son Horus, he is my child.

(Horus and Seth 49/3)

He found a fruit, and he went home with it, and behold, it was (the) heart of his younger brother.

(Two Brothers, 23/9)

He is your father.

(Truth and Falsehood, 33/4)
Nominal pattern $\ p3 \ $. A is $\ p3j \ $, the $\ p3 \ $. A being the predicate.

24.11

$\ bj3t \ c3t \ t3j \ hpr.tj \ $ This is a great marvel that has come to pass.

(Two Brothers, 24/40)

2. **The $A\emptyset$ pattern, in which the second member is not actually expressed.**

24.12

$\ bn \ rmt \ pw \ p3 \ ntj \ m \ hnw.n \ $ It is no human being who is in our midst.

$\ sth \ c3 \ phfj \ bcr \ m \ hc.f \ $ (It is) Seth, great in strength, Baal in person.

(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh 53/3)

24.13

$\ hr \ jr \ p3 \ ntj \ jw.k \ r \ jr.f \ n.j \ $ As for this that you should do for me, (it is) your coming after me in order to take care of me.

$\ p3j.k \ jt \ r \ nwjt.(w)j \ $

(Two Brothers 17/11, 12)

24.14

$\ cnh.tw \ n \ ptr.k \ $ (There is) life in seeing you.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 14/5)
This is the 'nim' $\varnothing$ pattern.

3. The A.B pattern

(a) Category I

The two members are nouns

(o) Category I(a)

A is defined (by an article, a demonstrative or a suffix) and B is undefined. The defined noun is the subject, and the undefined one the predicate.

And since the greatest abomination of this town is stealing copper in it

This is a bimembral nominal sentence. $t3$ $bwt$, being defined is the subject, $t3$ $wt$, being undefined is the predicate.

$t3$, the definite article here expresses the notion of the superlative (Groll 1973:70).
Is it right for a father to ignore his son?
Are my deeds a matter for you to ignore?
(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 34/7-12)

He has not moved nor has he stirred since he was born.
His abomination is (the) work of an active man.
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 17/17-18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category I(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B is defined, A undefined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... and its one horn is on the western, and its other is on the eastern mountain, and (a) great river is the place of it's lying down.
(Blinding of Truth by Falsehood, 35/4-6)

Lapis lazuli is her hair.
(Chester Beatty III, Love Poems Pap. 1, verso C 1, 4)
A great wrongdoer is the citizeness Heria, worthy of death (is she), righteous is the workman, Nebnufer.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Verso 2,3)

Since $c$ has the ending $t$, one must classify the sentence as a nominal sentence and not an adjectival.

$s$ is a one-membral adjectival sentence.

$m^3c \text{ rm} \text{ jst} \text{ nbnfr}$ is a $nfr$ B adjectival pattern (Groll 1973:70).

(γ) Category I(c)

The two members are unequally defined.

Byblos is it's name.

What is it like?

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 32/11)

(Compare this with Two Brothers 25/10, 11 $ntk njm \text{ tr jnk b3t3}$ Who are you? I am Bata.)

(b) Category II

The first member is an interrogative.
24.23

njm r n p3j.j jt

What is (the) name of my father?
(Lit. Who is (the) name of my father?)

(Blinding of Truth by Falsehood, 32/16)

24.24

j3 jh p3j.tm jri $hrw wC.tn

What (means) your planning by yourself?

(Horus and Seth, 37/12, 13)

The p3j.k $dm is a noun equivalent, indifferent to time indication.

24.25

jh n3 mdwt

j.$d.k

ntj bn $3w $dm.tw.w

What are these words, which you spoke, which are not worthy of being heard?

(Horus and Seth, 42/4,5)

Compare the two relative forms j.$d.k and the negative passive ntj bn ...

The p3 $dm j.jr.j.k, the defined infinitive is restricted to past time.

24.26

jh p3j jri.tm ...

What is this, which you are doing (here)?

(Doomed Prince, 4/5)

24.27

jh p3 ntj jw.n r jri.f

What is it that we shall do?

(Horus and Seth, 39/13)
$j h + a$ definite article + $n t f$ + a Third Future + a resumptive pronoun.

cf.

24.28

$j w \cdot w j h$  
What are they for?

(Papyrus Lansing, 107/3)

A nominal sentence question

$j h$ is $p 3$ A, the $j h$ being the predicate.

and cf.

24.29

$nt n j h$  
What are you?

(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh 110/1)

and

24.30

$j s n w n w^c j m \cdot m n$  
$\text{Is there none among you whom I}$

$\text{did something good for in my land?}$

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 57/3)

$n \ w n$ is ME $w n$ of existence before an indefinite noun.

$j w \ j r j . j$ is LE relative circumstantial $\delta m . f$ following an indefinite noun

(Frandsen's Function B 1974).

4. The $j n k$ B Pattern

In the $j n k$ (or $n t f$) is $\emptyset B$ pattern, the $j n k$ is the subject, and the $\emptyset B$

(indefinite noun) the predicate.
In the *jnk* (or *ntf*) *p3.B*, (definite noun) there is an indifference to time indication. Only the philological analysis can help us to classify subject and predicate.

(a) Examples of *jnk nB*

24.31

*ntk šrt njm*  
Whose son are you?  (Lit. You are son of who?)

(Blinding of Truth by Falsehood, 32/14)

24.32

*jj.k trw p3 šr nfr*  
"Whence did you come, the fair youth?"

*jw.f hr ḫd n.sn*  
And he said to them:

"I am (a) son of an officer of the land of Egypt.

(Blinding of Truth by Falsehood, 32/14)

24.33

*jst j.jr.j prj r bl*  
It is from his ear that I shall come forth,

*m mšgr.f*  
I, who am (the) divine effluence.

*jw jnk mw ntrj*  
(Blinding of Truth by Falsehood, 32/14)

24.34

*ntk njm tr*  
Who are you, pray?

*jnk b3t3*  
I am Bata

(Two Brothers, 25/10)
24.35

\textit{jnk \textit{hm} n \textit{h.k}}

I am a servant of your house.

(Prayers as School Texts, 60/11)

24.36

\textit{mk \textit{ntk sš šhknt mšc}}

Behold you are a scribe in command of the army.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 12/9)

\textit{mk} usually has a dependent pronoun rather than an independent pronoun.

24.37

\textit{nn \textit{ntk nw n t3,h3št}}

You are not a hunter of the desert.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 43/1-3)

24.38

\textit{ntk \textit{čh3tj nfr}}
\textit{n mjt.t.k}

You are a perfect fighter, there is none like you.

(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh 76/8)

(b) Examples of \textit{jnk . p3 B}

24.39

\textit{hr \textit{ntj nttm n3 nbw}}

For you it is who are the lords

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/9)

24.40

\textit{jnk p3j.k Ššw jṛj \textit{jw m sš.k}}

I am your fate that has come after you.

(Doomed Prince 8/15, 16)
24.41

jis bn jnk t3j.k mwt

Lo, am I not your mother?

(Two Brothers, 24/6)

24.42

mntk krt šhyw
n p3 jwj mwt.f

You are he who offers counsel to the orphan (one who has no mother.)

(Prayers as School Texts, 60/9, 10)

(c) Some examples unique to NDE

24.43

m3C.hrw rC r hftw.f

As Re overcomes his enemies, so I overcome my enemies.

m3C hrw.j r hftw.j

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III, - Dream interpretation. Isis' invocation to the good dream 10/16 (Groll 1985:83).

A bimembral nominal sentence, whose subject and predicate are both emphatic šdm.f formations. (Groll 1985:84).

"As it is his enemies, whom Re overcomes, so is it my enemies, whom I overcome."

In this text of Dream Interpretation, Groll (1985:102ff) discusses several unimembral nominal sentence patterns immediately following dw.â or nfr.â, i.e. If one dreams such and such, bad/good - (it can mean) etc., e.g. Ex. 89 p. 103 r9, 16b
24.44

dw.Ø ṣw m.hwt. tw.f

Bad, (it can mean) deprivation of his property

A + adverb and e.g. Ex. 91 (p. 103) r 16b

24.45

nfr.Ø ẓsm3 p3j.f jrijn£h3

Good: (it can mean) killing his adversary.

Here we have the predicate of the sentence being an infinitive extended by a direct object, and e.g. Ex. 100 (p. 105) r8 4b

24.46

dw.Ø dr.f m j3wt.f

Bad, (it can mean) expelling him from his office.

and e.g. Ex. 103 (p. 106) r4 22b

24.47

nfr.Ø swd n.f ẓnh jn nfr.f

Good, (it can mean) giving him life by his (own) god.

"(The latter two) are classified as unimembral nominal sentence patterns since to translate them as passive or active prospective $sdm.f$ forms would necessitate abandoning the aspect of probability, which is essential to our understanding of this text as a diagnostic text which regards nightmare as curable." (Groll 1985:106, 114ff).

So Groll believes that $dr$ and $swd$ are infinitives acting as nouns, and she suggests that the notion of probability is achieved by the fact that infinitives have no specific time indication, and by the fact that the (ME) element $pw$ in the
bimembral nominal sentence pattern does not agree in gender with the predicative infinitive.

Compare

24.48

\[ nfr.? \text{ pr.}(t) \text{ pw } m \text{ mdwt} \]

(Ex. 148 r.6 8b (p 114))

with

24.49

\[ nfr.? \text{ pr.t } m \text{ mdwt } \text{ pw} \]

Good, (it can mean) the outcome of a quarrel.

(Ex. 149 r4 15.b)

Groll concludes that the indifference to time and gender of the pattern predicative infinitive + \text{ pw} makes it the pattern which can best express the aspect of probability (it might/may/could happen).

The grammar of the language of dream interpretation is expressed in terms of a system of elements rather than abstract rules.

Papyrus Chester Beatty III is probably LE, rather than a transformed ME.

We have \text{ pw} in nominal sentences, and not \text{ p3j}, \text{ t3j}, \text{ n3j}.

In LE, masculine and neuter are the same, so \text{ p3j} is neuter \text{ and} masculine, but in Chester Beatty III, \text{ pw} stands for neuter and \text{ p3j} for masculine.

The \text{ sdm.f's} used in Chester Beatty III are \text{ not} prospective, and do not say that something \text{ will} occur in the future. Rather there is a probability. "It \text{ may/could} occur."

And it is a \text{ sdm.(f.)} compatible with \text{ pw}, so it is a nominalised \text{ sdm.(f.)}.

A final example is of a nominal cleft sentence with \text{ pw} (- \text{ pw} following the nominal subject immediately), e.g. Ex. 80 (p. 100) r.8 18.b
24.50

Bad, (it can mean that) it is (even) his (own) god who may be blind towards him.

Conclusion

All the nominal sentence forms occur in ME, and progress unchanged to LE, existing of course too in the intermediate NDE period.

The ME non-verbal sentences with adverbial predicate continued into LE.

The independent statement jw.f + adverbial predicate of ME did not continue into LE, whereas the circumstantial form did, often the First Present being used to express this. The independent statement though is still found in NDE.

The copula pw is of ME origin, and a new sentence form developed; Predicate pw Subject. This continued into LE, but rarely, but is found in NDE.

Unique to NDE is a form occurring in the Dream Interpretation papyrus, - unimembral nominal sentences with an infinitive, (nominalised kjm.f) + pw expressing the aspect of probability. This is probably a new form (LE), rather than a transformed ME (Groll 1985:102).

II. ADJECTIVAL SENTENCES

Introduction

This section discusses the adjectival sentence patterns nfr šw, nfr B, nj. šwA and jnk šw, nfr p3j, jnk nfr, nfr ṣ, and m or (n)Aṣ as they are used in NDE.
A. **The basic ME adjectival sentence pattern is nfr šw, in which**

1. the predicative adjective fills the first position;
2. the actor expression, when taking the form of a pronoun, is the dependent pronoun;
3. there is no correspondence in gender or number between the 'šw' and the predicative adjective.

Many examples of this ME form are found in these NDE texts, but they do not occur in the non-literary texts of the Twentieth Dynasty. These forms fall into Category A or I (Černý and Groll 1975:542, Groll 1967:34).

**These are examples of the nfr šw pattern**

**24.51**

\[3h \, n \, j \, šnt \, j \, r \, phrT \, nbt\]
\[wr. \, šw \, n \, j \, r \, t3 \, dmnr\]

My sister is more beneficial to me than any medicine.

It (she) is more efficacious for me than the sum total of all the remedies.

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III, Love Songs, Pap.1 Verso C4, 10)

The second line is a nfr šw pattern parallel with a nfr B.f pattern.

**24.52**

\[jr \, sš \, n \, p3 \, ntj \, rj.\, šw\]
\[3h. \, šw \, r \, j3wt \, nbt\]

With regard to writing, for the one who knows it, it is more advantageous than any other occupation.

(Papyrus Lansing, 100/13)
24.53

šbk. šw nšt.k

Precious is it, your tongue.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 20/11)

24.54

mr. wj šw

How beloved is he.

(Merneptah's Stele 18/1-3)

An adjectival nfr šw sentence with an admirative wj of ME.

24.55

hr ptr pnctic. šw n.k m ktjw

It is distorted for you into something different.

(Two Brothers, 16/13, 14)

A šdm (passive participle) šw pattern.

24.56

jw nfr šw r p3 htp r p3 šnn
h3wtj wn m p3 t3

And it is better than the former peace and the former brotherhood, which was in the land.

(Hittite Treaty, 227/11)

24.57

ndm šw r šdh

It pleases more than pomegranate wine.

(Papyrus Lansing, 100/12, 13)
24.58
ṣrj šw (r) mj
He is smaller (than) a cat, and
c3 šw r gff
bigger than an ape.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 18/14)

24.59
3ḥ šw n.k r nn 10n sp
It is ten times more advantageous to
you than this.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 18/8)

The following patterns may be found in ME, NDE, and LE.

B. The following are nfr B patterns, also grouped in Category A or I.

24.60
bjn . tw r šs3w hr h3št cnhf m
You are worse than the desert
šhšḥ
antelope, that lives by running.

(Papyrus Lansing, 102/11)

24.61
cd3.t c3 cnh n njwt ḥrj3
A great wrongdoer is the citiziness
ššw mwt
Heria, worthy of death (is she),
m3c rmḥ jst nbnr
righteous is the workman,

(Hieratic Ostracon, Verso 2,3)
mJr

24.62
3ḥ k3p
Hiding is useful.

(Stele of Merneptah, 15/12)
Although the nfr $w$ pattern does not exist in non-literary Twentieth Dynasty Texts, patterns which reveal a considerable resemblance to it do exist, e.g.

C. nj $w$ A and jnk $w$

And this occurs in NDE too as a variant.

24.63

$wsr nht n\acute{s}j \sw$  
Might and strength are his.  
(Stele of Merneptah, 15/12-14)

24.64

$bn n\acute{s}j hrt.tn$  
It does not belong to your requirements.  
(Kanais (Wady Mia), 68/2)

24.65

$bn jnk \sw$  
It is not mine.  
(Truth and Falsehood, 34/10)

D. Category B or II of adjectival sentences include

$nfr p\acute{3}j$

$jk\acute{n} nfr$

$nfr \emptyset$

or

$m$ or $(n) A\emptyset$
(1) Examples of *nfr p3j* which occur in NDE.

**24.66**

3ḥ n.k p3j

Advantageous to you is it.

(Two Brothers, 12/11)

Compare this to the 3ḥ ṣw Category A or I examples above Papyrus Anastasi I, 18/8, Papyrus Chester Beatty, Love Songs, Pap. 1 Verso C4, 10 (3ḥ ṣ) and Stele of Merneptah 15/12 and Papyrus Lansing 100/13.

| These are different ways of expressing the same adjectival sentence: 3ḥ ṣw, 3ḥ ṣ, (Category A or I) and 3ḥ p3j (Category B or II) and all are found in NDE. |

**24.67**

jn jw nfr p3j.k ḫdb n3j.k b3k.w

Is it good that you slay your servants?

(Ramesses II, Battle of Kadesh 24/59)

**24.68**

nn nfr p3w

This is not good.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 30.4)

**24.69**

bn nfr jwn3 p3j gb.tw m.b3ḥ t3 pṣdt

It is not good to defraud me before the Ennead.

(Horus and Seth, 42/5, 6)
24.70

nfr r jkr šp. šn p3w j.jr.j.k nb

It is very, very good, this that you have done.

(Horus and Seth, 57/16 - 58/1)

This is a nfr p3w j.jr.j.f pattern

24.71

nfr jrij hr r n nfr

Happy is he who acts on the word of god.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/8)

nfr + a relative form for p3j. (It could possibly be a Type A nfr B pattern too.)

(ii) The jnk nfr pattern occurs in

24.72

hr ntj jš jnk nεj jb εn hr

For I am indeed considerate and compassionate toward travellers.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 66/7)

This is B³ of Groll's classification.

24.73

hrp wɟ3t m3c n pądt

Presenting the Eye (to Horus) seems right to the Ennead.

(Horus and Seth, 37/11, 12)

An adjectival sentence Type B³ with infinitive as noun.
(iii) Other Category B or II patterns

24.74

\[
\text{m}^{3c} \text{t} \ m \ \text{h} \text{h} \ n \ \text{s}p \\
p3 \ \text{dd} \ \text{djw} \text{tj} \ n \ t3 \ \text{ps} \text{dt}
\]

A thousand times correct is this that Thoth has said to the Ennead.

(Horus and Seth, 56/8, 9)

The \( m^{3c} \text{t} \ p3 \ \text{s} \text{dm} \text{f} \) pattern. The first member is an abstract noun serving as an adjective. Similarly in the next example.

The \( m \ m^{3c} \text{t} \ n3 \) pattern.

24.75

\[
\text{ntt} \ \text{jt}3 \ p3j \ h3 \ n \ \text{nbnfr} \\
m \ m^{3c} \text{t} \ n3w \ m \ \text{hj}3t \\
\text{qd} \text{n} \ \text{hj}3 \ \text{mbj}3t \\
\text{bn} \ \text{jnk} \ \text{r} \ \text{jt}3 \ \text{sw}
\]

"It was you, who stole this chisel of Nebnufer.

Is it true or is it not?" Then Heria answered:

"No. It was not I who stole it."

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 7,8)

An affirmative and a corresponding negative participial statement. (Type I).

The second has \( \text{rjt}3 \) for \( \text{jjt}3 \), a specific formation of the participle for the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. The first has no prothetic yod or \( r \).

\[ \]

is the independent pronoun \( \text{ntt} \)

\( m \ m^{3c} \text{t} \ n3w \) is negation of a \( \text{nfr} \ \text{sw} \) adjectival question.

24.76

\[
\text{m}^{3c} \text{tw} \ m \ \text{j} \text{dd} \text{f} \ \text{nb} \ \text{hr} \ s3 \ 3st
\]

Right in all that he has said is Horus the son of Isis.

(Horus and Seth, 56/6)
A great wrongdoer is the citizeness Heria, worthy of death (is she), righteous is the workman, Nebnufer.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Verso 2,3)

It has come to a good ending in Thebes, the place of Truth.

(Horus and Seth, 60/11, 12)

This is a difficult sentence. This may not be a non-verbal adjectival sentence. But it may be, viz. "It's coming (to an end) is good", jw.š being an infinitive and with the copula pw acting as a noun, i.e. B pw nfr.

CONCLUSION

The Category I or A pattern nfr sw is a ME form. It does occur in literary LE of the Twentieth Dynasty, but not in Non-literary texts of LE.

Some forms built on the nfr sw pattern, however, do continue into LE (literary and non-literary), e.g.

nj. šw A, ntk šw, which are not identity or nominal sentences.

The m3c.tw, m3c.tj, bjm and cd3 forms as well as the one-membral sentence occur in ME and in LE.

The nfr p3j and jnk nfr forms (Category II or B) are not found in ME, but are commonly found and well established in LE.
All the above adjective sentence patterns are found in NDE, in both the non-literary and literary texts.
CHAPTER 25

INDICATORS OF DIRECT SPEECH AND GREETINGS

INTRODUCTION

There are certain patterns, in Egyptian, perhaps corresponding to our quotation marks or inverted commas, which introduce or which immediately follow direct quoted speech.

They appear to have persisted with but little variation through ME, NDE and LE.

These are discussed in this chapter, with examples from NDE texts.

The chapter includes too a note on j.n̄d hr.tm - a greeting "Hail to thee".

I. Indicators that direct speech is to follow

These include

- n ḥr.n t3 - of which we said:
- mdw - utterance
- j. ḏd.n.f - which he said
- r.ḥd - saying:
- whm.k r.ḥd - again you say:
- kjj ḏd r.ntj - another topic:
- ḫn̄c ḏd - saying;
- r.n̄tj - to wit (or namely):
- ḏd jr.j n A - the speaking which A did
(i) Non literary NDE texts

25.1

mj wn.f n.n t3 w3t r šmt wn.s šrjt.tj
n hr.n t3
wn.n hr snj.n § wd₃.n

For he opened the way for us to go, that had been blocked before us
Of which we said
"If we pass it, we are safe".
(Kanais (Wady Mia), 65/8, 9)

(ii) Literary NDE texts

25.2

md(w) dj.n.(j)
n.k
kn nb nḥt nb

md(w) introduces direct speech.

25.3

wn.jn p3j.f šn šṛj hr jrt šḥrw nb
j.dd.n.f p3j.f šn c3
j.jrj.sn

And his younger brother did all the things that his elder brother said to him: "Do them".
(Two Brothers, 11/5-7)

A ME pseudoverbal construction.

j.dd.n.f is a LE relative form with a prothetic yod
j.jrj.sn is LE imperative with a prothetic yod.
25.4
hr.k ?nh3.w gC(.k) hr swmwn n
psdj.w r.dd
mj.n r njnC.j
dj.tm n.j drt

Your looks are troubled, while (you) are standing coaxing the assistants (?) and saying
"Come with me and lend a hand to me."
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 11/2,3)

r.dd is r + infinitive, the counterpart of the Biblical Hebrew יִרְאֵה
mj is imperative, with .n (for .tn) for emphasis.

25.5
whm.k r.dd
33w c jwtx ~ ~  phlx

Again you say, (concerning me)
"Feeble (?) broken) of arm, strengthless one!"
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 16/7-10)

whm is "to repeat"
jwtx is the ME negative relative adjective.

25.6
kjj dd r.ntj
t3j.k 3c spr r.j ...

Another topic: "Your letter reached me ...."
(Papyrus Anastasi I, 10/1)

25.7
hnC dd

saying,
(Papyrus Anastasi I (Really Papyrus Koller), 41/1)

25.8
r.ntj = to wit.

(Papyrus Anastasi I (Really Papyrus Koller), 42/6)
25.9
\[dd \ jrj.n \ dhw\tilde{t}j \ n \ nb \ r\,dr\]
Thoth spoke to the All-Lord.
(Horus and Seth, 56/7)

\[jrj.n \ dhw\tilde{t}j\] is a relative \[\text{sdm.n.f}\]

All these examples (above) are found and used in ME, NDE, and LE

II. The expressions \[hr.f, \ ji.n.f\] and \[k3.f\] are used after direct speech

\[hr.f, \ ji.n.j, \ k3.f\] etc. used in quotations must be considered as survivals of the ME \[\text{sdm.f}\] and \[\text{sdm.n.f}\] forms (Černý and Groll 1975:157).

25.10
\[str\,w \ p3j.k \ j\,t\]
"Where is your father?"

\[hr.w \ n.j\]
So they say to me and they mock me.

\[mtw.w \ j3dt.j\]
(Truth and Falsehood, 33/2)

\[mtw.w\] is a conjunctive of regular past custom

25.11
\[\text{d3mw} \ hr \ dd \ n \ d3mw \ n \ n3j.w.f \ nht\]
Generation says to generation of his victories:

\[bw \ jrj.f \ r.n \ cn \ dr \ p3 \ r\]
"It was never done to us since the time of Re (primordial times)"

\[hr.f \ m \ j3w \ nb \ hr \ dd \ n \ s3.f\]
- So says every old man, speaking to his son.
(lit. "he says, namely every old man")

(Stele of Merneptah, 15/7-9)
It is related that there were once two brothers by one mother and one father.

(Two Brothers, 9/10)

"He is your father". So she said to him.

(Truth and Fasehood, 33/4,5)

"For we will plough with a will (start to plough) in the early morning"

So spoke he to him.

(Two Brothers, 11/4-5)

"Long is the march before us"

We say "What means it that there is no bread at all?"

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 29/17)

m.kf3 at the end of a negative sentence, is for emphasis.

"I am a scribe, a maher" so you say.

"If there is truth in what you say", say we, "Come forth that you may be tested."

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 30/7-9)
25.17

\textit{wšb 3s} \quad "Answer quickly! Render me a report ..."

\textit{j.dd n.j $snj} \quad \text{So I will say to them.}

\quad ...

\textit{k3.j n.sn}

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 39/3-5)

\textit{k3.j} (cf. \textit{j.n.j} and \textit{hr.j}) \text{ refers to the future.}

25.18

\textit{k3.tw n.f} \quad \text{So one shall say to him.}

(Horus and Seth, 47/2)

In \textit{LE}, the verb \textit{j.n.f} following direct speech invariably refers to the past "so he said", while \textit{k3.f} refers to the future, "so he shall say". It is not always the case though that \textit{hr.f} refers to the present or the near future (Wente 1981:528).

One might be tempted to explain the use of \textit{hr.f} as a past as being simply a carry-over from ME, where \textit{hr.f} could function as a past or present tense.

In some later examples - after the Nineteenth Dynasty - some quotations concluded by \textit{hr.f} comprise imperatives and may be regarded as present rather than past and imparting a certain immediacy to the injunctions of the inner quotations. These might be borderline cases of \textit{hr.f} where there is some ambiguity in our evaluation of its tense.

It may be too that \textit{hr.f} is quite neutral as to tense, being similar to the conjunctive in deriving its tense from the preceding environment. There is sometimes a past durative nuance of \textit{hr.f}, - not so much an innate quality of the formation but rather dependent upon the preceding context.
Examples of hr.f clearly used as a past are:

25.19

\[
\begin{align*}
hr \ jr \ w^c \ rmj \ drdj \ jj \\
jw.f \ hm\dot{\j}\ m \ p\dot{\j}j \ jht \\
hr.f \ mj \ n\dot{\j}j \ hr \ \dd \ n \ p\dot{\j}j.\ j \ \ddj \\
jw.j \ knkn.k \ mtw.j \ nhm \ n3 \ j3\dot{w}t \\
n \ p\dot{\j}j.k \ jt \\
mtw.j \ h3\dot{\c}.k \ r.bl \\
hr.f \ hr \ \dd \ n.f
\end{align*}
\]

Then a stranger came.

He sat down in my stable and spoke thus to my child:

"I shall beat you,
I shall take your father's cattle and
I shall throw you out!" So he spoke to him.

(Horus and Seth, 45/3-6)

Many features of LE and their interactions are found here.

Line 1 - is a First Present, with a verb of motion, preceded by hr jr, making it past meaning.

This is followed by a jw.f (hr) $\ddm.f$ of the continuative narrative sequential past.

A hr.f (of the past) then precedes the spoken speech.

In the "inverted commas", a Third Future is followed by two conjunctives.

Then again after the quoted speech, a hr.f with past meaning, and

25.20

\[
\begin{align*}
jr \ m.h.t \ hrw \ knw \ hr \ s3 \ nn \\
wn.jn \ p3 \ k3j \ hr \ \dd \ n \ p\dot{\j}j.\ j \ \ddj \\
jw.j \ knkn.k \\
mtw.j \ nhm \ n3 \ j3\dot{w}t \ n \ p\dot{\j}j.k \ jt \\
mtw.w \ lpr \ m.dj.j \\
hr.f \ hr \ \dd \ n \ p\dot{\j}j.\ j \ \ddj \\
j.r.s \ n.j
\end{align*}
\]

"And many days after this, the intruder said to my son:
'I shall beat you,
I shall take the cattle of your father;
it shall be mine'.

Thus he spoke to my son"

So she said to me.

(Horus and Seth, 46/5)
The mother is speaking in quoted speech. Within this, she in turn quotes the intruder's words. Following this is a hr.f and following the mother's words is a clear past j.n.s n.j. The hr.f too is clearly past.

III. The greeting j.n iç hr.tm - "Hail to thee"

E.g.

(i) Non-literary NDE text

25.21
ddf j.n iç hr.tm ntr.w wr.w

He said "Hail to you, great gods"

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/5)

(ii) Literary NDE text

25.22
wrw h3št dd.sn m ššw3 hm.f cnḥ
wg3 šnb
m šc3 phtj.f
j.n iç hr.k nšwt n kmṭ

The chiefs of the countries - they say in acclaiming his majesty, 1ph, in magnifying his might

"Hail to thee, O king of Egypt."

(Northern Wars of Seti I, 19/15,16)

The first line is a noun + šdm.f (see Doret 1980:37)

CONCLUSION

The patterns preceding and introducing quoted direct speech - dd.f, hr.e dd, r.dd, r.ntj, whm.k r.dd, kjj dd r.ntj are all found in ME, NDE and LE.
It appears that most of these pointers to direct speech are of ancient origin. Those preceding and thus introducing direct speech may have evolved slowly over time, e.g. j.dd n.f to dd jjrj A. r.dd, i.e. r + infinitive is old, the exact counterpart of the Biblical Hebrew ידוע, and bn c dd is obviously similar.

The forms following direct speech (hr.f, k3.f and j.n.f) may be survivals of the ME šdm.f and šdm.n.f synthetic forms. There appeared to be no need for them to evolve further. They were well recognised and understood, frequently used and fulfilled their old function well. All are still found unchanged in NDE and later in LE too.
CHAPTER 26

PARTICIPLES

INTRODUCTION

Participles in Egyptian are frequently used in situations, where relative forms might be used more frequently, for example in English. They are also used in the sense of "doing", "acting" and in the passive "being magnified", "being exalted". In this sense, they are frequently used to eulogise and praise gods and kings by describing their attributes or activities. These are well-known Middle Egyptian forms, frequently used and persisting to LE through the intervening NDE.

Infinitives occasionally may express the same thing, e.g. "to come and to go" for "coming and going".

The LE participle may have a prothetic yod, but this is not invariable.

Participles of course occur in ME jn-constructions, e.g.

26.1

\( m \ jmn \ wcf \ sw \) It is Amun, who curbs him.

(Merneptah's Stele, 17/12-14)
1. Non-literary NDE texts

26.2
j.n4 / hr.tn ntr. w wr. w
grg pt t3 n jb.sn
Hail to you, great gods, who founded heaven and earth at your pleasure.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/5,6)

26.3
nfr jwj hr r n ntr
Happy is he who acts on the word of god.

(Kanais (Wady Mia), 67/8)

26.4
jw nfr sw r p3 htp r p3 snn
h3tj
wn m p3 t3
And it is better than the former peace and the former brotherhood, which was in the land.

(Hittite Treaty, 227/11)

wn is a ME participle with an adverbial predicate.
A corresponding main clause would be jw.f m p3 t3. (Gardiner 1982:314 and 93).

Similar is

26.5
jr p3 nc mtj
wn dj m h3w sprr ...
As for the regular customary agreement, which was here in the time of Suppiluliuma ...

(Hittite Treaty, 228/1)
26.6

... k3 nht
h3 m w3ât
$\mathfrak{g} \text{n} \mathfrak{h} \ t3wj ... 
whm mâswt
$\mathfrak{sh} \text{m} \ c
\text{dr} \ pâdt ...

Mighty Bull,
shining in Thebes,
who makes the two lands to live,
who repeats births, strong of arm,
repressing the Nine-Bow tribes ...

(Nauri Decree, 46/3)

These are all active participles, occurring in ME and in NDE. Usually the LE participle has a prothetic yod, but may not.

II. In literary NDE texts

26.7

\text{prt.}\$ \text{mj} \ șb3.nrt (or \ șb$t),
h^c \text{m} \ h3t \ mpt \ nfrt
$\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}pt \ jk\mathfrak{t}
\text{wbh.}\text{t} \ ja.w \ c\mathfrak{nt} \ jntj
gm\text{h}
\text{bnr} \ spt.\$ \ mdwt

Behold, she is like the star-goddess,
 ARISING AT THE BEGINNING OF A HAPPY YEAR, SHINING BRIGHT, GLISTENING OF SKIN,
lovely of eyes, when she stares (or wherewith to gaze), sweet her lips
when she speaks (or wherewith to speak).

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C1/1,3)

\text{h}^c \text{ may be a LE feminine participle.}

None of the participles have the prothetic yod.

$\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{sp}t, \ \text{wbh.}t, \ \text{gm}h \ \text{and} \ \text{bnr} \ \text{may be participles too.}
26.8

\[ p3 \ k3 \ nht \ hp\hat{\imath} \ mr \ hp\hat{\imath} \]

The bull, great of strength, who loves strength.

(Prayers as school texts, 18/5,6)

26.9

\[ nswt \ bjtj \]

\[ htp \ hr \ m\hat{\imath}3\hat{\imath}t \ s\hat{\imath}3 \ phtj \ sk3j \ hp\hat{\imath} n \ hr \]

The king of Upper and Lower Egypt, content with Maat, magnified by the power, exalted by the strength of Horus ...  

(Stele of Merneptah IV, 13/7)

Active and passive participles.

These are all participles with no prothetic yod. \( s\hat{\imath}3 \) and \( sk3j \) are passive participles. They occur in ME, eulogising and praising gods and kings to describe their attributes or their activities. They occur in NDE too and in LE, either with or without a prothetic yod.

26.10

\[ \$w \ kf \ \$n\hat{\imath}c \]

\[ wn \ hr \ km\hat{\imath}t ... \]

Shu, who uncovered the cloud that was over Egypt ...  

(Stele of Merneptah IV, 13/10)

\textit{kf} and \textit{wn} are participles.

26.11

\[ ... \ wn \ sb\hat{\imath}3.w \ n \ mn.nfr \]

\[ wn \ gb3 \]

... opener of Memphis' gates, that were barred ...  

(Stele of Merneptah IV, 13/14)
26.12

\[ j \dot{s}m t \ n j t \ m \ h s f \]

Going and coming are with song.

(Stele of Merneptah IV, 18/13)

These are probably infinitives rather than participles. One has a prothetic yod, one does not.

26.13

\[ n t r \ n f r \ j r j \ m \ c w j . f \ ... \]

\[ h r \ j b \ w 3 t \ t j t \ s t t \]

\[ j r j \ t s . f \ r \ d d \ j b . f \]

The good god, achieving with his arms, residing in Thebes, smiting the Asiatics, making his boundary as far as his desire places it.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 7/10)

\[ d d \]

is the reduplicated imperfective of \( dj \)

26.14

... 

\[ m j \ w t t . s w \]

\[ s w b n \ h d \ t 3 w j \]

like him that begat him, illuminating the two lands.

(Northern Wars of Sethos I, 17/13)

Note

26.15

\[ j m j . r \ h t m \ n b \]

\[ h p r . t j . f j \ h r \ p 3 \ h t m \ s t h j \ m r . n . p t h \]

\[ n t j \ m \ s h m t \]

... any superintendent of a fort, who shall be over the fort of Seti-Merneptah, which is in Sekhemt ...

(Nauri Decree, 56/7,8)
hpr.tj.fjj is not really a participle. It is a șgm.tj.fjj, a ME verbal adjective, the meaning of which is that of a future participle, probably active.

Here we find, ntj m șhmt rather than wn m șhmt, which would refer to past time.

This is not an example of a participle - rather a ME verbal adjective, the meaning of which is that of a future participle, occurring here in NDE. It is not found in LE.

26.16

... wnnt rš jefb n hwt.k3.pth m ... who let Hut.ka.Ptah (= Memphis)
n3j.śn ḫfšjw.f exult over its foes ...

(Stele of Merneptah, 13/12-14)

26.17

cnḫ wḏ3 śnb, the formula following a king's name (= lph), may he be given life, prosperity and health, e.g. Nauri Decree 50/13, are ME pseudoparticiples.

CONCLUSION

Participles, of course, are found in ME jm-constructions (example 26.1). Excluding these, a series of participles in these Nineteenth Dynasty texts have been compiled, to show how they were used at this time. They are used, particularly in texts eulogising and praising gods and kings, to describe their attributes or their activities (example 26.6). They may be active ('content', 'shining', 'making live') or passive ('magnified', 'exalted') (example 26.9).

There are examples of wn as a participle (26.4, 26.5, 26.16).

They are found in both the non-literary and literary texts.

With the verb hpr - 'become', the Middle Egyptian verbal adjective șgm.tj.fjj is used with the meaning of a future participle (example 26.15).
There is a reminder that $c^n \text{nh} \ w_d \text{3 snb}$, the formula following a king's name (= $lph$), "may he be given life, prosperity and health" (example 26.17) are not participles, but Middle Egyptian pseudoparticiples or stative forms.

The participles used in the ME $jn$-construction or cleft sentences developed in later LE into relative forms, and both types of sentences are found in NDE (as shown in Chapter 24).

The other uses of participles are found in ME and continued through NDE to LE, where the participles may have had a prothetic yod or may not have. The praise or eulogy with many participles, indicating attributes was well known to scribes and populace, and it seemed that there was no need for further analytical evolution.
CHAPTER 27

MISCELLANEOUS

INTRODUCTION

Some miscellaneous and varied grammatical forms are referred to and discussed in this chapter. This is so as to demonstrate some important forms, and perhaps their evolution.

Many of these are special and unique to the Rameside period comprising NDE as it does. They are important to know, as they form part of the "idiom" of NDE, and their appearance and recognition in literature can even help in dating texts to the NDE period.

I. \textit{j.jrt.f $\mathcal{g}m$} is LE and refers to "until", e.g.

27.1

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{jmj $\text{l3c.tw.j}$}
\item \textit{jrj $n \text{h3t.j}$}
\item \textit{j.jrt $p3 \text{ntr p3 ntj m jb.f}$}
\end{itemize}

Let me go that I might act according to my heart

until the god does what is in his heart.

(Doomed Prince, 13/14)
II. \( p\text{3.}\text{wn} = \text{because, for.} \)

This particle predominates in the Nineteenth Dynasty texts and is almost completely absent in those of the Twentieth Dynasty. (Goldwasser 1985:51), e.g.

27.2

\[
p\text{3 wn jw.n r mh šk3 m dw3w}
\]

... for we will start to plough in the early morning.

(Two Brothers (Literary text), 11/4,5)

and

27.3

\[
nfr \text{ jrj hr r n nfr}
\]

\[
p\text{3 wn bw h3j.n.sn šyrw.f}
\]

Happy is he who acts on the word of god, for his plans do not fail.

(Kanais (Wady Mia) (Non-literary text), 67/8,9)

---

\[ p\text{3.}\text{wn} = \text{"because", "for" is almost unique to NDE.} \]

III. \( h\text{3} \text{- ME non-enclitic particle = \"would that\", e.g.} \)

27.4

\[
f\h
\]

If only I had Thoth behind me tomorrow.

(Prayers used as School Texts, 86/2)

---

\[ h\text{3 is found in ME and in NDE.} \]
IV.  *hn* occurs obscurely before a negative, e.g.

27.5

\[ \text{hn bwpm.k hnj n.f} \]

You have never approached it.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 22/1)

This occurs rarely in NDE and perhaps in LE.

V.  Possessive pronouns

Many examples have been alluded to in the texts of

(a) a suffix pronoun following a noun, indicating possession. This is ME, e.g. noun *f*, noun *n*.n, etc., and

(b) The LE possessive pronouns preceding the noun, e.g.

\[ p3j.f, t3j.s + \text{Noun} \]

27.6

\[ p3j.f \text{ sn srj} \]

- his younger brother

(Two Brothers (Literary), 11/5,6)

and cf.

27.7

\[ jb.sn \]

- their hearts.

(Two Brothers (Literary), 11/8,9)

and
27.8
tš.w.šn
their boundaries
(Nauri Decree (Non-literary), 54/2,3)
and cf.

27.9
n3j.šn hmunwt n3(j).sn b3kw
their women and their servants.
(Nauri Decree (Non-literary), 55/6)

VI.  n3.n, the definite article
I have also drawn attention in the texts to n3.n, the definite article, which is still occasionally written during the Nineteenth Dynasty as n3.n, thereby retaining the memory of the ME demonstrative pronoun (Goldwasser 1985:51), e.g.

27.10
j.nḏ. hr.t rswn t(3) n nfrt
Welcome, O dream of good (fortune)
(Papyrus Chester Beatty III - Dream interpretation, 10/14)
(Groll 1985:83,4)

This is the Ramesside construction definite article and n.

VII.  t3

27.11
hr jw s3 t3 bwt n p3j dmjt t3wt
And since the greatest abomination
of this town is stealing ...
(Hieratic Ostracon, Verso 7)

It seems that t3, the definite article here expresses the notion of the superlative (Groll 1973:70).
And in the same text \( t3 \) is not the LE definite article, but the ME anaphoric demonstrative (Groll 1973:70), e.g.

27.12
\( t3 \) \( h3rt \) this widow

(Hieratic Ostracon, Verso 8)

and

27.13
\( t3 \) \( st \) this place.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Verso 9)

VIII. \( r3 \) \( pn \)

27.14
In Papyrus Chester Beatty III - Dream interpretation, The Chemical Prescription 10.16 (Groll 1985:85), \( r3 \) \( pn \) = this spell, \( pn \) is the anaphoric demonstrative. The group \( r3-pn \) should thus be translated "the above-mentioned spell".

27.15
In Papyrus Anastasi I 48/9 (Really Papyrus Koller), \( s\$ \) \( pnn \) (for \( pn \)) = this letter. \( pnn \) for the demonstrative \( pn \) is typical of the Nineteenth Dynasty and not common before or after (Goldwasser 1985:51).

| \( n3.n, \) and \( t3 \) as an anaphoric demonstrative and \( pn \) or \( pnn \) are almost always purely found in NDE. |

IX. \( r.\$dm \) for \( j.\$dm \), the participle, e.g. in

27.16
\( bn \) \( jnk \) \( r.jt3 \) \( sw \) It was not I who stole it.

(Hieratic Ostracon, Recto 8)
This is a specific formation of the participle in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties.

X. Demonstrative adjective and possessive pronoun

27.17
(as in Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs C1/8) is a ME feminine singular demonstrative adjective = "that" or "yonder",

27.18
while jnk.sn (in Kanais 69/2,3) = "they are mine", a LE possessive pronoun jnk + a suffix pronoun .sn.

27.17 is found in ME and NDE and 27.18 in NDE and LE.

XI. p3 nfrw.f

27.19
p3 nfrw.f is unusual (as in Nauri Decree 46/12 = his beauties, (lit. the beauties of him). This is Ramesside.

This is almost exclusively NDE.

XII. Note. An interesting verbal formation, expressed in different ways

27.20
ptr.tj (for .tw) prj.$ r h3
One sees her going forth
(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, C1/7)
prj is the direct object of a previous verbal formation.
This is ME, and unusual.

cf. the LE non-literary formations

27.21

\( \text{rḥ.ṣj jb n ũnt} \)
\( p3j.f \ tm \ w3w \ r \ ũnt \)

How well the sister’s heart knows that he is not far from her - (the sister)

(Papyrus Chester Beatty I - Love songs, G1/8 - Xxa A/1)

27.22

\( jḥ k3\ t \ m \ ūd\ t \)
\( jw.tw \ hr \ ūdm.f \)
\( p3j.tn \ h3c.j \ wc.kw j \ n \ snwj \)

What will men say when they hear of it - that you left me alone without a comrade?

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 81/1-6)

27.23

\( jḥ \ h3b.k \ p3 \ ntj \ jw.\ n \ r \ jrr.f \)

Write us what we should do.

(Horus and Seth, 56/15,16)

27.24

\( hmsj \ jrj \ wḥ3 \ n \ wṣr \)
\( ūdm.n \ p3 \ ntj \ jw.f \ dd.f \)

Sit down and write a letter to Osiris that we may hear what he has to say.

(Horus and Seth, 56/10,11)

27.25

\( hr \ jw.k \ c m3 \ r.dd \ wn \ nkt \ r.j \)

Hereby you will learn that something (mischief) has befallen me.

(Two Brothers, 18/3)
Regarding the above three examples - *r.dd* turns what follows it into the adverbial predicate of the sentence; while *p3 nti* nominalises the emphatic form. (i.e. "what it is that we should do" and "what it is that he says").

*wn(t)* can also be used for "that" after verbs of seeing, knowing or saying, as in

27.26

```
$m \text{jj} \text{dj} \text{dt} \text{dd.tw.k}
$\text{wn knt m hm.k}
```

Let it not be said of you that there is anything which you do not know.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 26/7)

Finally, another example complementary to the first sentence in this group -

27.27

```
$\text{gm.n.j p3 h3h3 500 n c n htr}
$\text{wn.wj m hnw.sn}
$\text{hpr m gbgbjt r . h3t ssm.t}$
```

I found the mass (lit. 2 500) of chariots in whose midst I was scattering before my horses.

(Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh, 45/8-14)

The verb *hpr m gbgbjt* is the object of *gm.n.j*

XIII. *tj sw*

27.28

```
$tj \text{sw m thh}$
```

Behold, he is in exaltation.

(Nauri Decree, 48/1)

This is ME - particle *tj* + pronoun *sw* in an adjectival or adverbial sentence.
XIV. A First Present pattern, whose second position is filled by the infinitive of a verb of perception.

27.29

\textit{tw.j hr m33.o w3j.o jm.j} \hspace{1cm} \text{I see you far away from me.}

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III - Dream interpretation, A spell against nightmares, 10.11)
(Groll 1985:82)

This is a typically Ramesside formation.

The pronominal suffix object \textit{.t} after \textit{m33} is expressed by a zero morpheme, a grammatical phenomenon, which occurs in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties.

XV. In Literary LE, the pronominal suffix \textit{.k} sometimes takes the form \textit{.kwj}, e.g.

27.30

\textit{dr.j dwwt.kwj} (sic) \hspace{1cm} \text{so that I can drive away your sufferings.}

(Papyrus Chester Beatty III - Dream interpretation, Isis' invocation, 10.13)
(Groll 1985:83)

and in
XVI. A passive šdm ᵐA construction indicating the pluperfect.

27.31
rdj n.f o prs r.hft - hr  ... after he has first been given a slice of bread.
(Papyrus Chester Beatty III - Dream interpretation, 10.17)
(Groll 1985:85)

This is a specific literary Ramesside formation.

and in

XVII. nhj n A

27.31
... hr₉ nhj n šmₐ w3d and some fresh herbs
(Papyrus Chester Beatty III - Dream interpretation, 10.17)

nhj n A - "some of A" is Ramesside, and the writing of w₃ₐ for w3d - an orthographic error is typically Ramesside too.

XVIII. Zero morphemes

27.32
šw 3tp r ēnsh
WG.ₐ m 3bw
hnj.₈ hřj r.f r htp ſt.f m w3št
It is loaded on a barge.
Departing from Yebu, it is conveyed until it comes to rest on its place in Thebes.
(Papyrus Lansing, 101/5,6)
wd. and hn. both have no subject, i.e. zero morphemes. The first is the active form of a non-transitive verb, the second, the passive of a transitive verb. The subject is \textit{sw} of the First Present pattern. I think this is a Ramesside formation.

XIX. Some Temporal Clauses
include

27.34
\textit{wd t3} \hspace{1cm} \textit{When dawn comes.}
(Papyrus Lansing, 105/2)

27.35
\textit{hr jr m.h\textit{t} p3 hrd cjt} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Now when the boy had grown ...}
... \hspace{1cm} (Doomed Prince, 2/1)

27.36
\textit{hr jr m.h\textit{t} h\textit{r}w knw nn} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Now when many days had passed ...}
(lit. many days after these things ...)
(Doomed Prince, 3/9,10)

27.37
\textit{hr jr p3 sw hr htp} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Now when the sun had set ...}
(Two Brothers, 14/6 - 15/2)

27.38
\textit{hr jr m.h\textit{t} h\textit{r}w knw s3 nn} \hspace{1cm} \textit{And many days after this ...}
(Two Brothers, 10/1-2)
An old formula of unsophisticated narrative.

27.39

jr mljt mnk.w mnmnt sjkr jrj.w

... When the monument had been finished and its inscriptions completed ...

(Kanais (Wady Mia) (Non-literary), 67/4)

XX.  $hm  $hm

27.40

$hm  $hm is used for the superlative.

(Northern Wars of Seti I, 17/13)

XXI. Ordinal numbers

27.41

p3 ntj 5
p3 ntj 6 etc.
i.e. ordinal numbers with prefixed $p3$ $ntj$ = fifth, sixth, etc.

(Papyrus Anastasi I, 11/10ff)

CONCLUSION

The collection of analecta in this chapter serves to gather under one heading a diverse series of grammatical forms, particles, morphemes and expressions, many of which are unique to NDE, and an integral part of its "idiom" or "patois".
Goldwasser (1985:50) pays special attention to these grammatical and lexicographical forms, side by side with the epistolary formulae. I believe they are significant, and this is my excuse for compiling them in this chapter - for completeness sake, in a study of the Nineteenth Dynasty Egyptian language.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter includes:

i. Some paradigms showing the appearance or absence of grammatical forms in the ME, NDE and LE languages. It is mainly a descriptive, synchronic study and appears under "Summary".

ii. A series of tables showing columns side by side of ME formations, the intervening NDE and LE to tentatively suggest evolution and development. It is mainly an analytical and diachronic study, and is found under "Conclusions".

It will be noted that almost all the synthetic, aspect-related ME forms and the fully analytical, tense-related LE forms appear side by side in the bridging NDE, in which, in addition to these, unique and hybrid forms are found too.

SUMMARY

It would appear that NDE was the birthplace/starting point of most of the LE forms, where they were tested (in the fire/crucible), some (most) persisting (paradigm 1), while others (unique and hybrid NDE forms) were feeling their way, and were, in fact, eliminated (paradigm 3).

But the preceding ME forms had not been discarded yet, and were still used side by side with the new evolving forms, some to be retained (paradigm 2) and others rejected (paradigm 4).

Thus NDE was a rich, heterogeneous language, incorporating ME synthetic forms, "unique" and "hybrid" NDE forms, (which would later disappear) and many analytic LE forms, which would form the very basis of the remarkable LE language, and would continue forward even into Coptic.
This study is about the language of the Nineteenth Dynasty, (NDE) and not primarily about each of the ME and LE grammatical forms, as well as those not yet fully established.

The contribution of this thesis has been to collect and collate a series of grammatical forms in a representative group of Nineteenth Dynasty literary and non-literary texts and to group them together in a grammar book type approach to NDE. At the same time, this shows in context how the grammatical forms are used interchangeably, describing the same event or expressing the same thought in both literary and non-literary texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty.

All grammar books are, of course, synchronic in nature - describing the language of a specific time. This is the synchronic component of the study. But, because this perhaps unique language has a mix or amalgam of earlier, contemporary and later forms, the thesis has a diachronic component too. A secondary, perhaps wider result too was to study in depth and clarify many grammatical usages. The diachronic component is especially evident in the chapters on the \( \text{slm.f} \), the negative sentences, the uses of \( jw \) and \( \text{wn} \) and the epistolary formulae, and, of course, in the paradigms and tables.

The synchronic grammar text book approach has not been done before for the Nineteenth Dynasty, as has been noted by Orly Goldwasser (1985) and by Sarah Groll (1973). Certainly, signal work has been done on some individual aspects of the Nineteenth Dynasty language, including those by the indefatigable Sarah Israelit Groll, Orly Goldwasser, A H Gardiner, H J Polotsky, P J Frandsen, E F Wente, Virginia Davis, Jaroslav Černý and Pascal Vernus and many others.

The study of these texts shows that the written language of the Nineteenth Dynasty is a unique blend of grammatical and syntactic forms. The texts include pure ME "synthetic" forms, and pure LE non-literary "analytic" forms, as well as all LE literary forms.

The language had never been like this before - including so many elements - some still evolving - side by side, alternating and combining one with another to express essentially the same thing.

And all these forms occurred in both the literary and the non-literary texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty. So while these texts could be recognised as literary or non-literary by the subject, context and content, they could not be easily differentiated by the grammatical forms used - as they could in later LE.
And the language would never be the same afterwards. The grammar books of LE (e.g. Černý and Groll 1975; Frandsen 1974) and the non-literary texts of the Twentieth Dynasty or late Ramesside period (e.g. Late Ramesside Letters and Wenamun) now have almost exclusively pure non-literary LE forms, e.g.

$bwpw.f \ sdm.f$
$bw \ jr.f \ sdm.f$
$jjr.f \ sdm.f$ and
$twj \ hr \ sdm \ ... \ r^c \ nb$

The literary texts include both these non-literary LE forms (perhaps approximating to the spoken language, and those which were the ancestors of Coptic) - and the literary forms. But now the older ME forms are no longer extant.

This heterogeneity of forms in LE, from different periods and in different genres, I am sure, prompted Sarah Groll to describe the LE of the Nineteenth Dynasty as "an independent self-sufficient system, which is neither ME, nor LE of the Twentieth Dynasty" (Groll 1973:70).

The possible combinations or paradigms showing the presence or absence of grammatical forms are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As all the examples in this thesis are from NDE, paradigms I and VI and VII are not relevant. And paradigm VII is in any case most unlikely/improbable.
So I will number the relevant paradigms as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARADIGM 1

Forms found in ME and NDE

j jt pw j rj.w.n.f (Chapter 1)
c j rj.f (Chapter 2) - but see specific uses in NDE (paradigm 3).
ME pseudoverbal constructions (Chapter 4) (developed into LE First Present) (paradigm 4.)
śdm.n.f (Chapter 6) (with the exception of bw śdm.n.f (paradigm 3) and bn śdm.n.f (paradigm 3).
The following śdm.f forms (See Chapter 7) or their ME precursors
jw śdm.n.f perfect active, (which became LE perfect active śdm.f) (paradigm 4).
jw śdm.f of the simple present, (which became LE śdm.f) (paradigm 4)
n śdm.n.f of the simple present (which evolved into LE bw śdm.f or bw j rj.f śdm paradigm 4)
Emphatic śm.f or śm.n.f (which developed into j rj.f śdm paradigm 4).
The performative dj.n.j of the synchronous present (which evolved into LE First Present paradigm 4)
śdm.jn.f (Chapter 11) including wn.jn.f of the pseudoverbal construction or wn.jn.f with a finite verb (11.7).
Negative sentences (Chapter 12).

\[ nn \] (replaced later by \[ bn \]) (paradigm 4)

\[ n \] (replaced later by \[ bw \]) (paradigm 4) (including \[ n \relax \])

\[ jwtfj \] = negative relative adjective

\[ m \] + negative complement (12.59)

\[ tm \] + negative complement

\[ tm.k \relax \] a negative purpose clause (12.25)

\[ lfn \relax \] the ME precursor of the LE conjunctive (paradigm 4)

\[ wn(n) \] of the pseudoverbal construction

The ME uses of \[ wn \] and \[ wnn \] (Chapter 19).

The particle \[ jw \] in its ME usages (Chapter 22).

\[ zdm.tj.ffj \], a verbal adjective with the meaning of a future participle (e.g. 25.15)

\[ jr \] conditional clauses with ME apodosis forms.

**PARADIGM 2**

**Forms occurring in ME, NDE and LE.**

The \[ inj \] construction Cleft sentences or participial statements (Chapter 3)

- ME usage
- LE usage

\[ zdm.f \] (Chapter 7)

- Initial and non-initial prospective \[ zdm.f \]
- \[ zdm.f \] of the oath

Some \[ jr \] conditional clauses, in which the apodosis may be ME or LE forms (Chapter 9).

Polite requests \[ jh \relax \] \[ zdm.k \]
Affirmative imperatives - evolved from ME to LE (preceding prothetic yod in the latter). Both forms in NDE (Chapter 10)

Particples - (Chapter 26).

*nn* sometimes persists into LE, before *bn* occurs.

*jrf* as an auxiliary verb (excluding *jrf.f sdm* or *bw jrf.f sdm*

or LE negative imperative

or LE 3 Future → for *jw* (which are in paradigm 4)

*hr.f* after direct speech (Chapter 25) and the patterns preceding quoted direct speech.

*cnh wd3 šnb*, which began as ME pseudoparticples.

Non-verbal sentences - Nominal sentences

- Adjectival sentences

(Note *jw, wn/wnn sdm.f* all appear morphologically similar in ME, NDE and LE, but the usages of course are different).

**PARADIGM 3**

**Forms found in NDE only**

(i) **Probable Unique Forms**

*chc.n dd.n.f* - used in court procedure - indicating a new phase in the trial investigation (Chapter 2)

*chc.n* subject *hr dd*, expressing the verdict of a trial. (Chapter 2)

*bn sdm.n.f* (See discussion) 12.152

*bw sdm.n.f* (12.102, 12.112, 12.113, 7.27, 7.28 (See discussion)

*nn sdm.n.f* (12.5) (See discussion)
\( nn \; \text{sp} \; jrj \; mjtt.s \) (12.1)

----------------

\( bw \; \text{5dm.f} \; c n \) (12.114)

----------------

\( m \) (Negative Imperative) + Infinitive (12.57)

----------------

\( nn \; rj.j \) (ME is \( n \; rj.j \); LE is \( bw \; rj.j \))

The form \( tm.k \), a prospective \( 5dm.f \) optatively used in Papyrus Anastasi I and Papyrus Lansing (12.65 - 12.69). (Compare this with \( tm.k \; 5dm \) as a negative purpose clause (cf. לבלבל) in paradigm 1).

The epistolary formula \( hft \; sp \; rj.j \; 3f \; r.k \; jw.k \; hr + \) infinitive ("frozen" formula) (Chapter 18).

-------------

Nominal Sentences with Infinitives acting as nouns + \( pw \), achieving the notion of probability. (Dream Interpretation - Chapter 24: 24:43-24:50)

-------------

\( jrj \) acting a \( jw \) of the Third Future as a base to adverbial phrases (13.15). Possibly occurs in LE too, i.e. paradigm 4.

-------------

A passive \( 5dm \). A construction indicating the pluperfect (27.31).

-------------

\( n \; m3c \; hrw.\) - a passive \( n \; 5dm \). A simple present (12.37).

-------------

Verbs with zero \( \emptyset \) morphemes for subject (27.29 and 27.33) (indicating the active form of non-transitive verb or the passive form of a transitive verb and for object (27.31), occur in NDE (and in early LE (Late Ramesside) texts too). The first is a First Present pattern, whose second position is filled by the infinitive of a verb of perception with the pronominal suffix object being a zero morpheme.
jw $dm.f$ as the relative present (rather than pluperfect). ((7.18) in LE (and in NDE), i.e. paradigm 4, the relative First Present expressed this (e.g. 7.16))

hr $stp.f$ as a simple present (may occur in later literary LE too) (e.g. 7.24).

r jt3 for jjtjt3 (27.16)
p3 wn - because (27.2)
$p\nu$, pnn (27.14, 27.15)
n3. n (27.10)
nhj n A (27.32)
$w3d$ written for $w\nu$ (27.32)
.\,$wkJ$ for .\,$kJ$ (27.30)

Finally - an example of various forms in context -
e.g. The close parallel of $sdm.n.f$ and $sdm.f$ in fairly clear Second Tense constructions suggests the basic identity of the two forms in Ramesside texts (7.46 - 7.48) (Wente 1969:11, 12).

(ii) Probable hybrid forms
jjt $jn.A$. A bare infinitive + $jn$ as agent (1.6).

$c’h.c.n.tw$ jw $r.dd$ (2.10)
$c’h.c.n.f$ jw.f hr $sdm$ (2.11)
$c’h.c.f$ $sdm$ (2.9)
Participial statement

jn $m \cdot A$ + participle (3.26)

$A$ + participle or relative form (No preceding $jn$ or $m$) (3.30).

Some forms of the Pseudoverbal Construction.

$mk \cdot A$ + infinitive (No $hr$ or $r$) (4.18)

$mk jj$ (No subject/pronoun attached to $mk$) (4.19)

$wn \ wn.kwj$ (stative, or pseudoparticiple ...) (4.30)

$mk +$ two pseudoparticiples (no pronoun (.$wj$) attached to $mk$) (4.33)

$bn.tw +$ stative (not $nn.tw$ of ME, and not $bn tw.k$ + stative of LE) (4.34)

A form of the First Present

$tw.j hr +$ stative !? of an adjectival verb ($t3m$ - ready) is very unusual indeed. Perhaps the scribe meant to indicate that the readiness was an activity rather than a state(?) (5.57)

Noun + $\textit{s}dm.n.f$ (6.44)

Unusual polite requests $jß \textit{s}dm.k$

$\textit{jh} \ jmj.wj$ (no .$k$) (10.27)

$\textit{jh} \ jttj \ n.k$ (should be $\textit{jh} \ jttj.k \ n.k$) (10.26)

Some unusual negative formations

$\textit{jw} \ nn \ wn \ mj.kdnw.f$ (12.22)

$\textit{nn} + \textit{bw}$ (12.25)
A double negative and (12.111). Perhaps the concept "Surely, you have ...."!

\( nn + \) Third Future (12.31) (12.34)

\( bw \ jrj.k \ (hr) \ (!) \ sdm \) (12.104)

----------

\( wn. A \ r \ sdm.f \ ... \) (13.41)

\( wn \) for \( jw \) of Third Future

----------

\( mtw.tw \ j.jrf.w \)

Conjunctive with a LE imperative with a prothetic yod (?) (14.22)

\( mtw.n \ rwj.n \)

Conjunctive with a finite \( sdm.f \) (!) (14.25)

----------

\( jst \ wnn. \ hm.f \ sngm \)

\( wnn.f \), but past tense, although not preceded by \( hr \) (18.6)

----------

\( st \ r \ swn \ ... \) (21.3) (See discussion)

Perhaps this is a form of LE. First Present with a future sense.

----------

\( jw.\$ \ pw \ nfr \ m \ hnw \ w3st \) (24.76), and see discussion.

PARADIGM 4

Forms found in NDE and in LE

The LE First Present (\( bn \)) (\( tw.j \ hr \ sdm \)) (Chapter 5) - (developed from ME pseudooverbal constructions (paradigm 1).)
$sdm.f$ (Chapter 7)

- perfect active $sdm.f$ (derived from $jw$ $sdm.n.f$) (See paradigm 1)
- $sdm.f$ of the relative past
- simple present (evolved from $jw$ $sdm.f$ (paradigm 1))
- $bw$ $sdm.f$ of the simple present (evolved from $n$ $sdm.n.f$ (paradigm 1))
- $j.jrj.f$ $sdm.f$ (emphatic) (evolved from $sm.f$ or $sm.n.f$ or $mrr.f$) (paradigm 1)

Negative forms (Chapter 12)

(See table of negatives in Chapter 12).

$tm$ = infinitive (e.g. $r$ $tm$ $djt$ 12.63 - negative purpose clauses)

$bw$ $sdm$

$m$ $jrz$ $sdm.f$, $m$ $jrz$ $djt$ $sdm.f$ and $m$ $dj$ $jrz.f$ $sdm$.

$mn$ $m$ $dj.f$ $A$

$bw$ $jrz.f$ $sdm$

$bw$ $sdm.f$ (maybe paradigm 3)

$bw$ $jrt.f$ $sdm.f$

$bw$ $sdm.f$ $cn$ (12.114) (paradigm 3?)

$bn$

$tm$ isomorphisms groups

$bn$ ... $jwn3$

$p3j.f$ $tm$ $sdm$ (indifferent time indication) and

$p3$ $tm$ $sdm$ $j.jrj.f$ (restricted to past time) (12.182)

The LE sequential forms:

The LE Third Future ($bn$) ($jw.f$ $r$ $sdm$) (Chapter 13)

$jw.f$ $hr$ ($tm$) $sdm$ of the Future (Chapter 20)
The LE Conjunctive *(mtw.f (tm) šgm)* (Chapter 14) - (derived from *hnc ntf šgm* - paradigm 1)

The LE Second Tense (Chapter 17)

Possibly *jrj* as an auxiliary (but more likely Paradigm 4).

- **wn**
  - of the past (e.g. 19.13)
  - of existence - preceding bare or undefined nouns (e.g. 19.15)

- **jw** of LE
  - initial independent *jw* of the future (Chapter 13)
  - Successive independent *jw* of the past (Chapter 15)
  - successive independent *jw* of the future (Chapter 20)
  - the dependent *jw* (the *jw* converter) (Chapter 23).

  A  - as an adverb including *jw.f šgm* of the Circumstantial First Present (7.16), cf. *jw štp.f* as relative pluperfect as in paradigm 3 (7.18)

  B  - as a virtual relative clause

  C  - with a Second Tense - ("that"-form)

  D  - as a concessive clause *hr jw*

i.e. *jw* (time conveyance can refer to the past, the future or the relative present (Chapters 22, 23))

- **p3j.tn** *jrj šhrw* (24.48) and

- **p3j.k** *hdb* (24.59) (and their negations 12.174 and 12.182)

- *j.n.f* and *k3.f* (and *hr.f*) after direct speech (Chapter 25) (perhaps paradigm 2)

- *j.jrt šgm* = until (27.1)

- *hr jr m.ht hrw kmw s3 nn* (27.38)
CONCLUSIONS

Egyptian was an evolving language. It developed from a predominantly synthetic language in ME through NDE and LE to the fully-evolved analytic and tense (or time-oriented) language in Coptic. And all these forms are found in NDE.

The ME suffix conjugations $sdm.f$, $sdm.m.n.f$, $sdm.m.jn.f$ etc. are synthetic forms and expressing aspect and taxis rather than tense. That is, they had to be translated or understood in context, or in relation to other (synthetic?!) forms in the sentence.

Some, however persisted into LE, notably the perfect active $sdm.f$, and the initial and non-initial prospective $sdm.f$, especially the prospective used as a wish.

However they existed side-by-side with evolving analytical forms, clearly now expressing absolute time or tense rather than aspect. These could be recognised from their morphology, rather than entirely from context.\(^1\)

These include the

- LE $jw.f \ hr \ sdm.f$ of the Third Future, an initial form, (which derived from the ME $sdm.hr.f$, $sdm.k3.f$ or prospective $sdm.f$)

- LE $jw.f \ hr \ sdm$ of the sequential future - a new analytic form

- LE $jw.f \ hr \ sdm.f$ of the successive past

\(^1\) In the following six shaded tables (the seventh includes only ME and NDE blocks), the middle NDE bridging column is left blank. This has been done so as not to detract from showing how a synthetic, mostly aspect-related language (ME) developed into an analytical tense-based language (LE).

However, it must be stressed that both ME and LE forms are represented in the NDE texts, and this will be clearly shown in the later series of tables.
LE mtw.f  sessionId of the conjunctive. This developed from the ME  $hn^c$ ntf $sdlm$, in which in ME, an attempt at an analytical form is already evident.

The tense in the conjunctive is still dependent in LE on the sense of a preceding future or imperative - and even expressing regular custom if used independently or following a past tense.

The LE First Present is an analytical form, and clearly signals either a tense or an aspect if used with $hr$ + infinitive or with a stative respectively.
The preceding ME pseudoverbal construction is an early attempt at becoming analytical already, before it developed into the LE First Present.

The LE First Present evolved from the ME pseudoverbal construction, and perhaps too from the ME imperfective šdm.f in meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudoverbal construction</td>
<td>First Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tw.j</td>
<td>(šw) hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ infinitive</td>
<td>(action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or stative (state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LE Emphatic form ("that"-form) in ME is unmarked and dependent on context only and morphologically resembled other ME synthetic forms, e.g. šdm.f, šdm.n.f, šm.f and mrr.f.

This evolved into the clearly marked LE Second Tense, j.jrf.f šdm.f for a present or past meaning and j.šdm.f for a future.

It is now analytic and tense-related. Tense is even more clearly developed in this formation in Coptic.

The ME performative statement ("synchronic present") dj.n.j (n.k) became in LE jw.j hr rdjt and then tw.j hr djt - a new analytic First Present - a performative statement within a time limit.

Some negative forms clearly became fully analytical. (See tables in Chapter 12 and in summary and conclusions.)

- e.g. bwpw.f šdm.f of the past, which evolved from ME n šdm.f
- the LE imperative forms - the m jrf djt šdm.f being the final evolution in LE
- the LE bw jrf šdm, a First Present negation denoting habitual action
- the LE bw jrt.f šdm - denoting "not yet".
In LE, negation of the Second Tense emphatic is now fully analytical and *tm* now negates nearly all infinitives, even those in sequential forms.

*bn* ... *jwn3* is now a LE analytical form, derived from ME *n* ... *jš*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>n sdm.f</em></td>
<td><em>bwpw.f</em></td>
<td><em>šdm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>m sdm(w)</em></td>
<td><em>m</em> <em>jř</em></td>
<td><em>šdm.f</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n sdm.n.f</em></td>
<td><em>bw</em>  <em>jř.f</em></td>
<td><em>šdm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n sdm.t.f</em></td>
<td><em>bw</em>  <em>jřt.f</em></td>
<td><em>šdm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n sdm.n.f</em></td>
<td><em>bn</em>  <em>jř.jř.f</em></td>
<td><em>šdm</em> <em>jwn3</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nn sdm.f</em></td>
<td><em>bn</em></td>
<td><em>jšdš</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tm</em></td>
<td><em>tm</em></td>
<td><em>šdm</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*jř* evolved as an auxiliary verb in LE and ME *čřče* dropped away.

*jw* evolved from ME forms.

In ME *jw* was a marker, signalling the *šdm.f* forms as being indicative/predicative, rather than dependent (nominal/emphatic) forms in which the *jw* was absent.

In ME sentences with adverbial predicates, the presence or absence of *jw* is difficult to characterise, and cannot be explained on syntax alone. *jw* may relate the statement to the sphere of interest and to the time of the speaker. Omitting *jw* may refer to a general state of affairs.

*jw* in ME as a sort of circumstantial converter *jw* similar to its use in LE began existence in ME.
The LE *jw* is later found in the sequential forms, and in the Third Future, and as the converter - all analytical evolved forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jw</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicative/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statement to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sphere of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time of speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- circumstantial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>converter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circumstantial</td>
<td>Sequential forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>converter</td>
<td>Third Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *wtn* and *wtnn* evolved from ME into a *wn* of the past and *wn* or *wtnn* of existence with bare nouns.

*wtnn.f* may be future or durative, while *wn.f* may reflect past with no stress on duration.

The LE *wtn* t3j.j .sorted 3 spr r.k ... epistolary formula now developed from the earlier *hft* spr t3j.j .sorted.

The particle *hr* may have developed into a LE time converter, e.g. *hr jr* and *hr wtn*. *hr jr*, for example, preceding a First Present pattern, indicates past time. Vernus (1985:347) in fact suggests that *hr* in LE assumes the same function that *jw* does in ME.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wn, wnn</td>
<td>wn, wnn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Epistolary formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hft spr</th>
<th>wnn</th>
<th>t3j.j</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t3j.j spr</td>
<td>$ct$</td>
<td>r.k...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interesting development now arose in NDE and seems unique to this time. It expresses the notion of probability. It is a unimembral nominal sentence with an infinitive (nominalised $sdm.f$) + $pw$, the copula.

- $pw$, the copula is found in ME in nominal or non-verbal sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$pw$ (copula)</td>
<td>The notion of probability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unimembral nominal sentence with an infinitive (nominalised $sdm.f$) + $pw$, the copula

LE now has morphological forms, clearly recognised, and expressing tense, irrespective of context, e.g.

The sequential forms in LE (past jw.f hr $sdm.(f)$, future jw.f hr $sdm.(f)$, conjunctive mtw.f $sdm$) even when seen out of context, are clearly recognisable.
Emphatic (Second Tenses, "that"-form) (ṣdm.m.f or ṣdm.f e.g.), recognised solely in context and position in ME, - now have a clearly recognised form (j.jrj.f ṣdm.f) in LE.

The Third Future in LE has an easily apparent manifest form (jw.f r ṣdm), while in ME this was probably represented by a prospective ṣdm.f, recognised in context alone.

The LE First Present, which evolved from the ME pseudoverbal construction, now had clearly recognised preformatives with pronouns, e.g. tw.j, ̣sw etc.

Therefore LE is an analytical language, expressing tense, derived from an earlier synthetic ME language, expressing aspect and taxis or relative tense.

It is necessary now to set forth in table form a series of grammatical forms and expressions used in ME and those used in LE - with these columns flanking a column of NDE forms (to the left ME and to the right LE).

Careful perusal and study of these tables will, it is hoped, reveal the following:

i. By studying the forms tabulated under NDE only, a synchronic grammar of NDE would be evident/apparrent, while

ii. By examining all the columns from left to right to include the intermediate NDE, a tentative evolution or development is suggested.

These tables should be studied or evaluated together with the preceding paradigms or categories, each expressing in a different way what the other shows.

Some of these tables reflect side by side the different forms as they were used in the varying periods (ME, NDE, LE), thus indicating their evolution and development, while others tabulate the occurrence (Yes) or absence (-) of certain grammatical formations at the various times.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jst pw jwm.nf</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cg</em> as auxiliary verb</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cg.n dd.nf</em> (court investigation) and <em>cg.n subject br dd</em> (trial verdict)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Pseudoverbal Construction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DEVELOPED into LE</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kdm.nf</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bw kdm.nf</em> and <em>bn kdm.nf</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Conjunctive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bn nef kdm</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bn nef kdm</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mow bef kdm</em></td>
<td>mow bef kdm</td>
<td>mow bef kdm</td>
<td>mow bef kdm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistolary formula (Review) (See end of Ch. 18) NB. For completeness sake (Amenophis here only) <em>ht spr st pn</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here only *ht spr tji *fr <em>rtj frk hr</em> + infim. <em>wnn bef kdm jw bef kdm</em> Free usage *wnn tji *fr <em>rtj frk hr rjw</em> - infinitive (Frozen formula)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wnn...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fr conditional clauses</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with ME apodosis forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperatives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative imperative</td>
<td>ME forms</td>
<td>Yes (± prothetic yod)</td>
<td>Yes (± prothetic yod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite request (<em>bt kdm.k</em>)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>r.kdm for j.kdm</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dream Interpretation (infinitives acting as nouns achieving the notion of probability; ME element *pw* not agreeing in gender with the predicate infinitive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tm.k</em> - prospective - optatively used (in Papyrus Anastasi I and Pap. Lansing)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>šm.jn.f</em> (+ <em>wn.jn.f</em> + pseudoverbal construction or <em>wn.jn.f</em> + finite verb)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wn</em> and <em>wnn</em> in ME usages</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wn</em> of the pseudoverbal construction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wn</em> and <em>wnn</em> in LE usages</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>šm.jn.jf</em> (Verbal adjective with the meaning of a future participle)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LE  
**First Present**

(šm) *šm*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tm</em> <em>šm</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sequential Past**

(šm) *šm*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>šm</em> (šm) <em>šm</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third Future**

(šm) *šm*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>šm</em> (šm) <em>šm</em> of Future</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jr</em> as an auxiliary verb</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jr</em> standing for <em>jw</em> of the Third Future</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p3jm jr</em> <em>thw</em> (24.48) and *p3jk <em>bdh</em> (24.59) and their negatives (12.174 and 12.182)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quoted speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>j.n.f</em> and <em>k3.f</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>hr.f</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jr</em> <em>s4m</em> (= &quot;until&quot;)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hr jr m.jt hrw knw s3 nn</em> (27.38)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The <em>jn</em> - participial construction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exceptions (e.g. 3.15)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cnh w3 inh</em> (originally ME pseudoptes)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$sdm.f$</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and its precursors and derivatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect active $sdm.f$</td>
<td>$jw$ $sdm.n.f$</td>
<td>$jw$ $sdm.n.f$</td>
<td>$sdm.f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>$jw$ $sdm.f$</td>
<td>$jw$ $sdm.f$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative simple present</td>
<td>$n$ $sdm.n.f$</td>
<td>$n$ $sdm.n.f$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic</td>
<td>$lm.n.f$ ($lqm.n.f$)</td>
<td>$lm.n.f$ ($lqm.n.f$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective $sdm.f$</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(initial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-initial)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$sdm.f$ of the oath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performative $dj.n.j$</td>
<td>$dj.n.j$</td>
<td>$dj.n.j$</td>
<td>$nij bj dj$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(perhaps synchronous present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$sdm.f$ of the relative past</td>
<td>(initial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($jw$ $sdm.f$ of the relative present (not pluperfect) (7.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$jw$ + First Present as a relative present</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + $sdm.f$ as a sort of pseudoverbal formation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + $sdm.f$ the noun being emphasized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + $sdm.n.f$</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw form</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw jkm.n.f (perfect active)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw jkm.f (simple present)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw in main clauses (Gardiner 1982:95) (22.1) - independent statements or assertions made with a certain detachment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw jkm.f (imperfect; - sayings, reiteration, custom or continuity (Gardiner 1982:384)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw f jkm.f (22.7)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw jkm.n.f (22.8)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw in pseudoverbal construction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw + jn construction (22.10)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw as a virtual relative clause after indefinite or zero noun</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nn (= bnj jw ...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nijn jw ...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw of LE 3 Future</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ijf for jw of 3 Future)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jw of narrative past</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successive independent jw of the future</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *jw* converter

A. - as an adverb
B. - as a virtual relative clause - with indefinite or zero article
C. - with a Second Tense
D. - as a concessive clause (*by jw*)

(Frandsen's classification) (1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*jw* - past, future or relative present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*jw by 5dm* - past

- future
- relative or circumstantial present (7.16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 3 distinct *jw* morphemes of LE (Chapter 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LE sequential forms (cf. Hebrew Chp. 23.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE FORMS</td>
<td>Markers or elements</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bw</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>n #dm.n.f</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bw #dm.f</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bw jff #dm</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jwej (neg. rel. adj.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m + negative complement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m + infinitive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tm + negative complement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tm + infinitive (e.g. r tm djf)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tm.k #dm (a neg. purpose clause) (12.25)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tm.k #dm (a prospective #dm optatively used (only in Pap. Anastasi I) (e.g. 12.66)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bwpw.f #dm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bn twj her #dm (First Present)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m jfl #dm.f</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m dj jfl #dm.f</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mn mdl.f #A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE FORMS</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isomorphisms group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$bn$ + First Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Third Future ($\pm jwn3$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ non-verbal sentence ($+ jwn3$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ initial prospective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ emphatic $j.sdm.f$ of the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$tm$ + infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($jw.f$ $hr$ $tm$ $sdm.f$ of past or future)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($mtw.f$ $tm$ $sdm.f$ - conjunctive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- negating infinitive acting as an imperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... $tm$ $sdm.f$ of the non-initial prospective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>NDE</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$bw$ $jrf.f$ $sdm$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$bw$ $sdm.f$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (rarely)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$bw$ $jrf.f$ $sdm$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$bw$ $sdm.f$ $cn$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$bw$ $sdm.n.f$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$bn$ $sdm.n.f$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$nn$ $sdm.n.f$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n kdm.f</em></td>
<td><em>n kdm.f</em> (12.41)</td>
<td><em>bwpw.f kdm</em> (12.75)</td>
<td><strong>Negation of kdm.f</strong> of the past or First Present denoting past time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>bwpw.f kdm</em> (12.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n lp kdm.f</em></td>
<td><em>n lp kdm</em> (12.1)</td>
<td><em>bwpw.f kdm e_n</em></td>
<td><em>never</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(bn)</em> <em>bwpw.f kdm</em> (12.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perhaps <em>bw kdm.n.f</em> (12.102)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perhaps <em>A wn bw njtw.f</em> (12.109)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perhaps <em>bw kdm.f</em> (12.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n kdm.t.f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>bw jrf kdm</em></td>
<td><em>not yet</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jwrf (kdm.f)</em></td>
<td><em>jwrf kdm.f</em> (12.53)</td>
<td><em>njf bwpw.f kdm</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(negative relative adjective)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>m kdm(w)</em></td>
<td><em>m kdm(w)</em> (12.59)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative Imperatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(negative complement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jmm kdm.f</em></td>
<td><em>jmm kdm.f</em> (12.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>m kdm</em> (infinitive) (12.57) Unique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>m jrf kdm.f</em> (12.163)</td>
<td><em>m jrf kdm.f</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>m dtj kdm.f</em> (12.161)</td>
<td><em>m dtj kdm.f</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>m jrf dtj kdm.f</em> (12.159)</td>
<td><em>m jrf dtj kdm.f</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>nn</strong></td>
<td><strong>nn</strong> (12.23)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-existence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nn wn</em></td>
<td><em>nn wn</em> (12.22, 12.9) (19.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n wnt + subject</em></td>
<td><em>nn wn(t) + subject</em> (12.44) (12.46)</td>
<td><em>mn m.dj.k aA</em> (12.168)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(?bn njrf jwn 12.144)</em></td>
<td><em>mn m.dj.k aA</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>nn wn m.dj.k aA</em> (12.168)</td>
<td><em>mn m.dj.k aA</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>mn aA</em> (12.167)</td>
<td><em>mn aA</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ṭhj</td>
<td>nn ṭhj (12.7, 12.10)</td>
<td>bw ṭhj</td>
<td>&quot;I do not know&quot; Præsens with verb ṭh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ṭjm.n.f</td>
<td>n ṭjm.n.f (12.47)</td>
<td>bw ṭjm</td>
<td>1 Præsens denoting habitual action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nn ṭjm.n.f (12.5)</td>
<td>bw ṭjm.n.f (12.101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bw ṭjm.n.f (12.102)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bw ṭjm (7.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps n ṭjm.n.f</td>
<td>Perhaps bn ṭjm.n.f (12.44)</td>
<td>bn ṭjm (12.124, 12.127)</td>
<td>1 Præsens conveying a synchronous or progressive action or an action in the near future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps jw.f n ṭjm</td>
<td>? 12.52 variant</td>
<td>jw bn ṭjm (12.130)</td>
<td>Circumstantial præsens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nn ṭjm.f</td>
<td>nn ṭjm.f (12.2)</td>
<td>bw jw.f ṭjm (12.122)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bn jw.f ṭjm (12.122)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? n ṭjm.n.f</td>
<td>(j) bn ṭjm.n.f (12.151, 12.152)</td>
<td>(parallel to an emphatic ṭjm.n.f)</td>
<td>Second Tense - emphatic ('that' sentences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>? bw ṭjm.f (7.46, 7.48)</td>
<td>? jw.f bn ṭjm (6.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j.jf.k bn ṭjm (12.183)</td>
<td>(paraphrase: negating the 'that'-form itself)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bn j.jf ṭjm (12.150)</td>
<td>bn j.jf ṭjm (jwn.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bn ṭjm (12.169)</td>
<td>bn j.ṭjm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emphatic Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nn *sdm.f</td>
<td>*nn *sdm.f (12.4)</td>
<td>*nn *sdm.f</td>
<td>Initial prospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or *m *sdm(w))</td>
<td>*m *sdm(w) (12.60)</td>
<td>*bn *sdm.f (12.146)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*bn *sdm.f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*hnC nfr *sdm (affirmative)</td>
<td>*mtr.f *mr *sdm (12.172)</td>
<td>*mtr.f *mr *sdm</td>
<td>The Conjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(perhaps *hnC *nn *jw *sdm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*jw *nn *sdm.f</td>
<td>*jw *nn *sdm.f (12.30)</td>
<td>*jw.f *hr *tm *sdm (12.180)</td>
<td>The continuative past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*jw.f *hr *tm *sdm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*... *tm.f *sdm</td>
<td>*... *tm.f *sdm (12.70)</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>The causative infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*... *tm A *hr *sdm (12.71)</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>(or non-initial prospective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_</td>
<td>*... *tm dj *sdm (12.74, 12.178)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_</td>
<td>*... *rm dj *sdm (12.169)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tn.k *sdm (prospective used as an optative) (12.66)</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nn + infinitive</td>
<td>12.6, 12.9</td>
<td>*bn (sdm) jwn3</td>
<td>meaning &quot;without&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nn nfr</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>*bn nfr *p3j *sdm.f</td>
<td>Negation of adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*stp formations as object</td>
<td>7.51 in the affirmative (12.174 and 12.182) in the negative</td>
<td>*p3j.f *mr *sdm (indifferent to time)</td>
<td>p3 *mr *sdm j.jrj.f (past tense)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDUM I

THE TEXTS AND PAPYRI STUDIED

"The non-literary written documents are those which deal with everyday life and affairs, such as genuine letters, accounts, court reports, oracles. Since the very purpose of their existence is to communicate and inform native speakers about practical matters concerning them, they are the nearest alternative to the spoken language.

Literary texts include the LE "novels", songs wisdom literature, and "documents" serving as exercises for apprentice scribes. Thus, in the literate community of the Egyptian scribes, imbued with a profound knowledge and admiration of the writings of the past, there developed a situation of diaglossia, wherein literary and non-literary languages were learnt and used by educated Egyptian scribes as independent languages, a situation reminiscent of the peculiar status of Latin in medieval and Renaissance Europe. This is not to say that literary texts have no grammatical system. On the contrary, they constitute a grammatical system of their own, which differs from that of the non-literary language. The literary language contains many specific verbal formations, many ME verbal formations, and also the verbal formations which occur in non-literary texts."

In a discussion on non-literary texts, Groll (1985:350) stated: "Wen-Amun" (of course a Late Ramesside text and later than this study) "is non-literary and it is the most literary text we have from the point of view of beauty, sensitivity, choice of idiom and anything else. Non-literary is not unbeautiful and not limited as to subject matter. The non-literary texts are texts which are written in the language which is the predecessor of Demotic and Coptic, but not of Ptolemaic and Roman ...
is a creation of the literary texts, and, it was transferred, I don't know how, to the Demotic."

(The literary equivalent of this was hr $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$, and the non-literary form was the First Present tw.j hr $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$ ... $\ddot {r}$ nb, which did not go forward into Coptic. Mostly the non-literary LE forms did and were represented in Coptic.)

"Certainly, the literary language is a language which is active, but it is a language which does not pay attention to certain phenomena, and it carries along with it many stages from Old Egyptian to Late Egyptian, e.g. "even Love Songs jj.kwj as if it were the Old Pyramid Texts".

Groll (1975/6:237) showed that the literary texts of Twentieth Dynasty LE differed from the non-literary texts, in that they preserved some archaic forms, which were no longer used in the spoken and non-literary language.

Some examples are -

i. The circumstantial $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$ indicating relative past tense occurred in literary LE, alongside $\ddot {s}d\mu.n.f$ of ME and jw. $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$ of non-literary LE, and which became $\ddot {\varepsilon}\alpha\gamma\zeta\omega\tau\mu\nu$ in Coptic.

ii. The $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$ of the simple present was the successor of ME jw $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$, and existed in literary LE alongside hr $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$ and tw.j hr $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$ ... $\ddot {r}$ nb of non-literary LE.

iii. $bw $ $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$ of the simple present was preceded by ME n $\ddot {s}d\mu.n.f$ and existed in literary LE together with $bw jjr.j.f$ $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$ of non-literary LE, and the latter became the Coptic $\ddot {\varepsilon}\gamma\zeta\omega\tau\mu\nu$.

iv. The $bw $ $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$ of the past which was present in literary LE together with the non-literary $bw$ $prj.n.f$ $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$, which became $\ddot {\mu}\pi\gamma\zeta\omega\tau\mu\nu$ in Coptic, and

v. The emphatic $prj.n.f$ or $sm.n.f$ from ME and $mr.f$ from ME existed in literary LE side by side with the non-literary jj$jr.j.f$ $\ddot {s}m$ or jj$jr.j.f$ $\ddot {s}d\mu.f$. The latter became the Coptic $\ddot {\nu}\gamma\zeta\omega\tau\mu\nu$.

The literary LE has several ways of expressing the same thing. In addition to its archaic forms, it has the identical form as the non-literary or spoken form too.

Lack of redundancies and the identity of the Coptic and non-literary LE systems is sure indication of their succession.
In discussing the Hieratic Ostracon pl. XLVI, 2 recto, 2 verso, a Nineteenth Dynasty non-literary LE text, Sarah Groll (1973:67) writes, "Our main source of information for LE is the non-literary texts of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties (the Ramesside period). But even in the framework of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties, one can trace a considerable grammatical development. It seems that ME elements still exist in the non-literary texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty. Indeed, since they occur only under specific conditions, which are peculiar to the Nineteenth Dynasty, one is entitled to describe the LE of the Nineteenth Dynasty as an independent, self-sufficient system, which is neither ME nor the LE of the Twentieth Dynasty".

The texts and papyri studied in this thesis are:

A. NON-LITERARY TEXTS

i. The Dedication Inscription of Seti I in the Rock Temple of Wadi Mia (Kanais, "Redesiyeh").

The sanctuary was erected by King Seti I to mark the site, where, on his orders, a well had been dug to provide water for the expeditions that came to this part of the eastern desert to quarry gold and building stones. Along with the well and the temple, a permanent settlement had also been planned.


ii. The Nauri Decree (The Abydos Decree of Seti I at Nauri).

This is a charter granted by Seti I to his great new sanctuary at Abydos; and this, strange to say, is inscribed on a high rock at Nauri, a short distance to the north of the Third Cataract. After a long and poetically worded preamble, describing the wealth and beauty of the temple 600 miles away, there follow the specific commands addressed to the Vizier, the officials, the courtiers, the courts of judges, the King's son of Cush, the troop captains, etc. etc., and it mentions the ways in which the
privileges of the temple staff might be infringed, the punishments and the exaction of justice.


iii. **The Hittite Treaty** of Ramesses II with Hattusil III, Year 21. The kings agreed to a treaty wherein they effectively ceased any overt hostility towards each other. Extant today are two versions of that treaty, one in Akkadian and one in Egyptian. Essentially the Egyptian version represents a translation from Akkadian to Egyptian.


This text concerns a legal matter in court, and shares in common some of the biblical laws, while some are in contradistinction to biblical law.

**B. LITERARY TEXTS**

i. **Papyrus Anastasi I and Papyrus Koller** discuss many matters in a series of letters to a scribe, Amenemope. There is much philosophy, discussion and reproof.

Papyrus Koller is a continuation of Pap Anastasi I and comprises four letters, discussing the equipment of a Syrian expedition, warnings to an idle scribe, Nubian tribute and preparations for Pharaoh's arrival.

ii. **The Tale of the Two Brothers.** This is a delightful narrative story, certainly based on a myth. The world in which the events take place have supernatural happenings, in which the cedar has large blossoms, oxen speak and all kinds of marvellous and impossible things happen.


iii. **Prayers Used as School Texts.** These include prayers to Amun-Re and to Thoth, couched in beautiful and humble language.


iv. **The Northern Wars of Seti I - The Karnak reliefs.** These form the most important document surviving from Seti I's reign, being practically our only source for his wars. Unfortunately their function was a religious one; they furnish us with a series of scenes presenting the wars of Seti I in their religious aspect, accompanied by a few meager explanatory inscriptions annexed to the principal actors in each scene. The Pharaoh offers to the god the captives and the plunder gained. These were found on the northern wall of the great hypostyle hall in Karnak, and reflect the campaign from Sile to P'Kana'an in Year I.

Text in Kitchen (1975), I, pp. 6-20.

v. **Papyrus Lansing: A schoolbook** (Pap. British Museum 9994). This is an instruction in letter writing, and praises the scribe's profession, comparing it favourably to other occupations, and castigates unwilling pupils.


Text in Gardiner, A H. *Late Egyptian Stories*, pp. 30-36.


A wonderful combination, in historical inscriptions, of prose narratives with poems extolling the royal victories. The poem is more than a brief
song of triumph that sums up the narration - it itself is narrative. This is a genre not hitherto found in Egypt: the epic poem.


viii. **Papyrus Chester-Beatty I. Love songs.** "The Nineteenth Dynasty has bequeathed to us some tender little love songs" (Pap. Chester-Beatty I. 1931. London) (Gardiner, A H. 1982, p. 24(c)).


Verso C1, C2, C3, C4, unfinished XXVI A missing,

Verso Section G.

ix. **Papyrus Chester-Beatty III - Dream Interpretation.**

A unique dream book, with a grammatical text which tries to systematize a specific technical dream language of literary Late Egyptian. It is also a type of medical text specialising in dream interpretation.


x. **The Poetical Stela of Merneptah (Israel Stela) (Cairo Museum 34025 Verso)**

This is a poetic account of Merneptah's victory over the Libyans who had invaded Egypt in the fifth year of his reign. Like the Kadesh Battle Inscription of Ramesses II, this is epic poetry containing narration. After lauding Merneptah for freeing Egypt from the Libyan menace, the poem then extols him as victor over all of Egypt's neighbours, especially the peoples of Palestine and Syria. The poem has a special significance owing to its mentioning Israel among the conquered peoples and places, for this is the only occurrence of the name of Israel in Egyptian texts.
The Tale of the Doomed Prince (from Pap. Harris 500, verso).

This is a charming tale, but the ending is missing. Scholars think that the tale should be more accurately called "The prince who was threatened by three fates", for the now missing ending of the tale may have been a happy one in keeping with the fairy-tale character of the story. Moreover the Ancient Egyptian concept of fate was a fluid one. There was no rigid determinism, no firm belief in an inescapable fate; Rather a sense that righteousness would triumph and innocence would overcome adversity.

Text - Gardiner, A H. Late Egyptian Stories, pp. 1-9.

Horus and Seth (Pap. C. Beatty I, recto). A wonderful tale steeped in Egyptian, legend of Osiris, Isis, Horus and Seth.

Text - Gardiner, A H. Late Egyptian Stories, pp. 37-60.

In addition, I make reference to:

(i) Some model letters of the Nineteenth Dynasty, which are a "normative" text - not part of administrative texts, and probably non-literary rather than literary texts. (Goldwasser 1985).


Bruxelles 1933. Edition de la Fondation Egyptologique Reine Elisabeth. a non-literary text.

As mentioned above the theoretical base included a thorough study of the ME and LE languages and of the forms peculiar to each, and a study of Coptic. I studied the ME language, notably from the textbooks of A H Gardiner (1982), A Erman (1933 and 1972) and H Brunner (1979).

I studied Coptic, making reference mainly to the textbook of C C Walters (1972).

I reviewed relevant literature, and this is reflected in the Bibliography.

I studied and translated and correlated the chosen NDE texts, - a representative group, I believe, of Nineteenth Dynasty writings, a selection which gives a good broad scope of the language of the Nineteenth Dynasty in varied contexts.

I translated and studied many of the preceding Eighteenth Dynasty and succeeding Twentieth Dynasty texts too. The language of the Twentieth Dynasty texts is well established Late Egyptian (e.g. The Great Papyrus Harris, the Wilbour Papyrus, Ramesside Administrative Documents, The Tomb Robberies, Late Ramesside Letters and The Tale of Wen Amun), while the Eighteenth Dynasty records (e.g. the stelae and inscriptions of Tuthmosis III, Hatshepsut, Amenhotep IV, the Medical Papyrus Ebers and the Great Hymn to the Aten) are in Middle Egyptian language.
ADDENDUM II

THE CHRONOLOGICAL CHART OF THE EGYPTIAN DYNASTIES

Early Dynastic Period (2920-2575)
First Dynasty 2920-2770
Second Dynasty 2770-2649
Third Dynasty 2649-2575

Djoser of this Dynasty built the step pyramid at Saqqara.

Old Kingdom (2575-2134)
Fourth Dynasty 2575-2465
Cheops, Chefren and Mycerinus were the pyramid builders at Gaza.
Fifth Dynasty 2465-2323
Unas
Sixth Dynasty 2323-2150

Pepi. I and Pepi. II
Seventh and Eighth Dynasties 2150-2134

---
1 I use the classification and dates of Time Life Books (1992:158-159).
First Intermediate Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ninth and Tenth Dynasties</td>
<td>(Herakleopolitan - 2134-2040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh Dynasty</td>
<td>(Theban (before unification of the country) 2134-2040)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Middle Kingdom (2040-1640)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh Dynasty</td>
<td>(after the unification of the country by Nebhepetre Mentuhotpe) 2040-1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth Dynasty</td>
<td>1991-1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteenth Dynasty</td>
<td>1783-1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteenth Dynasty</td>
<td>a separate dynasty that ruled contemporaneously with the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Dynasty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Intermediate Period (1640-1550)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifteenth (Hyksos),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteenth and Seventeenth Dynasties</td>
<td>(In a divided country, kings of these dynasties ruled contemporaneously with one another.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Kingdom (1550-1070)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eighteenth Dynasty</td>
<td>(1550-1307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmose III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatshepsut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhanaten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutankhamen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horemhab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nineteenth Dynasty

the Period of this Thesis (ca 1308-1196 or 1184)

Ramesses I (ca 1308)

Seti I (1308-1291)

Ramesses II (1290-1224)

Merneptah (1224-1214)

Seti II

Amenmesse

Siptah

Twosre

Twentieth Dynasty

(1196 or 1184-1070)

Ramesses III-XI

Third Intermediate Period (1070-712)

Twenty-first Dynasty 1070-945

Twenty-second Dynasty (Libyan) 945-712

Twenty-third Dynasty ca 828-712 (Libyan)

Twenty-fourth Dynasty 724-712

Twenty-fifth Dynasty (Nubian and Theban area) 770-712

(Egypt politically fragmented, rival dynasties overlapped)

Late Period (712-332)

Twenty-fifth Dynasty

(Nubia and all Egypt) 712-657

Twenty-sixth Dynasty 664-525

Twenty-seventh Dynasty (Persian) 525-404
Even mighty Persia was defenceless against Alexander the Great, who conquered the Persian Empire - and Egypt - in 332 BCE, signalling the approaching end of the epic civilization.
ADDENDUM III

AN ASSESSMENT OF LITERARY AND NON-LITERARY TEXTS

Is there a well-defined difference between the non-literary and the literary texts in this thesis? Obviously there is; the context is different, the language in a court case (e.g. Hieratic Ostracon) is very different from that in a narrative (like The Tale of Two Brothers), and that of a charter granted to a great sanctuary from prayers couched in beautiful and humble language. But most of the grammatical forms appear in both genres of texts. I will discuss the few exceptions.

In the non-literary texts, there are no examples of the following Middle Egyptian forms:

- \textit{jjt pw jrj.w.m.f}, the negative, \textit{n}, the negative imperative or the emphatic \textit{sn.f} or \textit{mr.f}. This is not necessarily unexpected in a genre, which tends to eliminate earlier forms and to have fewer forms with no redundancies. The absence of \textit{~} too, may mean little anyway, as after the middle of the Eighteenth Dynasty, \textit{~} tends to take the place of \textit{n}. For the negative imperative, Late Egyptian forms are exclusively used (e.g. Kanais 12.157, Hittite Treaty 12.158).

The Late Egyptian negative perfect \textit{bwpw.f sdm.m} is not found in these non-literary texts either, perhaps because these are not narrative texts on the whole. Where there is a need for this tense, \textit{bw sdm.f} is used (e.g. Kanais 12.87, Hittite Treaty 12.84).

There is no use of \textit{mn} for expressing non-existence in the non-literary texts: rather \textit{nn wn} (Nauri Decree 12.9) and even \textit{wn bw rj.tw.f} (Kanais 12.87).
And I can find no example of the Late Egyptian non-literary Second Tense emphatic form in these non-literary texts yet. This is, I think rather surprising, as there are many examples in the literary texts. In fact, as there are no examples of the Middle Egyptian emphatic šmf or mrr.f (see above), the only emphatic form I could find in these non-literary texts is šdm.n.f! (e.g. Kanais 7.44. Nauri Decree 7.43). This form is usually only found in Middle Egyptian and not in Twentieth Dynasty Late Egyptian. (No doubt, the j.jr.f šdm is found in other non-literary texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty, not studied here.)

Of all the many Middle and Late Egyptian and mixed forms found in the literary texts, the only one I could not find is hnC ntf šdm, the Middle Egyptian predecessor of the conjunctive.

I have summarised these non-literary and literary omissions below:

Non-literary Texts:

Absence of ME forms:
  i. jjt pw jrjw.n.f
  ii. n
  iii. ME negative imperative (LE negative imperative used)
  iv. Emphatic šmf or mrr.f (Emphatic šdm.n.f used instead)

Absence of LE forms:
  i. j.jr.f šdm Emphatic (Emphatic šdm.n.f used instead)
  ii. bwpw.f šdm (bw šdm.f used)
  iii. mn of non-existence (nn wn or wn bw ... used instead)

Literary Texts:

Absence of ME hnC ntf šdm - the predecessor of the LE conjunctive.

I do not think one can draw any definite conclusions from this.
The above singular exceptions, and the fact that all the other older and later forms are found in the non-literary texts, alongside disparate, motley, inconsistent forms show too that NDE is unique, original, authentic and inimitable.
ADDENDUM IV

AFTERTHOUGHTS ON TEXTS IN CONTEXT

It is necessary to review some of the texts separately and in their contexts, so as to draw attention to the special characteristics and singularities of expression in different genres.

I.

In discussing the Hieratic Ostracon pl. XLVI, 2 recto, 2 verso, a Nineteenth Dynasty non-literary LE text, Sarah Groll (1973:67) writes, "Our main source of information for LE is the non-literary texts of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties (the Ramesside period). But even in the framework of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties, one can trace a considerable grammatical development. It seems that ME elements still exist in the non-literary texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty. Indeed, since they occur only under specific conditions, which are peculiar to the Nineteenth Dynasty, one is entitled to describe the LE of the Nineteenth Dynasty as an independent, self-sufficient system, which is neither ME nor the LE of the Twentieth Dynasty", e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recto 1.2</td>
<td>Recto 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spr jrn.Å</td>
<td>tjms.Å</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An infinitive *spr* of a verb of motion, followed by a relative form. LE perfect active *šdm.f*. This is a specific LE formation, - the equivalent of ME *jw šdm.n.f*. The negative of the LE is *bwpw.f šdm.f*. 
Recto 2  smj.n.f
A non-initial šdm.n.f formation, i.e. the ME narrative šdm.n.f formation.

Recto 6  ċhcbc.n ṣd n A
A common ME formation, classified here as a specific formation of LE of the Nineteenth Dynasty.

cf. Verso 1.2

jw.tw hr jj3.f
jw.j hr djt ċk3.sn rmt nb
These are specific LE formations. The corresponding ME is the narrative šdm.n.f.

Recto 3.4  b3w ntr hpr
A First Present LE with stative of hpr. The ME equivalent is either jw b3w hpr or mk b3w hpr
r + infinitive + a noun in the direct genitive.

Perfect active $\delta$dm.f followed by a circumstantial First Present (indicating the relative present time). The negative would be $jw$ bn $sw$ hr $jt3$.

Are you prepared to take a great oath?

$n =$ interrogative $jn$.

A Third Future pattern with the infinitive $rh$ + $jrt$, indicating willingness or ability. The $r$ before the Third Future is left out.

- the elliptical conjunctive in an oath.

A virtual relative clause, indicating absolute past time.

$jw$ $jt3$. $"after she had stolen"

$jw$ $+$ perfect active $\delta$dm.f indicating pluperfect.

The genuine LE formations occur, in this ostracon, basically in the framework of the actual trial investigation, and not in the framework of the technical procedure of the trial.
II.

Ophel (1985:153) in discussing the Ramesses II Battle of Kadesh poem writes, "We note the clear use of the perfect active šdjm.f's with their negative counterpart, the bw šdjm.f of the past (a Nineteenth Dynasty formation). These specific LE formations stand side by side with ME elements, e.g. the emphatic šm.n.f formations.

The appearance of specific LE formations within the framework of a royal inscription early in the Nineteenth Dynasty, is but another call 'to describe the LE Egyptian of the Nineteenth Dynasty as an independent self-sufficient system'."

III.

Gardiner (1982:3) tells us that a striking feature in Egyptian in all stages is its concrete realism, neglecting subtleties of thought as are implied in "might", "should", "can", "hardly"; possibly they would have been repugnant to the Egyptian temperament.

Intellectual and emotional qualities were ordinarily described by reference to the physical gestures or expressions by which they were accompanied, thus "liberality", is "extension of hand" šwt c, "cleverness" is "sharpness of face (sight)" špd hr.

Regarding the "can", "could" or "might", let us look again at Papyrus Chester Beatty III - Dream Interpretation, (Groll 1985:114). The pattern in these many examples are as follows -

i. jr m33 s sw m rswt
   If a man sees himself in a dream

ii. circumstantial clauses, acting as the adverbial extension of jr m33 s, e.g.
   9.28 recto
   hr jnj pnw.w m šḥt
   ... bringing mice from a field.

iii. ḏw. or nfr..named
   "good" or "bad"
- apodosis - unimembral adjectival sentence pattern.

iv. an implied ("it means") (or "it might" or "could mean").

v. a series of sentence patterns, many of which include a predicative infinitive $+ \text{pw}$ (rather than a prospective tense).

A prospective can indicate either the speaker's wish or a notion of inevitability.

The notion of probability (Groll 1985:114) is achieved both by the fact that infinitives have no specific time indication and by the fact that the element $\text{pw}$ in the bimembral nominal sentence pattern does not agree in gender with the predicative infinitive.

The text used $\text{pw}$ in the nominal sentence and not $\text{p3j}$, $\text{t3j}$, $\text{n3j}$. In LE, the masculine gender was the neuter, so $\text{p3j}$ stood for the neuter gender and for the masculine. In Papyrus Chester Beatty III, $\text{pw}$ stands for the neuter and $\text{p3j}$ for the masculine.

The examples are $\phi A$ $\text{pw}$ sentence patterns, e.g.

r6.15b $\text{nfr} \circ \phi_{j,t} \text{pw} \text{s3j.f jm.sn}$

Good, (it may mean) something with which he is satisfied, e.g.

r7.19a-20b $\text{gwr} \circ \text{hr} \text{md.wt} \text{pw} \text{rf}$

(cf. $\text{sdm.f} \text{pw}$ in Medical Texts = he may die.

This text is composed of a system of elements, rather than abstract rules. This is probably unique to the Nineteenth Dynasty and to this text. Linguistic creativity is apparently used on the principle of analogical formation.

Regarding element $\phi$ (above) - "circumstantial clauses acting as the adverbial extension of $\text{jr m33 s}$" - the vast majority of these (90%) are formed by the construction $\text{hr} +$ infinitive.

They can also be formed by

- a ME pseudooverbal construction, e.g. 9.3 recto

\[ \ldots \text{d3jw cm.w hr} \text{f} \]

\[ \ldots \text{the garment of Asiatics being upon him ( = wearing Asiatic clothing),} \]

\[ \text{e.g. 8.12 recto} \]
... jbh.w.f hr hrf.f
... when his teeth are falling out ...
- a circumstantial $dm.n.f$ formation, e.g. 3.3 recto
... c3.n sn.w.f
... after his hair has grown long

and other patterns. These are mostly ME or LE Ramesside literary forms. It is interesting that we do not find verbal formations introduced by the converter $jw$ typical of non-literary Ramesside LE.

This may be an older text, copied, re-copied and emended. Even if it did start earlier, what we have is the last stage of the process. It is probably a LE text rather than a transformed ME.

IV.

The Nineteenth Dynasty Egyptian language is interesting, rich and broad in scope.

It includes a specific language of court procedure (Hieratic Ostracon), in which ME elements still exist, occurring only under specific conditions peculiar to the Nineteenth Dynasty.

LE formations occur in the framework of the trial investigation, while ME elements appear in the technical procedure of the trial. ME $ch^c.n$ dd.n $A$ indicates a new phase in the actual trial investigation, while $ch^c.n$ $A$ $hr.dd$ expresses the verdict. The LE conjunctive expresses an oath in court.

V.

In the Nauri Decree, we find many "conditional legal sequences", which include LE $ntj +$ Third Future, but also variants like $ntj +$ $sw$ $r$ $sdm$ of ME, ME $ntj$ $r$ without $jw.f$ and $ntj$ $jw.f$ without $r$. Many are followed by LE conjunctives, and even their ME ancestor $hn^c$ $ntf$ $sdm$. We encounter $r$ $tm$ $djt$'s as negative purpose clauses.
VI.

In the Hittite Treaty, many Nineteenth Dynasty bw ʾdgm.ʾs appear, some even indicating future time, and even bw ʾdgm.n.f forms with future meaning, e.g.

227/14,15 +jw bw hpr.n hrwj r'jwd.sn r.nlḥ

And hostility will never more occur between them forever.

This occurs in the Kanais text too, e.g.

67/8,9  +p3 wn bw h3j.n.sn šhrw.f

For his plans do not fail

(p3 wn is a Nineteenth Dynasty form)

VII.

We find too in the Hittite Treaty  jrj replacing the  jw of a LE Third Future before a noun subject, e.g.

229/3,4  +bn jrj p3 wr c3 n ḥt3 r ʾšp.w

The great prince of Hatti will not receive them.

And in the Kanais text, too, e.g.

70/3  +jrj wsjr m s3.f

Osiris will be after him.

VIII.

In Dream Interpretation (Papyrus Chester Beatty III) we have a unique Nineteenth Dynasty text and language. The nuance of probability is now neatly expressed in a new grammatical way.

In addition, the circumstantial adverbial clauses extending the protasis ... "If a man sees himself in a dream ..." are expressed in most instances with ME formations, and not by the converter jw as in LE.
IX.
Goldwasser, writing of the **epistolary formula**, thinks that the model normative Nineteenth Dynasty letters published in Late Egyptian Miscellanies show a synthesis between the new and the old. And I believe that this applies to most of Nineteenth Dynasty literature - non-literary and literary. The language is finding its way, incorporating ME forms ("they remembered"), LE non-literary forms, and some LE literary forms as well as forms as yet not fully evolved.

X.
Ramesses II: **Battle of Kadesh** poem expresses rhetoric so effectively with the use of ME emphatic $m.n.f$ formations (sometimes preceded by $j\;bn$), and these are found side by side with the $bw\;sdm.f$ of the past - a specific Nineteenth Dynasty formation, which does not appear later, being replaced by the non-literary late Ramesside $bw\;jrj\;sdm.f$.

XI.
The narrative tales (like Horus and Seth, The Doomed Prince, Truth and Falsehood, The Two Brothers) combine ME $wn.jn\;hr\;sdm$ pseudoverbal constructions with $chc.n\;sdm$, and with $jw.f\;hr\;sdm.f$ of the LE sequential past - freely.

Two Brothers cleverly uses the LE **conjunctive**, expressing past tense habitual custom to set the scene of what used to happen regularly every day, and then changes to the bona fide narrative LE continuative past to express the activities on that particular day of the narrative.

There are sequences of ME $sdm\;pw\;jrw.n.f$ followed by LE $jw.f\;hr\;sdm$ of the continuative past, and even by $wn.jn$ in a ME pseudoverbal construction. And these interchange very skillfully one with another.

ME and LE negative forms alternate in no seemingly predictable pattern, and $bw\;sdm.f$ appears more commonly than $bw\;jrj\;sdm.f$.

XII.
In didactic texts, like Prayers used as school texts, Papyrus Lansing and Papyrus Anastasi I (and Papyrus Koller), many combinations of grammatical and
syntactical forms occur. There are many ME prospective $sdm.f$'s used optatively. And there are many ME active and passive participles, expressing the qualities of a good man. There are $bw$ $sdm.f$'s of the simple present, e.g. Prayers

18/2
$bw$ jnj n j $sr$ m nh
$bw$ $shbn.j$ $nt$ wnw
$bw$ dj(.j) p3j.j $dn$ hr lps n s3
I take not a noble as protector,
I associate not with a man of wealth,
I place not my share in another's case.

There are several uses of LE First Present to express accepted truths and maxims, e.g. Prayers used as school texts.

86/6-8 in which Thoth is compared to a sweet well
$sw$ htm.tj n p3 gm r.f
$sw$ wn.tj n p3 gr.w
It is sealed to him who finds words, it is open to the silent.

and 86/8 tw.k mlh.jb
You are trusted.

There are alternating ME pseudoverbal formations and LE First Present patterns: - the latter of course evolved from and later displaced the former. $sdm.f$ forms alternate freely too.

There are Second Tense emphatics too, the morphological form of which is easier to recognise than ME emphatics, which can only be recognised by position and context, e.g.

Papyrus Lansing

100/4 $j.jrf$ $sn$n $c3.w$ r.f
It is with those greater than he that he makes friends

and 101/10  
\[ jw \ j.jj.jt \ r \ qr.w \ sp.sn \]
\[ n \ sn \ n \ knkn \]

It is for fear of a beating that they do their utmost.

There is a form of \textit{tm} used as a \textit{\textcircled{m}f} optatively, mostly in Papyrus Anastasi I, e.g.

23/5  
\[ tm.k \ knf \]

Do not be angry.

XIII.

\textbf{The Love Songs} have many interesting forms typical of literary LE, e.g. Circumstantial \textit{\textcircled{m}f}

C2/1  
\[ sh3.tw.f \]

...when recalling him.

and a ME emphatic formation

C1/7  
\[ ptr.tj \ prj.\$ \ r \ h3 \]

One is aware of her going out, - the \textit{prj.\$} acting as direct object of a verb. This does not occur in later LE non-literary texts.

Here we find too \textit{bw} \textit{\textcircled{m}f}'s of the present from literary LE, e.g.

\[ bw \ sm.j \ mj \ rmf \]
\[ bw \ wnh.j \ p3j.j \ bhn \]

...It does not let me walk like a human being.

...I cannot use my fan properly.

XIV.

In the \textbf{Northern Wars of Sethos I}, we find the old synchronic present in ritual texts, better called the performative, e.g.
15/4 and
20/4  \(dj.n(j) \ n.k\)

XV.

In Merneptah's (Israel) stele, many ME participles occur, e.g.

13/7,8

... \(h^3j \ m \ m3Jt\)
... \(htp \ hr \ m3Jt\)
\(k3 \ nht \ hwj \ p\delta t\)
... rejoicing in Maat,
... content with Maat, strong bull, who smites the Nine Bows.
These are imperfect active participles, and
\(s\text{â}3 \ phtj\)
\(sk3j \ hp\delta \ n \ hr\)
... magnified by the power and exalted by the strength of Horus.
(These are passive participles.)

In the final section, Merneptah, (or his scribe), describing many countries he has vanquished, alternates \(sdm.\text{s}^s\) with (either) ME pseudoverbal constructions or LE First Presents in a very effective poetical way, e.g.

19/3-7  \(jnj.w \ jskn\)
Ashkelon is conquered
but  \(j\text{s}\tilde{r}\tilde{r}r \ fkt\)
Israel is wasted.

Therefore, the Nineteenth Dynasty language combines many forms and this is unique, not being found in any other period. It may (Goldwasser 1985:55), be a synthesis of the new and the old; it may be a language in transition from ME
(synthetic) to non-literary LE (analytic) and to later Coptic; or it may be (Groll 1973:70) "an independent self-sufficient system".

However we interpret and "see" it, it is an important, vital and vibrant language.
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