

# LINGUA AEGYPTIA

—

## JOURNAL OF EGYPTIAN LANGUAGE STUDIES

ISSN 0942-5659

*LingAeg* 1 (1991), p. 201–226

Loprieno, Antonio

Focus, mood, and negative forms: Middle Egyptian syntactic paradigms and diachrony

### Conditions of Use

You may use this pdf and its content for personal, non-profit / non-commercial / non-retail use without further permission. Some examples of non-commercial uses for educational and research purposes are: academic curricula developed by teachers, research papers written by students or scholars, non-profit educational or non-profit research publications produced by authors or publishers. For other non-commercial or commercial uses, permission must be obtained from the editors of *Lingua Aegyptia*. It is not allowed to change the pdf file.

### Editors

Friedrich Junge  
(Göttingen)

Frank Kammerzell  
(Berlin)

Antonio Loprieno  
(Basel)

### Addresses

Seminar für  
Ägyptologie und Koptologie  
Georg-August-Universität  
Göttingen  
Weender Landstraße 2  
37073 Göttingen  
Germany

Seminar für Archäologie und  
Kulturgeschichte Nordostafrikas  
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin  
Unter den Linden 6  
10099 Berlin  
Germany

Ägyptologisches Seminar  
Universität Basel  
Bernoullistrasse 32  
4056 Basel  
Switzerland

Online: <http://www.gwdg.de/~lingaeg/>

© Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie, Universität Göttingen

## Focus, mood, and negative forms: Middle Egyptian syntactic paradigms and diachrony

Antonio Loprieno, Los Angeles

### 1 Introduction

In many languages, negative constructions exhibit the tendency to become "fixed" phrases that cannot be further segmented into their original constituents, thus providing a useful insight into the history of a linguistic system: they often show the permanence of synthetic structures that have otherwise been superseded in the corresponding positive paradigms. This diachronic trend can be easily observed in Hamito-Semitic: e.g., Classical Arabic *lam yaqum#* "he didn't stand up," but no positive form *\*yaqum#* "he stood up," the Protosem. Preterite *\*yáqum* having been superseded in the positive paradigm by the suffix conjugation Perfect *qāma*; or *laysa* "not to be," "not to exist," without any positive counterpart from Protosem. *\*yṯ / \*yš* "there is, there was," for which the verb *kāna* is used<sup>1</sup>; Amharic negative copula *aydollām* "it is not," etymologically the negative form (*al-...-m*) of the imperfect of an obsolete root *\*dbl > \*dwl*<sup>2</sup>, etc. Egyptian examples of the conservative nature of negative compounds are offered by well-known phenomena such as: (1) the permanence throughout the history of the language of the obsolescent perfective form *sdm.t=f* in the negative construction *nj sdm.t=f* ( $> bw-jr.t=f-sdm > \overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{Q}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{M}}$ ); (2) the maintenance in MEG of the OEG negative particle *nj* in the compound *nj wn.t* even

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss II*, §§ 56 ff. Similar phenomena can be observed in some Arabic dialects as well, e.g., Egyptian *lissa ma gā-š* "he has not come yet," with *lissa* "still, yet"  $< *li-'s-sā'a$  "to the present time" (I thank H. Satzinger for this information) and *ma gā-š* "he has not come," *ma gū-š* "they have not come," without *imāla* resp. suffix *-m*, as opposed to the positive *gih, geh* "he came" resp. *gum* "they came," with *ih, eh < ā'*. Cf. Mitchell, *Teach Yourself Colloquial Arabic*, 97, 108; Woidich, in: *Handbuch der arabischen Dialekte*, 220.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Leslau, *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage*, 3, 14-15 s.v. *ädäbb<sup>e</sup>l*.

after the emergence of *nn*, cf. *nn wn*<sup>3</sup>, and of the OEg "indicative" *sdm=f* in the negative past *nj sdm=f*; (3) the morphologization of the otherwise not productive verb *p3w* "to have done" in the LEg negative past *bw-pw=f-sdm*; (4) the endurance of the Negatival complement of *jrj* (*\*jār•w*) down to Coptic  $\bar{\text{M}}\bar{\text{P}}\bar{\text{W}}\bar{\text{P}}$ , etc. A theoretical treatment of this issue has been presented by E. S. Meltzer<sup>4</sup>, who – expanding on S. Groll's observations<sup>5</sup> – discriminates between the three categories of "free," "fixed," and "bound" negatives: originally free negative constructions, in which a negative morpheme (e.g. *nj*) modifies a positive string of the language (e.g. *sdm=f*), tend to become syntactically fixed constructions once the negative particle and the VP are perceived as representing a *new* syntactic unit, different from the mere juxtaposition of its two components (MEg *nj-sdm=f* ≠ OEg *nj + sdm=f*), and eventually prosodically bound, in which case the original morphological components often no longer survive as productive units within the synchronic system of the language (*nj-sdm=f* > *bw-pw=f-sdm*, but *\*pw=f sdm*; *nj-sdm.t=f* >  $\bar{\text{M}}\bar{\text{P}}\bar{\text{A}}\bar{\text{T}}\bar{\text{C}}\bar{\text{W}}\bar{\text{T}}\bar{\text{M}}$ , but *\*sdm.t=f*, *\*A\bar{\text{T}}\bar{\text{C}}\bar{\text{W}}\bar{\text{T}}\bar{\text{M}}*). This diachronic process can often result in a lexicalization, as in  $\text{M}\bar{\text{E}}\bar{\text{W}}\bar{\text{A}}\bar{\text{K}}$  (< *bw-rh=k* < *nj rh=k*) "perhaps."<sup>6</sup>

But fixed negative constructions are not the only structure to exhibit the tendency to syntactic conservatism: the same feature is shared by the so-called "thetic" sentence, in which – other than in the "categorical" sentence – there is no actual Predicate affirming or denying a quality of a well-defined and recognized Subject: rather, an entity or a state of affairs are presented as a whole: "there is water," "it rains," Peas. R<sub>1</sub> *zj pw wn.w*, etc.<sup>7</sup> From a semantic or pragmatic viewpoint, while categorical sentences display a subject or topic about which some state of affairs is predicated, thetic sentences are simple assertions containing one global message, rather than a subject qualified by a predicate, or of a topic followed by a comment. However, the surface structure of these sentences will perforce have to exhibit all the necessary syntactic components of a well-formed unit of the language: hence, in some languages, the presence of semantically or pragmatically irrelevant units such as "there," the dummy "it," etc. A clear example of the conservatism of thetic constructions in Egyptian is offered by the survival of the LEg Cleft sentence *NP p3/t3/n3-*

<sup>3</sup> Edel, *AäG*, § 979A.

<sup>4</sup> Meltzer, in: *L'Égyptologie en 1979*, 1, 49-51.

<sup>5</sup> Groll, *Orientalia* 44 (1975), 126-128.

<sup>6</sup> For a similar type of lexicalization in Semitic cf. Akkadian *ul idi*, Ge'ez *'enda'i*, Amh. *'enğa* "(it is) not my knowledge" > "perhaps": Brockelmann, *Grundriss I*, § 253; *Grundriss II*, §§ 21 f.

<sup>7</sup> The best recent treatment of this question is by Sasse, *Linguistics* 25, 3 (1987), 511-580, who offers a theoretical analysis as well as many examples drawn from different languages: cf. especially 511-530 for the historical and terminological discussion. For a typological application cf. Pennacchietti, forthcoming (in: *Atti della 5. Giornata Comparatistica Nazionale*, Perugia 1989).

*j.sdm(=f)* in the Coptic grammaticalized "simple survivance"<sup>8</sup> ΟΥΓΖΙΜΕ ΤΕΝΤΔΜΟΟΥΤῪ "it is a woman who killed him."<sup>9</sup> Generally, the *pw*-insertion represents in Egyptian the most typical syntactic device of athetic sentence, from the simple Pred-*pw* structure to the very complex embedding of an AdvS as Pred of a bipartite sentence with "dummy" *pw*<sup>10</sup>; in these cases, it is the whole sentence that represents something pragmatically new, and not just the comment of an informationally known topic, as in the case of categorical statements. This is why our translations make recourse to paraphrases such as "What happened is that ...," "C'est que ...," "Es ist nämlich so, daß ...," or to the use of an adverbial actualizer, which emphasizes the cotextual unpredictability of the posited entity or event<sup>11</sup>:

(1) pWestcar 6, 5-6      *nh3w pw nj mfk3.t m3.t hr.w hr mw*  
 "What happened is that a jewel of new malachite has fallen into the water," or else "A jewel of new malachite has just fallen into the water."

(2) Urk. V 53, 1-2      *wnn šw pw hr jrj.t jmj.t-prw n gbb*  
 "Cela signifie que Shou est en train de faire un acte de transfert en faveur de Geb."<sup>12</sup>

(3) Pyr. 763 c-d    *h3 NN pw 'h' NN pn hr ns.t=k hnt 'nh.w š'.t=k pw jr h3t(j).w=sn*  
 "Ho, King NN! You shall sit on your seat in front of the living: *this means that* your ruthlessness will be at their hearts."<sup>13</sup>

Thethetic nature of the *pw*-sentences is also the reason why they appear so frequently in mythological and medical texts: aetiologies and diagnoses constitute in fact global judgments rather than categorical statements about defined subjects:

(4) CT IV 286a - 289b    *zj pw mjw '3 r'w pw ds=f*  
                                  *dd.n.t(w) mjw r=f m dd sj3 r=f*  
                                  *jn mjw sw m nn jrr(.w)=f*

<sup>8</sup> Polotsky, *Orientalia* 31 (1962), 413-430. Cf. now the complete theoretical setting in id., *Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbaus*, 105-127.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the recent discussions by Satzinger, in: *Studies Polotsky*, 480-505 and Callender, *Studies in the Nominal Sentence*, 61ff. I shall return to this problem below.

<sup>10</sup> Loprieno, *JAAL* 1 (1988), 37 ff.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Sasse, *Linguistics* 25, 3 (1987), 519: "On the whole, all languages can be shown to use strategies which help diminish the grammatical predicativity ofthetic sentences by nominalization, incorporation, intonation, and similar devices which blur the strict subject-predicate division of corresponding categorical sentences." In this respect, *jw* a typical categorical, and notthetic marker in Egyptian (*pace ibid.*, 576): cf. § 5 below.

<sup>12</sup> Vernus, in: *L'Égyptologie en 1979*, 1, 85.

<sup>13</sup> Allen, in: *Crossroad*, 14.

*ḥpr rn=f pw n(j) mjw*

"Who is this great cat? – It is Ra himself. He was named 'cat' when Sia said about him: 'Is he (really) a cat in what he does?' *This is how* his name of 'cat' came about."<sup>14</sup>

(5) pRamesseum IV C 18-19 *jr q3'=f st m(w)t=f pw jr ['m=f] st 'nh=f pw*

"Wenn er es erbrechen wird, *so bedeutet es, daß* er sterben wird; wenn [er] es [schlucken wird], *so bedeutet es, daß* er leben wird."

(6) pBerlin 3038, 194 *jr d'=s nj msj=s pw*

"Wenn sie Winde läßt, *so bedeutet es, daß* sie nicht gebären wird."<sup>15</sup>

It is the compound of predicate and subject that constitutes here the scope of thethetic diagnosis, as opposed to a categorical sentence like *nj msj=s*, in which a specific relation between a predicate (*msj*) of a recognized subject (=s) is denied (*nj*). One may compare the structural similarity between the *pw*- (thetic) and the *jn*- (cleft) sentence<sup>16</sup>, both belonging to the *it is...that*-type, the main difference being that in the latter the presupposition appears as an essential semantic component of the sentence, whereas in the former the message stands alone, covering the whole sentence – except for the semantically insignificant, but grammatically required dummy subject. Hence the difficulty of Egyptologists in dealing with the markedness of the *pw*-constructions: because of the structural similarity with the unmarked nominal sentence, the bipartite thetic judgment will be treated as a type of regular Pred-Subj structure at the syntactic level, but as a special predicate-only resp. focus-only structure at the semantic resp. pragmatic level. The marked *pw*-sentence is a thetic sentence in which the conveyed message is in fact the *unexpected identity* between two NPs – cf. example (3): [<sup>1</sup>=]<sub>Pred</sub> [*NN, ḥrw prj m šnt*]<sub>Arguments</sub> – whereas in the *jn*-sentence the focalization invests the subject of a deep-structurally verbal, or better categorical sentence. Obviously, their pragmatic performance turns out to be relatively similar, but by no means identical.<sup>17</sup>

In this paper I would like to speculate on the contribution that the study of OEG and MEG negative and thetic constructions can offer to a better understanding of two seemingly unrelated problems of Egyptian grammar: a morphological one, i.e., the relationship

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Doret, *RdE* 41 (1990), 55.

<sup>15</sup> Westendorf, *GMT*, §§ 205, 346.

<sup>16</sup> A detailed analysis of this problem is offered by E. Doret in this same volume.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Sasse, *Linguistics* 25, 3 (1987), 571-573 on the difference between a sentence with focalized subject (Eg. *jn*), where the predicate is still required, although pragmatically presupposed, and a thetic statement (Eg. *pw*-actualizer), in which the subject itself is cotextually new within the communicative whole. A very fine Egyptological analysis of this difference can be found in Satzinger, in: *Studies Polotsky*, 497, who underscores the fact that focalization with *jn* invests the subject of a "deep-structurally verbal" (I would prefer the term: categorical) sentence.

between Prospective and Subjunctive, and a syntactic/pragmatic one, i.e., the presence or absence of focal stress in the AdvP of a Complex Adverbial Sentence.

## 2 *Leftward movement*

Although the monolithic view which does not allow for any major typological layers in the emergence of the Classical system is still defended, sometimes with apodictic vigor<sup>18</sup>, it seems to me relatively clear that by the end of the OK the Egyptian verbal system underwent two interrelated evolutions: (a) a more or less significant reduction of its grammatical inventory – explicit evidence being offered, e.g., by the merging of "Prospective" and "Subjunctive" into the MEG "prospective *sḏm=f*"<sup>19</sup> and by the obsolescence of the "indicative" *sḏm=f*<sup>20</sup>; (b) the systematic transposition of verbal forms into nominal resp. adverbial functions with the dramatic decrease of non-transpositional VPs – what we are now accustomed to call the "Polotskyan" or "Standard Theory". Historically and typologically, it is difficult to decide whether (a) precedes (b), (b) precedes (a), or the two are concomitant<sup>21</sup>: influenced as I am by Givón's theory of syntacticization as a diachronic process<sup>22</sup>, whereby tight syntax finds its origin in discourse constraints, I tend to view these progressive constraints on syntactic freedom as the cause eventually leading to a reduction of morphological variety. Ideally, in classical literary Egyptian the choice of a specific verbal form becomes predictable solely on the basis of its corresponding syntactic function. But as I have tentatively discussed elsewhere, the global "standardization" of Egyptian syntax and the distribution of verbal forms in nominal vs. adverbial is a progressive phenomenon that is likely to have found its origin in one specific opposition, namely the alternation between marked and unmarked *sḏm=f*, because this is the only manifest one at the morphological level.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Shisha-Halevy, *Orientalia* 58 (1989), 251; Satzinger, *WZKM* 79 (1989), 202 ff.

<sup>19</sup> Schenkel, *BiOr* 42 (1985), 485 ff.

<sup>20</sup> Kammerzell, *GM* 102 (1988), 41-57.

<sup>21</sup> For a discussion cf. Harris, in: *Recent Developments in Historical Phonology*, 159-172. Hock, *Principles of Historical Linguistic*, 366 ff. applies the teleological concept of simultaneous "conspiracy" of more than one factor in explaining syntactic change.

<sup>22</sup> E.g., Givón, *On Understanding Grammar*, 207 ff.

<sup>23</sup> I have recently observed that this is also the approach taken by current research in historical linguistics; e.g. Hock, *Principles of Historical Linguistic*, 378: "The sweeping generalizations which we can so often notice by comparing different chronological stages of a given language seem to result from a sometimes very long and complex series of extensions, none of which, taken by itself, is really 'sweeping'." Cf. example (48) in § 5 below for an analogically motivated non-paradigmatic reduplication.

A certain number of phenomena of Egyptian language history document the transition involved in this process. Consider, e.g., sentences (7) - (9), which are cases of apparent inversion, with a focalized AdvP occupying a syntactic position that in the paradigm of the classical language belongs to a NP<sup>24</sup>, as opposed to the regular patterns (10) - (12), in which the focalization invests the comment of an AdvS:

- (7) Pyr. 562 a-c<sup>N</sup> *jw m dd.t hnw.t=j mrw.t NN sm.t NN*  
*jw m dd.t hnw.t(=j) sm NN jm3.t NN m h.t n(j).t ntr.w*

"In your very act of giving, o my mistress, resides the love of the King and the help of the King; in your very act of giving, o my mistress, resides the help of the King and the graciousness of the King in the company of the Gods."<sup>25</sup>

- (8) Pyr. 671 a-b *ttw ttw tnj šm=k 'h' n NN*  
 "Serpent, serpent, where are you going? Wait for the King!"

- (9) Pyr. 681 a-b *tn(j) hrw prj m šnt*  
*mk NN NN pw hrw prj m šnt*  
 "Where is Horus who escaped from the serpent?  
 Here is the King: He is Horus who escaped from the serpent."

- (10) Pyr. 560 c *wnm NN jr dd=k*  
 "The King eats according to your giving."

- (11) Pyr. 914 c<sup>N</sup> *šm=k tnj šm NN jr p.t*  
 "Where are you going? The King is going to heaven."

- (12) Ti 111 *jw b3.t(j) tn(j)*  
 "Where is the shepherd?"

How are we to explain the leftward movement of the AdvP in cases such as (7) - (9)? We can of course invoke "emphasis," but this term has come to indicate so many contradictory concepts in Egyptological linguistics that one would feel compelled to specify each time what type of emphasis (topical, focal, etc.) we are referring to. Moreover, in the standard analysis of an AdvS the rhematic AdvP is supposed to be the element upon which the attentional stress is laid anyway: what need is there to "emphasize" it via thematization?

An answer to this question can be reached by observing the syntactic behavior of the only Egyptian binary construction in which a pragmatic stress unequivocally lies upon the first of the two components, i.e., the Cleft sentence, both the variety introduced by *jn /*

<sup>24</sup> Cf. the examples and the discussion by Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, §§ 219, 243 and n. 158 p. 523.

<sup>25</sup> The presence of the vocative *hnw.t=j* immediately following the verbal form makes it less likely for *mrw.t NN sm.t NN* to be the object of *dd=t* (according to the *jw-Ø-AdvP* pattern).

independent pronoun and the LEg variety with copula *p3*, for which structural antecedents in the classical language can be established (s. infra). In these patterns, the first element is the Focus, i.e., the pragmatically promoted element of the utterance, whereas the second is presented as its Presupposition, i.e., its pragmatically demoted component<sup>26</sup>. Example (9) is particularly interesting: the NP *NN pw* in the answer is in paradigmatic relation with the focal adverb *tn(j)* in the question. *Hrw prj m šnt* "Horus who escaped from the serpent," is clearly a presupposition already stored in the experience of the speaker, rather than a simple subject, which would have probably been resumed by a pronoun in the second hemistich. Ergo, the first element of the sentence (i.e., "Where" in the question and "the King" in the answer) is the pragmatic Focus, not simply the syntactic predicate of the sentence – an identification which is by no means automatic<sup>27</sup> and is in fact reversed in the following example<sup>28</sup>:

(13) CT I 44 a-b *prj m šnt.t prj m šnt.t hrw pw prj m šnt.t*

"Come out from the dispute, come out from the dispute, for even Horus came out of the dispute!"

This passage is interesting for two reasons: first, because in the second hemistich *S<sub>10</sub>C* displays a variant with focal independent pronoun (*twt hrw prj m šnt.t*), thus offering further cogency to the case for a paradigmatic relation between *jn-* and (some) *pw-* constructions; and second, because it exhibits a VP-predicate (i.e., the imperative *prj m šnt.t*) demoted to the rank of presupposition in the immediately following portion of discourse (i.e., the NS *hrw pw prj m šnt.t*), while still keeping of course, semantically, full predicative function. Therefore, we are led to posit for the sentence pattern *NN pw sdm(.w/.t)=f* of the early stages of Egyptian the same complementary distribution of pragmatic "markedness" vs. "unmarkedness" that characterizes LEg *NP p3/t3/n3-j.sdm(=f)*<sup>29</sup>: both conceal either a Focus-copula-Presupposition (= Cleft Sentence) or a Pred-copula-Subj (= Nominal Sentence) construction. A structurally opposite analysis is called for by example (12): here we have an interrogative adverb, which should be an emphasized AdvP (i.e., a focus) *per definitionem*, as predicate of a *jw*-sentence, although

<sup>26</sup> Loprieno, *JAAL* 1 (1988), 48 ff. Cf. now Doret, *RdE* 40 (1989), 59 ff.

<sup>27</sup> Loprieno, *JAAL* 1 (1988), 28 ff. This has been an area of (sometimes mainly terminological) disagreement between my friend F. Junge and me for some time, periodically emerging in written form: cf. now Junge, "Emphasis" and sentential meaning, 42-79.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. the discussion of this example and of the paradigmatic relation between the independent pronoun and the Noun + *pw* construction by Doret, *RdE* 40 (1989), 58.

<sup>29</sup> For a very insightful analysis see Satzinger, in: *Studies Polotsky*, 485 ff.



this is not the expected norm in the classical language;<sup>30</sup> in this syntactic surrounding, the standard theory would rather predict the use of a *wnn*-form.<sup>31</sup>

It appears, therefore, that in older Egyptian focalization is still – at least partially – a *free* phenomenon, possibly conveyed by suprasegmental features in the case of an otherwise unmarked syntactic structure like the nominal sentence Pred-Subj, or even by the leftward movement of an AdvP in the case of an adverbial sentence Topic-Comment, an extraposition which on the contrary is subject to severe restrictions in the classical paradigm (see § 3 below). How not to recognize in this evolution the effects of a *Systemzwang* whereby *all* AdvP – whether "background," "comment," or "focus" – are progressively confined to the rhematic position?

### 3 Focus

Let us now consider example (14), in which we observe another case of leftward movement of a focal AdvP ("Why?"):

(14) CT III 202 i *hr jšst jrj tm=k wnm(.w) ḥs zwr(.w) wzš.t n šwj.t ḥrw wd'w*  
 "Why don't you eat faeces and drink urine for the emptiness of Horus and Seth?"

as opposed to the more regular pattern (15), a typical example of Complex adverbial sentence:

(15) CT V 93 c-d *wd=j sw jrf<sup>32</sup> tn(w)*  
*ḏḏ=k sw m wzš.wt=s*  
 "Where should I put it? You should put it into her bilge-water."<sup>33</sup>

We encounter here another example of the phenomenon observed in § 2: that in older texts, the interrogative adverb can undergo focal extraposition, adopting the Focus–Presupposition sequence of the Cleft Sentence:

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Junge, *Syntax*, § 7.1.

<sup>31</sup> Polotsky, *Transpositions*, § 3.8.3.3. Locus classicus is Sin. B 43-44 *wnn jr=f t3 pf mj-m m-ḥmt=f* "How is this land without him?" But the counterevidence, although not frequent, is by no means exceptional: for other examples of *jw*-sentences in which the predicate is an interrogative construction cf. P. Vernus' article in this same volume.

<sup>32</sup> This is a "synchronically ananalyzable morph" representing in the CT a particularly frequent constituent of focal contexts, such as the interrogative pattern and the Cleft sentence: cf. Shisha-Halevy, *JAOS* 106 (1986), 641-658, especially 650 for this example.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Polotsky, *Orientalia* 38 (1969), 474.

- (16) CT V 89 d-90 a T<sub>1</sub>C *jn-m jrf z3.y=f n=n dp.t pn* (sic)  
*jnn=k sd pw n(j) znmm.ty dj<.n>=k sw m ph.wj=s(j)*  
*swt z3.y=f s(j)*

"Who will protect for us this boat?' – 'Now, you shall fetch the tail of the *znmm.ty*-animal and put it in her stern. This is what will protect her'."

This confirms the observation that in the linguistic stage from Pyr. through CT the pragmatic movement of focalization is still relatively free, the sequence Focus-Presupposition being marked as opposed both to the unmarked Topic-Comment sequence of the AdvS – in which case we have a structure AdvP-NP as in (14) instead of the regular structure NP-AdvP as in (15) – and to the unmarked Pred-Subj sequence of the NS – in which case we find the nominal Focus in thematic position as in (8), where the pattern is syntactically identical to the unmarked sequence, or in (16), where the focalized Subj<sup>34</sup> is extraposed. That this analysis is correct is shown by the existence, down to the classical language, of two different, yet related phenomena:

(a) the paradigmatic relation between patterns with and without *jn*, e.g. in the CT<sup>35</sup>, which seems to point to the existence of either a type of Cleft sentence without *jn* and without *pw*, marked just by the fronting of the focalized Subj, or to the non-focal character of some of the *jn*-constructions, especially with independent pronouns in a hierarchy of predictability<sup>36</sup>;

(b) the syntagmatic relation between a focalized AdvP and a following main sentence, in cases in which extraposed prepositional constructions *precede* a non-transpositional AdvS<sup>37</sup>, as in (17), or a VS, as in (18):

- (17) Adm. 14,14 *mj-m jrf zj nb hr sm3 sn=f*  
 "Why then is everyone killing his brother?"

- (18) Peas. B 1, 78-80 *m mrr=k m3=j snb.kw*  
*swdf=k sw '3 nn wšb r dd.t(j)=f nb.t*  
*jn-mrw.t wn=f hr dd*

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Loprieno, *JAAL* 1 (1988), 49-50.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Loprieno, in: *SAK. Beihefte* 3 (1988), 77-98; Doret, *RdE* 40 (1989), 54 ff.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. e.g. CT V 102 a-b *jn-m tr k(w) jj – jnk hk3.y* "Who are you who have come?" – "I am a magician." I am confident that not even Junge (*pace Emphasis and sentential meaning*, 21 ff.) would want to interpret the pragmatic distribution of foci in this dialogue as "Who are you who have come?" – "The magician, that's me."

<sup>37</sup> The linguistic and philological difficulties of the concept of "adverbial transposition" within the frame of the standard theory, especially as concerns substitution, is being revised by M. Collier in a series of interesting articles: cf. Collier, *JEA* 76 (1990), 73-85.

*gr jh jnj.t(w) n=n mdw=f m zh3 sdm=n st*

"If you really wish to see me happy, you shall keep him here without answering to anything he may say; in order to keep him talking, be silent, and let his speech be brought to us in writing, that we may hear it."

#### 4 Mood

Let us now return to examples (14) - (16) and consider more closely the morphology of the verbal forms exhibited in these sentences. Example (14) displays *tm=k wnm(.w) hs zwr(.w) wzš.t*, negative counterpart of a nominal form; but in example (15), *wd=j* has to be a "prospective" (*wdj.w=j*)<sup>38</sup>, whereas *dd=k* is clearly the present emphatic; in example (16) both syntax (= Cleft sentence structure) and morphology (= the ending .y) concur to characterize the form *z3.y=f < z3j* again as prospective.<sup>39</sup> While on the one side the similarity of function between the emphatic *jrr=f* and the prospective *jrj.w=f*, on the other side the possibility of independent uses of the subjunctive *jw.t=f* have been established<sup>40</sup>, the prospective being *inter alia* the perfective counterpart of the emphatic as nominal transposition<sup>41</sup>, the subjunctive the 1st and 3rd person counterpart of the imperative<sup>42</sup>, there are still many problems that await clarification:

- (a) the semantic relation between prospective and subjunctive;
- (b) the relation between the two OEg paradigms (prospective / subjunctive) and the unitary MEg prospective *sdm=f*;
- (c) the existence of autonomous future circumstantial transpositions.

---

<sup>38</sup> Vs. "emphatic" *wdd=j* and "subjunctive" *dj=j*: for the morphology of this verb cf. Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, §§ 164 ff., 390.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Schenkel, *BiOr* 42 (1985), 488-490.

<sup>40</sup> Polotsky, *Transpositions*, § 2.7 and Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, §§ 364 ff. for a detailed analysis of the distribution of inflected forms.

<sup>41</sup> Incomprehensible remain to me the arguments of Satzinger, *BiOr* 44 (1987), 619; *WZKM* 79 (1989), 207 against my view (Loprieno, *Verbalsystem*) that prospectivity is a subcategory of perfectivity, a connection that I am by no means alone in seeing perspicuously documented both in Egyptian and in many other languages. The fact that perfectivity inevitably contains the closure marker is exactly the reason why this concept can englobe prospectivity as one of its subcategories, the latter displaying the closure marker at its beginning rather than at its end.

<sup>42</sup> Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, §§ 255 f. Cf., e.g., Pyr. 1160b-61P' *dd dd ntt jm=k dd(.w) jw.tt bwt ntr zn.t mdw(.w) j.nd.t(j)=j jm=k dd(.w) wj jnk z3=k jnk jw'w* "Speaker, say what exists, but do not say what does not exist: God abominates doing violence to the words. I shall be greeted: do not speak of me, for I am your son, I am the heir." The close connection between Subjunctive and Imperative is also very evident in the negative forms, cf. § 5 below.

These three questions are closely interrelated, and in the light of the former paragraphs I would like to argue that allowing for a more complex interplay of syntactic and pragmatic functions in earlier stages of Egyptian as opposed to the more rigid syntactic codification of the classical literary language can take care of some of these problems. First of all, the category of non-realized perfectivity (as opposed to the theoretical 1:1 correspondence in the "imperfective") seems to have plenty of nominal, but no autonomous adverbial forms: apparently, the unmarked (circumstantial) *sdm=f* is used for all tenses, whereas circumstantial uses of both prospective and subjunctive are somewhat opaque, being limited for the former to the one *PT*-example in a *juw*-sentence, and for the latter to the clause of purpose, whose adverbial character looks very clear at the theoretical level<sup>43</sup> but requires supplementary comments because of its negation with *tm* in Classical Egyptian<sup>44</sup>. While it is of course possible to allow for a NP with adverbial function (one need only think of the use of nouns as AdvPs), prospective and subjunctive themselves have primarily nominal, but also independent functions:

	NOMINAL FUNCTIONS	INDEPENDENT USES
PROSPECTIVE	(a) as NP of complex AdvS (b) in balanced sentences (c) in Cleft sentences (d) as object of verbs of wish (e.g., <i>mrj</i> ) (e) after prepositions	(a) after negative <i>nj</i> (b) as passive form
SUBJUNCTIVE	(a) as object of verbs of command (e.g., <i>rdj</i> ) (b) in clauses of purpose (negation with <i>jm</i> , cf. § 5)	(a) after negative <i>nj</i> ( <i>zp</i> ) (b) in optative/jussive sentences (negation with <i>jm</i> , cf. § 5)

<sup>43</sup> Cf. the discussion of purpose clauses as "oblique" (i.e., adverbial) clauses in Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, 172 ff.

<sup>44</sup> Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, §§ 285-290; Edel, *AäG*, §§ 1108, 1116; Gardiner, *EG*, § 347, 4. Cf. also § 5 below.

Thus, the label "nominal" appears insufficient to describe the full range of their functions as well as their reciprocal connection with the nominal form *par excellence*, i.e., the emphatic *sdm=f*, the more so since some features, like the negation with *jm*, are common to both nominal and independent uses. Each of the following tentative hypotheses is meant to suggest the possibility that other oppositions (beside the syntactic – "nominal" vs. "adverbial" – and the temporal/aspectual – "unmarked" vs. "prospective") played a role in the paradigm of these forms in the earlier stage of Egyptian:

(a) The Prospective is more "presuppositional" than the Emphatic, and tends to be preceded or followed by a Focus (in the future Cleft sentence resp. in the Complex AdvS); the Emphatic is more "topical" than the Prospective, and tends to be followed by a Comment. Let us consider this CT-passage<sup>45</sup>:

(19) CT V 92 f-g "To what should I fasten it? – To the haunches that separate the shanks."

T<sub>1</sub>C *s:mn.y(=j) sw jrf hr jšst - hr mn.tj wp.t(j) hnd.wj*  
 Sq<sub>1</sub>Sq *s:mn.w(=j) sw jr(j) hr jšst - hr mn.tj wp.t(j) hnd.wj*  
 Sq<sub>2</sub>Sq *s:mn.w(=j) sw jr(j) hr jš[.....]p.t(j) hnd.wj*  
 Sq<sub>1</sub>C *s:mn.y[.....]hr jšst - hr[.....], vs.*  
 M<sub>2</sub>C *s:mn(=j) sw jrf hr jšst - smn=k sw hr wp.t hnd.y*

In the variants with AdvP-Focus, in which the focus-only answer consists of an AdvP, the verbal forms display the prospective *w*-suffix; on the contrary, in the only case in which the answer is represented by a complete topic-comment sentence, the verbal form does not display the *w*-suffix and is probably to be analyzed as emphatic *sdm=f*.

(b) Being more presuppositional, the Prospective appears more often in marked (e.g., interrogative) sentences (with a sequence Focus-Presupposition if Focus = NP as in T<sub>1</sub>C, vs. Presupposition-Focus if Focus = AdvP as in T<sub>1</sub>Be, cf. however § 3)<sup>46</sup>, the Emphatic in categorical statements (as in the answer to this question, preserved only in T<sub>1</sub>C)<sup>47</sup>:

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Polotsky, *Orientalia* 38 (1969), 473.

<sup>46</sup> In this context it is interesting to note that interrogative sentences in Egyptian also display a formal marker of their focal character, i.e., the introductory particle *jn*: Loprieno, in: *SAK. Beihefte* 3 (1988), 77 ff.

<sup>47</sup> As is frequently the case in the CT, answers do not always semantically correspond to the preceding questions in the same coffin. As I have already written in the case of another contrastive analysis based on CT-testimonies (Loprieno, in: *SAK. Beihefte* 3 [1988], 77 ff.), I am of course aware of the fact that plain mistakes have indeed abundantly intervened into the transmission of the CT, but I think that in many cases

(20) CT V 90 e-f<sup>48</sup>

T<sub>1</sub>C *jn-m jrf jn(j.w)=f n=k s(j) hn'=j* "Who should bring her to you with me?"

Sq<sub>1</sub>C *jnn=j n=k s(j) jrf hn'-m* "With whom shall I bring her to you?"

T<sub>1</sub>Be *jn(j.w)=j n=k s(j) jrf hn'-m* "With whom should I bring her to you?", vs.

T<sub>1</sub>C *jnn=k s(j) hn' nfr ntr.w* "You shall bring her with the best of the Gods."

Sq<sub>1</sub>C *jnn=k n=j s(j) hn' nfr ntr.w* "You shall bring her to me with the best of the Gods."

T<sub>1</sub>Be *jnn=k n=j s(j) hn' nfr ...* "You shall bring her to me with the best ..."

(c) The relative frequency of a Prospective in the (1st person) question as opposed to an Emphatic in the (2nd person) answer – cf. examples (15) - (19) - (20) – and the paradigmatic relation between Subjunctive and Imperative as independent VPs would suggest that *modality*<sup>49</sup> may be originally a relevant category in the alternation between Prospective, Subjunctive and Emphatic. In the classical system, where all forms are syntactically bound, Prospective and Subjunctive merge as "grammatical" mood (i.e., determined primarily by the syntactic environment) in what we call the MEg "prospective *s<sub>dm</sub>=f*" (whose morphological paradigm also represents a juxtaposition of the two, combining prospective – e.g., the sporadic *w > y*-suffix in the 3.inf. – and subjunctive features – e.g., the *t*-suffix in *jnj* and *jwj*). Here are some grammatical elements whose presence suggests a "modal" reading of the early opposition between Subjunctive and Emphatic:

(aa) Questions are *per definitionem* more modal than answers<sup>50</sup>: in the history of Egyptian one can detect persuasive examples of this higher "modality," e.g., in the functional evolution experienced by the Greek particle *μή* in its adoption in Coptic (MH): it represents in Greek the modal counterpart of *οὐ*(κ), being used with imperative, subjunctive and optative<sup>51</sup>; in questions it is used whenever a negative answer is expected, but in Coptic it loses its modal features, becoming a sheer marker of rhetoric question<sup>52</sup>.

(bb) Prospective and Subjunctive are used as objects of *different* types of verbs: of wish for the former, e.g., *mrj* vs. of command for the latter, e.g. *rdj*, thus showing their

---

the testimonies, even if philologically incorrect, can provide useful insights into the linguistic categories of the language, since in many instances the resulting text is (re)organized within a new specific cotext.

<sup>48</sup> Polotsky, *Orientalia* 38 (1969), 473.

<sup>49</sup> I rely on the recent analysis by Palmer, *Mood and Modality*.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 30 f., 81.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 41 f.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. the discussion by Horn, *Untersuchungen*, 137.

potential syntactic independence as VPs<sup>53</sup>. This is not the case with the Emphatic, which cannot be the direct object of such a verb<sup>54</sup>, while it can indeed, needless to say, represent the substantivization of a *ju*-sentence<sup>55</sup>. A short explanation may be in order here: *js*, much like *pw* (§ 3), is a marker of theticity rather than of modality. In fact, "explanation" is one of the most typical domains for thetic expressions<sup>56</sup>, in which both subject and predicate convey cotextually *new* information and are actualized via a pronoun (> eventually conjunction) such as *wnt/ntt* or a particle such as *js*:

(21) CT I 28c - 29a B<sub>1</sub>P *sdm=sn dd.t=f nb.t nfr m hrww pn*  
*ntt swt js šw.t tw pw wbn.t m t3-ntr*

"May they hear all the good things he says on this day, i.e., that he owns this feather which appears in God's land."<sup>57</sup>

(22) Pyr. 1862 a-b<sup>N</sup> *dd=tn hr r'w wnt=f jj(.w) m ntr*  
 "You will say to Re that he has come as God."

<sup>53</sup> Cf. the distribution of *iubeo* + Indicative vs. *impero* + subjunctive in Latin.

<sup>54</sup> Loprieno, *GM* 102 (1988), 68 ad Doret, *Narrative Verbal System*, 49-50. I do not understand any of the arguments by Satzinger, *WZKM* 79 (1989), 217 f. against my generalization that in all cases in which an Emphatic appears to be used as object of a verb of wish or command, it is in fact the complex AdvS that represents its object:

(1) we would definitely not expect *js* in a sentence like Urk. I 301, 3-6, since this particle introduces only "assertive" object sentences introduced by verbs such as *rh* or *dd*: cf. Gilula, *JEA* 57 (1971), 16 f.; Allen, *GM* 32 (1979), 8-9; id., in: *Crossroad*, 17-18. Therefore, *js* is a metalinguistic operator: *dd=j "X"* vs. *wđ=j X*. Cf. Horn, *A Natural History of Negation*, 379-82.

(2) as far as the "inhaltliche Auffassung" is concerned, I believe that by now it should be *opinio communis* that the presence of a marked form is dictated in the classical literary language by the *syntactic* presence of an AdvP as rheme, and surely not always by its actual *pragmatic* focality: Urk. I 301, 3-5 *ju wđ.n hm(=j) srr=f jrr=f qd m zp3.wt (j)ptn hft wđ=k jrr=f m whm(.w)=k* "My Majesty commanded that he become an official and that he acquire a good reputation in these nomes in accordance with your command that he be your herold," i.e.:

(a) *wđ* + [S<sub>1</sub>]

(b) [S<sub>1</sub>] → [*srr=f, jrr=f qd m zp3.wt jptn*]NP [*hft wđ=k* + [S<sub>2</sub>]]AdvP

(c) [S<sub>2</sub>] → [*jrr=f*]NP [*m whm.w=k*]AdvP

(3) for a possible answer to Satzinger's question about the (semantic?) reason for the presence of an Emphatic *jrr=f* in this example cf. (cc) below.

<sup>55</sup> E.g. Urk. I 61, 14 *sk hm rh.t(j) mrr(=j) tw* ← \**sk hm rh.tj [ju mrj=j tw]*. For a somewhat different approach cf. J. Allen's article in this same volume.

<sup>56</sup> Sasse, *Linguistics* 25, 3 (1987), 566.

<sup>57</sup> Doret, *RdE* 40 (1989), 59; cf. also id., *RdE* 41 (1990), 50.

(23) Pyr. 1490 a *dd=k wnn js NN <p>n m 'b=sn*  
 "You will say that this King will be among them."

But with epistemic or deontic verbs<sup>58</sup> such as *wḏ*, *mrj*, *rdj*, etc., the embedded sentence represents itself the scope of the modal verb: it does not need any actualizer nor is it introduced by *js*<sup>59</sup>.

(cc) In the formation period of the literary language, the Emphatic progressively becomes syntactically bound as NP, but it still keeps clear memories of early modal functions:

(24) Urk. I 223,17 - 224,3 *j rmt.w nb šm.w m-ḥd jw(.w) m-ḥnt 'nh n=tn nzw*  
*'nh n=tn ntr nt(j) tn hr=f dd=tn n(=j) t' ḥ(n)q.t m ntt m-'=tn f33[=tn] m '.wj=tn*  
*wdn=tn m r'=tn*

"O everyone who goes north or who comes south, as the King lives for you, as the god whom you worship lives for you, give me bread and bier from your possession, whether you bring it with your hands or you offer it orally."<sup>60</sup>

(25) Heqanakhte I, 5 *dd=sn st jm gr*  
 "They shall also use it there" (with 3rd person jussive)

(26) Heqanakhte I, 17 *dd=k n=f ḥq3.t 8 m jtj-mhj n 3bd*  
 "You shall give him 8 ḥq3.t of lower Egyptian barley a month," and even

(27) Heqanakhte I, vs. 15 *dd=j-wg n=k hr-jh*  
 "Why do I have to punish you?" (with 1st person "compulsive"<sup>61</sup>), down to the famous

(28) Sin. B 236 *jrr hm=k m mrr=f*  
 "Let Your Majesty act as it pleases him" (with 2nd person "hortative.")

(dd) An opposition between a "mood of command" (Subjunctive) vs. a "mood of wish" (Prospective) is suggested by the different behavior of these two forms with passive.

<sup>58</sup> Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, 51 ff. resp. 96 ff.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Gardiner, *EG*, § 442.1.

<sup>60</sup> Edel, *AäG*, § 505 already noticed: "Varianten zu dieser Formel [scil.: with emphatic *sḏm=f*] haben *ddk3tn m r' in wdnw m 'in* [...], ersetzen also die geminierte Form durch die *sḏmk3f*-Form bezw. durch den Imperativ."

<sup>61</sup> Cf. contrastively the "advisory" use of the 1st person Prospective in example (15) above.



While in the latter, which is *per se* a perfective form, diathesis remains predictably unmarked, passivity being itself, like prospectivity, a subcategory of perfectivity<sup>62</sup>:

- (29) Pyr. \*1969b-1970b *s:p3.w (j)r=f NN m jšst*  
*jnj.k3.t(j) n=k [hn]w (...) s:p3=k jm*

"With what will the King be caused to fly?' – 'Let the *hnw*-bark be brought to you (...). It is with it that you shall be caused to fly'."

the former undergoes the *tj-* > *tw*-insertion, thus showing its closer connection with active "factuality" or "factivity" as opposed to the diathetically more neutral "wish" or "expectation" typical for the prospective<sup>63</sup>:

- (30) Pyr. 1160b-61P' *dd dd ntt jm=k dd(.w) jw.tt bwt ntr zn.t mdw(.w)*  
*j.nd.t(j)=j jm=k dd(.w) wj jnk z3=k jnk jw'w*

"Speaker, say what exists, but do not say what does not exist: the God abominates doing violence to the words. I shall be greeted: do not speak of me, for I am your son, I am the heir."

- (31) Pyr. 1253M *dj=t 'wj=t(j) jr NN hms NN jmjw.t(j) ntr.wj '3.w(j)*  
*hnt s.wt NN*  
*šzp.t(j) '=f jr šh.t htp hms NN m-m sb3.w jmj.w p.t*

"May you give your arms to the King, that he may sit between the two Great Gods, his places being to the front; let his arm be taken to the Field of Offering, that the King may sit amongst the stars of the sky."

In examples (30) and (31) the Subjunctive is used as an independent form.

- (32) Pyr. 392b *jj.n NN hr=t j.dj<sup>64</sup> j.wn.tj n=f nw*  
 "The King has come to you: let these be opened for him."

(ee) An evolution of the expression of modality similar to the one I suggest for Egyptian, from a pragmatically free to a syntactically bound mood, is documented in other languages as well: one might think of the evolution of the subjunctive in some Indo-European languages, e.g., from a true mood in Ancient Greek and Latin, where it primarily appears in main sentences, to sheer indicator of syntactic subordination in Modern Greek and Romance; or of the Central Sem. prefix conjugation form in *-a* (*\*yaqtula*), from

<sup>62</sup> For this discussion cf. Loprieno, *Verbalsystem*, 38 ff.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, §§ 485-562. Allen is much more informed (and prudent) than the present writer, and does indeed offer isolated examples showing deviations from the tendency I have just discussed, but I would tend to find alternative analyses for cases of, say, prospective passive *sdm.w.tj=f* or of a verb of wish followed by a subjunctive *sdm.tj=f* in the PT.

<sup>64</sup> For the augment *j* as marker of "transitivity" and "activity" cf. F. Kammerzell's article in this volume.

syntactically independent indicator of mood in the Heb. Cohortative (*'eqt<sup>e</sup>lâ*) to syntactically bound subordination morpheme in the Arab. Subjunctive (*yaqtula*).

One might, therefore, establish the following distribution of the tendency of the four early Egyptian "moods" to appear in discourse<sup>65</sup>:

	COMMAND (resp. main sentence)	WISH (resp. dependent clause)
1ST PERSON	Subjunctive	Prospective
2ND PERSON	Imperative	Emphatic
3RD PERSON	Subjunctive	Prospective/Emphatic

## 5 Negative forms

However, if we accept the possibility of a broader intervention of modality into the structure of an Egyptian sentence in the early stages of its development, we need to partially revise the list of sentence types admitted within the Standard theory. Specifically, we shall have to posit the existence, in the same syntactic structure, e.g., the Complex AdvS, of an "unmarked" Topic-Comment vs. a "marked" Presupposition-Focus sequence: does the sentence *Pyr. 475b zh3 NN m db' wrj* express an unmarked "The King writes with the big finger," or rather a marked "It is with the big finger (the implication being: "and not with the little one") that the King writes"? In this last paragraph of my paper I will argue that the study of negative forms can prove very useful in this respect, since the Egyptian negative system grammaticalized pragmatic oppositions conveyed by the same syntactic structure in their positive counterpart.

As a transition from the last paragraph, let us begin with the verbs *tm* and *jm*, which represent two modal negators, the first being "existential," the second "deontic": while in the PT their use is primarily dictated by modal oppositions, as can be seen from the use of *tm* in assertive<sup>66</sup> and conditional clauses, but of *jm* in the clause of purpose, in

<sup>65</sup> This system tends to be progressively superseded by the syntactically bound "standard system," in which Prospective and Subjunctive have merged into the *s<sub>d</sub>m=f* "prospective" function, whose morphology partakes of both older forms, and in which Emphatic is only syntactically determined by the presence of an AdvP-comment/focus.

<sup>66</sup> *Pyr. 998 m=tn nw dd(.w).n=tn ntr.w tm NN wnn(.w) m hnt=tn m=tn NN mn(.w) m hnt=tn m jmnw n sm3* "Look at what you said, gods, namely that the King would not be at your head: look, the King is now established at your head as a victorious bull."

MEg it solely depends on the syntactic surrounding: *jm* appears in the imperative and other independent jussive sentences, *tm* in any dependent clause (whether conditional, causal, temporal, of purpose, etc.). For the early difference between the two, let us consider a passage like:

- (33) Pyr. 696 e-g<sup>T</sup>                    *hdn.wt hdn.wt*  
   *(j)m jn(j.w) stj hdn=t (j)r NN*  
   *tm.hr=t jn(j.w) stj hdn=t (j)r NN*

"*Hdn*-plant, *hdn*-plant!

Do not bring the smell of your *hdn*-plant to the King!

You should not bring the smell of your *hdn*-plant to the King!"

While the first sentence, having a negative Imperative, is syntactically a clear VS, the second sentence displays contradictory indications: the use of the "contingent Aorist" *sdm.hr=f*<sup>67</sup> would point to an analysis as independent VP, while the combined appearance of the negative verb *tm* and of a more or less emphasized AdvP *jr NN* would recommend its interpretation as Complex AdvS<sup>68</sup>. But such an analysis has one major drawback, i.e., the problematic scope of the negation<sup>69</sup>. In a sequence of negative sentences in climax of emphasis, one would only expect the scope of the negation, and no other component of the sentence, to receive pragmatic *Nachdruck* in the second statement:

- (34) (a) Don't bring the smell to the King!  
       (b) Don't bring the smell *to the King*!

But the negation would semantically affect in this case the focalized AdvP, not the verbal form, which would become a (positive) presupposition. In other words, while the scope of the negation is ambiguous in (a), being either the predicative nexus (*2nd person, bring*), the object NP (*the smell*), or the AdvP (*to the King*), it has been inevitably narrowed to AdvP in (b), although in one of the possible surface structures of this sentence in English, namely (b), the negative indicator (*don't*) is added to Pred (*bring*)<sup>70</sup>. But Egyptian already has a grammatical pattern for this type of focal negation, i.e., the discontinuous morpheme *n ...js*:

<sup>67</sup> Depuydt, *Orientalia* 58 (1989), 1-27, especially 10 f. for a discussion of example (33) under a different perspective, namely the discourse implication of the use of this contingent tense. Within my "dynamic" view of the formation of MEg, I find it symptomatic that of all examples discussed by Depuydt, this OEg sentence is the only case in which the analysis as a contingent tense is not co(n)textually cogent.

<sup>68</sup> Polotsky, *Orientalia* 38 (1969), 472 f.

<sup>69</sup> For the theoretical frame cf. now the monumental Horn, *A Natural History of Negation*, from whose insights I have largely profited in conceiving this paragraph. I therefore see no need to refer here to separate portions of this important book.

<sup>70</sup> But cf. a semantically and pragmatically identical solution of the type: "*Not to the King* you should bring the smell."

- (35) Pyr. 475 b-c                    *zh3 NN m db' wrj*  
     *nj zh3=f js m db' šrr*

"The King writes with the big finger;  
 it is not with the little finger that the King writes."

Here it is evident that Pred is positive: "the King writes," the negated element being the focal AdvP: "but only with the big finger, not with the little one." This also allows us to give a temporary answer to the question at the beginning of this paragraph, Pyr. 475 b emerging *per viam negationis* as a clear example of Cleft sentence. This type of negation is known among semioticians as "contrary." For Egyptological purposes, let us formalize it in the following way:

Rel(Topic, Comment)∅ vs. Rel(Presupp, Focus)*nj...js*

which means that in a sentence with *n .. js*, the scope of the negation is its *pragmatic Focus*. In the preceding paragraphs, we have seen that there are basically three pragmatically marked structures in Egyptian, i.e., (a) the subject-focused Cleft sentence with *jn*, including the formally identical Participial sentence, (b) thethetic statement with *pw*, including the formally identical Nominal sentence, and (c) the AdvS with focal AdvP, including the formally identical Complex AdvS with marked rhematic VP (whether circumstantial form or complementary Infinitive). These are precisely the constructions negated by *nj.. js*<sup>71</sup>.

Ad (a):

- (36) Pyr. 1324 a<sup>P</sup>                    *nj jn js NN pn dd nn jr=tn ntr.w*<sup>72</sup>  
 "It is not this King who tells you these things, o Gods!"

- (37) CT VII 18 w-y                    *nj jnk js m(w)t hm r'=f jnk rh tpj-t3=f sh3 jmn.t*  
 "I am not a deceased of unknown reputation: I am someone who is well known among his descendents and remembered by the West."<sup>73</sup>

Ad (b):

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Gilula, *JEA* 56 (1970), 208 ff. I shall discuss below a few conceptual problems in Gilula's analysis, which has become *communis opinio* in Egyptology.

<sup>72</sup> In later texts, such as the CT, the redundant focality marker *nj jn js* appears replaced by the simpler constructions *nj NP js* or even *nj js NP*, as shown by Doret, *RdE* 40 (1989), 60 ff.

<sup>73</sup> This is a good example of the pressure of formal patterns as opposed to pragmatic yield: in example (37) the subject *jn* is certainly not focal, since the nominal predicate conveys in both cases new information within the flow of discourse (not a deceased of unknown reputation, but on the contrary a well known one), and yet this sentence type is negated by *nj .. js* because of its formal identity with focalized patterns.

- (38) Pyr. 1233 b<sup>P</sup> *NN pw dhwtj nd tn nj NN js pw sth jtj s(j)*  
 "The King is Thoth-who-protected-you, he is not Seth-who-took-it-away."
- (39) Urk. I 250, 10 *nj gmj.t.n=(=j) js pw m-‘ hrj-tp wn m sp3.t tn tp-‘.wj*  
 "This is something that I have not found by any nomarch who had been in this nome earlier" < \* *nj jh.t js pw gmj.t.n=j* etc., with deletion of the indefinite antecedent *jh.t*.
- (40) pBM 10059, 25c *jr rn.w=sn m3‘ nn rh.tw=f js pw*  
 "As far as their true names are concerned – this cannot possibly be known."

Westendorf<sup>74</sup> correctly perceived the problem posed by the lack of congruence between the plural topic (*rn.w=sn*) and the coreferential singular suffix (=f), connecting this anomaly with the cases in which a plural noun followed by *nb* is treated as a singular in its pronominal congruence. But while the semantic nature of the quantifier *nb* provides a good explanation for its syntactic tendency to privilege singular congruence, this does not seem to be the case here. I would suggest that the irregularity is motivated by the focus-only, i.e., thetic nature of this sentence, in which *pw* serves as "dummy" Subj: "there is (*pw*) no way (*nn...js*) of knowing such a thing (*rh.tw=f*)."

Ad (c):

- (41) Pyr. 333a-c<sup>T</sup> *m=k NN pr(j.w) m=k NN jw=f*  
*nj jw.n=f js ds=f jn jpw.wt=tn jn(j.w)t sw*  
 "Look, the King has come! Look, the King comes!  
 But he has not come spontaneously: your messages have fetched him!"
- (42) Pyr. 134a<sup>N</sup> *h3 NN nj sm.n=k js m(w)t.tj*  
*sm.n=k ‘nh.t(j)*  
 resp. Pyr. 833a *h3 NN pw sm.n=k ‘nh=k*  
*nj sm.n=k js m(w)t=k<sup>75</sup>*
- (43) Pyr. \*1947 Nt<sup>b</sup> *h3 NN pw nj m(w)t.n=k js m(w)t.t*  
*‘nh.n=k ‘nh.t m ‘b=sn 3hj.w j.hm.w-sk(j.w)*

<sup>74</sup> Westendorf, *GMT*, §§ 128cc, 351e. Within this model, it becomes easy to solve the author's difficulty in dealing with the difference between a *nj*- and a *tm*-negation of the *pw*-sentence, cf. § 346 "ob daher *pw* zu streichen ist?" ad example (6) above: in pEbers 855 e *jr ‘md jb tm mdw.t h3.tj pw* (*ibid.*, § 363) the scope of the negation is not a prospective (i.e., VP), but an emphatic (i.e., NP) *sdm=f*: "this means that the heart does not speak." Consequently, while *nj msj=s* is by itself a well-formed sentence, transformed by means of *pw* into a "diagnosis," into a "thetic judgment," \**tm mdw.t h3.tj* is not: pEbers 855 e is an example of a "simple" bipartite *pw*-sentence, whereas pBerlin 3038, 194 offers an example of a complex embedded structure, which itself of course can be an AdvS with an emphatic *sdm=f* as subject: cf. *ibid.*, § 226.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. CT I 187e.

"O King, you haven't really died;  
you have become alive together with them – the imperishable stars."

Rather than a *propositional* negation, contrariety is in fact a *term* negation, affecting the predicate (better: the focus) itself rather than the relation between a subject and a predicate, i.e., what in logics and in linguistics (but not in Egyptology) is called the predicative nexus, or simply the "nexus." This is ultimately the reason why the relation of contrariety tends to be marked (focal,thetic, etc.). The unmarked, "categorical" negation is expressed by a different type of opposition, called "contradictory": the scope of the negation is here the nexal relation between a predicative base and a predicate. In Egyptian, the contradictory negation is expressed by the basic negative particle *nj*, the resulting structure being widely recognized as the negative counterpart of a *jw*-sentence<sup>76</sup>:

Rel(Subj, Pred)<sub>jw</sub> vs. Rel(Subj, Pred)<sub>nj</sub>

(44) Pyr. 2117-2118a<sup>N</sup>                      *jw ḥ3.n(=j) ṭw nj s:mḥ.w(=j) ṭw*  
"I have mourned you, I shall not forget you."

(45) Ptaḥhotep 13-14                      *r' gr(.w) nj mdw.n=f*  
   *jb tm.w nj šḥ3.n=f sf*

"The mouth is silent, and cannot speak;  
the heart is dumb, and cannot remember yesterday."

(46) Pyr. 1931b-c<sup>Na</sup>                      *3ḥ.k(j) n=k nj wzṭ(=j) n=k*  
"I am useful for you! I am not useless to you!"

A few explanatory words are required here. While the difference in use between simple *nj* and *nj...js*, thanks mainly to Gilula's work, has been very well understood for some time, our Egyptological conceptual frame has remained somewhat opaque: following Gilula, we now mistakenly call "sentence nexus" the relation between a NP ("logical subject") and an AdvP ("logical predicate") negated by *nj..js*<sup>77</sup>, whereas everyone else defines in this way the *propositional* relation between (categorical) subject and predicate. We could of course decide that we want to ignore what happens "in some quarters of linguistics"<sup>78</sup>, namely among the insignificant minority of linguists who are not Egyptologists as well, if this did not have an unfortunate Egyptological consequence as well, i.e., the fact that *nj* is then

<sup>76</sup> Polotsky, *Transpositions*, §§ 4.1.

<sup>77</sup> *Pars pro toto* Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, § 338.

<sup>78</sup> I borrow this plastic description from Junge, *"Emphasis" and sentential meaning*, 41 n. 9. By the way: I never took the term "logical predicate" to be used in Egyptology in the same "unfortunate" way as in some quarters of linguistics; I know very well that this is not the case. But I think it *should* be the case, and on the whole I advocate the use of a less idiosyncratic terminology in Egyptological linguistics.

inevitably taken to be the *term* negator<sup>79</sup>, which is obviously wrong: this would make *nj* the focal negator and destroy its functional symmetry with the prototype of a sentence-marker, namely *iw*. In this respect, an interesting example is offered by

(47) Pyr. 232a *swt jj (j)r NN nj šm NN (j)r=f*  
 "He is the one who came against the king: the king didn't go against him"

which brings us back to two observations contained above: (a) that the Cleft sentence is a subject-focus, deep-structurally verbal sentence, as is shown by the use of a categorical VS *nj šm NN jr=f* as negative counterpart of *swt jj jr NN*<sup>80</sup>; (b) that the scope of the particle *nj* is the propositional nexus between a subject (*NN*) and a predicate (*šm jr=f*).

Let us return now to example (33). We have just seen that in a pragmatically marked negative sentence the scope of the *nj...js*-negation is the focus, the presupposition keeping its positive character: the King does indeed write, but not with the little finger, he has indeed come, but not on his own, etc. On the other side, we know that the *tm*-negation, being the nominal negation *par excellence*, is in a way functionally symmetrical to *nj...js*: it is used in sentences where the adverbial focus is positive (example: "Why?"), the scope of the negation being the presuppositional VP, as in the *locus classicus* of pWestcar 6, 5 (*tm=t hnj.w hr-m*)

Rel(Theme, Rheme) $\emptyset$  vs. Rel(Presupp, Focus)*tm*

But in (33) neither is it possible to take *jr NN* as focus, in which case it would inevitably be the scope of the negation and thus negated by *nj...js*, nor is it likely for *tm.hr=t jnj.w stj hdn=t* to be a negative presupposition, because *sdm.hr=f* is usually a VP. The solution appears once more to be a recourse to *modal* oppositions: if we go back to our diagram containing the tentative distribution of early Egyptian moods in discourse, we could ascribe *jm* to the category of Command > syntactic independence (Subjunctive / Imperative), and *tm* to the category of Wish > syntactic dependence (Prospective / Emphatic): "Don't bring the smell of the *hdn*-plant to the King, please don't!"

The use of the *sdm.hr=f*-form provides syntactic autonomy as VP, the opposition between *jm* and *tm* being originally parallel to the one between Subjunctive / Imperative on the one side and Prospective / Emphatic on the other. With the reorganization of the verbal system at the end of the OK and the emergence of "standard" MEG, Subjunctive and

<sup>79</sup> Gilula, *JEA* 56 (1970), 208: "The great difference between the negative *n ... is* and the negative *n* is that *n* negates the word to which it is adjacent whereas *n ... is* does not. *n ... is* is the negation of the predicative nexus in the following patterns [...]"

<sup>80</sup> To be sure, the distribution of information foci is not identical in the positive vs. the negative part of this discourse segment, the former being cleft, the latter being unmarked. An equal pragmatic distribution between the two would have probably required a negative counterpart of the type *\*nj NN js pw šm jr=f*, whereas a focal *Nachdruck* on AdvP would have yielded *\*nj šm NN js jr=f*.

Prospective merge into one paradigm, thus breaking the old "solidarity" between the former and Imperative resp. the latter and Emphatic; *jm* is used only in independent VPs, *tm* in all cases of syntactic dependence, as nominal transposition but also in dependent clauses – which also explains why VP in the clause of purpose is circumstantial but *tm*-negated: circumstantial because of its function within the "second verbal system,"<sup>81</sup> *tm*-negated because of its original modality and its syntactic dependence<sup>82</sup>.

This interpretation of the evolution of *tm* clarifies in my opinion a few irregularities exhibited by the syntax of the "balanced sentence." While it is known that this syntactic structure consists of two nominal transpositions (emphatic or prospective<sup>83</sup>), the behavior of its negative counterparts is more difficult to formalize<sup>84</sup>:

(48) CT V 326 g-h 
$$jw=k \ r=j \ dd=j \ r=k$$
  

$$tmm=k \ jw(.w) \ r=j \ tm=j \ dd(.w) \ n=k$$

"If you come to me, I shall speak to you,  
 but if you don't come to me, I shall not."

Here both nominal transpositions are predictably negated by the corresponding emphatic form of the verb *tm* followed by the negational complement. The non-paradigmatic reduplication in *tmm=k* is probably the result of analogic pressures or *Systemzwang*, whereby reduplication was perceived as being the most specific feature of topical VPs; similar cases are documented for the stative as well<sup>85</sup>. And in fact, the first correlate of a balanced sentence is indeed more "topical" (or "nominal") than the second, as one can observe in examples (49) - (50), in which the first of the two forms is negated by *tm*, whereas the second is treated as an independent VP:

(49) CT V 323 h-i 
$$jw=k \ r=j \ dd=j \ r=k$$
  

$$B_2L \quad tm=k \ jw(.w) \ r=j \ nn \ dd=j \ r=k$$
  

$$B_{17}C \quad tm=k \ jw(.w) \ r=j \ dd=j \ r=k$$

"If you come to me, I shall (not) speak to you" (prospective), vs.

(50) Pyr. 412 b<sup>W,T</sup> 
$$mrr=f \ jrr=f \ msdd=f \ nj \ jr.n=f$$
  
 "If he likes (it), he acts; if he hates (it), he doesn't" (emphatic)

<sup>81</sup> Polotsky, *Transpositions*, § 3.6.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, 174 ff. ('Implicated' clauses).

<sup>83</sup> Cf. Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, §§ 223-225.

<sup>84</sup> Polotsky, *Orientalia* 38 (1969), 471.

<sup>85</sup> Gardiner, *EG*, § 310; cf. Loprieno, *Verbalsystem*, 98 f. This shows once more that in the history of Egyptian there is a definite diachronic pattern pointing towards the *progressive* juxtaposition of the Emphatic form and the NP-function.



Can we really speak here of "balanced sentence," or are these structures to be taken as examples of "standard" complex AdvS? Once more, I would solve the problem from a diachronic viewpoint: defining the character of the two VPs of a balanced sentence as "nominal" is correct only within the perspective of the syntactic system of classical MEG, but inadequate when referring to its functional development. The balanced sentence is originally a conditional sentence whose two correlates ("protasis" and "apodosis" in the traditional terminology, functionally corresponding to "topic" and "comment") tend to be structurally identical. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that both correlates display either the emphatic or the prospective form, since these two forms belong to the same *modal* category (generally labelled WISH in my diagram above). The negation by *tm* is perfectly understandable within this modal category, which does not autonomously survive after the reorganization of the verbal system in the literary language, whereas the negation of the comment by means of *nj sdm.n=f* resp. *nn sdm=f* represents the non-modal option. The balanced sentence becomes a bound structure, a "singularity" only in the classical system, in which the distribution of VPs is dictated solely by their syntactic environment (plus a relatively scanty temporal paradigm) and in which reduplicated forms are always topical, nevel focal. But that this was not the case in earlier stages is shown by occurrences of "free" balanced sentences, in which the negated comment is extraposed:

- (51) Pyr. 499 b-c<sup>W</sup> *nj šp NN d=k sw m kkw*  
*nj jd=f tm=f sdm(.w) hrw=k*

"(Even) if you put the King in darkness, he is not blind; (even) if he does not hear your voice, he is not deaf." (rather than "\*If the King is not blind, you put him in darkness; if he is not deaf, he does not hear your voice.")

The conditional clauses (protasis, topic) are here undoubtedly *d=k sw m kkw* resp. *tm=f sdm(.w) hrw=k*, the main sentences (apodosis, focus) *nj šp NN* resp. *nj jd=f*. Their leftward movement (due perhaps to focalization? Cf. § 3) would not be possible in the classical language any longer.

A final point, which brings us back to the beginning of this paragraph: throughout the history of Egyptian, a distinction is kept between different treatments of negated AdvP rheme. We just saw that the focus is negated by *nj...js*. On the other side, Allen and Doret<sup>86</sup> have substantiated Gunn's case for the analysis of the *sdm=f* after *ny* (> MEG *nj-js sdm=f*) as circumstantial:

- (52) Pyr. 1021 b-c<sup>P</sup> *jj.n z3(=j) NN m htp - j.t jn nw.t -*  
*njj hr ndh hr s3=f njj hr (j)h.t dw.t hr '.wj=f(j)*

---

<sup>86</sup> Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, § 340; Doret, *Narrative Verbal System*, 36 ff., 92. Kammerzell, *GM* 117/118 (1990), 181-202 has discovered the common functional pattern underlying the use of an adverbial suffix *w/y* in the Old Egyptian stative (as opposed to the perfect).

"My son the King has come in peace' – says Nut – 'not with a whip falling upon his back, and not with anything evil falling upon his arms'."

(53) Tb 125γ, 28 *nn dj=n 'q=k hr=n – j.n bnš.w n(j.w) sb3 pn – nj-js*  
*dd.n=k rn=n*

"We shall not let you in through us' – say the jambs of this gate – 'unless you have pronounced our name'."

(54) Tb 26, 2 *nj-js wnm=j š'.tt n(j).t wsjr*  
"unless I eat Osiris' food."

(55) pKahun 30, 11-13 *nj grt sdm.n jmj-r' šn.t jt3 nj-js ndr.t m-'=f*  
"The judge cannot try a thief unless he has got the appropriate documents" (lit. "unless the documents are in his possession"), with non-verbal AdvS.

This structure, however, appears in complementary distribution with *nj* (> MEg *nn*) + Infinitive, which is used when the two verbal forms have the same subject<sup>87</sup> and clearly has a "backgrounding," rather than a focal function:

(56) Pyr. 789cP *wnm=f t' hn'=k nj nwr n d.t d.t*  
"He will eat bread with you, without ceasing forever and ever."

(57) Urk. I 181, 10 *qd 3 'w nj dr z3.wt*  
"The structure was built without damaging the flooring."

This state of affairs suggests the generalization that *nj...js* resp. OEg *ny* > MEg *nj-js* negate in fact two possible types of rhematic VP, i.e., the "focus" resp. the "background." The opposition between focus and unmarked rheme appears neutralized in what I would call a "contrastive" function when *nj-js* follows a positive AdvP (possibly deleted in the surface structure) and is followed by a prepositional AdvP:

Rel(Theme, AdvP-Rheme)∅ vs. Rel(Theme, AdvP-Rheme)*nj-js*

(58) Urk. I 147, 3: "[I caused myself to be buried in one tomb together with this *D'w*]<sub>Theme</sub>, [in order that I be with him in one place]<sub>Rheme 1</sub>, [and not because I would not have been able to build two tombs]" (*nj-js n tm(=j) wnn(.w) hr-' n jrj.t jz sn.wj*)<sub>Rheme 2</sub>.

(59) pWestcar 8, 16: "His Majesty said: 'Is the rumor true that you can join a severed head?' – Djedi answered: 'Yes, I can, o sovereign, my Lord!' Then His Majesty said: 'Have a prisoner brought to me from the prison, that he may be executed.' Then Djedi said: [[ I can indeed do this]<sub>Theme</sub> [to any animal,]<sub>Rheme 1</sub>]Presupp [but not to any human

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Gunn, *Studies*, 155 ff., 187.

being] (*nj-js n rmt.w nb*)<sub>Rheme 2</sub>, O sovereign, my Lord! Look, it is forbidden to do such a thing to the Noble Cattle!"

The evidence seems to me to make a strong case for a hierarchy of pragmatic focality in the Complex adverbial sentences, the VP- or AdvP-focus being negated by the discontinuous morpheme *nj...js*, the non-focal VP or AdvP (either "comment" or "background") being negated by the morpheme *ny > nj-js*, or else by aspectual (*nj sdm.t=f*) or modal (*nj sdm.n=f*) verbal forms. The two different pragmatic patterns are of course formally undistinguishable in positive statements, and we might posit the existence of diacritic suprasegmental features. And once more, it is the corpus of the *CT* that displays the evidence of different typological layers, as in our last example, in which each of the three testimonies displays a different solution for the negation of a non-focal adverbial VP: (a) the aorist *nj sdm.n=f*; (b) the perfective *nj sdm.t=f*<sup>88</sup>; (c) the circumstantial *ny sdm=f*:

(60) CT I 280 e-f

	<i>š3s=k r n'.t wrj.t</i>
T <sub>2</sub> C	<i>nj ndr.n tw 3kr.w</i>
T <sub>1</sub> C	<i>nj ndr.t tw 3kr.w</i>
Sq <sub>3</sub> C	<i>ny ndr tn 3&lt;k&gt;r.w</i>

"You shall travel to the Great City, for the Earth-gods cannot detain you."

---

<sup>88</sup> For a discussion on the progressive tendency *nj sdm.t=f > nn sdm=f* in *égyptien de tradition* (cf. pBM 10188, 26, 22 *š3 hpr.w m prj m r'=j nn hpr p.t nn hpr t3* "There were many forms which came out of my mouth, before the heaven existed, before the earth existed") see my forthcoming study in: *Festschrift Peter Behrens*.

## Bibliography

- Allen, J. P., "Is the 'Emphatic' Sentence an Adverbial-Predicate Construction?," *GM* 32 (1979), 7-15.
- , "Synthetic and Analytic Tenses in the Pyramid Texts," in: *L'Égyptologie en 1979*, 20-27.
- , *The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts*. BA 2, Malibu 1984.
- , "Features of non-verbal predicates in Old Egyptian," in: *Crossroad*, 9-44.
- , "Tense in Classical Egyptian," in: W. K. Simpson (Ed.), *Essays on Egyptian Grammar*. YES 1, New Haven 1986, 1-21.
- Allen, T. G., *A Handbook of the Egyptian Collection of the Art Institute of Chicago*, Chicago 1923.
- , "Independent uses of the Egyptian qualitative," *JAOS* 49 (1929), 160-67.
- Andersen, F. I., *The Hebrew Verbless Clause in the Pentateuch*. JBL Monograph Series 14, Nashville 1970.
- Assmann, J., *Liturgische Lieder an den Sonnengott*. MÄS 19, Berlin 1969.
- , "Ägyptologie und Linguistik," *GM* 11 (1974), 59-76.
- , *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*, Zürich-München 1975.
- , "Ewigkeit," in: *LÄ* II, 47-54.
- , "Persönlichkeitsbegriff und -bewußtsein," in: *LÄ* IV, 963-78.
- , "Schrift, Tod und Identität. Das Grab als Vorschule der Literatur im alten Ägypten," in: A. und J. Assmann - Chr. Hardmeier (Hgg.), *Schrift und Gedächtnis*. Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation 1, München 1983, 64-93.
- , *Re und Amun. Die Krise des polytheistischen Weltbilds im Ägypten der 18. - 20. Dynastie*. OBO 51, Freiburg 1983.
- , *Ägypten. Theologie und Frömmigkeit einer frühen Hochkultur*. Urban-Taschenbücher 366, Stuttgart 1984.
- , "Verklärung," in: *LÄ* VI, 998-1006.
- , "State and Religion in the New Kingdom," in: W. K. Simpson (Ed.), *Religion and Philosophy in Ancient Egypt*. YES 3, New Haven 1989, 68-82.
- , "Egyptian Mortuary Liturgies," in: *Studies Lichtheim*, 1-45.
- Baer, K., "A Deed of Endowment in a Letter of the Time of Ppjj I?," *ZÄS* 93 (1966), 1-9.
- Bally, Ch., "L'expression des idées de sphère personnelle et de solidarité dans les langues indo-européennes," in: F. Frankhauser - J. Jud (Eds.), *Festschrift Louis Gauchat*, Aarau 1926, 68-78.
- , *Linguistique générale et linguistique française*, Bern 1965.

- Bakir, A., *Ancient Egyptian Epistolography*. BdE 48, Cairo 1970.
- Barns, J. W. B., *The Ashmolean Ostrakon of Sinuhe*, London 1952.
- Barta, W., *Die Bedeutung der Pyramidentexte für den verstorbenen König*. MÄS 39, München 1981.
- , "Das Personalpronomen der *wj*-Reihe als Proklitikon im adverbialen Nominalsatz," *ZÄS* 112 (1985), 94-104.
- , "Das Erstnomen des A B *pw*-Satzes," *GM* 88 (1985), 7-9.
- von Beckerath, J., "Die 'Stele der Verbannten' im Museum des Louvre," *RdE* 20 (1968), 7-36.
- , "Zeiteinteilung, -messung," in: *LÄ VI*, 1371-72.
- Belova, A., "Sur la reconstruction du vocalisme afroasiatique: quelques correspondances égypto-sémitiques," in: H. G. Mukarovsky (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress 1987*. Vol. 2, Beiträge zur Afrikanistik 41, Wien 1991, 85-93.
- Behnk, F., *Grammatik der Texte aus El-Amarna*, Paris 1930.
- Benveniste, E. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, vol. 1, Paris 1966.
- , *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, vol. 1, Paris 1969.
- , *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, vol. 2, Paris 1974.
- Berlev, O., "The Date of the 'Eloquent Peasant'," in: *Festschrift Fecht*, 78-83.
- Birkenmaier, W., *Artikelfunktionen in einer artikellosen Sprache. Studien zur nominalen Determination im Russischen*. Forum Slavicum 34, München 1979.
- Blackman, A. M., *The Rock Tombs of Meir, Part 1-3*. 3 vols., London 1914-15.
- , "Some Notes on the Story of Sinuhe and Other Egyptian Texts," *JEA* 22 (1936), 35-44.
- Blumenthal, E., *Untersuchungen zum ägyptischen Königtum des Mittleren Reiches I*. ASAW 61, Berlin 1970.
- , "Die Textgattung Expeditionsbericht in Ägypten," in: *Fragen an die altägyptische Literatur*, 85-118.
- , "Ptahhotep und der 'Stab des Alters'," in: *Festschrift Fecht*, 84-97.
- Bolinger, D., *Intonation*, Harmondsworth 1972.
- van den Boorn, G. P. F., "*Wd'-ryt* and Justice at the Gate," *JNES* 44 (1985), 1-25.
- , *The Duties of the Vizier. Civil Administration in Early New Kingdom*. Studies in Egyptology, London/New York 1988.
- Boretzky, N., *Einführung in die historische Linguistik*. rororo Studium 108, Reinbeck 1977.
- Borghouts, J. F., "'*Iw sdm.f* in Late Egyptian," *JNES* 28 (1969), 184-91.
- , "A Special Use of the Emphatic *sdm.f* in Late Egyptian," *BiOr* 29 (1972), 270-76.
- , *Ancient Egyptian Magical Texts*. Nisaba 9, Leiden 1978.
- , "Prominence Constructions and Pragmatic Functions," in: *Crossroad*, 45-70.
- Bossong, G., "Variabilité positionnelle et universaux pragmatiques," *BSLP* 75 (1980), 39-67.
- Bosticco, S., *Museo archeologico di Firenze. Le stele egiziane*. Vol. I: dall'Antico al Nuovo Regno, Rome 1959.

- Brockelmann, C., *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*. 2 Bde, Berlin 1908-13.
- Brunner, H., *Die Geburt des Gottkönigs*. ÄgAbh 10, Wiesbaden 1964.
- , "Persönliche Frömmigkeit," in: *LÄ IV*, 955
- Brunner-Traut, E., "Altägyptische Sprache und Kindersprache. Eine linguistische Anregung," *SAK 1* (1974), 61-81.
- Bruyère, B., *Mert Seger à Deir el-Médineh*. MIFAO 58, Le Caire 1930.
- Buccellati, G., "An Interpretation of the Akkadian Stative as a Nominal Sentence," *JNES* 27 (1968), 1-12.
- , "The State of the 'Stative'," in: Y. L. Arbeitman (Ed.), *Fucus*. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 58, Amsterdam 1988, 153-89.
- de Buck, A., "Some New Interpretations on Sinuhe," in: *Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith*, London 1932, 57-60.
- , *Egyptian Readingbook*, vol. 1, Leiden 1948.
- Callender, J. B., "Grammatical Models in Egyptology," *Orientalia* 42 (1973), 47-77.
- , "Afroasiatic cases and the formation of Ancient Egyptian constructions with possessive suffixes," *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 2/6, Malibu 1975.
- , *Middle Egyptian*, Afroasiatic Dialects 2, Malibu 1975.
- , Review of Schenkel, *Suffixkonjugation*. *BiOr* 34 (1977), 305-7.
- , "Grammatical Models and 'Middle Egyptian,'" *JEA* 69 (1983), 154-58.
- , "Sentence initial position in Egyptian," *CdE* 58 (1983), 83-96.
- , *Studies in the Nominal Sentence in Egyptian and Coptic*. NES 24, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1984.
- , "Discourse and sentence structure in Egyptian," in: *Crossroad*, 71-89.
- Camino, R. A., *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, London 1954.
- , "Brief," in: *LÄ I*, 855-64.
- Capart, J., *Une rue de tombeaux à Saqqarah*, Bruxelles 1907.
- Carr, D., *Time Narrative and History*. Bloomington/Indianapolis 1986.
- Černý, J., "Le caractère des *Oushebtis* d'après les idées du Nouvel Empire. I. – Les tablettes Rogers et McCullum. II. – Sur un passage du chapitre supplémentaire 166 du *Livre des Morts*," *BIFAO* 41 (1942), 105-33.
- , *Répertoire onomastique de Deir el-Médineh*. DFIFAO 12, Le Caire 1949.
- , *Coptic Etymological Dictionary*, Cambridge/New York 1976.
- Černý, J. - A. H. Gardiner, *Hieratic Ostraca*, Oxford 1957.
- Černý, J. - S. I. Groll, *A Late Egyptian Grammar*. Studia Pohl: Series Major 4, Rome 31984.
- Chaîne, M., "La forme p $\Delta$  du verbe  $\text{ⲛⲣⲓ}$ ," *RdE* 2 (1936), 35-6.
- Chassinat, É., *Le quatrième livre des entretiens et épîtres de Shenouti*. MIFAO 23, Le Caire 1911.
- Chetveruchin, A. S. "Unexpected linguistic interpretation of JN 'say(s), said'," *GM* 104 (1988), 75-88.

- Chomsky, N., "Deep Structure, Surface Structure, and Semantic Interpretation," in: D. D. Steinberg - L. A. Jakobovits (Eds.), *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*, Cambridge 1971, 183-216.
- Christopherson, P., *The Articles: a Study of their Theory and Use in English*. Copenhagen/London 1939.
- Cifola, B., "Ramses III and the Sea Peoples: A Structural Analysis of the Medinet Habu Inscriptions," *Orientalia* 57 (1988), 275-306.
- Clère, J. J., "Une stèle familiale abydonienne de la XII<sup>e</sup> Dynastie," *BIFAO* 85 (1985), 77-87.
- Clère, J. J. - J. Vandier, *Textes de la première période intermédiaire*. BAe 10, Bruxelles 1948.
- Collier, M., "The circumstantial *sḏm(f)/sḏm.n(f)* as verbal-forms in Middle Egyptian," *JEA* 76 (1990), 73-85.
- Comrie, B., "The formation of relative clauses," in: B. Lloyd - J. Gay (Eds.), *Universals of Human Thought: some African evidence*, Cambridge 1981, 215-33.
- Coseriu, E., *Synchronie, Diachronie und Geschichte*, München 1974.
- , *Sprachtheorie und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, München 1975.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., "A New Look at Contrastive Intonation," in: R. J. Watts - U. Weidman (Eds.), *Modes of Interpretation. Essays Presented to Ernst Leisi on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. TBL 260, Tübingen 1984, 137-58.
- Crossroad. Chaos or the Beginning of a New Paradigm*. Papers from the Conference on Egyptian Grammar (Helsingør 28-30 May 1986), ed. by G. Englund and P. J. Frandsen. CNI Publications 1, Copenhagen 1986.
- Crum, W.E., "Verbalpräfixe im Koptischen," *ZÄS* 65 (1930), 125-27.
- , *A Coptic Dictionary*, Oxford 1939.
- Culler, J., *Structuralist Poetics*, London 1975.
- Daneš, F., "A three-level approach to syntax," *TLP* 1 (1964), 225-40.
- , "Order of Elements and Sentence Intonation," in: *To Honor Roman Jakobson. Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, vol. I, The Hague 1967, 499-512.
- Darwin, Ch., *The Origin of Species*, London 1859 [repr. Harmondsworth 1985].
- Davies, N. de G., "Akhenaten at Thebes," *JEA* 9 (1923), 132-52.
- , *The Tomb of Ken-Amun at Thebes*. PMMA 5, New York 1930.
- Davis, V. L., *Syntax of the Negative Particle bw and bn in Late Egyptian*. MÄS 29, München 1973.
- von Deines, H. - W. Westendorf, *Wörterbuch der medizinischen Texte*. 2 Bde, GMAÄ 7, Berlin 1961-2.
- Depuydt, L., "Coffin Texts 414 J-K: Aspects of Syntax," *GM* 58 (1982), 15-25.
- , "The Standard Theory of the 'Emphatic' Forms in Classical (Middle) Egyptian: a Historical Survey," *OLP* 14 (1983), 13-54.
- , "A propos de la notion de mouvement en copte et en égyptien," *CdE* 60 (1985), 85-93.
- , "The Emphatic Nominal Sentence in Egyptian and Coptic," in: *Crossroad*, 91-117.
- , "The Emphatic Nominal Sentence in Egyptian and Coptic," *Orientalia* 56 (1987), 37-54.

- , "New Horizons in Coptic and Egyptian Linguistics," *CdE* 63 (1988), 391-406.
- , "The Contingent Tenses of Egyptian," *Orientalia* 58 (1989), 1-27.
- Derchain, Ph., "Sinouhé et Ammounech," *GM* 87 (1985), 7-14.
- , "A propos de performativité. Penser anciens et articles recents," *GM* 110 (1989), 13-18.
- Diakonoff, I. M., "Ancient writing and ancient written language: pitfalls and peculiarities in the study of Sumerian," in: S. J. Lieberman (Ed.), *Sumeriological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen*. Assyriological Studies 20, Chicago 1976, 99-121.
- Doret, É., "A Note on the Egyptian Construction Noun + *sdm.f*," *JNES* 39 (1980), 37-45.
- , "La première personne du passé dans les textes narratifs de l'Ancien Empire," *BSEG* 7 (1982), 17-31.
- , *The Narrative Verbal System of Old and Middle Egyptian*. Cahiers d'Orientalisme 12, Genève 1986.
- , "Sur une caractéristique grammaticale de quelques sarcophages d'El-Bersheh," *BSEG* 13 (1989), 45-50.
- , "Phrase nominale, identité et substitution dans les textes des sarcophages (première partie)," *RdE* 40 (1989), 49-63.
- , "Phrase nominale, identité et substitution dans les textes des sarcophages (seconde partie)," *RdE* 41 (1990), 39-56.
- Edel, E., *Untersuchungen zur Phraseologie der ägyptischen Inschriften des Alten Reiches*. MDAIK 13.1, Wien 1945.
- , *Altägyptische Grammatik*. 2 Bde, AnOr 34/35, Rom 1955-64.
- , "Zur Etymologie und hieroglyphischen Schreibung der Präpositionen  $\overline{M}\overline{N}$  und  $\overline{N}\overline{T}\overline{\epsilon}$ ," *Orientalia* 36 (1967), 67-75.
- , *Hieroglyphische Inschriften des Alten Reiches*. ARWAW 67, Opladen 1981.
- Edgerton, W. F., "On the origin of certain Coptic verbal forms," *JAOS* 55 (1935), 257-67.
- , "Stress, Vowel Quantity and Syllable Division in Egyptian," *JNES* 6 (1947), 1-17.
- Edgerton, W. F. - J. Wilson, *The Historical Records of Ramses III: The Texts in Medinet Habu*. Vols. I-II, SAOC 12, Chicago 1936.
- Edwards, I. E. S., "The Bankes Papyri I and II," *JEA* 68 (1982), 126-33.
- L'Égyptologie en 1979. Axes prioritaires de recherches*. Tome I. Colloques internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 595, Paris 1982.
- Elanskaia, A. I., "The *t-causativa* in Coptic," in: *Studies Polotsky*, 80-130.
- Eliade, M., *Traité d'histoire des religions*, Paris 1964.
- Erichsen, W., *Demotisches Glossar*, Kopenhagen 1954.
- Erman, A., *Die Flexion des ägyptischen Verbums*. SPAW, Phil.-Hist. Cl. 1900, 317-53.
- , *Zaubersprüche für Mutter und Kind. Aus dem Papyrus 3027 des Berliner Museums*. APAW, Phil.-Hist. Cl., Berlin 1901.
- , *Ägyptische Grammatik*. Porta Linguarum Orientalium 15, Berlin 21902.
- , *Neuägyptische Grammatik*, Leipzig 21933.
- , *Die Religion der Ägypter. Ihr Werden und Vergehen in vier Jahrtausenden*, Berlin 1934.



- Even-Zohar, I., "Polysystem Studies," in: *Poetics Today* 11.1, Durham 1990.
- Eyre, C. J., "Approaches to the analysis of Egyptian sentences: syntax and pragmatics," in: *Crossroad*, 119-43.
- , "Speculations on the structure of Middle Egyptian," in: *Lingua Sapientissima*, 22-46.
- , "Egyptian and Semitic conjugation systems in diachronic perspective," *BiOr* 45 (1988), 5-18.
- , "Tense or aspect in Middle Egyptian?," in: *Akten des Vierten Internationalen Ägyptologen-Kongresses. Beihefte SAK* 3 (1988), 51-65.
- Fairclough, N., "Register, power and socio-semantic change," in: D. Birth - M. O'Toole (Eds.), *Functions of Style*, London 1988, 111-25.
- Faulkner, R. O., "The Installation of the Vizier," *JEA* 41 (1955), 18-29.
- , *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, Oxford 1962.
- , *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. 2 vols., Oxford 1969.
- , *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*. 3 vols., Warminster 1973-78.
- Fecht, G., "Die *i*-Klasse bei den anfangsbetonten koptischen Infinitiven starker dreiradikaler Verben," *Orientalia* 24 (1955), 288-95.
- , *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache*. ÄF 21, Glückstadt 1960.
- , "Prosodie," in: *LÄ* IV, 1127-54.
- , "Cruces Interpretum in der Lehre des Ptahhotep (Maximen 7, 9, 13,14) und das Alter der Lehre," in: *Hommages à François Daumas*. 2 vols., Montpellier 1986, 227-51.
- Finnegan, R., *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication*. Oxford 1988.
- Fischer, H., "The Nubian Mercenaries of Gebelein during the First Intermediate Period," *Kush* 9 (1961), 44-80.
- , "*Sh3-sn* (Florence 1774)," *RdE* 24 (1972), 64-71.
- , "Some Early Monuments from Busiris, in the Egyptian Delta," *MMJ* 11 (1976), 5-24.
- , "Two replies," *GM* 49 (1981), 25-31.
- Fischer-Elfert, H.-W., *Die satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I*. KÄT, Wiesbaden 1983.
- Form und Mass. Beiträge zur Literatur, Sprache und Kunst des Alten Ägypten. Festschrift für Gerhard Fecht zum 65. Geburtstag am 6 Februar 1987*. ÄAT 12, Wiesbaden 1987.
- Foster, J. L., "The *sḏm.f* and *sḏm.n.f* Forms in the Tale of Sinuhe," *RdE* 34 (1982-83), 27-52.
- , "'The Shipwrecked Sailor': Prose or verse?," *SAK* 15 (1988), 69-109.
- Foucault, M., *Les mots et les choses: une archéologie des sciences*, Paris 1966.
- Fragen an die altägyptische Literatur. Studien zum Gedenken an Eberhard Otto*. Hg. von J. Assmann, E. Feucht und R. Grieshammer, Wiesbaden 1977.
- Frandsen, P. J., *An Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System*. Copenhagen 1974.
- , "On the Relevance of Logical Analysis," in: *Crossroad*, 145-59.
- Frankfort, H. - J. Pendlebury, *The City of Akhenaten II*. EES Memoirs 40, London 1933.

- Fries, U., "Theme and Rheme Revisited," in: R. J. Watts - U. Weidman (Eds.), *Modes of Interpretation. Essays Presented to Ernst Leisi on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. TBL 260, Tübingen 1984, 177-92.
- Gamer-Wallert, I., "Baum, heiliger," in: *LÄ I*, 655-66.
- Gardies, J. L., *Esquisse d'une grammaire pure*. Paris 1975.
- Gardiner, A. H., *Egyptian Hieratic Texts I*, Leipzig 1911.
- , Review of Polotsky, *Études de syntaxe copte*. *JEA* 33 (1947), 95-101.
- , *Ramesside Administrative Documents*, London 1948.
- , "A Pharaonic Encomium," *JEA* 42 (1956), 8-20.
- , *Egyptian Grammar, being an introduction to the study of Hieroglyphs*, Oxford 1957.
- Gardiner, A. H. - T. E. Peet - J. Černý, *The Inscriptions of Sinai II*, London 1955.
- Gardiner, A. H. - K. Sethe, *Egyptian Letters to the Dead*, London 1928.
- Geach, P. T., "Subject and Predicate," *Mind* 49 (1950), 461-82.
- Gelb, I. J., *Sequential Reconstruction of Proto-Akkadian*. Assyriological Studies 18, Chicago 1969.
- Gilula, M., "An Adjectival Predicative Expression of Possession in Middle Egyptian," *RdE* 20 (1968), 55-61.
- , Review of Satzinger, *Die negativen Konstruktionen*. *JEA* 56 (1970), 205-14.
- , "Coffin Texts Spell 148," *JEA* 57 (1971), 14-19.
- , "An Unusual Nominal Pattern in Middle Egyptian," *JEA* 62 (1976), 160-75.
- , "Sinuhe B 255," *JNES* 35 (1976), 25-28.
- , "Shipwrecked Sailor, lines 184-85," in: E. F. Wente and J. H. Johnson (Eds.), *Studies in Honor of Georges R. Hughes*. SAOC 39, Chicago 1976, 75-82.
- , "The stative form of the verb *sdm* 'to hear'," *JARCE* 14 (1977), 37-46.
- , "Does God exist?," in: *Studies Polotsky*, 390-400.
- Givón, T., *On Understanding Grammar*. Perspectives in Neurolinguistics and Psycholinguistics. New York/San Francisco/London 1979.
- Goedicke, H., "Untersuchungen zur altägyptischen Rechtsprechung I. Die altägyptischen Ausdrücke für 'richten'," *MIO* 7 (1963), 333-67.
- Goldwasser, O., "A Late Egyptian Epistolary Formula as an Aid to Dating Ramesside Texts," in: S. I. Groll (Ed.), *Pharaonic Egypt*, Jerusalem 1985, 50-56.
- , "On the Choice of Registers – Studies on the Grammar of Papyrus Anastasi I," in: *Studies Lichtheim*, 200-240.
- Goody, E. N. "Towards a Theory of Questions," in: E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*, Cambridge 1978, 17-43.
- Goody, J., *The Interface between the Written and the Oral*, Cambridge 1987.
- Graefe, E., "Morgenstern," in: *LÄ IV*, 206.
- Grapow, H., *Von den medizinischen Texten*. GMAÄ 2, Berlin 1955.
- , *Die medizinischen Texte in hieroglyphischer Umschreibung autographiert*. GMAÄ 5, Berlin 1958.
- Green, M., *The Coptic Share Pattern and its Egyptian Ancestors: A Reassessment of the Aorist Pattern in the Egyptian Language*, Warminster 1984.

- Greenberg, J. H., "The Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Present," *JAOS* 72 (1952): 1-9.  
 ---, *Essays in Linguistics*, Chicago 1963.
- Gregory, M., "Aspects of varieties differentiation," *Journal of Linguistics* 3 (1967), 177-198.
- Greimas, A. J., *On Meaning*, London 1987.
- Griffith, F. Ll., *Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob*, London 1898.  
 ---, *Demotic Graffiti from the Dodecaschoenus*, Oxford 1935.
- Griffiths, J. G., "Love as a disease," in: *Studies Lichtheim*, 349-64.
- Grimal, N.C., *Études sur la propagande royale égyptienne I: La stèle triomphale de Pi('ankh)y au Musée de Caire, JE 48862 et 47086-47089*. MIFAO 105, Le Caire 1981.
- Groll, S. I., *Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns in Late Egyptian*, London 1967.  
 ---, "'*Iw sdm.f* in Late Egyptian," *JNES* 28 (1969), 184-91.  
 ---, *The Negative Verbal System of Late Egyptian*, London 1970.  
 ---, Review of Davis, *Syntax of the Negative Particles*. *Orientalia* 44 (1975), 126-28.  
 ---, "The Literary and the Non-Literary Verbal Systems in Late Egyptian," *OLP* 6/7 (1975/1976), 237-46 (Fs Vergote).  
 ---, "A Ramesside Grammar Book of a Technical Language of Dream Interpretation" in: S. I. Groll (Ed.), *Pharaonic Egypt*, Jerusalem 1985, 71-118.  
 ---, "The *sdm.n.f* Formations in the Non-literary Documents of the 19th Dynasty," in: *Crossroad*, 167-79.  
 ---, "A Sense-equivalence Translation of Ostrakon Gardiner 5 (OG 5)," in: *Studies Lichtheim*, 365-421.
- Guillaume, G., *Le problème de l'article et sa solution dans la langue française*, Paris 1919.
- Gunn, B., "The Religion of the Poor in ancient Egypt," *JEA* 3 (1916), 81-94.  
 ---, *Studies in Egyptian Syntax*, Paris 1924.  
 ---, Review of Sander-Hansen, *Die religiösen Texte auf dem Sarg der Anchnesneferibre*. *JEA* 28 (1942), 71-76.  
 ---, "The Decree of Amonrasonther for Neskhons," *JEA* 41 (1955), 83-105.
- Habachi, L., "Graffito of the Chamberlain and Controller of Works Antef at Sehel," *JEA* 39 (1953), 50-59.  
 ---, *The Second Stela of Kamose*. ADAIK 8, Glückstadt 1972.  
 ---, *Sixteen Studies of Lower Nubia*, Cairo 1981.  
 ---, *Elephantine IV. The Heqaib Sanctuary in Elephantine*. 2 vols., Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 33, Mainz 1985.
- Hagège, C., *La structure des langues*, Paris 1982.  
 ---, *L'homme de paroles*, Paris 1985.
- Halliday, M. A. K. - R. Hasan, *Language, Context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*, Oxford 1989.
- Hamp, E. - F. Householder - R. Austerlits, *Readings in Linguistics*. 2 vols., Chicago 1966.

- Harries-Delisle, H., "Contrastive Emphasis and Cleft Sentences," in: J. H. Greenberg (Ed.), *Universals of Human Language. Volume 4: Syntax*, Stanford 1978, 419-86.
- Harris, M. B., "The interrelationship between phonological and grammatical change," in: J. Fisiak (Ed.), *Recent Developments in Historical Phonology. Trends in Linguistics - Studies and Monographs 4*, The Hague/Paris/New York, 159-72.
- Hasan, R., "Code, Register, and Social Dialect," in: B. Bernstein (Ed.), *Class, Codes, and Control. Vol. 2. Applied studies towards a sociology of language*, London 1973, 253-92.
- Hassan, S., *Excavations at Giza 1930-1931*, vol. II, Cairo 1936.
- Haugen, E., "Dialect, language, nation," *American Anthropologist* 68 (1966), 922-35 [reprinted in: J. B. Pride - J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, Harmondsworth 1972, 97-111].
- Havelock, E. A. *The Greek Concept of Justice from its Shadow in Homer to its Substance in Plato*, Cambridge, Mass. 1978.
- , *The Muse Learns to Write. Reflections on orality and literacy from antiquity to the present*, New Haven/London 1986.
- Hawkes, T., *Structuralism and Semiotics*, London 1986.
- Hawkins, J. A., *Definiteness and Indefiniteness: a Study in Reference and Grammaticality Prediction*, London 1978.
- Hayes, W. C., *Ostraka and Name Stones from the Tomb of Sen-Müt (No. 71) at Thebes*. PMMA 15, New York 1942.
- Helck, W., *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und Neue Texte der 18. Dynastie*. KÄT, Wiesbaden 1975.
- , "Die Weihinschrift Sesostris' I. am Satet Tempel von Elephantine," *MDAIK* 34 (1978), 69-78.
- , *Die Lehre des Djedefhor und die Lehre eines Vaters and seinen Sohn*. KÄT, Wiesbaden 1984.
- Hewson, J., *Article and Noun in English*. Janua Linguarum Series practica 104, The Hague 1972.
- Heyer, G., "Generic Descriptions, Default Reasoning, and Typicality," *Theoretical Linguistics* 12 (1985), 33-72.
- Hickerson, N. P., *Linguistic Anthropology*, New York 1980.
- Hintze, F., *Untersuchungen zu Stil und Sprache neuägyptischer Erzählungen*. VIO 2, 6, Berlin 1950-52.
- Hock, H. H., *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Trends in Linguistics - Studies and Monographs 34, Berlin/New York/Amsterdam 1986.
- Horn, J., *Untersuchungen zu Frömmigkeit und Literatur des christlichen Ägypten: das Martyrium des Viktor, Sohnes des Romanos*, Diss. Göttingen 1981 [1988].
- Horn, L. R., *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago/London 1989.
- Hornung, E., *Das Am-Duat. Die Schrift des Verborgenen Raumes*. 3 Bde, ÄgAbh 7, Wiesbaden 1963.
- , *Texte zum Amduat*, vol.1. *Aegyptiaca Helvetica* 3, Genève 1987.

- Israeli, S., "A Grammatical Analysis of the First 23 Pages of the El Amarna Texts: *Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca* VIII," in: S. I. Groll (Ed.), *Papers for Discussion*. Presented by the Department of Egyptology, Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Volume I: 1981-82, Jerusalem 1982, 279-304.
- Jakobson, R., *Selected Writings*, vol. 2, The Hague 1971.
- James, T. G. H., *The Mastaba of Khentika called Ikheki*. ASE 30, London 1953.
- , *The Heḳanakhte Papers and Other Early Middle Kingdom Documents*. PMMA 19, New York 1962.
- Janssen, J. J. "Two Personalities," in: R.J. Demarée - J. J. Janssen (Eds.), *Gleanings from Deir el-Medīna*, Leiden 1982, 109-31.
- Jensen, H., *Altarmenische Grammatik*. Indogermanische Bibliothek 1, Heidelberg 1959.
- Jespersen, O., *The Philosophy of Grammar*, New York 1965.
- Jéquier, G., *Fouilles à Saqqarah. Les pyramides des reines Neit et Apouit*, Le Caire 1933.
- Johnson, J. H., *The Demotic Verbal System*. SAOC 38, Chicago 1976.
- , "NIMS in Middle Egyptian," *Serapis* 6 (1982), 69-73.
- , "The Use of the Particle *mk* in Middle Kingdom Letters," in: *Festschrift Westendorf*, 71-86.
- , "Focusing on Various Themes," in: *Crossroad*, 401-10.
- , "The Use of the Articles and the Generic in Demotic," in: S. P. Vleeming (Ed.), *Aspects of Demotic Lexicography*, Leiden 1987, 41-55.
- Jones, D., *A Glossary of Ancient Egyptian Nautical Titles and Terms*. Studies in Egyptology, London/New York 1988.
- Junge, F., *Studien zum mittelägyptischen Verbum*, Diss. Göttingen 1970.
- , "Einige Probleme der *sdm.f*-Theorie im Licht der vergleichenden Syntax," *Orientalia* 31 (1972), 325-38.
- , *Syntax der mittelägyptischen Literatursprache*, Mainz 1978.
- , "'Emphasis by anticipation' im mittelägyptischen Verbalsatz," *RdE* 30 (1978), 96-100.
- , "Der Gebrauch von *jw* im mittelägyptischen Satz," in: M. Görg - E. Pusch (Hgg.), *Festschrift Elmar Edel*, Bamberg 1979, 263-71.
- , "Adverbialsatz und emphatische Formen, Nominalsatz und Negation. Eine 'Gegendarstellung'," *GM* 33 (1979), 69-88.
- , "Nominalsatz und Cleft sentence im Ägyptischen," in: *Studies Polotsky*, 431-62.
- , "Über die Entwicklung des ägyptischen Konjugationssystems," *SAK* 9 (1981), 201-11; id., "Über die Entwicklung des ägyptischen Konjugationssystems. Ein Ersatz für Fahnenkorrekturen bei *SAK* 9," *GM* 60 (1982), 93-96.
- , "Form und Funktion ägyptischer Satzfragen," *BiOr* 40 (1983), 545-59.
- , "Sprache," in: *LÄ* V, 1176-1211.
- , "Sprachstufen und Sprachgeschichte," in: *ZDMG. Supplement VI*, Stuttgart 1985, 17-34.
- , "Das sogenannte narrativ/kontinuative *jw=f hr (tm) sdm*," *JEA* 72 (1986), 113-32.
- , "A Study on Sentential Meaning and the Notion of 'Emphasis' in Middle Egyptian," in: *Crossroad*, 189-254.

- , "Morphology, sentence form and language history," in: *Lingua Sapientissima*, 47-56.
- , "Emphasis" and Sentential Meaning in Middle Egyptian. GOF IV/20, Wiesbaden 1989.
- Kalmár, I. "Are there really no primitive languages?," in: D.R. Olson - N. Torrance - A. Hildyard, *Literacy, Language and Learning. The nature and consequences of reading and writing*, Cambridge 1985, 148-66.
- Kalverkaemper, H., *Textlinguistik der Eigennamen*, Stuttgart 1978.
- Kammerzell, F., "Norm, Relikt oder Fiktion? Zweifel an den Existenz einer morphologisch-syntaktischen Kategorie 'indikativ-perfektisches *sdm=f*' im Mäg.," *GM* 102 (1988), 41-57.
- , "Funktion und Form. Zur Opposition von Perfekt und Pseudopartizip im Alt- und Mittelägyptischen," *GM* 117/118 (1990), 181-202.
- , "Grammatische Relationen und Paradigmenbildung. Subjekteigenschaften und die Entstehung der Opposition Perfekt versus Mediopassiv im Ägyptischen," in: P. Berrettoni (Ed.), *Atti della Quinta Giornata Comparatistica Nazionale*, Perugia 1991, forthcoming.
- Kawagachi, J., "Le concept de personne," in: G. Serbat (Ed.), *E. Benveniste aujourd'hui*, vol.1, Louvain 1984, 119-25.
- Keenan, E. L., "Towards a universal definition of 'subject'," in: Ch. N. Li (Ed.), *Subject and Topic*. New York 1976, 303-33.
- Kees, H., "Ägypten," in: A. Bertholet (Hg.), *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch* 10, Tübingen 1928.
- , "Sargtexten und Totenbuch," in: *HdO* I, 1, 2, Leiden 1952, 39-47.
- Kitchen, K. A., *Ramesside Inscriptions, Historical and Biographical*, Oxford 1968-.
- Korostovcev, M. A., "Kategorija perexodnosti i neperexodnosti v egipetskom jazyke," in: *Vestnik drevnej istorii* 106 (1968.4), 109-18.
- , *Grammaire du Néo-égyptien*, Moscou 1973.
- Kroeber, B., *Die Neuägyptizismen vor der Amarnazeit. Studien zur Entwicklung der ägyptischen Sprache vom Mittleren zum Neuen Reich*, Diss. Tübingen 1970.
- Kruchten, J. M., "Un emploi intéressant du morphème de substantivation *wnn* et deux exemples de la forme rare *bw sdm.n.f* (Pentaouer, §§ 114-116)," *GM* 89 (1986), 61-65.
- , *Le grand texte oraculaire de Djéhoutymose*. Monographies Reine Élizabeth 5, Bruxelles 1986.
- , "Une nouvelle édition des textes biographiques de la période libyenne," *BiOr* 45 (1988), 489-99.
- Kuno, S., "Subject, Theme, and the speaker's Empathy - a Reexamination of Relativization Phenomena," in: Ch. N. Li (Ed.), *Subject and Topic*, New York 1976, 417-44.
- Kuno, S. - E. Kaburaki, "Empathy and Syntax," *Linguistic Inquiry* 8 (1977), 127-72.
- Kurylowicz, J., *Esquisses linguistiques*, Wrocław-Kraców 1960.
- Labov, W., "Rules for Ritual Insults," in: D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*, New York 1972, 120-69.
- Labov, W. - D. Fanshel, *Therapeutic Discourse*, New York 1977.

- Lacau, P., "Les verbes à troisième radicale faible  $\text{𓂏}$  (*i*) ou  $\text{𓂐}$  (*w*) en égyptien," *BIFAO* 52 (1953), 7-50.
- Leclant, J., "A la pyramide de Peepi I, la paroi Nord du passage A-F (antichambre-chambre funéraire)," *RdE* 27 (1975), 137-49.
- Lefebvre, G., *Grammaire de l'égyptien classique*. BdE 12, Le Caire 1955.
- Lesko, L. H., *Index of the Spells on Egyptian Middle Kingdom Coffins and Related Documents*, Berkeley 1979.
- , *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian I*, Berkeley 1982.
- Leslau, W., *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage (Ethiopic)*. 3 vols., Wiesbaden 1979.
- Levinson, S., *Pragmatics*, Cambridge 1983.
- Lichtheim, M., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. 3 vols., Berkeley/Los Angeles 1973-80.
- Lingua Sapientissima*, edited by J. D. Ray. A seminar in honour of H.J. Polotsky organised by the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge and the Faculty of Oriental Studies in 1984, Cambridge 1987.
- Logan, Th. - T. Westenholz, "*sdm.f* and *sdm.n.f* forms in the Pey (Piankhy) Inscription," *JARCE* 9 (1971-72), 111-19.
- Loprieno, A., "Methodologische Anmerkungen zur Rolle der Dialekte in der ägyptischen Sprachentwicklung," *GM* 53 (1982), 75-95.
- , *Das Verbalsystem im Ägyptischen und im Semitischen. Zur Grundlegung einer Aspekttheorie*. GOF IV/17, Wiesbaden 1986.
- , "Egyptian Grammar and Textual Features," in: *Crossroad*, 255-87.
- , "Der ägyptische Satz zwischen Semantik und Pragmatik: die Rolle von *jn*," in: *Akten des Vierten Internationalen Ägyptologen-Kongresses. Beihefte SAK* 3 (1988), 77-98.
- , "On the Typological Order of Constituents in Egyptian," *JAAL* 1 (1988), 26-57.
- , *Topos und Mimesis. Zum Ausländer in der ägyptischen Literatur*. ÄgAbh 48, Wiesbaden 1988.
- Lutz, H. F., *Egyptian Tomb Steles and Offering Stones of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnology of the University of California*, Leipzig 1927.
- Lyons, J., *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, Cambridge 1968.
- , *Semantics*. 2 vols., Cambridge 1977.
- Malaise, M. "La conjugaison suffixale dans les propositions conditionnelles introduites par *ir* en ancien et moyen égyptien," *CdE* 60 (1985), 152-67.
- Malinowski, B., "The problem of meaning in primitive languages. Suppl. I," in: C.K. Ogden - I.A. Richards, *The Meaning of Meaning*, London 1923 [1966], 296-336.
- Maspero, G., "Notes sur quelques points de grammaire et d'histoire," *RecTrav* 2, 105-20.
- , *Études de mythologie et d'archéologie égyptienne*, vol. II. Bibliothèque égyptologique 2, Paris 1893.
- McDowell, A., *Jurisdiction in the Workmen's Community of Deir el-Medīna*. Egyptologische Uitgaven 5, Leiden 1990.
- Meeks, D., *Année Lexicographique*. 3 vols., Paris 1980-2.
- Meltzer, E. S., "Remarks on bound negative constructions in Egyptian and their development," in: *L'Égyptologie en 1979*, 49-51.

- , Review of Simpson (Ed.), *Essays on Egyptian Grammar*. *JARCE* 24 (1987), 148-51.
- Mitchell, T. F., *Teach Yourself Colloquial Arabic*, London 1962.
- Möller, G., *Hieratische Lesestücke für den akademischen Gebrauch*. 3 Hefte, Leipzig 1909-10.
- Müller, D., *A Concise Introduction to Middle Egyptian Grammar* (Ms.), Lethbridge 1975.
- Müller, H.-P., "Wie alt ist das jungsemitische Perfekt? Zum semitisch-ägyptischen Sprachvergleich," *SAK* 11 (1984), 365-79 (Fs Helck).
- Münster, M., *Untersuchungen zur Göttin Isis*. MÄS 11, Berlin 1968.
- Navailles, R. - F. Neveu, "Une ténébreuse affaire: P. Bankes I," *GM* 103 (1988), 51-60.
- Neu, E., "Das frühindogermanische Diathesensystem. Funktion und Geschichte," in: Schlerath, B. (Hg.), *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte*. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wiesbaden 1985, 275-95.
- O'Connor, M., *Hebrew Verse Structure*, Winona Lake 1980.
- Oikawa, H., "The Papyrus Sallier's Understanding of *sdm.n.f* in the Battle of Qadesh," in: *L'Égyptologie en 1979*, 53-55.
- Osing, J., *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*. 2 vols., Mainz 1976.
- , *Der spätägyptische Papyrus BM 10808*. ÄgAbh 33, Wiesbaden 1976.
- , "Zur Syntax der Biographie des Wnj," *Orientalia* 46 (1977), 165-82.
- , Review of Brunner, *Die Geburt des Gottkönigs*. *OLZ* 74 (1979), 116-18.
- , "Die Partizipien im Ägyptischen und in den semitischen Sprachen," in: *Festschrift Fecht*, 337-60.
- Otto, E., *Das ägyptische Mundöffnungsritual*. ÄgAbh 3, Wiesbaden 1960.
- Palmer, F. R., *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge 1986.
- Parker, R. A., "The Durative Tenses in P. Rylands IX," *JNES* 20 (1961), 180-87.
- , "The Orthography of Article plus Prothetic *r* in Demotic," *JNES* 33 (1974), 371-82.
- Peet, T.E., "Two Eighteenth Dynasty Letters. Papyrus Louvre 3230," *JEA* 12 (1926), 70-74.
- Pennacchiotti, F. A., "Le forme verbali pseudo-relative nel Semitico sud-occidentale e nel Curdo settentrionale," in: P. Berrettoni (Ed.), *Atti della Quinta Giornata Comparatistica Nazionale*, Perugia 1992, forthcoming.
- Piccione, P. A., "On the Use of the *sdm.n.f* in the Historical Texts of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu," *Serapis* 6 (1982), 103-16.
- Plank, F. (Ed.), *Objects. Towards a theory of grammatical relations*, London 1984.
- Polotsky, H. J., *Études de syntaxe copte*. Le Caire 1944.
- , "The 'Emphatic' *sdm.n.f* Form," *RdE* 11 (1957), 109-17.
- , "Zur Neugestaltung der koptischen Grammatik," *OLZ* 54 (1959), 453-60.
- , "The Coptic Conjugation System," *Orientalia* 29 (1960), 392-422.
- , "Zur koptischen Wortstellung," *Orientalia* 30 (1961), 294-313.
- , "Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Koptischen," *Orientalia* 31 (1962), 413-30.
- , "Ägyptische Verbalformen und Ihre Vokalisation," *Orientalia* 33 (1964), 267-85.
- , *Egyptian Tenses*. IASHP 2/5, Jerusalem 1965.
- , "Zur altägyptischen Grammatik," *Orientalia* 38 (1969), 465-81.
- , *Collected Papers*, Jerusalem 1971.



- , "Notre connaissance de l'égyptien," in: *Textes et Langues de l'Égypte Pharaonique, vol 1*. BdE 64/1, Le Caire 1972, 133-41.
- , "Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique," *IOS* 6 (1976), 1-50.
- , "The Sequential Verb Form" in: S. I. Groll (Ed.), *Pharaonic Egypt*, Jerusalem 1985, 157-61.
- , "Verbalaspekte im Koptischen," *GM* 88 (1985), 19-23.
- , "Egyptology, Coptic studies and the Egyptian language," in: *Lingua Sapientissima*, 5-21.
- , *Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbaus*. 2 vols., ASP 27-29, Decatur 1987-90.
- Posener, G., "La complainte de l'echanson Bay," in: *Fragen an die altägyptische Literatur*, 385-97.
- Posener-Kriéger, P., *Les archives du temple funéraire de Néferirkarê-Kakaï (Les papyrus d'Abousir)*, 2 vols. BdE 65, Le Caire 1976.
- Pottier, B., "L'absence de l'article en français et sa motivation," *RLR* 26 (1962), 158-62.
- Pritchard, J. B. (Ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton 31969.
- Ranke, H., *Die ägyptischen Personennamen*, vol.1, Glückstadt 1935.
- Reder, S., "The written and the spoken word: influence of Vai literacy on Vai speech," in: S. Scribner - M. Cole (Eds.), *The Psychology of Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass. 1981, 187-99.
- Redford, D.B., "The Coregency of Thutmosis III and Amenophis II," *JEA* 51 (1965), 107-22.
- Roccati, A., "Una tomba dimenticata di Asiut," *OrAnt* 13 (1974), 41-52.
- Roeder, G., *Ägyptisch: praktische Einführung in die Hieroglyphen und die ägyptische Sprache mit Lesestücken und Wörterbuch*. Clavis linguarum semiticarum 6, München 1913.
- , *Urkunden zur Religion des Alten Ägypten*, Jena 1915.
- , *Inschriften des Neuen Reiches*. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Ägyptische Inschriften 2, Leipzig 1913-24.
- von Roncador, M., *Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede*, Tübingen 1986.
- Rosén, H. B., *Struktural-grammatische Beiträge zum Verständnis Homers*. Amsterdam 1967.
- Rossi, M., "L'intonation prédicative dans les phrases transformées par permutation," *Linguistics* 103 (1973), 64-94.
- Rowton, M. B., "The use of permansive in Classic Babylonian," *JNES* 21 (1962), 233-303.
- Sander-Hansen, C. E., *Die religiösen Texte auf dem Sarg der Anchnesneferibre*, Kopenhagen 1937.
- , *Ägyptische Grammatik*, Wiesbaden 1963.
- Sandman, M., *Texts from the Time of Akhenaten*. BAe 8, Bruxelles 1938.
- Sasse, H. J., "Thethetic/categorical distinction revisited," *Linguistics* 25.3 (1987), 511-80.

- Satzinger, H., *Die negativen Konstruktionen im Alt- und Mittelägyptischen*. MÄS 12, Berlin 1968.
- , "*sdm.t* 'Schließlich hörte er'," *JEA* 57 (1971), 58-69.
- , *Neuägyptische Studien: Die Partikel 'Ir. Das Tempussystem*, Wien 1976.
- , "Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Neuägyptischen," in: *Studies Polotsky*, 480-505.
- , "Attribut und Relativsatz im älteren Ägyptisch," in: *Festschrift Westendorf*, 125-56.
- , "On Tense and Aspect in Middle Egyptian," in: *Crossroad*, 297-313.
- , Review of *Festschrift Westendorf*. *BiOr* 44 (1987), 617-28.
- , "Bemerkungen zum ägyptischen Verbalsystem gelegentlich zweier Neuerscheinungen," *WZKM* 79 (1989), 197-220.
- , "Anmerkungen zu *iw.f sdm.f*," *GM* 115 (1990), 99-102.
- , "Structural Analysis of the Egyptian Independent Personal Pronoun," in: H. G. Mukarovsky (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress 1987*. Vol. 2, Beiträge zur Afrikanistik 41, Wien 1991, 121-35.
- de Saussure, F., *Cours de linguistique générale*, ed. Tullio de Mauro, Paris 1972.
- Säve-Söderbergh, T., *Einige ägyptische Denkmäler in Schweden*. Arbeten utgivna med understöd av Vilhelm Ekmans Universitetsfond Uppsala 52, Uppsala 1945.
- Scharff, A., "Briefe aus Illahun," *ZÄS* 59 (1924), 20-51.
- Schenkel, W., "'Singularisches' und 'pluralisches' Partizip," *MDAIK* 20 (1965), 110-14.
- , "Beiträge zur mittelägyptischen Syntax," *ZÄS* 92 (1965), 47-72.
- , "Das altägyptische Pseudopartizip und das indogermanische Medium/Perfekt," *Orientalia* 40 (1971), 301-16.
- , *Die altägyptische Suffixkonjugation. Theorie der innerägyptischen Entstehung aus Nomina actionis*. ÄgAbh 32, Wiesbaden 1975.
- , "*sdm=f* und *sdm.w=f* als Prospektivformen," in: *Studies Polotsky*, 506-27.
- , *Aus der Arbeit an einer Konkordanz zu den altägyptischen Sargtexten*. GOF IV/12, Wiesbaden 1983.
- , *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*. GOF IV/13, Wiesbaden 1983.
- , "Fokussierung. Über die Reihenfolge von Subjekt und Predikat im klassisch-ägyptischen Nominalsatz," in: *Festschrift Westendorf*, 157-74.
- , "Zur Verbalflexion der Pyramidentexte," *BiOr* 42 (1985), 481-94.
- , "Zur Struktur des dreigliedrigen Nominalsatzes mit der Satzteilfolge Subjekt-Prädikat im Ägyptischen," *SAK* 14 (1987), 265-82.
- , "Aktuelle Perspektiven der ägyptischen Grammatik," *BiOr* 45 (1988), 269-89.
- , *Materialien zur Vorlesung "Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift"*, Wintersemester 1989/90, Tübingen 1989.
- , *Einführung in die altägyptische Sprachwissenschaft*, Darmstadt 1990.
- Schifflein, B. - E. Keenan - M. Platt, "Questions of Immediate Concern," in: E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and Politeness. Strategies in Social Interaction*, Cambridge 1978, 44-55.
- Schleicher, A., *Die darwinische Theorie und die Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin 1863.

- Schott, E., "Die Biographie des Ka-em-Tenenet," in: *Fragen an die altägyptische Literatur*, 443-61.
- Schott, S., *Mythe und Mythenbildung im Alten Ägypten*. UGAÄ 15, Leipzig 1945.
- Searle, J. R., *Speech Acts*, Cambridge 1969.
- , "Indirect Speech Acts," in: P. Cole - J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Speech Acts. Syntax and Semantics* 3, New York 1975, 59-82.
- Seiler, H. J., *Possession as an Operational Dimension of Language*. Language Universal Series 2, Tübingen 1983.
- Sethe, K., *De Aleph prosthetico in lingua Aegyptiaca verbi formis praeposito*, Diss. Berlin 1892.
- , *Das Ägyptische Verbum im Altägyptischen, Neuägyptischen und Koptischen*. 3 vols., Leipzig 1899-1902.
- , *Der Nominalsatz im Ägyptischen und Koptischen*, Leipzig 1916.
- , *Ägyptische Lesestücke*, Leipzig 1928.
- , *Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den altägyptischen Pyramidentexten*. 6 Bde, Glückstadt 1936-62.
- Shisha-Halevy, A., "Protatic εϣωτ̄: a Hitherto Unnoticed Coptic Tripartite Conjugation Form and its Diachronic Connections," *Orientalia* 43 (1974), 369-81.
- , "Notes on Some Coptic Nominal Sentence Patterns," in: *Festschrift Westendorf*, 175-89.
- , *Coptic Grammatical Categories*. AnOr 53, Rome 1986.
- , "(I)rf in the Coffin Texts: A Functional Tableau," *JAOS* 106 (1986), 641-58.
- , "Grammatical Discovery Procedure and the Egypto-Coptic Nominal Sentence," *Orientalia* 56 (1987), 147-75.
- , "Work-Notes on Demotic Syntax I," *Orientalia* 58 (1989), 28-60.
- , "The Narrative Verbal System of Old and Middle Egyptian," *Orientalia* 58 (1989), 247-54.
- , "Papyrus Vandier *recto*: an early Demotic literary text?," *JAOS* 109 (1989), 421-35.
- , *The Proper Name: Structural Prolegomena to its Syntax. A Case Study in Coptic*. WZKM Beihefte 15, Wien 1989.
- Shore, A. F., "Votive Objects from Dendera of the Graeco-Roman Period," in: J. Ruffle et al. (Eds.), *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt. Studies in honour of H. W. Fairman*, Warminster 1979, 138-60.
- Shorter, A. W., *Catalogue of Egyptian Religious Papyri in the British Museum. Copies of the Book Pr(t)-m-hrw from the XVIII<sup>th</sup> to the XXXII<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty*, London 1938.
- Silverman, D. P., *Interrogative Construction with JN and JN-JW in Old and Middle Egyptian*. BA 1, Malibu 1980.
- , "An Emphasized Object of a Nominal Verb in Middle Egyptian," *Orientalia* 49 (1980), 199-203.
- , "The Relative Past Future Form in Late Egyptian," in: *Festschrift Westendorf*, 191-96.
- , "Verbal Nominal Clauses in Middle Egyptian," in: *Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mokhtar II*. BdE 97, Le Caire 1985, 269-85.

- , "Divinity and Deities in Ancient Egypt," in: B. Shafer (Ed.), *Religion in Ancient Egypt*, Ithaca 1991, 75-87.
- , "Royalty in Literature," in: D. O'Connor - D. Silverman (Eds.), *Ancient Egyptian Kingship: New Investigations*, forthcoming.
- Simpson, W. K., "The Letter to the Dead from the Tomb of Meru (N 3737) at Nag' ed-Deir," *JEA* 52 (1966), 39-52.
- , "The Memphite Epistolary Formula on a jar stand of the First Intermediate Period from Naga Ed-Deir," in: W. K. Simpson - W. M. Davis, *Studies in Ancient Egypt, the Aegean, and the Sudan. Essays in Honor of Dows Dunham on the Occasion of his 90th Birthday, June 1, 1980*, Boston 1981, 173-79.
- Smith, H. S. - A. Smith, "A Reconsideration of the Kamose Texts," *ZÄS* 103 (1976), 48-79.
- Smith, M., *Demotic Papyri in the British Museum*, vol. 3, London 1987.
- von Soden, W., *Grundriß der akkadischen Grammatik*. AnOr 33, 47, Roma 1969.
- Spalinger, A., "A Sequence System," *RdE* 39 (1988), 107-129.
- Stricker, B. H., "De indeeling der Egyptische taalgeschiedenis," *OMRO* 25 (1944), 12-51.
- Stubbs, M., *Discourse Analysis*, Chicago 1983.
- Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*. 2 Bde, Göttingen 1984.
- Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*. 2 vols., ed. by S.I. Groll, Jerusalem 1990.
- Studies Presented to Hans Jacob Polotsky*, edited by D. W. Young, Beacon Hill 1981.
- Szemerényi, O., *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*, Darmstadt 1989.
- Tesnière, L., *Éléments de syntaxe structurale*, Paris 1959.
- Thacker, T. W., *The Relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian Verbal Systems*, Oxford 1954.
- Tobin, V. A., *The Intellectual Organization of the Amarna Period*, Diss. Jerusalem 1986.
- Tosi, M. - A. Roccati, *Stele e altre epigrafi di Deir el Medina*, Torino 1972.
- Tresson, P., "L'inscription de Chéchanq I<sup>er</sup> au Musée du Caire: un frappant exemple d'impôt progressif en matière religieuse," *Mélanges Maspero I. Orient Ancien*. MIFAO 66, Le Caire 1934, 817-40.
- Tylor, J. - F. Ll. Griffith, *The Tomb of Paheri at el-Kab*, London 1894.
- Van Siclen, C. C. - W. Murnane, in: *ARCE Meeting 1989 (Philadelphia: University Museum)*. Abstracts, 41-42.
- Vandier, J., *Tombes de Deir el-Médineh. La tombe de Nefer-Abou*. MIFAO 69, Le Caire 1935.
- , *Mo'alla. La Tombe d'Ankhtifi et la tombe de Sébekhotep*. BdE 18, Le Caire 1950.
- Vergote, J., *De oplossing van een gewichtig probleem: de vocalisatie van de Egyptische werkwoordvormen*. Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Kl. der Letteren, XXII, 7, Brussel 1960.
- , *Grammaire copte*. 2 vols., Louvain 1973-83.

- , "La vocalisation des formes verbales en égyptien. Des matériaux nouveaux?," *BiOr* 34 (1977), 135-39.
- Vernus, P., "La stèle C3 du Louvre," *RdE* 25 (1973), 217-34.
- , "Un texte oraculaire de Ramsès VI," *BIFAO* 75 (1975), 103-11.
- , "La formule 'Le souffle de la bouche' au Moyen Empire," *RdE* 28 (1976), 139-45.
- , "Littérature et autobiographie. Les inscriptions de S3-Mwt surnommé Kyky," *RdE* 30 (1978), 115-46.
- , "Études de philologie et de linguistique," *RdE* 32 (1980), 117-34.
- , "Deux particularités de l'égyptien de tradition: *nty iw* + Présent; *wnn.f hr sdm* narratif," in: *L'Égyptologie en 1979*, 81-89.
- , Review of Černý-Groll, *LEG. Orientalia* 50 (1981), 429-30.
- , "Formes 'emphatiques' en fonction non 'emphatique' dans la protase d'un système corrélatif," *GM* 43 (1981), 73-88.
- , Review of Silverman, *Interrogative Constructions. CdE* 57 (1982), 243-49.
- , "Sujet + *sdm.f* et sujet + pseudoparticipe avec les verbes de qualité: dialectique de l'aspect et de l'*Aktionsart*," in: *Festschrift Westendorf*, 197-212.
- , "Allusion au partage des acquets dans une autobiographie de la deuxième période intermédiaire," *DE* 6 (1986), 79-86.
- , "Aspect and Morphosyntactic Patterns in Middle Egyptian," in: *Crossroad*, 375-88.
- , "Études de philologie et de linguistique (VI)," *RdE* 38 (1987), 163-81.
- , "L'instance de la narration dans les phases anciennes de l'égyptien," *DE* 9 (1987), 97-111.
- , "Sur deux inscriptions du Moyen Empire (Urk. VII, 36; Caire JE 51911)," *BSEG* 13 (1989), 173-81.
- , "Entre néo-égyptien et démotique: la langue utilisée dans la traduction du Rituel de repousser l'Agressif (Études sur la diglossie I)," *RdE* 41 (1990), 153-208.
- , "La date du Paysan Éloquent," in: *Studies Lichtheim*, 1033-47.
- , *Future at Issue. Tense, Mood and Aspect in Middle Egyptian: Studies in Syntax and Semantics*. YES 4, New Haven 1991.
- Volten, A., *Ägypter und Amazonen. Eine demotische Erzählung des Inaros-Petubastis-Kreises aus zwei Papyri der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Pap. Vindob. 6165 und 6165A)*. Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek 6, Wien 1962.
- Vycichl, W., "A propos de la flexion nominale en égyptien et en sémitique," *CdE* 57 (1982), 55-64.
- , *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*, Louvain 1985.
- Wente, E. F., *The Syntax of Verbs of Motion*, Diss. Chicago 1959.
- , "A Note on 'The Eloquent Peasant' B I, 13-15," *JNES* 24 (1965), 105-9.
- , "A Late Egyptian Emphatic Tense," *JNES* 28 (1969), 1-14.
- , "Mysticism in Pharaonic Egypt?," *JNES* 41 (1982), 161-79.
- , *Letters from Ancient Egypt*. Writings from the ancient world 1, Atlanta 1990.
- Werner, O., "Appellativa-Nomina Propria," in: *Proceedings of the 11<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Linguists*. 2 vols., Bologna 1974, 171-87.

- Westendorf, W., *Der Gebrauch des Passivs in der klassischen Literatur der Ägypter*. VIO 18, Berlin 1953.
- , "Die Wortstellung Nomen + *sdm.f* als grammatische Konstruktion," *MIO* 1 (1953), 337-43.
- , "Das geminierte passive *sdm-f (mrr-f)*: imperfektisch oder emphatisch?," *ZÄS* 84 (1959), 147-55.
- , *Grammatik der medizinischen Texte*. GMAÄ 8, Berlin 1962.
- , "*sdmwf* = *sađmóf*," *ZÄS* 90 (1963), 127-31.
- , *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1965-1977.
- , *Beiträge zum altägyptischen Nominalsatz*. NAWG, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1981, 3, 77-99.
- , "Der dreigliedrige Nominalsatz Subjekt-*pw*-Prädikat: konstatierend oder emphatisch?," *GM* 109 (1989), 83-94.
- Wild, H., *Le Tombeau de Ti*, vol. 2. MIFAO 65, Le Caire 1953.
- Wilson, J. A. "The Language of the Historical Texts Commemorating Ramses III," in: U. Hölscher - J. A. Wilson, *Medinet Habu Studies, 1928/29*. OIC 7, Chicago 1930.
- Woidich, M., "Das Ägyptisch-Arabisches," in: W. Fischer - O. Jastrow (Hgg.), *Handbuch der arabischen Dialekte*. Porta Linguarum Orientalium 16, Wiesbaden 1980, 207-48.
- Zandee, J., *Death as an Enemy According to Ancient Egyptian Conceptions*. Studies in the history of Religions 5, Leiden 1960.
- , "Sargtexte um über Wasser zu verfügen," *JEOL* 24 (1975-76), 1-47.
- Zemb, J.-M., "Le 'Satzgegenstand' en appel," *BSLP* 80 (1985), XXIV-XXV.