

EGYPTIAN TENSES

by

H. J. POLOTSKY

- I The Basic Elements of the Tense-System §§ 1-3
- II Verb-Forms in Clauses of Circumstance §§ 4-15
- III Clauses of Circumstance as Logical Predicates §§ 16-21
- IV Verbs of Motion: Initial *sdm.n.f* versus Auxiliary plus Stative §§ 22-33
- V Transitive Verbs: Initial *sdm.n.f* versus *jw sdm.n.f* §§ 34-40
- VI Compound Verb-Forms in Initial Position §§ 41-46
- VII Conclusion §§ 47-50

I. THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF THE TENSE-SYSTEM

1. The purpose of this paper is to present a list of the basic elements of the Middle Egyptian tense-system. I use the expression 'basic elements' in a two-fold sense. We want to single out the forms which are (1) morphologically simple (i.e., not compound, but capable of becoming part of compound forms),¹ and (2) in respect of meaning as nearly as possible 'indicative', i.e., expressive of a statement of fact, free from modal colouring. If distinct morphological units (paradigms or single forms) exist within the 'indicative mood', it seems reasonable to expect that the distinctions conveyed by them will belong to the category of tense and/or aspect.

¹ We are not concerned with the forms *sdm.jn.f*, *sdm.hr.f*, *sdm.k3.f*, nor with the construction Infinitive plus *pw jr.n.f*.

2. In order to achieve our aim, we need to find a syntactic position where the greatest possible number of simple forms are interchangeable within the same syntactic frame.

Initial position, which seems the obvious first choice, is not a suitable point from which to start our inquiry, because the verb-forms which occur in this position do not all belong to the same syntactic order and therefore are not really exchangeable. In particular, a bare *sdm.f* form in initial position is very rarely indicative.² As a rule, it is either prospective or 'emphatic'. The latter heralds an emphasized adverbial complement (§ 16) which either need not be present at all, or, if present, is not emphasized, after a prospective *sdm.f*. As regards *sdm.n.f*, both bare *sdm.n.f* and the compound *ju sdm.n.f* are found in initial position. The relationship of these two forms is far from being clearly understood; the difference between them is probably underrated (§§ 34 ff.). In any case, the simple forms which occur in initial position turn out to be less simple than they appear. The syntactic position we are looking for ought to be free from such complications.

3. Our requirements are met by the clause of circumstance. In this type of non-initial clause we encounter a fairly wide range of exchangeable verb-forms (or verbal phrases) which express actions or states anterior, or concomitant, or in prospect, relatively to the initial verb.

II. VERB-FORMS IN CLAUSES OF CIRCUMSTANCE

4. In order to collect the forms we are looking for, we need only examine a certain number of examples of two common constructions, viz., (1) 'to find' or 'to see' someone or something in such and such a state, and (2) Infinitive (mostly of verbs of motion) plus *pw jr.n-*, which is often followed by a clause of circumstance. Between them these two constructions supply us with the following seven forms and phrases:

- (1) *sdm.f* (§ 11)
- (2) *sdm.n.f* (§ 12)
- (3) Passive *sdmw.f*
- (4) the Stative³
- (5) *hr* plus Infinitive

² The most important instances of indicative bare *sdm.f* are *mr.f* 'he loves, likes' and *msd.f* 'he hates, dislikes'. It is precisely these two verbs which are used, jointly and severally, in the construction *jnk sdm.f* (Edel § 1051; for references cf. *Zu den Inschriften der 11. Dyn.* § 44). And this fact in turn is probably connected with the curious rarity, if not complete absence, of the active imperf. participle *mrr* after *jnk* in laudatory epithets: *Denderah* Pl. 8c = Janssen *Autobiogr.* II.Aw 1 is less certain than Janssen (II, p. 91, 'een zeker voorbeeld') thought; cf. *infra*, § 11.

³ The parallelism of *sdm.n.f*, the passive *sdmw.f* and the Stative in this construction was pointed out by Edel § 540 Anm.

(6) *m* plus Infinitive

(7) *r* plus Infinitive (§ 5).

5. After 'to find', *r* plus Infinitive does not seem to occur. Its inclusion in our list is justified by a passage in the introductory narrative of the Prophecy of Nfrty, which has achieved some fame because a conjectural emendation suggested by Gardiner long ago has recently received documentary support from an ostrakon.⁴ Here we find *sdm.n.f* (the *-n-* supplied by the ostrakon) and *r* plus Infinitive in contextual contrast:

'q pw jr.n qnbt nt hnw r Pr-'3 '.w.s. r nd hrt
pri pw jr.n.sn nd.n.sn hrt mj nt-'sn nt r' nb

The courtiers of the residence went into the Palace
in order to pay homage,
they came out after having paid homage according to
their daily custom.

6. In bringing all these expressions together under the common head of 'circumstantial' verb-forms, we rely on the fact that they make up a substitution table. The morphological properties of the individual forms are not immediately relevant to the business of setting up the syntactic order represented by them. However, we cannot fail to notice that they are of very different sorts.

7. On formal grounds they fall into three groups, viz., (1) the forms of the suffix-conjugation, (2) the Stative, and (3) the preposition-plus-Infinitive phrases. From the point of view of being capable of inflexion for person, gender and number, the Stative goes with the forms of the suffix-conjugation. Both always refer back to either the subject or the complement of the initial verb. So long as they have no subject of their own, these seven forms, disparate though they are in respect of their morphological character, show no difference so far as their syntactic treatment is concerned. As soon, however, as they have a nominal subject of their own, the grouping changes. The Stative goes with the prepositional phrases, inasmuch as both have their nominal subject in front of them; the 3rd person endings of the Stative agree with its nominal subject in gender and number. The forms of the suffix-conjugation stand apart, having their nominal subject, in place of the suffix, after the verb-stem. This difference has further consequences, when the seven forms combine with various auxiliary elements so as to produce the compound forms used in indicative initial position. See below, § 42.

8. In addition to the characteristic position of their nominal subject, the Stative and the preposition-plus-Infinitive phrases share the property

⁴ Posener *Littérature et politique dans l'Égypte de la XIIe dynastie* (Paris 1954) 147-148. The passage is reproduced in corrupt form in de Buck's *Leesboek* 20, 6-8, and in emended form in Brunner's *Abriss der mittelläg. Gr.* (1961) 98, 5.

of being naturally fit to function in a clause of circumstance, i.e., of belonging by their very nature to the category of adverbial adjuncts. The preposition-plus-Infinitive phrases are in fact merely a particular case of preposition plus nominal complement, and some authorities would lay so much stress on this identity as to disregard the fact that the Infinitive is, after all, a 'part' of the verb.

9. The fact that forms of the suffix-conjugation are interchangeable with such forms of genuinely adverbial function as the Stative and the preposition-plus-Infinitive phrases raises a familiar problem. The forms of the suffix-conjugation have the appearance of predicative forms capable of being used in independent sentences, and if they are found functioning as circumstantial expressions they are suspected of doing so only 'virtually', i.e., according to the definition of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 'in effect, though not formally or explicitly'. It is held that in translating them in English or in other modern European languages as clauses of circumstance we introduce an element which is not really present in Egyptian. To speak in our grammars of clauses of circumstance amounts, according to this view, to falsifying Egyptian structure. It is from considerations of this kind that the clause of circumstance as such is denied a place in Westendorf's admirable *Mediz. Gr.* (§ 432), though the 'virtually' circumstantial function of the verb-forms concerned receives full treatment in each individual case.

10. This argument seems to take it for granted that bare *sdm.f* and *sdm.n.f* can function as genuinely predicative forms in independent sentences (i.e., in initial position)⁵ or, to put it differently, that the *sdm.f* and *sdm.n.f* forms which indubitably do occur in initial position are (1) genuinely predicative, and (2) identical with the *sdm.f* and *sdm.n.f* forms found in clauses of circumstance.

11. In strictly morphological terms the question of identity can be examined only in respect of *sdm.f*.

The verbs which have distinctive *sdm.f* forms are not very plentifully attested in clauses of circumstance. Such as it is, the evidence may be summed up as follows.

The verbs IIIae inf. do not reduplicate the second radical and therefore resemble both the prospective and the 'perfective' forms, e.g., *dg.f* in *Denderah* Pl. 8c, *jnk mrrj (Mrrj) wnm dg.f, n jnk js wnm 'fnw* 'I am one who likes (? , *Mrrj* is the name of the deceased) to eat while he sees, I

5 According to Gardiner a 'virtual subordinate clause' is to be recognized 'when a subordinate clause has nothing to distinguish it from a complete sentence except its meaning and its syntactic function (e.g. the replacing of a nominal object, § 69)' *Gr.* § 182, cf. *JEA* 33 (1947) 100.

am not one who eats blindfolded' (note the parallelism with the stative 'fnw).

'To give' appears in a shape which elsewhere is typically prospective, *dj-* (Erman *Äg. Gr.* § 294, 1).⁶

On the other hand, the form of 'to come' differs from the characteristically prospective one and resembles both the 'perfective' and the 'emphatic' form: *ju-*. A particularly good example has been recognized by Edel *ÄZ* 83 (1958) 10 in *The Mastaba of Khentika called Ikhekhi* Pl. V Text B, 6 *jr m33.t(j.j) ju(.j) (Q~D)* 'if I was seen coming'; cf. also CT V 101a. But in some examples this form seems to be a mere spelling variant of a separate form, spelled *~DQq* and *Qq* (CT VII 255d, 330c).⁷

'To bring' appears in the characteristically non-prospective form *ju-*, which resembles both the form used after *jr* 'if' (*Peasant* B 1, 252 = B 2, 5) and the 'perfective' form used after the negative *n* (Gunn *Studies* 108): *Shipwrecked Sailor* 113-114 *m.k ntr rdj.n.f 'nh.k, ju.f tw r ju pn n k3* 'Behold, it is by bringing you to this island of a *ka* that the God has caused you to live.' As a rule this verb, when used circumstantially, seems to prefer the *sdm.n.f*, although it must be translated by the Present, 'bringing (back)', e.g., *Urk.* I 138, 11; *Sinuhe* R 15; *Urk.* IV 330, 3; 346, 10. This *ju.n-* often accompanies verbs like 'to come', 'to return', and for practical purposes the best rendering is often simply 'with'.⁸

As regards 'to see', though the typically non-prospective form *m33-* is frequent enough in non-initial clauses, it is doubtful whether these are clauses of circumstance. The action of 'seeing' is not concomitant with the action of the initial verb (most often 'to rejoice', also 'to be afraid'), but rather denotes its motive or cause. It is therefore possible that *m33-* not only resembles, but actually is, the 'that-form' in adverbial function. On the other hand, *m33-* is also the form used after *jr* 'if',⁹ and it will be seen

6 It is probably the circumstantial *sdm.f* that we have to recognize in Metrop. Mus. 13.182.3 (Clère-Vandier *Bibl. aeg.* X § 15), legend in front of the king (continuing line 15, in larger hieroglyphs than the main inscription): 'King Antef etc. (shown in this relief) as he gives (*dj.f*) milk and beer to Re' and Hathor and says (*dd.f*) what the two of them love.' In Aramaic we would have כד יאהב and in Amharic *andäsätä*.

7 The spelling *ju-* (*Q~D*) thus can have three different meanings: it can be (1) the standard spelling of the 'perfective' *sdm.f* after the negative *n* (Gunn *Studies* 108); (2) a defective (but nevertheless standard) spelling for the 'emphatic' *juw-* (Edel §§ 456, 491c); (3) the circumstantial *sdm.f* = *juw-*, *ju-*.

8 In the 'Destruction of Mankind' ap. de Buck *Readingbook* 123, 14 *ju.n.f* is circumstantial and *ju.n.k* 'emphatic'. This *ju.n.f* is the ancestor of Late Eg. *ju ju.f* (an intermediate form *ju ju.n.f* Kuentz *Bataille de Qadech* p. 365, with the interesting variant *hr*), which has recently been discussed by Černý *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics* (Jerusalem 1964) 81-85 and by Wente *JNES* 21 (1962) 306 n. 19.

9 The form used after *jr* (*ju-*, *m33-*) must be a 'that-form', witness the negation by

later (§ 41) that *m33-* appears in the same constructions as does the distinctive form of 'to come'.

Thus, while most distinctive *sdm.f* forms severally seem to recur in some other variety of *sdm.f*, especially the 'perfective', the entire set of *sdm.f* forms used in clauses of circumstance cannot be identified with any other known set as a whole. In particular, 'to come' seems to possess a form peculiar to clauses of circumstance. The safest course is, therefore, to follow Erman's example (*Äg. Gr.* §§ 294–295) and to set up, at least for the time being, the 'circumstantial *sdm.f*' as an independent variety of *sdm.f*.

12. As regards *sdm.n.f*, at least one thing can be asserted, viz., that it is not 'emphatic'. This conclusion follows from the fact that the only passive form encountered in clauses of circumstance is the passive *sdmw.f*, never *sdm.n.tw.f* (confirmed by Edel § 567).

13. Some complication arises from the fact that the clause of circumstance is not the only type of clause which can be represented by non-initial *sdm.f* and *sdm.n.f* forms. The prospective *sdm.f*, which with certain verbs (e.g., 'to give') coincides with the forms used in clauses of circumstance, expresses purpose as well as consequence. Above all, there exist continuative clauses, in which the *sdm.n.f* form is used to carry the narrative a step further. With the *sdm.n.f* no formal distinction whatever becomes apparent. As a rule only the context, i.e., considerations of the natural sequence of events, can guide us in the choice between a circumstantial¹⁰ and a continuative¹¹ rendering.

In this case, indeed, no criterion except 'meaning' seems to be available. To reject this criterion and to claim that the non-initial *sdm.n.f* is essentially a 'complete sentence' is to impute to the Egyptians a somewhat improbable indifference to the natural sequence of events. In the case of a non-initial *sdm.n.f* expressing anteriority in relation to the initial verb, the device of rendering it by an independent Pluperfect involves a fallacy: a relative tense as such is no less subordinate to some neighbouring verb-form than a conjunction would make it.

14. There is perhaps some slight evidence to suggest that continuative *sdm.n.f* as distinct from circumstantial *sdm.n.f* may in certain conditions require to be understood as 'emphatic'. This possibility is suggested by *CT V* 184f, g (and similarly 182b, c) *spr.ljr.f r ky sb3, gnm.f jrj-'3.f 'h'* 'then he arrives at another gate and finds its door-keeper standing.' Between this passage and a narrative passage like *Peasant R* 37–39 (sim.

tm, but it is neither the *mrr.f* form (*jnn-*) nor the prospective form (*jnt-*, *m3-/m3n-*, cf. n. 23). The details are still very obscure.

¹⁰ Gardiner § 414, 2 n. 7.

¹¹ e.g., *Westcar* 11, 26–12, 1; 12, 12–13.

Westcar 10, 1-2) *spr pw jr.n.f r w n Pr-Fjj...*, *gm.n.f z (jm) 'h' hr mryt* 'then he arrived at the district of *Pr-Fjj...*, and found a man (there) standing on the landing place,' the only difference seems to lie in the time-field. It would seem, then, that *gm.n.f* is parallel to *gmm.f* and consequently must be 'emphatic': 'to be standing' appears to have been considered a sufficiently distinctive attitude to require or justify emphasis.¹² The examples adduced by Westendorf *Mediz. Gr.* § 228, 1 and 2, can probably be interpreted in the same way, without positing *ad hoc* a *mrr.f* form with the special (non-'emphatic') function of continuing certain verb-forms. However, the evidence is too slight for us to speak with any certainty,¹³ and may, at best, be valid for *gmj* only.

15. As regards criteria for recognizing 'syntactic function' (supra, n. 5), it is hardly correct to represent matters as if there were only the two opposite extremes, viz., 'mere logical points of view' on the one side and 'distinctive formal features' on the other, especially if the latter expression is too narrowly understood as applying only to positive signs of subordination. The possibilities of 'parataxis' (in the sense of 'konjunktionslose Hypotaxe')¹⁴ are many and subtle, though some of them are not accessible to observation so far as dead languages are concerned. In particular, there exists the possibility of subordination being effected by negative means, viz., by the absence of positive morphological elements characterizing syntactic independence. I am much inclined to think that this is precisely what we have to reckon with in Middle Egyptian: the *sdm.f* and *sdm.n.f* forms used in clauses of circumstance are characterized as subordinate by the negative 'formal feature' of not being preceded by *jr*.

III. CLAUSES OF CIRCUMSTANCE AS LOGICAL PREDICATES

16. An eminently characteristic type of Egyptian sentence structure is the relation of an initial 'that-form' as subject to an adverbial adjunct as predicate.¹⁵ In this construction the place of the adverbial adjunct can likewise be filled by a clause of circumstance. Since a 'that-form' cannot, as a rule, occupy initial position (as 'emphatic' form¹⁶) without being followed by an emphasized adverbial adjunct, it is perhaps poss-

12 But the prospective (optative) *gm.j* is not replaced by **gmm.j* in CT V 390b = 399i, *gm.j S3h 'h' hr w3t(.j)* 'may I find Orion standing on the (my) way.'

13 Cf. CT IV 207b, c *jj.n.j // pr.n.j* in contextual contrast with *h33.j // wnn.j*, the difference between the two pairs of forms being one of tense.

14 E. P. Morris *On Principles and Methods in Latin Syntax* (New York 1902) Ch. VI.

15 Cf. *Orientalia* 33 (1964) 276.

16 In this particular function of the 'that-form' the time-honoured name 'emphatic form' or 'emphatic *sdm.f*' can perhaps be justified as a somewhat bold brachylogy for 'a form which heralds an emphasized adverbial adjunct'.

ible to argue that a *sdm.f* or *sdm.n.f* which functions as an emphasized adverbial adjunct is formally characterized as such by the 'emphatic' form of which it is the necessary complement.

17. A good example occurs in the rubrics of two chapters of the Book of the Dead, 64 and 125.¹⁷ The first passage is especially instructive because the initial verb-form, *šdd.tw* 'one shall recite', is clearly 'emphatic' and shows that the *dd.tw* 'one shall say' of the second passage must be the same form.¹⁸ The second passage offers in the circumstantial clause a *sdm.n.f* form in parallelism with several Statives: 'One shall say this spell being pure and clean (*w'b twr*), being dressed (*wnhw*) in clothes, being shod (*ibw*) with white sandals, being painted (round one's eyes, *sdmw*) with kohl, being anointed (*wrhw*) with myrrh, and having offered up (*wdn.n.f*) an offering (of various ingredients).'

18. The translation of such sentences presents a certain difficulty. Compared with the English or French Cleft Sentence the Egyptian construction offers the advantage that the entire expression of emphasis is concentrated in the initial verb-form, while the rest of the sentence remains unchanged and in particular the word-order is not affected: since the emphasized adverbial adjunct as a rule (with the exception of *n-* with suffixes) occupies rear position, it can be expanded to a very considerable extent (cf. *infra*, § 31) without making the whole unwieldy. In the Cleft Sentence the fact that the emphasized element, 'la vedette', is flanked by the two operative elements of the construction, viz., the introductory *it is/c'est* and the *that/que*-clause, imposes certain limits upon the length of the vedette, especially if it consists of a clause or of several clauses. So long as there is only one clause of circumstance, the English Cleft Sentence can probably be tolerated, at least for literal translation, as a means to exhibit the grammatical structure. With a larger number of clauses of circumstance the use of the Cleft Sentence becomes awkward or impossible. In such cases the relatively best solution is to make a subordinate clause of the initial verb-form and to turn the clauses of circumstance into main sentences:¹⁹ 'When saying this spell, one

17 ed. Budge 145u and 267pu — 268, 3 respectively; reproduced in de Buck's *Leesboek* 6, 8 ff. and *Readingbook* 39, 11-13 = 122, 12-14 respectively.

18 Cf. *infra*, n. 20.

19 Cf. James *The Heḳanakte Papers* (1962) 106 under (9) and my comments *Orientalia* 33 (1964) 277 n. 1. — Even with one clause, the literal rendering is apt to sound so unnatural in English that some readers may feel doubts about the Egyptian structure which it seeks to reproduce. Perhaps such doubts will be allayed by analogous Late Egyptian and Demotic constructions in which the 'emphatic' and circumstantial forms are easier to identify owing to their analytic structure; e.g., Bologna 1094, 4, 5-6 = Gardiner *L.-Eg. Misc.* 4, 8-10 (cf. *Caminos ditto* p. 15) *jdj.k* (*ḏ*) *spr.j r Pr-R'-ms-sw-Mr-'Imu*..... *fw.w grg* lit., 'it is while they (sc.

shall be pure, clean, dressed, shod, etc., and one shall have offered up...

19. Twenty years ago the connexion between the 'emphatic' *sdm.f* and the emphasized adverbial adjunct had yet to be demonstrated. By now this connexion seems to be well enough established to justify a certain measure of confidence in recognizing an initial verb-form as 'emphatic', though it may lack distinctive formal features, solely on the strength of the emphasis borne in a given context by the adverbial adjunct. This applies not only to *sdm.f*-forms from other verb-classes than the IIIae inf. (*mrr.f*),²⁰ but also to other forms of the suffix-conjugation. The passive *sdm.n.tj|tw.f*²¹ and the *sdm.n.f* of 'to come' and other verbs of motion have already been shown to have a claim to join the 'emphatic' company, and they are likely to be followed by more.

20. In arguing the 'emphatic' character of these forms, no reference has yet been made to the fact that they share with the *mrr.f* form a marked incompatibility with *jw*.²² In the context of the present paper this feature is an argument of central significance.

the chariots) are ready that you shall cause me to arrive at Pi-Ramses' = 'you shall see to it that they are ready, when I arrive at Pi-Ramses'; Kubban Stela 26 (Sander-Hansen *Bibl. aeg.* IV 32, 14) *dd.k* (𓄏𓄏) *hpr 3bd n hrw, jw hb[k.....]* lit., 'it is while you have (already) sent out [.....] that you shall cause a month [Spiegelberg *ÄZ* 58 (1923) 158] to pass' = 'before you allow a month to pass, you shall (already) have sent out [.....]'; *Insinger* 34, 6 *jjr.f ph r .wj, jw p3 sy wh3 jr bl h3t.f* lit., 'it is while Fortune wishes to escape before him, that he arrives at a house' = 'when he arrives at a house, Fortune wishes to escape before him.' Incidentally, this analysis explains the now well-known fact that Late Eg. *jw.f hr sdm* must be translated as referring to the future, when it follows an initial *wnn.f hr sdm* (Černý orally 1951; Wente *JNES* 20 (1961) 122 n. j): *wnn.f* is the 'emphatic' form and often refers to the future; *jw.f hr sdm* is circumstantial and expresses concomitance with the preceding sentence.

20 Sethe *Verbum* II § 352 denied the validity of such conclusions by arguing that there was no provable need to assume that 'emphatic' forms existed at all in strong verbs. It is only fair to admit that such arguments as can be brought forward, for what they may be worth, were not available when Sethe wrote: (1) the negation by *tm-*, which is required by the morphological character of the form, and not merely by its meaning, applies to all verb-classes; (2) the Late Egyptian and Coptic successors of the old 'emphatic' forms, i.e., *jjr.f sdm* and the Second Tenses respectively, are subject to no limitation in respect of verb-classes; (3) parallelism as a stylistic procedure would not work if 'emphatic' forms existed only in one particular verb-class: a passage like *Sinuhe* B149 ff. would be pointless if *w'r* were not as distinctly 'emphatic' as *z33* and *rw* are.

21 Some further examples from the Coffin Texts: *jr.n.t(w)* I 344/5d, IV 5b, 106a; *ms.n.t(w)* IV 105i; *rdj.n.t(w)* III 200f (var. *dj.tw*), IV 109a; *-j* I 232e; *-s* IV 262a (var. *wnn.s*); *sjp.n.t(w).k* II 128b; *s'h.n.t(w).k* I 146c; *sb3.n.tw.j* 1231g (cf. 230c *sb3.n.f wj*); *gm.n.t(w)* I 166h; *iz.n.t(w)* II 302/3d.

22 For *jw mrr.f* Gardiner § 462 n. 6 quotes only *Ptahh.* 59 (L2) *jw gmm.tw.s* as 'an

21. The presence of an initial verb-form which we thus have come to suspect of being 'emphatic' will in turn lead us to conclude that a subsequent verb-form must be emphasized. If, e.g., an initial *sdm.n.f* of a verb of motion is followed by another verb-form, the latter may be presumed to represent the emphasized adverbial complement: as a rule it will be either a clause of circumstance or a clause of purpose.²³ Examples where both the initial and the circumstantial form are in *sdm.n.f* will be studied in §§ 29 ff.

The circumstantial form can also be in *sdm.f* and can be used with the effect of stressing (perhaps with some measure of hyperbole) that the action of the second verb occurred concomitantly with ('as soon as') that of the initial verb. Literal translation would sound too unnatural to be of any use; by employing the device described in § 18, at least the distribution of subject and predicate will be adequately expressed. *Sinuhe* B 38 *jj.n.j m m5' r (? n?) T3-Tmhjw, whm.tw n.j, jb.j 3h(d)w* 'When I returned from the Libyan expedition, it was (at once) reported to me and my heart fainted.'

Brit. Mus. 574, 11 (*Hierogl. Texts* II Pl. 9) = *Sethe Les.* 75, 13 *jj.n.j m hnt hr hm.f, dj.f sjp(.j) jtw ntrw* 'when I first²⁴ came to His Majesty, he (at once) caused me to check...'

IV. VERBS OF MOTION: INITIAL *sdm.n.f* VERSUS AUXILIARY PLUS STATIVE

22. The relationship of *jj.n.j* and *m.k wj jj.kwj* was for the first time discussed by Gunn (*Studies* 98), according to whom *jj.n.j* denotes the past event of coming, and *m.k wj jj.kwj* the resulting state of having

isolated exception'. A further example is perhaps *Knyf* § VIII (*Posener Ostraca hié-atiques littéraires de Deir el Médineh* II Pl. 9), if the true reading is indeed *jw rmm.s jw hr rmw.k m grh, 3pdw.k m hrw* 'she weeps ['und zwar weint sie,' cf. § 26; the preceding sentence is of the type discussed by Edel § 494] for you on account of your fishes by night, and your fowl by day.' The only example that can be adduced for *jw sdm.n.tw.f* is the title of the Rhind Math. Pap., *jw jsf grt sphr.n.tw...* (*Sethe Les.* 60, 11); the *jw* is disturbing not only in connexion with *sphr.n.tw* but also with *jsf grt*, an unusual combination to find outside initial ('non-enclitic') position (Gardiner § 231 n. 12, cf. § 248).

23 For a clause of purpose cf. *BD* ed. Budge 249, 5-6 (*Nu*, CXXV, *Introd.*) = de Buck *Readingbook* 116, 3-4 *jj.n.j hr.k nb.j jnt.k wj m3n.j nfrw.k* 'I have come to thee, my lord, that thou mayest bring me and that I may see thy beauty.' Both *jnt-* and *m3n-* happen to be characteristically prospective forms, contrasting with the circumstantial ones listed in § 11. According to de Buck *Gramm.* § 123, where this example is quoted, 'la ligne de démarcation entre' an independent optative and a clause of purpose 'ne peut être tracée d'une manière absolument nette'. The latter alternative is supported by the form *jj.n.j* (*infra*, §§ 23, 24).

24 i.e., apparently, for the first time, or as the first caller, sc. after the coronation (*Sethe Erläut.* ad loc.); cf. Blackman *JEA* 16 (1930) 65.

(being)²⁵-and-remaining-come. Gardiner (§ 414, 4) accepted this distinction and added the important observation that *jj.n-* is preferred where it is accompanied by a statement of the purpose for which the grammatical actor (who for the most part is also the speaker) has come. He did not, however, succeed in explaining why for the statement of a purpose an expression of the act of coming should have been preferred to an expression of being in a state of 'comeness' (Gunn). The idea that the presence of a statement of purpose was relevant to the difference between the two constructions did not meet with general acceptance. Westendorf in his article 'Dynamischer Gebrauch des passivisch-intransitiven Pseudopartizips', *Mitt. Inst. Orientf.* 1 (1953) 38-56 endeavoured to invalidate Gardiner's argument by pointing out that, on Gardiner's own admission, statements of purpose occur after *m.k wj jj.kwj* as well.²⁶

23. On the other hand I had supplemented (and, as I thought, strengthened) Gardiner's observation by showing (*Études* 84) that Old and Middle Egyptian *jj.n.j* preceding a statement of purpose is matched in Late Egyptian and Demotic by *jjr.j jy*²⁷ and in Coptic by the Second Perfect $\pi\tau\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$.²⁸ From these diachronic correspondences I concluded that *jj.n.j* was 'emphatic', and I modified Gardiner's account of its use by restricting it to emphasized statements of purpose.

24. Westendorf's counter-argument would lose its force if it could be shown that statements of purpose accompanying *m.k wj jj.kwj* are not emphasized. The obvious difficulty is that in certain contexts the presence or absence of emphasis is a matter of individual choice rather than of logical or contextual necessity. In such cases philological interpretation is not of much use as an independent check upon grammatical theory, because inevitably it will lend support to whichever solution is desired. It is evident that a grammatical category ought to be based on more objective foundations. As it happens, the two forms of the verb 'to come' seem to present a peculiarity which it may be worth trying as a criterion.

There are clear examples to show that *m.k wj jj.kwj* by itself can be a self-contained minimal construction.²⁹ If it is found followed by an adverbial adjunct, the latter must be described as facultative and accessory. On the other hand, *jj.n.j* has never been found to occur alone. It is incapable of constituting a minimal construction by itself, but must

25 Jespersen *Mod. Eng. Gr.* IV 3.1(2)-3.2(1).

26 Also *Peasant* B1, 77 *m.k sw jw r spr n.j hr.s*.

27 Further Demotic examples are *Rylands* IX 4, 11; in the 3rd f. sg., *Setne* 5, 3.

28 Further examples are 2 Sam. xxiv 21 ($\pi\tau\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$ is an addition of the translator's, cf. Gen. xxiii 8, quoted *Études* 30); Judith x 13; with nominal actor, Ex. xx 20.

29 e.g., *CT* I 265a; V 95c, and passim in this spell.

necessarily be accompanied by some kind of adverbial adjunct. Such an adverbial 'adjunct' is therefore no adjunct in the strict sense of the word, but rather an obligatory part of the sentence; it is, in fact, the central part (the 'logical predicate'). It is a matter of some importance for the present argument that *jj.n.k* must necessarily be used before an adverbial 'adjunct' consisting of a preposition plus interrogative pronoun,³⁰ and that the answer to such a question correspondingly requires *jj.n.j*.³¹ An interrogative pronoun, as well as a word representing the answer to an interrogative pronoun, is by its very nature the central element (the 'logical predicate') of the sentence. If we submit to the guidance of these two extreme cases, on the one hand the self-sufficiency of the bare *m.k wj jj.kwj* and on the other hand the necessity for the use of *jj.n.k* when followed by a preposition plus interrogative pronoun, we may hope to have reduced arbitrary judgment as much as the circumstances permit.

25. An opportunity to put this criterion to the test is afforded by examples where the verb 'to come' appears in both forms within a short distance of one another, the first time in the Stative and the second time in *sdm.n.f*:

CT I 116b, *m.t N pn jw hr.t (j)nd.f hr.t r' nb.....* 117b, *jj.n.f nd.f hr.t m 'Iw-nrsr* 'Behold this N has come unto thee (f.), in order to greet thee daily... it is from the Island of Fire that he has come to greet thee.' In the first part the verb is accompanied by no less than three adverbial adjuncts ('unto thee', 'in order to greet thee', 'daily'), but our criterion shows them to be accessory: on its first occurrence the verb still occupies the centre. Only when the verb is repeated in *sdm.n.f* (German 'und zwar ist er gekommen', cf. § 26) does it cede its central position to the adverbial adjunct ('from the Island of Fire').

26. Examples of the same kind occur with other verbs of motion. Westendorf (p. 53) quotes from the inscription of Ameny (*Beni Hasan* I Pl. 8) 11-12 <'h'.n.j>³² *hnt.k(w)j r jnt bj3w nbw n hm n* (Sesostris I)... *hnt.n.j hn' rp'(t) h3tj'*... 'Imny' .w.s., referring to Erman *Äg. Gr.* § 310 for the 'special use' of *sdm.n.f* 'um das im vorhergehenden Satz gesagte näher auszuführen'. So far as the positive *sdm.n.f* is concerned, the evidence for this use is rather doubtful.³³ Nevertheless, Westendorf

30 CT III 151c *jj.n.k r jst* 'what hast thou come for?'; CT V 95f, g *jj.n.k tr mj zy jw?* *pr.n.k tr mj zy prt?* 'how hast thou come? how hast thou come forth?', cf. Sethe *ÄZ* 54 (1918) 6 n. 3.

31 *BD* ed. Budge 266, 9-10 = de Buck *Readingbook* 122, 3-4 *jj.n.k r m?* :: *jj.n.j '3 r smjt* 'what hast thou come for?', 'I have come hither to be announced' [cf. Gunn *Studies* 67, ex. (12)].

32 Thus Erman in the Lesestücke of his *Gr.*, e.g., 312* n. c, after the similar passage in line 14.

33 Up to the 3rd edition all examples quoted in this section showed the negative *n*

arrives at a translation with which I am in complete agreement from my somewhat different point of view: '...und zwar fuhr ich südwärts zusammen mit dem Fürsten...' Wherever German idiom requires or favours the addition of 'und zwar', there is good reason to believe that in Egyptian a n 'emphatic' form is present (*Études* 24 n. 2; 81 n. 4). With reference to the passage under discussion this conclusion was drawn by U. Heckel *ÄZ* 81 (1956) 81 and seems to be accepted by Westendorf *Mediz. Gr.* p. 276 n. 3.

26a. EXCURSUS. A similar contrast seems to exist with *rh* 'to know', the only transitive verb used in the Stative with active meaning (Sethe *Verbum* II § 10). A good example occurs in the letter of King 'Izzj (Quibell *Saqqarah* 1907-1908 Pl. LXI, 2)³⁴ line 4 *jw hm hm(.j) rh mrr.k dd ht nb(t) mrrt hm(.j)* 'Henceforward My Majesty knows that you love to say everything that My Majesty loves,' as against line 11 *hr[sic].n(.j) hrw mrr wj R' hr rdjt.f n(.j) tw* 'Henceforward I know that Re' loves me, because he has given you to me'; 'because he has given, etc.' is the predicate.

The formula 'I know you, I know your names' appears in the Coffin Texts in two forms, viz., (1) *rh.n.j tn, rh.n.j rnw.tn*, and (2) *jw.j rh.kwj tn, rh.kwj rnw.tn*. This formula is often associated with a wish expressed by the prospective *sdm.f*. It is perhaps no accident that in *CT* V 222, where the two constructions are variants of each other, the *sdm.n.f*-construction precedes, and the Stative construction follows, the wish (*sw3d.tn wj...*). In *CT* VII 164b, c the *sdm.n.f* stands at the beginning of the spell and is followed by the wish, which must, therefore, probably be understood as a subordinate clause, *nh.j jm.tn, hpr.j jm.tn*. Cf. also *CT* VI 323v-y,

rh.n.j tn, rh.n.j rnw.tn
rh.tn wj mj rh.j tn
rh.tn rn.j mj rh.j rnw.tn.

27. To conclude this chapter we shall consider that well-known formula of the autobiographical inscriptions which has recently been studied by Goedicke³⁵ and by Schenkel.³⁶ It involves three verbs of motion in *sdm.n.f*, viz., *jj* 'to come', *prj* 'to come forth', and *h3j* 'to descend', the first two as variants, the third as parallel member. In the First Intermediate Period the formula occasionally occurs at the end of the in-

sdm.n.f, which does in fact possess the meaning in question; cf. Gunn *Studies* 113 under (II).

34 I am quoting from Farina (tr. Neuville) *Gr. de l'ancien égyptien* (1927) 275-276.

35 'The Egyptian Idea of Passing from Life to Death', *Orientalia* 24 (1955) 225-239. Cf. also Federn *JNES* 19 (1960) 256.

36 *Frühmittelägyptische Studien* (= *Bonner Orientalistische Studien* N.S. 13, Bonn 1962) pp. 125-128 §§ 50, 51; 'Notes sur la transmission de l'autobiographie traditionnelle', *Rev. d'ég.* 15 (1963) 63-67.

scription with nothing after it.³⁷ Its ordinary place, however, is at the beginning, and as a rule it is followed³⁸ by a varying number of phrases which are undoubtedly connected with it contextually. Whether the connexion is also grammatical, is a question of some interest not only for the point of grammar under discussion, but also for the true understanding of the formula.

28. We begin with the less common but grammatically unambiguous case where the phrase or phrases following the introductory formula are clearly circumstantial, showing either a pure adverbial predicate or the so-called pseudo-verbal construction, e.g., Brit. Mus. 1671 [*JEA* 16 (1930) Pl. XXIX, cf. p. 198 n. 24]

pr.n(.j) m pr(.j), h3.n(.j) m jz(.j)

pr(.j) grg

ju'(.j) 'f nht

I have come forth from my house, I have descended into my tomb,
my house being established,
my heir's arm being (having grown) strong.

Cairo 20007

pr.n(.j) m pr(.j), h3.n(.j) r jz(.j)

m qrstt nfrt jrt.n(.j) m hpš.wj(.j)

pr(.j) hr rmt, njwt(.j) m-s3(.j)

mswt(.j) hr(?) nny m-s3(.j) nn nh.s

I have come forth from my house, I have descended into my tomb,
in the beautiful tomb-equipment which I had acquired with my own arms,

my house weeping, my town following me,
my offspring ...-ing after me without exception.

Cf. Janssen *Autobiogr.* VI.G 13 (II pp. 75 n. 42; 197)

Siut III 13 (cf. *OLZ* 1939, 156)

jj.n(.j) '3, z3(.j) m st(.j)

I have come hither, my son being in my place.

29. In the vast majority of examples the phrases which follow the introductory formula contain the *sdm.n.f*-form. In view of the close proximity in which these phrases and the formula usually stand to each other, it seems legitimate to ask whether they are not grammatically connected. A comparison of them with the ones discussed before would seem to support the view that in both cases we have before us the same syntactic pattern in which *sdm.n.f* interchanges with genuinely circumstantial ex-

³⁷ The emphasized part of the sentence must in this case be 'from my house' and 'into my tomb'.

³⁸ An exception is, e.g., *JEA* 14 (1928) Pl. XX, 3; also *CT* IV 207b, c.

pressions. We conclude that the *sdm.n.f* forms no less than the other circumstantial expressions function as predicates of 'emphatic' initial verbs of motion.

30. A phrase which occurs especially often in more or less close association with our formula is 'I did (*jr.n.j*) what the great ones love and the little ones praise' (and variants). Now it is of some importance for the present argument that the *sdm.n.f*-form at the head of this phrase occurs both with and without *iw* in front of it. Regrettably my own presentation of the evidence, *Zu den Inschriften der 11. Dynastie* § 43, is marred by my failure to pay attention to the presence or absence of *iw*, let alone to classify the examples accordingly. I confess that thirty-five years ago I was unaware of the importance of this feature. Of the examples quoted in § 43a, *Amer. Journ.* 38, 56 (stela of *Dmj*)³⁹ and *Qurneh* Pl. 2 top [= Clère-Vandier *Bibl. aeg.* X § 19] both have *iw* (cf. n. 41); while *Urk.* I 151 [= Clère-Vandier *op. cit.* § 1] and Cairo 20503 are fragmentary. Of the later examples quoted in § 43c likewise some have *iw jr.n.j*, and others bare *jr.n.j*.

An examination of the examples reveals that the choice between the two variants depends on whether and in what sequence 'I have done, etc.' is associated with 'I have come forth, etc.' If 'I have done, etc.' occurs alone,⁴⁰ or if it precedes 'I have come forth, etc.',⁴¹ *iw jr.n.j* is used, i.e., 'I have done, etc.' constitutes an independent formula by itself. Where, on the contrary, it comes immediately after 'I have come, etc.', no *iw* is present,⁴² i.e., the phrase can, and probably must, be understood as circumstantial; in other words, it forms an integral part of a composite formula.

31. The longest example of this kind is presented by the two almost identical inscriptions of Nfr-sšm-R' and Nfr-sšm-Pth ap. Edel *Untersuchungen* 71, where 'I have come forth from my town, I have descended from my nome' is followed by over a dozen *sdm.n.f*-forms. Among these

39 Now Goedicke *JNES* 19 (1960) 288-291.

40 First Intermediate Period, Cairo 1641 (Dendera); Cracow stela of Merer, *JEA* 47 (1961) Pl. I, l. 4. Dyn. XVIII, *Urk.* IV 131, 14; 941, 4; 1530, 7-10 ('Der grosse Stelentext'); *BD* ed. Budge 260u (*Nu*, CXXV, Address to the Gods) = de Buck *Readingbook* 119, 1.

41 *Dmj* stela (supra, n. 39): 'I have done, etc.' near the beginning, 'I have come forth, etc.' near the end of the inscription; *Qurneh* Pl. 2 top.

42 *Siut* IV 62; *Metrop. Mus.* 57.95 (Fischer *JNES* 19 Pl. VII); *Brit. Mus.* 562; Cairo 20024, 8; Louvre C 174; *Siut* I 266; *Sinai* no. 123 A 38; cf. Janssen *Autobiografie* II.A 12 + II.F 148; II.A 11 + II.F 132. — Also *Urk.* IV 484, 3; this text, however, has for the initial verb-form the uncommon variant *iw.j jj.kwj*, i.e., the non-'emphatic' form, which means that *jr.n.j*, though probably circumstantial, is not emphasized.

it is interesting to find 'I gave (*rdj.n.j*) bread to the hungry, clothes to the naked,' which normally has *jw rdj.n.j*. The reason for the difference⁴³ is that this phrase is normally an independent sentence by itself, while in these two inscriptions it is included in a series of clauses of circumstance.⁴⁴

32. All *sdm.n.f*-clauses which occur after the introductory formula 'I have come, etc.' refer to actions which the deceased can only have performed during his lifetime, and which must therefore have anteceded his 'coming forth from his house'. If all these *sdm.n.f*-clauses are understood as both circumstantial and emphasized, the whole purpose and function of the formula appear in a somewhat different light.

'The passing from life to death' does not occupy the centre of interest, but merely supplies the background. The grammatical emphasis thrown on the circumstantial clauses means that the important thing is for the deceased to be able to look back on a series of good deeds and creditable achievements and on the well-ordered state in which he has left his affairs on earth.

33. Before leaving this topic we must consider *Urk.* I 57, 11-14, where 'I have come from my town, I have gone forth from my nome' is enlarged by a third clause, 'I have been buried in this tomb', in the passive *sdmw.f: qrs(w.j)*. If this inscription were of the Middle Kingdom, we should probably be justified in expecting **qrs.n.tw.j* — or, conversely, we should be compelled to conclude that the *sdm.n.f*-forms of the first two clauses are not 'emphatic'.⁴⁵ As, however, it belongs to a period where, according to Edel *ÄZ* 83 (1958) 17-18, *sdm.n.tj/tw.f* was not yet fully evolved as the passive of 'emphatic' *sdm.n.f*, the passage unfortunately proves nothing either way.

V. TRANSITIVE VERBS: INITIAL *sdm.n.f* VERSUS *jw sdm.n.f*

34. The variants of the two phrases 'I did what the great ones love and the little ones praise' and 'I gave bread to the hungry and clothes to the naked', with and without *jw* in front of the initial *sdm.n.f*, have been seen (§§ 30, 31) to correspond to two different syntactic and stylistic functions. They provide a transition to the subject of the present chapter, viz., the true meaning of *jw sdm.n.f* and its relationship to initial bare *sdm.n.f*.

43 Edel *Gr.* § 537 seems to regard the difference as a matter of chronology: '...in den übrigen, zeitlich etwas späteren Füllen ...'; cf. also his § 889.

44 A much later example of 'I gave bread, etc.' being brought into temporal subordination to a statement referring to the deceased's existence in the necropolis occurs in the Late M.K. stela *Metrop. Mus.* 35.7.55 pub. by Hayes *JEA* 33 (1947) Pl. II *wnn.j m 3h jqr m hr-ntr, m-ht rdj.j*, etc.

45 Unless the absence of *jw* was sufficient to make the passive *sdmw.f* 'emphatic'.

The construction *jw sdm.n.f* is often described as very frequent. As a matter of fact, it is anything but frequent in the great literary texts of the Middle Kingdom. It is also said to be a common, or even the commonest, narrative form.⁴⁶ Where it does indeed resemble a narrative form, it will be found to be in the first person singular or to have the first person singular for its complement; and the texts where it is so used will turn out to be autobiographical inscriptions. Now autobiographical inscriptions are to be classed as direct speeches rather than as narrative texts. The same is true of the Coffin Texts, where *jw sdm.n.j* is common enough.

35. The function of *jw* was discerned by Gunn.⁴⁷ It has the effect of relating the statement to the sphere of interest and to the time of the speaker: the distinction between 'Rede' and 'Erzählung' is no less fundamental in Middle Egyptian than Hintze has shown it to be in Late Egyptian. All verb-forms compounded with *jw* 'introduce a statement regarded from the standpoint of the Present.' Accordingly, *jw sdm.n.f* is a Present Perfect (even though English idiom may in certain contexts favour a rendering by the Simple Past Tense), which has its proper place in direct speech as distinct from narration.⁴⁸

36. However, the bare *sdm.n.f* is by no means excluded from initial position in direct speech nor is it restricted to verbs of motion. If the latter are a class apart, it is because they are not used in *jw sdm.n.f*, this construction being a prerogative of transitive verbs.⁴⁹ Since the passive *sdm.n.tw.f*, which can of course be formed only from transitive verbs, is 'emphatic' and therefore avoids *jw* (§ 20), there is no cause for surprise if the initial bare *sdm.n.f* of the same verbs turns out to be no less 'emphatic' than *sdm.n.tw.f* and the initial bare *sdm.n.f* of verbs of motion. It would follow that *jw* has the additional function of indicating that the verb-form which it precedes has full predicative force, while an initial bare *sdm.n.f* and non-prospective *sdm.f* are characterized as non-predicative, i.e., as 'emphatic'.

46 Some authorities use 'narrative' in a loose sense in which it becomes practically synonymous with 'predicative', 'finite', and 'indicative'.

47 *Studies* 98 n. 1; *Ann. Serv.* 25 (1925) 247.

48 It is possible to narrate about oneself in verb-forms appropriate to 'Erzählung', but not about third persons, without reference to the narrator, in the language of 'Rede'. It is very doubtful whether *jw sdm.n.f* could have been used in the formula of the *Shipwrecked Sailor* and the *Lebensmüde*, 'he opened his mouth against me' and 'I opened my mouth against him', if either the actor or the adverbial complement had not been in the first person.

49 [Confirmed by Edel § 886.] Including *rj* 'to know' (e.g., *CT* I 139c, VI 252h, VII 425a). I cannot say anything definite about other intransitive verbs than those of motion.

37. We verify this conclusion by comparing a few examples of *sdm.n.j* and of *jw sdm.n.j*, and, in order to be sure that the forms in question are not syntactically connected with what precedes them, we consider only the absolute beginning of direct utterances. In autobiographical inscriptions, where it would be wasteful to illustrate *jw sdm.n.j*, we consequently choose examples of *sdm.n.j* following immediately upon *dd(.f)* 'he says'. In literary texts it will be hard to find instances of direct speech in which either *sdm.n.j* or *jw sdm.n.j* is not preceded by a vocative. Cases where *sdm.n.j* is preceded by *m.k* 'behold' need to be discussed separately (§ 45).

It hardly needs stating that our results cannot claim validity beyond the contexts and stylistic conditions specified.

38. A. *jw sdm.n.j*

Peasant B 1, 74-75 nb.j, jw gm.n.j w' m nn n shtj nfr mdw n wn-m3 'My lord, I have found one of these peasants who is truly eloquent.' Report of a discovery.

Westcar 8, 8 jty '.w.s. nb.j, jw jn.n.j Ddj 'King my lord, I have brought *Ddj*.' Report of a mission accomplished.

Westcar 6, 1 D3d3-m-nh sn.j, jw jr.n.j mj n3 dd.[n.]k 'D., my brother, I have done according to what thou hast said,' i.e., 'I have followed your advice.'

39. B. *sdm.n.j*

Berlin 13272 (Clère-Vandier *Bibl. aeg.* X § 31), *7 gm.n.j hwt-k3 nt rp'(t) Nhtj-jqr w3s.t(j), jnbw<.s> jsw, twt.s nb [n]g* 'I found the funerary chapel of the Prince N. decayed, its walls old, and all its statues broken.' In contrast to the first example quoted in § 38, the meaning of *gmj* here is not 'to find by a fortunate accident or as the result of a search', but 'to find something in such and such a state', the expression of this state occupying the centre of interest, while 'to find' is a verb of incomplete predication.

Brit. Mus. 575 (7 Sesostri III, *Hierogl. Texts* II Pl. 18)

*jr.n.j grt m'h't tn r rd n ntr '3, nb 'nh, hntj 3bdw,
n mrwt šzp '3bwt sntr htpw-ntr hr wdhw n nb ntrw*

I made this tomb at the staircase of the Great God, the Lord of Life, Foremost in Abydos,

for the sake of receiving provisions, incense, and divine offerings on the offering-table of the Lord of the Gods.⁵⁰

The verb-form 'I made' is manifestly of secondary importance in regard to the emphasized expression (*n mrwt*) of the purpose for which the tomb

⁵⁰ This is a short version of a formula which admits of many variants and considerable elaboration. The short version has the advantage of leaving no doubt about the words which bear the emphasis.

has been made. This is confirmed by a similar formula in which the same relationship is conveyed in a different way. The verb 'to make' is here relegated to the rank of a relative form to define *jz pn* or *m'h't tn* 'this tomb', the latter word, preceded by *jr*, standing in extraposition, e.g., Louvre C 170 (2 Sesostriis II)

jr m'h't tn jrt.n.j m T3-wr 3bdw r rd n ntr '3, nb ntrw, hr w'rt nb(t) htpt, t3-dsr, 3ht jnntt, n mrwt wsr 3h m šms n ntr '3

This tomb which I have made in Abydos at the staircase of the Great God, the Lord of the Gods, in the district 'Mistress of Offerings', the Sacred Ground, the Western Horizon, (I have made it)⁵¹ for the sake of being strong and powerful in the suite of the Great God.

40. Finally, an example may be quoted, which shows *jw sdm.n.f* and bare *sdm.n.f* in contextual contrast. The inscription of the nomarch *D'w* (late VIth Dyn.), *Urk.* I 145-147, includes five narrative and two argumentative and rationalizing sentences: the former are in *jw sdm.n.f*, the latter in bare *sdm.n.f* (though accompanied by particles):

146, 3 *jw qrs.n(j)* 'I buried my father...'

146, 6 *jw dbh.n(j)* 'I asked the king...'

146, 10 *jw rdj.n hm.f jn.t(j)* 'His Majesty caused to be brought'

146, 16 *rdj.n(j) swt qrs.t(j.j)* 'I caused myself to be buried in one tomb together with this *D'w*, for the sake of (*n mrwt*) being with him in one place, and not through the non-existence (*n js n tm wnn...*) of the wherewithal⁵² to make two tombs.'

147, 4 *hr jr.n(j) nw* 'rather did I do this for the sake of (*n mrwt*) seeing this *D'w* every day, and for the sake of (*n mrwt*) being with him in one place.'

147, 13 *jw dbh.n(j)* 'I asked His Majesty...'

147, 15 *jw rdj.n hm.f* 'His Majesty caused...'

VI. COMPOUND VERB-FORMS IN INITIAL POSITION

41. We now return to the point from which we started. In looking for a syntactic position on which to base our inquiry we chose the clause of

51 The noun in extraposition and the relative form are not resumed, as we should expect them to be. An isolated, but not quite successful, attempt at resumption occurs in Leiden V 4; cf. Sethe *Erläut.* ad 72, 11. A grammatically more satisfactory solution is to open the direct speech with *jj.n.j*: 'I have come to this tomb which I have made... for the sake of...'; thus, e.g., Leiden V 3 (*jw.n.j*), Turin '21' [Piehl *ÄZ* 19 (1881) 18; Maspero *Rec. tr.* 3 (1882) 115]. The Kinnaird stela [*JEA* 38 (1952) Pl. I] has the same formula as Turin '21', but breaks off at *r rd n ntr špsj* and thus omits the essential 'for the sake of...'.
52 This is Gunn's translation (*Studies* 187 n. 4); for a different possibility cf. Edel *ÄZ* 83 (1958) 16-17 and Gr. § 1123.

circumstance. This choice finds its justification in the fact that the seven forms which occur in that position are also the ones which combine with various auxiliary elements so as to produce the indicative forms used in initial position. The most common auxiliary elements are *jw*, several forms of *wnn* (*wn-*, *wnjn-*), *'h'.n-*, *m.k* (*m.l*, *m.ln*); to these may be added the particles *jsk/jsl/tj*. If we write our seven forms in a horizontal line and the auxiliaries in a vertical line, we obtain a synopsis of all compound verb-forms (with a few 'empty boxes'):

BASIC FORMS	<i>sđm.f</i>	<i>sđm.n.f</i>	<i>sđmw.f</i>	Stative	<i>hr +</i> Inf.	<i>m +</i> Inf.	<i>r +</i> Inf.
AUXILIARIES							
<i>jw</i>	x	x	x	—	—	—	—
<i>jw.f</i>	x			x	x	x	x
<i>wn.f</i>	x						
<i>wn.jn.f</i>	x			x	x		
<i>'h'.n</i>	x	x	x	—	—	—	—
<i>'h'.n.f</i>				x	x		
<i>m.k</i>	[x]	[x]	x	—	—	—	—
<i>m.k sw</i>	x	[x]		x	x	x	x

An examination of the distinctive *sđm.f*-forms will show that they are in fact the same as the ones listed in § 11.

The verbs IIIae inf. do not reduplicate the second radical.

'To give' has *dj-*: *Shipwrecked Sailor* 18-19 *jw... dj.f*; *Sinuhe* B 96, 151 *jw.j dj.j*; *CT* V 199d *jw dj.tw*.

'To come' shows the following forms: *CT* VII 495g *jw ntr jwy.f* (𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎢𐎠𐎠); *m htp*; *Sinuhe* R 15 *tj sw hm jy.f* (𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎢𐎠𐎠).

'To see' appears as *m33-* in the following combinations: *CT* VII 477j *jw m33.j*; *ibid.* 44c *jw.j m33.j*, *ibid.* 507e *jw.f m33.f*.

'To bring' appears as *jn-*: *CT* VII 45o *jw.sn jn.sn*.

In the light of this evidence Erman (*Äg. Gr.* § 343) appears to have been right in concluding that the combinations with *jw.f* actually contain the circumstantial form⁵³ and that they literally mean 'er ist indem er hört'.

42. In these combinations the syntactic differences between the two main groups, into which the seven forms were found to fall (§ 7), make

⁵³ Similarly Edel p. LXXXI, add. to § 895, with reference to the *sđm.f*-forms used in combination with *wn.f* and the perf. participle *wn*.

themselves felt. To take the most important auxiliary element, *ju*, it remains without a suffix with most forms of the suffix-conjugation, but must take one when followed by the Stative and the preposition-plus-Infinitive phrases, forming what is known as 'pseudo-verbal' construction.⁵⁴ The exception is *sdm.f*, which admits both constructions, *ju sdm.f* and *ju.f sdm.f*, apparently without functional difference.

Next to *ju*, the most important auxiliary capable of taking the personal suffixes is '*h*'.*n*. The general rule regarding the presence or absence of the personal suffix after '*h*'.*n* is the same as with *ju*, viz., suffix before the Stative and the preposition-plus-Infinitive phrases, no suffix before forms of the suffix-conjugation. Regarding '*h*'.*n*, the generally accepted explanation is (e.g., Gardiner § 476) that the personal suffix does duty for the auxiliary as well. This explanation is perfectly plausible⁵⁵ and no different explanation seems to be needed for *ju* (Gardiner § 461). The principle which regulates the presence or absence of a personal suffix is the avoidance of two identical inflexional endings in a compound verb-form. This principle is not unknown in other languages; the clearest example is perhaps the so-called Compound Perfect of Amharic, i.e., the Gerund compounded with the auxiliary *allä*: the Gerund is inflected throughout the paradigm, but *allä* only in those persons in which the ending differs from that of the Gerund.⁵⁶

43. With *m.k* the situation is only partly analogous. After *m.k* the dependent pronoun, or else a nominal subject, is indispensably required with an adverbial predicate and in the pseudoverbal construction: *m.k* plus dependent pronoun can thus be looked upon as an alternant of *ju* plus personal suffix: with the Stative of 'to come' the construction *m.k wj jj.kwj* is much more frequent than *ju.j jj.kwj* (e.g., CT III 325j, VII 476i), while with *rh* 'to know' *ju.j rh.kwj* is the rule and *m.k n rh.wjn* (*Westcar* 10, 5) is rather exceptional; in any case *m.k* is an integral and indispensable part of the construction.

With *sdm.f* and *sdm.n.f* after *m.k* both constructions are found, viz., with and without dependent pronoun or nominal subject. Whether de-

54 In these constructions, so far as Middle Egyptian proper is concerned, the distinction between independent sentences (initial position) and clauses of circumstance is completely neutralized for *ju*- with suffixes [CT III 187b (sim. 19a-d) *dk n.j t3, ju.j hqr.kwj* 'that thou mayest give me bread, when I am hungry'], and examples of circumstantial *ju* with nominal subject, though still exceptional, are not altogether rare (Erman § 372, Gardiner § 323). Edel § 880 cites isolated examples from the late VIth Dyn. and from the First Intermediate Period.

55 There is perhaps room for doubt whether in '*h*'.*n sdm.n.f* the *sdm.n.f* is continuative, as Gardiner thinks, or possibly circumstantial, 'he stood up having heard.'

56 The 3rd pl. was in Old Amharic *mältäwallu* (Praetorius *Amhar. Spr.* § 207b) as against the modern *mälöltäwal*.

pendent pronoun and nominal subject are really equivalent and interchangeable is not certain. In *CT* II 180c we find *m.tn N pn h3.f r pt* 'Behold, this N descends to heaven' (or, 'behold this N, as he ...?'), with a verb IIIae inf. in the form which we expect in a clause of circumstance. But in other examples, where a non-distinctive *sdm.f* or a *sdm.n.f* occurs, the context sometimes would seem to require, or at least to tolerate, an 'emphatic' form, e.g., *CT* II 384a, b *m.k wj sm.j r.j, phtj.k m-.j* 'Behold, I am going away, your strength being with me,' i.e., 'I am taking your strength away with me' [= *BD* ed. Budge 220, 5-6 *m.k wj sm.kwj r.k ...*]; *Shipwrecked Sailor* 113-114 (supra, § 11) *m.k ntr rdj.n.f 'nh.k, jn.f tw r jw pn n k3* 'Behold, it is by bringing you to this island of a *ka* that the God has caused you to live.' However, these examples are not conclusive.

44. In some examples of *m.k sdm.f*, without dependent pronoun, the *sdm.f* is clearly shown by form and by function to be 'emphatic', e.g., *Sinai* no. 90, 4 = *Sethe Les.* 86, 5 *m.tn dd st Ht-Hr n ...* 'Behold, it is to the... that Hathor gives it,' cf. Černý's note d on p. 97; *Peasant* B 1, 81 *m.k jw w' n n3 n shtj r swt pr.f r t3* 'Behold, it is (only)... that one of these peasants comes.'⁵⁷ Considering the characteristic repugnance of 'emphatic' forms to being preceded by *jw* (§ 20), it seems unlikely that in such cases *m.k* could be an alternant of *jw*. We must, I think, conclude that it is not an integral part of the construction, but could be detached from it without doing syntactic harm.

45. The same seems to be true at least of some examples of *m.k sdm.n.f* (*Gardiner* § 234 p. 179 top): *m.k* is not an integral part of the construction, i.e., not an auxiliary element, but a free 'présentatif', and the *sdm.n.f* to which it is prefixed fulfils the same function as it would do if it stood at the absolute beginning of the sentence, viz., it is 'emphatic'; Prophecy of Nfrty 6 *rhw, m.tn rdj.n.j j3' s.tw n.tn r rdjt q'r.tn n.j...* 'Friends, behold, I have caused you to be (re)called in order to cause you to search on my behalf...' The king has caused the counsellors to be recalled after they had left the royal presence. He is telling them, not that he has had them recalled, but for what purpose he has done so. Similarly, a clause of purpose introduced by *n mrwt* is emphasized at the expense of the initial verb-form in *Siut* I 271 and 275. In *Siut* I 270 the emphasis seems to be placed on the words *z3w htjht ht jm.sn* 'lest'⁵⁸ anything of them go astray'.

57 For the obscure words *r swt pr.f r t3* cf. de Buck's suggestion ap. *Sethe Erläut.* ad 23, 7-8.

58 Whatever the origin or literal meaning of *z3w*, I believe it always makes better sense if taken as a conjunction 'lest' rather than as an imperative 'beware lest'. Thus even in the classical example *Urk.* I 130, 9, 'appoint efficient men who guard

46. The relationship of the two constructions of *r* plus Infinitive, with or without *jw* in front of the nominal subject, has been discussed by U. Heckel *ÄZ* 81 (1956) 80–81. However, her conclusions are the direct opposite of the view which follows from the foregoing discussion. This discrepancy is the more embarrassing for me as I am, in a way, responsible for the principle on which her interpretation is based. The passage which promises the key to the difference between the two constructions is *Westcar* 5, 3–7, where they occur both within a short distance of one another. Without wishing to criticize U. Heckel's reasoning as such, I think the passage can be interpreted with at least equal justification along the lines advocated in this paper. In the first part of the sentence the words *jb n hm.k r qbb* are, according to U. Heckel herself, related to the initial words *hwj-3 wd3 hm.k...* as an apodosis (Nachsatz) expressing the result to be expected from the suggested pleasure-trip. At least notionally, therefore, the words in question are closely connected with what precedes them, and it is not impossible that they are an apodosis even in the strictly grammatical sense: the construction would then represent a forerunner of the Late Eg. examples quoted by Till *ÄZ* 69 (1933) 116–117; in any case, it conforms to the general rule according to which the absence of *jw* indicates non-initial, i.e., dependent status. As regards the second occurrence with *jw* in front of it, I see no difficulty in regarding the words *jw jb.k r qbb hr.s* as an independent sentence, summing up the whole. That *jw* should ever serve as the exponent of emphasis is, I believe, most improbable and contrary to the evidence.

VII. CONCLUSION

47. Our heptad of basic forms will not strike the reader as very startling. Presumably any Egyptologist who was called upon to draw up a list of such forms would have produced more or less the same items. It is, however, precisely the question of more or less that matters. I would attach some importance to the fact that our list includes only one single *sdm.f*. Whatever further *sdm.f* forms may have to be recognized — such as the prospective and the 'emphatic' (*mrr.f*) — belong to a different order from the indicative forms with which alone we are concerned. I use this opportunity to reaffirm my conviction that the indicative ('narrative') 'imperfective' *sdm.f* (*mrr.f*) is a mere ghost-form which has been suffered to haunt Egyptian grammar long enough.

48. The following table shows the chief representatives of the non-

him on both sides of the ship, lest he fall into the water.' Thus also in *CT* I 71b = f and d (here followed by *tm-*), where Edel § 1120 takes *z3w* as the passive *sdmw.f* ('es wird verhütet').

'emphatic' (indicative) and the 'emphatic' order in so far as they correspond to each other in initial position:

NON-'EMPHATIC'	'EMPHATIC'
<i>jw gm(j).f, jw.f gm(j).f</i>	<i>gmm.f</i>
<i>jw gm(j).n.j</i> (Transitive)	<i>gm(j).n.j</i>
<i>jw rdjw.f</i> (Passive)	<i>rdj.n.tw.f (; rdjw.f)</i>
<i>jw.j pr(j).kwj</i>	<i>pr(j).n.j</i>
<i>m.k wj jj.kwj</i>	<i>ij.n.j</i>
<i>[jw.j jj.kwj</i> } (Motion)	<i>wnn.j jj.kwj</i> ^{59]}

49. Within each of the two orders, the indicative and the 'emphatic', the relation between *sdm.f* and *sdm.n.f* is exactly the same: it is a contrast which could very well be described as Present vs. Past, if these harmless terms had not fallen into disrepute. If it is wished to avoid them, they might be replaced by Marcel Cohen's *inaccompli vs. accompli*, or by Imperfect⁶⁰ (in the sense defined by Gunn *Studies* 110) vs. Perfect:

An aspectual contrast exists between *jw(.j) sdm.j* and *m.k wj* (presumably also *jw.j hr sdm: jw(.j) m33.j* (§ 41) means 'I can see', *m.k wj hr m3.f* 'I see it at this moment' (CT II 338/9a). The latter construction seems to have no 'emphatic' counterpart. The difference between *jw.j...* and *m.k wj...* seems to be that the former is simply egocentric, while the latter invites the attention of the interlocutor as an interested party.

As regards the combinations with *sdm.n.f, jw sdm.n.f (sdm.n.j)* is an egocentric Past, while '*h'.n* provides the form for objective narration. In the 'emphatic' order this distinction is neutralized. Within the egocentric Past such distinctions as single action vs. habitually repeated action are entirely alien to the Egyptian system (Edel §§ 887-889).

50. It is antecedently probable that the distribution of the initial indicative and the circumstantial forms as we find it in Middle Egyptian does not represent the primitive state of things. At least so far as the suffix conjugation is concerned, the bare forms can hardly have been restricted from the beginning to the position in which we find them in Middle Egyptian. It can be conjectured that originally they must have been capable of occupying initial position.⁶¹ This conjecture is, in the

59 For this construction I can only quote CT III 356f, IV 45d.

60 But not Imperfective, which has an entirely different meaning and only causes misunderstanding.

61 Vestiges probably survive in specialized uses. Thus, in CT Spell 148 (II 209-226), which Drioton has plausibly claimed as dramatic (*La Revue du Caire*, Année 4 — no. 36, Nov. 1941, pp. 45-58), a bare *sdm.f* (forms of verbs IIIae inf.: 210b *tz* 'raises', 222b *h3* 'descends') functions as the form for stage directions.

first place, suggested by the general experience that the simple historically precedes the compound. In addition to this consideration there exist specific analogies to be drawn from Semitic. These analogies are of two kinds. On the one hand the Imperfect of the older Semitic languages has the tendency to be driven out of independent position and to be restricted to dependent and subjunctive function, while it needs to be compounded with some auxiliary morpheme in order to be able to fulfil indicative function. The phenomenon has recently been studied by Rundgren in his *Erneuerung des Verbalaspekts im Semitischen* (Uppsala 1963). On the other hand the compound tenses of Arabic and other languages have long been recognized as embodying original clauses of circumstance, 'ursprüngliche' or 'erstarrte Zustandssätze'.⁶²

Read 23 February 1965

⁶² Reckendorf *Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen* (Leiden 1898) p. 549; Brockelmann *Grundriss der vergl. Grammatik der semit. Sprachen II* (Berlin 1913) §§ 324-328.