Junge, Friedrich

How to study Egyptian grammar and to what purpose. A summary of sorts

How to study Egyptian grammar and to what purpose.
A summary of sorts

Friedrich Junge, Göttingen

Doing something for the second time somehow establishes a tradition: having someone try to summarise what we were talking about in our long meeting. Janet Johnson was the exemplary first to do that at the end of the meeting in Denmark in 1986[1]. As we all remember, she did it with great success: We were all satisfied with the account she gave of our opinions, their specific troubles and the discussions they arouse, found her statements fair and felt ourselves well treated.

Now it is my turn to do as she did; I am, however, already going to step away from the tradition she founded: Although I have tried hard, I have not succeeded in giving an account as "gentlemanly" as hers was "ladylike". I am sorry, but it will in part be an account that cannot hide how deeply involved I feel in most issues put forward; I am about to shamelessly take advantage of the privilege of the "last word" by being partial and unfair instead of neutral and understanding, I shall repeat arguments I have already made use of in the discussions, and I shall, still worse, behave like an arbiter, even though no one has asked me to be one or even cares to have one.

This is too bad for you, of course, but you may also have noticed the far-sighted and considerate arrangements: I am not speaking at the very end of the meeting, there will still be plenty of time when I shall have finished – you will have plenty of opportunity to calm down and get me back to the sombre grounds of emotion-free reasoning. And believe me: It is no fun to try to pass in review what such a lot of experts have put forward, and if you find my statements too harsh or perfunctory, it may be a symptom of my being suffocated by the amazing wealth of evidence and ideas at hand.

---

[1] Johnson, in: *Crossroad*, 401 f.

If one now, to begin with, tries to find out what has remained or changed in the general lay-out of subjects since Helsingør – the basic implicit coherence of the subjects that reflects the "frontline of research", so to say, at least one thing seems evident: The verbal aspect, "accompli" and "inaccompli", is out of fashion again, its protagonists apparently said what they were eager to say, found it well done and went off to break new ground. Neither they themselves nor anybody else seem to care much any more:

In Gardiner's and Polotsky's concepts alike, for example, the morphological and functional correspondences between suffix-conjugation and relative phrases – participles and relative forms – play a prominent role; one should have expected the aspectologists to show perhaps some concern about the modes of reference of the relative phrase; they did not – except A. Loprieno[2], or found it self-evident – as Satzinger did[3]. Allen and Meltzer, who treated the interrelation of attributive and substantival forms explicitly here, scarcely mentioned the term "aspect", which, of course, is not much of a surprise.

Allen finds that a tense-system of "past, present, future" is expressed in the different forms of the relative phrase[4]; it evolved out of a system that marks the tense "past" or that marks the "distribution" of "aktionsart" versus an unmarked "aorist", that is, the verbal action as such. What Allen calls "the major contribution of the Standard Theory"[5], and what he, to be sure, acknowledges only in part – the "transposition", the "syntactic transformation" that mediates between the "nominal forms", "emphatic" $sdm=f$ and participles or relative forms, this he presents as operating in the direction from the inflected substantival forms of the suffix-conjugation to the attributive forms via a "secondary marking for gender/number concordance"[6]: Relatives are no transformations but derivations from nominal $sdm=f$.

Meltzer, for his part, demonstrates exactly what he said by way of introduction: that "the 'equation' geminating = imperfective, non-geminating = perfective is often honoured more in the breach than in the observance when it comes to actual translation and often requires considerable good will to rationalize"[7] – "imperfective" and "perfective" understood rather traditionally. The evidence is not categorized satisfactorily either by a concept of a durative or repeated, a habitual or generic action – even with the inclusion of a "context

---

[2] Loprieno, *Verbalsystem*.

[3] Satzinger, in: *Festschrift Westendorf*, 125 ff.

[4] Cf. Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, § 643.

[5] Preprints, 2 (§ 1).

[6] *Ibid.*, 8.

[7] *Ibid.*, 147.

of plurality", the Schenkel-concept of old[8], or by the search for something like an "emphatic" relative – an adventurous idea one might call the Westendorf/Callender scheme (!). But I think we must still ask whether the classification of shades of meaning will ever be anything more than a description of semantic tendencies. At any rate, it is usually of little help in understanding texts or in translating them.

Unlike "aspect", approaches to questions of semantics, text linguistics or discourse analysis, "pragmatics" in a broad sense, the other centre of interest at Helsingør, are still a matter of concern and have again been dealt with by a number of competent exegetes, old and new: Leo Depuydt, Éric Doret, Antonio Loprieno, Pascal Vernus, finally Sarah Groll, Orly Goldwasser, Shlomit Israeli and last, but not at all least, Deborah Sweeney. In a way, the shrewd philological observations of Mordechai Gilula about the "King's Egyptian" may also be connected to this group. In not a few contributions, the issue now seems to have taken on a slightly diachronic touch. Groll herself is somehow trying to breathe life into the concepts of text linguistics by using a structuralist's know-how to follow in minute detail the trails of meaning in a New Kingdom stela, from grammatical signals to cotext and context information, from the features of a god-man-speech situation to those of human perception.

The members of her "school" – if I may be permitted to say so – continued the exploration of the para- and subsystems of Late Egyptian. Israeli shows that it would be inadequate to divide the use of forms in the Medinet Habu war texts simply by "Rede" and "Erzählung", speech and narration, but that both "narrate" advance of action, though from different "perspectives".

Taking the Anastasi I papyrus as an example, Goldwasser creates a model of textual "registers" in the "preprint" version of her paper that may be an explanatory scheme for language and literary phenomena alike: the drift of forms, of phrasal and stylistic formulas through the linguistic layers of society, through a hierarchy of "norms" of speech,[9] eventually ends up by changing the picture, both of style – e.g. the type of the "literary letter" pAnastasi I stands for, and of the language itself – the pattern of Late Egyptian, for instance. The "register marking" by specific forms is exemplified by the use of ME *nn* in Late Egyptian texts. What she actually read at the meeting itself was an elaboration of the issue based on other Ramesside texts. The procedure she calls "canonization" is, I think, of interest for the question of language development. Since the scheme of the development of the Egyptian language I myself have outlined is based on the mutual interaction of "norms

---

[8] *Ibid.*, 154 (with lit.).

[9] To her anglophone literature relevant to the subject ("norm" and "system" in the language), one should at least add the most influential of the germanophone works, i.e. those of Coseriu (especially *Synchronie, Diachronie und Geschichte*).

of speech" and "linguistic system",[10] I, of course, especially welcome Goldwasser's contribution, although I find her register definitions somewhat ad hoc in character.

Her synchronic approach to diachronic processes was somehow opposed by the paper David Silverman gave, although he cannot be said to share the pragmaticists' approaches treated here. Silverman asked the question of "how Late Egyptian the Amarna texts are", and he found them to be very Late Egyptian, at least the Amarna letters he was scrutinizing philologically. The letters were shown to be the place where innovations which will abound in Ramesside texts appear for the first time. To phrase it in my own way by using Goldwasser's terminology: Their "register marking" shows that the picture of language typology has already changed in the lower "registers" or "norms of speech" while the older "register markers" are still in use on the higher levels of the "norm" hierarchy (like boundary stelae and hymns). They are mementos of the history of a living language but surely are not marks of the intrusion of contemporary language into the classical one, surely not signs of the gnostic partition of old that emerged in the discussion.

Speaking of language history and historical grammar, one should, of course, also mention here the results obtained by Kammerzell and Ritter; one traces back the perfect /"Old perfective" system into prehistory, the other attempts a corpus grammar analysis of the 18th Dynasty texts – another of the language's subsystems not yet comprehensively explored. I shall come back to their contributions in another context.

Sweeney went into the question of questions, in method, as she herself states, as a departure from her "normal structuralist approach"[11], and she gave account of the conditions and the presuppositions of interrogative sentences and their general speech act layout. As a result, she defines rhetorical questions as questions which are either unanswerable, unanswered or predetermined[12] and gives Egyptian examples. She reaches the conclusion that, for rhetorical questions, the Egyptian speaker freely disposes of all sentence types he uses for questions in general. This, she says, is in contradiction to what Junge once said when arguing for a possible identification of question types and sentence types: "The match between perlocution and syntax does not seem to be particularly fortunate", she concludes. That is all right, as far as I am concerned; another tradition, begun by Frandsen, has perhaps been founded: Someone is always making a spectacular wreck of another one of my raving successes at every "Crossroads"-meeting. But I, of course, do not feel as pessimistic as that: I think I did not have a counter position as strict as Sweeney makes it

---

[10] Junge, in: *ZDMG. Supplement VI*, 17 ff.

[11] Paper, 19.

[12] Paper, 6.

appear for the sake of argument[13] – why shouldn't she – since I spoke of "tendencies", and I do not feel my primary concern has really been challenged, namely to find out the "illocutionary" forces of Egyptian sentences and their reaction to being questioned (see Appendix [3]).

Loprieno, who was the first to give the issue of discourse analysis some virulence in our field,[14] has further elaborated his "focus negation"[15] by way of "modal oppositions"; they may allow us to understand the differences in usage in that section of the Egyptian negation that comprises the *nj...js / nj-js*, the "circumstantial" *ny* of Doret[16] and the *jm-* and *tm-*negation. His opposition between a subjunctive / imperative[17] "mood of command" and a prospective (*sdm.w*) / emphatic "mood of wish" seems to have some explanatory power. The background, however, against which this issue arises, that is, the historical development from "pragmatic" to "syntactic" method in Early Egyptian and the "focus" – "presupposition" structuring by way of free movements of the parts of utterance, is something I cannot follow as readily. I believe him to be right when he states that the diachronic process within the verbal system can be characterized by "a more or less significant reduction of its grammatical inventory"[18] – I should even strengthen it by saying that the continuous reduction of the grammatical system by means of "speech norms" and subsequent "norm grammars" is the true impetus of language change and language evolution[19]; I cannot believe, however, in Givón's theory[20] of progressive evolution from "pragmatic" to "syntactic mode" to which Loprieno refers, that is, I cannot believe that there are even the slightest remains of glottogonic processes in any historical language, processes expected to show that "tight syntax finds its origin in discourse constraints"[21] – although those translator's liberties they call "syntactic freedom" are most popular among Egyptologists,

---

[13] Junge, *BiOr* 401 (1983), 557 f: "Abschließend will ich festhalten, daß die Überlegungen hier zwar der Sprechakt-Funktion von Satzarten galten, weniger den Frageklassen und ihrer Zuordnung zu Satzarten, es aber so aussieht, als könne als ein Nebenprodukt eine vorläufige Zuordnung versucht werden – wohlgemerkt: in der Tendenz der 'Affinität'; man muß im Prinzip freilich davon ausgehen, daß alle Satzarten im Zweifelsfall auch noch anderen als den angegebenen Frageklassen zugeordnet werden könnten und den angegebenen auch noch anders, je nach Geschick des Sprechers und seinen Absichten".

[14] Along with his paper read in München, see now Loprieno, in: *SAK. Beihefte* 3 (1988), 77 ff.

[15] Loprieno, in: *Crossroad*, 278 ff.

[16] Doret, *Narrative Verbal System*, 36 ff.

[17] Following Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, §§ 255; 256; 324.

[18] Preprints, 119.

[19] Junge, in: *ZDMG. Supplement VI*, 17 ff.

[20] Givón, *On Understanding Grammar*.

[21] Preprints, 120.

nor can I believe in the evidence Loprieno puts forward to prove traces of an early "syntactic freedom" (see appendix [2]).

After having expressed his relief that his colleagues have also finally come to agree to a tripartition into syntactic, semantic and pragmatic viewpoints, Pascal Vernus gave a classification and typology of Egyptian examples of a marked rheme ("le rhème marqué"): The statistically normal disposition of the information structure ("le point de vue énonciatif"), with a theme being expressed by the syntactical subject, the rheme by the predicate, is, according to Vernus, often overridden by another information structure that marks out other members of the syntactical structure, either as having the theme correspond to predicate or circumstantial – the rheme vice versa, or by scaling their thematic or rhematic value. The marked rheme may thus correspond to the actor expression or predicate of nominal sentences, cleft sentences and emphatic constructions by giving them adversative, restrictive or specificational shades of meaning and may organize complex sentences via second tenses[22]. His argument is based on a variety of examples (mostly of CT) that often do not hold out philological scrutiny (see appendix [5]).

The Cleft Sentence, I think, could be said to have now found its final treatment with the paper delivered by Doret in a comforting matter-of-fact approach that is nevertheless linguistically well organized. He explicitly parts company with those who make distinctions between sentence and information structure[23] – "le niveau syntaxique ou grammatical et le niveau énonciatif" in francophone linguistics, that is, the first position of the Cleft Sentence is said to be the "subject" of the relative phrase predicate that follows but the "rheme" of the information structure[24] – which I do not think serves the purpose well[25]; primarily, however, he scrutinizes the semanto-grammatical classes that occupy this position: first of all, nouns of a high semantic specificity (proper names and pronouns, non-alienable and mono-referential nouns), then, diachronically increasing, those nouns that – most interestingly – defy determination (class terms, abstract nouns); since this is something the cleft sentence has in common with the *pw*-sentence, their connection is further strengthened.

Finally, when reviewing the Helsingør papers, it was mainly in terminology that Schenkel[26] found the "chaos" proclaimed in their title, that is, in the merry-go-round of the terms "subject", "theme" and "topic", "predicate", "rheme" and "focus" – a question that

---

[22] Here Vernus has accepted the results of Polotsky's "Egyptian Tenses".

[23] This is not really understood the same way in the school of the "Functional Sentence Perspective" he cites in n.6.

[24] See also Loprieno, *JAAL* 1 (1988), 26 ff.

[25] It is something not easy to elicit from the texts of dead languages; cf. Junge, *"Emphasis" and sentential meaning*, 56 ff. (§ 4.1.1).

[26] Schenkel, *BiOr* 45 (1988), 270.

was taken up again by Satzinger, who was trying to integrate even Schenkel's terminology. Depuydt, however, has solved the question by simply cutting, as it were, the "Gordian knot": none of the terms is fit for describing empirical phenomena since they are but "purely theoretical categories".[27] He is right, of course, but thus the question is only shifted to another level, namely: Is conceptualization a tool in philological and linguistic research? Posed that way, the answer that the members of the respective "pro-" and "contra-theorizing" party among the participants shall eventually give is easily foreseen; I, at any rate, think that when someone finds himself arguing theory-free, he grossly underestimates the weight that preconceived ideas possess in analysing texts from dead languages, especially in analysing meaning. The only rational response is to make the subconscious concepts clear to one's own and everybody else's mind[28] and to hold on to their instrumental character. I shall devote a few more words to the subject below.

So much, I think, for continuity; the other papers ring a different bell. The bell of morphology, for instance, or more precisely, of an acute sensitivity to the relationship of signifiant and signifié, of things meaning and things meant – maybe under the influence of the general taste for semiotics in the humanities. Hieroglyphic writing or as yet un-interpreted or not even noted morphological marks are apt to reveal unexpected features. Take, for example, Polotsky's short paper on "article" and "pronominal antecedent": nominalized attributes may show the marks of the sentences embedded by using an "article" different from the one the material substantive asks for.

Frank Kammerzell has further developed the systemic consequences of his discovery of an "adverbial transpositor" (-.j): He now is able to explain the connections between first person active Old Perfective, the augmentation of the verbal stem by "prothetic" "reed-leaf" and the appearance of the expanded formatives of the stative / Old Perfective as steps in the ramification of a reconstructable "perfect"-conjugation; the apparently inconsistent usage of the forms in historical texts are "survivals" of the systematic steps that precede. And he is able to correlate the development of morphology nicely with developments of function, including the "middle voice" meaning Schenkel has postulated, and supporting – even if a bit in the vacuum of language prehistory – the historical frame Loprieno has provided for his development of the Afro-asiatic verbal systems.

Most gratifying, too, I think, is how Jean Winand solves the nearly age-old question that concerns the mutual relationship of the two verbs that lexically mean "to come" (jy; jwj), for Late and Middle Egyptian alike. It may be tabulated as follows:

---

[27] Depuydt, *CdE* 63 (1988), 402.

[28] Is, by the way, "property" ("that which is attributed", "attribution on the level of the sentence" – *CdE* 63 [1988], 404) not another conceptualization? For its being "less formal and less 'objective'", cf. also Loprieno, in: *Crossroad*, 258 and Shisha-Halevy, *Orientalia* 56 (1987), 155 f (j), who calls subject/predicate terms "crucial in determining clause and text structure, logical ('information package') as well as grammatical".

	jy	*jwj*
	=====	=====
1.	infinitive (*jj.t*)	verbal noun (*jw(.t)*)
		neg. compl.
2.	PsP 1. / 2.p.	PsP 3.p.!
3.	preterite *sdm=f*	---
	sdm.n=f	--- (< *jwj.n=f*; both Pyr.)
	sdm.t=f	---
4.	---	*sdm.ḥr / k3=f*
5.	Part.pf.	Part.impf.
		sdm.tj.fj
6.	---	prospective / subjunctive
	---	*mrr=f*
7.	perf. *n / bw sdm=f*	aor. *n / bw sdm=f*

His results not only bring order into chaos – irregular verbs become regular ones – but show some nicely conclusive groupings of verbal stems – LE preterite *sdm=f* goes with *sdm.n=f,* prospective with nominal *sdm=f* as expected, perf. and imperf. participles become recognizable, the negative patterns of *n sdm=f* reflects somehow earlier *jw sdm.n=f* and *jw sdm=f*!

A few papers now remain for which I should like to reserve a chapter of their own in my account: the papers of Jim Allen, Chris Eyre, John Ray, and Thomas Ritter, and the title I have in mind for this chapter could be something like: "Hypotaxis at issue" or even better "Is Egyptian really a primitive language?"

Firstly, you know that when beards grow white, people get into the habit of telling stories about their youth and adolescence ... and so shall I: When I was a student in the sixties, I grew up nicely in the tradition of the Berlin School, and was, as every student of Egyptology in the world, amply fed with Gardiner's grammar. I was a willing and diligent student and knew the phenomena of Egyptian Grammar, as categorized in the respective paragraphs in Gardiner, almost by heart after a while, and I identified with the views artic-ulated by Gardiner. The whole situation was impressively peaceful: the language seemed to be known satisfyingly, the basic knowledge at least seemed to be agreed on, aside from a few feuds about whether or not there was a "prospective *sdm=f*" morphologically and func-tionally independent of the "perfective *sdm=f*", and, of course, the "imperfective *sdm=f*" was acknowledged to show a mysterious "emphasis" now and then, a phenomenon, how-ever, one did not care much about, something more of interest for Late Egyptian, Demotic and Coptic than for Old or Middle Egyptian.

Socialized that way, and then, as most Egyptologists deep within, still believing Ancient Egypt to be near the golden ages of innocence and noble simplicity that are connected, as everybody knows, with the origin of mankind – the "dawn of conscience", as James Henry Breasted put it –, I was not yet particularly concerned about the idea of the Egyptian mind that the language I had learned was thought to reflect. I may be allowed to quote Gardiner[29] a bit lengthily here: "The most striking feature of Egyptian in all its stages is its concrete realism, its preoccupation with exterior objects and occurrences to the neglect of those more subjective distinctions which play so prominent a part in modern, and even in the classical, languages. Subtleties of thought such as are implied in 'might', 'should', 'can', 'hardly', as well as such abstractions as 'cause', 'motive', 'duty', belong to a later stage of linguistic development; possibly they would have been repugnant to the Egyptian temperament." "Another feature of Egyptian is its marked preference for static over dynamic expression; ... No less salient a characteristic of the language is its concision; the phrases and sentences are brief and to the point. Involved constructions and lengthy periods are rare, ...". So far Gardiner and the standpoint he took towards Egyptian – a standpoint that made him save his faculties for sophistication for general linguistics, for his *Theory of Speech and Language*.

I, to continue my narrative, was of course slightly concerned – not to say I was struck forcibly by the light of cognition – when I came to realize that this concept of Egyptian was something of a thought-guiding theory of normative power in my own reality: After having tried to outline at length "aspect" as a possible category of the Egyptian verb[30] in my thesis, I was almost literally forced by my tutors to justify explicitly how such a "subtle" and "subjective" thing as "aspect" could be thought possible within the framework of the "simple", "static" and "objective" cultural expressions of the Egyptians.

From then on I went about fighting what had at first only baffled me, then had embarrassed me the more I went into Egyptian texts, and what I myself had at one time hoped the concept of verbal aspects might remedy a bit: namely, the amazing fact that all the different expressions found in the texts, their constant change of forms and their variety of constructions, all resulted in translation in the same sequence of flat, short, affirmative main sentences. There was an insurmountable discrepancy between the grammatical description of Gardiner – summarized in his typological remarks just quoted – and the mere exterior appearance of the evidence.

What definitely set me right, however, was a short stay at a famous institution in the Midwest of this country at the end of the sixties. It was only by having been constantly urged in class then to give my opinion of Polotsky's *Tenses* that I really went into the

---

[29] Gardiner, *EG*, 4, § 3.

[30] Junge, *Studien zum mittelägyptischen Verbum.*

matter. But when I did, cognition struck me again, the recognition that there was not only an answer for some of the peculiarities of some Egyptian verbal forms but the solution for the discrepancy of variety there and flatness here, too – in short: the key to the realm of Egyptian hypotaxis.

Ever since then I have been thoroughly convinced that "involved constructions and lengthy periods", "subtleties of thought" and "such abstractions as 'cause', 'motive', 'duty'" are not in the least "repugnant to the Egyptian temperament", as Gardiner believed, and that it is only up to us to find their means of expression in Egyptian and the rules by which Egyptian hypotaxis was governed. It was on this that I spent a large part of my energies. And although I did not cease to accept and admire Gardiner as the great figure he was in our field, he also stands, as I see it, for the "minimalistic view" that I feel an almost moral obligation to object to by now.

So much for my story; but why did I tell it? It was simply to explain why I am going to treat some of the papers read here with the same "apodictic vigour" our host has noticed in Ariel Shisha-Halevy: Everyone who tells me again, either implicitly or explicitly, that Egyptian favours parataxis to hypotaxis, that "phrases and sentences are brief and to the point", and that expressions are but "simple", "static", "concise", and "objective"; everyone who does this will not only meet with my blunt disbelief but will somehow suspend my scientific stance, too, thus forcing me to consider his opinions an act of severe hostility – which, of course, does not necessarily exclude the possibility that I might love him dearly as a person.

Now then, "Hypotaxis at issue" or "Is Egyptian really a primitive language?". In spite of not a few features of linguistic simplicity, of a "pragmatic mode", Egyptian is, of course, not primitive in an evolutionary sense, as Christopher Eyre assured us. "Pragmatic mode" – used by Loprieno, too, as already noted, in its evolutionary meaning, however – was coined by Givón, *On Understanding Grammar*, to typify a specific state of a language versus its "syntactic mode", and the features of the "pragmatic mode" appear to Eyre to be "of immediate interest for understanding the structure of Middle Egyptian, and the historical trends in Egyptian syntax and discourse structure. Pragmatic mode is characterised ... by the predominance of a topic-comment over a subject-predicate structure. Word order is governed by one pragmatic principle, and is not varied ... Grammatical morphology is absent. The unit of discourse is short and simple, with a roughly one-to-one ratio of noun to semantically simple verb. Finally loose conjunction is used and not tight subordination."[31] Thus, according to Eyre, not even those nominal and attributive forms that Allen accepts[32] are well defined in terms of overt marks of subordination. Very well, indeed; I

---

[31] Preprints, 35.

[32] *Ibid.*, 35; in fact Eyre speaks against the narrow definition Kalmár, in: *Literacy, Language and Learning* gives, but it is clear that way that he actually thinks these forms to be without overt marks of subordination.

think, it is clear enough that this is nothing but a paraphrase of what Gardiner had already given as features of Egyptian typology. But while Loprieno thought of finding traces of the "pragmatic mode" in early Egyptian, Eyre is now classifying the whole of literary Middle Egyptian as being in the "pragmatic mode".

Accepting those "pragmatic" features, Eyre is even inclined to consider the over-simplifications[33] of certain "'geometrical', ... pidgin-like, structuralist analyses" as correct, since they somehow reflect the primitiveness of the language. The pragmatic structure and the primitiveness of the grammatical models pertaining to it, however, may not reflect typology or a state in language history but the stage of an evolution of literary style and genre[34] from "orality" to a written narrative that has the same features – that is the ingenious turn his argument takes: The linguistic character of Middle Egyptian is explained as the character of an "artificial 'poetic' dialect" as compared to "real" language like Hekanakhte's that makes use of "explicit 'evolved' features of language".[35] The nominal style of Middle Egyptian is mainly a trait of a "rhetorical performative labelling", an outcome of "descriptive labelling" in a "formal rhetorical context of performance".[36]

This was, of course, well posed and gave the audience many occasions for amusement and protest; all its interesting remarks, complex thoughts and educated arguments, all its debatable issues notwithstanding, Eyre's contribution is, however, based on a few simple presuppositions:

(1)   Middle Egyptian is in the "pragmatic mode", has little morphology, word order is fixed, discourse units are short and simple, there is no "real", outwardly signalled subordination.

(2)   Structural analysis on the one hand reflects the simple construction methods of the language, on the other hand oversimplifies the loose pragmatic relationship as syntactic relationship, is too "mechanical" and violates the subtle web of the texts.

(3)   Markers for linguistic interrelations, for tense, phrases and subordination are either materially explicit or do not exist.

---

[33] "... analysis of Egyptian has tended to lead first into the oversimplification of classifying a loose pragmatic relationship as a sort of universal syntactic relationship, and then into the overelaboration of justifying this relationship from all manifestations of surface structure" (p.49).

[34] The development "might begin from spontaneous speech, then prepared speech and rhetoric, through short texts that are memorised and reused, particularly in a ritual of quasi-ritual context": Preprints, 38 f.

[35] All quotations Preprints, 46 f.

[36] Quotations Preprints, 41; 39.

(4)   The "analytic" tendency of Egyptian exhibits linguistic elaboration, an evolution from primitive "pragmatic" to evolved "syntactic mode" as an interplay of literacy and language development.

Now I could have gone into a good deal of explanation, such as: A formula like the famous $E = mc^2$ is a quantitative model, the atomic model a qualitative model of some aspects of reality but neither are oversimplifications of reality; they are not simple because they represent a simple reality but because they represent reality abstractly reduced, and usually they are only simple in their topmost abstraction; abstraction and reduction are necessary to help us understand a complex reality, and abstraction is done by generalisation. In exactly the same way, grammar theories of demand are abstract qualitative models of the complex reality of a language that neither, by being simple, reflect a primitiveness of the object they deal with nor are simple except that they look simple in their highest level of abstraction;[37] realizing that he is not aware of these things, I really feel a bit sorry for Eyre when he makes a point of materializing the abstract relationship of such abstract categories as "noun phrase" and "adverbial phrase" in the shape of the English copula "is"[38] – a scholastic approach indeed,[39] if it were not for the reduction of the theoretical approaches in question to absurdity by showing that they end up in the primitive "interlinear translation" sometimes used in the class-room.

Or: If the existence of analytic signals of interrelationship sets the standard for evolved languages, synthetic Latin is more primitive or nearer to formal orality than is French – a proposition only a Frenchman might agree to; and the English language of today with its fixed word order and its tendency to omit conjunctions[40] that German, for example, asks for would be less evolved than the German language – which is usually judged

---

[37] As far as my theoretical constructions are concerned, they usually become simple or even simple-minded only in some accounts others give; the most unbelievably abstruse account is by Satzinger in a recent review, where he writes: "F. Junge entwickelt das System in der Syntax weiter: Jedes Adverb(-syntagma) ist prädikativ. Jedes auf *jw* folgende Glied is prädikativ. Einbettung kann nur unter der Matrix des Satzes mit adverbialem Prädikat erfolgen. Eine Kategorie Verb gibt es nicht. Die tollkühne Abstraktion im Kleid der Transformationsgrammatik endet damit, daß es nur noch Nomina gibt ..." (*WZKM* 79 [1989], 200 f). If he had not given my name I would not have recognized what I am said to have said. And comparable, I am sorry to say, with Eyre and Ray: apparently they do not care much about making a distinction between "Wortart" and categories of syntax, between Verb and the abstract category "Verbal phrase", substantive and "noun phrase", etc.

[38] Preprints, 42 f.

[39] And to be sure, the classical approach of the nominalist when arguing against the platonistic realist, namely to concretize abstract and general concepts and to prove thus that conclusions drawn therefrom are wrong.

[40] Does this mean, for example, that, if in "I believe that he went home" the conjunction is skipped, in "I believe he went home" there is no explicit subordination any more?!

to be the opposite. And by the way, if one goes into typological studies of the Edward Sapir kind, English and Middle Egyptian are even somehow akin in typology[41].

Well, I said I wouldn't go into reasoning along those lines, but at least one thing is clear: All of Eyre's standpoints could be reduced further to one single statement about his cognitive beliefs – he is a classical positivist who only accepts what he can see and touch; I am quite positive, however, that this is a label he feels more honoured by than criticized, and a label that puts him in good company.

This may all be very well, of course, but posed this way it is rather easy to categorise and, to be sure, predict most of the arguments of those scholars Eyre's paper stands for and the arguments I could have made use of to represent what I think Ray calls the "syntactic school"; one can even say that there is a simple way of finding out who is who by looking at the respective translations of the evidence given: those who revolt against the "formalist-logical approach to the analysis of Egyptian" (Eyre) have a tendency towards straightforward, even "interlinear" translation and short main sentences, those who believe in the explanatory power of conceptual analysis – or what might be understood as such – prefer complex or even involved constructions and more "free" translations. The one party uses a variety of more or less ad hoc explanatory schemes and brings forth a "primitive" looking Egyptian, the other uses a seemingly "pidgin-like" analytic apparatus that yields a complex Egyptian.

Or to put it differently: Those who dislike theory are parataxists, those who theorise are hypotaxists. Parataxists love to produce the evidence that the hypotaxists ignore or violate; they detest generalizations, and they consider their opinions proved by a listing of parallels. Hypotaxists talk about paradigmatic evidence, suspect subconscious prejudice in interpretations, and consider theoretical consequence as a proof. Parataxists have their primitive Egyptian, hypotaxists their sophisticated Egyptian – everybody gets the Egyptian he deserves.

And mapped this way, I could just as well stop here, since these opposing viewpoints are nothing other than a question of scientific temperament and the reflex – in Egyptology, thus of course on a rather basic level – of an age-old struggle that has never been solved by reasoning: the struggle between "universalia in voce" and "universalia in re", between realists ("idealists") and nominalists in Scholasticism, between a priori and a posteriori cognition, between rationalism and empiricism, between René Descartes and Francis Bacon, or, let's say, Karl Marx and John Stewart Mill, although this comparison might not serve me well since Marx is by now said to have come off a loser. But at least

---

[41] See what I once made of it, *Orientalia* 31 (1972), 335 ff.

Satzinger will love it since he smells "ideology" and "dogma" whenever he, shall I say, cannot keep up with the reasoning?[42]

And we should have discussed grammar, as one of the major "artes liberales", in Latin, using time honoured and prefabricated phrases – just imagine the scenario: I am, for instance, rejecting the mingling of functional categories and history by quoting Aristotle: "non idem est natura prius et ad nos prius"[43], Thomas Aquinus Loprieno is pointing out the notion of "focus" κατὰ δύναμιν καὶ κατ᾽ ἐντελέχειαν, while Christopher William Occam cries "flatus vocis", and Allen alias David Hume grumbles, a few centuries later: "sophistry and illusion", claiming that a noun is a noun is a noun, not an adverb.

Alright – although I know how dead-locked the situation is, I do go on playing Don Quixote, fighting windmills. A true paradigm of the typology of scientific reasoning outlined is the paper John Ray has delivered, a paradigm of how a "nominalist" whom I admire for his scholarly achievements in the field of philology comes to grief when working with issues of grammar as such. To liberate "some contemporary Egyptian philology", as he says, "from the syntactic dead-end" it finds itself in,[44] he restores to life Callender's hypothesis about pre-hieroglyphic case endings that so justly had fallen into oblivion. Since in prehistory Egyptian nouns must have had the same vocalic case discriminants some Semitic languages have, and since the forms of *sdm=f* were nouns in origin, they must have the same vocalism the cases have[45], although there is no evidence for case endings in Egyptian itself, as Ray concedes.[46] Since the "imperfective *sdm=f*" geminates as the Semitic second stem does, "it seems perverse" to him not to accept its imperfective or habitual

---

[42] *WZKM* 79 (1989), 202 f. with n.18.

[43] J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus*. Series Latina, 64 (something like "the earlier by nature is not the same as the earlier concerning us").

[44] See Preprints, 168.

[45] The independent preterite *sdm=f*, the nominative vowel *-u*, the prospective – Allen's subjunctive – *sdm=f*, the *-a* of the casus adverbialis (the accusative), the circumstantial, the vowel *-i* of the casus adnominalis (the genitive). At least one should ask, however, what independent verbal forms have in common with the nominative, and the genitive with circumstance, the more so since in the Semitic languages it is the accusative that is the casus adverbialis (cf. Akkadian, or the Arabic *ḥāl*). Note that his lines of argument follow those of Thacker, Vergote, Vycichl, that is, the lines of a semitocentric reconstruction of Egyptian vocalism.

[46] Preprints p.167 with n.2. The examples given in n.2 are not to the point at all since ϣⲧⲁⲙ goes back to *ḫᵛtĕm (Type *siḏĭm), not to *ḫatīm < *ḫatīmu (see Osing, *Nominalbildung*, 60), and ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲧ (sideform to ⲛⲟⲩϣⲧ̄ "to become firm") to *nᵛḫắt, not *naḫāt < *naḫātu (*Ibid.*, 37; compare ⲙⲟⲩⲧⲛ̄ < *mād(a)n "to appease" versus ⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲛ < *m(a)dắn "be appeased" (Fecht, *Orientalia* 24 [1955], 290 with n.2).

force,[47] from which the "emphatic" force emerges. The "imperfective *sdm=f*'s" may func-
tion as noun clauses, but it is "in practice wrong" to declare them nouns, as it is wrong to
see Middle Egyptian as a language without verbs,[48] because "the origin of a form or insti-
tution is not in itself a guide to its later behaviour"[49] – statements and a principle I most
heartily subscribe to.[50] Considering the tenses of the perfective *sdm=f* "as the nominative,
accusative and genitive of a verbal noun"[51], however, seems to explain a lot to Ray, and he
thinks there may still be some evidence for their vowel quality in "Old Coptic". Finally, he
is against a mechanical and law-like validity of "emphasis" even in noun clauses[52] – justly,
of course, but a bit unaware of Polotsky's *Transpositions*, I think.

Jim Allen – to change the specific subject, so to say, within the same frame – has,
of course, not asked questions about the primitiveness of Egyptian – would never have, he
simply started presenting his way of processing the language, somehow bringing to light in
theory what he so irresistibly and intimidatingly did in practice – pair forms with meaning
to the bitter end: "Pyramid grammar" on the march, so to say. After having found the
formal and syntactic evidence for the synthetic nominal forms of the verb acceptable[53], he
proceeds by showing that there is nothing he can approve of as evidence for the adverbial
forms of the *sdm=f* since he does not consider their paradigmatic proximity to the preposi-

---

[47] Preprints, 169. He does not seem very familiar with Semitic languages in practise, however, otherwise
he would have noticed that verbs in the second stem very seldom follow the schemes of the school
grammars.

[48] Preprints, 171.

[49] *Ibid.*

[50] I may be permitted a rather straightforward comparison. In a syntagma like "I believe the priest" or "I
believe him" it is agreed, I am sure, that "the priest" or "him" are nouns that fill the object slot of the verb;
the object slot is a nominal slot. Now in "I believe that he went home", what is "that he went home"? It is
not a noun, but a clause in a nominal slot, a noun clause in the object slot of the verb – a noun clause,
however, is not a noun. This noun clause is built up with the help of a verb. By calling this clause a noun
clause, I do not deny the verbality of the verb the clause is constructed with. Now, *sdm=f* is built up of a
verb; when it is said that *sdm=f* is a noun clause, it is not said that *sdm=f* is a noun – nor is it said that
there is no verb in Middle Egyptian when it is said that all *sdm=f*'s are noun clauses.

[51] *Ibid.*, 172.

[52] Particularly in n. 5, where he "proves" that there is no emphasis possible in a noun phrase after preposi-
tions, although the note only gives evidence of the use of substantival *sdm=f* (one of the much discussed
usages of geminating *sdm=f*); see Kammerzell, *GM* 102 (1988), 46 (§ 5). Or the simple example of the
currently much discussed "balanced sentence" *wnn pt wnn mnw=j tp t3* easily understood and translated as
"Does heaven endure, my monument on earth will endure" (or "As truly as heaven/sky exists ..." or "Will
heaven exist ..."), but taken by Ray as impossible to translate in terms of the "Standard Theory" since
"such a sentence collapses under the weight of its own emphasising" (p.170). See my treatment of
examples of this type of "balanced sentences", too (Junge, *"Emphasis" and sentential meaning*, 91 [E 68]).

[53] Preprints, 7.

tional adverbs and their syntagmatic surroundings conclusive – fare thee well, grandpa de Saussure, and good bye to linguistic structuralism.

In the predicate of "emphatic" constructions, not only adverbials but also nouns are to be found, *sdm.n=f* occurs with nominal, non-referential agent in apparently circumstantial clauses.[54] Like *sdm.n=f*, stative / Old Perfective and the *sdm=f*-forms, "subjunctive", "indicative", and even "circumstantial" considered as morpho-semantic unities, can be used independently as well as adverbially, their differences being rather semantic than syntactic in nature; "usage" is the governing principle of subordination – what Eyre had quoted as the "semantic subordination" that does not count[55]. Being "unmarked" for syntax, "these seven or eight forms clearly express primary differences in meaning rather than function",[56] he says. "Meaning" means: Description of state (stative / Old perfective) versus action, cross-bred with "mood", aspect ("relative" perfect[57] – *sdm.n=f*) and non-aspect (simple past – *sdm=f*), prospectivity being a subcategory of the "inaccompli"[58]; this range of meaning, moreover, meets with "usage", "the result of a more complex interaction between the basic (formal) meaning, the lexical features of the verb denoted in the form, and the context in which the form is used".[59]

When all is said and done, it might be called a consequent semantic counter-scheme to syntax – a counter-scheme, however, at least as complicated. And if one finds his reasoning acceptable – which I cannot (see appendix [1]), it is again not segmentation signals any more that allow us to decide the set-up of sentences and periods, but "meaning" and "usage", principles that do not ask for codes of the author's intentions but are interpretative and turn decision-making over to the translator. And to be sure: It is nothing other than an up-date, a Pyramid-texts based revival of Gardiner's grammatical beliefs reconciled with Polotsky's patterns of the nominal forms of the verb – hypotaxis being up to the translator's will again. Or more precisely, the existence of hypotaxis being denied by Allen if not overtly marked: "Throughout the history of Egyptian, adverbial usage ... is signalled analytically ... or through the use of specific markers. ... Otherwise, adverbial function is a

---

[54] But who has ever asked for co-reference of the agent of a circumstantial form to the main sentence agent as a mark or conditio sine qua non of circumstantiality?

[55] Preprints, 35.

[56] *Ibid.*, 14.

[57] "With respect to some point of reference"; "since the reference-point is contextually determined, this accounts for the ability of both forms to express past (independent), prior (circumstantial), and subsequent (continuative) action", p.15.

[58] Which is quite the opposite to Loprieno's approach to aspects, cf. his *Verbalsystem*.

[59] Preprints, 19.

purely contextual feature..."[60] – exactly the syndrome to be expected from the classification of scientific behaviour given above. For a few more remarks on method and evidence see appendix [1].

Very instructive as to a specific parataxist's position, finally, has been the paper of Thomas Ritter. He undertook an ambitious corpus study of the language of the formal texts of the 18th Dynasty – that I, for my part, thought showed in part a skilful and elaborate, and sometimes most refined, usage in Middle Egyptian with as yet little influence of the Late Egyptian "proper" to come. Ritter's results were somehow disturbing: There seemed to be an independent use of the 1.p. stative / Old perfective of a passive-medial meaning that is neither known to older Egyptian[61] nor to Late Egyptian, *jw*-sentences are but scarcely used, and there is an initial *sdm.n=f* that is not nominal.[62] The latter did not, of course, come as a surprise to the hard-boiled Gardinerians; and to those who stick to the "Standard Theory", such as Ritter himself, it could have been explained as "Late Egyptianisms", either in comparison with the use of *sdm.n=f* in non-literary texts of the Ramesside time, as classified by Sarah Groll in Crossroads I[63], or as the *sdm.n=f* that in Late Egyptian formal texts and in post Late Egyptian is an "allomorph" of preterite *sdm=f*.

Somehow conspicuous in the terms of my account here, however, were the translations Ritter gave of the evidence his paper is amply supplied with: they are mostly confined to short main sentences, that is, they have the appearance of a "parataxist's" endeavour. Upon closer examination, it becomes evident why: He holds with the strict temporal anteriority of the past or perfective circumstantials stative, *sdm.n=f* and passive *sdm / sdm.w*. And if one allows for multiple filling of sentence slots and "continuative" function, most of the examples easily yield the construction patterns to be expected, with very few exceptions, indeed[64]; the peculiarity of the forms turns out to depend on segmentation (see appendix [4]).

Drawing to a close here I cannot but meditate a bit on the issue and what I think to be the right way of adhering to the "Standard Theory" again – whatever it may be at the moment: I always thought grammatical circumstantiality in Egyptian to be a rather involved and complicated thing to describe, since there are a lot of cotextual features to account for,

---

[60] *Ibid.*, 25 f.

[61] There is only a use of the 1.p. stative / Old Perfective with active meaning in Old Egyptian.

[62] Less surprising that the *sdm/sdm.w*-passiva are confined to nominal "subjects": this is well known since Westendorf, *Der Gebrauch des Passivs* (see *ibid.*, 38 for a summary).

[63] Groll, in: *Crossroad*, 167 ff.; especially convincing Ritter's example 33 (Groll's "group VIII A minimal unit: The narrative *dd.n=j*").

[64] Perhaps his ex.3 (possible explanation: indirect speech of the Late Egyptian type, cf. Frandsen, *Outline*, § 118; Hintze, *Untersuchungen*, 172 f.); ex.16 (possibly very short "emphatic construction"); ex.34.

and I always argued against simple and straightforward behaviour in that respect.[65] So I remember clearly that I denied the existence of a "continuative *sdm.n=f*" at the meeting in Grenoble since the use so described is easily explained as the use of multiple circumstantials – parallel forms in the same syntactic slot – without the need for an extra rule; not a few colleagues present there, especially Callender and Satzinger, protested, arguing against my theoretical stubbornness and prejudice and pointing out how little knowledge of texts I thus revealed. But when Éric Doret proved that to be exactly the case, everyone seemed to have been of that opinion all the time. Nevertheless, in the meantime, those who insist on the simplistic rule that circumstantial *sdm.n=f* is always a form of anteriority are telling me again that they cannot tolerate the "mechanical, quasi-mathematical"[66] rules that keep me from accepting the law of constant anteriority, apparently forgetting now everything about their own "continuatives". Or as Vernus has put it: "Parce que ses postulats théoretiques l'empêchent de distinguer le niveau énonciatif du niveau syntaxique que Junge ...se voit contraint de nier le jeu de l'aspect accompli dans une subordonnée"[67]; at least my "postulats théoretiques" keep me from falling into the traps others fall into when their left hand does not know what their right hand did – and by the way, it was one of my major interests in *Studien zum mittelägyptischen Verbum*[68] to come to terms with the subtle and intricate "jeu de l'aspect accompli dans une subordonnée" without the uncouth rules Vernus and others prefer. The truth is that they don't mind "mechanical" rules but they do mind sophisticated ones.

Enough, I had better stop talking before not only those who feel particularly offended but everyone else, too, finally runs out of patience. I myself think my summary has one virtue, after all: The reviewer to come of the publication of the papers read here will save a lot of time by simply rewriting my account in his words. By already delivering a review of sorts with the papers reviewed, we actually declare ourselves completely independent; and in that sense, my comparing myself to Don Quixote takes on quite another slant: Since what you said has come to guide what I said in the same way as Don Quixote was guided by his romances of chivalry, one might even say, according to Michel Foucault,[69] that "language broke its old kinship to things to enter into that secluded sovereignty that it will return from only as having become literature" – perhaps with us as with Don Quixote the mark of a new age. It would be grand, wouldn't it?

---

[65] See now Junge, *"Emphasis" and sentential meaning*, 56 ff. (§ 4.2.3).

[66] Preprints, 48.

[67] *Ibid.*, 254 n.39.

[68] *Ibid.*, 31-43.

[69] *Les mots et les choses*. German edition: *Die Ordnung der Dinge*. STW 96, Frankfurt 1974, 81.

Finally, I am perfectly happy if you blame some of my faux pas upon my using a language foreign to me, and it was, of course, utterly out of place for me to place some of your papers in a framework you did not care for or do not agree with. But you can be sure that I did it on purpose.

Appendix

(1) J. Allen

(1.1) In his first example (1), Allen advances with some confidence "circumstantial" *sdm.n=f*'s of verbs of motion and intransitives, although they should be "uniformly nominal / 'emphatic' in the *sdm.n=f*", as he states[70]. First, however, this is a statistical probability that has proved to be correct in a lot of cases but has no law-like binding-force – no qualitative model will ever produce it. Second, the examples given are not much of a surprise; they are very well known, and in part, if they have not solved, they are at least amply treated in my thesis[71] and quoted again in my *Syntax*[72]. Third, they are of the same type that is best represented by the occurrence Ptahhotep 58-59 (L$_2$) already quoted by Polotsky,[73] where a geminating *sdm=f* follows *jw* (the parallel has non-geminating *sdm=f*):

– Pt. 58-59   *dg3 md.t nfr.t r w3d jw gmm.tw=s m-' hm.wt hr bnw.t* "Good speech is more hidden than greenstone; one does find it, however, with the maids at the milling-stone"[74].

A few theoretical turns are necessary to demonstrate the possibilities for explanation:

a) There are cases that are to be analyzed as *jw* [NP]AP

– Nfrtj E 9-10 *jw hr.j-h3b.t '3 n.j B3st.t jty nb=n Nfr.tj rn=f...* "There is a great lector priest, king, our lord, Neferti by name" or

– type *jw hm=f jb=f qbh.w* "His Majesty's mood was bettered"[75]

---

[70] Preprints, 1.

[71] Junge, *Studien zum mittelägyptischen Verbum*, 12 f.

[72] Junge, *Syntax*, 18 with n. 3. Allen need not owe references to P.Vernus (Preprints, 1 n.1) since he could have found them there already.

[73] *Egyptian Tenses*, n. 22.

[74] See Junge, *Syntax*, 89.

[75] Cf. Gardiner, *EG*, § 215; Polotsky, *Transpositions*, § 3.8.7.1. See, however, the shrewd observations of Gilula, in: *Studies Polotsky*, 390 ff. (although he explicitly denies the existence of the type *jw* + noun, I agree with his analysis there).

b) If geminating *sdm=f* is a "substantival *sdm=f*", it might simply be a substitution of a noun by a nominal verb form *jw* [[*sdm=f*]NP + complement]AP, where complement is a "necessary" part of the verbal content ("to find something in such and such state")

c) A nominal verb form does not "emphasise" an adverb when in non-subject noun position (as object, after prepositions).

d) *jw* is not incompatible with "nominal forms" but with the "emphasising" function! That is, the "imbedded" sentence with predicate marking (focus) loses its sentence function by becoming a clause (no predicate marking any more).

The theoretical problem that there is a pure "noun" to be found following *jw*, although adverbials are to be expected, is not solved either with or without the existence of nominal *sdm=f*'s in this position.

(1.2) Even if the above is not accepted as an explanation, there is no reason at all to allege that this example has explanatory power (or better: destroying power) for quite another syntagmatic surrounding, for instance, like that of his example (4).

(1.3) There is one general principle that might stand above Allen's treatment of the adverbials (preprints pp.8 ff.): A complex linguistic structure can always be cracked easily into smaller pieces without their losing their minimum of meaning – think of Eyre's "pidgin" – while it is much more difficult to prove that small pieces may be organized by rules into higher units that are still meaningful as such. And even if one is prepared to accept his neglect of structuralistic principle (looking for paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationship)[76], his method of argumentation is very simple, indeed: If there is an independent usage of a form that is used in subordination, too, the form is said to be "unmarked" with regard to subordination, although it is usually the more specific usage that "marks" a form for a function (that is, the methodological "normal" question should be: Why is a form marked for subordination used independently). Let's look more closely at his examples:

– In his example (16) *dd=f kt hrww n.j wp.t rnp.t* "He gives another on New Year's Day", the noun phrase *hrww n.j wp.t rnp.t* is used as an adverb following the statistical rule that Gardiner has phrased thus: "Indications of time are often expressed by a noun used absolutely, i.e. without prepositions", something he termed "adverbial uses of nouns"[77], giving a variety of examples. When nouns indicating time are used adverbially, then the use of a noun indicating time in the "adverbial slot" after a "substantival form of the verb" does not invalidate the "adverbial character" of this slot.

---

[76] See the short methodological account of Frandsen, *Outline*, IX.

[77] Gardiner, *EG*, § 88.

– The stative / Old Perfective is treated still more light-handedly; he simply declares his adverbial function to be of "a paratactic rather than syntactic origin" since there are independent usages. First, the independent uses are particularly firmly defined, that is, only the stative 1.p.s. is sometimes used as preterite, 2. / 3.p., however, only with "conative" function[78], while there are no restrictions on circumstantial use. Second, the stative is morphologically not a single form, but shows in its circumstantial use the "adverbial transpositor"-ending Frank Kammerzell has discovered[79].

– With his example (21) (and [20]) *gmj.n=j ḥq3 j3m šm.w r.f t t3 ṯmḥ* "I found the ruler of Iam gone to Tjemeh-land", he intends to show that the circumstantial stative derives from the "parataxis" of the two independent statements

a)   *gmj.n=f   ḥq3 j3m*
b)   *ḥq3 j3m šm.w r.f r t3 ṯmḥ*

by deletion of the coreferential "subject"-noun of the second sentence. But he should think this over again since it shows exactly the opposite. These are the examples from which one can even derive a rule of Egyptian subordination, such as: A sentence is subordinated by raising its subject (or other nominals in the sentence) to function as a noun in another sentence, for example, as an object after *gmj* or as a noun after prepositions, etc.:[80] Thus one sentence becomes a member of another sentence while its predicate loses its "predicate character" and becomes a "circumstantial" of the "matrix"-sentence. Furthermore, the mechanism demonstrates that the stative is not used independently by itself but only with a preceding nominal. Finally the "rule" is not confined to adverbial sentences with stative but is a rule fitting all kinds of adverbial predicates, as for example

– Sin. B 86 *rḏj.t=f wj m ḥq3* ... "He made me a ruler" (< **rḏj.t=f wj* and **(mk) wj m ḥq3*);

termed "embedding" it is the most usual explanation for subordination in most languages[81]. "Noun"-raising of the kind named could thus be called precisely the explicit "subordination" signal everybody is asking for.

---

[78] This function is easily understood if compared with imperative and the "imperative" use of adverbials (like *ḥr ḥr=ṯn ḥf3w* "on your faces, snakes" [see § 8.4.1]).

[79] Already in Kammerzell, *GM* 102 (1988), 48; particularly treated here (Preprints, 94 ff.) and *GM* 117/118 (1990), 181 ff.

[80] Very often the noun raised functions in apposition to another noun; that could be called an explanation for circumstantials with "subjects" of their own. Cf. below. The semantic differences between Ex. 20 and 21 made note of by Allen are not really pertinent to the syntactical question.

[81] For Egyptian, I have treated it amply in Junge, *Syntax*, § 3.2 and – already discussing a contribution of Allen of similar kind – again in *GM* 33 (1979), 81 ff. (§ 1.3.3). The "Shipwrecked Sailor" example Allen

– Allen misses *sdm.w*-passive in what he calls the "subject-verb" construction (one of the syntagmatic patterns he accepts for distribution analysis); the non-appearance there, however, but follows the reference of the form: "Passive" is an "actor-not-mentioned" reference that runs counter to "actor mentioning" plus "passive" form; noun plus stative is the appropriate counterpart.

– Example (22) is particularly strange as evidence, since Allen translates circumstantially what he proposes to be a paratactic since *sdm.n=f* has a "nominal (i.e. non-coreferential) subject":

– *nb jrp m wȝḥ*

> *jp.n sw tr=f*
> *sḫȝ.n sw nw=f* (Pyr 1524a-b)

"The lord of wine is in fullness, his season having recognized him, his time having remembered him."

This example demonstrates most clearly that Egyptian circumstantials have about the same "subordinating character" as the English gerund: signalling subordination without denoting the logical nexus involved (as German conjunctions would necessarily ask for).

– In the realm of *sdm=f* the relationship of "indicative" and "circumstantial" *sdm=f* is his yardstick. Even if there is an "indicative" *sdm=f* in Middle Egyptian which I doubt,[82] I do not see the problem Allen does when he states: "If the 'indicative' and "circumstantial' *sḏm.f* are syntactic alternants of a single grammatical tense, these different semantic values" – that I have not seen either – "indicate that the tense is not marked either temporally ... or aspectually... ."[83] Why does this speak against their being "alternants of a single ... tense"? And I do not find reasons to accept either the "independent uses of the 'circumstantial' form" in (28), since it is nicely circumstantial there – compare the version

– (28) *NN pj kȝ jȝḫwj ḥr jb jr.t=f*

> *wḏȝ r' NN m hh*

>> *tp NN m wp.t nb šm'w*

> *sšm NN nṯr*
> *sḫm NN m psḏ.t*
> *s:rd NN ḫsbḏ*
> *ȝg NN twn šm'w*

---

calls me on (Preprints, 9 n. 41) I would understand differently now, namely as an example of an "indirect speech" type of object: "'I found: it was a serpent'".

[82] See Kammerzell, *GM* 102 (1988), 41 ff.

[83] Preprints, 12.

"NN is the power of light (<bull of light) in each eye while (or: and) NN's mouth breathes blaze (<proceeds with blaze); NN's head is as the horny vertex of the Lord of the Nile Valley when NN leads god, when NN disposes over the Ennead, makes the lapis-lazuli grow and plants the Nile Valley *twn*",

nor can I find the "indicative" form in adverbial use convincing in the least: Example (30) ShS 10-11 is analysable as 1.p.plural Stative (*mk ...n jj.(wj)n m ḥtp*) with much less constraint, in example (31) Sin. R 17-18 (*smr.w n.w stp-z3 h3b=sn ...*), the *sdm=f* functions as the "no tense reference" / "relative present" that not a few of the circumstantial forms display (except stative and *sdm.n=f*): This means that they are not expressive of a tense but may be used together with any tense. For example (32), see my elaborate treatment of the *rdj*-forms[84].

In general a lot of the examples given by Allen can be understood as subordinate without constraint when one keeps in mind that the "continuative" function is a function of the "circumstantial", too[85].

(2) A. Loprieno

(2.1) Inversion in *jw*-sentence and nominal sentence.

– In preprint example (1), Pyr. 562a-c

$$jw \ m \ \underline{d}\underline{d}=\underline{t} \ \hbar nw.t=j \quad mrw.t \ NN$$
$$sm.t \ NN$$
$$jw \ m \ \underline{d}\underline{d}=\underline{t} \ \hbar nw.t=j \quad sm \ NN$$
$$jm3.t \ NN \ m \ \underline{h}3.t \ n.t \ n\underline{t}r.w,$$

both Loprieno and Allen[86] – to whom he owes the segmentation – analyse the example as *jw*-sentence with an *m + sdm=f* clause moved forward for "emphasis" / "focus", taking recourse to rather unusual constructions: Loprieno has AP plus NP somehow "balanced" in translation, "In your very act of giving ... resides (nexus representation!) the love of the King and the help of the King; in your very act of giving ... resides the help ... and the graciousness of the King in the company of the Gods". Allen thinks of a double occupation of the fronting *jw* + AP + nouns and a common predicative AP (*m ḫ3.t n.t nṯr.w*), translating

---

[84] Junge, *Syntax*, 100.

[85] See Junge, *JEA* 72 (1986), 113 ff.

[86] Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, § 243.

"When / As you give ... there is love for King NN and help for King NN;
when / as you give ... there is help ... and graciousness towards King NN
in the company of the gods."

Both analyses are a bit strange; the Loprieno-construction simply reverses the "*m* of predication" function, the Allen-construction has a doubling of *jw* plus multiple adverbials and nominals with one common predicate although usually there is one *jw* and multiple nouns and predicates or one noun and multiple predicates ("continuatives")[87]. Before going into unusual constructions one should, I think, scrutinize the example a bit for possibilities more "normal". The following considerations seem to arise:

a) The *sdm=f* of the verb *rdj* (*dd*) necessarily asks for at least an object to mean "to give" (intransitive *rdj* does but scarcely occur and then only in the meaning "to lie down", "to prostrate" – Nfr.tj E 8 – or "to be partial" – with *hr gs*); if it could not be *hnw.t=j* "my mistress", there ought to be another noun to follow (*mrw.t / sm*).

b) A nominal "vocative" is most apt to occupy free positions in a sentence, one can even think of very unusual ones if it makes sense; still more probable here, however, is an apposition to the preceding suffix-pronoun.

c) There are not a few cases of *jw*-sentences of the type *jw* + AP[88], like

– Sin. B 43 *jw mj shr ntr* "It was like the counsel of god";

this structure should at least be considered a possibility. Altogether, one might suggest a translation that makes at least as much sense as the one Allen / Loprieno prefer but that is more grammatical:

"It is by your, my mistress', giving love for NN and help for NN, it is by your, my mistress', giving help and graciousness of NN in the company of the gods."

– In other cases of presumed "leftward movement", alternative explanations are less evident; Loprieno's explanations give reason for suspicion nevertheless. In his preprint example (2), for instance, the grammatical category of *tn* "where" is far from clear. At least in a few occurrences, it has something of a nominal / substantival character (of an "interrogative noun" instead of an "interrogative adverb") – which would at least weaken the case of "leftward moved adverbs" considerably; compare

---

[87] See Doret, *Narrative Verbal System*, 133 ff.; Johnson, *Serapis* 6 (1982), 69 ff.; Junge, *JEA* 72 (1986), 119 f.

[88] What Gardiner, *EG*, § 123 calls "Omission of the subject before adverbial predicate" (and see his examples).

– pWestc. 12,14 *jr=t r ṯn* "Whither art thou (f.) making?"[89] or cases like those quoted by Gardiner ("treated as though it were a nominal predicate"): *ṯn sw prj* "Whence is he who has gone forth?"[90]

Thus it is quite possible to understand Loprieno's preprint example (2) from the Pyramid-texts (Pyr. 671a-b) as an example of "Pyramid Cleft Sentences / Nominal Sentences": "Serpent, serpent, it is where that you will go?" or "where is it that you go?".

Finally his preprint example (7) may be understood as an instance of the "conative" use of AP's (see note):

– CT III 202i *ḥr jšs.t jr.j tm=k zwr.w wzš.t* ... "What is it, your not drinking urine?", "what does it mean, that you do not drink urine?"

(2.2) Focalized AP and "thetic sentence"

Loprieno's preprint example (10) that is meant to demonstrate a "pragmatic movement" of focal extraposition is, I think, not to the point since another segmentation is called for:

– Pyr. 956a-959e *ḏd-mdw*
    ʿḏ p.t
    nwr t3
        jj Ḥrw
       ḫʿj Ḏḥwt.j
            ṯzj=sn Wsjr ḥr gs=f
            ḏj=sn ʿḥʿ=f m psḏ.tj

    (956a-c) "When sky vibrates and earth quakes, Horus comes and Thot appears so that they raise Osiris to his side, that they make him stand among the two Enneads."

    sḫ3 Stš
    dj jr jb=k   *mdw pw ḏd.n Gbb*
                f3w pw jrj.n nṯr.w jr=k
                      m ḥw.t srj m Jn.w ḥr ndj=k Wsjr jr t3
                            m ḏd=k Stš nj jrj.n=j js nw jr=f
                                  sḫm=k jm
                                      nḥm.tj sḫm=k n Ḥrw

---

[89] Translation by Gardiner, *EG*, § 503, 2.

[90] *Ibid.*, § 503, 4; Gardiner explicitly compares those examples with the parallel with *m* "who", *pw* "who" (§ 132).

> m ḏd=k Stš jw=f wnn.t jk.n=f wj
>   ḫpr rn=f pw n.j Jkw-t3
> m ḏd=k Stš jw=f wnn.t s3ḥ.n=f wj
>   ḫpr rn=f pw n.j S3ḥ
>   ʿw rd
>   pḏ nmt.t
>   ḫnt.j t3 šmʿw

"Remember, Seth, and put this utterance that Geb has said in your heart, this curse that the Gods have made against you in the Noble House in Heliopolis when you threw Osiris to the ground[91], by your saying, Seth: 'It was not to him that I did it', so that you might gain control thereby since your control was taken away to Horus; by your saying, Seth: 'He, indeed, attacked me' – so that this his name of 'Earth-attacker' came into being; by your saying, Seth: 'He, indeed, kicked me' – so that this his name of 'Orion' came into being,[92] the long-legged with the wide step, the foremost of Upper-Egypt."

(3) D. Sweeney

Concerning my convictions in the paper of mine in question, I should like to divide them into those of major and those of minor interest for me: Of minor interest is the relationship of question classes and sentence types; they are something of a by-product there, and I have stressed that they are but tentatively put forward (see the main text above) in the sense of a "tendency". In particular, I have given little attention to questions built of nominal sentences or introduced by "question operator" jn jw, and I am perfectly prepared to be mistaken; I am, however, not yet convinced that I am mistaken in all of Sweeney's cases since there is much interpretation involved and I still believe that I can stand up to hers in not a few cases. Nevertheless, what I attach more importance to is the speech act function of Adverbial Sentence and jw-Sentence and their reaction to being questioned. And here I have not a few objections to Sweeney's objections:

First, her gestures against some sentence structuring and the respective "illocutionary" forces. She begins by hinting that Adverbial Sentences are not "main sentences"[93]; it may suffice to simply point to Gardiner's § 322 (and there especially to those cases of the "pseudo-verbal construction" that follow the "direct indicator of initiality", ḏd)[94]. She con-

---

[91] This part Allen, *Inflection of the Verb*, § 667.

[92] That far *ibid.*, § 415.

[93] Paper, 15 f.

[94] And see especially Ptahhotep 1-20 quoted in Junge, *"Emphasis" and sentential meaning*, 46 (E 29); *BiOr* 40 (1983), 550 n. 31 (with short discussion).

tinues by arguing that "it is not clear that S + adverb structures are necessarily AB-events[95]." What does that mean, "not clear"? Does she have examples that speak against it or does she simply have a feeling of uneasiness? Her counter-example (17), at any rate, is none;[96] the "presentative" illocution of the AdvS she negates is quite clear when accounting for the cotext:

– Sin. B 76-77   *ḏd.jn=f ḫft=j*
                  ḥr ḥm Km.t nfr.tj <n>-ntt s(j) rḫ.tj rwḏ=f
                      mk tw ꜥꜣ
                      wnn=k ḥnꜥ=j
                      nfr jrr.t=j n=k

"Then he (Amunenshi) said to me: 'Well then, Egypt must surely be happy since it knows him to be strong. But you are here; you are with me, and I treat you well."[97]

Second, the instances she gives for "the exact opposite of the structures" suggested by me are not as conclusive as she thinks; I am arguing only those cases that are of major interest to me (*jn jw* + AdvS; *jn* + AdvS):

        One of the occurrences Sweeney quotes for "questions asking for confirmation" with the structure "*jn jw* + S + adverbial predicate" does evidently have the meaning she assumes (Meir I pl.V, with *ḥr* + infinitive), the other two examples do not:

– CT V 102c-f *jn jw=k mḥ.tj jw=j mḥ.kw*
        "'Are you made whole?' – I am made whole."

– Adm.14,13 (Ipuwer) *jn jw=s m ṯmḥ.w kꜣ jrj=n ꜥnw*
        "Is it Libyans? (If yes,) then we will return."

The CT-instance is a clear case of a real "neutral" question for information in a (fictional) ritual dialogue; it nicely displays the formal question – answer correspondence pointed out by me at the time[98]; the Admonitions-instance is not a question for confirmation ("it is surely Libyans, isn't it?") but a question that is characterized by a slight shift from "neutral" towards "dubitative" – not seldom used in constructions Silverman has rather unluckily labelled "interpretation of questions as conditions" and amply treated in my review[99].

---

[95] Events known to both speaker and addressee.

[96] The example pWestcar 11,5, which she notes on p. 16 n. 1, is treated by Junge, *BiOr* 40 (1983), 553.

[97] See also Loprieno, *Topos und Mimesis*, 56 f.

[98] Junge, *BiOr* 40 (1983), 554 (with n. 45; 46).

[99] *Ibid.*, 548 n. 26; 555.

Her examples, finally, which are given for a "dubitative question" with the structure *jn* + AdvS (*jn wnn* + AdvS), are quite evidently instances of "questions for confirmation", as already assumed in my earlier treatment[100]:

– Hekanakhte XVI v1 *jn wnn jb=j mḥ r ḏd rḏj.n=j ʿq.w n prw=j*
"I will be confident to have given provisions to my household, won't I?"

(4) Th. Ritter

First I should like to state briefly the basic grammatical lay-out into which Ritter's examples fit. In Egyptian sentences and periods, the adverbial phrases can have the following functional positions[101] ("consecutio temporum"):

(1) As simple or multiple immediate constituents of the sentential structure (necessary part of the sentence), type [[noun phrase] + [adverbial phrase]]sentence or

	+ [adverbial phrase]	
[[noun phrase]	+ [adverbial phrase]	]sentence
	+ [adverbial phrase]	

The same holds true, of course, with multiple noun phrases (of course nominal *sdm=f* included) plus simple or multiple adverbial phrases.

(2) As simple or multiple non-immediate constituents, that is, "real" circumstantially used adverbial phrases (not necessarily adverbs), extensions of the "self contained minimal constructions", type [[NP] + [AP]]sentence + [AP] (+ [AP]) etc. (again simple or multiple).

(3) Neither adverbial phrases are necessarily "anterior" in time to its preceding phrase or sentence when they are forms expressing "past" or "perfect"; they may be anterior or may be "synchronous" in time if their forms of reference are "past" or "perfect" by themselves, or they may even "continue" the general temporal lay out of the text in question.

Ritter's examples thus could be given structural shape as follows.[102] Although I shall spend a fair amount of effort and paper on them, I should like to stress that in general

---

[100] *Ibid.*, 557 (Silverman, *Interrogative Constructions*, 23, ex. 22).

[101] For the theoretical and practical arguments see Junge, *"Emphasis" and sentential meaning*, 49 ff. (§ 4.2), especially 53 ff. (§ 4.2.3).

[102] And the translation by English cleft sentences here is mostly to the purpose of structural clearness and should – if felt to overdo it – sometimes perhaps be remodelled to forms less conspicuous; if I choose other translation devices, I keep to the principles described *ibid.*, § 4.3 and passim.

I feel nonetheless much more in grammatical accord with Ritter than with others the examples of whom I did not scrutinize to the same extent.

(4.1) First person Old perfective/stative

– (ex.1)   Urk. IV 76,15-77,1 – type (1)
                  ḏd=f jtj.n=j rnp.wt ʿš3.wt   m ḥ3.tj-ʿ n.j Nḫn
                                                    mzj.n=j jn.w=s n nb t3.wj
                                                    ḥsj.kw n gmj.tw zp=j

"He said: I have spent many years as mayor of Hierakonpolis, sent its tribute to the Lord of the Two Lands and was praised, no fault having been found with me."

– (ex.2)   Urk. IV 158,17-159,1 – type (1)
                  ḏj.jn=f wj   ḫr ḥ3.t ḥm=f
                                    s:ʿḥʿ.kw r ʿḥʿ.w n.j nb

"Then he placed me in front of His majesty (himself) and had me assigned to the position of lord."

Or type (2), the stative / pseudoparticiple reflecting the general temporal situation of the text – as the *sḏm.jn=f* form does: "Then he placed me in front of His majesty, having been assigned to the position of lord."[103]

   I cannot offer an alternative explanation for his ex.3: the "direct indicator of initiality" *r ḏd* in front of *h3b.kw* is very good evidence; what I could think of, however, is the Egyptian type of "indirect speech" with its characteristic change of pronominal reference[104], perhaps then: "when his messenger complained that, when he (< I) was sent with a message (!) to the official so-and-so, he had him (< me) arrested ...". But Ritter has, of course, the better case.

– (ex.4)   Urk. IV 1377,11-13 – type (2)
                  jw šms.n=j nṯr nfr
                  [[rḫ.n nb t3.wj jqr=j]NP [šm.kw ḥr mṯn]AP]S [tr.kw ḥr=s]AP

"I served the perfect god. Since I went (his) way, the lord knew my excellence, and I was praised for it."

– (ex.5)   Urk. IV 1377,17-20 – type (1)
                  jw=j   ḫnt zj ḥḥ
                              ḏʿr.kw m-m zj ḫfn.w

---

[103] If the "consecutio temporum" is still not felt to be satisfying, one could even think of the "virtually consecutive" use of Old perfective – "so that I was assigned" –, see Westendorf, *GMT*, 121 n. 3 (to § 166, 4), or Lefebvre, *GEC*, § 350.

[104] Cf. Erman, *NäG*, § 428; Frandsen, *Outline*, § 118 (and the numerous examples *ibid.* 130 ff., 136 ff., § 81); Hintze, *Untersuchungen*, 172 f.

njs=f wj r jpw.tj nzw

s:ḫnt.kw mm šny.t

"I rank before millions of people and was chosen from among hundreds of thousands. That I was appointed royal messenger made me being promoted in the retinue."

(4.2) As concerns his examples of the use of "*sdm=f* perfect passive" / pass. *sdm.w* as passive counterpart of *sdm.n=f*, one should expect a grammatical behaviour similar to its active counterpart (i.e. a syntactical division into "adverbial" and "nominal forms"); Ritter, however, adheres to Schenkel's opinion that it could not be used as a "nominal passive *sdm.w*" any more since the emergence of *sdm.ntw=f* in Middle Egyptian – undeniable occurrences being examples of "Old Kingdom language". I, however, think it could be shown that *sdm.ntw=f* was on the way, but did not really push aside passive *sdm.w* in nominal function until both submerged into the Late Egyptian system (especially preterite *sdm=f* / *sdm.tw=f* versus *j.jr=f sdm* / *j.jr.tw sdm* and converter *jw*) – and the early New Kingdom examples Ritter gave are easily analysed that way:

– (ex.6)   Urk. IV 80, (8-)11 – type (1)
                    jrj.w nḫb.t=j m Ḥrw Kȝ nḫt NN

"It was as Horus 'Strong Bull NN' that my titulary has been fixed"

– (ex.7)   Urk. IV (97,14-)98, 1 and 2 – type (1 / multiple nouns after *m*)
                    jrj.w n=f wṯs nfr.w m ḥḏ nbw ḫsbd bjȝ km ʿȝ.t nb.t šps.t

"It was of silver, gold, lapislazuli, black copper and every precious stone, that a portable shrine was built for him."

– (ex.8)   Urk. IV 667-10-12 – type (1)
                    jst jrj.w nȝ n.j ȝḥ.wt m ʿḥ.wt s:jp n rwḏ.w nw pr.w-nzw

                                            r ʿwȝy.t pȝy=sn šmw

"And in order to extract their crops, the fields (of Megiddo) were turned into crown-land assigned to the agents of the palace."

His (ex.9) is to his credit – at least as long as the missing *.t* is considered enough evidence against an interpretation as an infinitive still in the 18th Dynasty (which in principle I should vote for, as Ritter does).[105]

– (ex.10)   Urk. IV 1106,6-11 – type (1)
("The vizier reports to the 'Lord chancellor': All your affairs are well and in order. Every department of the residence is well and in order.")
                    smj.w n=j   ḫtm ḫtm.w r nw

---

[105] Here, however, I personally think all verbs are in the infinitive – and, to be sure, all of them depending on the preceding *ḥr*: "Year 30. Then His majesty came over the country of Retenu on his 6th campaign, reached the town of Qadesch, destroyed it, cut down its trees, tore out its crops, marched over *zš-r-y-tw*, reached the town of Simyra, reached the town of Ardata and did the same to it."

$wn=st\ r\ nw$
$jn\ jr.j\ nb\ s\check{s}m$

"And it was by each leading official that locking and unlocking in due time was reported to me."

– (ex.11)   Urk. IV 4,6-9 – type 1
("He was brought as a captive on the road to the town."
        $[[d3j.n=j\ hr=r\ hr\ mw]NP\ [smj.w\ n\ whm-nzw]AP]S$
"After I had crossed the water with him, it was reported to the royal herald."[106]

– (ex.12)   Urk. IV 6,7-11
"($wn.jn.tw\ hr\ rdj.t$ ...) Thereupon I was given 5 persons and 5 arouras of fields in my home-town, ($jrj.w$ ...) while the same was done to the whole crew."

– (ex.13)   Urk. IV 400,10-12 – type (1 / multiple noun phrases)[107]
        $dd.w\ n=j\ nt.t\ m\ jb$
        $s:wd.w\ n=j\ [jmn.t]$
                $wd.w\ n=j\ m\ stp-s3\ hr\ k3.t\ jb\ hm=s\ r\ qd\ m\ ///$
"Being informed about (her) wishes and entrusted with secrets, I (Senmut) was given order in the palace about the plans of Her majesty to build in ..."

– (ex.14)   Urk. IV 687,5-10 – type (1)
        $jst\ skj.n\ hm=f\ dmj\ n.j\ J-r-t-tw$ $m\ jt=s$
                                                $\check{s}^{\prime}d.w\ ht.w=s\ nb\ bnr$
"Then His majesty ravaged the town of Ardata in its crops and (in that respect) that all its fruit trees were cut down."

– (ex.15)   Urk. IV 897,5(!)-8 – type (1)
        $[s3h].n=j\ t3$
                $[\![s:^{\prime}r]\!].kw\ r\ hnr.t\ ^{\prime}h$
                $rdj.w\ ^{\prime}h^{\prime}=j\ m-b3h\ z3-Jmnw$
"When I reached land, I was raised to the private tracts of the palace and was made standing in front of 'Amun's son' (the king)."

The examples given for $sdm.tw=f$ could, of course, perfectly well stand for Late Egyptian (passive) preterite $sdm=f$, but again it is no problem either to understand them within the terms of (Late) Middle Egyptian syntax, e.g.

– (ex.17)   Urk. IV 82, 13-83,1 – type (1)
("He appeared as overlord over the two lands in order to rule what the sun encircles as well

---

[106] For translation devices of this kind cf. Junge, *"Emphasis" and sentential meaning*, § 4.3.1.

[107] And a typical case of the $sdm.n=f–sdm.n=f$-balanced sentence type (passive).

as the south and the Delta, the shares of the two lords")

$zm3.tw\ t3.wj$

$s:n\underline{d}m=f\ \hbar r\ ns.wt\ Gbb$

$w\underline{t}s.tw\ \underline{h}^{\prime}w\ s\underline{h}m.tj$

$tj\ \hbar m=f\ jtj.n=f\ jw^{\prime}.t=f$

"It is when he settles down on the thrones of Geb and the Double Crown is put on that the Two Lands are united. Now His majesty has seized his heritage."

(4.3) The first person Old perfective / stative of verbs of motion follows the same lines of usage as does the one of transitive verbs.

– (ex.30)   Urk. IV 390,9-12 plus (ex.22) Urk. IV 390,13-15 – type (1)

$\hbar q3.n=sn\ m\ \underline{h}m\ R^{\prime}w$

$n\ jrj=f\ m\ w\underline{d}\ n\underline{t}r\ nfry.t\text{-}r\ \hbar m.t=j$

$mn.kw\ \hbar r\ ns.wt\ R^{\prime}w$

$sr.ntw=j\ r\ \hbar n.tj\ rnp.wt\ m\ \underline{h}pr=s\ jtj.tj$

$jj.kw\ m\ \underline{H}rw\ w^{\prime}t.t\ \hbar r\ nsr\ r\ \underline{h}ft.w=j$

"Since they (the Hyksos) ruled without Re's support, he did not act through oracles until My majesty's having been firmly established on the thrones of Re. And since I was announced for the future as 'born conqueress'[108], I came as Horus 'the unique one flaming against my enemies'".

– (ex.23)   Urk. IV 484,7(!)-15(!) – type (1)[109]

$n\underline{d}r.n=j\ mtr.t.n=f\ \underline{h}r=j\ \ n\ jw\ zp=j\ m\ stp\text{-}s3$

$n\ s:r\underline{h}.tw=j\ m\text{-}m\ \check{s}ny.t$

$n\ gmj\ wn=j\ m\ r3.w\text{-}prw.w$

$nn\ bs\ pf\ s\underline{h}3w.n=j\ r\ rw.tj$

$jj.kw\ m\ \hbar s.wt\ n.t\ \underline{h}r\ nzw$

$\hbar tp.kw\ m\ jmn.t\ nfr.t$

$b3=j\ m\ p.t$

$\underline{h}3.t=j\ m\ jm\hbar.t$

$^{\prime}b.n\ n\underline{t}r\ jrj\ \hbar r\ mw=f$

"Since I exercised what he made me do[110] without being rebuked in the palace or denounced among the courtiers, without faults of mine being found in the temple-administration nor there being any secret that I disclosed to the public, I came into favour with the king and went to rest in the beautiful west. My ba is in heaven and my body in the tomb, since God keeps company with him who acts faithfully to him."

---

[108] (< "Does she come into existence, she conquers").

[109] With an extensively elaborated first verb (adverbial negatives).

[110] Cf. *Wb*. II 171, 20.

– (ex.28)   Urk. IV 123,6-8 – type (1)

> *wn=j m t3 pn n.j ʿnḫ.w nn jw n.j nṯr r=j*
>> *ḫpr.kw m [3ḫ] ʿpr*

"Since I existed in the land of the living without having the wrath of a god against me, I have become a well supplied spirit."

– (ex.29)   Urk. IV 161,2-5 – type (1)

> *qd.n=f wj m bjk n.j nbw*
> *dj.n=f n=j sḫm=f pḥ.tj=f*
>> *dsr.kw m ḫʿ.w=f jpn*
>> *m rn pwy ///*

"Being formed by him as falcon of gold and being given his might and strength, I became holy by these crowns and in my name ..."

– for (ex.30) see above;

– (ex.31)   Urk. IV 974,1-5 – type (2)

("It was my heart that caused me to do it by its guidance")

> *jw=f [n=j] m mtr mnḫ*
> *n ḥd.n=j dd.wt=f*
>> *snd.kw r th.t sšm=f*
>> *rwd.kw ḥr=s wr.t*

"It is a benefiting witness for me and I am not able to be disobedient to what it says, since I am afraid to disregard its guidance and since I have become very powerful on account of it."

(4.4) From the great variety of active transitive forms, initial *sdm.n=f* and the interplay of *sdm=f* and *sdm.n=f* is the most interesting.[111] The "hypotactic" variants I can offer for the examples cited follow the same structural lines as those given above.

– (ex.32)   Urk. IV 618,15-17 - type (1)

("Your monument is bigger than that of any other king")

> *wd.n=j n=k jr.t st*
>> *ḥtp.kw ḥr=s*

"It is to be satisfied with it that I have ordered you to make it."[112]

---

[111] Of course, there is no reason why one should not consider those *sdm.n=f* forms already as the "allomorphs" of Late Egyptian preterite *sdm=f* (cf. the main text) that abound in Ramesside formal texts – besides trying to narrow down the time when this will become an indisputable fact.

[112] And, to be sure, it is only that way that the typical recursive motion of Egyptian ritual scenes is expressed (e.g., the king presents victory and prisoners to Amun while Amun promises victory to him).

For examples 33 and 34, I do not feel able to suggest structural explanations; the *ḏd.n=sn* of ex.33 is, however, as Groll has shown, not quite unusual in Late Egyptian texts as a "minimal unit" "narrative *ḏd.n=j*" (cf. above and n.).

– (ex.35)   Urk. IV 1282,19-1283,5 – type (1) extremely elaborated
> *nḥb=f m Mn-nfr m ṯ3my.t*
> *w3ḥ=f r ḥnw n.j Ḥrw-m-3ḥ.t*
> *jrj=f 3.t jm   ḥr pn'n' st*
> *ḥr m3 šs3.w n.j ḥnw pn n.j NN*
> *'bj.n ḫ3.tj=f s:'nḫ rn=sn*
> *ḏd=f m jb=f ḥr ḫr=f r ḫpr.t wḏ.n n=f jtj=f R'w*

"Since he used to harness in Memphis ..., to stop at the sphinx sanctuary and to spend time there to encircle it and to admire the craftsmanship of this sanctuary of NN (Cheops and Chephren), his heart wished to revive their name. It was, however, until it happened what his father Re had arranged for him that he stored it in his heart just for himself."

– (ex.36)   Urk. IV 102,11-16 – type (1) with multiple AP
> *jrj.n=j t3š.w T3-mrj r šnn.t jtn*
> *ḏj=j nḫt wn.w ḥr ḥry.t*
> *dr=j ḏw.t ḥr=s*
> *ḏj=j wn Km.t m ḥr.t*
> *t3 nb m mr.wt=s m jrj w'jw ḥzj.n Jmnw z3-R'w n.j ḫ3.t=f mrj=f NN ...*

"I have made Egypt's boundaries extend towards what the sun encircles, in giving strength to (< of) those who used to be afraid, in casting the evil out from it, in making Egypt be the topmost. All countries are its serfs, as the deed of the one whom Amun has praised, the bodily Son of Re whom he loves, NN (Thutmosis)..."

– (ex.38)[113]   Urk. IV 272,10-12 – type (1)
> *jst jb=k ḥ'w ḫft jrr=j*
> *s:wḏ=k nzy.t=j mj nb nḥḥ*
> *s:ḫntj=k wj r psḏ.t*

"Since your heart is in joy about my doing, you apportioned my kingdom like that of the lord of eternity and promoted me in the eyes of the ennead."

– (ex.39)   Urk. IV 1246,10-12 – type (2)
> *jw   jwj ḥm=f r tnw zp*
> *hd=f ḫpr m qn.t nḫt*
> *ḏj=f wn Km.t m sḫr=s mj wn R'w jm=s m nzw*

"His majesty came back each time and his fighting had turned out to be most victorious, so that he made Egypt appear as if Re himself were king there."

---

[113] I cannot offer an alternative for example 37.

– (ex.40)   Urk. IV 1280,18-1281,1 – type (2)

  ḫdj.n=f js ḥr st.t r=s mj Mnṯw m ḫkr.w=f
  ʿḥɜ.w=f prj.w ḥr-sɜ jr.j
                         kfʿ=f kt ḥm.t

"And it was like Month in his panoply that he drove to shoot at it (the practice target); his arrow (!) came out at the back of it, so that it (the arrow) gained another pole."[114]

(5) P.Vernus

It is somehow amazing how light-handedly Vernus sometimes bases conclusions on occurrences the interpretation of which, upon looking more closely, is not at all philologically sound:

(5.1) "Prédication de situation ('Adverbial Predicate')"

The syntagma Vernus takes as expressing the "speech situation" named (*jn* + noun / *jnk* + adverbial) is quite unusual and should have aroused suspicion; he seemed, however, to be convinced to have examples for it. They turned out to be of the following appearance:

– (ex.2) CT IV 25b (Sq₁Sq) *jnk jm.s* "C'est moi qui suis en elle"; the parallel (Sq₆C) is, however, somehow different: *Wsjr N pn ṯwt wʿjw jm=sn* "O Osiris N, you are one of them". The explanation of the difference is distressingly easy, indeed; after *jnk* in Sq₁Sq there is the sign of the small stroke (Gardiner Z1) – but not, as Vernus apparently believed, as "ideogram" of *jnk* or the like but as a quite normal shortening of *wʿjw* "one", thus *jnk wʿjw jm=s<n>* "I am one of them" – which is a most common type of the Nominal Sentence.

– (ex.3) CT I 176 d-e *ṯwt ʿɜ m tɜ pw ḏsr nt-k jm.f* "C'est toi qui es là dans ce pays à part où tu es."

A bit more of the cotext is necessary in this case to show the semanto-philological trap he is fallen into:

– CT I 174 o - 175 a ... *šzp=j sʿḥ=k rnš=j ṯw m s.t=k ṯw m tɜ pw ḏsr ntj=k jm=f* ... "... so that I may receive your dignity, that I may oust you from this place of yours in this sacred land in which you are ...";

– CT I 175 j-k *jsk wj ʿɜj m ⟦mdw=k⟧ jm.j ḏɜḏɜ.t rmṯ* ... "See, I am here as your speaker who is in the Tribunal of Men ..."

---

[114] Those *ḥm.t*-poles supporting the practice targets are posted in a distance of 20 yards from each other (Urk. IV 1280, 13-14).

– CT I 175 q *jrj.w twt=k tp t3* ... "your statue on earth is being made ..."

– CT I 176 b [[*s:rwḏ*]].*w n=k ʿrr.wt=k m jrr=j* ... "your gate is strengthened for you by my making ..."

– CT I 176 d-f *ṯwt ʿ3 m t3 pw ḏsr ntj=k jm=f m mdw=j jm.j ḏ3ḏ3.t [nṯr.w]*
                        jsk wj ʿ3j m t3 pn n.j ʿnḫ.w m mdw=k jm.j ḏ3ḏ3.t rmṯ r jw.t=j n=ṯn

"You are a great one in that sacred land in which you are as my speaker in the Tribunal of Gods; I am, however, in this land of the living as your speaker who is in the Tribunal of Men until I come to you ..."[115]

Although the hieroglyphic writing is exactly the same in *ṯwt ʿ3* and in *jsk wj ʿ3j* (both in I 175 j and I 176 f), it is evident from the cotext given that it is a participle / adjective following the independent pronoun in the nominal sentence of I 176 d and an adverb that follows the dependent pronoun as adverbial predicate in I 176 f: The adjective is grammatical common, its meaning is substantiated in the preceding cotext ("great" since having a "statue on earth" and a "strengthened gate"), the tautology of a "you are here in the land in which you are" is avoided and the interesting "there-here"-opposition of the father there "in the tribunal of the gods" and the son here "in the tribunal of men" is taken care of. There is no necessity whatsoever for a peculiar and uncommon "independent pronoun plus adverbial"-construction.

In the footnote (nr. 7) to the preceding example, he cites further occurrences – which, however, again do not pertain to his grouping:

– CT III 348 b *jnk ḫr.j fnḏ Wsjr* "I am someone who is under the nose of Osiris" (although the *j* is not written, it is the nisba of *ḫr* and not the preposition Vernus seems to believe in, and thus again a common nominal sentence with an adjective in second position).

– *RdE* 25 (1973), 226 q (in the text:) *jnk ḏs m hʿw.t* "I am a person in joy"[116] (not necessarily *jnk ḏs(=j)* ... and "Moi-même, j'étais dans la joie" – and even then: *ḏs=j* is a noun and not an adverb).

– (ex.4) Hekaib nr.10 l.20
        rḏj.n n=j ḥm=f   *qrs.tj.t m ʿš* ...
                                        wsḫ m nbw
                                        ḥbs
                                        mrḥ.t

---

[115] Compare the translation of Faulkner who, too, has not realized the correct meaning of this beautiful text (it is not a dialogue but the speech of a son).

[116] See *Wb*. V 607, 4.

> *jn jm.wj n.j ḫr.t-jb*
> *jn jm.j-r3 ꜥḥnw.tj n.j ḥm=f m tr*[117] *jr.y*

"His majesty gave a 'burial-equipment' of pine-wood... to me, a golden necklace, clothing and ointment, by means of two ships as desired, and by (the hands of) the Royal Chamberlain, in due time."

Since Vernus did not take the preceding clause into consideration, he did not recognize that it is a shortened but more envolved version of the memphitic "donation"-formula of Old Kingdom tomb inscriptions.

(5.2) "Les constructions emphatiques"

If one believes in the existence of an "auto-focal" construction as presumed by Shisha-Halevy, it is something one should invest a lot of argument in; the example Vernus takes into consideration is scarcely promising, however, if one has regard to the cotext:[118]

– (ex.6) CT I 55 a-e

> *ḥ3 Wsjr NN pn*
> *jw=k m nṯr*
> *wnn=k m nṯr   nn ḫft.jw=k*
> *nn tp.jw-m3ꜥ=k*
> *ḥr Rꜥw jm.j p.t*
> *ḥr Wsjr nṯr ꜥ3 jm.j 3bḏw*

"NN, you are god, and you shall be god without foes and opponents in the presence of Re in the sky, and of Osiris, great god in Abydos."

Arguing for his part for the well known and famous semantical interrelation of cleft sentence and emphatic construction[119], his example 10 is not well chosen:

– Urk. IV 1195,15

> *[jn jb=j] s:ḫntj s.t=j*
> *jqr.w=j ḏj.n=f wj m sḥ*

"It was my mind that advanced my position; my excellence put me into the council."

---

[117] Thus, not *m s3*!

[118] Incidentally, this is a very good example of the constructions I treated in *Syntax*, 110 ff. (§ 8.2.2).

[119] For Coptic Polotsky, *Études*, especially §§ 21; 22; for Egyptian id., *Orientalia* 33 (1964), 278. In his note 20, Vernus quotes me, in: *Crossroad*, as "refusing" this connection – strangely enough, since I had tried to confirm it there.

The textual surrounding is altogether rather depressing, the focal part of the cleft sentence (*jn jb=j*) a restoration by Sethe and the second sentence not an ingeniously double focalizing emphatic construction but an adverbial sentence of the type [[noun]NP [*sḏm.n=f*]AP]S.

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 [4]1965.

Bakir, A., *Ancient Egyptian Epistolography*. BdE 48, Cairo 1970.

Barns, J. W. B., *The Ashmolean Ostracon 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 adverbiellen 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., "*Wḏ'-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 sḏm.f* in Late Egyptian," *JNES* 28 (1969), 184-91.

---, "A Special Use of the Emphatic *sḏm.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 Anre-
gung," *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.

Caminos, 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 tablet-
tes 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 ⲡⲁ du verbe ⲓⲡⲓ," *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 abydénienne de la XIIᵉ 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 + *sḏm.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 testes 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 ⲙⲛ̄ und ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ," *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., *Traîté d'histoire des religions*, Paris 1964.

Erichsen, W., *Demotisches Glossar*, Kopenhagen 1954.

Erman, A., *Die Flexion des ægyptischen 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 dreiradikaliger 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.

---, "*Sḫꜣ-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 ³1957.

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 *sḏm* '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 Ostracon 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 Anchnesnefer-ibre. 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-Mūt (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 und 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 Ḥeḵanakhte 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-Medîna*, 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 ḥr (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 *sḏm=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 sḏm.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*, Wroclaw-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 𓆓 (*i̯*) ou 𓏲 (*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 ²1955.

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, "*sḏm.f* and *sḏm.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 [¹⁰1966], 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-Medîna*. 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 *sḏm.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.

Pennacchietti, 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 *sḏm.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' *sḏm.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 Languages de l'Égypte Pharao-nique, 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 Lite-ratur*, 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 [3]1969.

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," *Lin-guistics* 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*, Kopen-hagen 1937.

---, *Ägyptische Grammatik*, Wiesbaden 1963.

Sandman, M., *Texts from the Time of Akhenaten*. BAe 8, Bruxelles 1938.

Sasse, H. J., "The thetic/categorical distinction revisited," *Linguistics* 25.3 (1987), 511-80.

Satzinger, H., *Die negativen Konstruktionen im Alt- und Mittelägyptischen*. MÄS 12, Berlin 1968.

---, "*sḏmt.f* '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 *jw.f sḏm.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.

---, "*sḏm=f* und *sḏm.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 deverbalen Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*. GOF IV/13, Wiesbaden 1983.

---, "Fokussierung. Über die Reihenfolge von Subjekt und Prädikat 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 Ægyptische Verbum im Altægyptischen, Neuægyptischen 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 ⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄: 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 XVIIIth to the XXXIInd 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 [3]1989.

Tesnière. L., *Eléments 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 Ier 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 ḥr sḏm* 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 + *sḏm.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 11th 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 + *sḏm.f* als grammatische Konstruktion," *MIO* 1 (1953), 337-43.

---, "Das geminierende passive *sḏm-f* (*mrr-f*): imperfektisch oder emphatisch?," *ZÄS* 84 (1959), 147-55.

---, *Grammatik der medizinischen Texte*. GMAÄ 8, Berlin 1962.

---, "*sḏmwf* = saḏmóf," *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-Arabische," 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.