HAL
open science

# Noun Phrase Syntax and Definiteness Marking: A new explanation for the morphology of Earlier Egyptian participles

Elsa Oréal

## To cite this version:

Elsa Oréal. Noun Phrase Syntax and Definiteness Marking: A new explanation for the morphology of Earlier Egyptian participles. Eitan Grossman; Stéphane Polis; Andréas Stauder; Jean Winand. On Forms and Functions : Studies in Ancient Egyptian Grammar, 15, Widmaier Verlag, pp.173-200., 2014, Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica, 978-3-943955-15-6. hal-01481017

**HAL Id: hal-01481017**

**https://hal.science/hal-01481017v1**

Submitted on 28 Mar 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

offprint from

# Lingua Aegyptia
# Studia Monographica

Herausgegeben von
Frank Kammerzell, Gerald Moers und Kai Widmaier

Band 15

Institut für Archäologie
Humboldt Universität
Berlin

Widmaier Verlag
Hamburg

Institut für Ägyptologie
Universität Wien
Wien

copies of this volume may be ordered from the publisher (orders@widmaier-verlag.de)
and the North American distributor Eisenbrauns (www.eisenbrauns.com)

offprint from

# On Forms and Functions: Studies in Ancient Egyptian Grammar

edited by
Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis,
Andréas Stauder & Jean Winand

Widmaier Verlag · Hamburg
2014

copies of this volume may be ordered from the publisher (orders@widmaier-verlag.de)
and the North American distributor Eisenbrauns (www.eisenbrauns.com)

Titelaufnahme:
Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, Andréas Stauder & Jean Winand (eds.)
On Forms and Functions: Studies in Ancient Egyptian Grammar
Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2014
(Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica; Bd. 15)
ISSN 0946-8641
ISBN 978-3-943955-15-6

© Widmaier Verlag, Kai Widmaier, Hamburg 2014
Das Werk, einschließlich aller seiner Teile, ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.
Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, archivierfähigem Papier.
Druck und Verarbeitung: Hubert & Co., Göttingen
Printed in Germany

# *CONTENTS*

Eitan Grossman & Stéphane Polis
*Forms and Functions in Ancient Egyptian: A short introduction* ..... 1–6

Mark Collier
*Antiphrastic Questions with ist and is in Late Egyptian* ..... 7–40

Todd Gillen
*Ramesside Registers of Égyptien de Tradition:*
*The Medinet Habu inscriptions* ..... 41–86

Eitan Grossman, Guillaume Lescuyer & Stéphane Polis
*Contexts and Inferences:*
*The grammaticalization of the Later Egyptian Allative Future* ..... 87–136

Matthias Müller
*Expressing Necessity in Sahidic Coptic* ..... 137–172

Elsa Oréal
*Noun Phrase Syntax and Definiteness Marking:*
*A new explanation for the morphology of Earlier Egyptian participles* .... 173–200

Stéphane Polis & Andréas Stauder
*The Verb ib and the Construction ib=f r sḏm:*
*On modal semantics, graphemic contrasts, and gradience in grammar* ... 201–231

Sami Uljas
*On Earlier Egyptian Control Constructions* ..... 233–256

Pascal Vernus
*La non représentation segmentale du (premier) participant direct*
*(« sujet ») et la notion de ø* ..... 257–308

Daniel A. Werning
*Uninflected Relative Verb Forms as Converbs and Verbal Rhemes:*
*The two schemes of the Emphatic Construction as a detached adjectival*
*phrase construction and as a truncated Balanced Sentence* ..... 309–338

Jean Winand
*When* and *meets* with ..... 339–366

*On Forms and Functions*, 173-200

# Noun Phrase Syntax and Definiteness Marking*

## A new explanation for the morphology of Earlier Egyptian participles

Elsa Oréal, Paris (LLACAN-UMR 8135, Inalco-CNRS)


### Abstract

This paper proposes a new analysis of various morphological features characterizing different forms of the participle in Earlier Egyptian: graphemic endings and gemination. In both cases, the proposed explanation is based on the idea that participles may show nominal rather than verbal morphology. Syntactic and functional parameters are identified that may explain the hitherto neglected distribution of <*w*> and <*j*> endings, and gemination is shown to be better understood in relationship with discursive and referential properties of the participle itself that can be regarded as involving a form of definiteness marking rather than TAM values.


## 1 State of the art and research question

This paper aims at proposing a new explanation for two morphological features that contribute in various ways to characterizing different forms of participles in Earlier Egyptian. First, the gemination of the last strong radical with *ult. inf.* verbs. Second, the endings, graphically represented as <*j*> and <*w*>.

It is important to note from the outset that both phenomena do not have the same status. Gemination applies only to a certain class of verbs[1], while endings concern virtually all classes of verbs, even if some of them (verbs with *j* as last radical) may show a special tendency to make them appear in writing due to their peculiar morphology, as we shall see. There is also a very different state of the art: while various theories that have been influential for our understanding of Earlier Egyptian grammar have tried to explain the meaning of gemination, the use of different graphical endings, conventionally represented as <ø>, <*j*> and <*w*>, has remained largely neglected[2].

The structure of the paper is as follows. I shall first briefly review the ways both phenomena, i.e., gemination and endings, have been dealt with in previous literature. In §2, I will argue that property-encoding and class membership-encoding functions of the participle are relevant parameters in order to understand the distribution of the <ø> and <*w*> endings, and that stative-resultative semantics explain the use of the <*j*> ending. §3 is devoted to proposing a new analysis of the geminated participle as a

* I am deeply indebted to Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis and Daniel Werning for their attention and comments that were of special help in developing this research.

1 The geminated participle is generally considered to represent a form that also exists with other morphological classes of verbs that do not show gemination. I will keep this perspective without discussing its methodological legitimacy here.

2 We shall at first try to give an account of their respective role without considering what these graphical means may in fact indicate, see below §5.

form marked for definiteness, while TAM readings are dependent both on the lexical semantics of the verb and on the actionality of the construction. In §4, I will show how the passive definite participle may have the intensive reading that has long been observed with evaluative verbs, while with other types of actional phrases, the TAM reading obtains. §5 aims at making more explicit the nature of the morphemes involved in marking each form of the participle. In §6, wide-reaching implications of this research for the understanding of verbal morphology, in particular the morphogenesis of the 'imperfective Second Tense', marked for information structure, are sketched. A brief summary of the main results of this research is given at the end of the paper.

## 1.1 Gemination in previous studies

The traditional approach to gemination considers it to be a formal feature related to aspecto-temporal marking. According to this view, the geminated participle is imperfective, as opposed to the perfective form showing no gemination, both in the active and in the passive[3]. Of course, the understanding of what the aspectual opposition *perfective* vs. *imperfective* represents in the Earlier Egyptian verbal system in terms of semantics may vary considerably between different approaches, but here is not the place to go into details. Suffice it to state, for the time being, that even when the necessary distinction between temporal and aspectual values is made, it appears that some uses of both forms do not fit well in the picture. Problems with the aspectual analysis of gemination arise especially when one considers passive forms of the participle like *mr-jj* ('beloved') and *mrr-w* ('beloved'), which both appear in identical contexts in self-presentative discourse. Sometimes a non-geminated participle is used where the geminated participle would be expected if it was really marked for imperfective aspect. Thus in the following example, where an adjunct explicitly relates the expressed situation to some daily process:

Ex. 1 *ḥz-jj* *n(j)* *nb-f* *m* *ḫrt-hrw* *nt*
praise\PTCP-RESUL.MSG REL lord-3MSG PREP daily_requirement REL
[*r*$^{c}$ *nb*]
day every
'Praised of his lord as a daily requirement of every day'
(*British Museum* 614, l. 14)

Conversely, 'imperfective' participles are sometimes used where a perfective form would be expected, as shown in Ex. 2:

Ex. 2 *jwf* *jn~n-w* *m* *st-jb-R*$^{c}$
meat bring\PTCP~DEF-PASS.MSG from Favourite_place_of_Re
'Meat that is/was brought from Favourite-place-of-Re'
(*pAbousir*, chap. 3, col. a,2)

Such difficulties gave rise to another type of explanation of the functional difference between geminated and non-geminated participles. Broadly speaking, it has been proposed to replace the aspectual opposition by a feature involving either verbal plurality[4] or intensity[5]. A weak point of the latter analysis lies in the fact that they focus on

3 Gardiner (1957: § 353-362); Edel (1955-1964: § 626-649).
4 Schenkel (1965 and 2011), followed by Allen (1984), Depuydt (2008).
5 See Jansen-Winkeln (1997).

passive participles, while active forms are mostly left outside their scope[6]. It is interesting to note that none of them has tried to consider the possibility of nominal morphology and function being marked by gemination. This is the alternative hypothesis that I want to explore in this contribution.

### 1.2 The participal endings <*j*> and <*w*> in grammars

Grammars are less concerned with the presence of a <*j*> or a <*w*> grapheme at the end of participles than with gemination. The main reason for this is that, while gemination appeared to be a robust phenomenon, also represented in a special verb form (the so-called *mrr-f* form), on which to build some conception of the Egyptian verbal system in general, the writing of <*j*> and <*w*> was always considered a dubious phenomenon in itself. It is indeed a well-known fact that the Egyptian writing system does not deal with these endings in a completely consistent way. Scribes thus wrote final <*j*> and <*w*> more or less arbitrarily, or, in a diachronic perspective, the more ancient <*j*> was in the process of being replaced by <*w*> (in the ending of the Pseudoparticiple)[7]. Of course, it is evident that the presence or absence of a final <*w*> or <*j*> does not represent as reliable a fact as our expectations about modern orthography would lead us to expect. But this does not imply that there can be no principled analysis of its actual distribution in a given text or corpus of texts, if one allows for a reasonable appreciation of what can be seen as exceptional and what seems to be the norm, according to frequency, as soon as this distribution is functionally explained by the proposed analysis. I will thus advance here a new hypothesis that makes the use of <*j*>, <*w*> or <ø> coherent with the syntactic use of a given participial form and its semantics in context.

## 2 Explaining participial endings: property-encoding vs. class membership-encoding

The base form of the participial system in Earlier Egyptian is a perfective participle. It shows no ending, nor gemination. This is the form that appears in the participial sentence used to focalize the fronted agent introduced by *jn*[8]:

Ex. 3 *jn* *zꜣ* *smsw* ***jri*** *n-f*
AG son older make\PTCP.PERF.MSG DAT-3MSG
'It is the older son who made (this) for him'
(H. Junker. 1950. *Giza* IX, Vienna, 177, fig. 78)

With this base, one finds in Earlier Egyptian three endings: <ø>, <*j*> and <*w*>. In order to examine the correlation between their attested distribution and the proposed analysis, we shall choose to go from active (<ø> vs. <*w*>) to stative-resultative (<*j*>

6 The version of the 'verbal plurality' analysis proposed by Jansen-Winkeln (1997) suffers from an excessive eclecticism dictated by the need of explaining uses of the geminated participle that cannot fit the picture of 'intensity', as elusive as this category may already be.

7 Edel (1955-1964: § 573).

8 This marker of agentivity has as a probable source a form taken by the preposition *n* (dative) at the beginning of the utterance.

vs. <*w*>) uses of the participle. This section ends with a proposal as to the relationship between class membership encoding participle and Pseudoparticiple[9].

## 2.1 In the active: property encoding <ø> vs. class membership encoding <*w*>

I shall first examine the use of the <*w*> form as opposed to the form without an ending. While the form without an ending is used as a phrasal attribute encoding a property, my claim is that the <*w*> form denotes an entity considered as a member of a class. As such, it is used either as an appositive term showing coreference with the head, or as a clausal attribute, both situations involving a quasi-predicative act. When headless, it shows a semantic affinity with the expression of a role defining a category of persons. One can already note that this function has something to do with a basic definition of indefiniteness, since indefinite articles, while having other less prototypical roles, generally denote class membership of the noun they modify. For the time being, I prefer to keep a more descriptive label whose adequacy will appear more clearly in this section. In §5, we shall come back to the relevance of the indefiniteness label, both at a diachronic and a synchronic level.

The <*w*> form of the participle without gemination is not frequent with an active reading. The following passage of the *Pyramid Texts* presents one occurrence of its headless use, where it designates an entity that is described as belonging to a class characterized by a way of moving:

Ex. 4 *jy* ***prj-w*** *(bis)*
come:PFT come_out\PTCP-INDEF.MSG
*jy* ***ḥfd-w*** *(bis)*
come:PFT climb\PTCP-INDEF.MSG
*jy* ***šwj-w*** *(bis)*
come:PFT rise\PTCP-INDEF.MSG
'It has come someone who comes out (*bis*), it has come someone who climbs (*bis*), it has come someone who rises up (*bis*)' (PT §996a-996bN)

This form also appears in the discursive genre of self-presentation, when the speaker evokes his own qualities. Egyptologists tend to consider these passages as lists of 'epithets'. It has not been noticed that the apparently awkward distribution of <*w*> in some of these texts may be considered in relationship with the status of the participle as either a headless adjective (no ending) or a headless indefinite entity (<*w*> ending):

Ex. 5 *jnk wnnt* [*ḏd* *nfr-t*] *wḥm*
1SG PTCL say\PTCP.PERF.MSG good-FSG repeat\PTCP.PERF.MSG
*nfr-t* ***jṯi-w*** *ḫ*[*t n*] *tp nfr*
good-FSG take\PTCP-INDEF.MSG thing PREP way good
'I was really saying good and repeating good, someone who makes property in the right way' (*Hawawish*, p. 25-27, pl. 3, fig. 16)

The proposed translation of this example sheds light on the fact that the form marked by <*w*> as belonging to a class naturally encodes an entity when it is used headlessly.

9 This label traditionally designates a form of a participle used in adverbial function, showing person indexes in agreement with a noun or personal pronoun. Its morphology in the third person also deserves a fresh analysis that puts it in parallel with the perfective participle itself, for their basis is in fact common, and the endings show the same variants <ø>, <*j*> and <*w*>. See §2.3.

This allows for a structuring function in such a list of properties, for the <*w*> marked form can be used as a stylistical means of establishing a step in this accumulation[10].

The following is another example of the same discursive category, but from a later period:

Ex. 6 *jnk* *ḥḏ* *ḥr* ***rḏi-w*** *ḫt* *m* *jš-wt*
1SG white face give\PTCP-INDEF.MSG thing PREP good-FPL
*nt* [*ḏ*]*t*
REL estate
'I was generous, someone who gives from the goods of the estate (given to me by the Majesty of my lord)' (*Tomb of a Theban official*, pl. 8, l. 8)

The presence of <*w*> goes with the use of the participle to encode an entity as a member in a class, while a past reading of the non-geminated participle *rḏiw* seems excluded[11].

The corpus of self-presentative discourse thus alllows us to observe quite frequently the contrast between forms in <*w*> and forms without an ending, as in the following example from a Middle Kingdom stela:

Ex. 7 *jnk* ***sꜣq-w*** ***ꜥn-w***
1SG collect\PTCP-INDEF.MSG be_friendly\PTCP-INDEF.MSG
***sfn-w*** ***sgr*** ***rmi-w***
be_gentle\PTCP-INDEF.MSG make_silent\PTCP.PERF.MSG weep\PTCP-INDEF.MSG
*m* *ḫn* *nfr*
PREP speech good
'I was a collected one, a friendly one, a gentle one who soothed a weeping one with a good speech' (*Lesest.*, p. 80)

We have here four participles showing a <*w*> ending, and one without written ending. The <*w*> forms represent entities encoded as indefinite substantives by the nominal ending <*w*>. A different situation occurs with *sgr* ('to make silent' > 'to comfort'), a participle of a bivalent verb with causative semantics. It shows no ending, in contrast with *sꜣq-w*, *sfn-w* and *rmi-w*. If one takes *sgr* as just another member in the list, it is impossible to explain why it shows no ending except for defective writing. According to the proposed analysis, the difference in syntactic function could motivate this morphological distinction, if one takes *sgr* as a phrasal attribute bearing on *sfn-w*. As a categorizing tool, <*w*> is thus used to encode quality with verbs that are not treated as statives. This explains why this ending is not found with state verbs

10 In such utterances, the presence of the grapheme <*w*> may also function as a means of disambiguation between a cleft sentence with focalization of the agent and a nominal predication where the pronominal agent is not focalized. Presumably already in Earlier Egyptian, the pronounced form may have been different in prosody and vocalic realization. See below Ex. 41 to 44 on the different forms of the participle in cleft and pseudo-cleft sentences.

11 In this context, one has to notice that the geminated form *ḏḏ* often occurs in self-presentative discourse of the Middle Kingdom beginning with *jnk*. The possibility of a free choice between two ways of presenting the same content is totally compatible with the proposed analysis, maybe more than with the tense-aspect accounts of the contrast between both forms, which says nothing about the relevance of <*w*> vs. <ø>. It is also possible to imagine a diachronic evolution in the conditions of use for the <*w*> form as opposed to the geminated one. For the time being I shall leave this point aside, whose relevance appears in the state of affairs characteristic of Late Egyptian.

such as, e.g., *nfr*, 'to be good,' for the perfective participle of this kind of verbs expresses in itself a property.

The <*w*> form is not specialized for entity-encoding as is the case in headless examples. In some texts, the presence of the <*w*> may again be characteristic of the 'indefinite' form of the participle, used as an attribute. It is thus interesting to consider the contrast between the use of the active participle with <*w*> ending *sḏm-w* and the use of the form without an ending, *sḏm*, in one manuscript of *Ptahhotep* that seems to be rather coherent in this respect (P. Prisse):

Ex. 8 *ꜣḫ* *sḏm* *n* *zꜣ* ***sḏm-w***
beneficial listen:INF DAT son listen\PTCP-INDEF.MSG
'It is beneficial to listen for a son who listens' (*Ptahhotep* 16,3)

Contrary to what the translation might suggest, it is not the noun *zꜣ*, 'son,' that is marked as indefinite and determines the form of the participle, but the participle itself. Here it functions as an attribute[12]. We can compare with a predication establishing an identity between two definite terms, where the participle shows no ending:

Ex. 9 *mr~r-w* *nṯr* *pw* ***sḏm***
love\PTCP~DEF-PASS.MSG god COP listen\PTCP.DEF.MSG
'It is the one beloved of god, the one who listens' (*Ptahhotep* 6,7)

With 3-*lit*. verbs such as *sḏm* 'to listen', that do not geminate, the written ending <*w*> thus allows to distinguish the indefinite active participle as opposed to the definite active form[13]. This does not mean that it is systematically used as such a means of disambiguation, but further research is needed in order to assess how particular documents handle this possibility. In this respect, the pPrisse version of *Ptahhotep* seems to exploit this resource in a rather coherent way, as is shown by the following example:

Ex. 10 *nfr* *wj* ***pri-w*** *n* *rꜣ-f*
nice ADM come_out\PTCP-INDEF.MSG REL mouth-3MSG
'How nice is something that comes out of his mouth!' (*Ptahhotep* 19,3)

Here, the headless use of the <*w*> participle denoting an entity produces a semantic effect that is similar to the use of an indefinite quantifier.

In a negative environment, class membership marking on the headless participle may also function as an indefinite quantifier, as is to be expected:

Ex. 11 *nn* ***wn-w*** *mwt* *ḥr* *sḥr-j*
NEG exist\PTCP-INDEF.MSG die\PTCP.RESUL.MSG PREP command-1SG
'There is not anyone who died by my command' (*Hannover* 2927)

This marking of course remains optional, as is the use of the indefinite quantifier *any* in English[14].

---

12 The form *sḏm-w* also appears in the *Tale of the Eloquent Peasant* with similar semantics. The *Thesaurus Linguæ Ægyptiae* sometimes classifies it as a form of the verb, and sometimes as a substantive. This hesitation is normal from a philological point of view, for there is a continuity between the participle marked for class membership and its headless use as a substantive designating a member of a given category. See §5.3 on the lexicalisation issue.

13 But not the non-geminated form of the participle with no ending, which remains indistinguishable in writing from the geminated one. See below for the analysis of the latter.

14 Thus, 'there is no one who died by my command' makes sense, and our analysis predicts that <*w*> correlates with the expressive choice, by the speaker, of using the indefinite quantifier.

## 2.2 Stative-resultative <*j*> vs. class membership-encoding <*w*> with passive orientation

According to the proposed explanation, the <*j*> form functions like a property encoding term, while the <*w*> form is marked as an indefinite member belonging to a class, as is the case in the active[15]. I will first illustrate this point with two examples involving the verb *msi*, 'to give birth to.' They show a contrast between the use of the ungeminated participle with <*j*> ending as a phrasal attribute (form *msjj*) and the use of the same participle with <*w*> ending marking indefiniteness as a clausal attribute (form *msiw*):

Ex. 12 *wnjs* *ḏs-f* *jwnw* ***ms-jj*** *m* *jwnw*
Unis self-3MSG Heliopolitan give_birth\PTCP-RESUL.MSG in Heliopolis
'Unis himself is an Heliopolitan born in Heliopolis' (PT §483aW)

Here, the use of the <*w*> form is not expected since the participle, having the function of a phrasal attribute, expresses a property qualifying the head. The following example illustrates a different viewpoint on a similar reality, in correlation with a different syntax of the noun phrase:

Ex. 13 *n* *ṯwt* *js* *ꜣḫ* ***msi-w*** *nwt*
for 2MSG FOC *akh* give_birth\PTCP-INDEF.MSG Nut
***snq-w*** *nbt-ḥwt*
suckle\PTCP-INDEF.MSG Nephthys
'For you are indeed an *akh*, someone born by Nut and someone suckled by Nephthys' (PT §623aP)

The <*w*> form *msi-w* refers to the same content, but this time considered as a member of a class. Syntactically, it seems to function as a detached apposition rather than as a clausal attribute in the noun phrase as was the case in preceding examples with active reading[16]. The absence of prosodic features leaves us without essential empirical criteria for this syntactic analysis. Be it as it may, in both cases, clausal attribution and apposition are very close on a functional continuum as quasi-predicative categories.

A crucial fact lies in the fact that headless and appositive uses are not restricted to the <*w*> form marked for class membership/indefiniteness. Property encoding terms are also used in theses conditions. In Earlier Egyptian, as in many Semitic languages, the headless use of adjectives indeed makes it clear that adjectives are better conceived of as "an attributive complex with pronominal reference and attribute as distinguishable components, the former represented by the inflexional markers and the latter given in the lexeme involved" (Goldenberg 1995: 8). The contrast between phrasal and clausal status in attributive use is replaced in headless use by an opposition between indefiniteness, which implies an instanciation as a class member (<*w*> form), and a free choice indefinite (<*j*> form). In the following example, the adjectival form *ms-jj* thus appears in a headless configuration:

15 The <*w*> form thus appears as an originally ambitransitive one, as is the case of the Old Perfective based on the same perfective participle. See Oréal (Forthcoming a).

16 Of course this explanation of the <*w*> form has a deep impact on how one should understand the morphegenesis of the so-called 'perfective relative form' (also called 'Clère's form'). I have dealt with this topic in my talk at the workshop on *Possession in Ancient Egyptian* in Liège (8/02/2014). See Oréal (Forthcoming b).

Ex. 14 *ḥsi* *grt* ***ms-jj*** *n-f* *sw*
praise\PTCP.RESUL.MSG PTCL give_birth\PTCP-RESUL.MSG to-3MS 3MSG
'Praised is whomever he was born to' (*Ptahhotep* 19,1)

In this case, it also refers to an entity, but this entity is not marked as belonging to a class, as would have been the case with **msi-w n-f sw* ('someone he was born to'). The semantic reading of this combination results in free choice indefiniteness, as opposed to the indefinite instanciation marked by <*w*>.

With a verb whose participle may express a stable state like *mri* 'love' or *ḥzi* 'praise' the contrast between the <*j*> form and the <*w*> form can only be interpreted as a variation between the choice of the unmarked property encoding form and a participle marked for class membership referring to the same situation:

Ex. 15 *jnk* ***ḥzi-w*** *n(j)* *jt-f*
1SG praise\PTCP-INDEF.MSG REL.MS father-3MSG
*jnk* ***mr-jj*** *mwt-f* ***nbi-w*** *n(j)*
1S love\PTCP-RESUL.MSG mother-3MSG gild\PTCP-INDEF.MSG REL
*ꜣbt-f*
family-3MSG
'I was someone praised of his father, I was beloved of his mother, someone gilded of his family' (*Tomb of Hesi*, 38, pl. 33a, 59a)

The <*w*> form is rarely attested in the textual genre of self-presentation. The preference for the form unmarked for class membership/indefiniteness is not problematic in view of the great frequency of such constructions following the scheme '*jnk nfr*', i.e. with the simple perfective participle of a property verb as predicate.

Here again, one should keep in mind the potential distortion brought by a problem of translation in understanding what is marked by each form of the participle[17]:

Ex. 16 *jnk* ***pr-jj*** *ḫrw* *n-f*
1SG go_out\PTCP-RESUL.MSG voice DAT-3MS
'I was someone to whom invocation is offered' (*Denderah*, pl. IIa)

In English, it is impossible here to avoid adding an indefinite head to the participial predicate ('someone whom…'), while in Egyptian, the form *pr-jj* is used as a predicate without bearing any mark of entity encoding. This is precisely what distinguishes it from the form with ending <*w*>.

## 2.3 From class membership-encoding to secondary predication

One can only be struck by the fact that, according to grammars, the form traditionally called the 'Pseudoparticiple' appears to have the same range of endings as the participles. Nonetheless, it is not usual to consider this fact as significant, for grammars consider these forms separately. The reason for this obviously lies in the consideration that the 'Pseudoparticiple', being inflected for person, represents an autonomous paradigm. I propose to take a different approach. Since the 'Pseudoparticiple' has the perfective participle as a basis, it makes sense to try to find possible common points in

17 I owe the knowledge of this rare occurrence to the erudition of Andrea Pillon, an expert in First Intermediate Period documents. It has remained largely unnoticed, although it offers a rare case of the headless stative-resultative participle in a relative construction.

the use of <*j*> and <*w*> with 3MSG Pseudoparticiples and similar forms usually categorized as participles[18]. The next section addresses the relevance of this distinction.

### 2.3.1 The missing link between 'Pseudoparticiple' and passive participles with <*j*> or <*w*> ending

In section 2.2, we have observed the use of the Stative-resultative participle in <*j*> as well as of the participle in <*w*> marked for class membership/indefiniteness with verbs whose lexical semantics allow for a reading of both forms as encoding a stable state (*mrjj*, loved) or entity (*mri-w*, someone loved). With a bivalent verb in a clause whose actional content refers to an event viewed as accomplished, the temporal reading of the <*j*> participle does not refer to a state, as was the case with *mrjj*, but to this past event:

Ex. 17 *šẖsf* *n* *wẖ*[19] ***šd-jj*** *n* *wdnt-jhy* *r-gs*
collation REL column take-\PTCP-RESUL.MSG DAT offering PREP
*ẖrj-ḥbt*
lector_priest
'Collation of the column taken away for the Ihy-offering in the presence of the lector priest' (*pAbusir*, pLouvre E 25416 c verso, pl.13+14 A, l. 2-3)

The participle here functions as a phrasal attribute and there is no possible confusion with the Pseudoparticiple. The only use of the latter where it regularly shows a <*j*> ending and in fact appears identical to the Stative-resultative participle is as a depictive or in resultative constructions (see § 2.3.2 and 2.3.3).

As a clausal attribute, the participle with the <*w*> ending is read as categorizing quasi-predicative form. The nominal phrase is then usually translated as indefinite in languages like English. Ex. 18 shows a <*w*> form used in an environment very similar, at first sight, to Ex. 17:

Ex. 18 [*sṯꜣ* *twt*] ***jri-w*** *n-f* *m* *wᶜbt* *r* *jz*
bring:INF statue make\PTCP-PRED.MSG DAT-3MSG PREP *wabet* PREP tomb
'[Bringing a statue] made for him in the *wabet*, to the tomb'
(*Tomb of Debeheni*, p. 175-177, fig. 122, pl. 50)

The contrast between these similar contexts sheds light on a crucial difference: the <*w*> form functions as a clausal attribute, while the <*j*> form is a phrasal attribute. In fact, nothing precludes the use of the <*j*> form of the participle in Ex. 18, but the choice of the <*w*> form is correlated with a way of presenting things: *jri-w* expresses a property that is conceived of as describing the head without restricting the reference already made to it:

'statue a-made(-one?) > a statue made for him in the *wabet*'

18 I leave here aside the question of 3FSG endings. The feminine form of the participle with <w> ending in other uses than as a secondary predicate is bound to be barely attested due to the surviving documentation. Self-presentative discourse typically involves a masculine speaker, and even in other types of texts, it is still difficult to find feminine forms. Nonetheless, further research will have to reassess some of the examples given by Gunn (1924) as feminine forms of a prospective participle that in fact show the same ending as the 'Pseudoparticiple'.

19 See Edel (1956-1964: § 66) for the reading of the stroke after the ideogram.

In contrast with this use, the choice by the speaker of the adjectival <*j*> form would have triggered a restrictive interpretation of the quality expressed by it, conceived of as referentially determinative and not describing:

‘the statue made for him in the *wabet*’ (vs. any other statue)

But the clausal function of the participle also interacts with its syntactic status. As opposed to its attributive use, the <*w*> form can be used as as appositive or detached[20]. This syntactic status was probably encoded in supra-segmental features. For obvious reasons, the analysis of Egyptian prosody remains out of reach, so that linguists will lack empirical criteria other than context in order to tell apart detached apposition from attributive uses. It is nonetheless crucial to understand that the <*w*> form used as a secondary predicate (traditionally called ‘Pseudoparticiple’) is nothing other than the categorizing, class membership encoding form of the participle used in detached apposition. Ex. 18 makes perceptible this ambiguity in the analysis of the form *jri-w*. It is clear that it could also be considered as a Pseudoparticiple, and not as a passive participle, if one considers the form as detached from the head:

‘statue, a-made(-one?) > having been made for him in the *wabet*’

Understanding the semantics of the <*w*> ending thus allows for a principled analysis of uses previously classified as passive participle or Pseudoparticiple in an arbitrary way.

### 2.3.2 Depictive use of the <*j*> form vs. the <*w*> form as a secondary predicate

The following pair of examples illustrates the contrast between the depictive use of the adjectival stative-resultative participle in <*j*> and the use of a participle of the same verb functioning as a secondary predicate:

Ex. 19 *sḏm-ṯ* *n* *ppy* *nfr-kꜣ-rᶜ* ***wᶜ-jj***
listen\PROSP-2FSG to Pepy Neferkare be_alone\PTCP-RESUL.MSG
‘You should listen to Pepi alone’ (PT §1606aN)

Ex. 20 *jri* *sp* *ḥnᶜ-f* ***wᶜi-w***
make\IMP matter with-3MSG be_alone\PTCP-PRED.MSG
‘Settle the matter with him as he is alone (with you)’ (*Ptahhotep* 14,7)

In fact in many occurrences, it will appear very difficult to make a distinction between the 3MSG Pseudoparticiple and a perfective participle, which is only natural if one recalls the traditional difficulties that are met with in various languages in attempts to distinguish empirically between uses of such forms as depictive in the strict sense and as secondary predicate[21]. Ex. 21 further illustrates this difficulty:

Ex. 21 *mw-k* *n-k* *bᶜḥ-k* *n-k* *b*[*zn*]*-k*
water-2MSG DAT-2MSG flood-2MSG DAT-2MSG *bzn*-2MSG
*n-k* ***jn-jj*** *n-k* *ḫr* *sn-k*
DAT-2MSG bring\PTCP-RESUL.MSG DAT-2MSG PREP brother-2MSG

20 As can also the <*j*> form functioning as phrasal attribute, e.g., in lists of epithets.

21 See Van der Auwera & Malchukov (2005) for a semantic map that elaborates on these semantic and formal contiguities. Their study also sheds light on possible diachronic pathways of evolution that are relevant for the relationship between participant-oriented uses of the participle and so-called ‘adverbial’ uses of the Pseudoparticiple, among which Earlier Egyptian grammaticalizes the distinction between depictive (<*j*> ending) and secondary predicate (<*w*> ending).

'Your water belongs to you, your flood belongs to you, your *bzn* belongs to you, brought to you by your brother N' (PT §774bNt)

According to the presentation currently adopted in grammars, the use of the form with the <*j*> ending *jn-jj*, rather than *jni-w* with the <*w*> ending, would have no other reason than arbitrary writing or a diachronic evolution from <*j*> to <*w*>. But the <*w*> form being in fact attested in the same corpus, one may want to try another way to explain this variation. The proposed analysis thus recognizes that here, as elsewhere, the <*j*>-form of the Stative-Resultative participle has the syntactic function of a phrasal attribute. The <*w*> form could be used here as well, but, as a result of its class membership encoding function, it would be interpreted as a clausal attribute. Since *jni-w* in this context cannot be interpreted as a stable entity (like *msi-w* in Ex. 12), a secondary predication reading obtains. Thus, the proposed analysis allows for a diachronic explanation of the emergence of the ending <*w*> in the Pseudoparticiple not as 'adverbial' marking, but as former nominal morphology.

### 2.3.3 The <*j*> form in resultative constructions vs. the <*w*> form in the New Perfect

Having treated this topic in more details[22], I shall first give here only a few examples that will show how the proposed value for final <*j*> and <*w*> attached to the perfective participle makes sense also in analyzing forms formerly interpreted as graphic variants of the Pseudoparticiple in the locative construction that is the source of the new perfect construction:

Ex. 22 *mk* *Ppy* *Nfr-kꜣ-Rᶜ* ***pr-jj***
PTCL Pepi Neferkare come\PTCP-RESUL.MSG
'Here is Pepi Neferkare having come' (PT §949aN)

Ex. 22 shows the <*j*> form *pr-jj* in a resultative construction, as opposed to the predicative *pri-w* (<*w*> form) in a construction that I have called the 'New Perfect':

Ex. 23 *mk* *Ppy* [*pn*] ***pri-w*** [*n* *ᶜnḫ* *wꜣs*]
PTCL Pepi DEM come\PTCP-PRED.MSG PREP life prosperity
'Here to you Pepi has come for life and prosperity' (PT §1112bP)[23]

As is well-known, this use of the Pseudoparticiple has been analyzed as an 'adverbial predicate'. It is in fact predicative, but the label 'adverbial' is not felicitous. The schematic parallel between this construction and the locative construction has indeed masked the role of the participle as a nominal rather than adverbial predicate. Diachronically, it seems that the participle may have acquired its predicative function first in its use as a secondary predicate. One should also note that the spread of the <*w*> ending in this construction seems to be more relevant for Middle Egyptian texts than for Old Egyptian documentation, in accordance with the historical path of change that I have proposed in my study.

22 See Oréal (Forthcoming a).

23 *MIFAO* 118, pl. VIII. There are two versions of the *spell* 508, only one showing the participle with <*w*> ending.

## 3 Explaining gemination in the participle as definiteness marking

I would now like to explore the hypothesis that gemination in the participle of *ult. inf.* verbs results from a nominal rather than a verbal feature, namely, definiteness marking[24]. This is not to say that a definite participle should go with a definite head, from a referential point of view. According to the proposed analysis, it is not the head whose referential status or definiteness matters, but rather the participle itself. When it expresses a property that the speaker wants to present as selective in terms of reference to the head, the geminated participle will be used:

Ex. 24 *mj* *wᶜb-sn* *n* *ꜣḫ* *jqr* ***jr~r***
ADV purify\IMPERF-3PL DAT *akh* excellent make\PTCP~DEF.MSG
*ḥz~z-t* *nb-f*
praise\PTCP~DEF.PASS-FS lord-3MSG
'(As for every people, who will enter in this tomb in an impure state…not purifying themselves) as they purify themselves for an excellent *akh*, the one who does what his lord praises' (*Tomb of Ankhmahor*, pl. 2-35)

The geminated participle *jrr* here functions as an appositive attribute to a head that is contextually indefinite. This example confirms that it is not the definiteness of the head that controls the discursive status of the participle. Gemination is bound to the fact that it refers to a property presented as a means of identifying the individual among other possible ones.

Conversely, the non-geminated participle without an ending can always be used even with a semantically definite head:

Ex. 25 *ṯwt* *sbꜣ* *pw* *ᶜꜣ* *rmnwtj* *s(ꜣ)ḥ* *n{h}m* *pt* *ḥnᶜ*
2MSG star DEM big companion Orion traverse\PTCP.PERF.MSG sky with
*s(ꜣ)ḥ* ***ḫni*** *d(w)ꜣt* *ḥnᶜ* *wsjr*
Orion row\PTCP.PERF.MSG netherworld with Osiris
'You are this big star, companion of Orion, who traverses the sky with Orion, who rows the netherworld with Osiris' (PT §882b-cP)

This example also shows how the perfective participle can be used in contexts where properties are attributed to an entity within a general descriptive setting that strongly disfavours a past reading. Rowing is considered here as a habitual process and not as a past event. It is clear that the head is a specific term in discourse. Thus, it is not the referential status of the head that determines definiteness marking in the participial attribute. The use of the non-geminated form *ḫni* is bound to the fact that the property is seen as a potentially shared property that does not allows for a selective identification of the head[25].

Semantic effects of marked definiteness may vary according to the lexical features of the verb, the syntactic constructions in which the participle appears, as well as other textual features. In the next sections, we shall illustrate this point in further detail.

24 Typologically, the marking of definiteness on the adjective is a well-known phenomenon for example in South Slavonic languages such as Slovene. See Lyons (2003: 82).

25 Contrast this use with Ex. 29, where the geminated form *prr* is used in a similar context to single out one specific star among all others.

## 3.1 Specific use of definiteness: encoding an identificational property

The following examples are interesting in that they offer a contrast between the two forms of the active participle with the same weak verb *zꜣi*, 'to guard.' In both cases, the participle is attached to a head:

Ex. 26 *jr* *rmṯ* *jqr-w* *wn~n-w* *ḥꜣ-f* *ḥr*
make\IMP people excellent-MPL exist\PTCP~DEF-MPL PREP-3MSG PREP
*gs-wj* *dpt* ***zꜣ-w*** *ḫr-f* *m* *mw*
side-DU boat guard\PTCP.PERF-MPL fall\SUBJ-3MSG PREP water
'(If he gets on board with you in the boat,) have efficient people staying around him on both sides of the boat, who take care lest he falls in water'
(*Urkunden* I, 130,9)

Here, a past reading of the non-geminated participle is clearly not coherent with the context. The speaker considers an event that is still to happen in the future. Can the choice of the form relate to a mere aspectual point of view? In that case, it would indicate a single event viewed as a whole, as opposed to the following example would express a contextual meaning associated with imperfectivity:

Ex. 27 *j(n)ḏ-ḥr-ṯn* *ḫnt(j)-w* *bᶜḥ(w)* ***zꜣ~ꜣ-w*** *ḏfꜣ*
greeting-2PL front:ADJ-MP flood guard\PTCP~DEF-MPL provision
*ḥmsi-w* *m-ḫnt* *sḫt* *wꜣḏt*
sit\PTCP.PERF-MPL PREP field green
'Hail to you, those who are at the head of the flood, the ones who guard provision, sitting at the head of the green field' (PT §*1059bN)

According to this perspective, iterativity or durativity seems a likely candidate ('who keep guarding…'). But since some uses of the geminated participle resist this kind of interpretation, I suggest that such an aspectual reading is a context-induced semantic effect of definiteness marking: the addressed entities are identified by a specific role, and as such, they are expected to fulfill it in more than one occasion. In Ex. 26, the non-geminated participle is used because the role of guarding the precious pygmy is not seen as specific. Even when the addressed entity is implicitly specific, the choice of using the definite participle is correlated with the need to present the expressed property as identificational as opposed to a property merely seen as an attribute that contributes to characterizing this entity:

Ex. 28 *j* *ḏ3i* *jwy* *mꜣᶜ* *mšnt(j)* *sḫt-j3rw*
O ferry\PTCP.PERF.MSG boatless right ferryman field_of_reeds
'O you who ferry the right one who has no boat, ferryman of the field of reeds'
(PT §1188a-bP)

Let us compare two other contrasting occurrences of the geminated and non-geminated participle from the verb *pri*, in a closely similar syntactic environment:

Ex. 29 *ṯwt* *sbꜣ* *pw* *wᶜṯj* ***pr~r*** *m* *gs* *jꜣbtj*
2MSG star DEM sole come_out\PTCP~DEF.MSG PREP side east
*n(j)* *pt*
REL sky
'You are the sole star, the one that comes forth in the east of the sky'
(PT §877c-dP)

In the following example, the head is also determined by the demonstrative *pw*, but the participle of the same verb *pri* is not geminated:

Ex. 30 *m* *sᶜḥ-k* *pw* ***pri*** *m* *r* *n(j)* *Rᶜ*
PREP dignity-2MSG DEM come_out\PTCP.PERF.MS PREP mouth REL Re
'In this your dignity that comes from the mouth of Re' (PT §1720dM)

In Ex. 29, there is a process of selection marked by *prr*: the star is selected as the one that has a characteristic itinerary as opposed to other stars. In Ex. 30, the speaker does not consider 'your dignity coming from the mouth of Re' among other possible ones. It may be relevant here to note that the geminated participle is never used as an imperfective converb, which should have been the case if it were really a converb marked for imperfective aspect:

Ex. 31 *ᶜḥᶜ-tj* *ḫft* *rᶜw* ***pri-f*** *m* *j3bt*
stand\PTCP.RESUL-2MSG PREP Re come_out\CVB.IMPFV-3MSG PREP east
'standing as you are in front of Re coming out in the east' (PT §743bT)

This example illustrates the use of the *sḏm-f* form that really plays the role of an imperfective converb with circumstancial function, as opposed to the geminated form of the participle considered to be imperfective in TAM-oriented analyses. In some cases, like the following, the context makes it clear that the definite participle is correlated to a choice made by the speaker:

Ex. 32 *jri* *ṯw* *jr* *wp(w)t(j)* *pw* *n(j)* *nṯr* ***pr~r***
make\IMP 2MSG PREP messenger DEM REL god come_out\PTCP~DEF.MSG
'(you doorkeeper of heaven !) Do act concerning this messenger of the god, the one who is coming out' (PT § 1252bM)

Here, the speaker wants to insist on the identity of the head more than on a circumstance, as was the case with the imperfective converb in the preceding example. Ex. 32 thus illustrates the use of the geminated form *prr* to express a property that is presented as allowing the identification of the head from a referential point of view.

The following example with the same verb appears in an administrative account[26]:

Ex. 33 *mḏd* *n* *sšp* *60* ***pr~r*** *n* *kꜣkꜣj* *m*
division REL cloth 60 come_out\PTCP~DEF.MPL to Kakai PREP
*s-wt-f*
place-FPL-3MSG
'Division[27] of 60 clothes that come out for Kakai in all his places'
(*pAbusir*, pBM 10735, pl. 53 A, l. Z1)

Follows a list of names, designating people having benefited from this distribution. The geminated form of the participle cannot be explained as an imperfective in a TAM account, since the event can hardly be presented by the speaker as general or habitual (vs. punctual) or present (vs. past). The discrepancy between the usual temporal reading of the form and this kind of occurrence reinforces the analysis of gemination as a mark belonging to the domain of nominal rather than verbal morphology. In fact, definiteness goes well with the context: *prr* does not express a property attached to the head in a restrictive way, but makes reference as a phrasal attribute to a property that allows to identify the considered entity.

26 It is in fact interesting to note that the Abusir archive has many occurrences of the geminated participle that considerably change the picture of its use in Old Egyptian but were not taken into account in grammars due to its later publication.

27 See Posener-Krieger (1976: 359-360) for the interpretation of this word and this document.

## 3.2 Generic use of definiteness: encoding a selective property

In a similar way, one can contrast the following examples showing non-geminated and geminated forms of the same verb *jri* 'to make':

Ex. 34 *jr sn(-w) j[p]n ḥm-kꜣ(w) jpn* ***jri*** *n-n*
TOP brother-MPL DEM priest-MPL DEM make\PTCP.PERF DAT-1PL
*r* [*pr-ḫrw*] *n-n*
PREP offering DAT-1PL
'As for these brothers and these priests who act for us in order to make offering for us (…)' (*Nianchchnum und Chnumhotep*, pl. 28, scene 11)

A past reading does not fit the context. The actionality of the clause is non-transformative: the verb *jri* is used intransitively to indicate an action that does not bring a change in the situation. The perfective participle functions as a restrictive attribute that helps define the reference of the noun phrase, while leaving unmarked the referential status of the property in itself. In contrast, with the same verb *jri*, the geminated participle can be used in a similar context:

Ex. 35 *mr~r(-w)* *nswt pw sḥḏ-ḥm-kꜣ* *nb*
love\PTCP~DEF-PASS.MSG king COP Inspector-priest-*ka* every
***jr~r*** *ḫt ḫft sḫr pn*
make\PTCP~DEF.MSG thing PREP plan this
'It is the loved one of the king, every Inspector of the priest of the *ka*, the one who acts ritually in accordance with this plan' (*Tomb of Neb-kau-Hor*, pl. VII b)

The geminated form *jrr* is used as an attribute to the head next to the quantifier *nb*. The head does not refer to a certain individual, but to the entire class defined by the title '*sḥḏ-ḥm-kꜣ*' 'Inspector of the priest of the *ka*'. The property expressed by the participle is singled out as a selective feature: only those inspectors who will conform to the plan shall enjoy royal favour. This occurrence illustrates the fact that definiteness, as it is marked by gemination in the participle, is not only referential/specific, but can also have a generic reading, be it by extension of its original use or not.

In self-presentative discourse of the Middle Kingdom, the definite (geminated) participle alternates with the non-geminated form in a way that cannot be accounted for aspectually. We will just take one example here that shows both forms of the same verb *rḏi*[28]:

Ex. 36 *jnk* (…) ***ḏ~ḏ*** *z r wn-f mꜣʿ*
1SG (…) give\PTCP~DEF.MSG man PREP exist-3MSG true
***gmi*** *ḫt gꜣ~ꜣ-w* *r-s*
find\PTCP.PERF.MSG thing lack\PTCP~DEF-PASS.MSG PREP-3FSG
***rḏi*** *grg n ḏd sw*
give\PTCP.PERF.MSG lies DAT say\PTCP.PERF.MSG 3MSG
'The one who places a man according to what he really is, who finds the thing that is lacking, who gives lies to who tells them' (*CCG* 20539, b, 8)

According to the proposed explanation, the headless definite form of the geminated participle *ḏḏ* is used in a similar way as the indefinite one in other texts belonging to the same genre, to refer to an entity, while the 'perfective', non-geminated form *rḏi* of

28 A more exhaustive study will have to elucidate the text-structuring function of this alternation on larger samples of discourse.

the participle without an ending still functions as an attributive adjective. Both forms may indeed have a generic reading. Further research is needed to address the question of the potential diachronic relationship between the two devices. Its relevance is showed by the relatively limited use of the <*w*> form.

Broadly, one may say that definiteness is a way of looking at a referent, a point of view construed by the speaker as much as correlated to discourse properties. Indefiniteness also has a generic use. But the conceptualisation attached to this genericity is different, as is made clear by the interaction of both participles with the quantifier *nb*, *every* or *any*. Thus, with the quantifier *nb*, there are two possible construals:

> exhaustive reference: all the, every
> indefinite reference: any, whatever

This explains why one can find the geminated as well as the non-geminated participle qualifying a head that is determined by *nb*, as shown in the following examples. They show geminated and non-geminated participial forms of same verb, *msḏi*, 'to hate,' in analogous contexts, thus providing a sort of minimal pair illustrating the distinct referential status of the different participial forms:

Ex. 37 *jṯi* *n-k* ***msḏ~ḏ-w*** *wnjs* *nb-w*
take\IMP to-2MS hate\PTCP~DEF-MPL Unis each-MPL
'(Osiris,) take to you all the people who hate Unis' (PT §16aW)

Ex. 38 *m* *ḫꜣtb-k* ***jmsḏi-w*** *nb* *jt-j*
PROH pity-2MSG hate\PTCP-INDEF.MSG any father-1SG
'(Thoth,) don't take pity on anyone who hates my father' (PT §1336aP)

In both examples, there is no aspecto-temporal difference, and one cannot find any reason to read the non-geminated form *j.msḏiw* in Ex. 37 as expressing past. It is interesting to notice the different syntactic place of the adjective *nb*. With the Definite participle, it is read as an universal quantifier (English translation *all*), while it functions as an existential quantifier (English translation *any*) with the participle marked for class membership/indefiniteness.

The two following examples also shed light on a difference in referential status opposing geminated and non-geminated participles:

Ex. 39 ***msḏ~ḏ*** *qdd* *sbꜣg-jj* *ꜥḥꜥ*
hate\PTCP~DEF.MSG sleep cause_to_be_weary\PTCP-RESUL.MSG stand up\IMP
'(you) who hate sleep, having been made weary, stand up' (PT §260bW)

Ex. 40 *nj* *gmi(-j)* ***msḏi*** *wj* *m* *njwt* *tn*
NEG find\IMPFV-1SG hate\PTCP.PERF.MSG 1SG in city DEM
'I did not find someone hating me in this city' (Stela of Dedi = *CGC* 20507, l. 3)

Again, both participial forms share the same TAM value. At the syntactic level, both are headless and used in a nominal slot. In Ex. 39, the geminated form *msḏḏ* is a direct address to the hearer, thus having a referential status that is definite[29]. Functionally, the property expressed by the participle is considered as an identificational attribute. On the contrary, in the negative context of Ex. 40 the non-geminated participle *msḏi* makes reference to the same property as applying to an entity that is not identifiable, thus referentially indefinite.

29 Crosslinguistically, this need not be so. Cf. Lyons (2003: 152).

## 3.3 TAM reading of definiteness

The following section illustrates how a nominal feature such as definiteness may obtain in TAM readings that lie at the source of previous explanations of the form as marked for TAM. This very fact might lead one to ask whether, from a synchronic point of view, it is relevant to consider definiteness as actually marked by gemination, or rather whether definiteness is better seen as a source for a TAM value that was already fully grammaticalized in Earlier Egyptian[30]. Of course, previous analyses of Earlier Egyptian participial morphology in terms of aspect were not arbitrary. They are based on uses of the participle where lexical semantics of the verb involved and the actionality of the whole construction interact with the nominal feature 'definiteness' in order to produce a semantic effect that indeed has something to do with TAM. In a basic formulation, one may say that in transformative phrases, the perfective participle tends to be read as indicating a past event, while the participle marked as definite tends to be interpreted as indicating a general viewpoint on the event[31]. It thus shows an affinity with recurring situations. The following example where both forms, *msi* and *mss*, share the same referent, is particularly relevant in this respect:

Ex. 41 *wnjs* *pj* *ḏrṯ* ***msi*** *ṯw*
Unis DEM ADV give_birth\PTCP.PERF.MSG 2MSG
***ms~s*** *ṯw*
give_birth\PTCP~DEF.MSG 2MSG
'This Unis is (both?) one who gave birth to you and the one who gives birth to you' (PT §486dW)

In many previous analyses, this affinity has been explained as 'imperfective' aspect, and this explanation would indeed hold, except for the fact that it cannot account for other uses of the form. Cleft sentences with participial predicates are perhaps the context in which the temporal readings of geminated vs. non-geminated forms seem most convincing at first sight. More often than not, the use of a geminated participle seems to be correlated with a present, general, or in any case imperfective reading:

Ex. 42 *jn* *ḏsr-tp* ***z3~3*** *n-f* *sn*
AG PN guard\PTCP~DEF.MSG DAT-3MSG 3MPL
'It is Djesertep who guards them for him' (PT §401bW)

On the other hand, we have seen above that the use of the non-geminated form in the participial cleft sentence clearly refers to an accomplished event in many examples. But in some cases, things are not that clear. In the following examples, the context does not favour any temporal distinction between the two forms:

30 In which case it would not be synchronically relevant to gloss the geminated participle as definite, but it should be glossed as imperfective. A more refined account of this historical development would require further research.

31 According to Johansson (2000: 59), 'an actional phrase is transformative if the action designated by it has a natural evolutional turning point, a crucial initial or final limit … Transformativity is not tantamount to telicity. The terms transformative and nontransformative refer to properties of the actional phrases, whereas the term telic and atelic will be reserved for properties of the actions themselves.'

Ex. 43 *jn* *wnjs* ***ḫni*** *jm-s*
AG Unis row\PTCP.PERF.MSG PREP-3FSG
'It is Unis who rows in it' (PT §335bW)

Here a past reading of the perfective participle is not very plausible. This fact could be related to the lexical semantics of the verb *ḫni*, 'to row.' It expresses an atelic event, which can be regarded without taking any endpoint into consideration. The main difference between this example and Ex. 42 could thus lie rather in the fact that the geminated participle of the same verb, as a form marked for definiteness, makes the utterance a 'pseudo-cleft' sentence rather than a cleft:

Ex. 44 *jn* *msktt* *ḥnᶜ* *mᶜnḏt* ***ḫn~n-t(j)*** *nw* *n* *ttj*
AG Nightboat with Dayboat row\PTCP~DEF-FDU DEM to Teti
'The Nightboat and Dayboat are the ones who row this to Teti' (PT §717c-dT)

The state of affairs expressed by the participle does not seem to refer to a fact more habitual than in Ex. 41, the viewpoint of the speaker being apparently the same. On the other hand, the context is in favour of the information presented by the participle as shared common ground between speaker and hearer: the speaker considers as given information the fact that someone has to row this to Teti. This kind of participial predication identifies the definite participle bearing the presupposed information with the agent marked by *jn*. In the preceding example, there is no such marking of the information expressed by the perfective participle. There is also a focalization of the agent as the marked rheme, but it is not presupposed by the speaker that the event expressed by the participle is already known, which explains why this type of sentence can be used with thetic function, as an answer to a question such as 'what happened?'

## 4 The passive definite participle: entity-encoding, secondary predication and orientation

At the morphological level, there is an empirical observation that must be underscored concerning the passive geminated form of the participle: the frequency of the graphic ending <*w*>, which is much more regularly present than with other forms that can potentially occur with <*w*>. Another point is that, contrary to forms like *jri-w,* which is ambitransitive, the geminated participle with final <*w*> is always passive. Why is this so? In other words, if <*w*> is initially a nominal marker of class membership, what motivates its use with the passive only for geminated participles? The suggested analysis is that <*w*> is used here in the same way as with the Pseudoparticiple: as a 'class membership-marker', it has come to function as a marker of clausal attribution. This predicative relationship involves an orientation on S/P in a way similar to what happens with the construction 'NP + Pseudoparticiple' in main sentences[32].

32 As is widely recognised in reference grammars, the active geminated participle *jrr* never shows a <*w*> ending. Possible exceptions that are sometimes mentioned are not significant. As for the <*j*> ending that is described by Gardiner (1957), its reality with the singular is not clearly established. In the present study, I shall refrain from examining possible explanations for cases whose attestation, in any event, remain scarce.

## 4.1 TAM reading of the passive definite participle

As already illustrated above in §3.3, TAM readings of participial forms result from the interaction between the semantics of the construction in which they are used, the lexical aspect of the verb, and the marking of the form itself. As expected, some occurrences of the geminated passive form in transformative clauses support its 'imperfective' label:

Ex. 45 *mꜣꜣ sḫmḫ-jb nb nfr* ***jr~r-w*** *m tꜣ r-ḏr-f*
look enjoyment every good make\PTCP~DEF-PASS.MSG PREP land whole
'Looking at every good enjoyment that is made in the whole country'
(*Ramesseum*, pl. 32-33)

This caption of a scene, which belongs to the iconographical répertoire of a tomb, describes a situation seen as virtually occuring in indefinite repetition. Even more explicitly, the next example in a similar context shows that the represented event is conceived of as eternally recurring:

Ex. 46 *ḥtp-nṯr* ***jn~n-w*** *j[n] msw-f mri-w-f-n-ḏt-f*
offering bring\PTCP~DEF-PASS.MSG AG child-MPL-3MSG servant-MPL-3MSG
*m njw-wt-f nj-wt šmᶜw mḥw*
PREP village-FPL-3MSG REL-FPL Lower and Upper Egypt
*ḥb nb nfr*
holiday every good
'The offering brought by his children and his servants from his villages of Lower and Upper Egypt (at) every good holiday'
(*Tomb of Nebet and Khenut*, p.82-83, pl.31)

Taken in isolation, the last two examples would appear to be in favour of a generic reading for the geminated participle.

The following pair of examples illustrates the same event:

Ex. 47 *[ꜣ]ḫ jᶜnw n mᶜw n-k ḥr nn*
*akh* plea DAT appeal? DAT-2MSG PREP DEM
***jr~r-w*** *ḏt-k snj*
make\PTCP~DEF-PASS.MSG servant-2MSG Seni
'May a plea be useful to someone who appeal? to you because of this being what is done by your servant Seni' (*Nag' ed-Deir*, K1-K3)

Ex. 48 *(j)n-jw mj* ***nf*** ***jr-jj*** *n smr-wᶜt(j) ḥr-ḫwi-f*
Q like DEM make\PTCP-RESUL.MSG to Sole_friend Harkhuf
'Is there anything like that thing made for the Sole friend Harkhuf (as he came back from Iam?)' (*Urkunden* I, 129, 11)

The form *jr-jj* functions as a phrasal attribute expressing a state qualifying the head, with a past reading resulting from the lexical semantics of the verb *jri*, 'to make,' and its use in the construction. Both constructions thus differ in their syntactic status: *jrr-w* is a clausal attribute to *nn*, while *jr-jj* functions as a phrasal attribute with restrictive reading. Thus, the demonstrative *nn* that is the head is identified to an entity, *jrr-w*, 'that which is done'. Moreover, *jrr-w* is marked for definiteness, thus allowing a TAM reading of the form that does not imply completedness of the action. Semantically, there is in fact a strong connection between generality, which is one of the semantic readings of definiteness, and non-completion of the event. On the other

hand, the use of the stative participle in <*j*> as a phrasal attribute naturally obtains in a past reading with a verb like *jri*, 'to make' and no expressed agent[33].

## 4.2 With evaluative verbs: from definiteness to intensivity

Ex. 49 to 52 involve the verbs *mri*, 'to love' and *ḥzi*, 'to praise' in self-presentative discourse are well-known. They show that no traces of an aspectual contrast exist between the two forms of the participle:

Ex. 49 *zꜣ-f* *smsw* ***mr-jj-f*** ***ḥz~z(-w)-f***
son-3MSG elder love\PTCP-RESUL.MSG-3MSG praise\PTCP~DEF-PASS.MSG-3MSG
'His elder son loved of him, his praised one' (*Tomb of Djau*, 4-6, pl. 3)

Ex. 50 *zꜣ-f* *smsw* ***mr~r-w-f*** *n(j)* *ḫt-f*
son-3MSG elder love\PTCP~DEF-PASS.MSG-3MSG REL body-3MSG
'His elder son, his loved one from his body'(*Tomb of Min-inu*, 28-29, pl. 1, 4a, 42)

The form with <*j*> ending and no gemination (*mrjj*, *ḥzjj*) is used in parallel with the geminated form with <*w*> ending (*mrrw*, *ḥzzw*), with no manifest difference in meaning. A crucial observation lies in the fact that, as shown by Jansen-Winkeln (1997), there is, in this kind of context, a *Steigerung* effect that always goes from non-geminated to geminated form. Our analysis of gemination as marking definiteness allows for an explanation of the difference between both forms that integrates observations by previous studies. At a semantic level, there is indeed a relationship between definiteness and the selection of a higher degree for a property such as is expressed by verbs like *mri* or *ḥzi*. 'Intensivity' thus appears as a by-product of the identification associated with definiteness bearing on the participle.

It is interesting to note that the proposed analysis predicts that, in negative contexts such as the following, the non-geminated form of the participle oriented on S/P is used:

Ex. 51 *nn* *ḥr(j)* *kꜣhs* ***mr-jj***
NEG superior arrogant love\PTCP-RESUL.MSG
'There is no arrogant superior who is beloved' (London UC 14333, l. 11)

As a restrictive attribute bearing on a term whose non-existence is predicated, the participle cannot take its definite form, which implies a process of identification of the reference.

A diachronic evolution may also affect the definite form of the participle so that it no longer marks definiteness proper. Such a process is indeed known in various languages[34]. In that case, the former definite form may express intensity or have a stylistic use. As a result of this evolution, the former definite participle may also come to function as an intensive adjective like in the following use in a Middle Kingdom stela:

Ex. 52 *ntt* *wj* *m* *bꜣk* ***mr~r-w***
CONJ 1SG PREP servant love\PTCP~DEF-PASS.MSG
'(One stands and sits under my goodness), for I am the favourite servant'
(BM EA 572, l. 8)

33 With an expressed agent, the TAM reading of the construction depends on the syntactical way in which it is encoded, see Oréal (Forthcoming b).

34 See Lyons (2003: 83), *e.g.* on the Lithuanian definite adjective and its evolution.

## 5 Morphological assumptions

This paper aims to propose a general hypothesis about unresolved problems concerning participial forms and their functional motivation. There is of course a lot more to say, both from a linguistic and a philological point of view. In particular, I have left aside the question of what is represented by the writings on which our observations are based[35]. Thus, what follows is only a sketch of basic assumptions that indicate the general line of interpretation I suggest for these phenomena.

### 5.1 Gemination, definiteness marking and verb class

Previous explanations of gemination were influenced by a more or less explicit analogy between gemination in the Egyptian verb and some phenomena attested in other languages, where a seemingly similar phenomenon may affect verbal morphology. In doing so, one was sometimes tempted to forget that, in Egyptian, gemination shows up only with a certain class of verbs. This basic fact is crucial. A sound premise for any explanation is thus that gemination with weak verbs in the participle result from a phonetic evolution conditioned by the interaction of some other formal feature that does not produce any written change with strong verbs. This is not easy to imagine if one has to think of this formal feature as a mark belonging to verbal morphology. An alternative analysis has been left unexplored, which fits my proposal to see gemination as associated with nominal morphology. I thus would like to suggest that, at some point in Egyptian language history, a distinctive morphological feature for definiteness marking involved nominal accent[36]. Diachronically, a change in word accentuation could be the only trace left after the disappearance of a more important element like a clitic[37]. Here again, it is of crucial importance to note that definiteness as it is marked on the participle should not be thought of as a status bound to the discourse properties of the head: the viewpoint on the property expressed by the participle itself is rather subject to a choice made by the speaker.

### 5.2 <*j*> as a property marker and a morpheme for adjectival derivation

My hypothesis concerning the original nature of the ending <*j*> is very simple[38]. I propose to recognize in it the very same ending that appears in what Egyptological tradition calls *nisba*-adjectives[39]. When added to weak verbs, this morpheme seems to produce a phonetic realisation that has more opportunities to be noted in the Egyptian

35 I shall dwell more at length on this topic in a forthcoming study on participles, converbs, and action nominals in Earlier Egyptian.

36 This hypothesis does not in any way imply that this feature had to be marked on nouns themselves. It is typologically attested that definiteness marking may affect only adjectives, for example. See for instance Stolz (2010) on Lithuanian. In Slovene, the distinction between the definite and the indefinite adjective is expressed mainly by tone, see Lyons (2003, 82).

37 I owe many thanks to Denis Creissels, with whom I discussed this topic from a typological point of view.

38 For a more detailed analysis, see Oréal (Forthcoming a). In this study on perfect grams in Earlier Egyptian, I discuss the role of the various endings traditionally considered as variants for the Pseudoparticiple in correlation with its uses as a depictive vs. secondary predicate on one side, and in resultative vs. perfect constructions on the other.

39 See Gardiner (1957), Jansen-Winkeln (1997).

writing system, which explains why it is more frequent with this kind of verbs, while not unattested with other verbal classes. From a semantic point of view, one may briefly recall here how this final <*j*> works with different bases:

- with a substantive, *e. g. njwt*, city > *njwtj*, 'that which is of the city'
- with a preposition, *e. g. ḥr*, on > *ḥrj*, 'that which is on'

It is not so easy to define the semantic relationship between the *nisba*-adjective and its base. Naturally, with a participial base that is basically perfective and neutral as to orientation, the analogy is stronger with a prepositional base than with a substantive one. Thus, the <*j*> form serves as a means to derive an adjective expressing the property of being in the state corresponding to the perfective participle:

- *jri*, made > *jrjj*, 'that which is made'
- *pri*, come > *prjj*, 'that which has come'
- *mri*, loved > *mrjj*, 'that which is loved'

The <*j*> ending basically indicates a state. Consequently, it confers an orientation on S/P to the participle. This state may but need not be resultative, depending on the lexical semantics of the verb.

## 5.3 <*w*> from class-membership marker to nominal derivation

One might be surprised at the suggestion that the <*w*> sometimes written at the end of participles in Earlier Egyptian has to do with nominal morphology. Still, it immediately reminds one of one of the derivational morphemes appearing in nominal classes studied by Jürgen Osing (1976). In this study, agent nouns and participles are said to belong to the same reconstructed nominal classes. Some of them have a final <*w*> whose relationship with the <*w*> ending of the participle needs to be investigated. The very existence of an <*w*> ending is taken by Osing as a feature excluding a participial analysis of the form *qmꜣw* (in a context where an imperfective analysis is not adequate)[40]. He thus ignores the potential <*w*> ending with the perfective non-geminated participle. Moreover, one may indeed ask whether the distinction made is completely relevant. From a semantic point of view, agent nouns are in many cases nothing else than participial forms expressing a property that are marked as referring to the member of a class[41]. Thus, the ending <*w*> in these nominals may find its source in the very same <*w*> that marks class membership on the participle.

Now there are different ways of formulating the function of this formal device according to the syntactic construction under scrutiny. This <*w*> may be termed 'adverbial' or 'nominal' if one wants to associate one of its functions to a part of speech. When the Pseudoparticiple with <*w*> ending is used as a secondary predicate, it is tempting to see it as adverbial. In this respect, the proposed analysis challenges this assumption, for it shows that it does not function primarily as a marker of adverbiality. Even its use in the 'subject + predicate' construction might be considered as nominal in origin. If one was to unify these various uses, what is common to

40 See Osing (1976: 665).

41 The use of the corresponding adjectival form may or may not be attested or continued in the language according to various parameters.

forms showing a final <*w*>? To answer this question, it is better to list them according to the usual categorization found in grammars:

- *jri-w*, perfective active participle
- *jri-w*, perfective passive participle
- *jri-w*/*pri-w*, Pseudoparticiple
- *jrr-w*, imperfective passive participle

I propose to trace the source of these different uses back to a former nominal marker for indefiniteness conceptualized as class membership. Its function was then extended to mark secondary predication along a path of change, as was suggested above (§ 2.3). This marker, when applied to a non-geminated participle, i.e., to a form that is basically a verbal adjective, allows it to be used either as a noun referring to an entity, or as a secondary predicate. From a diachronic point of view, one can conceive a path going from the first to the latter function, bridging uses being as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *zj, msiw* | > | *zj msiw* |
| man, a-born(-on?)='man, someone born' | | 'man, having been born' |

According to such a path of change, the use of <*w*> as a means of signalling secondary predication can be traced back to its original meaning as an indefinite marker.

As for the definite form of the participle, at the synchronic level, <*w*> may be said to mark the passive. But from a diachronic point of view, I suggest that the <*w*> ending might be nothing else than the same morpheme <*w*> marking a secondary predication:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *zj jrr-w* | > | *zj jrrw* |
| 'man a-made(-one?)[+DEF]' | | 'man being the one who is made' |

As is the case with so-called Pseudoparticiple, the S/P orientation of this form in fact results from the function of the participle in a predicative clause.

## 6 Further implication for verb morphology

In the Earlier Egyptian verbal system, a crucial question related to the morphology of participles lies in the debate pertaining to the morphogenesis of relative constructions and relative forms. I shall leave it aside for the time being. For the moment, it is enough to say that the proposed analysis of both endings and gemination allows us to understand better the semantics characterizing relative constructions based on participles as TAM readings resulting from the interaction of syntactic use and originally nominal marking related to reference and (in)definiteness effects.

### 6.1 Definiteness and topicality

Without entering into details here, I shall just briefly indicate how the explanation of the distribution of participles relate to the long-standing problems faced in analyzing the various uses of the *mrr-f* form. As is well-known, gemination of the second radical with *ult. inf.* verbs is a morphological fact common to participles and the *sḏm-f* form that is usually called 'nominal' or 'Second Tense' in the imperfective (the '*mrr-f* form'). It is evident that the new functional explanation proposed here for the participle morphology has deep consequences for the understanding of the functional range of uses characterizing the geminated verb form. Of course it has long been

noticed that gemination was a shared feature relating the so-called *mrr-f* form and the 'imperfective' participle:

Ex. 53 *mr~r-j* *ṯw* *ḥnᶜ-j*
love\NMLZ~DEF-1SG 2MSG PREP-1SG
'I want you *with me*' (*Urkunden* I, 63,3)[42]

As was discovered by Hans Jakob Polotsky[43], the former is a form marked for information structure. Since then, it has remained a problem to uncover a common point between this verbal paradigm and the geminated participle, as long as the latter was considered to be a form marked for TAM, for it is obvious that imperfectivity is not characteristic for any use of the *mrr-f*[44]. On the contrary, definiteness marking fits in well within the general picture of the uses of this form. For definiteness obviously has something to do with thematicity[45]. One of the more characteristic use of the *mrr-f* is precisely to express some information presented by the speaker as a shared common ground with the hearer, something that lies out of the rhematic scope of his utterance. It is thus immediately related to one possible semantic reading of definiteness. From a morphological point of view, definiteness marking on a verb form resulting from the grammaticalization of a former action nominal makes sense. Thus, the *mrr-f* form appears to be not merely nominal in origin, but also to bear a morphological trace of nominal morphology motivated by its discursive status.

Moreover, other uses of the same form in different syntactic positions and their semantic readings can also be explained as resulting from a contextual interpretation of what was originally nominal definiteness. It would allow for a coherent explanation of these uses in parallel with other forms of a similar source that are unmarked for definiteness or even marked for indefiniteness[46]. Semantic differences in TAM readings of these various forms that are used in apparent competition, e.g,. in completive function, can thus be explained as resulting from the grammaticalization of nominal morphology applied to action nominals[47]. This explanation has a special strong point, inasmuch as it allows a better understanding of the apparently free choice between geminated and non-geminated forms in syntactic positions other than the thematic

42 One might argue against the gloss NMLZ.DEF for the *mrr-f* form that, from a synchronical point of view, the grammaticalisation of the imperfective Second Tense as a verb form marked for information structure is a completed process. In this perspective, a gloss like BG for 'backgrounding' might be more in order. This is a point needing further qualification.

43 See for example Polotsky (1944) and Polotsky (1976).

44 The verbal 'plurality' hypothesis in its revised version by Jansen-Winkeln (1997) finds a bridge between the intensive reading of the geminated participle and the *mrr-f* form in a postulated affinity between intensivity and the use of *mrr-f* in 'emphatic' contexts. Intensivity still remains poorly defined as a linguistic category. Moreover, this analysis does not take into sufficient account other uses of the form, especially in Old Egyptian.

45 This is not the place to deal with this topic. Suffice it to say that this kind of phenomenon remains language-specific. In French, for example, Lambrecht (1994) considers that there is no sentence like: 'une souris court dans l'herbe', for a new element in discourse as marked by the indefinite article *une* cannot occur in thematic position without further marking of the information structure, *e.g.*, using a thetic construction like *il y a*: 'il y a une souris qui court dans l'herbe'.

46 I have exposed the main lines of this diachronic explanation at the workshop 'New directions in Egyptian syntax' (Liège, 12-14/05/2011).

47 The analysis of the role of action nominals as a source for verbal morphology in Earlier Egyptian will be part of a forthcoming study. See Oréal (Forthcoming c).

one. Thus, this new approach has deep consequences for the long-standing debate on the nature and functions of Second Tenses in Earlier Egyptian. Its diachronic dimension provides a frame that allows for a better understanding of the interaction between information structure and syntactic features in shaping verbal morphology.

### 6.2 (In)definiteness and modality: a nominal source for 'irrealis' verb-forms

There is a stimulating convergence between the consequences of the analysis proposed here and some results of Uljas' (2007) work on completives demonstrating that the choice of one or the other possible verb form, and especially the *mrr-f* or the *sḏmw-f*, is related to a semantic motivation formulated in terms of proximal vs. distal irrealis. Synchronically, the relevance of such an observation is shown by his analysis of many examples, while other uses of the forms do not fit perfectly in the picture. I will propose a diachronic explanation relating the written morphology of these forms to the former (in)definite marking of an action nominal build on a participial basis. It can provide a basis for a more coherent functional analysis of the whole range of uses attested for the *mrr-f* form and the *sḏmw-f* form than the synchronic formulation in terms of realis vs. irrealis, a category notoriously problematic from a cross-linguistic viewpoint. Thus, the new analysis proposed for the morphology of participles in Earlier Egyptian has a wide-reaching impact in understanding the morphogenesis of more than one *sḏm-f* conjugation. A reassessment of the old theory of its participial origin thus appears to be in order. I shall leave it for another study.

## 7 Summary and perspectives

The analysis of participial morphology proposed here represents a new approach. As such, it lacks a proper discussion of the linguistic categories it uses, and especially the notions of definiteness and indefiniteness and their relevance for Earlier Egyptian[48]. I hope to give a more refined account of the relevant data in a future study with a larger scope. To conclude, it might be useful to present here a brief summary of the main points presented in this article, for it clearly has wider implications and deserves a wider scope in empirical study than the limited illustration given here. Finally, an annex recapitulates the proposed analysis for each form[49]:

- Gemination and endings originally belong to the domain of nominal morphology and are related to definiteness and indefiniteness marking on the participle, independently of the referential and discursive status of the head.
- What has been interpreted as TAM marking is a contextual semantic reading of the interaction between definiteness and various types of actional phrases.
- There is a common source and common functional or morphological features to the so-called Pseudoparticiple (3MSG) with <*w*> and <*j*> endings and the non-geminated participle with the same endings.

48 For a study devoted to this topic with a larger scope, see Shisha-Halevy (2007).

49 I have presented here the basic ideas that will be developped in a work that is still in progress, and I am fully aware of the fact that many philological details, especially in relationship with verbal morphological classes, were left outside of the scope of this paper.

- The morphogenesis of the relative constructions or forms and their related TAM readings will be explained on the basis of the proposed new understanding for participial morphology.
- The proposed explanation may help us to provide a coherent understanding for the functional range of uses that characterizes the *mrr-f* form and the *sḏmw-f* form.

## Annex: synthetic analysis of the various forms of the participle

***jri***

perfective participle
property encoding
phrasal attribute in noun phrase
contextual past reading
only active reading

***jriw***

(1) perfective participle marked for class membership/indefiniteness
clausal attribute in noun phrase
active or passive reading
categorizing semantics

(2) in detached apposition
secondary predicate (Pseudoparticiple)
participant oriented
perfect semantics
passive reading with bivalent verbs, active with monovalent verbs (S/P orientation)

(3) extension to predicative function in 'S/P + predicate' construction > perfect gram

***jrjj***

(1) perfective participle marked as a nisba-adjective
phrasal attribute in noun phrase
stative-resultative semantics (S/P orientation)

(2) depictive use in depictive constructions (Pseudoparticiple)

***jrr***

definite participle
phrasal attribute in noun phrase
selectional/identificational semantics
contextual TAM reading as imperfective
only active reading

***jrrw***

definite participle
clausal attribute in noun phrase
selectional/identificational semantics
contextual TAM reading as imperfective
only passive reading

Caution: as property encoding terms, all Earlier Egyptian participles may be 'substantivized', i.e. used headless without any marking. Translation in languages like English

with periphrasis such as 'someone who' may obscure the fact that only the participle with <*w*> ending is marked for class membership/indefiniteness.

## Bibliography


Allen, James P. 1984. *The inflection of the verb in the pyramid texts*, Bibliotheca Aegyptia 2, Malibu.

————. 2005. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, Writings from the Ancient World 23, Leiden-Boston.

*British Museum* EA 572 = E.A.W. Budge. 1912. *Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae, &c., in the British Museum* 2, London, 8, pl. 22

*CGC* 20507 = Lange & Schäfer 1908: 97, pl. 34.

*CCG* 20539 = Lange & Schäfer 1908: 150-158, pl. 41-42.

Clère, Jacques Jean. 1949. Une nouvelle forme verbale relative en égyptien, in: *Actes du XXI^e Congrès international des Orientalistes*, Paris, 64-66.

*Denderah* = William M.F. Petrie. 1898. *Dendereh*, Egypt Exploration Fund 17/2, London.

Depuydt, Leo. 2008. Zum Nebeneinander von An- und Abwesenheit der Gemination in der Wendung *mrjj jt.f mrrw snw.f*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 16, 27-38.

Edel, Elmar. 1955-1964. *Altägyptische Grammatik*, Analecta Orientalia 34/39, Rome.

Gardiner, Alan H. 1957. *Egyptian Grammar being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphics*, 3rd edition, Oxford.

Goldenberg, Gideon. 1995. Attribution in Semitic Languages, in: *Langues Orientales Anciennes: Philologie et Linguistique* 7, 1-20.

Gunn, Battiscombe. 1924. *Studies in Egyptian syntax*, Paris.

*Hannover* 2927 = Rosemarie Drenkhahn. 1989. *Ägyptische Reliefs im Kestner-Museum Hannover*, Sammlungskatalog 5, Hannover, 72-74.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1994. Passive participles across languages, in: Barbara Fox & Paul J. Hopper (eds.), *Voice: Form and Function*, Amsterdam, 151-177.

*Hawawish* = Naguib Kanawati. 1987. *The Rock Tombs of El-Hawawish. The Cemetery of Akhmim* 7, Sydney.

*Hu Bowl* = Alan H. Gardiner & Kurt Sethe. 1928. *Egyptian letters to the dead, mainly from the Old and Middle Kingdoms*, London.

Jansen-Winkeln, Karl. 1997. Intensivformen und 'verbale Pluralität' im Ägyptischen, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 5, 23-36.

Johansson, Lars. 2000. Viewpoint operators in European languages, in: Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, 27-187.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form*, Cambridge.

Lange, Hans O. & Heinrich Schäfer. 1908. *Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reiches im Museum von Cairo* 2-4, Berlin.

*Lesest.* = Kurt Sethe. 1928. *Ägyptische Lesestücke zum Gebrauch im akademischen Unterricht: Texte des Mittleren Reiches*, Leipzig.

London UC 14333 = Hans Goedicke. 1962. A Neglected Wisdom Text, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 48, 25-35.

Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*, Cambridge.

Malaise, Michel & Jean Winand. 1999. *Grammaire raisonnée de l'égyptien classique*, Ægyptiaca Leodiensia 6, Liège.

*Nag' ed-Deir* = William K. Simpson. 1966. The letter to the dead from the tomb of Meru (N 3737) at Nag' ed-Deir, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 52, 39-52.

*Nianchchnum und Chnumhotep* = Ahmed M. Moussa & Hartwig Altenmüller. 1977. *Das Grab des Nianchchnum und Chnumhotep*, Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 21, Mainz.

Oréal, Elsa. Forthcoming a. *Les parfaits en ancien égyptien. Chemins de grammaticalisation*.

————. Forthcoming b. From noun phrase syntax to TAM features. Possessive encoding of the participants as a source for non-subject relative constructions in Earlier Egyptian, in: Eitan Grossman & Stéphane Polis (eds.), *Possession in Ancient Egyptian*, De Gruyter – Mouton, The Mouton Companions to Ancient Egyptian.

————. Forthcoming c. *L'ancien égyptien*, Les Langues du Monde, Leuven-Paris.

Osing, Jürgen. 1976. *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*, Mainz.

*pAbusir* = Paule Posener-Krieger & Jean-Louis de Cenival. 1968. *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum. Fifth Series. The Abu Sir Papyri*, Londres.

Polotsky, Hans Jacob. 1944. *Études de syntaxe copte*, Le Caire.

————. 1976. Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique, in: *Israel Oriental Studies* 6, 1-50.

*Ptahhotep* = Zbynek Žába. 1956. *Les maximes de Ptahhotep*, Prague.

*Pyramid texts* = Kurt Sethe. 1908-1922. *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte*, Leipzig.

*Ramesseum* = James Quibell. 1898. *The Ramesseum*, London.

Schenkel, Wolfgang. 1965. 'Singularisches' und 'pluralisches' Partizip, in: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo* 20, 110-114.

————. 2011. Merkmalloses versus pluralisches/distributives/intensives Partizip: Kritik der Ausgangsbeobachtungen, in: *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 138/1, 63-78.

Shisha-Halevy, Ariel. 2007. Determination-Signalling Environment in Old and Middle Egyptian: Work-Notes and Reflections, in: *Studies in Semitic and General Linguistics in Honor of Gideon Goldenberg*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 334, 223-254.

Stolz, Thomas. 2010. Pleonastic morphology dies hard: Change and variation of definiteness inflection in Lithuanian, in: Franz Rainer et al. (eds.), *Variation and change in morphology*, Amsterdam, 217-244.

*Tomb of Ankhmahor* = Naguib Kanawati & Ali Hassan. 1997. *The Teti Cemetery at Saqqara II: The Tomb of Ankhmahor*, ACE Reports 9, Warminster.

*Tomb of Debeheni* = Selim Hassan. 1943. *Excavations at Gîza 1932-1933*, Cairo.

*Tomb of Djau* = Norman de G. Davies. 1902. *The Rock Tombs of Deir el Gebrâwi II*, London.

*Tomb of Hesi* = Naguib Kanawati & Mahmoud Abder-Raziq. 1999. *The Teti Cemetery at Saqqara V: The Tomb of Hesi*, ACE Reports 13, Warminster.

*Tomb of Min-inu* = Naguib Kanawati. 2006. *The Teti Cemetery at Saqqara VIII: The Tomb of Inumin*, ACE Reports 24, Oxford.

*Tomb of Nebet and Khenut* = Peter Munro. 1998. *Der Unas-Friedhof Nord-West. I: Topographisch-historische Einleitung. Das Doppelgrab der Königinnen Nebet und Khenut*, Mainz.

*Tomb of Neb-kau-Hor* = Hans Goedicke. 1970. *Die privaten Rechtsinschriften aus dem Alten Reich*, Beihefte zur Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 5, Vienna, 94-103.

*Tomb of a Theban official* = Alan H. Gardiner. 1917. The tomb of a much-travelled Theban official, in: *Jounal of Egyptian Archeology* 4, 28-38.

*Urkunden I* = Kurt Sethe. 1935. *Historisch-biographische Urkunden des Mittleren Reiches* I, Leipzig.

Uljas, Sami. 2007. *The Modal System of Earlier Egyptian Complement Clauses: A Study in Pragmatics in a Dead Language*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 26, Leiden.

van der Auwera, Johan & Andrej Malchukov. 2005. A semantic map for depictive adjectivals, in: Nikolaus Himmelmann & Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.), *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives*, Oxford, 393-421.