

THE EARLIER EGYPTIAN “EMPHATIC” CONSTRUCTION: AN ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

ANDRÉAS STAUDER

THE EARLIER EGYPTIAN “EMPHATIC” CONSTRUCTION¹ has been classically analyzed as involving “nominal” or “abstract-relative” forms of the verb, and thereby as a syntactically biclausal, of cleft-like, structure; syntax would thus mirror the articulation of information structure expressed by the construction. In relation to this analysis, it has also been hypothesized that the construction would have been associated with a marking on the verb across the board, that is, with all types of events. In the first part of the present paper, I take critical issue with these analyses. I then propose an alternative analysis by which parameters such as aspect, voice, and event semantics play a crucial role. In the proposed analysis, the “emphatic” construction has a monoclausal syntax and its linguistic form involves a marking on the verb only with certain types of events. In emphasizing the role of verbal semantics, the analysis has further implications as to the functional profile of the construction.

PART I. CLASSICAL ANALYSES

1 “Nominality” and the biclausal, or cleft-like, analysis of the “emphatic” construction

1.1 A classical analysis

In a classical analysis, the distinctive forms of the verb found in the “emphatic” construction—the *mrr=f* in the unaccomplished, the *il.n=f* in the accomplished with intransitive events such as *īwi* “come,” and the *sdm.n.t=f* in the accomplished passive—are analyzed as “nominal” or “abstract-relative.”² Under this analysis, the “emphatic” construction is analogized to the adverbial predicate construction: the verb, its subject, and its non-adverbial complements are taken to form a nominalized clause; this is understood as the subject to a following broadly adverbial expression, itself interpreted as the syntactic predicate of the overall construction. The “emphatic” construction would thereby consist in two levels of predication, a lower-order one internal to the nominalized clause, and a higher-order one between the nominalized clause and the following adverbial expression. The articulation of information structure is analyzed as bipartite (presupposition–focus) and would be mirrored by the hypothesized higher-order predicative nexus. The overall syntax of the “emphatic” construction would be cleft-like, that is, biclausal. Taking one famous example, in schematic terms:

[1] (“You are the steering-oar of the entire land.”)

skdd t3 hft wd=k (Peas. B1 298–99)

It is as you command that the land sails.

	[[<i>skdd</i>	<i>t3</i>]	<i>hft wd=k</i>]
Lower-level predic.	<i>V</i> _{predicate} ←Pr.→	<i>NP</i> _{subject}	

- 1 The quotation marks used throughout the present paper indicate that the received label of the construction, which harkens all the way back to Berlin School analyses of the *mrr=f*, is a misnomer under any analysis, the traditional one and the one proposed here alike. These quotation marks are not meant to suggest a challenge to the existence of an “emphatic” construction in Earlier Egyptian, which the present paper is all about. By the expression “the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions,” I refer to the set of three closely related constructions, the “emphatic” construction, the “setting” construction (or “second schème,” namely, of the “emphatic” construction), and the “balanced” construction.
- 2 Gradually developed in a series of studies by Polotsky (1944; 1957; 1965; 1976); considerable discussion since.

Higher-level predic.	<i>Nominalized_clause_{subject}</i>	←Pr.→	<i>AP_{predicate}</i>
Information structure	Backgrounded information	←→	Focus

(Compare the cleft-construction in, e.g., English:

<i>It is</i>	<i>as you command</i>	<i>[that the land sails]</i>
←Pr.→	“AP”	<i>Nominalized clause</i>

This biclausal analysis of the “emphatic” construction was proposed based on a series of observations, the most important of which are the following. (a) Both synchronically and historically, constructions with a biclausal structure are not uncommon cross-linguistically to “cleave apart” a constituent which is thereby set under narrow focus. In Egyptian itself, for example, so-called “pseudo-clefts” of the type *A pw B* (with *B* a relative form, a passive participle, or a *nty*-headed relative clause) are of this broad type (leaving the issue of agreement aside). (b) When in the “emphatic” construction the relation between the verb and its subject is negated, this is done by *tm*, a negative word that also finds various uses with clearly nominal categories of the verb, such as the infinitive, participles, and relative forms. (c) The forms used in the Earlier Egyptian “emphatic” construction seem closely related morphologically to relative forms. (d) The forms used in the “emphatic” construction are also found in other environments, such as after prepositions and in complement clauses; these environments are themselves said to be diagnostic of “nominality.”

In the above, (a) defines only one possibility among others: narrow-focus constructions with a biclausal, cleft-like structure are not uncommon cross-linguistically but a variety of other construction types are just as common.³ The negative word *tm* (b) also provides the regular negation of various categories that cannot be analyzed as “nominal,” inflectional forms of the verb (*tm.hr=f.sdm*, *tm.k3=f.sdm*)⁴ and constructions (*ih tm=f.sdm* and *k3 tm=f.sdm*); *tm* cannot, therefore, be a reliable diagnostic of “nominality.”⁵ Concerning (c), the relative *mrr(t)=f* and the *mrr=f* used notably in the “emphatic” construction are closely related morphologically: both are finite forms based on the long stem (with *III.inf*, *mrr-*). This, however, does not carry any necessary implication to the effect that the latter should be a specialized use of the former in non-attributive, or “abstract-relative,” function: Earlier Egyptian has two finite forms based on the long stem, one in the attributive paradigm, the other in the non-attributive paradigm, with different functions (discussion: § 4.1–2). In the accomplished, a form of the *sdm.n=f* is used both as a relative form and in the “emphatic” construction: these may even be identical morphologically (leaving aside the issue of agreement with the relative form). Here as well, however, no implication can be derived that the latter should be a specialized use of the former in non-attributive, or “abstract-relative,” function: by definition, synthetic relativization makes use of a synthetic form of the verb, and thus, in the accomplished, of the *ii.n=f*, not of the subject–verb construction *NP PsP*; the latter construction is in fact also found in relativization (thus *nty NP PsP*), if only rarely, and with the additional semantic import more generally associated with subject–verb patterns.⁶ In short, (a)–(c) speak neither for, nor for that matter directly against, “nominal” forms and the biclausal analysis of the “emphatic” construction. The issues raised in (d) warrant a separate discussion (§ 1.3).

3 Illustration: Lambrecht 1994, 13–35.

4 Noted by Polotsky 1957, 109, n. 3.

5 On the semantics of *tm*, lastly Uljas 2007a, 210–20.

6 E.g., *pty n3 ntt n ly.wyn r=s nn irt bl3yt n n3 n hr dw (...)* “What have we come here for, without doing a wonder for the children (...)?” (pWestcar 11, 10–12), with an additional emphasis on the Endpoint of the event of directed motion.

1.2 The “setting” construction, or “second schème” of the “emphatic” construction

Related to the “emphatic” construction are the “balanced” construction and the “setting” construction, or “second schème” of the “emphatic” construction.⁷ Like the subtype of the “emphatic” construction in which the second part is a circumstantial clause, the “setting” construction consists of two clauses, the first with the same distinctive forms of the verb as the “emphatic” construction. The two constructions only rarely differ formally,⁸ but they differ functionally, in terms of the relative prominence of the two clauses, and, as an effect of this, also in the relative temporality of these two clauses in narrative contexts:⁹

“Emph.” constr.	<i>Clause_{main}</i>	–	<i>Clause_{circ.}</i>
“Setting” constr.	<i>Clause_{backgrounded}</i>	–	<i>Clause_{main}</i> ¹⁰

Under the biclausal analysis of the “emphatic” construction, the *mrr=f*, the *il.n=f*, and the *sdm.n.t=f* are analyzed as “nominal” forms of the verb. Pursuing this analysis, the “setting” construction is then analogized with a construction in which a left-dislocated nominal topic precedes the clause (*Clause_{nominalized}* – *Clause_{main}*, analogized to *NP_{left-disloc. topic}* – *Clause*¹¹). The first clause in the “setting” construction is then analyzed as a “clausal topic.”¹²

This analysis faces major difficulties. The notion of “clausal topic” itself is problematic: unlike noun phrases, clauses are not referentially accessible, neither anaphorically nor cataphorically; “topicality,” on the other hand, is a category all to do with, and defined precisely per, these notions of (anaphoric and/or cataphoric) referential accessibility.¹³ Against an association between “clausal topic” (with this notion then necessarily understood in a somewhat metaphorical fashion) and “nominalization,” Earlier Egyptian displays other constructions in which an un-introduced form of the verb in a first backgrounded clause is in the pseudoparticiple¹⁴ or in the subjunctive,¹⁵ neither of which can be analyzed as “nominal.”¹⁶ Regarding the

- 7 Identified by Vernus 1981; intuited by Polotsky 1957, 114–15 (discussing *Sinuhe* B 199–201). The label “second schème (*scil.* of the emphatic construction)” (Vernus) refers only to the history of discovery, expressing that the construction was discovered later than the “emphatic” construction; it does not imply any secondariness of the “second schème” vis-à-vis the “emphatic” construction in either functional or diachronic terms. Other labels include “setting” construction (e.g., Uljas 2007a, 355) and “Rang-V Erweiterung” (Schenkel 1998; 2014).
- 8 E.g., with the second clause introduced by *tw*: *šh=f iw=i skš=i šsh=i* “When he reaps, I plow and I reap” (CT V, 375e B9C; Schenkel 2012a, 315); further examples: Stauder 2014a, 216–17.
- 9 Vernus 1981; subsequently, e.g., Schenkel 2014; Stauder 2014b, 183–88; Schenkel, this volume.
- 10 E.g., *rmm=sn tw=f hr sdm* “Whenever they (*scil.* mankind) weep, he (*scil.* the creator god) is listening” (Merikare E 135; not ?¹⁶ “They weep only/right when he is listening”; discussion: Stauder 2014b, 187–88, n.72).
- 11 E.g., the locus classicus [*hšst nbt rwt.n=i r=s*]_{NP/extraposed topic} [*iw lr.n=i hd=i lm=s (...)*]_{clause} “Every foreign country I marched against, I made my attack on it (...)” (Sin. B 101–102).
- 12 Thus Satzinger 1993a, 184; 2014, 306.
- 13 Givón, 2001: II, 344–45; Uljas 2007a, 233–34 and n. 35.
- 14 E.g., *hnt ph.n=f wšwšt hd ph.n=f tš-wr* “Having sailed upstream, he reached Wawat; having sailed downstream, he reached the Thinite nome” (Vandier 1950, 220, IV 14–15; a formula, more common in the first (speaker’s) person); *wšd hr šhr hšs[t] ḥc.n dd.n=sn n sdm=n ht nbt (...)* “Questioned about the condition of the desert, they said: ‘We have not heard anything (...)’” (Smither 1945, pl. V, x+9; discussion: Stauder 2014a, 149).
- 15 E.g., *mr=tn ḥh msd=tn hpt tw=tn r drp n=i* “Should you love life, should you hate passing away, you will present offerings to me” (Cairo CG 20003, 2–3); *mš=sn pt mš=sn tš mckš ib=sn r mšiw* “Did they see the sky, did they see land, their hearts were bolder than the ones of lions” (Sh.S. 28–30); *pr prrt nbt m pr-nsw smi ø n=f ḥq ḥqt nbt r pr-nsw smi ø n=f* “Should whatever leaves the palace leave, it shall be reported to him; should whatever enters the palace enter, it shall be reported to him” (Duties of the Vizier R 2–3; Davies 1943, pl. 26, 2–3).
- 16 For the subjunctive as certainly not “nominal,” § 1.3.

“setting construction” specifically, an analysis of the first clause as a “clausal topic” (metaphorically understood) would predict mostly conditional types of semantics: these are found,¹⁷ but only as a subtype of the overall semantics of the “setting construction”; in narrative contexts for example, the first clause does not express a condition to the second.¹⁸ The “setting” construction therefore poses a very serious challenge to any analysis of the *mrr=f*, the *ii.n=f*, and the *sḏm.n.t=f* as “nominal” forms of the verb.¹⁹ In doing so, it also poses a very serious challenge to a biclausal, or cleft-like, analysis of the “emphatic” construction itself.

1.3 “Nominality,” and the *mrr=f*, *ii.n=f*, and *sḏm.n.t=f* in other environments than the “emphatic” and related constructions

The forms of the verb used in the “emphatic” and related construction—the *mrr=f*, the *ii.n=f*, and the *sḏm.n.t=f*—are also found in environments such as after prepositions or in complement clauses (to name only the two with the highest text frequency). Under analogy with noun phrases (e.g., *Preposition NP*, analogized to *Preposition mrr=f*), these environments have been presented as being diagnostic of “nominality,” and hence as demonstrating the “nominal” character of forms of the verb used in the “emphatic” and related construction.

While the descriptive inventory of distributions—the Distributional Method, as this has been called—remains the basis of empirical syntactic studies,²⁰ the argument for “nominality” goes much beyond: in interpreting empirically observed distributions further, the argument analogizes different constructions with one another. That such a methodological principle—of “paradigmatic substitution,” as it has been called—is not valid in general is demonstrated by the case of “adverbiality,” a category that had been derived on just these grounds.²¹ As “nominality” relies on similar principles of method as “adverbiality” did, this casts a serious doubt on the former category as well.

By analogy with the constructions *Preposition NP* and *Preposition Verb_{infinitive}*, the construction *Preposition Verb_{finitive}* has for example been considered diagnostic of “nominality” for the forms of the verb that occur in it, among which is the *mrr=f*. Introducing noun phrases is the most common, and indeed

17 E.g., Merikare E 135, quoted above, n. 10.

18 E.g., *spr.n wḏ pn r=l ḥf.kw m ḥr-ib whwt=l šd.n.t=f n=l ḏ.n(=l) wl ḥr ḥt=l (...)* “When this decree reached me, I was standing in the midst of my tribe. When it was read out to me, I put myself on my belly (...)” (Sin. B 199–201; for the analysis, now Stauder 2014b, 185–88; Schenkel 2014, 105–13). Earlier Egyptian constructions that may perhaps be conceived of as “clausal topics” (under consequent metaphorization of the concept) are *lr*-headed ones (*lr V* and *lr preposition V*). These do not imply a nominalization of the clause. *lr V* only superficially resembles nominal topics of the type *lr NP*: the form of the verb is in most cases a subjunctive or a prospective, both of which are not “nominal” (§ 1.3 and § 2.3); *lr preposition V* can even less be analogized to *lr NP*.

19 Alternatively, it has been proposed to view the “setting” construction as a “detached relative form construction,” in which the forms of the verb would serve as converbs, that is, here, as less inflected adjectival forms of the verb used adverbially (Werning 2014). This analysis is problematic in its reference to other languages in which inflection is indeed reduced with respect to person (finiteness) and in several cases also to tense-aspect. In Earlier Egyptian, by contrast, the forms of the verb in the first clause of the “setting” construction—the *mrr=f*, the *ii.n=f*, the *sḏm.n.t=f*—are in no way reduced in their inflection; in particular, they are fully inflected for person and for tense-aspect.

20 E.g., Croft 2001, arguing against deductive approaches to syntax.

21 Collier 1994; also Collier 1992; 1991; 1990. From a different perspective also, e.g., Schenkel 1998. To arguments that have already been voiced, add for example the following: in the unaccomplished *N(P) sḏm=f*, the *sḏm=f* has been analyzed as “adverbial,” the construction *N(P) sḏm=f* being analogized to the situational predicate construction (*NP AP*). If this analysis were correct, the T-passive of the same form of the *sḏm=f* should also be “adverbial.” However, the passive counterpart to the construction *N(P) sḏm=f* is *sḏm.t NP*, not **N(P) sḏm.t=f* (Stauder 2014a, 223–27). Applying the same principles as for the active *N(P) sḏm=f*, its passive counterpart *sḏm.t NP* would then have to be analogized to a pattern “AP NP.”

defining, function of prepositions in general. However, implying that a finite verb after a preposition should necessarily be analyzed as “nominal(ized)” is going one step further. This requires making an assumption about universal grammar.

Concerning the construction *Preposition Verb_{finite}* in the specific language under study, Earlier Egyptian, the following is then observed:

- *The subjunctive sdm=f*

The two forms of the verb most commonly used after prepositions and similarly in complement clauses are the *mrr=f* and the subjunctive *sdm=f*. The latter is also used in (i) main clauses with a modal profile, (ii) in final or consecutive clauses, (iii) in continuation to an imperative, (iv) in continuation to a future construction, (v) after *ih* or *h3*, and (vi) in clausal left-periphery.²² None of these environments (i)–(vi) can be analyzed as “nominal,” nor can the subjunctive therefore. The subjunctive—not a “nominal” form of the verb—is also commonly used after prepositions and in complement clauses. Neither of these two environments can therefore be diagnostic of “nominality” in the particular language under study, Earlier Egyptian.

- *Alternations of verbal forms*

In Earlier Egyptian, a great many, and indeed most, synthetic forms of the verb can be found after a preposition (the ones excluded are for obvious semantic reasons, for example the *sdm.in=f*). Functionally, Earlier Egyptian prepositions do double duty, as preposition or as conjunction, depending on the segment, a noun phrase or a clause, that follows.²³ After certain prepositions, a great variety of forms of the verb alternate to express semantic contrasts or nuances. For example, with *r*, (i) *r ir=f_{subj}*, “so that he does” (common); (ii) *r irw=f_{prosp.}* “so that he does (will do)” (rare); (iii) *r irr=f* “according to

22 E.g., (i) *sdd=i b3w=k n ity* “I wish to relate your might to the sovereign” (Sh.S. 139); (ii) *it.n=i r bw nt hnw=i m3=i nfr=s* “I have come to the place where my mistress is so that I may see her beauty” (CT VI, 53b–c S1C); (iii) *ir n=k twt r kmt m3=k hnw hpr.n=k im=f sn=k t3 r rwty wrty hnm=k smrw* “Come back to Egypt and you will see the Residence where you grew up, kiss the earth at the Great Double Portal, and join the courtiers” (Sin. B 188–89); (iv) *tw dpt r iyt m hnw (...)* *sm=k hnc=sn r hnw mwt=k m niwt=k* “A boat will come from the Residence (...) and you will go with them to the Residence and die in your town” (Sh.S. 119–23); (v) *ih w3b=k (...)* “So you may answer (...)” (Sh.S. 14); *h3 d=tn p3 it* “May you give this barley” (pWestcar 11, 7); (vi) see above, § 1.2, n. 15.

23 That prepositions regularly function as conjunctions in Middle Egyptian is not unremarkable, particularly in contrast with Standard Average European languages such as the ones in which Egyptological analyses of Earlier Egyptian have mostly been expressed. In many languages, finite forms of the verb are introduced by conjunctions, some of which are the result of a reanalysis of a construction in which a nominalized clause follows a preposition (e.g., [*après*]_{preposition} [*que je suis venu*]_{nominalized_clause} > [*après que*]_{conjunction} [*je suis venu*]_{clause (not nominalized)}). In addition, prepositions not uncommonly themselves have nominal origins: when grammaticalized from nominal expressions, prepositions can display a nominal syntax with respect to the clause they introduce, e.g., in a language in which an only incipient prepositional system is seen emerging, Sumerian *u_{day}* *clause-anominalizer* “when ...” (lit. “the day ...”). Even in Standard Average European languages, however, prepositions can occasionally function as conjunctions, if limitedly only (e.g., French *comme je le disais*, *comme il venait*; English *after/before I came*, *as/like I said*, *like I said*). Middle Egyptian is remarkable in that the possibility for prepositions to function as conjunctions is not limited to some exponents of the class, but extends to all prepositions that would yield acceptable semantics when used as conjunctions. This may itself be a historically secondary development. In Old Egyptian, finite constructions after a preposition (*preposition V_{finite}*) are uncommon, against non-finite ones (*preposition V_{infinitive}*) which seem relatively more common in the record (Edel 1955–64: § 712–21). Moreover, the infinitive in this construction often projects arguments in Old Egyptian, as if its syntax were finite (Edel 1955–64: § 700–702). This suggests that the finite constructions common in Middle Egyptian could have developed against the background of the semantically under-specified non-finite constructions that were common in Old Egyptian. More research is required on the topic.

how (much) he does, as he does” (common); (iv) *r ir.t=f* “until he has done, does” (a bare expression of completion; common); (v) *r ir.n=f* “until he has done (completed doing)” (also an expression of completion, highlighting the culminating point of the event with accomplishments).²⁴ Other prepositions display distinguished associations with certain forms of the verb in particular (e.g., *hft*, often with the *mrr=f*, but hardly ever with the prospective *sdm=f*). With a given preposition, the form of the verb is therefore selected on semantic grounds: the lexical semantics of the preposition (taken in the temporal and conceptual areas when introducing a clause²⁵) interact with the aspectual, temporal, and/or modal profile expressed by the grammatical tense of the verb to yield the meaning of the overall construal. By the same token, certain combinations are overly common while other ones are uncommon. (Similar observations have been made regarding the alternations of forms of the verb in complement clauses, in relation to the semantics of various governing verbs.²⁶)

- *The mrr=f*

The *mrr=f* contrasts with other forms of the verb after various prepositions, e.g., (i) *m irr=f* “as he does” (common) vs. *m ir=f* “when he does”;²⁷ (ii) *qr irr=f* “to the extent that he does, since he does” (causal; uncommon) vs. *qr ir.t=f* “since he has done” (temporal);²⁸ (iii) *r irr=f* vs. *r ir=f*, etc. (see above). The *mrr=f* after prepositions is thus seen to display a marked semantic profile—in all cases as marked as, or even more marked than, e.g., the subjunctive *sdm=f* in the same environments. (Similar comments extend to the *mrr=f* in complement clauses.²⁹) The subjunctive *sdm=f*, however, is demonstrably not a “nominal” form of the verb (above). The marked semantic profile of the *mrr=f* then speaks strongly against an analysis by which this form would be syntactically deranked, as a “nominal” form of the verb.

“Nominality” runs into contradiction in other domains of Earlier Egyptian grammar as well. For example, with regard to another form found in the “emphatic” construction and which has also been analyzed as “nominal,” the *sdm.n.t=f*:

- *N sdm.n.t=f*

In Middle Egyptian, the *sdm.n.t=f* is regularly used in the negative unaccomplished construction *n sdm.n.t=f*.³⁰ If the *sdm.n.t=f* is analyzed as a “nominal” form of the verb, the negative *n* in *n sdm.n.t=f* must be analyzed as being predicative somehow. Negative *n* is also found before the past tense *sdm=f*

24 E.g., (i) *passim*; (ii) *r m33 tw s pf* “so that this man will see you” (CT II, 102b var. mss.); (iii) *ir ʕ3 r ʕ3=f šr r šrr=f* “The great one shall be treated according to how he is great, the small one according to how he is small” (Berlin 1911, pl. 1, 3); (iv) *h3 d=tn p3 tt ʕ3 m ʕt hmt.ti r tw.t=n* “Would that you put this grain here in a sealed room until we have come back” (pWestcar 11, 15–16); (v) *wn=i m mnʕt hr 3ty n i nb tnqdw r ssnb.n.t=f* “I was a nurse and a caretaker for whoever came afflicted until he had been comforted” (Hatnub 16, 9–10). For the semantic contrast between (iv) and (v), which is subtle, Stauder 2014a, 338–39; against the perfective analysis of the *sdm.t=f* more generally, Stauder 2014a, 69.

25 Stauder-Porchet 2009, 48–50; this volume.

26 Uljas 2007a.

27 E.g., *irr hm=k m mrr=f* “Your Majesty acts only as he wishes” (Sin. B 263).

28 *ʕr qr mrr=ʔ lhy lw h3 n lhy n k3=ʔ* “To the extent that you love music, there is music a million times for your ka” (TPPI § 15, 11); *tnk 3w nmtwt qr mrr=f* “I am one who strides to the limit of my desire” (CT III, 303h G1T, A1C, T3L; T3C {r} qr mrr=s—this example courtesy of Wolfgang Schenkel).

29 Uljas 2007a; Borghouts 1989.

30 For the rise of *n sdm.n.t=f*, Stauder 2014b, 304–308.

(*n sdm=f*). Since the past tense *sdm=f* cannot be analyzed as “nominal,”³¹ the negative *n* is clearly a negative operator in the negative past tense *n sdm=f*. Unless the negative *n* in the constructions *n sdm.n.t=f* and *n sdm=f* is split into two morphemes with altogether different syntactic properties, one predicative, the other a negative operator, the “nominal” analysis of the *sdm.n.t=f* runs into contradiction.³² Put differently, the construction *n sdm.n.t=f* directly demonstrates that the *sdm.n.t=f* is not a “nominal” form of the verb.

As a result of the above discussion, the *mrr=f* and the *sdm.n.t=f* cannot be analyzed as “nominal” forms of the verb. It follows that the syntax of the “emphatic” construction does not involve a predicative nexus between a nominalized clause (the verb, its subject, and its complements) and a broadly adverbial expression. Syntactically, the “emphatic” construction cannot be analyzed as a biclausal, or cleft-like, structure. Finally, the syntax of the “emphatic” construction does not simply mirror the articulation of information structure, however this is to be described (further, § 4.3).

2 The hypothesis of a morphological marking on the verb with all types of events, or of symmetrical paradigms

2.1 A symmetrical paradigm?

It has been proposed, and is often assumed, that the “emphatic” and related constructions (the “setting” and the “balanced” constructions) would involve a morphological marking on the verb with all types of events. Under this hypothesis, the forms used in the “emphatic” and related constructions would contrast with the forms used, for example, after *iw* across the board: the paradigm would be symmetrical.³³ While no contrast is readily identified in the written forms of the active *sdm.n=f* of transitive events and of various types of intransitive ones (such as e.g., *mdw* “speak”), it is hypothesized that a contrast existed in the underlying form, on levels such as syllable structure and/or vocalization. The hypothesis is based on the observation that morphological contrasts are observed in several parts of the overall paradigm and that the Egyptian writing system in general represents contrasts in verbal morphology only imperfectly. Thus, for classical Middle Egyptian (from the Twelfth Dynasty on), (a) non-subject-affecting actives (transitives, and intransitives such as *mdw* “speak”); (b) subject-affecting actives (such as *twi* “come”); (c) passives):³⁴

Written forms

	Unaccomplished	Accomplished
(a)	<i>N(P) mr=f : mrr=f</i>	← <i>sdm.n=f</i> →
(b)	<i>N(P) ii=f : iw=f</i>	<i>NP PsP : ii.n=f</i>
(c)	<i>mr.t=f : mrr.t=f</i>	<i>P PsP ~ V-pass non-P : sdm.n.t=f</i>

31 E.g., Doret 1986, 24–27.

32 Problem seen by Polotsky 1957, 116.

33 Explicitly, and with question marks only for the prospective, e.g., Schenkel 2012a, 191–208, 224–29 (among many others).

34 Here and in the following, “P” stands for pronominal subjects, “N” for full noun subjects, “NP” for pronominal and full noun subjects (indifferently); “non-P” for non-pronominal subjects (full noun subjects, clausal subjects, zero subjects, and subjectless constructions; for the distinction between zero-subject and subjectless constructions, which is crucial in the passive, Stauder 2014a, 140–48, 158–78). The tilde “~” (in the accomplished passive) stands for “complementary distribution,” here according to the nature of the subject. “V-pass” stands for “V-passive” (improperly “*sdm(w)*-passive”) and “PsP” for “pseudoparticiple”; the “*sdm.n=f_A*” and the “*sdm.n=f_B*” are the two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f* that are posited under hypotheses of a symmetrical paradigm. The prospective is left out of the table; see below, § 2.3.

The hypothesis of a symmetrical paradigm

(a)	$N(P) mr=f$:	$mrr=f$		$s\dot{d}m.n=f_A$:	$s\dot{d}m.n=f_B$
(b)	$N(P) ii=f$:	$iww=f$		$NP PsP$:	$ii.n=f^{1)}$
(c)	$mr.t=f$:	$mrr.t=f$		$P PsP \sim V\text{-pass non-}P$:	$s\dot{d}m.n.t=f^{2)}$

1) a $s\dot{d}m.n=f_B$ of iwi 2) a T-passive of a $s\dot{d}m.n=f_B$

The argument comes with one very major presupposition, namely that morphological contrasts associated with the “emphatic” and related constructions are uniform regardless of tense-aspect (inference from the unaccomplished to the accomplished), of voice (in the accomplished, inference from the passive (c) to the active (a)), and of event semantics (in the accomplished active, inference from subject-affecting events (b) to non-subject-affecting ones (c)). This is a presupposition: for the overall argument to be valid, the validity of the presupposition on which it is based has to be independently demonstrated first.

A possible morphological connection of the forms of the verb used in the “emphatic” construction with “relative forms” has been evoked in this respect (the “abstract-relative hypothesis”);³⁵ as already noted, the morphological connection is real, but inconsequential as to the nature of the forms used in the “emphatic” construction (§ 1.1). Until relevant contrasts are directly observed in written forms (see discussion below, § 2.2), the basic presupposition on which the hypothesis of a symmetrical paradigm relies is not independently demonstrated.

2.2 Written forms of the $s\dot{d}m.n=f$

Reflecting this situation, possible indications of different forms of the $s\dot{d}m.n=f$ have been sought in written forms.³⁶ Based on detailed data from the Coffin Texts, Schenkel proposed that the alternations between short and long written stems of $II.red$ (<ABn> ~ <ABBn>) would provide evidence in support of the existence of two forms of the $s\dot{d}m.n=f$ distinguished by the position of stress. The form found notably in the “emphatic” construction (the “abstract-relative” $s\dot{d}m.n=f$ in the author’s terminology) would have been stressed between the penultimate and the last root consonants ($C\tilde{C}vCn\tilde{-}$); the form found notably after iw (the “predicative” $s\dot{d}m.n=f$ in the author’s terminology) would have been stressed after the last root consonant ($C\tilde{C}Cv\tilde{n-}$).³⁷

35 Lastly, e.g., Schenkel 2012a, 191; 2009a; with references to Polotsky’s earlier formulations of the same hypothesis.

36 Prior to Schenkel’s study (discussed below in the main text), it had been observed that a few early Middle Egyptian texts (“petit nombre”) make a distinction between a written form $r\dot{d}.n=f$ in “nominal” environments and a written form $\dot{d}.n=f$ in “circumstantial” ones (Polotsky 1976, 23, n. 40). However, in most early Middle Egyptian texts, and in all texts from various other periods, the two written forms $r\dot{d}.n=f$ and $\dot{d}.n=f$ are observed to freely alternate. Furthermore, the alternation between stems of $r\dot{d}i$ with and without $r-$ seem to be at least in part conditioned by prosodic factors such as clause-initiality or the combination with negative n (Stauder 2014e, 254, n. 4). It had also been observed that in three instances in Old Kingdom private inscriptions, the written form of the $s\dot{d}m.n=f$ of lri in the “emphatic” construction comes with an additional read leaf (Doret 1986, 69, nn. 743–44; 152, n.1 802). However, < $l r-$ > is more generally a possible spelling for the stem $l r-$ found in various morphological categories, such as the prospective V-passive or the unmarked (“perfective”) passive participle in the Old Kingdom; that this rare spelling of the stem of the $l r.n=f$ does not occur after iw is for epigraphic reasons (Stauder 2014e, 254, n. 4). These written forms of the $s\dot{d}m.n=f$ of $r\dot{d}i$ and lri are therefore inconsequential as to whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the $s\dot{d}m.n=f$ or not (contra Satzinger 2014, 306).

37 Schenkel 2009a; further discussion, Schenkel 2006, 61–67; 2012, 192–97. Critically, already Depuydt 2008a, 116–18; Uljas 2010: 253–61.

The existence of a form of the *sdm.n=f* morphologically realized as C~C'vCn~ is independently established by cuneiform evidence;³⁸ being uncontroversial, this form is here labeled a *sdm.n=f_x* for the purpose of the argument. Schenkel's proposal therefore amounts to suggesting that the form of the *sdm.n=f* used, for example, after *iw* was different from this *sdm.n=f_x*; this hypothesized *sdm.n=f* realized as C~CC'vn~ is here labeled a *sdm.n=f_y*. Schenkel's “split *sdm.n=f*” hypothesis and the alternative “unitary *sdm.n=f*” hypothesis can then be contrasted as follows:³⁹

	after <i>iw</i> , etc.	“emphatic” constr., etc.
“split <i>sdm.n=f</i> ” hyp.	<i>sdm.n=f_y</i>	<i>sdm.n=f_x</i>
“unitary <i>sdm.n=f</i> ” hyp.	<i>sdm.n=f_x</i>	<i>sdm.n=f_x</i>

As discussed in detail elsewhere, the alternations of written forms of *II.red* in the Coffin Texts turn out to be equally consistent with the “split *sdm.n=f*” and the “unitary *sdm.n=f*” hypotheses.⁴⁰ Similar comments extend to written forms of the *ult.-n* (*non-II.red*)⁴¹ and to written forms of *wnn*, which afford a special case.⁴² The Coffin Text data adduced in support of the “split *sdm.n=f* hypothesis” thereby turn out to be inherently neutral as to whether Earlier Egyptian had one or two forms of the *sdm.n=f* distinguished by the position of stress. The hypothesis is at this stage not directly disproved, but it has lost the empirical grounds on which it was submitted.

Pursuing the study of written forms of the *sdm.n=f*, the case of *2rad* in the Pyramid Texts is of interest.⁴³ Under Schenkel's “split *sdm.n=f*” hypothesis, Earlier Egyptian would have had a *sdm.n=f_y*, that is, a form of the *sdm.n=f* stressed after the last root consonant (ʔC~CC'v-n~). One Earlier Egyptian inflectional category of the verb was stressed in just this way, after the last root consonant, namely the subjunctive *sdm=f*(C~CCá-). When accommodated onto *2rad*, this inflectional pattern resulted in an initial consonantal cluster (**CCá-), which could be solved by adding an initial vocalic segment to the form (*ʔCCá-). In the Pyramid Texts, a corpus in which written morphology is more explicit than in any other one, this initial vocalic segment is commonly represented by the written mark <*i*> (e.g., *i.ʕm=f*). If Earlier Egyptian had a *sdm.n=f_y*, the inflectional pattern of this form (ʔC~CC'v-n~) would have been subject to similar morphophonological phenomena when accommodated onto *2rad* (ʔ**CC'vn~ → ʔ*ʔCC'vn~-). The “split

38 E.g., Zeidler 1992, 214–15; Osing 1987, 356–57; Gundacker 2011, 59, n. 185.

39 As the reader will have noticed, the hypothesized *sdm.n=f_y* corresponds to the *sdm.n=f_A* in the previous table (§ 2.1). This is because the two representations operate on different levels. In the table in § 2.1, functional markedness is represented: under the hypothesis of two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*, the one used notably in the “emphatic” construction would have been the functionally more marked form, hence the label “*sdm.n=f_B*.” In the present section, *hypotheses* on morphological distinctiveness are considered: given the Cuneiform *Nebenüberlieferung*, the existence of a *sdm.n=f_x* is secure; the hypothesis bears on the possible existence of the other form, thus labeled a “*sdm.n=f_y*.” With reference to § 2.1, the question is therefore whether there existed a *sdm.n=f_A* (/a *sdm.n=f_y*) distinct from a *sdm.n=f_B* (/a *sdm.n=f_x*), not the reverse. One logical implication is that demonstrating the existence of a *sdm.n=f_x* (which is a foregone conclusion) does not amount to demonstrating the “split *sdm.n=f*” hypothesis (Stauder 2014c, 85–86).

40 A variety of issues are at stake (the full mapping out of the implications of the two competing hypotheses; the interpretation of individual written forms; the textual history of individual places in the Coffin Texts; the assignment of individual verbs to inflectional classes; see Stauder 2014c; 2014d, 196–204). In the Pyramid Texts, written forms of *II.red* are similarly inconsequential for the issue at stake (Stauder 2014e, 255). Outside funerary corpora, written forms of *II.red* in Eighteenth Dynasty texts may at first seem to support the “unitary *sdm.n=f* hypothesis,” yet remain associated with interpretive uncertainties on too many levels for any reliable conclusion to be derived (Stauder 2014c, 94–96).

41 Stauder 2014d, 205–207.

42 Stauder 2014d, 207–209.

43 Stauder 2014e, 262–71.

sdm.n=f” therefore entails that in relevant environments (“predicative” ones in Schenkel’s terminology) written forms of the *sdm.n=f* of *2rad* should in the Pyramid Texts display the same written mark <*i*> with some regularity, as they do in the subjunctive of *2rad*. They never do.⁴⁴ This demonstrates that *2rad* did not have the *sdm.n=f_Y* hypothesized by Schenkel. Based on further considerations bearing on the parameters and conditions of uniform and non-uniform inflection in Earlier Egyptian verbal morphology, the result generalizes to other inflectional classes.⁴⁵

The argument disproves the “split *sdm.n=f*” hypothesis that Earlier Egyptian had two forms of the *sdm.n=f* distinguished by the position of stress. Put differently, the Earlier Egyptian *sdm.n=f* was in all cases of the *sdm.n=f_X* type (C~C’vCn~–).⁴⁶ In strictly logical terms, this still leaves the possibility that Earlier Egyptian may have had two *sdm.n=f_X*’s, distinguished by vowel color (thus a *sdm.n=f_{Xa}* and a *sdm.n=f_{Xb}*, hypothetically distinct). Whether this was actually the case is highly uncertain: there is no evidence in support of the existence of two *sdm.n=f_X*’s in written forms (this subsection), nor on any other level (the preceding one).

2.3 Future events in “emphatic” contexts

With future tense, the prospective *sdm=f* (*lirw=f*) is used in “emphatic” contexts and in non-“emphatic” ones alike.⁴⁷ Despite thorough empirical studies, no distinction has ever been found in written form between various forms of the prospective active,⁴⁸ nor of the prospective passive.⁴⁹ Moreover, the written forms of the prospective suggest a reconstruction with a specific syllable structure, both in the active and in the passive.⁵⁰ Unless two forms of the prospective active, distinguished only by vowel color, are posited only to keep the paradigm symmetrical, “emphatic” contexts did not involve a morphological marking on the verb with future events, either in the active or in the passive. This illustrates that “emphatic” contexts need not be marked morphologically on the verb.

2.4 Accomplished passive events in “emphatic” contexts

In the accomplished passive, major changes occur during the history of Earlier Egyptian (further below, § 3.4–7). The table given above (§ 2.1), with the *sdm.n.t=f* regularly used in the “emphatic” construction, only concerns classical Middle Egyptian, from the Twelfth Dynasty on. The *sdm.n.t=f* is already documented in the Pyramid Texts, but occurrences are limited to a mere four in the overall pre-Coffin Text record.⁵¹ In earlier times—in the Pyramid Texts and in Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period

44 Stauder 2014e, 262–67, with the full data and additional considerations on the representativeness of these.

45 Stauder 2014e, 267–70.

46 Incidentally, the argument also disproves Kruchten’s proposal to interpret the differential obsolescence of the *sdm.n=f* in the Eighteenth Dynasty record—first in environments such as after *lw*, only later in environments such as the “emphatic” construction—as indicative of two differently stressed forms of the *sdm.n=f* (Kruchten 1999, 6–22). The above further demonstrates that the differential obsolescence of the *sdm.n=f*—Kruchten’s primary observations in the record remain robust—must be interpreted in constructional terms, that is, in relation to broader changes occurring in the language at the time (for a most provisional sketch, Stauder 2013, 15–16).

47 This situation gradually changed only when *NP r sdm* lost its originally highly specific semantics to develop into a regular expression of the future, during the Middle Kingdom. With main clauses not dependent on a preceding clause, this led to the rise of a secondary contrast between *NP r sdm* (in non-“emphatic” contexts) and the prospective (in “emphatic” ones). It is this secondary contrast, from later Middle Egyptian on, that may have formed the basis for older accounts of the prospective *sdm=f* (*lirw=f*) as an “emphatic,” or “nominal,” form of the verb.

48 Schenkel 2000a (summary: Schenkel 2012a, 203–208); Allen 1984, § 364–99.

49 Schenkel 2004–2005a (summary: Schenkel 2012a, 226–29); Allen 1984, § 486–562.

50 Schenkel 2000a, 59–60; 2005a, 52–53.

51 Stauder 2014a, 259–60.

inscriptions—the perfective V-passive⁵² is the form regularly used in “emphatic” contexts; the *sdm.n.t=f* can be seen to spread in Coffin Texts corpus and has superseded the perfective V-passive by the Twelfth Dynasty.⁵³ In a detailed study of the written morphology of the perfective V-passive, it was observed that the written forms in “emphatic” and non-“emphatic” contexts are exactly the same.⁵⁴ Unless two morphologically distinct forms of the perfective V-passive, distinguished by vowel color, are posited just to keep the paradigm symmetrical, “emphatic” contexts in the accomplished passive did in general not involve a specific morphological marking on the verb in Old and earlier Middle Egyptian.

As in the case of the active *sdm.n=f* and of the active and passive prospective *sdm=f* (*lirw=f*) (§ 2.2 and § 2.3), there is no evidence in support of two morphologically distinct forms of the perfective V-passive. In the present case, additional considerations speak directly against two morphologically distinct forms of the perfective V-passive. In early funerary literature (Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts), the perfective and the prospective V-passive are morphologically distinct from one another.⁵⁵ Should morphologically distinct forms of the V-passive in “emphatic” and in non-“emphatic” contexts be posited, this would result in no less than four morphologically distinct forms of the V-passive. Appreciating the likelihood of this option is left to the reader. Another observation is decisive. Throughout Old and Middle Egyptian, the accomplished passive in non-“emphatic” contexts is expressed by the pseudoparticiple with pronominal subjects in complementary distribution to the perfective V-passive with non-pronominal subjects (*P PsP* ~ *V-pass non-P*).⁵⁶ With a pronominal subject, the perfective V-passive (*V-pass P*), used notably in “emphatic” contexts, thereby contrasts with *P PsP*, used notably after *iw*. With non-pronominal subjects, no similar contrast is observed, since the perfective V-passive is used in all contexts alike. As it turns out, the very few pre-Coffin Text instances of the *sdm.n.t=f* are all with non-pronominal subjects: three are with full noun subjects while the fourth is in a subjectless construction.⁵⁷ Thus:

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| I. Pyramid Texts, Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period Inscriptions | | |
| non-“emph.”: | <i>P PsP</i> | <i>V-pass non-P</i> |
| “emph.”: | <i>V-pass P</i> | <i>V-pass non-P</i> |
| | | (/incipiently <i>sdm.n.t non-P</i>) |
| II. Coffin Texts | | |
| non-“emph.”: | <i>P PsP</i> | <i>V-pass non-P</i> |
| “emph.”: | <i>V-pass P</i> / <i>sdm.n.t P</i> | <i>V-pass non-P</i> / <i>sdm.n.t non-P</i> |
| III. Twelfth Dynasty inscriptional texts and Middle Egyptian literature | | |
| non-“emph.”: | <i>P PsP</i> | <i>V-pass non-P</i> |
| “emph.”: | <i>sdm.n.t P</i> | <i>sdm.n.t non-P</i> |
| | | (<i>V-pass</i> restricted to phraseologically bound formulations) |

52 On this label, § 3.4, § 3.8.A.

53 For the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* over the perfective V-passive in “emphatic” contexts in the record, Stauder 2014a, 250–63.

54 Schenkel 2004–2005a; also Stauder 2014a, 38–44.

55 Allen 1984, § 531-37; Schenkel 2004–2005a; Stauder 2014a: 21–44.

56 Stauder 2014a, 235–50.

57 (i) *ms.n.t N pn hr ls 3h̄t̄l̄ is* “This N was born like Horus, like the One-of-the-Horizon” (Pyr. 934b PAnMN; PT 473); (ii) *nd.n.t n(=l) i3̄t̄ nt hq̄3̄ wh̄3̄t̄ [...]* *w m hwn̄ i(3̄)z m̄d̄h̄ m hr-lb wrw špss.k hr hm=f r h̄prw m-h̄3̄t̄(=l)* “I was named to the office of Governor of the Oasis [(while still)...] a youth who tied the girdle amongst the great ones, because I was more august with His Majesty than who came into being before me” (Osing et al. 1982, pl. 60, 8–9); (iii) (...) *mr ntt ir.n.t ls zš pn h̄ft̄ d̄d wsr pn [im]* (...) “(...) to the effect that it is according to the words of this User that this piece of writing was made there (...)” (Berlin 1911, pl. 1, 5); (iv) Pyr. 179a WNNt (PT 219), quoted below, § 3.6, (9a).

In “emphatic” contexts, the *sdm.n.t=f* thus developed first in environments in which the perfective V-passive did not contrast formally with the pseudoparticiple (I); the earliest instances with a pronominal subject are found only later, in the Coffin Texts (II). The pattern of the early spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in “emphatic” contexts is best interpreted as pointing to a lack of distinctiveness of verbal morphology in accomplished passive “emphatic” contexts with non-pronominal subjects. This implies the morphological unity of the perfective V-passive.

This morphological unity of the perfective V-passive in turn makes it highly unlikely that the prospective V-passive should have consisted of two forms.

2.5 “Emphatic” contexts without morphological marking on the verb

As a result of the above, “emphatic” contexts did not involve a morphological marking on the verb with the following types of events:

- *The accomplished passive in Old Egyptian and earlier Middle Egyptian*
In the accomplished passive, the perfective V-passive—a single inflected form (§ 2.4)—was regularly used in non-“emphatic” and in “emphatic” contexts alike throughout Old and earlier Middle Egyptian. With non-pronominal subjects, “emphatic” contexts were therefore in most cases non-distinct from non-“emphatic” ones as far as verbal morphology is concerned. Explicit marking by the *sdm.n.t non-P* remained marginal in all pre-Coffin Text contexts.
- *The future passive in early funerary corpora*
In those earlier parts of the record in which the prospective passive was a productive category (Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts), this—a single inflected form (§ 2.4 *fine*)—was used in “emphatic” and non-“emphatic” contexts alike.
- *The future (active and passive)*
There are no empirical grounds in written morphology for distinguishing two forms of the prospective active *sdm=f (lirw=f)* (§ 2.3). In view of the above cases of non-distinctiveness in the passive (§ 2.1), there cannot be any systematic grounds for positing such a distinction either. In all likelihood, the prospective active *sdm=f (lirw=f)* was therefore a single inflected form. The same comment extends to the prospective T-passive (*lirw.t=f*), the diachronic successor of the prospective V-passive. With future events, both in the active and in the passive, the same form was in all likelihood used in “emphatic” and non-“emphatic” environments well into the Middle Kingdom.
- *The accomplished active with non-subject-affecting events*
Should Earlier Egyptian have had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*, these could have differed only by vowel color, demonstrably not by the position of stress (§ 2.2). There are no empirical reasons that there should have been any distinction at all, nor can there be systematic ones in view of the above (also § 2.1). In the accomplished active with transitive events and non-subject-affecting intransitive ones (such as *mdw* “speak”), the same form was with high likelihood used in “emphatic” and non-“emphatic” contexts alike. (Observing strict method, this must still be phrased in terms of “high likelihood” only at this stage; a direct demonstration of the unity of the *sdm.n=f* is possible but requires additional considerations of an altogether different nature: see § 3.3 *fine*.)

In short, “emphatic” contexts were associated with a morphological marking on the verb with certain types of events only, not with all.

PART II. AN ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

3. Morphological contrasts associated with the accomplished “emphatic” construction

3.1 The nature of morphological contrasts in the “emphatic” construction

A closer consideration of the nature of the morphological contrasts associated with the “emphatic” and related constructions is instructive. Beginning with the classical Middle Egyptian paradigm as established from the Twelfth Dynasty on—(x) unaccomplished; (y) accomplished; (y´) non subject-affecting actives (transitives, and non-subject-affecting intransitives such as *mdw* “speak”), (y´´) subject-affecting actives (such as *iwi* “come”); (y´´´) passives:

	after <i>iw</i> , etc.	“emph.,” etc.
	P non-P	
(x)	<i>N(P) mr=f</i>	<i>mrr=f</i>
(y´)	←————— <i>sdm.n=f</i> ^(s?) —————→	
(y´´)	<i>NP PsP</i>	<i>ii.n=f</i>
(y´´´)	<i>P PsP ~ V-pass non-P</i>	<i>sdm.n.t=f</i>

If Earlier Egyptian had a single form of the *sdm.n=f* (as has been shown to be likely in the preceding section), the paradigm reads as representing directly the morphological contrasts present in the language. Should Earlier Egyptian have had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*, the same paradigm reads, quite literally, as representing those contrasts that are visible in writing. The observation is then that the two hypothesized forms of the *sdm.n=f* would be instantiations of the same higher-order inflectional category, an accomplished tense marked notably by an inflectional suffix *-n-*. (A *sdm.n=f*_A and a *sdm.n=f*_B would both be *sdm.n=f*’s.⁵⁸) The contrasts visible in writing, on the other hand, are the ones that involve two, or three, unrelated morphological categories: in the accomplished with subject-affecting intransitives (y´´), (a form of the) *sdm.n=f* and the pseudoparticiple; in the accomplished passive (y´´´), the T-passive (of a form) of the *sdm.n=f*, the perfective V-passive, and the pseudoparticiple; in the unaccomplished (x), a form of the *sdm=f* based on a short stem (*mr-*) and one based on the long stem (*mrr-*). Regardless of whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*, therefore, a mere reading of the above paradigm leads to the following simple, yet consequential, observations:

- *Aspect as a parameter*
The unaccomplished paradigm can be stated in only one line (x); stating the accomplished paradigm requires three lines (y´)–(y´´´). Regardless of whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sdm.n=f*, aspect is therefore a parameter in analyzing the Earlier Egyptian “emphatic” construction.
- *Voice as a parameter*
In the accomplished, three morphological categories are involved in the passive (y´´´), while there are only two in the active with subject-affecting intransitives (y´´), and only one (or perhaps two) with non-subject-affecting events (y´). Regardless of whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct

58 More precisely still, both would be *sdm.n=f*’s, only distinguished by vowel color, if at all (§ 2.2); this precision is not logically required for the following argument.

forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, voice is therefore a parameter in analyzing the Earlier Egyptian “emphatic” construction.

- *Subject affectedness as a parameter*

In the accomplished active, the contrast is between two unrelated morphological categories with subject-affecting events, the pseudoparticiple and (a form of) the *sḏm.n=f* (*y''*). With non-subject-affecting events, there is no contrast at all, or a contrast between two instantiations of the same morphological category (*y'*). Regardless of whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, subject affectedness is therefore a parameter in analyzing the Earlier Egyptian “emphatic” construction.

In targeting the nature of morphological contrasts, the above observations are logically independent of whether Earlier Egyptian had two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f* or not: either way, aspect, voice, and subject affectedness—more broadly, therefore, event semantics—are relevant parameters in analyzing the morphology (and semantics: § 4.3, below) of the Earlier Egyptian “emphatic” and related constructions.

As just noted, the classical Middle Egyptian paradigm, from the Twelfth Dynasty on, is asymmetrical in terms of the nature of the morphological contrasts involved. The asymmetry is yet stronger in Old Egyptian and early Middle Egyptian (on the boldfacing of the pseudoparticiple, below; on the morphological unity of the perfective V-passive, § 2.4):

	after <i>tw</i> , etc.		“emph.,” etc.
	P	non-P	P non-P
(<i>y'</i>)	←————— <i>sḏm.n=f</i> ^(‘s?) —————→		
(<i>y''</i>)	←— <i>NP PsP</i> →		←— <i>ii.n=f</i> →
(<i>y'''</i>)	<i>P PsP</i>	←————— <i>V-pass</i> —————→	(<i>/sḏm.n.t non-P</i>)

Regarding the accomplished specifically, one additional observation can be made for both the earlier and the later paradigms. Whenever in the accomplished the contrast is between two unrelated morphological categories—or, equivalently, whenever a contrast is visible in written forms (see above)—one of the forms is the pseudoparticiple (*y''*)–(*y'''*). Although this observations concerns the later paradigm as well, it is even more directly apparent in the earlier one. The analysis may thus begin with the pseudoparticiple.

3.2 Background: a very short note on the semantics of the pseudoparticiple

The Earlier Egyptian pseudoparticiple has non-dynamic uses as well as dynamic ones. More precisely, the pseudoparticiple can express (a) a primary state (that is, a non-dynamic event that does not imply some previous dynamic event), (b) a secondary state (that is, a non-dynamic event that implies some previous dynamic event from which it results), and (c) a dynamic event implying some resulting state affecting the subject.⁵⁹ The use of the pseudoparticiple with dynamic events (c) represents a secondary development, already almost entirely completed in the earliest attested historical periods.⁶⁰ When the pseudoparticiple

59 In more detail, Stauder 2014a, 280–81.

60 Stauder 2014a, 110–12 (with a discussion of contrary opinions). This analysis is based on typological evidence, comparison with cognate categories in Afroasiatic (notably the Akkadian stative), and early occurrences of *V-pass P* in environments in which the pseudoparticiple has by and large generalized in historical times (for the last specifically, Stauder 2014a, 246–48).

spread beyond its original domain of use, the expression of non-dynamic events (a)-(b) to dynamic ones (c), it did so with all types of subjects for subject-affecting intransitives such as *lwi* “come,” but only with pronominal subjects in the passive.⁶¹ This results in a paradigm in which the pseudoparticiple stands in complementary distribution to the perfective V-passive according to the nature of the subject:⁶²

Dynamic uses of the pseudoparticiple (non-negative)

Subject-affecting intr. (e.g., <i>lwi</i>):	←————— NP PsP —————→
Passive:	P PsP ~ V-pass non-P

When expressing a dynamic event (c), the pseudoparticiple displays certain semantic properties and its use is subject to certain semantic constraints. The following are directly relevant to the present discussion:⁶³

- *Rarity of direct negation*

The pseudoparticiple is only rarely directly negated in Old and Middle Egyptian (*n NP PsP* is highly uncommon⁶⁴). (This restriction extends to non-dynamic uses of the pseudoparticiple (a)-(b).)

- *Telicity of the event and subject affectedness*

The pseudoparticiple typically requires the event to be telic (that is, to have a semantic representation that includes a salient culminating point by which the event ends). When used with otherwise atelic events, the pseudoparticiple triggers a telic interpretation of these. By the same token, the subject of the pseudoparticiple is typically affected by the event. The subject of the pseudoparticiple is therefore typically highly individuated with respect to that event. (The same constraints, or properties, extend to uses of the pseudoparticiple expressing a secondary state (b).)

- *Aspect*

When expressing a dynamic event, the pseudoparticiple strongly highlights the Endpoint of the event, the culminating point by which this ends and results in some implied state affecting the subject. (This property is of course directly related to the preceding one.) In this, the pseudoparticiple does not express a mere accomplished, but has perfective aspect.⁶⁵

These semantic properties and constraints are typical of resultative semantics, individually and in their correlation. Semantically, the pseudoparticiple can thus be described as a resultative category.⁶⁶

The active-transitive uses of the pseudoparticiple with events other than the lexical statives *rh* “know” and *hm* “know not” do not represent traces of an earlier stage of the language in which dynamic uses with non-subject-affecting active transitive events would have been regular, but extended (and in this sense innovative) uses of the pseudoparticiple made possible by the resultative semantics of the form (Stauder 2014a, 112–19).

61 This asymmetry in the paradigm has to do with the non-canonical nature of passive subjects (Stauder 2014a, 248–50), a phenomenon that also finds other reflections in Earlier Egyptian grammar (Stauder 2014a, 224–26, 343–44). In early texts, the spread of the pseudoparticiple to accomplished passive events with pronominal subjects is not yet fully completed: *V-pass P* is still occasionally encountered in environments in which *P PsP* is otherwise regular (Stauder 2014a, 246–48).

62 Stauder 2014a, 235–50.

63 In more detail, Stauder 2014a, 281–87.

64 Occurrences: Stauder 2014a, 287, nn. 122–23.

65 Using a stronger definition of “perfective” aspect than the one in Winand 2006a, where perfective aspect, as a general semantic category, essentially corresponds to the “accomplished,” as the particular instantiation of the general semantic category in Earlier Egyptian.

66 For resultative semantics and a cross-linguistic survey of resultative forms and constructions, Nedjalkov 1988. A general characterization of the pseudoparticiple as resultative is not new, see e.g., Winand 2006a, 226–34; Hannig 1991; Vernus 1984a

3.3 The accomplished “emphatic” construction prior to the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f*

Turning to the accomplished “emphatic” construction, I first discuss the earlier situation, when the perfective V-passive was regularly used in the construction (the second table in § 3.1). The spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* is addressed in turn (§ 3.4–7). The two issues are separated for expository reasons; as already noted, early occurrences of the *sdm.n.t=f* are found as early as in the Old Kingdom (§ 3.1).

When expressing a dynamic event, the pseudoparticiple—a resultative category—presents the event from the perspective of its typically affected subject, itself associated with the salient Endpoint of the event (§ 3.2). The “emphatic” construction, for its part, serves to highlight some broadly adverbial expression, and thereby, typically, the circumstances under which the event unfolds, that is, aspects of the event itself. More generally, the “emphatic” construction is not a participant-oriented construction: in particular, the construction presents the event under a perspective that does not revolve primarily around a participant associated with the Endpoint of the event. With events in which the Endpoint would otherwise be salient, the “emphatic” construction thus moves the perspective away from the Endpoint. The pseudoparticiple is avoided in the “emphatic” construction because the resultative, strongly Endpoint-oriented semantics of the form would conflict with the event-oriented semantics of the “emphatic” construction. Just as in negative constructions—another type of construction in which the Endpoint is out of focus, here due to the negative polarity—a form other than the pseudoparticiple is used instead, to avoid the over-determined resultative semantics of the latter. With subject-affecting intransitive events in the active, recourse is made to a form of the *sdm.n=f*, in negative constructions and in the “emphatic” and related constructions alike.⁶⁷ With passive events, recourse is made to the perfective V-passive under similar conditions:

Subject-affecting intransitives

	non-negative	negative
non-“emph.,” etc.:	NP PsP	→ n <i>il.n=f</i>
	↓	
“emph.,” etc.:	<i>il.n=f</i>	n <i>il.n=f</i> <i>is</i>

Passives

	non-negative	negative
non-“emph.,” etc.:	P PsP ~ V-pass non-P	→ n V-Pass
	↓	
“emph.,” etc.:	V-Pass	n V-Pass <i>is</i>

(In an alternative but ultimately equivalent account, the situation in the passive specifically can be described in terms of the parameters of semantic transitivity.⁶⁸ Being a resultative category, the pseudoparticiple expressing an accomplished passive can be described as subject to the conditions of

and 1986a (with the label “accompli extensif”); similarly in substance already Gardiner 1957, § 320, and earlier authors. The definition of “resultativity” here adopted differs from the more inclusive definition of the same term in Winand 2006a, 182–84, 188, 202–203, 226–50; see Stauder 2014a, 279–80, n. 103.

67 Concerning the avoidance of the pseudoparticiple in the “emphatic” construction with events such as *twl* “come” specifically, observations leading in the same direction are by Allen 2014, 5–6; Winand 2007, § 3.

68 For semantic (as distinct from syntactic) transitivity, see the seminal paper by Hopper and Thompson 1980; further discussion e.g., Lazard 1998; Woods 2008, 55–62. For the issue under discussion, Stauder 2014a, 288–94. The notion of semantic transitivity finds a fruitful application in various other domains of Earlier Egyptian grammar as well, see Stauder 2014a, 112–14, 118–19, 202–204, 284–86, 289–90; Winand 2006a, 34–150; Winand 2000; Collier 1994, 67–72.

high semantic transitivity, most notably: (a) affectedness and individuation of the O argument, here the subject; (b) positive polarity; (c) perfective aspect, punctuality, and assertive modality (compare § 3.2). The perfective V-passive comes into use whenever the semantic transitivity of the event is reduced in one or several parameters, thus with non-pronominal subjects (deviation from (a)), in negative constructions (deviation from (b)), and in the “emphatic” and related constructions (deviation from (c)). The two accounts—in terms of deviations from Endpoint orientation and of deviations from high semantic transitivity—are largely similar because Endpoint orientation is itself a bundle of various parameters associated with high semantic transitivity.⁶⁹

Whenever in the accomplished a contrast in written form is visible, this involves the pseudoparticiple as one term of the contrast (§ 3.1 *fine*). As just discussed, these contrasts all have to do with the resultative, participant-oriented semantics of the pseudoparticiple (be these described in terms of Endpoint orientation or, alternatively, in terms of high semantic transitivity), and of how these conflict with the event-oriented semantics of the “emphatic” and related constructions. Unlike passive events and subject-affecting intransitive ones (such as *twl* “come”), non-subject-affecting active events (transitives and intransitive ones such as *mdw* “speak”) are not oriented on a participant associated with the Endpoint of the event. Accordingly, the Endpoint is not salient with the latter type of events, in any environments. In “emphatic” contexts, there is no issue, therefore, in moving the focus away from a non-salient Endpoint so as to express a more event-oriented perspective against a more participant-oriented one; similar comments extend to negative constructions. As a consequence, should Earlier Egyptian have had two morphologically distinct form of the *sḏm.n=f*, these would have had the exact same semantic profile. Syntax not being an issue here either (§ 1), the analysis demonstrates that “emphatic” and related contexts, like negative ones, did not involve a distinctive morphological marking on the verb with non-subject-affecting active events: the *sḏm.n=f* was a single inflected form.

3.4 V- and T-passives in contrast

In the classical Middle Egyptian paradigm from the Twelfth Dynasty on, the *sḏm.n.t=f* is regularly used in the “emphatic” and related constructions, contrasting with *P PsP* and *V-pass non-P* in environments such as after *tw* (the first table in § 3.1). This paradigm is the result of an historical process of spread by which T-passives gradually superseded the perfective V-passive in various other environments as well. In analyzing the classical Middle Egyptian paradigm, broader consideration on how V- and T-passives contrast with one another as two different types of inflectional passives are therefore relevant (this subsection). The spread of the *sḏm.n.t=f* is analyzed in turn as a historical process in the record, also taking account of the other environments in which T-passives superseded the perfective V-passive (§ 3.5–8.A).

Both V- and T-passives are inflectional passives, and both are found in the same passive construction, with the exact same properties and under the exact same conditions.⁷⁰ V- and T-passives differ from one another on a variety of other levels. Morphologically,⁷¹ the perfective V-passive is based on a stem of its own, not derivable from any other stem; related to this, V-passive morphology cannot be accommodated on any other inflectional stem (for example, V-passive morphology cannot be accommodated on the stems

69 The two accounts are not redundant because of their slightly different scope of application. The account in terms of Endpoint orientation permits the inclusion of subject-affecting events such as *twl*. The account in terms of high semantic transitivity permits inclusion of the complementary distribution *P PsP* ~ *V-pass non-P*.

70 Stauder 2014a, 127–29.

71 Fuller discussion: Stauder 2014a, 9–44, 309–10. Preliminary observations by Reintges 1997, ch. 5.

sdm.n- or *mrr-*). In contrast, T-passive morphology combines with any active stem (provided the event is passivizable); {t} is appended to the outer edge of the form (after any inflectional marks of tense-aspect-mood there may be, e.g., *mrr-* → *mrr.t-*; *sdm.n-* → *sdm.n.t-*). While perfective V-passive morphology synthesizes—simultaneously expresses—voice and aspect, T-passive morphology has singular exponence ({t} codes passive voice only) and is inherently neutral as to tense-aspect-mood (in T-passives, tense, aspect, and/or mood is expressed by the inflectional stem, including possible affixes, to which {t} is appended; e.g., *mrr.t=f* as *mrr-* + {t} + subject clitic; *irw.t=f* as *irw-*_(prospective) + {t}_(passive) + subject clitic; *sdm.n.t=f* as *sdm.n-*_(accomplished) + {t}_(passive) + subject clitic): unlike V-passives, T-passives are morphologically compositional. For the present purpose, the perfective V-passive cannot be reconciled morphologically to any active form, and the expressions of voice and aspect are synthesized with one another. By contrast, the *sdm.n.t=f* is, quite literally, a T-passive of the *sdm.n=f*, that is, a direct morphological pendant to the active *sdm.n=f*, only additionally marked by the tense-aspect neutral passive marker {t}. In short, the temporal-aspectual profile of the perfective V-passive is inherent to the passive nature of the form, unlike T-passives (among which the *sdm.n.t=f*), which are compositional.

The perfective V-passive is used in the paradigm of the accomplished, but its semantics go beyond a mere expression of the accomplished, as, for example, with the *sdm.n=f*. To begin with, the form is used in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticiple in environments such as after *iw* (1a-b) or *ḥḥ.n* (2a-b) or in dependent clauses of various sorts (3).⁷² This complementary distribution with the pseudoparticiple, a form inherently marked for resultative aspect, illustrates the strong Endpoint orientation of the perfective V-passive in these constructions. E.g.:

- [1] a *iw rd n=i ḥw* (...) (CT III, 26c)
Nourishment has been given to me (...)
- b *iw=f rd n=s* (...) (CT VI, 167a–b B4C)
He (*scil.* her opponent) has been given to her (...)
- [2] a *ḥḥ.n in n=f smn* (...) (pWestcar 8, 17–18)
Then a goose was brought to him (...)
- b *ḥḥ.n=f in* (...) (Peas. B2 135)
Then he was brought (...)
- [3] *ḥḥ.n ʕ3g.n[=f] ḥr [ʕ]t=f nbt im=s*
nḥm [ʕ3w]=f
sʕk [r sp3t=f] (Peas. R 11, 3–4)
Then he thrashed his every limb with it
and his donkeys were taken
and entered into his estate.

The Endpoint orientation of the perfective V-passive is also seen in the common sequence *sdm.n=f* – V-passive.⁷³ The sequence—always in this order, never in the reverse—runs from a mere expression of the accomplished (the active) to one that derives its closing force from its highlighting of the Endpoint of the event (the passive). E.g.:

72 Stauder 2014a, 235–50.

73 Stauder 2014a, 149–53.

- [4] *iw m3.n st hm=i nn m iw-ms h3k.n=i hmw=sn in.n=i hrw=sn*
pr r hnmwt=sn hww k3w=sn wh3 it=sn rd ht im (Sethe 1928b, 84, 8–11)

My Majesty has seen it—no untruth—I have captured their wives, I have brought their dependents;
 their wells have been gone to, their cattle have been stricken, their wheat has been pulled out, it has
 been set on fire.

That the semantics of the perfective V-passive go beyond a mere expression of the accomplished is also seen in uses of the form that support, or even invite, a resultative reading, both in narrative and in non-narrative contexts (Ex. 5a–b). These are possible by virtue of, and therefore reflect, the often Endpoint-oriented semantics of the form. The perfective V-passive can also be used for events yet to come, carrying strong assertive force (Ex. 6a–b).⁷⁴ The speaker thereby presents the event in such a way as to leave no room for it not to occur.⁷⁵ This is yet another effect made possible by the strong Endpoint orientation of the form. E.g.:

- [5] a *hrc.n sk3.n=i 3hwt nbt nt m3-hd r t3š=f rst mht*
s^cnh hrw=f ir sbw=f (Urk. VII, 16, 9–10)

Then I plowed all the fields of the Oryx-Nome up to its southern and northern boundary, *and* (/so that)
 its people were nourished and its food was made.

- b *spp s m-ht mnit rdw spw=f r-gs=f m hrcw* (Merikare E 55)

Whenever a man remains after mooring, his deeds *are put* (*scil.* have been put) to his side in a heap.

- [6] a *ir hm-k3 nb dt(=i) sn.t=f ht r sn-nw=f(...)*
nhm <m>-f 3ht rmt ht nb (...) (Urk. I, 13, 3–7)

As regards any funerary priest of my domain who will go to trial against his fellow (...),
 all fields, people, and things (...) *shall be taken* from him.

- b *ir ir.t=sn im hft ddt.n(=i) [...]*

iw ir hft mrrt=sn (Urk. I, 224, 4–6)

As regards those who will act on it according to what I have said [...],
there shall be acted according to what they wish.

The *sdm.n=f* is not used in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticipial with the same type of events.⁷⁶ Nor is the *sdm.n=f* ever used in contexts that invite or support resultative readings like the ones in (Ex. 5a–b). Nor is the *sdm.n=f* ever used for events yet to come (other than, of course, as a relative tense). Similar comments extend to the passive *sdm.n.t=f*: unlike the perfective V-passive, the *sdm.n.t=f* is not found in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticipial (compare Exx. 1–3); it is not used as the second, closing member of a sequence *active – passive* (compare Ex. 4); it is not used in environments that support or invite a resultative reading (compare Ex. 5); and it is not used for events yet to come (compare Ex. 6). In terms of its semantic profile, the *sdm.n.t=f* aligns with the *sdm.n=f*, against the perfective V-passive.

74 Stauder 2014a, 31–33.

75 As Ex. 6b illustrates, assertive force can be underscored further by *iw*: the construction is thus the only synthetic verb–subject construction with a future or modal reading to accommodate *iw* (neither the prospective, nor the subjunctive, nor the *mrr=f* can).

76 The *sdm.n=f* is used in contrast to the pseudoparticipial with the same type of events, e.g., with *lwl* “come,” NP PsP (for example after *lwl*) vs. *il.n=f* (for example in the “emphatic” construction). The *sdm.n=f* is used in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticipial with different events, e.g., NP PsP with *lwl* “come” (a subject-affecting intransitive) ~ *sdm.n=f* with *mdw* “speak” (a non-subject-affecting intransitive).

On the grounds given above, the form here termed a “perfective V-passive” (until this point a mere label) can be described as perfective in substance in the sense that it often presents the event under a perspective in which the Endpoint is salient.⁷⁷ The *sdm.n.t=f*, by contrast, is a mere expression of the accomplished—like the active *sdm.n=f*, to which it is a direct pendant not only morphologically but also semantically.⁷⁸

3.5 The spread of T-passives over the perfective V-passive

A. Environments

The spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the “emphatic” and related constructions is part of a broader process of linguistic change by which the perfective V-passive was gradually replaced by T-passives in various constructions from the Old Kingdom on and through the early Middle Kingdom.⁷⁹ Among these changes, one concerns innovative uses of the *sdm.n.t=f* itself in another environment, the negative unaccomplished (*n V-pass* → *n sdm.n.t=f*). The spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the “emphatic” and related constructions must be analyzed not in isolation but in this broader context of change.

In the relevant processes of change, T-passives are occasionally documented in the Old Kingdom already, but are then still uncommon relative to the perfective V-passive. Leaving individual details aside, T-passives become more common only in the Coffin Texts and generalize by the Twelfth Dynasty:⁸⁰

(a) Neg. accomplished: ⁸¹	<i>n V-pass</i>	→	<i>n sdm.t=f</i>
(b) Neg. unaccomplished: ⁸²	<i>n V-pass</i>	→	<i>n sdm.n.t=f</i>
(c) “Emph.” constr.:	<i>V-pass</i>	→	<i>sdm.n.t=f</i>

With a view to what makes the semantics of passive voice in the accomplished specific, and different from the active, these environments are related to one another. In expressing that the event did (/does) not occur, and thereby did (/does) not go to completion, negative constructions (a)–(b) de-emphasize the Endpoint otherwise salient in the passive. In the unaccomplished, and particularly in a construction that invites a habitual or general interpretation (b), the Endpoint, if any, is naturally marginalized even further. The “emphatic” construction, for its parts, is semantically an event-oriented construction, and thereby one that similarly de-emphasizes the Endpoint otherwise salient in the passive. In all three cases, therefore, T-passives superseded the perfective V-passive in environments in which the Endpoint is less in focus than is the case with a prototypical passive of the accomplished. (Here as well, a broadly similar account can be given in terms of semantic transitivity: T-passives spread over the perfective V-passives in those environments in which the event scores relatively lower in semantic transitivity.⁸³)

77 This is what justifies the label (further, § 3.8.A). The Endpoint is of course not always strongly in focus: it is not, for example, when the perfective V-passive is used in “emphatic” contexts in earlier periods (§ 3.3), and more generally when the form is used in other environments into which T-passives would later spread (§ 3.5–8.A).

78 How morphology and semantics here mirror one another can be thought of as an illustration of the principle of “diagrammatic iconicity in stem-inflection relationships,” for which see Bybee 1985, 11–12.

79 Beyond what concerns the present discussion, the spread of T-passives also includes the change by which the prospective V-passive (*irw=f*) was gradually superseded by a T-passive of the prospective (*irw.t=f*), a process well on its way in the Coffin Texts (Stauder 2014a, 26–31, 300–301).

80 For other, relatively more minor environments in which *sdm.n.t=f* spread over the perfective V-passive, Stauder 2014a 334–39.

81 Stauder 2014a, 301–304.

82 Stauder 2014a, 304–308.

83 Stauder 2014a, 314–15.

3.6 The spread of *T*-passives over the perfective *V*-passive

B. The role of subjectless passives in early stages of the process

As just discussed, the *sdm.n.t=f* spread over the perfective *V*-passive not only in the “emphatic” and related constructions, but also in the negative unaccomplished (*n V-pass* → *n sdm.n.t=f*). There are only a handful of Old Kingdom and First Intermediate period occurrences of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the construction *n sdm.n.t=f*. All are subjectless (that is, passives of events that are either intransitive (Ex. 7b) or used intransitively (Ex. 7a):

[7] a *dmḏ.n=f kw n ḥn.n.ti im=k* (Pyr. 617b TAnMNJp; PT 364)⁸⁴
He has put you together: there can be no disturbing on you.

b *n pr.n.t n snd=f* (Vandier 1950, 202, II.η.2)⁸⁵
There was no going out for fear of them (*scil.* of the troops).

At the same time, the perfective *V*-passive is always used in the negative unaccomplished for passives with pronominal, full noun, or clausal subjects;⁸⁶ it is never found with subjectless passives.

Subjectless passives are also over-represented among early occurrences of the past tense *sdm.t=f* in the negative accomplished (Ex. 8a; one of two Old Kingdom occurrences⁸⁷) and of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the “emphatic” construction (Ex. 9a; one of four pre-Coffin Text occurrences⁸⁸). At the same time, the *V*-passive is regularly used in both constructions with all types of subjects (Exx. 8b and 9b);⁸⁹ with only one exception, it is not found in subjectless constructions.⁹⁰

[8] a *n fh.ti n=k*
n i3b.t n=k (Pyr. 204b WNNt; PT 222)⁹¹
There has been no loss for you,
there has been no cessation for you.

[8] b (...) *ḡr-ntt n ḥpr mit(=i) nn sw r ḥpr*
n ms mit(=i) n ms[.t]=f (Vandier 1950, 185, II.α.2)⁹²
(...) for someone like me has not come into being, nor is he to come into being,
someone like me has not been born, nor will he be born.

[9] a *nwt z3=ḏ pw pw-nn ḡḏ.n=ḏ ir=f*
ms.n.t n(=i)
i.t ḡn (Pyr. 179a WNNt; PT 219)
Nut, this one here is your son of whom you have said:
“There was birth for me”
—so you said.

84 Sim. Pyr. 635b TPMNNt (PT 367); Pyr. 1610b MNNt (PT 590); possibly Pyr. 1831c N (PT 649), lacunous.

85 Sim. Vandier 1950, 203, II.θ.2.

86 Occurrences: Stauder 2014a, 304–305.

87 The other early occurrence is with a full noun subject, *n m3.ti ns* “the tongue has not been seen” (Pyr. 243b W; PT 239).

88 For the other three (with full noun subjects), § 2.4, n. 57.

89 Occurrences of *n V-pass* expressing the negative accomplished: Stauder 2014a, 301–302. Occurrences of the perfective *V*-passive in “emphatic” contexts: Stauder 2014a, 250–59.

90 Below, n. 94.

91 Sim. Pyr. 206b WNNt.

92 On this much discussed passage, Stauder 2013, 371, n. 140, with references to the discussion.

- b *iwr N n ḏḥmw ms N n ḏḥmw*
in ḏḥmw z n mwt=f im=f (Pyr. 693c–d T; PT 398)
 N was conceived to Djaamu, N was born to Djaamu,
 it is Djaamu who has gone to his mother with him.

Semantically, subjectless passives differ from prototypical passives, and particularly accomplished ones, because the event is not oriented on a subject, here lacking (by definition). Rather than on a participant associated with the Endpoint of the event, the perspective is then often set on the event itself, as can also be seen in thethetic readings subjectless passives not uncommonly invite.⁹³ Subjectless passives thereby often have the effect of de-emphasizing the Endpoint of the event. As noted in the preceding subsection, the *sdm.n.t=f*, more generally T-passives, spread over the perfective V-passive in constructions in which the Endpoint of the event is de-emphasized. In the early stages of process, subjectless passive—those passive in which the Endpoint is least in focus—played a distinguished role.⁹⁴

3.7 Two inflectional passives in the accomplished: the “emphatic” and related constructions

Earlier Egyptian is remarkable in having two inflectional passives in the accomplished, the perfective V-passive and the *sdm.n.t=f*, the second spreading over the first diachronically. As observed, the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* in the “emphatic” and related constructions is part of a broader process which also saw the same form spreading in the negative unaccomplished, and another T-passive spreading in the negative accomplished, in all three cases gradually displacing the perfective V-passive (§ 3.5). As also noted, the environments in which T-passives spread over the perfective V-passive have in common that they depart from the Endpoint orientation generally characteristic of accomplished passives. Significantly, subjectless passives are over-represented in early stages of the process (§ 3.6): rather than on a participant associated with the Endpoint of the event, subjectless passives often set the perspective on the event itself.

The passive views the event from the vantage point of the participant that is associated with the Endpoint of that event: a prototypical accomplished passive is perfective.⁹⁵ In Earlier Egyptian, the form here labeled a “perfective V-passive” is perfective in the sense that it often presents the event under a perspective in which the Endpoint is salient (§ 3.4). The *sdm.n.t=f*, by contrast, is a mere expression of the accomplished, like the active *sdm.n=f*, to which it is a direct pendant not only morphologically but also semantically (§ 3.4). In the “emphatic” and related constructions, the *sdm.n.t=f* serves to present the event as merely accomplished, under a perspective that de-emphasizes the Endpoint orientation and perfective aspect otherwise characteristic of accomplished passives. Against the earlier situation in which the perfective V-passive was regularly used in “emphatic” contexts (§ 3.3), the *sdm.n.t=f* spread to provide a distinctive expression to the fact that an accomplished event—even though passive—is merely

93 On the semantics of subjectless passives in Earlier Egyptian, Stauder 2014a, 158–78. Subjectless passives are not to be confused with zero-subject constructions of the passive, where the lack of an overt expression of the subject is a strategy of inter-clausal integration, possible under certain semantic conditions (Stauder 2014a, 140–8).

94 The only occurrence of a subjectless perfective V-passive in an “emphatic” context is itself significant as it concerns an event of directed motion, with the Goal of the motion (here the highly topical speaker himself) providing a salient Endpoint: (...) *gm.n(=i) w3st gbtw mi-qd=s[n ...]=sn lthw twn m sg3 smh=sn spr r(=i) r=s* “(...) and I found that Thebes and Coptos in their entirety had [...] the strongholds of Ermant in the hills of Semekhshen. It was about this that one had reached out to me” (Vandier 1950, 198, II.e.2-3). Across constructions, contrast with, e.g., (3b), also with an event of motion but with no Goal expressed (*n pr.n.t n snd=f* “There was no going out for fear of them (*scil.* of the troops)”) (Vandier 1950, 202, II.η.2).

95 E.g., Comrie 1982; Woods 2008, 66–68, 285–89; Stauder 2014a, 310–11.

accomplished. It did so in the “emphatic” and related constructions like it did in the negative unaccomplished, *n sdm.n.t=f*, a construction that departs even further from the semantics of perfective passives in not even being accomplished.

3.8 *Two inflectional passives in the accomplished: some broader considerations*

A. The *sdm.n.t=f* also spread over the perfective V-passive in other environments not discussed so far: in the *pw*-marked glossing construction, in *ir*-introduced conditional clauses, in clauses dependent on an expression of time, and after prepositions.⁹⁶ While the issue warrants further research, these environments have in common that the clause is embedded into a higher syntactic node. (Pending further research, the exact nature of this embedding is here left open; for the *pw*-marked glossing construction specifically, § 4.2). Being embedded in a higher syntactic node, such clauses are not asserted like main clauses can be. This seems relevant, because in the accomplished passive, perfective aspect (or equivalently here, Endpoint orientation) correlates with assertive modality: in particular, an assertive modality is one parameter associated with high semantic transitivity,⁹⁷ from which the *sdm.n.t=f* in its other uses also serves to depart.

The *sdm.n.t=f* did not spread over the perfective V-passive in main clauses such as introduced by, e.g., *iw* or *ḥ^c.n*, and in various types of dependent clauses asyndetically linked to a preceding clause. Clauses introduced by, e.g., *iw* and *ḥ^c.n* are fully asserted and well grounded.⁹⁸ Asyndetically linked dependent clauses are also well grounded, to the preceding clause to which they are linked. In such environments, an accomplished passive event has perfective aspect: the *sdm.n.t=f*, which developed and spread precisely to express that an accomplished event—even though passive—is not perfective, does not come into play. This account extends to the distribution of the *sdm.n=f* of subject-affecting intransitives such as *iwi* “come”: as discussed (§ 3.3), this is used to indicate that an accomplished event—even though subject-affecting—is not Endpoint-oriented; after, e.g., *iw*, *ḥ^c.n*, and in dependent clauses asyndetically linked to a preceding clause, the event is well grounded and the Endpoint orientation accordingly strong.

The overall result is the distribution in classical Middle Egyptian, in which the perfective V-passive has become limited to a few uses, only with non-pronominal subjects, and only after, e.g., *iw*, *ḥ^c.n*, or in asyndetically linked dependency—that is, to uses in which the forms stands in complementary distribution to the pseudoparticiple. As the ultimate outcome of the spread of the *sdm.n.t=f* to all environments that are not strictly perfective, the perfective V-passive (now a “perfective” form in a yet stronger sense than the one introduced above, § 3.4) has lost all functional autonomy vis-à-vis the pseudoparticiple, an inherently resultative category.

B. Broadening the perspective to some more general correlations, Earlier Egyptian is illustrative of how in the accomplished, passive voice is semantically more complex than active voice.⁹⁹ Voice concerns the perspective under which an event is viewed. So does aspect. The two dimensions can therefore interact with one another, in various ways and more or less strongly in individual languages. The unaccomplished views the event from the perspective of its Initiator, as does the active. The accomplished is concerned with the completion of the event (by definition); passive voice, for its part, views the event from the vantage point of the participant that is associated with Endpoint of the event. Cross-linguistically, this is manifest for

96 Stauder 2014a, 334–39.

97 Hopper and Thompson 1980, 252; Stauder 2014a, 293–94.

98 On the grounding functions of *iw* and *ḥ^c.n*, e.g., Collier 1994.

99 Stauder 2014a, 344–47.

example in what has been called a “perfect(ive) skew” of passives.¹⁰⁰ Unaccomplished passives are thereby less prototypical than accomplished ones; for example, some languages that have morphological passives have them only in the accomplished, while the reverse situation is apparently not documented. Among accomplished passives, non-perfective ones (such as in the Earlier Egyptian “emphatic” construction, an event-oriented, rather than participant-oriented, construction), are themselves less prototypical. And subjectless passives (which by definition are not participant-oriented) are non-prototypical in all cases. In Earlier Egyptian, these correlations are manifest in how active and passive paradigms are not symmetrical to one another:

Unaccomplished

	unmarked	progressive
active:	$N(P) \text{ } \underline{s}dm=f$	$NP \text{ } hr \text{ } \underline{s}dm$
passive:	← $\underline{s}dm.t=f$ →	

Accomplished

	after <i>iw</i> , etc.	“emph.,” etc.
non-subject-affecting:	← $\underline{s}dm.n=f$ →	
subject-affecting intr.:	← $NP \text{ } PsP$ →	$ii.n=f$
passive, EEg.I:	$P \text{ } PsP$	← $V\text{-}pass$ →
		($\underline{i}sdm.n.t \text{ } non\text{-}P$)
EEg.II:	$P \text{ } PsP \sim V\text{-}pass \text{ } non\text{-}P$	$\underline{s}dm.n.t=f$

In the unaccomplished, the passive has a lesser semantic resolution than the active. In particular, the passive does not provide a formally distinct expression to events interpreted as progressive until the late Second Intermediate Period.¹⁰¹ In most succinct terms, this reflects the fact that progressive aspect tends to emphasize the Initiator, even more strongly than the unaccomplished in general; the passive, for its part, is among other things an Agent-backgrounding construction.¹⁰² In the accomplished, by contrast, the passive has a higher semantic resolution than the active (with subject-affecting actives representing an intermediate stage in complexity). Much more than active ones can, passive subjects deviate from the prototypical correlations between subjecthood, agentivity, individuation, and topicality. Moreover, the passive (here along with subject-affecting intransitives) is oriented on a participant associated with the Endpoint of the event. The active is not. The latter therefore has no issue in providing an expression to the fact that the Endpoint of the event is out of focus, as is the case in the event-oriented “emphatic” construction. In the accomplished, the active is simpler than the passive.

100 E.g., Comrie 1982; Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988, 45–49 ; Haspelmath 1990; Stauder 2014a, 310–11. For the associated cognitive dimensions, Woods 2008, 66–68, 285–89, providing access to the relevant literature.

101 For the rise of $(X.)iw \text{ } hr \text{ } \underline{s}dm$, Stauder 2014a, 360–65, and more broadly 349–403; Stauder 2013, 376–98.

102 Further, Stauder 2014a, 227–30. There is of course a historical dimension to the above asymmetry: when first grammaticalizing, $NP \text{ } hr \text{ } \underline{s}dm$ did so with positive and active events. The diachronic stability of the resulting paradigm over a near-millennium is sufficient witness to the semantic issues here at stake.

4. The “emphatic” construction more broadly

4.1 The unaccomplished “emphatic” construction

In attempting to accommodate Polotsky’s seminal discovery of Coptic second tenses, including their implications for the study of earlier stages of Egyptian,¹⁰³ with his own essentially aspectual analysis of the Middle Egyptian verbal system, Gardiner made the following proposal:

It is agreed that one of the grounds for the use of the “Imperfective *sdm=f*” was the desire to lay a predicative stress on an adverbial predicate. This result would naturally be best achieved by removing the stress from the verb-form in the sentence. It was thus important for the Egyptian to avoid saying positively that such and such an action happened or would actually happen. Now this avoidance of direct assertion may be effected by giving the verb-form a general or non-committal character.¹⁰⁴

This proposal of an aspectual basis to the “emphatic” construction did not win acceptance, and was largely forgotten in subsequent decades, notably because it did not extend beyond the *mrr=f* and the unaccomplished to the accomplished “emphatic” construction subsequently identified by Polotsky.¹⁰⁵ In the preceding section, I discussed how the accomplished “emphatic” construction is in fact based on aspectual contrasts, in relation to the parameters of voice and subject affectedness (§ 3). Against this background, and given the very major problems syntactically oriented analyses face (§ 1), Gardiner’s proposal merits revisiting.

The *mrr=f* displays a versatile functional profile. This is best described as the sum of the constructions in which the form occurs (the “emphatic” and related constructions, *nfr-n mrr=f*,¹⁰⁶ the *pw*-marked glossing construction (below), etc.), and, additionally for those constructions in which the *mrr=f* contrasts with other forms, in terms of the semantic contrasts thereby expressed (for example after prepositions or in complement clauses). While these uses of the *mrr=f* relate to each other in various ways, the overall functional profile of the *mrr=f* is too complex to be captured by any single denominator: functions of the form are defined in relation to actual constructions, in part differently in different constructions (hence also the purely formal label here adopted, as a “*mrr=f*”). In particular, a direct characterization of the *mrr=f* as “imperfective *sdm=f*,” as once in Gardinerian grammar, would fall well short of accounting for the variety of uses of the form (thus in the construction *nfr-n mrr=f*) or for its semantics in individual occurrences in text (for example, in occurrences in the unaccomplished “emphatic” construction). Furthermore, another construction, *N(P) mr=f*, is regularly used from early historical times on to express such typically imperfective semantics as habitual or general aspect.

This being made clear, imperfective semantics for the *mrr=f* not uncommonly shimmer through, more or less strongly depending on various environments in which the form occurs. A general association of the long stem (*mrr-*) with imperfective aspect is observed in participles, a paradigm in which forms based on the long

103 Polotsky 1944.

104 Gardiner 1947b, 100; quoted by Uljas 2007a, 356.

105 A milestone is Polotsky 1957.

106 Note that the construction *nfr-n V* certainly does not define a “nominal” slot: in addition to the major problems a “nominal” analysis of the *mrr=f* faces in general (§ 1.2–3), such analysis would fail to account for why the *mrr=f* is regularly used in *nfr-n V*, but the subjunctive (alternating with the infinitive) in *nfr pw V*, even though both slots would be similarly “nominal” in substitutional terms. Synchronically, *nfr-n mrr=f* is a grammaticalized construction (to wit, e.g., spellings such as *nfr-NEG* or *nfr-š*). Why the grammaticalizing construction selected the *mrr=f*, rather than, for example, the subjunctive as occurs in *nfr pw V*, is presumably for semantic reasons that are yet to be studied further. Provisionally, Uljas 2007a, 210–20.

stem provide the aspectually marked counterpart to forms based on the short stem (*mr-*).¹⁰⁷ Turning to the non-attributive finite form based on the same stem, the *mrr=f* itself, imperfective shades of meaning are clearly manifest in the distribution of the form after prepositions: in how the *mrr=f* contrasts semantically with other forms of the verb after certain prepositions, notably in expressing non-temporal meanings; and in how the *mrr=f* combines commonly with certain prepositions, but not with others.¹⁰⁸ Imperfective shades of meaning have also long been noted in complement clauses.¹⁰⁹ These have been analyzed further as to how they relate to a non-assertive modality of the *mrr=f* in these environments,¹¹⁰ very much along lines intuited by Gardiner for the unaccomplished “emphatic” construction itself.

Gardiner has described how the semantics of the unaccomplished “emphatic” construction can be derived from the imperfective semantics also otherwise often observed to be associated with the *mrr=f*: “(...) this avoidance of direct assertion may be effected by giving the verb form a general or non-committal character.”¹¹¹ This relation is most directly observed in the “setting” and “balanced” constructions, where imperfective semantics are not uncommonly fairly salient (10)–(11):

[10] *rmm=sn iw=f hr sdm* (Merikare E 135)
When (/whenever) they cry, he is listening.

[11] *ʒd.t r=f dd=f sʒ=f* (Sethe 1928b, 84, 6–7)
When (/whenever) one acts aggressively against him, he shows his back.

With the “emphatic” construction itself, imperfective semantics are also occasionally observed to shimmer through:

[12] *inn.t n=f r-tnw dbh=f*
sʒr.t n=f r-tnw ibb=f (CT V, 11c-d T1L)
“One brings to him *every time* he asks;
one presents to him *every time* he is thirsty.

107 Schenkel 1965a; Allen 1984, § 607–10, § 638–43; Jansen-Winkel 1997; disputed by Depuydt 2008b. Schenkel 2011 questions the validity of the methodological assumptions underlying the initial analysis in Schenkel 1965a, without, however, implying that the overall sequence of subsequent interpretations must be wrong. Relative forms, among which is the relative *mrr(t)=f*, form a different paradigm, organized around relative tense (anterior *mr(t).n=f* vs. simultaneous *mrr(t)=f*). Relative forms thereby align closely with non-attributive paradigms, in which the primary contrast also revolves around relative tense. (Another dimension of this alignment is the rise of the relative *sdm.n=f*, superseding Clère’s *mr=f* for the expression of anterior tense; for the latter form, see now Schenkel 2010.) Relative forms are functionally attributive (like participles) and morphologically finite (like non-attributive forms). In occupying an intermediate position on the continuum of actor nominalization, relative forms display a strong cross-linguistic tendency to align with non-attributive forms more closely than participles do (Haspelmath 1994); Earlier Egyptian is a case in point.

108 Provisionally above, § 1.3. E.g., with *r*, *ir ʒʒ r ʒʒ=f šr r šrr=f* “The great one shall be treated according to how he is great, the small one according to how he is small” (Berlin 1911, pl. 1, 3); *sbw dpt r mrr=s* “The boat drifts as it pleases” (Peas. B1 157–58); contrasting with temporal meanings (*r sdm.t=f*; *r sdm.n=f*) and final/temporal ones: *r lr=f*(subj.) “so that he does” (common); *r lrw=f*(prosp.) “so that he does (will do)” (rare). Noteworthy is also, for example, the apparently exclusive association of the *mrr=f* with expressions such as *r-tnw(-sp)* “whenever” or *n-ʒt-n* “on account of how much,” which display clearly imperfective semantics: e.g., *r-tnw ibb=f* “whenever he thirsts” (CT V, 11c; full quotation below, Ex. 12); *mk swt nʒ pw ddy=l r-tnw-sp gmm sw bʒk tm hr lit* “Look, this is what I will say each time this humble servant finds him coming” (Collier and Quirke 2002, pUC 32213, ro. 23–vo. 2); *n-ʒt-n hzz w hm=f* “on account of how much His Majesty praises me” (*passim*; an autobiographical topos).

109 Borchouts 1989.

110 Uljas 2007a.

111 Fuller quotation above; further, Uljas 2007a, 355–59.

[13] *ḏḏ=tn p3 ʿqw n rmt=i iw=sn hr irt k3t* (Heqanakht II, ro. 29–30)

You should give these rations to my people only when they are working.

(Along Gardinerian lines, with a possible paraphrase as: “*Should you give* these rations to my people (...)” (lesser assertive modality), itself related to: “*Whenever you give* these rations to my people (...)”.)

On the other hand, there are also a great many other occurrences of the unaccomplished “emphatic” construction in which this original aspectual basis is further remote. The point cannot be, therefore, to argue that the unaccomplished “emphatic” construction can be synchronically described in solely aspectual terms. Rather, it is proposed that the unaccomplished “emphatic” construction developed out of an aspectual contrast, with the originally imperfective semantics of the *mrr=f* developing specialized functions in this construction, like they developed specialized functions—different ones—in the other constructional environments in which the *mrr=f* is used.

4.2 Unaccomplished and accomplished

In terms of the bare set of constructions in which it occurs (that is, leaving aside the all-important issue of semantic contrasts with other forms of the verb in some of these environments, most notably in complement clauses and after prepositions), the *mrr=f* displays an overall distribution very similar to that of the *sdm.n.t=f* in classical Middle Egyptian.

For example, both the *mrr=f* and the *sdm.n.t=f* (in classical Middle Egyptian) are used in the the *pw*-marked glossing construction.¹¹² The construction serves to express a relation between a state of affairs expressed in the embedded clause and a preceding segment of discourse, indexed by *pw*.¹¹³ The categorial information structure in the embedded clause is thereby backgrounded with respect to the higher-order level of assertion, the one relating the state of affairs expressed in the embedded clause to the preceding segment of discourse via the anaphoric index *pw*.¹¹⁴ In the unaccomplished, the use of the *mrr=f* is illustrative of the general relationship between a lesser assertive modality and (originally) imperfective semantics, as in the “emphatic” construction (other things being of course different). In the accomplished, fully asserted accomplished passives have strongly Endpoint-oriented semantics; in the *pw*-marked glossing construction, as in other environments, the *sdm.n.t=f* spread to express that an accomplished event—even though passive—is not perfective, that is, that the Endpoint is out of focus.

Conversely, the *mrr=f* is not found after, for example, *iw* or in asyndetically linked dependent clauses, just as the *sdm.n.t=f* is not.¹¹⁵ In these environments, assertion is well grounded; as a form notably serving to express a lesser assertive modality, the *mrr=f* does not come into use. The *sdm.n.t=f*, for its part, did not spread to these environments because after *iw* or in asyndetic dependency the Endpoint of an accomplished

112 E.g., *ir ib=f mh mhh tb=f pw* “As for ‘his heart is flooded,’ this means that his heart is oblivious” (pEbers 102, 15–16); *ir s3wt sbiw ḥtm.n.tw sm3yt swty pw* “As for ‘guarding the rebels,’ this means that the cronies of Seth have been annihilated” (BD Nu 18, 5–6).

113 Uljas 2007a, 298–99. The construction is to be distinguished from an altogether different *pw*-marked construction, *NP pw hr sdm* (*NP pw PsP*, *NP pw sdm.n=f*), in which *pw* lacks referential content (Uljas 2007a, 300–302). The latter construction is not “explicative” (*pace* Polotsky 1976, 41–42), nor topic-presentative (*pace* Loprieno 1995, 111; Uljas 2007a, 195–96, 303), butthetic (study by Stauder and Uljas in preparation; intuited by Gardiner 1957, § 190.1).

114 Given the presence of the anaphoric index *pw*, the overall construction cannot be described asthetic (as suggested by Uljas, 2007, 298–300), hence also the label here adopted, as a “glossing” construction. With this precision being made, I concur with Uljas’s general analysis that the selection of the *mrr=f* reflects not syntax but the fact that the *pw*-marked glossing construction is not primarily about asserting something about the subject of the embedded clause, thus the lesser assertive modality.

115 As a rule; for the exceedingly rare occurrences of *iw mrr=f*, *iw V-pass P*, and *iw sdm.n.t=f*, see Stauder 2014a, 319–22.

passive is fully in focus (§ 3.8.A). (As already discussed, broadly similar comments extend to the *sdm.n=f* of subject-affecting intransitives.)

The configuration observed in classical Middle Egyptian, in which the *sdm.n.t=f* (and the *ii.n=f*) largely aligns with the *mrr=f*, represents the overall outcome of a diachronic process of spread, not the earlier state of affairs: for the reasons sketched above, the *sdm.n.t=f* superseded the perfective V-passive in a series of environments in which in the unaccomplished *mrr=f* was already used, and did not spread further to environments in which in the unaccomplished *mrr=f* was not used. Rather than syntax,¹¹⁶ this diachronically secondary configuration reflects how the various environments discussed—for example the *pw*-marked glossing construction or *tw*-headed clauses—are associated with different degrees of assertive modality, and how these in turn interact with verbal semantics. This interaction concerns both the unaccomplished and the accomplished (in the latter for passive events and subject-affecting intransitive ones only)—if in altogether different ways.

Turning back to the “emphatic” construction, it was argued that both the unaccomplished and the accomplished varieties of this construction have an aspectual basis, and a different one in each case. In the unaccomplished, the *mrr=f* developed specialized uses expressing a lesser assertive modality from an originally imperfective profile (§ 4.1). In the accomplished, the distinctive forms used in the “emphatic” construction express that the Endpoint is out of focus: for example, in the case of the *sdm.n.t=f*, that an accomplished event—even though passive—is not perfective (§ 3.4-7). This aspectual basis in the unaccomplished and accomplished varieties of the “emphatic” is not only different in nature, it also differs in salience in each case. In the accomplished, the aspectual basis is directly manifest in the construction as this can be synchronically described and analyzed. In the unaccomplished, imperfective semantics only shimmer through, fairly strongly in the related “setting” and “balanced” constructions, less so in the “emphatic” construction itself (§ 4.1, (10)-(13)).

A further difference between the unaccomplished and the accomplished constructions lies with the semantic markedness of the forms in either domain. In the unaccomplished, the *mrr=f* is used in the “emphatic” and related constructions, contrasting with the *mr=f*. The former is inherently more marked semantically than the latter. In the accomplished (in the classical paradigm), the *ii.n=f* and the *sdm.n.t=f* are used, contrasting with the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive. While the pseudoparticiple and the perfective V-passive have a strong semantic profile (§ 3.2; § 3.4), a *ii.n=f* is a mere *sdm.n=f* of *twi*, as a *sdm.n.t=f* is a mere T-passive of the *sdm.n=f*, itself is a mere expression of the accomplished (§ 3.4): in the accomplished, semantically less marked forms are used in the “emphatic” and related constructions. While the “emphatic” construction is a functionally marked construction in all cases, the forms used in this construction display a reverse relation of semantic markedness in the unaccomplished and the accomplished.

This accords with the fact that, in the unaccomplished, distinctive forms of the verb are used with all types of events, while in the accomplished distinctive forms of the verb are only used with some types of events, when de-emphasizing an otherwise salient Endpoint of the event is an issue. In succinct terms, the unaccomplished “emphatic” construction involves a form that developed specialized uses out of an erstwhile imperfective profile. The accomplished “emphatic” construction, when implying a morphological contrast on the verb, is all about de-emphasizing an otherwise salient Endpoint, that is, de-perfectivizing. The former characterization is a positive one, the latter a negative one.

116 Against syntax as the relevant parameter in the present context, § 1.2-3.

4.3 Forms and functions of the “emphatic” construction

Descriptively, the “emphatic” construction involves various elements of linguistic form, all contributing to make the construction distinctive. The division of labor differs depending on various parameters such as tense, voice, event semantics, or polarity:

- *Verbal morphology*

The “emphatic” and related constructions involve a morphological marking on the verb in the unaccomplished with all types of events; in the accomplished with subject-affecting intransitives; in the accomplished passive in the later paradigm; and in the accomplished passive in the earlier paradigm with pronominal subjects (*P PsP* vs. *V-pass P*), also optionally with non-pronominal ones (*sdm.n.t non-P*, uncommon). The “emphatic” and related constructions do not involve a morphological marking on the verb in the accomplished active with transitives and non-subject-affecting intransitives; in the accomplished passive in the earlier paradigm with non-pronominal subjects; and in the future.

- *The absence of iw, in environments in which iw might otherwise have been used*

By definition, this level of marking concerns only those environments in which the absence of *iw* is formally contrastive. Not included are, therefore, for example: future clauses with the prospective *irw=f*; *mk*-headed main clauses; non-initial clauses in a narrative sequence; subordinate clauses introduced by *ntt*; negative constructions; and much of the Pyramid Texts, in which *iw* is generally rare, due to the specific, ritual-performative temporality of these texts.

- *'Is, in certain environments*¹¹⁷

Environments concerned are notably negative constructions and clauses introduced by *ntt*. (In both, the presence of *is* thus complements the fact that the absence of *iw* is not distinctive.)

- *Possibly prosodics (only in spoken form)*

Focused-upon constituents display a cross-linguistically very strong, and possibly universal, tendency to be marked by a peak in intonational contour.¹¹⁸ Assuming this was the case in Earlier Egyptian as well—the reverse would be surprising—contour contributes to marking the construction. It remains, of course, invisible in written form, to the present-day reader and to the ancient one alike.

The functions of the “emphatic” construction have been described mainly in terms of the construction setting some broadly adverbial expression under narrow focus, the verbal event being downgraded to the status of presupposed information. Occurrences of the “emphatic” construction that support a narrow-focus reading are common in text, thus in word-questions and in answers to these, or in otherwise clear contexts;¹¹⁹ in the accomplished, such readings are common notably with passive events of creation or

117 On *is* discussed in a broader perspective, see now Oréal 2011, 103–70.

118 The iconic nature of this type of marking is evident: e.g., Bolinger 1985; also Lambrecht 1994, *passim*.

119 The latter include, for example, cases when a narrow-focus reading is implied (a) by a contrast in participants, (b) by the general context of an argument, (c) by the previous cotextual expression of the same event, or (d) when the event is of such a nature that it naturally reads as presupposed. E.g., with loci classici, respectively: (a) *m dgꜣ r nty m-bꜣh=f dgg=k r nty m-bꜣh=k* “Do not look at what is in front of him: you should look only at what is in front of you!” (Ptahhotep 122–23 L2); (b) *ḏḏ=ḏn pꜣ ḳw n rmt=i iw=sn hr irt kꜣt* “You should give these rations to my people only when they are working” (Heqanakht II, ro. 29–30); (c) *ḳhḳ.n(=i) pr.kw m gbtiw (...)* *pr.n(=i) m mšḳ n s 3000 (...)* “I went out from Coptos (...) It is with an army of 3000 men that I went out (...)” (Hammamat 114, 10–12); (d) *skdd tꜣ hft wd=k* “It is as you command that the land sails” (Peas. B1 298–99).

installation that are presupposed by the very speech situation.¹²⁰ However, these classically described functions of the “emphatic” construction are only the ones most easily identified in text. As has been noted on occasion by others, beginning with Polotsky himself, these are only part of a broader functional profile of the construction, yet to be defined in more precise terms. In the common uses with *gmi* + *clause* “find out that,” for example, the event of “finding” is semantically incomplete in context, yet remains part of the scope of assertion, which is extended so as to include the whole following segment. In the accomplished, the “emphatic” construction often serves as a strategy for tightening inter-clausal cohesion, without the first clause being necessarily demoted to the rank of presupposed information.¹²¹ Yet another situation is afforded by the following example, in which the construction, with a subjectless passive, invites a thetic reading, not a narrow-focus one:

[14] *nwt z3=1 pw pw-nn dd.n=1 ir=f*

ms.n.t n(=i)

i.t in (Pyr. 179a WNNt; PT 219)

Nut, this one here is your son of whom you have said:

“There was birth for me”

—so you said.

(Not: [?]“It is for me that someone was born.”)

It was argued in the present paper that the Earlier Egyptian “emphatic” construction does not present a biclausal, or cleft-like, syntactic structure (§ 1). It was argued further that the “emphatic” construction does not involve a morphological marking on the verb with all types of events, but only with some (§ 2–3); that when there is a morphological marking on the verb, this has an aspectual basis; and that this aspectual basis is different in the unaccomplished and in the accomplished (§ 3, § 4.1–2). These combined syntactic, morphological, and semantic observations also suggest that the functional profile of the “emphatic” construction is more broadly about expressing that the verbal event requires some further elaboration for it to be semantically complete, and that the scope of assertion is thereby extended to include some broadly adverbial, and most commonly adjunctal, expression.¹²² The narrow-focus interpretation, by which the verbal event is downgraded to the status of a mere presupposition, is only a special reading of the “emphatic” construction, if a highly common and salient one in text.

120 E.g., *hwr N m grh ms N (/ms=fTMN) m grh* “N was conceived at night, N was born at night” (Pyr. 132a WTMN; PT 211); *mr ntt ir.n.t is zš pn hft dd wsr pn [lm]* “to the effect that it is according to the words of this User that this piece of writing was made there” (Berlin 1911, pl. 1, 5); *is pn kd.n.tw=k n hb sn1.n.tw=k n bw nfr* “O this tomb, you have been built for celebration, you have been founded for happiness!” (Boeser 1909, pl. 33, a.9–11); *srw ir.n.tw ø r hsf r tyt ... srw ir.n.tw ø r hsf r grg* “Officials—they were appointed to outlaw evil ... Officials—they were appointed to outlaw falsehood” (Peas. B1 327–29). Further illustration and discussion: Stauder 2014a, 251–61.

121 E.g., *rđ l3w n nsw 3 dw3 ntr nb n s3hw-r^c sk sw rh hn^c šms r-dr=f ir is pry ht nb m r3 n hm=f hpr ø hr-^c sk rđ.n n=f ntr si3 ht m ht n-3t špss=f r ntr nb* “The king was greatly adored and the god was praised for Sahure because he (*scil.* Niankhsekhmet) knew and the whole retinue as well that if anything comes out of His Majesty’s mouth, it occurs immediately, and because the god caused him to be perceptive in his body, and because he was more august than any god” (Urk. I, 39, 10–6).

122 This analysis also permits a fairly direct description of how the “emphatic,” the “setting,” and the “balanced” constructions relate to each other. In each case, the verbal event requires some further elaboration to be semantically complete. In the case of the “emphatic” construction, this is provided by some broadly adverbial expression; in the case of the “setting” construction, this is provided by a subsequent main clause, resulting in an interpretation by which the first clause is backgrounded with respect to the second; in the “balanced” construction, this is provided by another clause in which the event is semantically incomplete like in the first: the two clauses are thereby made to lean on one another, as it were.

The discussion of morphology and verbal aspect further suggests that the semantic profile of the "emphatic" construction, rather than uniform across the board, may have been in part different in the unaccomplished and accomplished varieties of the construction, and for the latter, have been sensitive to voice and subject affectedness. For example, narrow-focus readings seem to be relatively more common in the unaccomplished than in the accomplished, possibly in relation to the particular verbal morphology associated with the former variety of the "emphatic" construction. In the accomplished, narrow-focus readings seem most common with passive events of creation or installation such as mentioned above, possibly reflecting the Endpoint-de-emphasizing semantics of this specific variety of the "emphatic" construction. The issues at stake are complex because they involve the parameters of aspect, voice, and subject affectedness, and beyond, the lexical semantics of individual events. They must be attended to further through detailed empirical investigations in the texts.