DE GRUYTER DOI 10.1515/zaes-2014-0007 — ZÄS 2014; 141(1): 83–96

Originalveröffentlichung in: Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde 141, 1, 2014, S. 83-96

Andréas Stauder

Splitting the *sḏm.n=f*? A Discussion of Written Forms in Coffin Texts

Part 1

Summary: This is the first part of a study discussing the written forms of *II.red* (e.g. *ỉmm*) in Coffin Texts adduced in support of a recent hypothesis of two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f*. As a result of a review of each individual written form, it is concluded that none supports the hypothesis (just as none contradicts it). The first part of the argument centers around how verbal stems are represented in writing, in *II.red-ult.n*, *II.red-ult.ỉ*, and *II.red-ult.m*. Early New Kingdom spellings of the same verbs are also reevaluated. (The second part of the study is to appear in the next issue of this journal.)

Keywords: *sḏm.n=f* – textual variation in Coffin Texts – verbal morphology – *II.red* system

Dr. Andréas Stauder: Universität Basel, Ägyptologie, Petersgraben 51, CH-4051 Basel, Switzerland, E-Mail: andreas.stauder@unibas.ch

Based on data from Coffin Texts, Wolfgang Schenkel has proposed that the mostly uniform written forms of the *sḏm.n=f* could conceal two morphologically distinct patterns, contrasting with each other by the position of stress[1]. This study has seminal importance in being the first ever to address the issue on an empirical level, through a detailed examination of alternations in written forms: without Schenkel's efforts, the present paper, a continuation of the discussion, would not exist. Schenkel's proposal has been met with acceptance by various authors[2], as well as assessed more critically by others[3]. An additional element that has been voiced in support of the hypothesis is problematic[4], so that the proposal fully relies on the data and interpretation thereof initially put forward by Schenkel.

1 The main exposition is Wolfgang Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", in Gideon Goldenberg & Ariel Shisha-Halevy (eds.), Egyptian, Semitic and General Grammar. Studies in Memory of H. J. Polotsky (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences, 2009), 40–60. Further discussion in id., "Von der Morphologie zur Syntax und zurück", LingAeg 14 (2006), 61–67; id., Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift (Tübingen 2012), 192–97. Of these studies, the first mentioned was also first to be written, despite its later date of publication.

2 Roman Gundacker, "On the Etymology of the Egyptian Crown Name *mrsw.t*. An 'Irregular' Subgroup of *m*-Prefix Formations", LingAeg 19 (2011), 59–60; Francis Breyer, "Ein Faktitiv-Stamm im Ägyptischen", LingAeg 14 (2006), 100; Daniel Werning, "Uninflected Relative Verb Forms as Converbs and Verbal Rhemes. The Two Schemes of the Emphatic Construction as a Detached Adjectival Phrase Construction and as a Truncated Balanced Sentence", handout to a paper given at the conference New Directions in Egyptian Syntax (Liège 12–14/5/2011), §1; the related paper is to appear in Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, Andréas Stauder & Jean Winand (eds.), New Directions in Egyptian Syntax. Proceedings, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica (Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, in preparation). Also in one teaching grammar: Boyo Ockinga, Mittelägyptische Grundgrammatik: Abriss der mittelägyptischen Grammatik (Darmstadt 2012[3]), IX–X.

3 Sami Uljas, "Formally Speaking. Observations on a Recent Theory of the Earlier Egyptian *sḏm.n=f*", LingAeg 18 (2010), 253–61; Leo Depuydt, The Other Mathematics. Language and Logic in Egyptian and in General (Piscataway/NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008), 116–18.

4 Werning, "Uninflected Relative Verb Forms", §1, n. 3, proposes that a hypothesized diachronic connection of the *sḏm.n=f* with the pseudoparticiple would provide evidence for a form of the *sḏm.n=f* as "*CaCCána-", based on a stem of the pseudoparticiple as "*CaCCa/*CaCaC". (A form "*CaCCána-" (i.e., a "*sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$" in the terminology introduced below, 1.2.A) would imply two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, because a form *CvC´vCnv- (i.e., a "*sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$": 1.2.A) is securely established based on Cuneiform transcriptions and long written stems of the *II.red)*. However, the stem of the pseudoparticiple is not simply "*CaCCa/*CaCaC": the underlying form of the stem is **CaCvC; before vowel-initial endings, this yields *CaCC-; before a consonant-initial ending (like the tempus marker *-n-* of the *sḏm.n=f* would be, assuming this form is directly related to the pseudoparticiple), **CaCvC would yield *CaCvCnv-, *not* "*CaCCána-". If the *sḏm.n=f* derived from a construction with the pseudoparticiple this would therefore provide direct evidence for the *unity* of the *sḏm.n=f*, since the "predicative" form would be identical with the "(abstract-) relative" one. In addition, the relationship of the *sḏm.n=f* with the pseudoparticiple is more complex than envisioned by Werning: while there is good reason to believe that the *sḏm.n=f* finds its origin in a construction with a resultative stem of some sort, considerations to do with alignment, word order, and thematicity hierarchies imply that this resultative source construction of the *sḏm.n=f* is not directly the pseudoparticiple itself (Andréas Stauder, The Earlier Egyptian Passive: Voice and Perspective, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 14 (Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2014), 97–101).

The present paper is devoted to a critical review of the Coffin Text written forms presented to discussion by Schenkel. Beyond the main issue itself – one or two *sḏm.n=f*'s? – a discussion of the written phenomenology of these forms also presents a descriptive interest, because the alternations of written forms pointed out by Schenkel are very real and because the written phenomenology of Earlier Egyptian is what a reader, modern or ancient alike, is in effect confronted with when reading. In various recent conferences and workshops, Schenkel emphasized the necessity of broadening the empirical perspective beyond his own reference corpus, the Coffin Texts: this call is taken up in another paper, which concerns written forms of the *sḏm.n=f* in the Earlier Egyptian corpus that displays the richest alternations in written inflection, Pyramid Texts[5].

1 *II.red* in Coffin Texts

Schenkel's hypothesis of two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f* is based on an analysis of alternations of written forms displayed by verbs of one inflectional class, *II.red*, in Coffin Texts[6]. In the present section, I discuss the written forms of these verbs based on which the hypothesis was initially proposed. *Ult.n*, which do not have primary argumentative status in Schenkel's hypothesis, are examined in turn (2), and similarly *wnn*, which raises issues of its own (3).

1.1 *II.red* in Coffin Texts: Schenkel's proposal

As Schenkel observed, the written stem of the *sḏm.n=f* of *II.red* is long in some cases (<ABBn>) but short in other ones (<ABn>). The primary data are gathered by the author in a table[7], which is reproduced here for subsequent reference. Adapting the author's convention only slightly, the figures given in parentheses express: number of textual loci – number of occurrences counting individual witnesses.

(a) Written forms of *II.red* in Coffin Texts[8]:

iššˁ "spit out"	/	*iššˁ.n* (2–8)
iṯṯ "fly up, soar"	/	*iṯṯ.n* (2–2)
ˁnn "bound up"	/	*ˁnn.n* (1–1)
nḥḥ "be old"	/	*nḥḥ.n* (1–1)
ȝmm "seize"	*ȝm.n* (3–9)	/
pnn "twine"	*pn.n* (1–1)[9]	/
mȝȝ "see"	*mȝ.n* (many–many)	/
nṯṯ "fetter"	*nṯ.n* (1–4)	/
rnn "nurse"	*rn.n* (2–2)	/
ḫnn "disturb"	*ḫn.n* (1–1)	/
tȝȝ "be hot"	*tȝ.n* (2–9)	/
wrr "be great"	*wr.n* (1–13)	*wrr.n* (3–4)
ngg "cackle"	*ng.n* (1–6)	*ngg.n* (10–19)

At a superficial glance, the above data could seem fairly unassuming, since except for two verbs (*wrr*, *ngg*) short and long written stems stand in complementary distribution to each other. This could be taken to suggest that the contrast between short and long written stems was lexically determined, in other words that the *II.red* were not uniformly inflected in the *sḏm.n=f*; if so, the contrast between short and long written stems would not point to two different inflectional categories at all[10]. Upon closer examination, however, a two-way correlation between written forms and grammatical environments, with only minor exceptions, is detected by Schenkel[11]:

(b) Short and long written stems in correlation with constructional environments:

(α) In "predicative" environments, only short written stems of *II.red* are found.

(β) In "emphatic" environments, only long written stems of *II.red* are found.

5 Andréas Stauder, "Interpreting Written Morphology: The *sḏm.n=f* in Pyramid Texts", forthcoming in JNES 73 (2014).

6 Sigla: *II.red* for what in Gardinerian terminology is labeled "secundae geminatae"; *ult.n* for verbs with *n* as their last root consonant; *ult.ȝ* for verbs with "aleph" as their last root consonant; *3rad* for "triradicals"; *II.red-ult.n* for verbs of the form ANN.

7 Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 45. It may be worth emphasizing that the table was intended only to present the bare data before discussion, not to express the conclusions of the study.

8 The original table also included one instance of *qb.n* (1–1), in reference to CT VI 155l (B2Bo) (Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 46, n. 17). The text reads differently: *iw qbb=i nȝš* (B2Bo; B1Bo *iw sqbb.n N pn nȝš*), and the reference is a slip (Wolfgang Schenkel, personal communication, 2.4.2013). The text in B2Bo is probably to be emended on two levels, as *iw <s>qbb<.n>=i nȝš*: independently from the reading in B1Bo, the emendation of the anterior tense marker is required for semantic reasons, while the emendation of the causative prefix S- is very likely in view of the transitive construction (sim., Wolfgang Schenkel, personal communication, 4/2013).

9 Altered from Schenkel's original figure "(1–2)" for reasons exposed below: 1.3.C.

10 Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 45–46.

11 Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 45–47.

This two-way correlation is interpreted by the author as suggesting that the apparent near-complete complementary distribution in (a) is in fact a mere artifact of the vagaries of attestation of individual verbs. Under the assumption that *II.red* were inflected uniformly in the *sḏm.n=f* formation(s) – a fully reasonable hypothesis until demonstrated otherwise – the alternation in written forms is then naturally interpreted as suggesting that a genuine inflectional contrast between two forms is here shimmering through. Based on the written forms in (a), two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f* are reconstructed for *II.red*, distinguished by the position of stress (c)[12]. It is then a reasonable assumption that such alternation would extend to other inflectional classes as well, such as e.g., *3rad:* in these classes, the morphological contrast remains invisible in written forms, but this would only be expected given the nature of the Egyptian writing system (d):

(c) Reconstructed patterns for *II.red*[13]:

<ABn>	AvBB´vnv-	(left column in (a))
<ABBn>	AvB´vB-nv-	(right column in (a))

(d) Schenkel's two *sḏm.n=f* formations:

<CCCn>	CvCC´vnv-	"predicative" (resp. "non-emphatic")
<CCCn>	CvC´vCnv-	"abstract-relative" (resp. "emphatic")

The form used in "emphatic" environments (CvC´vCnv-, surfacing with a long written stem <ABBn> in the case of *II.red*) would display the same syllable structure as the attributive(/relative) *sḏm.n=f*, documented in Cuneiform transcriptions (for which see below, 1.2.A). This would then substantiate a classical hypothesis that views the *sḏm.n=f* in the "emphatic" construction as morphologically closely related to the attributive *sḏm.n=f*. Schenkel's findings would, in other words, provide empirical evidence in support of the "abstract-relative" analysis of the "emphatic" construction[14].

Presented this way, the argument seems compelling. It has accordingly been accepted by some without further discussion[15]. Meanwhile, various possible weaknesses have been pointed out by Uljas, observing that individual data may be less robust than they would seem and possibly not enough[16]. Also discussed have been possible problems associated with the negative construction *n sḏm.n=f*: in Polotskyan theory, the form in this construction is classically assumed to be the same as in the "emphatic" construction (notably because the passive counterpart of the *sḏm.n=f* in both constructions alike is a *tw*-passive, *sḏm.n.tw=f*[17]); in Schenkel's data, however, the written forms of the *sḏm.n=f* in the *n sḏm.n=f* construction align with those in "non-emphatic" (resp. "predicative") environments. The issue has been noted by Uljas[18], as it has by Schenkel himself[19], and has subsequently been discussed further by the same author[20]. In the present section, I concentrate on other issues relating to the interpretation of the data adduced by Schenkel.

1.2 The two competing hypotheses

In Schenkel's analysis of the data, both columns in table (a) are counted as evidence. At first, this seems a fully natural step in view of the observed two-way correlation between written forms and constructional environments (b). Different implications emerge, however, when the two competing hypotheses are contrasted with each other in more explicit ways.

A. Earlier Egyptian had at least one form of the *sḏm.n=f*. Moreover, the inflectional scheme of this form can be reconstructed, with stress between the penultimate and the last root consonants (CvC´vCnv-). Such reconstruction is firmly established based on written forms of the *sḏm.n=f* of *II.red* with the long stem (<ABBn>) in the two Earlier Egyptian corpora that display the richest alternations in inflected forms of the verb, Coffin Texts and Pyramid Texts. Relevant written forms in Coffin Texts are gathered in the right column of table (a); in Pyramid Texts[21], all written forms of the *sḏm.n=f* of *II.red* are with the long written stem except for *m33* "see", a Sonderfall (below,

12 Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 50–51.

13 Here and elsewhere, representations in brackets (such as <ABn>) stand for written forms.

14 A classical exposition of that hypothesis is e.g., in Hans Jakob Polotsky, "Egyptian Tenses", Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Proceedings II/5 (1965).

15 See n. 3 above.

16 Uljas, LingAeg 18 (2010), 258–61; also 257, n. 21; also Depuydt, The Other Mathematics, 117–18.

17 Classically, Hans Jakob Polotsky, "The Emphatic *sḏm.n=f* Form", RdÉ 11 (1957), 109–17.

18 Uljas, LingAeg 18 (2010), 255–56; also Depuydt, The Other Mathematics, 118.

19 Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 48–49.

20 Schenkel, Tübinger Einführung (2012), 193; id., LingAeg 14 (2006), 63.

21 James Allen, The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts, Bibliotheca Aegyptia 2 (Malibu: Undena Publications, 1984), §767D.

1.4.A-B). The reconstruction finds independent confirmation in (admittedly later) Cuneiform transcriptions of the attributive(/relative) *sḏm.n=f*, which also implies a pattern (CvC´vCnv-)[22]. In the following discussion, this one form of the *sḏm.n=f* that is securely established as CvC´vCnv- will be referred to as *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$.

In the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis" submitted by Schenkel, Earlier Egyptian would have had an additional form of the *sḏm.n=f*, distinguished from the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ by the position of stress, after the last root consonant (CvCC´vnv-); accordingly, this hypothesized form will subsequently be referred to as *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$. The existence of a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ – i.e. of a form of the *sḏm.n=f* with stress between the penultimate and last root consonants – is thereby in common to both the competing hypotheses: these differ only with respect to the *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$, hypothesized in "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis", not in the "unitary *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis".

B. With respect to constructional environments, the two hypotheses then contrast as follows. Under the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis", the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ would have been used in what is variously labeled "emphatic" or "abstract-relative" environments, while the *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ would have been used in "non-emphatic" or "predicative" ones. Under the "unitary *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis," the single *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ would, by definition, have been used in all environments. Under either of these hypotheses, therefore, a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ would have been used in "emphatic" or "abstract-relative" environments: the two competing hypotheses only differ as to whether a distinctive form of the *sḏm.n=f*, namely a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$, would have been used in "non-emphatic" or "predicative" environments.

(e) The two competing hypotheses:

	"Split hypoth."	"Unitary hypoth."
"emph.":	*sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$	*sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$
"nonemph.":	*sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$	*sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$

(The reader may at first be surprised by the labeling, since the label "*sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$" is here given to the possibly distinct form that would have been used in the functionally less marked environments, "non-emphatic" ones, rather than the other way around. This is justified because the present study is on morphology: that there is a form of the *sḏm.n=f* with stress between the penultimate and last root consonants (CvC´vCnv-) is well established (above, A) and need not, therefore, be demonstrated. The only question is whether the differently stressed *sḏm.n=f* hypothesized by Schenkel also existed, hence the labeling as a "*sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$".)

C. The above already implies a somewhat different reading of the Coffin Text data in table (a). All forms with long written stems in that table are from "emphatic" environments. Under both hypotheses alike, the same form, a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$, is predicted in such environments. The written forms in the right column of the table are therefore neutral as to which of the two competing hypotheses is correct. Possible evidence in support of the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis" can only be with the short written stems in the left column of the table. I now discuss these in individual details.

1.3 *II.red-ult.n*

Among the verbs in the left column of table (a), three have *n* as their second reduplicated root consonant: *pnn* "twine" (1–1)[23], *rnn* "nurse" (2–2)[24], and *ḫnn* "disturb" (1–1)[25]. This is consequential for the interpretation of written forms, since the tense marker of the *sḏm.n=f* is itself *-n-*. Also relevant for interpretation is that none of these three verbs has a determinative.

A. Under Schenkel's hypothesis of two morphologically distinct forms of the *sḏm.n=f*, the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ of *II.red* would have a long written stem (<ABBn>) while the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ would have the short written stem (<ABn>) ((c), here repeated as (f)). Still under that hypothesis, *ult.n*(*non-II.red*) would display a reverse behavior in written forms when no determinative is written: the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ would have a short written stem (<ABn>: under haplography of the last root consonant with the tense marker) while the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ would have a long writ-

22 E.g., Jürgen Zeidler, "Review of Karel Petrácek, Vergleichende Studien", LingAeg 2 (1992), 214–15; Jürgen Osing, "Die Partizipien im Ägyptischen und in den Semitischen Sprachen", in: Jürgen Osing & Günter Dreyer (eds.), Form und Mass. Beiträge zur Literatur, Sprache und Kunst des alten Ägyptens. Festschrift für Gerhard Fecht zum 65. Geburtstag am 6. Februar 1987, Ägypten und Altes Testament 12 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987), 356–57. Gundacker, LingAeg 19 (2011), 59, n. 185.

23 CT III 133b S1C *n pn.n=i*. The original figure, including T2Be, was "1–2" (Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 48, n. 33): see below, C.

24 CT III 318b T2c *rnn{w}=i*^{i}, environment not fully clear; CT VI 415e M2NY, in lacuna, restored based on the parallel passage in Book of the Dead (thus already de Buck); references provided by Wolfgang Schenkel, personal communication, 8/2013.

25 CT VI 254l Sq6C *ḫn.n=f*, in a clause depending on a previous one, and therefore probably in a "non-emphatic" environment; reference provided by Wolfgang Schenkel, personal communication, 8/2013.

ten stem (<ABNn>) ((g); further discussion below, 2). For *II.red-ult.n*, (f) and (g) are then compounded with each other: when no determinative is written, the result is a short written stem in both the *sḏm.n=f*$_X$ and the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_Y$ (<ANn>) (h):

(f) *II.red* under the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis":
sḏm.n=f$_X$ AvB´vBnv- <ABBn>
sḏm.n=f$_Y$ AvBB´vnv- <ABn>

(g) *Ult.n* under the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis":
sḏm.n=f$_X$ AvB´vNnv- <ABn>
sḏm.n=f$_Y$ AvBN´vnv- <ABNn>

(h) *II.red-ult.n* under the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis":
sḏm.n=f$_X$ AvN´vNnv- <ANn>
sḏm.n=f$_Y$ AvNN´vnv- <ANn>

With *II.red-ult.n* lacking determinatives, both the *sḏm.n=f*$_X$ and the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_Y$ will, in other words, surface as the same written form <ANn>. As it turns out, Coffin Texts written forms of *pnn*, *rnn*, and *ḫnn* come in precisely this form, <ANn>. These therefore provide no evidence to establish the existence of the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_Y$, as they could equally well be interpreted as *sḏm.n=f*$_X$'s.

B. The fourth *II.red-ult.n* in Schenkel's material is *ꜥnn* "bound up" (1–2), in CT IV 3b. This differs from the above in that the written stem is long, suggesting a contrast with short written forms of *II.red-ult.n* discussed above, and possibly supporting Schenkel's hypothesis. However, as Schenkel himself now points out[26], the written forms of *ꜥnn* differ from the ones of *pnn*, *rnn*, and *ḫnn* in yet another respect, namely that in the former a determinative is written, while none is in the latter. More precisely, B1Bo has *ꜥnn*^{DET}*.n=f*. The other witness, B2Be, has *ꜥnn*^{DET} *N pn*, which Schenkel proposes to emend into *ꜥnn*^{DET}*<.n> N pn*[27]: this is likely after the past tense setting *ii.n N pn* (CT IV 3a)[28], and the mistake may have been caused by the alteration of the pronominal subject into a full noun[29]. The written form *ꜥnn*^{DET}*.n* is interpreted as a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$:

(i) *II.red-ult.n* with determinative under the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis":
sḏm.n=f$_X$ AvN´vNnv- <ANN^{DET}n>
sḏm.n=f$_Y$ AvNN´vnv- <AN^{DET}n>

Since a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$ would have existed under both the competing hypotheses, CT IV 3b B1Bo and B2Be do not provide evidence either for or against the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis". (For further discussion of how determinatives affect written forms, see below, 1.4.E; 1.5; 2.)

C. Written forms of *II.red-ult.n* of the type <ANn> without determinative – such as in CT III 133b S1C *n pn.n=i* – were discussed above as interpretable as a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$ or as the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_Y$, and therefore as being predicted by both the "split" and the "unitary *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis" alike (A). Interestingly, CT III 133b is documented in another witness[30], in which the form is written with a determinative:

(j) The same passage, with and without determinative:
CT III 133b
S1C *n pn.n=i*
T2Be *n p[n]n*^{DET}*.n=i*[31]

In the form with determinative, the written stem is long (T2Be), alternating with the short written stem in the form without determinative (S1C). In view of the above discussion of *ꜥnn*^{DET}*.n* (B), only an interpretation as a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$ is possible in T2Be:

(j') CT III 133b, possible interpretations:
S1C *n pn.n=i*
PvN´vNnv- (*sḏm.n=f*$_X$)
PvNN´vnv- (*sḏm.n=f*$_Y$)
T2Be *n p[n]n*^{DET}*.n=i*
PvN´vNnv- (*sḏm.n=f*$_X$)
not: !!PvNN´vnv- (*sḏm.n=f*$_Y$)

Taken as the text stands, CT III 133b thus suggests that the form of the *sḏm.n=f* in the negative construction was a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$, not a *sḏm.n=f*$_Y$ as proposed by Schenkel. The hypothesis that a *sḏm.n=f*$_Y$ should be used in the negative construction was based on two elements[32]: (i) *n t*^{DET}*.n*,

26 Personal communication, 7/2013.

27 Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 47, n. 23.

28 Note that the mistake carries over to CT IV 3f *wnm=f* (B2Be; B1Bo *wnm.n=f*), also after a past tense setting *ii.n N pn* (CT IV 3e).

29 "Der Fehler liegt eher bei B2Be, da bei diesem das an sich ausreichende Pronomen in 'NN' präzisiert worden zu sein scheint" (personal communication, 7/2013).

30 The third witness to document CT III 133b, T3Be, is corrupt on several levels.

31 *N p*[..]*n*^{DET}*.n=i*; no restoration other than the one proposed seems possible.

32 Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 48. In the original presentation of the argument, *n mꜣ.n* also played a role: this has now been withdrawn by Schenkel himself; see below, 1.4.A–B.

also with a short stem and with a determinative[33]; (ii) *wnn*, which has *n wn.n*, aligning with *iw wn.n* and contrasting with the extremely short *wn* in "emphatic" environments. Of these indications, the first would seem to carry some weight, because *n t*ꜣ^{DET}*.n* (2–7) documents the short written stem with a determinative somewhat more densely than *n pnn*^{DET}*.n* (1–1) documents the long one, while the second would seem compelling in itself. However, there are alternative scenarios by which *n t*ꜣ^{DET}*.n* could be accounted for without positing a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ (1.4.E), as there is one for *n wn.n* (3.2). Although the contrast <ANn> vs. <ANN^{DET}n> is documented only once in direct alternation within the same passage (CT III 133b here discussed), this alternation of written stems, short and long, is principled: this is just the broader alternation of short and long written stems of *II.red-ult.n* as these correlate with the absence, respectively presence, of a determinative in other passages (A; B).

Using CT III 133b T2Be as an indication that a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$, not a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$, was used in the negative construction of course presupposes that the text is correct as it stands. This remains slightly insecure: de Buck's reconstruction of T2Be is at times tentative, and an ancient aberratio occuli is always possible, here perhaps in relation to the pronominal suffix[34] (thus *n p*[*n*]*n*^{DET}*.n=i* in CT III 133b T2Be for *n p*[*n*]{*n*}^{DET}*.n=i*[35]). These are not positive indications that an emendation should be carried out, and the alternation in written forms presented by T2Be and S1C as the two witnesses stand is fully consistent with the behavior of *II.red-ult.n* in written inflection, with and without determinative. However, no definite conclusions, particularly if far-reaching, should be based on a single passage.

1.4 *II.red-ult.*ꜣ: *mꜣꜣ*, *tꜣꜣ*

Coffin Text forms of the *sḏm.n=f* of *mꜣꜣ* are from "non-emphatic" environments and come with a short written stem[36]: these forms readily lend themselves to an interpretation as representations of the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ (AvBB´vnv-), in conformity with the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis". However, Schenkel has subsequently noted that the more generally "irregular" inflectional behavior of *mꜣꜣ* precludes using this verb in support of his hypothesis[37]. I nonetheless discuss the case of *mꜣꜣ* in some details here, because this presents a descriptive interest in itself, and because it is relevant to the subsequent appreciation of the written forms of a series of other verbs, *tꜣꜣ* (E) and *ꜣmm* (1.5), as well as possibly of early New Kingdom forms (1.6).

A. In Pyramid Texts, the *sḏm.n=f* of *mꜣꜣ* consistently has the short written stem[38]. These short written forms are all from "non-emphatic" environments[39], as are the short written stems in other Old Kingdom texts (Urk. I 62, 1 *iw mꜣ.n*; sim. Urk. I 179, 13): as in Coffin Texts, an interpretation as instances of the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ is therefore possible. However, the short written stem also extends to the attributive *sḏm.n=f*[40], which would share the same syllable structure as the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$. In three cases in Pyramid Texts, the form is feminine (*mꜣt.n=f*)[41], as it is in all cases of the relative *sḏm.n=f* of *mꜣꜣ* in Coffin Texts as well[42]. In such forms, the feminine ending could have induced an alteration of the syllable structure: a plausible scenario to this effect has been proposed[43]. In the fourth case, however, the relative form is masculine (Pyr. §*1954b^{PNt} *mꜣ.n N*), yet still comes with a short written stem[44]: in this admittedly isolated case, the short written stem of *mꜣꜣ* is thus observed with a form that under either of the competing hypotheses alike would share the same syllable structure as a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$.

Turning to Middle Egyptian (literary) texts documented in pre-New Kingdom manuscripts similarly, the short written stem is found in "predicative" environments, yet also at least once in an "emphatic" one[45]:

---

33 To this, the short stem with determinative in CT I 397c*n* *ꜣm*^{DET}*.n.tw* (1–3) could be added (note the alternation with a long written stem, *n ꜣmm*^{DET}*.n.tw*, in one witness); this was not included in Schenkel's original dataset, no doubt because of the passive nature of the form, which could raise additional issues; discussed below, 1.5.C.

34 I thank Wolfgang Schenkel, personal communication, 8/2013, for discussion of these text-critical issues.

35 Regarding the state of the text in T2Be, CT III 133d *n tꜣ=i* may also be made note of, which is parallel to 133b and probably to be emended into *n tꜣ*<*.n*>*=i*, as is also suggested by S1C where *n tꜣ.n=i* is the last of a sequence of four *n sḏm.n=f*'s.

36 Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 46–47.

37 Schenkel, LingAeg 14 (2006), 62.

38 Allen, Inflection, §767D. Discussion in Stauder, "Interpreting Written Morphology".

39 Similarly noted by Gundacker, LingAeg 19 (2011), 59.

40 Allen, Inflection, §770E.

41 Pyr. §43b; §*1840c; Nt 717.

42 Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 49–50, n. 40–44.

43 Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 50.

44 Also noted by Gundacker, LingAeg 19 (2011), 59.

45 One instance of a relative *sḏm.n=f* has been noted, in Shipwrecked Sailor 143 *mꜣt.n=i*: this is feminine and therefore subject to the same caveat voiced above.

(k) Written forms of *mꜣꜣ* in Middle Kingdom texts other than Coffin Texts:
- "predicative": Herdsman x+3 *iw mꜣ.n=i*; Sinuhe B 108 *mꜣ.n=f*[46]; Cheops' Court 6.13 *iw mꜣ.n=i*; sim. negative: Hammamat 191, 6 *n mꜣ.n s(i) irt*;
- "emphatic": Debate of a Man and His Soul 71 *mꜣ.n=f*[47].

In all pre-New Kingdom times, the *sḏm.n=f* of *mꜣꜣ* thus regularly displays the short written stem, in all environments (for a singular exception, below, C). These include at least two cases in which a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$, or a form with the same syllable structure as a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$ is predicted under both the competing hypotheses alike. In Coffin Texts (as in Pyramid Texts), the *sḏm.n=f* of *mꜣꜣ* is documented only in "predicative" environments, always with the short written stem: while an interpretation as a *sḏm.n=f*$_Y$ remains fully possible, an interpretation as a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$ is therefore possible as well. The Coffin Text data regarding *mꜣꜣ* are thereby neutral as to which of the two competing hypotheses is correct. (This does of course not disprove the "split" hypothesis either, since two forms distinguished by the position of stress may well have surfaced as the same written form: B.)

B. While the above suffices to make the Coffin Texts instances of *mꜣꜣ* neutral to the issue, it is of some interest to account for the cases in which the written form *mꜣ.n=f* must stand for a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$. Two proposals have been made and a third is here submitted. In common to these proposals is the basic observation that the second reduplicated root consonant of *mꜣꜣ*, transcribed as "aleph" only by virtue of a late Nineteenth Century convention, is probably a liquid of some sort, and by any event not an obstruent.

Confronted with the masculine relative *mꜣ.n N* (Pyr. § *1954b[PNt]), Gundacker has proposed that this phoneme transcribed as "aleph" was undergoing assimilation to the tempus marker *-n-* (α)[48]. Schenkel, for his part, has suggested that the *sḏm.n=f*$_X$ of *mꜣꜣ* may have been based on the stem *mꜣn-*, also documented in the subjunctive (β)[49]. I submit a third possible account which, although related to Gundacker's proposal, differs from this on one important detail, as it does not require assimilation per se, nor makes any hypothesis on the precise phonological nature of whatever "aleph" may have stood for. In a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$ of *mꜣꜣ*, the second "aleph", certainly not an obstruent, stands at the end of the stressed syllable in the *sḏm.n=f*$_X$; this could have led to its written non-representation, or even to its absence in articulation (γ). Schematically, with capitalized "L" here standing for a liquid of same sort, not further specified:

(l) Hypotheses for the short written stem of *mꜣꜣ* in the *sḏm.n=f*$_X$:
(α) **/mvl´vlnv-/ > */mvl´vnnv-/ (and possibly further > */mvl´v(:)nv-/[50]), surfacing as *mꜣ.n*;
(β) */MvL´vNnv-/, surfacing as *mꜣ.n*;
(γ) */mv$L´vL$nv-/[51], perhaps also */mv$L´v(L)$nv-/, surfacing as *mꜣ.n*.

Of these, (β) is perhaps less likely, because the stem *mꜣn-* may well be limited to specific prosodic conditions: in the subjunctive, the only other inflectional category where it is certainly found, *mꜣn-* is in a form with stress after the last root consonant (CvCC´v-); the stem may then perhaps reflect a dissimilation of liquids before stress (thus **/MvLL´v-/>*/MvLN´v-/ (?))[52]. Whether a similar type of account may extend to the written forms *mꜣn-* occasionally encountered in the infinitive requires further examination.

Proposals (α) and (γ) could be related to each other if in both cases the hypothesized processes went to the end, to */mvl´v(:)nv-/(<*/mvl´vnnv-/) and to */mv$L´v(L)$nv-/ (lack of articulation, beyond lack of written representation), respectively. These scenarios would also be related in a deeper sense, since the non-representation of the syllable-final liquid of a form */mv$L´vL$nv-/, hypothesized in (γ), would reflect similar parameters as its loss in articulation, hypothesized in the final stages of both and (γ), if these were reached. Of these two scenarios, (α) and

46 In context: *rḏ{t}<n>ꜥ=f wi m ḫꜣt ḫrdw=f mꜣ.n=f r(w)dꜥwy=i iwt nḫt nt tnw* (...) "He placed me at the head of his children, having seen that my arms were strong. Coming of a strongman of (Re)tenu (...)" (Sinuhe B 107–9).

47 From a setting construction; in context: *mꜣ.n=f prt wḫt nt mḥyt rs m dpt rꜥ ḥr ꜥq* (...) "When he had seen the coming forth of the north wind's dark night, he was watching in the boat as the Sungod was entering (...)" (Debate 71–73).

48 Gundacker, LingAeg 19 (2011), 59–60.

49 Schenkel, LingAeg 14 (2006), 62; id., Tübinger Einführung, § 7.3.1.1.2.a, obs.

50 This last step is not part of Gundacker's proposal, which strictly limits itself to assimilation; it is, however, a natural possibility, if assimilation did occur.

51 When relevant, a "$" stands to signal the syllable boundary.

52 I wonder in this context whether the subjunctive forms *iwt* and *int* of *iwi* "come" and *ini* "bring" may not reflect a similar phenomenon: both *iwi* and *ini* lack any obstruent, and the final t, only in the subjunctive, may have been a way to provide a stronger onset for the stressed syllable (e.g., */jvn$t´v-/). Other accounts that have been proposed for these forms suggest that the paradigm was suppletive, with *iwt* and *int* being either verbal nouns or forms of the *sḏmt=f*. I find these accounts rather less likely in view of the distribution of the subjunctive, which is much broader than the one of either verbal nouns or the *sḏmt=f*.

(γ), I find the latter preferable, because the process of assimilation of whatever "aleph" may have stood for to *n*, hypothesized in (α), although plausible on general grounds, remains slightly uncertain in view of the unclear nature of what "aleph" may have stood for. The non-representation of a non-obstruent in final position of the stressed syllable is, on the other hand, documented[53]; the non-articulation of that syllable final "aleph" is also a possibility to be reckoned with on general grounds[54].

What is perhaps most important here is that one of these three scenarios, devised to account for the short written stem of the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ of *mꜣꜣ*, must be correct: this is because the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ of *mꜣꜣ* does occur in the record, with a short written stem.

C. A singular pre-New Kingdom written form with the long stem, *mꜣꜣ.n=f* in P. Ramesseum C vso I.7[55], deserves discussion. The context is too damaged for the constructional environment to be identified[56]. Whatever this may have been, the written form is remarkable as it differs from the short written stem found in *all* environments in all pre-New Kingdom times. Its interest further lies in its anticipating on spellings that would become more common in the early New Kingdom (below, 1.6).

Unless the form is declared aberrant, it must be interpreted as a morphemographic representation under hypothesis (α): the stem would be represented in its pre-assimilated form (**/mvl´vlnv-/), perhaps expressing the segmentation between the stem and the affix (MvL´vL–nv-). Under hypothesis (β), the form would probably be accounted for as an alternant stem formation of the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ (*/mvL´vLnv-/, alongside */mvL´vNnv-/ elsewhere). Under hypothesis (γ), it would, perhaps more simply, be accounted for as an occasional fuller written representation of the form (*mꜣꜣ.n*, alongside *mꜣ.n* elsewhere, for */mv$L´vL$nv-/).

D. Although somewhat older, a mention may also be made of the only *II.red-ult.ꜣ* other than *mꜣꜣ* documented in Pyramid Texts, *sꜣꜣ* "be wise". In the one place where it occurs (Pyr. §664c[T]), the written form is long (*sꜣꜣ.n*), in a clause providing a setting to a following clause[57]. A *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ is therefore expected under either of the two competing hypotheses, and the written form immediately lends itself to such an interpretation (*/SvL´vLnv-/). This merits a brief comment, because, also in Pyramid Texts, a masculine relative form of *mꜣꜣ*, with a syllable structure similar to the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$, had a *short* written stem (*mꜣ.n N*: A).

Under Schenkel's hypothesis of a different stem only for *mꜣꜣ* (β), *sꜣꜣ.n* would be accounted for directly as */SvL´vLnv-/. Under hypotheses (α) and (γ), *sꜣꜣ.n* could be interpreted like the singular *mꜣꜣ.n* just discussed (C): as an alternative, morphemographic representation, perhaps expressing the segmentation between the stem and the affix (SvL´vL – nv-) (α), or as a fuller written representation of the form (γ). Under (α) and (γ) alike, the singular *sꜣꜣ.n* (for a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$) would be to *mꜣ.n* in Pyramid Texts (found with both the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ and the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$) as the singular *mꜣꜣ.n* (C: environment unclear) is to *mꜣ.n* elsewhere in the Middle Kingdom (for both the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ and the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$). Whichever of these accounts is correct, such alternations demonstrate that additional complexities – as hypothesized, if differently, in all three scenarios (α)–(γ) – are at play with *II.red-ult.ꜣ*.

E. Turning back to Coffin Texts, these include forms of the *sḏm.n=f* of another *II.red-ult.ꜣ*, *tꜣꜣ* "be hot". While *tꜣꜣ* belongs to the exact same morphological subclass as *mꜣꜣ*, its case is slightly different because the spelling of *tꜣꜣ* is with a determinative. Written forms are in all cases with the short stem, *n tꜣ*^{DET}*.n* (2–7)[58]: interpreting this as a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$, as Schenkel proposes, is therefore clearly a possibility (thus, again with "L" standing for a liquid of some sort, not further specified: */tvLL´vnv-/). However, an interpretation as a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ is possible as well.

Under Gundacker's assimilation hypothesis ((α), here extended beyond *mꜣꜣ* for which it was initially proposed), the written form *tꜣ*^{DET}*.n* could be interpreted as standing for

53 Comparable phenomena have been studied in Pyramid Texts (Jochem Kahl, "Die Defektivschreibungen in den Pyramidentexten", LingAeg 2 (1992), 99–116).

54 To illustrate what is meant from a complementary perspective, one may contrast the form of the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$, which has a short written stem (*mꜣ.n*), with the form of the *mrr=f*, which has a long one (*mꜣꜣ*): in the latter, the second "aleph" almost certainly stood at the onset of a syllable (*/mvL´v$Lv-/, or the like), and was therefore articulated and represented in writing; in the former, it stood in syllable-final position (*/mvL´vL$nv-/) and could therefore have been left out in written representation or dropped in articulation. The written forms in the "aorist" *sḏm=f* may also be relevant to the issue, but currently remain too poorly understood to be included here (Wolfgang Schenkel, "Zur Formenbildung des prädikativen *sḏm=f* der Verben II. gem., vornehmlich nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte", GM 189 (2002), 89–98).

55 Noted by Joris Borghouts, Egyptian. An Introduction to the Writing and Language of the Middle Kingdom, Egyptologische Uitgaven 24 (Leuven/Leiden: Nederlaands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten and Peters, 2010), vol. I, § 65.c.2.

56 Vso I.7–8 [...] *mꜣꜣ.n=k wsir iṯ.t(w)=f in twꜣw=k* (Alan Gardiner, The Ramesseum Papyri (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955), pl. XXIX).

57 Allen, Inflection, § 767D.

58 CT I 342/3a BH2C (additional text, to the right); 380/1a (various witnesses): see Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 48, and n. 37.

**/tvl´vlnv-/ > */tvl´vnnv-/> */tvl´v(:)nv-/. Under hypothesis (γ), the second liquid, at the end of the stressed syllable in a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$, could have been left unrepresented in writing or even have been unarticulated in speech (*t*ȝ^{DET}.*n* as a written representation of */tv$L´vL$nv-/, or perhaps even for */tv$L´v(L)$nv-/). These are of course hypotheses only, yet some of the very same hypotheses that *had* to be made to account for the short written stems displayed by *m*ȝȝ in the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ (B): given the actual occurrence of these forms of *m*ȝȝ, one of these hypotheses, or a related one yet to be proposed, must be correct for *m*ȝȝ, which in turn defines a similar possibility for *t*ȝȝ, also a *II.red-ult.*ȝ.

In the above scenarios, the presence of the determinative does not, therefore, stand in the way of an interpretation of the written forms *t*ȝ^{DET}.*n* as a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$. Nor does another form which also has a determinative, but unlike *t*ȝ^{DET}.*n* comes with a long stem: ᶜ*nn*^{DET}.*n* (1.3.B; also note *n pnn*^{DET}.*n*, which unless to be emended, would document the long written stem in the exact same environment as here *n t*ȝ^{DET}.*n*: 1.3.C). The latter could stand for a morphemographic representation, perhaps expressing the segmentation between the stem and the affix (thus, with "D" standing for whatever "ayin" may have been: DvN´vN–nv-): such possibility was discussed in relation to the singular long written stem *m*ȝȝ.*n* (P. Ramesseum C vso I.7: C). Alternatively, ᶜ*nn*^{DET}.*n* could be a fuller written representation and/or stand for a fuller articulation than is the case in *t*ȝ^{DET}.*n*: such possibility was also discussed as an option for interpreting *m*ȝȝ.*n*, as an alternant to *m*ȝ.*n* found otherwise (C). Within certain well-principled constraints, modes of written representation may have varied, as articulation itself could have (above): that they did vary at least in some cases is demonstrated by the discussion in the two preceding sub-sections (C-D). In sum, *t*ȝ^{DET}.*n* could be interpreted as the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ – Schenkel's proposal is impeccable – or it could be interpreted as a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ – too many possibilities, documented independently, are given for this not to be taken into account. (See further the case of the structurally similar written forms ȝ*m*^{DET}.*n* discussed below, 1.5.B, particularly *fine*.)

1.5 *II.red-ult.m*: *ȝmm* "seize, grasp"

A. The (non-negative) *sḏm.n=f* of *ȝmm* "seize, grasp" occurs in three passages in Coffin Texts[59]. In all three, the written stem is short and a determinative is written, ȝ*m*^{DET}.*n*. Beginning the discussion on the level of written forms strictly (for constructional environments, below, B), these instances of ȝ*m*^{DET}.*n* naturally lend themselves to an interpretation as *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$'s (AvMM´vnv-), as Schenkel proposes. However, an interpretation as *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$'s seems possible as well, in view of the above discussion of *II.red-ult.n* (1.3) and *II.red-ult.*ȝ (1.4). Options similar to the ones presented for *t*ȝ^{DET}.*n* (1.4.E) can be contemplated. Under Gundacker's assimilation hypothesis extended, ȝ*m*^{DET}.*n* could stand for **/Lvm´vmnv-/ > */Lvm´vnnv-/> */Lvm´v(:)nv-/. Under the hypothesis introduced in the present study, the second liquid, at the end of the stressed syllable in a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$, could have been left unrepresented in writing (ȝ*m*^{DET}.*n* as a representation of */Lv$m´vm$nv-/), or perhaps even dropped in articulation (*/Lv$m´v(m)$nv-/). These scenarios are hypothetical, but must be contemplated as real possibilities in view of the behavior of *m*ȝȝ in written inflection (1.4.A–C). As discussed in relation to *t*ȝ^{DET}.*n*, the presence of the determinative does not stand in the way of such interpretation (1.4.E).

B. The constructional environments in which these forms ȝ*m*^{DET}.*n* occur are discussed in turn. As none of the three instances of ȝ*m*^{DET}.*n* follow *iw* or *n*, these constructional environments cannot be established on direct formal grounds and a consideration of context is required in each case.

(m) CT II 236b–239c (mult. mss.)

*ḫ*ᶜ.*n=i m bik* ᶜȝ
ȝm.n=i[a] *sw m* ᶜ*nwt=i*
spty=i r=f m ds tḥn
ᶜ*nwt=i r=f m šsrw sḫmt*
*ḥnwty=i r=f m sm*ȝ*-wr*
*ḏnḥwy=i r=f m ḥ*ȝ*w*
*sḏ=i r=f m b*ȝ ᶜ*nḫ*

"Having risen as the great falcon,
I seized him with my claws,
my lips against him like a knife of gleam,
my claws against him like Sekhmet's arrow
my horns against him like the Great-Bull,
my wings against him like a bird of prey's,
my tail against him like a living *ba*."

a) Thus S2P, S1P, S1Chass, S1C^{b}, S2C^{d}, probably also S2C^{a}. Three other witnesses (B2Bo, P. Berlin, S2C^{c}) have an alternative reading, also coherent, with a synchronous tense, ȝ*mm=i*. One witness, B9C, is unclear (ȝ*mm*[...]*=i*), and therefore left out of the discussion here[60].

59 Schenkel, "Prädikatives und abstrakt-relativisches *sḏm.n=f*", 45; id., LingAeg 14 (2006), 65–66; for an occurrence in a negative construction, below, C.

60 In Schenkel's written discussion (LingAeg 14 (2006), 64–65), a reading ȝ*mm.*[?*n*?]*=i* is critically examined and declared not impossible, yet ultimately insecure. In a subsequent personal communica-

In Schenkel's hypothesis, a short written form *ỉm.n* should be in a "predicative" environment. In full honesty, the author notes that "die oben *der Formenbildung zuliebe* (emphasis AS) gewählte Lösung" (...) is also the one he sees underlying Carrier's French rendering of the passage, and should therefore be viewed as "also wenigstens vom Sinn her vertretbar"[61]. If the interpretation is made according to the prediction of the hypothesis, the passage ceases to provide independent evidence in support of that hypothesis.

The first clause (*ḥᶜ.n=i* (...)) provides a setting to the next (*ỉm.n=i* (...)), as Schenkel himself also analyses[62]. This need not, however, imply that the following form (*ỉm.n=i*) must be "predicative": in general, a whole variety of constructions can follow a clause in setting function. Compare for instance CT IV 3a–b *ii.n N pn* (...) *ᶜnn*^{DET}*.n=f* (...), discussed above (1.3.B). Based on the written form (a long written stem of a *II.red-ult.n* written with the determinative), *ᶜnn*^{DET}*.n=f* is necessarily a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$. To this clause, the preceding one, *ii.n N pn* (...), provides a setting – just as *ḥᶜ.n=i* (...) does to *ỉm*^{DET}*.n=i* (...) in CT II 236b–c. If after a setting clause, only a "predicative" form can follow, then in CT IV 3b, *ᶜnn*^{DET}*.n=f* must itself be interpreted as "predicative": this would then demonstrate that a *sḏm.n=f*$_X$ was used in "predicative" environments, directly contradicting the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis". If, on the other hand, CT IV 3a–b is analyzed as it probably should be, with *ᶜnn*^{DET}*.n=f* in an "emphatic" environment, following upon a clausal setting (*ii.n N pn* (...)), then in CT II 236b–c similarly, *ỉm*^{DET}*.n=i* could be in an "emphatic" environment, following the clausal setting *ḥᶜ.n=i* (...). That this is indeed the case is strongly suggested by the string of five clauses that follow *ỉm*^{DET}*.n=i* (...) (*spty=i r=f* (...)), which these provide a five-fold semantic elaboration of the event of "seizing".

The second instance of *ỉm.n*, in CT VII 124l (a single witness: T1NY), comes from a severely damaged context. As Schenkel observes, the formulation seems analogous to the one in CT II 236b–239c (m)[63]; accordingly, the construction is probably the same. The third instance of *ỉm.n* reads:

(n) CT IV 92c–j (a single witness: B5C)
(...) *ḫr=i m ḫr=f*
ḫprw=i mi ḫprw=f m bik nṯr(i)
ḫw.n=i nṯrw m ᶜwy=i
[...].*n=i st m ᶜỉgwt=i*
{*ỉ*}*šḏ.n=i st m ḏbᶜw=i*
ỉm.n=i *st m ᶜnwt=i*
ᶜỉ pḥty=i r=sn m ḫprw=i nw ḫr ᶜỉ pḥty

"(...) for my face is his (*scil.* Horus') face,
my transformations are like his transformations as a divine falcon.
I struck the gods with my arms;
I [...] them with my heels,
I took them with my fingers,
I grasped them with my claws.
My strength is greater than theirs in my transformations of Horus, great of strength."

In context, *ỉm.n=i* is in the fourth of a series of four clauses in close parallel formulation, and an interpretation as an "emphatic construction", placing the perspective on "my claws", is semantically the most likely. Schenkel, on the other hand, has proposed to emend by relating *m bik nṯr(i)*, not to *mi ḫprw=f*, but to a preceding <*ḥᶜ.n=i*> in setting function[64]:

(o) The same, under Schenkel's emendation:
(...) *ḫr=i m ḫr=f*
ḫprw=i mi ḫprw=f
<*ḥᶜ.n=i*> *m bik nṯr(i)*
ḫw.n=i nṯrw m ᶜwy=i
(...)
ỉm.n=i m ᶜnwt=i

This proposal is based on the observation that while CT IV 92d reads *ḫprw=f* ***m*** *bik nṯr(i)*, CT IV 92i–j reads *ḫprw=i* ***nw*** *ḫr* (...). Should *m bik nṯr(i)* indeed relate to *mi ḫprw=f*, so argues Schenkel, *mi ḫprw=f* ***nw*** *bik nṯr(i)* might have been expected in CT IV 92d as well. I remain agnostic as to whether the text should be emended: the text is not incoherent as it stands, nor ungrammatical, as Schenkel himself acknowledges[65], but the emendation is not impossible either. As discussed above, however, a variety of constructions can follow a setting clause, including "emphatic" ones. In the present context, the *sḏm.n=f*'s come in a fourfold sequence, with lexical variation on verbs of violent action ("striking", [...], "taking", and "seizing") followed by four different expressions of the

tion (7/2013), Wolfgang Schenkel provides valuable arguments against this reading: B9C has various idiosyncrasies also elsewhere in Spell 149, and B9C tends to side with the versions to its right in de Buck's edition (B2Bo, P. Berlin, and S2C^c), i.e. the ones that have *ỉmm=i*; these, incidentally, include the only other witness of the B group.

61 Schenkel, LingAeg 14 (2006), 64.
62 Schenkel, LingAeg 14 (2006), 64.
63 Schenkel, LingAeg 14 (2006), 65.
64 Schenkel, LingAeg 14 (2006), 65.
65 Schenkel, LingAeg 14 (2006), 65.

instruments of such actions: such semantic texturing is generally indicative of "emphatic" environments.

In sum, none of the three passages in which *ỉm.n* occurs has a clearly "predicative" environment[66]. In CT II 236c (m), an "emphatic" analysis is more likely based on context, as is then the case in CT VII 124l as well. In CT IV 92h (n), the environment is clearly "emphatic"; emendation (o) is certainly not impossible, but even so the construction stills stands a greater chance to be "emphatic" than not. If a single one among the above passages were "emphatic", *ỉm*$^{\text{DET}}$*.n*, a short written stem with a determinative would be documented in an environment in which a *sḏm.n=f*$_{\text{X}}$ is predicted under either of the competing hypotheses alike. This would then make written forms such as *ỉm*$^{\text{DET}}$*.n* useless for establishing the existence of a *sḏm.n=f*$_{\text{Y}}$. It would also imply that one of the scenarios sketched above for interpreting *ỉm*$^{\text{DET}}$*.n* as a *sḏm.n=f*$_{\text{X}}$ (A), or another one yet to be proposed, *must* apply. By the same token, it would further imply that one of these scenarios should apply to *tȝ*$^{\text{DET}}$*.n* (1.4.E), a written form structurally similar to *ỉm*$^{\text{DET}}$*.n.* (Even if *all three* passages were "predicative" after all, one of these scenarios could still apply: this would then remain a possibility, to be considered on grounds of its general likelihood, but not be a necessary interpretation.)

C. For the sake of a complete description, one further passage with a *sḏm.n=f* of *ỉmm*, not mentioned by Schenkel probably because the form is passive, deserves discussion. In CT I 397b–398b, most witnesses have an alternation between prospective and general imperfective constructions (p), while other ones phrase in the prospective throughout (q)[67]; interestingly, one witness that here sides with the first group of texts, B1Bo, has a long written form, *n ỉmm.n.t*(*w*), in 397b:

(p) CT I 397b–398b B1C, B2L, B1P, B1Bo
n nḏrw.t(*w*) *bȝ=i in bikw*
***n ỉm.n.t*(*w*)**[a] *bȝ=i in šȝw*
n ḥf^{cc} *bȝ=i in ỉkrw*
***n sȝ.n.t*(*w*)** *bȝ=i in ḥkȝw šnwt r*^{c}

"My *ba* will not be taken by falcons,
my *ba* cannot be seized by pigs;
my *ba* will not be grasped by the earth-gods,
my *ba* cannot be retained by the magic powers of Ra's entourage."

a) B1Bo ***n ỉmm.n.t*(*w*)**.

(q) CT I 397b–398b S1C, S2C
n nḏr.t(*w*) *bȝ=i in bikw*
n ỉmm[a] *bȝ=i in šȝw*
n ḥf^{cc} *bȝ=i in ỉkrw*
n ỉmm *bȝ=i in ḥkȝ*

"My *ba* will not be taken by falcons,
my *ba* will not be seized by pigs;
my *ba* will not be grasped by the earth-gods,
my *ba* will not be seized by *Heka*."

a) S2C *ỉ{ỉ}<m>m=i*.

While both readings are coherent as they stand, the main tradition is probably superior in its more complex temporal and lexical texturing. Set against the principled alternation in negative constructions (prospective – general imperfective, twice) in the main tradition, the reading in S1C (with prospectives throughout) appears as a regularization. The impression of regularization in S1C is confirmed on the lexical level: while the main tradition has *sȝw* in CT I 398b, S1C has *ỉmm*, arguably a harmonization to *ỉmm* as already before in the parallel clause in CT I 397b.

The point of interest lies here in the long written stem in CT I 397b B1Bo, *n ỉmm*$^{\text{DET}}$*.n.t*(*w*). In Schenkel's overall hypothesis, the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{\text{Y}}$ would be used after negation: the long written form in B1Bo thus seem to contradict the hypothesis, in ways similar to *n p*[*n*]*n*$^{\text{DET}}$*.n* in CT III 133b T2Be (1.3.B). Just as the latter, CT I 397b B1Bo could then be declared faulty: in the present case, the long written stem could have had to do with the long written stem of the prospective, as in the other tradition of this passage ((q); also note that S2C is garbled on this very form).

Alternatively, one could speculate then that T-passive morphology could have triggered changes in the syllable structure of the form. While impossible to assess on directly empirical grounds, this does not seem very likely: if the form in CT I 397b is a *sḏm.n=f*$_{\text{Y}}$, as would be the case under the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis"[68], its struc-

66 Compare Schenkel's (LingAeg 14 (2006), 66) own final assessment: "Nicht-geminiertes *ỉm.n kann* (emphasis AS) im Referenzkorpus der Sargtexte in jedem Fall prädikativ sein".

67 One witness has a mixed formulation, in relation to the split column it has in CT I 397b: T3C *n nḏr* / ***n ỉmm*** *bȝ*(*=i*) *in bikw* / *šȝw* – <*n*> *ḥf*^{cc} *bȝ=i in ỉkr* ***n sȝ.n.t*(*w*)** *bȝ=i in ḥkȝ* "my *ba* will not be taken by falcons, my *ba* will not be seized by pigs; my *ba* will not be grasped by the earth-god, my *ba* cannot be retained by *Heka*." The much abbreviated spelling in T3C is more generally noteworthy, extending for instance to logographic representations of *bikw* and *šȝw*.

68 Note that the alteration of syllable structure hypothesized in the feminine relative form of *mȝȝ* concerns a *sḏm.n=f*$_{\text{X}}$ (1.4.A, with n. 45): the present situation is different.

ture in the active would have been AvMM´vnv-; adding a morpheme {*t*} would then most probably have resulted in a form such as AvMM'vn$tv-, or the like, with a similar syllable structure as far as the position of the reduplicated root consonants *m* is concerned[69]. In other words, the passive nature of the form does not easily account for the long written stem in B1Bo, if really a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$. Even if it could, by some other process here not contemplated, the short written stems in the three other witnesses, B1C, B2L, B1P, also passive, would then have to be explained in turn. This would then also be a further indication that in forms with determinatives a short written stem (as in the witnesses that have *n ꜣm*^{DET}*.n.t*(*w*)) could at least occasionnally stand for a form in which the two identical root consonants of a *II.red-ult.liquida* are separated by a vowel of some weight (as would be implied by B1Bo *n ꜣmm*^{DET}*.n.t*(*w*) under the hypothesis that the long written stem is triggered by passive morphology) – a possibility already discussed above (1.4.B–E).

The long written form in B1Bo as well as its alternation with the short written form in other witnesses that have a *sḏm.n=f* in CT I 397b could, on the other hand, be accounted for under an analysis developed in the present paper. It was hypothesized that short written forms of *ꜣmm* could be analyzed as instances of the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ if it is assumed that the second liquid consonant in syllable-final position was left unrepresented in writing and/or unarticulated in speech (A) – an analysis that would find direct support if at least one of the three passages with active *ꜣm*^{DET}*.n* is "emphatic", as is not unlikely (B). It was also observed that, should this interpretation be correct, a second liquid root consonant could occasionally be represented in writing, thus with determinative *ꜥnn*^{DET}*.n* (1.3.B; possibly also*n p*[*n*]*n*^{DET}*.n*: 1.3.C) and without determinative *mꜣꜣ.n* in P. Ram. C vso I.7 (against *mꜣ.n* in all environments in all other pre-New Kingdom texts: 1.4.C). In CT I 397b, *n ꜣmm*^{DET}*.n.t*(*w*) (B1Bo) against *n ꜣm*^{DET}*.n.t*(*w*) (B1C, B2L, B1P) could then be a case of a similar alternation: the latter set of witnesses would have the regular spelling with the reduplicated liquid in syllable-final position unrepresented in writing or non-articulated in speech, while B1Bo would have the occasionally fuller one. If so, CT I 397b would have a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ after negative *n*, as possibly CT III 133b T2Be as well (1.3.C), contra the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis".

As already expressed, I see no way to assess whether the reading in CT I 397b B1Bo – a textus unicus – is itself correct in the first place: it may not be. While the passage is worth discussing, no definite conclusions should therefore be derived from CT I 397b B1Bo.

1.6 Digression: Long Written Stems of *II.red* in Early New Kingdom Texts

A. The long written forms displayed by *II.red* in some early New Kingdom manuscripts and inscriptions may be evoked at the present juncture. The following have been noted in "predicative" environments, i.e. in environments that under the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis" would have a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$[70]:

(r) Long written stems of *II.red* in "predicative" environments in early New Kingdom texts:

II.red-ult.m:
iw ḥfꜥ.n=f (...) *ꜣmm.n=f*: Ahmose's Karnak Eulogy 10 (Urk. IV 17, 7–8).

II.red-ult.ꜣ:
iw mꜣꜣ.n=i: Sporting King A2.2; Fishing and Fowling B3.8; Kheti 4.2; Urk. IV 1004, 4 (from an inscription of Tjanuni)[71]; Mutter und Kind vso 4.3[72];
n mꜣꜣ.n=i: Fishing and Fowling B2.7; Kheti 3.2; 4.2.

II.red-ult.n:
n ꜥnn=i: Urk. IV 367, 12 (from Hatshepsut's Karnak Obelisk).

II.red, with the reduplicated root consonant an obstruent:
n tkk.n: Merikare E 33;
n qbb.n: Merikare E 68.

These long written forms contrast with the short Middle Kingdom ones discussed so far. With *mꜣꜣ*, the short written stem was observed to be the rule, notably in "predicative" environments, in the Old and Middle Kingdom alike (1.4.A). With *ꜣmm*, the short written stem is used in environments that remain unclear (1.5.A–B) and in the

69 The situation thus seems to be different from the case of the feminine relative form, evoked above (1.3.A), which is based on a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$, not on a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ as would be the form in CT I 397b under the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis".

70 Unless noted otherwise, references are drawn from Schenkel, LingAeg 14 (2006), 63, n. 15; some of these classically go back to GEG, p. 328, n. 8.

71 Noted by Uljas, LingAeg 18 (2010), 259, n. 30.

72 Noted by Schenkel, Tübinger Einführung, § 7.3.1.1.1, obs. 1; Allen, Middle Egyptian (2nd edition), § 18.2.

negative construction, in which under the "split *sḏm.n=f* hypothesis" the same form as after *iw* would be used (1.5.C). For both of these verbs, only singular instances of forms with a long written stem have been noted: *mꜣꜣ.n*, in an environment that cannot be further determined, but contrasting with *mꜣ.n* in all environments in all pre-New Kingdom texts (P. Ram. C vso I.7: 1.4.C); *n ꜣmm.n.tw*, in direct textual variation to written forms with the short stem (CT I 397b B1Bo: 1.5.C).

B. These early New Kingdom long written stems of the *sḏm.n=f* in "predicative" environments have been interpreted as reflecting changes in the conventions of written representation in the context of ongoing linguistic change. At a time when the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ was falling out of use, scribes might have been confused as to which form of the *sḏm.n=f*, the hypothesized *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$ or the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$, would be correct after *iw*[73]. More broadly, morphological distinctions reflected by the short and long written stems of *II.red* would have been in the process of becoming increasingly blurred, with the result that the long written stems could increasingly be used in lieu of the short one, in the *sḏm.n=f* as in other inflectional categories[74].

An alternative possibility is presented here, which consists in interpreting the data even more directly in terms of changes in the conventions of written representation, without reference to a situation of ongoing linguistic change. As discussed above, one possibility for accounting for the short written forms of *II.red-ult.ꜣ* (*mꜣꜣ* and *tꜣꜣ*) and *II.red-ult.m* (*ꜣmm*) in earlier times is to view these forms as *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$'s, under a convention by which the second reduplicated root consonant in syllable-final position would be left unrepresented in writing (e.g., *mꜣ.n* standing for */mv$L´vL$nv-/) and/or could be left unarticulated in speech (*/mv$L´v(L)$nv-/). In the case of *tꜣꜣ* (1.4.E) and *ꜣmm* (1.5.A; further 1.5.B–C), this is one interpretive possibility, while in the case of *mꜣꜣ* it is arguably the only possibility (1.4.B). Beginning therefore with *mꜣꜣ*, early New Kingdom written forms such as *iw mꜣꜣ.n* and *n mꜣꜣ.n* could then be interpreted as standing for the exact same form under the altered convention that the syllable-final "aleph" would here be represented in writing. A similar account could extend to long written forms of *ꜣmm* in the early New Kingdom.

Rather than to do with a blurring of the contrast between short and long written stems of *II.red*, the early New Kingdom written forms *iw mꜣꜣ.n=k* and *iw ꜣmm.n=k* would thus be fully correct ones, reflecting an only slightly changed convention in written representation with *II.red-ult.ꜣ* and *II.red-ult.m*. As the form after *iw* and *n* would then be a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$, the written forms *n qbb.n* and *n tkk.n* in Merikare would themselves be regular representations of the *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$ (e.g., */tvk´vknv-/), not "post-classical" at all[75]. (These forms would then have to be suppressed from lists such as the above in which they are customarily included.)

C. The scenario just presented would imply that the *sḏm.n=f* after *iw* and *n* is a *sḏm.n=f*$_{X}$, in other words that Earlier Egyptian had no *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$. Determining whether this scenario is correct therefore has some importance for the general issue discussed in the present paper.

The other scenario presented (altered written conventions in the context of ongoing linguistic change) is weakly supported by occasional early New Kingdom instances of long written stems of *II.red* in inflectional categories other than the *sḏm.n=f*: in the *sḏmt=f*[76] and in *-in-* and *-ḫr-* marked forms[77]. On the other hand, perhaps speaking mildly against this first scenario is that the obsolescence of the *sḏm.n=f* in "predicative" environments is observed as just incipient even in a fairly innovative written register such as in the Kamose Inscriptions[78]; yet, already Ahmose's Karnak Eulogy has *iw ꜣmm.n*. Moreover, no signs of a loss of productivity of the negative construction *n sḏm.n=f* is observed until later in the Eighteenth Dynasty[79]; yet *n ꜥnn.n=i* is already found by Hatshepsutian times.

Weakly speaking for the second scenario is also that the early New Kingdom ones written forms here under discussion are already encountered, if on a singular basis only, in much earlier times (*mꜣꜣ.n* and *n ꜣmm.n.tw*, once each). Both of these could be faulty, but they need not (1.4.C; 1.5.C): if not, they could document that spellings such as the ones to become more common in the early New Kingdom, were possible in earlier times already, when all relevant inflectional categories were still fully productive; in other words, they would document the

73 Schenkel, LingAeg 14 (2006), 63.

74 Schenkel, personal communication, Brown 3/2013; see also below, C.

75 In pre-New Kingdom times, the *sḏm.n=f* of *qbb* is apparently documented only in "emphatic" environments (Pyr. §151d^{W} [PT 216] and §212b^{WN} [PT 222]: Allen, Inflection, §767D); the written forms there have long stems (*qbb.n*), as is expected in such environments under both the competing hypotheses. The *sḏm.n=f* of *tkk* is apparently not documented at all in earlier times.

76 Schenkel, Tübinger Einführung, §7.3.1.1.8, obs.

77 Schenkel, Tübinger Einführung, §7.3.1.1.10, obs.

78 Jean-Marie Kruchten, "From Middle to Late Egyptian", LingAeg 6 (1999), 7–13.

79 Kruchten, LingAeg 6 (1999), 21–22.

possibility of such spellings as alternative, perhaps less standard written conventions, without reflecting changes in the language itself. The second scenario thus accounts for the early New Kingdom written forms by positing an only slightly changed convention in written representation concerning *II.red-ult.m/n/ỉ*, occasionally experimented with in early times and generalizing in the early New Kingdom: not that much changes at all.

On balance, the present author finds this second scenario slightly more likely. A tilting scale, however, is in absolutely no way sufficient here in view of the far-reaching implications that this scenario, if correct, would carry as to the non-existence of a *sḏm.n=f*$_{Y}$. Pending further research on the issue, any definite conclusion seems premature.

Acknowlegements: The present paper has benefited immensely from detailed comments on a first version by Wolfgang Schenkel whom it is a pleasure to thank here. The research was conducted as part of the project "The Old Egyptian Verb: Functions in Text", financed by the Swiss National Science Foundation.