

A STUDY ON SENTENTIAL MEANING AND THE NOTION OF "EMPHASIS"
IN MIDDLE EGYPTIAN

by Friedrich Junge

1. Introduction: The "Polotskyan" grammar - a reminder
2. Emphasis, focus and predicate
 - 2.1 "Emphatic" and "non-emphatic" predicates
 - 2.1.1 The standard "vedette"-hypothesis
 - 2.1.2 Emphasis inflation and counter hypotheseis
 - 2.2 The grammar of focus
 - 2.2.1 Focussing in linguistics; "given"/"new" status
 - 2.2.2 Focussing in Middle Egyptian
 - 2.2.3 "Pairing of foci" in balanced sentences ("Wechselsatz")
 - 2.3 Conclusion: Predicate "marking" and "unmarked" predicates
3. Subject and predicate, theme and rheme
 - 3.1 On defining the terms; "given" and "new" once again
 - 3.1.1 In general
 - 3.1.2 In Middle Egyptian
 - 3.2 The "theme-rheme" structure of the proposition
 - 3.2.1 Tense/aspect predication and theme
 - 3.2.2 "Thematic backgrounding"
 - 3.2.3 The "consecutio temporum"
 - 3.3 Conclusion: Verb thematization and focal predicate
 - 3.4 Excursus: The so-called "grammatical" subject
4. Focus, thematization and topicalization
 - 4.1 The notion of frontal exposition
 - 4.2 Theme focussing and topic shifting
 - 4.3 Conclusion: "Marked" and "unmarked" theme

Footnotes

Abbreviated Literature

1. INTRODUCTION: THE "POLOTSKYAN" GRAMMAR - A REMINDER

At present, the "Polotskyan theory" - henceforward "standard theory"¹ - might be characterized as follows: There are paradigmatic sets of nominal, adjectival and adverbial forms of the verb; nominal and adjectival forms have features of morphology in common and differ from the adverbial forms; the forms of each set express what, for the time being, may be called "tense" and/or "aspect" in their most general meaning. The use of the inflected nominal forms in the mould of a sentence with

adverbial predicate, that is, the "emphasizing" construction, has been - and still is - the most spectacular, most peculiar and most discussed part of the "standard theory", having been, in fact, its point of departure historically and systematically.

A reminder of the basic facts may not be superfluous as well known as they might be. Both the following sentences

(E 1) Adm.7,10 mtn šps.wt ḥr šdw "Now nobleladies are on rafts" - and

(E 2) Cairo 19061,9-10² mk dd=k jb=k ḥft hrww nfr "You should take thought only for a holiday" -

have a common structure: The noun šps.wt or the nominalized verbal form dd=k plus object function as "logical subjects" followed by adverbials that function as "logical predicates", both adverbials consisting of a preposition and the noun governed by it; mk/mtn are "unbound particles" followed by a complete sentence³.

(E 3) a [šps.wt]_{subject} [ḥr šdw]_{predicate} ;
 b [dd=k jb=k]_{subject} [ḥft hrww nfr]_{predicate} .

Evidence such as the following nicely puts the nominal character of "verbal" subjects like (E 3)b into focus:

(E 4) (CT Spell 219)

a CT III 199a tzz sw z ḥr gs=f [j3bj] "que l'on se lève sur sa côté [gauche]";

b CT III 200g t_z.t ḥr gs j3bj ... "(se) lever sur la côté gauche ..." ⁴.

Thus, according to (E 3)b, the prepositional adverb in (E 2) has the certain "emphasis" of the information focus we are accustomed to associate with the verbal predicate in declarative sentences of our own languages; consequently, it has become common practice to take refuge in translating these forms into types of sentences that are more marked but less customary, as e.g. cleft sentences - here (E 2): "It is for a holiday that you should take thought", or, more moderate, "To holiday you (should) give (over) your heart" ⁵.

The aforesaid might seem to be a rather naive and uncontro-

versial rendering of the commonly held opinion, but upon looking closer, it isn't. It is either the idea of grammar involved or else the presumed range of "commonness" that might arouse resistance. On the one hand, there are those philologists who feel sufficiently equipped with grammar and who entertain the idea that they have all the evidence; they regard linguistic theorizing as a nuisance that threatens their liberty in translating. On the other hand there are the tough linguists - very few indeed, however, in Egyptology - who are too preoccupied with external grammatical devices to devote much attention to Egyptian peculiarities. And then, of course there are the happy dilettantes who abound in fields like Egyptology and who very soon feel free and knowledgeable enough - like J.L.Foster⁶ - to dispose of all the sophisticated hindrances to their "do-it-yourself" devices, e.g. to reduce Egyptian literature to "couplets". It is true, after all, that there is a great deal of discussion of specific problems still needed; the following is meant to be a contribution to that discussion. The open question in this area may be divided into groups: First, strange as it seems after all the thought spent on it, the nature of the "emphasis" in question; second, the notions of "subject" and "predicate"; third, the range and meaning of terms like "sentence" in Egyptian.

2. EMPHASIS, FOCUS AND PREDICATE

2.1 "Emphatic" and "non-emphatic" predicates

2.1.1 The standard "vedette"-hypothesis

As a relative form, the "relatif abstrait", or nominalized sdm=f is nevertheless treated differently in translation from the "relatif concret"⁷ in the same paradigmatic position:

(E 5) Peas. B 1,104-106 dd.jn sh.tj pn

h3.w n.j h^cw hr sj3.t n=f

mh n ky hr hqs h3.w=f

sšm r hp hr wd^cw3.t

(j)n m jr.f hsf bw hwr.w

"And this peasant said: 'The measurer of the corn-heaps converts to his own use ; he who should render full account to another filches his belongings; he who should rule accor-

ding to the law commands to rob. Who then shall redress evil?"⁸.

Although these are sentences with adverbial predicates like (E 1) and (E 2), with a nominalized verbal form in subject function like (E 2) and a comparable structure to (E 3)b,

[h3.w n.j ^ch^cw] _{subject} [hr sj3.t n=f] _{predicate} ,

no one feels compelled to translate it as: "(?) It is in acting on his behalf that the one who measures is"⁹.

Thus, the adverbial predicate of (E 2) is not considered as simple a predicate as the one in (E 1) and (E 5) but is said to be "cleft", put into the "vedette"¹⁰, that is, as having something of an extra mark of prominence. This assumption is not only furthered by the conspicuous way of translating the sentence with the help of a "cleft sentence"¹¹ or by the French "c'est ... que", although Polotsky himself takes it to be in complementary relationship to the pw-constructions ("vedette nominale") that are less emphatic in that respect -

(E 6) CT VI 273b mrr.t=t pw jrr.t=t "C'est ce que tu veux que tu fais"¹² -

it is not only furthered by the use of this translation model¹³ but strengthened by indications of a correspondance with jn-constructions ("participial statement")¹⁴:

(E 7) Urk.IV 1111,6-7 jnn.tw n=f jmj.t-pr.w nb ntf htm s.t
"It is to him that all wills shall be brought; it is he who shall seal them."

Most explicitly, though concerning another type of sentence, it has recently been stated by L.Depuydt¹⁵ that "... there are basically two degrees of predicate-quality, a non-emphatic one ('Prädikat') and an emphatic one ('vedette')", and "it is obvious that all vedettes are predicates, whereas not all predicates are vedettes". The nature of this extra mark of prominence may be gathered from the views of P.Vernus¹⁶: "... l'emphase ne sert qu'à spécifier les circonstances comme choix restrictif parmi plusieurs circonstances possibles ..." - that is, as a focus of contrast.

If, then, examples like (E 2), (E 7) display "marked predicates" while (E 1) and (E 5) contain an "unmarked" one, marking is not just a matter of syntagmatic positioning but exists either by the very fact of using the "relatif abstrait" - which is not probable in regard to (E 5) - or it involves something additional which marks. A few possibilities have been given more or less explicit consideration, e.g. morphological or semantical features of the nominalized verbal form - "in der Art eines Energicus"¹⁷ - or, more commonly, the suprasegmental features of the sentence (intonation pattern). That is, all theoretical declarations notwithstanding, the constructions in question have not been treated as plain predicative constructions with a nominalized verbal subject but as focussing constructions.

Originally, in fact, it was the morphology of the verb, the reduplication ("gemination") of root consonants in the mrr=f-form of the mutable verbs that lent credibility to the idea of an "emphatic form" for immutable verbs as well, and has been thought indicative of the extra mark discussed above: "It has been conjectured that in such cases¹⁸ the geminating form serves as a noun subject to an adverbial predicate, which would thus acquire a special stress". This is what Gardiner was prepared to concede in his grammar¹⁹ and this is the form in which the "Polotskyan theory" came to be accepted. Acceptance was still reluctant, however, since not a few grammarians did not accept a clear-cut "emphatic sdm=f" but kept the arbitrary standpoint of the "as well as" that Gardiner had formulated: "It is undeniable that ... emphasis often does seem to rest on an adverbial adjunct, but it is equally undeniable that in all the main clauses ... a notion of repetition or continuity is invariably present"²⁰. W. Westendorf²¹ maintained this position until recently²². Although Polotsky himself, from the very beginning, considered sdm.n=f and "sdm.f sans gémination" possible candidates for "emphasis" as well²³, he seemed at times favourably inclined towards the "purer" hypothesis; this might be concluded from his remarks that mrr.f "einer ganzen Reihe von 'Tempora', einschließlich mr.f, in der Weise gegenübersteht, daß deren spezi-

fische temporell-aspektuell-modale Bedeutungen sich in ihm aufheben, d.h. also daß die Funktion der mrr.f-Form außerhalb der Kategorien Tempus-Aspekt-Modus liegt"²⁴ - or are thus somehow similar to Late Egyptian "emphatic" j.jr=f-sdm.

2.1.2 Emphasis inflation and counter hypotheses

Only the impact of the "Egyptian Tenses" and then of the "Transpositions" changed the picture - toward greater clarity in semantics, toward greater ambivalence in morphology: mrr=f is but one "emphasizing" verbal form; while it kept its distinguishing features versus its (circumstantial/"simple") counterpart mrj=f, its competitors displayed no (sdm.n=f) or as yet insufficiently distinctive (nominalized "prospective" sdm=f) morphological features to distinguish them properly from their respective circumstantial and "predicative" forms. To be sure, there may be morphological signals hidden behind the script, but we can't be concerned about those; and as a matter of fact, I believe that every grammatical signal is properly marked in the written form if it is of any importance. - Thus while the number of possibilities for "emphasis" increased considerably, the morphological criteria lost reliability - however fictitious they might originally have been. The increase in the number of emphasizing constructions - especially of sdm.n=f's - gave rise to another kind of scepticism: the fear of an inflation of "It is ... that"-constructions as, still cautiously, expressed by J. Allen: "... it seems highly unlikely that the transitive sdm.n=f is 'emphatic' or adverbial (circumstantial) 95% of the time"²⁵. The deficiencies of morphology, on the other hand, meant that most instances became subject to a fundamental ambiguity: In the case of the adverbials after verbal forms apt to be nominalized, it seemed again to be up to the translator to think of them as "marked", i.e. focussed predicates, or "unmarked" ones, and a decision against emphasis was very often already interpreted as a decision against the "predicative" character of the adverbial and with it as a decision against the nominal

character of the preceding verbal form. This is what P.Vernus²⁶ e.g. has in mind when arguing for "formes 'emphatiques' en fonction non 'emphatiques'":

(E 8) pTurin 54065

- a hpr.n(=j) hpr.n hpr.t "When I came into being, 'Being' came into being,"
- b hpr.n hpr.t [nb m]-ht hpr=j "and all beings came into being after I came into being" -

For reasons that mustn't concern us yet, Vernus has found fit to take (E 8)a as a construction he calls "second schème", which is said to display a "hpr.n 'continuatif'" or "circonstanciel"²⁸ followed by a grammatical independent sdm.n=f (hpr.n hpr.t) and which is a stylistic variant of (E 8)b; now, (E 8)b is accepted as a construction of the "standard theory", which Vernus calls "premier schème", sdm.n=f being the subject, the adverbial the predicate, which he decided to translate, however, as "Ce qui est apparu est apparu après que je fus apparu", the question of focus on the predicate explicitly left open ("emphase ou non"). Now, if it weren't for the consecutio temporum of the sdm.n=f's, which causes Vernus some difficulty, example (E 8) could perfectly well be translated as "It was that Being came into being when I came into being; it was after I had come into being that all beings came into being" - which, incidentally, does not improve the meaning a great deal. Since there is, however, somehow a deeply "felt" connection between emphasizing the predicate and the use of a nominalized verbal form, being free to decide for emphasis or not in (E 8)b makes it appear that there is not much value in the subject-predicate construction itself, which is thus easily abandoned for the construction in (E 8)a. Consequently, constructions such as this might be analyzed as subject-predicate constructions, or they might not:

(E 9) SinB 127 sdr.n=j q3s.n=j pd.t=j ... "At night I strung my bow ..."²⁹ -

"Premier schème: 'C'est après avoir bandé mon arc, ... que je passai la nuit ...'";

Second schème: 'La nuit passée (quand j'eus passé la nuit), je bandai mon arc, ...'".

It should be noted, however, that the "second schème" taken for an Egyptian construction is notably similar to advice for translation Polotsky once gave³⁰: "In such cases the relatively best solution is to make a subordinate clause of the initial verb-form and to turn the clauses of circumstance into main sentences"; I shall return to this question soon.

In any case, it should be clear enough that one is prepared to find "unmarked" predicates after nominalized verbal forms; in conclusion, there are instances like (E 2) that display "unmarked" predicates like (E 1), and the structural similarity of both - (E 3) - is less superficial than has commonly been maintained; it should be taken more seriously. But what does this mean?

2.2 The grammar of focus

2.2.1 Focussing in linguistics; "given"/"new" status

Let's reconsider what is meant by the notion of "marking", "focussing" on more general terms. On formal grounds one is inclined to think of different intonation patterns which, of course, are unrecoverable in written discourse: this is taken as argument for their ambiguity. It's again L. Depuydt who gave the commonly expressed idea some contours³¹, and I shall return to his demonstration, taking another example from the linguistic literature³²:

- (E 10) a "John saw a play yesterday" (plainly declarative statement, simply related, preceding information not necessarily implied; or it may be an answer to "What happened?" or a comparable question);
- b "John saw a play yesterday" (implied contexts: contradictory/contrastive to "Did John see a picture?" - question for specification: "What did John see yesterday?", or again unspecified: "What happened?");

- c "John saw a play yesterday" (contrastive to "Did Mary see ...?"; specifying "Who saw ...?"; identifying "Who was the one who saw ...?");
- d "John saw the play yesterday" (contrastive to "I guess John just heard of it"/"Did he miss it?"; specifying "What did John do ...?");
- e "John saw the play yesterday" (contrastive "Did John see the play this morning?", or specifying "When did ...?").

Compared to (E 10)c-e, (E 10)a doesn't show any prominent unit, it is "unmarked" as to "information focus"; the former, however, are "marked". (E 10)b is ambiguous and thus "unmarked", too³³. What is focal in the "marked" sentences is a specified, identified or selected item, or a contrastive selection from a limited set of candidates³⁴; the rest of the "marked" sentence makes the predictability of the cotext easy: it takes up what is "presupposed" by the sentence and very often repeats this presupposition literally³⁵. Whatever function the focal item may have had in the "original", "normal" declarative utterance or sentence, "subject"³⁶, "predicate", adjective, adverb, etc. - and still superficially appears to have in the outwardly ("taxonomically") unchanged sentence -, whatever function the focal item may have had, having been elected to be focal, it is this item that delivers the "new" information while the rest - superficially still appearing to be like the usually organized sentence - is assumed, by the speaker, to be known to the addressee, is assumed to be "given"³⁷. Regarding pronouns and other anaphoric items, it should be noted for later reference that the notion "new" here "does not necessarily imply factually new information; the newness may lie in the speech function, or it may be a matter of contrast with what has been said before or what might be expected"³⁸. What is meant by "given", however, is to be understood in its broadest sense; since the information structure of the unmarked sentence is its substratum, it may inform somehow, too, but then it is of a kind that sets something as known:

(E 11) "She said he will come. I say he won't come". -

They agree that it is about somebody's coming but they are not in accord; unmarked sentence, followed by one with a focus of contrast and a "givenness" contradicted by negation. Focus vice versa, again with negation:

(E 12) (Topic is the visit of a castle in Switzerland) "... she says she shouldn't think we'd want to go to see castles here; she should think we'd want to wait till we got to Italy"³⁹.

To conclude: "Focussing" is a device to mark out a single member of a declarative statement for specification or contrast; the focal stress overrides the "normal" information structure of the utterance in terms of "new" and "given" and rearranges it. In languages like German, focal stress is about the only way to single out an item for specification and contrast, in English (or French) there is the additional means of special constructions, the "cleft sentence"⁴⁰: "It is John who saw a play yesterday" - compare with (E 10)c - or the "pseudo-cleft sentence"⁴¹: "Who saw a play was John", a kind of sentence others prefer to call "identifying", as opposed to the non-identifying, "unmarked" sentence "John saw a play": "Where a non-identifying clause specifies a process and its participants, the identifying clause adds the ... information that one of the participants is definable by participation in the process"⁴².

Finally, as far as I can detect, nobody really knows why or under what conditions either focussing by intonation or by syntax is chosen. Excluded from being formally "cleft" by these constructions is only (E 10)d - focus on the verb/ the predicate.

2.2.2 Focussing in Middle Egyptian

I think it can be agreed that the mentioned focussing constructions have Egyptian counterparts in function and - as far as possible in different languages - noticeably equal in form as well in the jn-constructions⁴³ and pw-constructions such as (E 6). In Egyptian, however it is not the focus on

the verb that is being excluded from formal cleaving - compare the type $\check{v}sm.t pw jrj.n=f$ "Off he went"⁴⁴ - but, in contrast to English, the focus on the adverb - see (E 10)e -, and it is this which the emphatic construction is assumed to aim at⁴⁵. The statements above are not, of course, much of a surprise, but I think they make one thing quite clear: What could have been achieved in focussing by intonation stress is exactly what the cleft sentence - Egyptian style - achieves: identification, specification or contrast⁴⁶, organizing a statement in terms of "new" and "given", focus and presupposition. This is uncontroversial in cases like

(E 13) CTI 302e-f (T9C) n jnk js \underline{dd} n=k nw
jn Gbb \underline{dd} n=k nw hn^c Wsjr

"Not I said this to you; it is Geb and Osiris who said this to you"⁴⁷ -

where the focal "it isn't I" / "not I" by contrast means "but somebody else" which is taken up by the focal "it is nobody but Geb / Osiris", while the presupposed / given item (that something has been said to the addressee) is repeated literally⁴⁸.

Highly controversial, on the contrary, are the following examples; they serve A.Loprieno - based on an article on focussing by W.Schenkel⁴⁹ - as essential evidence for eliminating the basic sentence pattern commonly assumed. What might have caused doubt about their being focussing constructions is perhaps their common feature of not having textually bound ("anaphoric") presuppositions like (E 13) and its kind, but situationally and / or culturally bound ones:

(E 14) CTVII 18w-y n jnk js mwt \underline{hm} r3=f
jnk \underline{rh} tp.j-t3=f
 $\underline{sh}3$ jmn.t

"I am not a dead one of unknown reputation; I am one who is well known by his earthly descendant and remembered by the West"⁵⁰. -

These are two identifying sentences with focal identifiers⁵¹, the parts to be identified are characterized by relative clauses with head noun (mwt) or without (nominalized); in the

first sentence, it is the well known and frightening state of someone's dying unremembered, identification with which state the speaker rejects; in the second instance, it is the semantically paraphrased negation of the undesired state of the former which to be in is "emphatically" confirmed this time: both are culturally presupposed states, here called to mind on behalf of the speaker. The example is structurally and semantically related to (E 11) / (E 12)⁵².

(E 15) Sin B 113-115 (The "hero of Retenu" has made his appearance and threatens to fight Sinuhe and to plunder him, see example (E 27));

ḥq3 pf ndnd=f ḥn^C=j

dd.k(3)=j n rh=j sw

n jnk tr zm3=f wstn=j m^Cf3j=f

"The aforementioned ruler conferred with me and then I said: 'I don't know him; I am not an ally of his that I may walk about in his camp"⁵³ ("; have I ever opened his back rooms or climbed over his fence?"⁵⁴; followed now by Sinuhe's speculative thoughts about the motivation of the attacker). -

Paraphrased: "How could you expect me to know something about him? I - as you well know, and in possible contrast to other people you would be better off asking - have never been close to him"; situational presupposition: to know something about him, you have to be as close to him as an ally; if you expect me to know him you appear to think me an ally of his, which - focus - I am not - contrary to what you seem to think of me⁵⁵.

(E 16) pWestcar 11,24-26 (The house of Ruddedet and Rawoser is being prepared for a holiday: "Said Ruddedet: 'Why have the beer jugs not been brought?' Said the maid: 'There is nothing here for making (beer) except the sack of barley of those dancers, which is in the room under their seal'"⁵⁶)

^Cḥ^C.n dd.n Rwd-dd.t h3j

jnj jm=f

k3 jn R^Cw-wsr rdj=f n=sn db3 jr.j

m-ht jwj=f

"Said R.: 'Go down, bring some of it. Rawoser then will compensate them for it when he has come'."

By Ruddedet's ordering the maid to fetch some of the barley sealed away and not belonging to her, both of them know they do something wrong, which is only admissible under their tacit agreement that they have to make good for it; it has to be Rawoser since, in "contrast" to him, they can't; he is the one responsible for the supply and made responsible now - what he is made responsible for is situationally "given" by the very order to do something that is illicit if it is not indemnified. The point of the utterance is lost if the part set as presupposed is considered "normal" predicative information, as by A.Loprieno⁵⁷.

(E 17) Sh:S. 12-13 (The relating "attendant" - : "Take heart, my lord" - has reported a proper return home)

s_{dm} r=k n=j ḥ3.tj-^C=j

jnk šwj <m> ḥ3.w

"Now listen to me, my lord! I do not exaggerate" - paraphrased: "I - as you well know - am someone who is free of exaggeration, so you can believe in my advice and in the story that follows without reservation." It is again an identifying sentence, the item to be identified characterized by a qualifying relative clause (participle); the speaker calls it to mind as something the addressee well knows him to be; the focal identifier "I" has exactly that "isolating emphasis" (contrast with everybody else) B.Gunn has listed as "often with a laudatory intention"⁵⁸.

2.2.3 "Pairing of foci" in balanced sentences ("Wechselsatz")

The peculiarities of focussing constructions allow some further amplifications of interest here⁵⁹. In the example

(E 18) "John saw the play yesterday and Mary did too" -

the presupposition of the first sentence is carried over into the second one and, if not repeated literally, compare (E 13), is taken up by a verbal "pro-form" ("to do") while the focus

is specified by another variable ("Mary"). This pairing of foci can enforce the presuppositional character of the presupposed part to a degree that it either becomes "Zero":

(E 19) "John saw the play yesterday, Mary the picture" -

or can force a notion of semantic equivalence even upon different semantems, as the following repeatedly discussed⁶⁰ example may demonstrate:

(E 20) "First John called Mary a Republican and then she insulted him". -

The sentence can be interpreted in such a way as to allow the inference that to call someone a Republican is to insult him: "... the pairing of foci is understood as a pairing of semantically mutually exclusive items, while the pairing of non-focal material ... is understood as a pairing of semantically equivalent material"⁶¹.

So much for the background; more relevant are some contrary conclusions which can be drawn from examples (E 13), (E 18), (E 19): If utterances are paired, the equal or semantically equivalent parts - the more so equally repeated readings - are apt to be strongly felt to be presupposed, while the differing or changing parts in those pairs are apt to be felt as foci. So there is an effect of focussing even if no focussing construction or intonation pattern is being used intentionally - and there is the explanation for the way a sentence like $\text{ph.tj=j ph.tj St}_h$ treated by M.Gilula⁶² is felt to convey its content: "My power is the power of Seth". Here then is a basic explanation of the semantics of an entire subcategory of the "balanced sentence":

(E 21) CT III 24a-25b (S1C)

h33=sn m hf3.w h3y=j m q3b.w=sn

$\text{prr=sn r p.t m bjk.w}$ $\text{prr=j r dn}_h.\text{w=sn}$

"Do they go down as snakes, I shall go down in their coils; do they ascend to the sky as falcons, I ascend on their wings". -

In the terms of the "standard theory", these are four independent sentences with "emphasized" adverbials; they are, however, formally and semantically paired. Whether treated formally as balanced sentences or not, they are perfectly well suited examples for the said pairing of foci⁶³, and it is for this very reason - against the verdict of P.Vernus⁶⁴ - that they well fit the standard theory. The variant puzzling Vernus

(E 22) CT III 100h-i (S1C)

pr̄r=sn r p.t m bjk.w jw=j ḥr dn̄.w=sn

"Do they ascend to the sky as falcons, I am on their wings" -

is exactly the Egyptian counterpart of (E 19) or (E 18), jw here being used as a kind of "pro-form"⁶⁵.

Finally, I think, this analysis can nicely explain the difficulties of a passage that has received some attention⁶⁶:

(E 23) Peas. B 1,83-86 (The king is speaking, ordering that the peasant's family be provided for; then)

a jrj gr.t ^Cnh̄ sh̄.tj pn m ḥ^C.w=f

b wnn=k ḥr rdj.t dj.tw n=f ^Cq.w nn rdj.t rh̄=f nt(t)

ntk rdj n=f st

c wn.jn.tw ḥr rdj.t n=f t 10 ḥnq.t ds 2 r^C.w-nb

d dd st jmj-r3-pr.w Mr.w-z3-rnsj dd=f n ḥnms=f

ntf dd.n=f st

"(a) And provide for the peasant himself, too. (b) But when you ensure that provisions be given to him, do it without letting him know that you are the one who gave it to him'. (c) So they gave him 10 loaves and 2 jugs of beer every day.

(d) The High Steward Meru's-son-Rensi gave it by his giving it to his friend; he was the one that gave it to him" (< *(The way) that NN gave it was that he gave it to his friend"). -

(E 23)d is a very fine example of a "balanced sentence" whose semantically equal nominalized verbs pair foci in the way described - and the first dd-clauses is not an undesirable and unnecessary addition but an example of grammatical subtlety.

For the way the "emphatic construction" nominal wnn=k plus circumstantially negatived infinitive in (E 23)b is rendered, compare § 2.1.2 above and § 3.3.3 below.

2.3 Predicate marking

I think I can now conclude with some confidence that what L. Depuydt called "an emphatic predicate-quality"⁶⁷, as opposed to the "non-emphatic predicate-quality", is the "focussing quality" treated above with its selective, contrastive and identifying effects. For nouns, this focus is clearly and most prominently put into effect by the cleft sentence of Egyptian style, and for qualifications - it is necessary to add this but I will not discuss it - by nfr-sw and pw-sentences as noted by W. Schenkel⁶⁸. Focus, however, is supposed to be of equal significance within the frame of "second tense"/"emphatic"-constructions, and this was my point of departure.

While the cleft sentence is used in texts to the more moderate extent apparently appropriate to its "emphatic" character - although cleft sentences may abound in specific texts like "The installation of the vizier" example (E 7) is from -, "second tense focus" is far more frequent than seems appropriate. To be more precise: The translation of a "second tense"-construction as a focussing construction is not seldom too expressive to be appropriate to the "normal" discourse its frequency seems to point to otherwise. Furthermore it appears to grossly inflate the absolute number of focussing constructions acceptable in an average text, the more so when the "emphasized" part is also represented by a verbal transposition. Thus uneasiness and resistance to this approach emerged, ending in doubts about the accuracy and validity of the grammatical analysis of the standard theory. But it is, after all, a translation problem, and this is discussed below. First, however, it should be taken into account that very often there is something of a choice between "emphase ou non" (see above), and if this is compared to the focussing possibilities of English sentences mapped in (E 10), the "emphatic"

construction behaves comparably to (E 10)b, that is, like the "unmarked" counterparts to the "marked" cases which the English cleft sentence corresponds to: focus is possible but not "markedly" expressed.

(E 24) Urk.IV 363,2-8 jrj.n=j nn m jb mrr n jtj=j Jmn.w

"I have made this (the obelisque) lovingly on behalf of my father Amun" (after having come close to him and having learned his might and not having forgotten his orders)
 jw hm.t=j rh.tj ntr=f⁶⁹

jrj.n=j j<s> st hr wd=f
 ntf ssm wj

"My majesty had learnt him to be god, so⁷⁰ I acted under his order; it is he who guides me." -

the "predicated" adverbials n jtj=j / hr wd=f after nominal jrj.n=j translated as "It is to my father Amun" / "It is under his order that I acted" would have made perfectly good sense, but so does the translation given above - if one accounts for what is predicatively conveyed in those phrases, that is, that the adverbials have a certain information stress but not necessarily the focal one.

To express this "unmarked", "non-emphatic" "predicate quality" in translation is not easy; the problem is that an Egyptian adverbial predicate can only be either an adverbial or a predicate in the translation languages - if not predicated by "to be". Perhaps a translational device that is somehow semantically related to (E 18) and (E 22) could help, namely, rendering e.g. jrj.n=j st hr wd=f as "(When) I made it, (I did it) under his order" - dividing "subject-part" and "predicate-part" into two clauses the first of which is rendered as circumstantial, the second as main sentence but displaying a verbal pro-form of the first sentence's verb. Why this might be a justifiable possibility and what consequences it may have to take those "second tense" adverbials/circumstantials as "predicate" and what their "unmarked predicate quality" might mean shall be the subject of the next chapter.

3. SUBJECT AND PREDICATE, THEME AND RHEME

3.1 Defining the terms; "new" and "given" once again

3.1.1 In general

In the preceding discussion, the terms "subject" and "predicate" were used rather unpretentiously and in ways that most Egyptologist could agree on; even describing them as "logical" would probably not arouse too much disagreement.⁷¹ For further use, however, it seems desirable to be more explicit. "Logical subject" is understood - as by A. Shisha-Halevy⁷² - to coincide with the term "theme"⁷³, but only partly with "topic"⁷⁴, and its function may be characterized as "not very different from the ancient statement that the subject is what we are talking about"⁷⁵; it is the point of departure chosen by the speaker to begin his communication: If one looks at knowledge as consisting of a large number of cognitive units concerning particular individuals and events, "new knowledge is communicated by identifying some particular as a starting point and adding to the addressee's knowledge about it"⁷⁶. Admitted that this might be called a modification of how "subject" is defined in logic, it also serves to justify the term "logical subject"⁷⁷.

Since the "particular" chosen for a subject/theme is part of the "addressee's knowledge" - it has to be to fulfill its "thematic" ends - it is again a "given" item; it may be something already talked about: "textually given"; something in the situational horizon: "situationally given"; or "culturally given" as an item belonging to the general background knowledge of the hearer/addressee.

Usually, and under "unmarked" conditions, there is a certain preference on the part of the speaker as to what may be chosen as a subject; and his preferences may be graded according to a "hierarchy of topicality"⁷⁸, which e.g. may inform us "that 1st and 2nd person are one of the major devices to hinge a story into an acceptably context, to present it as relevant"⁷⁹; but, of course, this is a matter of statistics and

doesn't condition the speaker's will in the least: What he chooses is his option and he can choose anything as the starting point of his communication⁸⁰. The degree of topicality of a certain linguistic item is of no cognitive (or hermeneutic, as it is, for philologists) value whatsoever⁸¹.

Now, whatever the "subject" called to mind and established as the starting point of a discourse, whether by pointing to it or just by naming it or by making sure what discourse will be about by elaborately marking and characterizing it⁸², the speaker "adds knowledge" to it; that part of the sentence that adds knowledge is the "logical predicate" or "rheme"⁸³. In principle both parts together will be a minimal proposition, and their linguistic forms together will build up the minimal form of a sentence; both of them might be extended, however, to a considerable size.

What the speaker chooses to start his communication with depends on the conditions of the speech act, the "situation" and the "tactical" or "strategical" considerations of the speaker, who the hearer is, what is uttered and when: it is a pragmatic decision. That he is forced, however, to give the thematic item chosen a certain form and position in his proposition and to build a sentence of a certain appearance with it is determined by the "syntactical" rules of his language: there is no "pragmatic" liberty in how he uses his "theme" in his actual utterance.

It is true that the terms "subject" and "predicate" have become somehow misleading in general linguistics as heavily charged by diverging concepts and controversial theories as they are, and it may be wise to substitute "theme" and "rheme" for them there. In Egyptology, however, there are no such reasons; on the contrary, their basic meaning appears to be satisfactorily agreed on: I would plead for their further use but shall retain both kinds of terms here as synonyms. I shall give a certain preference to theme/rheme when I can make use of the illustrative force of their more "sensual" reading.

3.1.2 In Middle Egyptian

The following example may serve to illustrate the matters discussed:

(E 25) Pt.1-...-20

dw3y.t nt jmj-r3 nw.t t3.tj Pth-htp.w hr hm n.j nzw-bjt
 Jssj Cnh d.t r nhh "Instruction of the Mayor of the Ci-
 ty, the vizier Ptahhotep, under the Majesty of king Ise-
 si, who lives for all eternity";

jmj-r3 nw.t t3.tj Pth-htp.w dd=f "The Mayor of the city,
 the vizier Ptahhotep says:"

itj nb=j tnj hpr(.w)	"King, my lord! Age is grown,
j3.w h3.w	old age is descended,
wgg jw(.w)	feebleness has come,
jh.w hr m3w	and weakness is itself reviv-
	ing;

.....

jr.tj nds.w	eyes are dim already,
Cnh.tj jmr.w	ears are deaf,
ph.tj hr 3q n wrd-jb	now strength is waning be-
	cause of weariness.

r3 gr(.w)	The mouth is silent
n mdw.n=f	and cannot speak,
jb tm.w	the mind is void
n sh3.n=f sf	and cannot remember
	yesterday

jrr.t j3w n.j rmt bjn(.w) m	What age does to people is
jh.t nb.t	of evil in everything". -

After "the stage is set" by the title, the author introduces a person to the reader, a person who, according to the information, "says" something, and this something is the entire text that follows: the person is the "subject", he who relates the text, and the text itself is the "predicate" - a rather abstract predicate, however, at this point still to be filled with "real" meaning. Naming the addressee by a vocative and thus as well defining the speech act to be direct discourse, the speaker begins with declarative sentences in their minimal

form⁸⁴: something ("age", "eyes") is called to attention, made "subject" to what is presently being said about it ("grown", "dim") - and it is this "predicated" information that explains why the speaker's having the subject called to the addressee's mind is of relevance to him. And with "subject" and "predicate" the notion of "givenness" and "newness" come in.

Formally, one might say that the "subject" of the very first sentence is already made known by the heading as someone who gives instructions, but in a strictly cognitive sense, it is "new" that there is a person by the name of "Ptahhotep" and that he is vizier and "Mayor of the city"; but, first, it may well be that for the reader of the time, the Vizier Ptahhotep was a very well known person, that is, of a "culturally bound" "givenness" though not "textually bound" (if not by the heading); and, second, even if not "given" in that sense, for the modern reader it is recognized and stored as "given" simply because it is a person made known by name and title (The syntactical means languages use to formally mark "givenness" or "subjectiveness"⁸⁵ are left aside here). This acknowledged, the information of interest, that part the speaker wishes to convey as his "new" information, follows, namely that the person named has something to say.

And again, "age" and "eyes" are items not textually "given" but newly introduced, and one couldn't very well speak of "cultural" or "situational boundness" either; still, every hearer immediately knows what is meant when they are uttered (and that holds for Egyptian and modern hearer alike!) - perhaps it could be called an "epistemological boundness". Only what the speaker wishes to convey about "age" within the confines of his discourse's ends - that he has grown too old for his office by now - is "new" knowledge added to the hearer's general knowledge, even if it is phrased as subtly as here where the "predicating" old perfective / stative *hpr.w* somehow "borrows" its meaning from its subject: it makes the abstract notion of "age" "become" reality and relevant to the speaker.

Finally, the relative phrase "what age does to people" de-

livers a subject of textual "givenness" which surprisingly enough is the only one linguists seem to think of⁸⁶; it takes up what has been stated minutely in the lines preceding rather abstractly and its predicate, too, somehow takes up what has been said before, in more abstract terms now as well - but still something "new" in itself precisely because it resumes and concludes⁸⁷.

One couldn't say, however, in spite of its being "conclusive", that this last phrase of the passage has more "predicative value", is more "rheme" than the first utterance about the coming of age - as little as one should perceive a higher degree of "givenness" or a higher degree of expectation on the listener's side in the textual initial "age is grown" as opposed to later "ears are deaf". Not even in r3 gr(.w) n mdw.n=f "the mouth is silent and cannot speak" can one properly observe a lesser degree of "communicative dynamism" in gr.w than in n mdw.n=f, as A.Loprieno assumes when he tries to demonstrate the theme/given - rheme/new interrelation as a "continuous" left-right "spectrum" with intermediating degrees of "given" and "new"⁸⁸; as far as informational progress is concerned, one could even simply reduce the introductory passages of Ptahhotep's speech in (E 25) to one statement and then go on

(E 26) Pt.29 (tnj hpr.w "age is grown"...) (jmj) wd.tw n b3k-jm jr.t mdw j3w "Have me, your servant, be ordered to make a 'staff of old age' (successor)!" -

At any rate, example (E 25) shows subjects and predicates, themes and rhemes as neatly in binary distinction as one might wish; equally, given vs. new is scarcely more than a discrete dichotomy, the credibility of a scale of distinction has not convincingly been demonstrated⁸⁹.

3.2 Theme-rheme structure

3.2.1 Tense/aspect predication and theme

If not by adverbials, cf. (E 1), adjectives or nominals -

which are very often verbal transpositions, too⁹⁰, the predicate in Egyptian is, as in a large number of other languages, mostly represented by the semantic notion of what is called a "verb" in different forms - the verb with its action or participants roles (actor/agent; object; regimen/"indirect object") and its peculiar, more or less formally marked obstinacy in calling to mind the persons participating in the discourse, the time or perspective the things related are seen under, or in bringing changes thereof to notice⁹¹. To be sure, the expression of the "tense" is one of the main duties of the predicate, and the forms found as predicates⁹² refer to tense in different ways. Since Polotsky gave those references "names", that is, called them "accompli", "inaccompli" and "prospectif", it has come into fashion to think of the Egyptian "tense" system as a system of aspects⁹³. This may well be, but since aspectual markers are mostly observed with the different forms of sdm=f, a most deplorable - and to be sure, somehow ignorant - backlash has been the revival of the ideas of a primitive predicativity of sdm in sdm=f-forms by themselves without taking their transpositional and sentential frame into account. I will refrain, however, from going into that subject here.

The temporal and/or aspectual setting of what the hearer is to be informed about is often "newly" given together with the other "predicated" information:

(E 27) Sin B 142-145 (The "hero of Retenu" is defeated; Sinuhe has praised God)

a ḥq3 pn ^cmw-z3-nnšj rdj.n=f wj r ḥpt=f
^cḥ^c.n jnj.n=j jḥ.t=f
 ḥ3q.n=j mnmn.t=f

b k3.t.n=f jrj.t st r=j jrj.n=j st r=f

The ruler NN took me in his arms.

Then I carried off his (the enemy's) goods
 and seized his cattle.

What he had meant to do to me, I did to him." -

The example delivers a series of predicative sdm.n=f's of different mutual reference to one other: rdj.n=f reflects the time

of the story, the perspective from which it is related or the action as being "perfect"; altogether, the statement is the final one in a series of utterances relating the actions of the fight and those accompanying it. With the $^c h^c .n$ -sentence the story and its time is pushed one step forward, but the syntactically parallel $jnj.n=j$ and $h3q.n=j$ ⁹⁴ don't specify whether the "seizing of cattle" ($h3q$) took place "after" the "carrying off" (jnj) or at the same time. If at the same time, $h3q.n=j$ either simply repeats the absolute temporal/aspectual setting $jnj.n=j$ has already given, or describes - less probable here but nonetheless possible - the "seizing of herds" just as a specification of the "carrying of goods". Again, the predicate ($jrj.n=j$) of (E 27)b may be understood either as summarizing what he said before about "doing" (or, what he will say in the following), thus within its verbal content embracing the entire phase of time of the events related in the preceding passage and what happened in it; or it may be understood as an additional statement: "carrying off", "plundering" and "doing", which the defeated opponent might otherwise have thought of doing first. Naturally, I am not showing how unreliable the forms in (E 27) are - they are quite easy to get along with; I am trying to demonstrate that there is no simple rule for the consecutio temporum of a chain of equal verbal forms but that their mutual relationship regarding tense or aspect may be rather intricate.

Now, the last sentence, (E 27)b, exhibits a feature of central interest here that is of more general import. By virtue of "transposition", not only the predicate but the subject, too, is expressed by a verb: a nominalized n-relative form. First, it is an excellent example of a "textually given" theme since it had already been phrased almost literally in the preceding text:

(E 28) SinB 111-113 (The "hero of Retenu" comes)

$dr.n=f$ sj $r-dr=s$ $dd.n=f$ $^c h3=f$ $hn^c=j$

$hmt.n=f$ $hwtf=f$ wj

$k3.n=f$ $h3q$ $mnmn.t=j$ hr sh $n.j$ $why.t=f$

"After having subdued all of it (the land Retenu), he said

he would fight me; he thought of plundering me and meant to seize my cattle under the auspices of his tribe."; (example (E 15) follows). -

Second, the subject/theme of (E 27)b is by itself marked as past/perfective/related as well as its predicate/rheme. Now, between the "subjective" tense marking and the predicative tense marking, one should expect something like a consecutio temporum, and there is one, of course, of about the same kind as the preceding sentence (E 27)a had displayed: either as it is translated above "What he had thought of doing to me I did to him", that is, pluperfect for the subject verb in respect to the preterite of the predicate verb, or else something like "What he thought of doing to me I did to him", that is, stating perhaps that whatever he did I did, whatever he thought of doing I did - synchronous time in the past. In fact, however, the relationship is more intricate. Although the subject/theme is marked for tense as is the predicate/rheme, the difference is that the former marking is a "thematicised" marking while the latter is "rhematic"; "rhematic" tense marking, however, is the one that is conveyed in an utterance, the "thematic" tense-marking is only something called to mind - in (E 27) something already mentioned before, in (E 28). In a specific utterance, the thing called to mind, the subject/theme, which the predicate/rheme is uttered about, must be something mentally given before the content of the predicate can be properly delivered; thus the subject is giving a kind of "backgrounding" for the predicated information - and because it is backgrounding, the thematic relative form of (E 27)b is translated in a way that fittingly conveys a temporal / aspectual background to a past action: as pluperfect (see further below). But what may be acceptable here needn't be fitting somewhere else; as so very often, the outcome of a general rule like "backgrounding" quality has to be adjusted to the individual examples.

3.2.2 "Thematic backgrounding"

As is to be expected, of course, the aforementioned developments fully only when the subject is represented by an action nominalization - the "emphatic" form of the verb. And here I am back to the "standard theory" I seemed to have lost sight of in the meantime.

- (E 29) Hammamat 114,10-...-12 $C_h^C.n(=j)$ prj.kw ... prj.n(=j) m $ms^{\vee C}$ n.j z 3000 "Alors je sortis ... c'est accompagné d'une armée de 3000 hommes que je sortis";
- (E 30) Beni Hasan I pl.8,14 $C_h^C.n=j$ hnt.kj ... hnt.n=j m hsb 600 "Alors j'allai au sud ... c'est accompagné de 600 ouvriers que j'allai au sud"⁹⁵.

These appear to me to be excellent examples of the textual givenness of a nominalized thematic verb⁹⁶ and its backgrounding quality for the information in "predicative focus", namely how large the expedition was; it is backgrounding precisely because it is the journey one is "talking about" (= subject/theme). The advice to translate it as "und zwar fuhr ich südwärts" in German once given by Polotsky⁹⁷ is a useful means of expressing textual givenness of that kind in translation.

Examples of the following kind are abundantly attested and demonstrate very clearly the connection between givenness and thematization⁹⁸:

- (E 31) Urk.IV 312,14-15 (Hatshepsut is having fortifications and embankment repairs made) jrj.n hm.t=s nw n- C_3 .t-n.j mrr=s jtj=s Jmn.w r ntr.w nb.w "It was because she loved her father more than any god that she had made it", or "When she had made it, it was because ...". -

"La forme substantive du sdm.n.f figure dans certains clichés où elle sert à résumer en termes généraux (verbe 'faire', complètement 'cela') les actions racontées dans les phrases précédentes pour leur ajouter, comme prédicat ('und zwar ...'), l'expression de leur motif"⁹⁹.

We now have the means by which to unravel the philologi-

cal problems that made P.Vernus feel forced to tackle with a hypothesis of his own, the "second schème", and we can now unravel them within the frame-work of the "standard theory":

(E 32) pRamesseum VI 105-106¹⁰⁰

ḥ^cj Sbk ḥq3.n=f p.t

mḥ.n=f t3.wj m wsr.w=f

"Quand Souchos apparait, il régente le ciel et remplit les deux pays de sa puissance"¹⁰¹. -

Sobek and his mightiness is the general topic of the text, and in the context of this passage, he is praised as sun god. What is talked about is his appearance in the morning (nominal sdm=f, ḥ^cj + noun), what one is actually informed about in this sentence is that "he has brought the sky under his rule" etc. (circumstantial sdm.n=f) and for that, his appearance is the necessary presupposition. ḥ^cj Sbk is the subject/theme, ḥq3.n=f / mḥ.n=f the predicate/rheme, but how the backgrounding presupposition expressed by the subject is translated is something else again. What P.Vernus did quite intuitively¹⁰² was precisely the right choice for rendering the said fact in translation: find an appropriate subordinate clause for the subject and a proper main sentence for the predicate; but, of course, this is a translation device and doesn't describe the Egyptian grammatical pattern itself, a "second schème", "un système à protase circonstancielle"¹⁰³.

In terms of "contrastive" or translation grammar, one could even give more reasons why the translation device is suitable: In the translation languages¹⁰⁴, there is a relationship between main sentences and discursive "innovation"¹⁰⁵ and subordinate clauses and "backgrounding" that is used for "narrative relief"; since in the translation languages verbs represent the sentence "kernels" more often than in Egyptian, Egyptian sentences like those in question tend to be appropriately transformed into complex sentences in translation.

At this point, some of the examples treated earlier need to be considered structurally:

(E 8) pTurin 54065 ḥpr.n(=j) ḥpr.n ḥpr.t¹⁰⁶ -

the "coming into existence" of God is the general topic of the passage; here, specifically, the fact "that I came into existence / my coming into existence"¹⁰⁷ (nominal sdm.n=f) has been made the subject/theme, to which the knowledge is predicatively added (circumstantial sdm.n=f) that it is exactly his coming into existence which has made "Existence come into existence"; the pre-existence of God is presupposed for his making the world: "When I came into existence, Existence came into existence" - and well understood, the translation, too, exhibits the same tense marker in both parts of the sentence as the Egyptian does.

(E 9) Sin B 127 sdr.n=j q3s.n=j pd.tj ... -

it is clear that "spending the night" before the day of fight is of interest in the disposition of the narrative (nominal sdm.n=f), but the preparation of his weapons is, of course, of major interest for Sinuhe here (circumstantial sdm.n=f), and the fact that it was during/after/before the night is "background"; all of Vernus' translations seem possible depending on the cotext interpretation one prefers - I should prefer the usual one "I spent the night with ...", excellently rendered simply as "At night" by M.Lichtheim.

Basically, however, it is the question of a consecutio temporum that P.Vernus has drawn attention to and that is a prime interest of his, an interest that is well deserved, although it should be treated less rigidly and the flexibility of Egyptian syntax taken into greater account: compare (E 28) with a backgrounding theme (nominal sdm.n=f), three parallel, that is, syntactically equally positioned, rhemes (circumstantial sdm.n=f; since they are parallel in syntactical position but sequential in reading, these sdm.n=f forms are called quite unnecessarily "continuative/sequential") and a delightful consecutio temporum, but

(E 33) pHeqanakht 1,9-10 mk grt jj.n=j mjn3 m hnty.t hsb.n=k n=j qdb n.j 3h.t 13 m jt-mh hr [w^c.]t=f "After you reckoned for me the rent of 13 arouras solely in northern barley, I came south here"¹⁰⁸.

3.2.3 The "consecutio temporum"

As P.Vernus rightly perceived¹⁰⁹, the notion "past perfect"/"pluperfect" ("passé du deuxième degré") is the outcome of the reference of a form expressing perfect/perfectivity to a statement already describing a past event; it should be stressed, however, that this holds true independently of the question whether the form expresses a past tense or a perfective aspect, and independently of the question whether the statement referred to expresses a past/perfective by itself or by context. Three cases may be differentiated:

(1) If the statement of reference is a sentence that a following clause is circumstantially referring to, this clause might well express "temporal concomitance" of the "past perfect" kind:

(E 34) Sin R 13-16

a jst r.f zbj.n hm=f m^vc r t3-t_hw

z3=f sms.w m hr.j-jr.j

ntr nfr (Z-n.j-Wsr.t)

b tj sw h3b(.w) r hwj.t h3s.wt

r sqr jm.jw t_hnw

c tj sw hm jj=f jnj.n=f sqr-^cnh n.j t_hnw

mmn.t nb.t nn dr.w=s

"Now, his Majesty had dispatched an army to Libya¹¹⁰, his eldest son in command, the perfect god Sesostris. He had been sent to smite foreign countries and to punish the Libyans. He was returning now after he had fetched Libyan captives and cattle of all kinds beyond number"¹¹¹.-

tj sw h3b.w in (E 34)b and tj sw ... jj=f in (E 34)c both represent minimal forms of a sentence by themselves; both are expanded by circumstantial, r plus infinitive or circumstantial jnj.n=f respectively. In about the same way as sentence (E 34)b describes something "anterior" to sentence (E 34)a and sentence (E 34)c something "posterior" to (E 34)a by contextual relationship, the circumstantial (in form a n d function) p h r a s e jnj.n=f in the complex sentence (E 34)c repre-

sents an "accompli d'antériorité" regarding its reference sentence (sw ... jj=f) of contextually bound past tense.

(2) There is a "consecutio temporum" within the limits of the sentence which isn't one in its proper meaning, namely the backgrounding notion of the nominalized verb in subject function versus a past tense predicate, as elaborated above; this derives from the "givenness" of the subject versus the "newness" of the information given at the moment of utterance, not from the temporal/aspectual sequence of two past tense forms:

(E 35) Memph.Theol. 59-61 (The creator Ptah is been spoken of)

msj.n=f ntr.w

jrj.n=f nw.wt

grg.n=f sp3.wt

⋮

sw ^Cq ntr.w m d.t=sn m ht nb

m ^C3.t nb

⋮

"After he had created the gods, made the cities, founded the nomes ..., the gods entered their bodies of wood of all kinds, of precious stones of all kinds ..." ¹¹². -

Although in translation the parallel sdm.n=f forms are circumstantially rendered, they do not, as P.Vernus believes, reflect a similar structure in Egyptian; they are nominal sdm.n=f forms expressing what Ptah had done as parallel subjects/themes to which is predicatively added that the gods finally took shape in the world. Egyptian circumstantial clauses never take position in front of their reference sentence. Since H.Satzinger analyzed Old Egyptian examples exactly that way, too ¹¹³, however, it might also be advisable to demonstrate his type of examples as being of a "classical" cut: not "fronted" circumstantials but nominals as subjects -

(E 36) Urk.I 261,1-2

gmj.n wj hm=f m jqdw n.j ^Cs3.t

nđ n(=j) hm=f ...jmj-r3 jqdw.w

"After his Majesty had found me as a common craftsman, his Majesty assigned the office of ... chief craftsman to me" ¹¹⁴. -

Nothing prevents us from translating the structure nominalized sdm.n=f - circumstantial sdm=f as "It was so that his Majesty made me chief when he found me a commoner", but instead of translating it as such, namely "subject plus emphasized predicate", one might equally well translate it as "subject characterized as given/known at the moment of utterance plus predicate" namely nominalized gmj.n=f as backgrounding theme "after/when NN had found", circumstantial sdm=f as the information predicatively added to it. There is no need whatsoever to consider \underline{nd} =f an independent statement, gmj.n=f a "fronted" circumstance.

But as is to be expected, the relationship from clause to clause within a sentence is not necessarily a temporal one; not seldom another shade of "subordinate logic" is present in the sequential frame:

(E 37) Gebel-Barkal-Stela 1.4¹¹⁵ (Nobody can resist Thutmosis III, who opposes anybody coming against him. "All foreign lands united stood as one ready to fight. There was no running away - relying on a multitude of fighters and an unlimited number of people and horses")

jj.n=sn jb.w=sn \underline{sh} m.w
nn hry.t m jb.w=sn

s:hr.n st \underline{sh} m-ph.ty
tm3-C tjtj hft.jw=f

"They have come, their hearts strong and without fear, only to be overthrown by 'The-Powerful-of-Might'¹¹⁶, the strong-armed, who tramples down his enemies". -

Or better: "Although they have come brave and fearless, the king's power overthrew them"; the subject jj.n=sn (with adverbially attributed jb.w=sn \underline{sh} m.w etc,) resumes in short what had been said before and, by being the thematic pivot of the utterance, is effectively opposed by the predicative part: their fearlessness notwithstanding, his Majesty defeated them. Vernus - by his segmentation "C'est plein d'assurance ... qu'ils étaient venus; le puissant de force les abattit" - misses the point¹¹⁷.

(3) Finally there are those cases like (E 33) where the predicate/rheme seems to express some anteriority versus the subject/theme. Since past perfect / "accompli d'antériorité" status of the subject is but one possible realisation of givenness, nothing should prevent a vice versa construction (past perfect status of the predicate) from general use when the speaker wishes to express anteriority intentionally. As far as I can see, however, it is verbs of motion that seem to have this effect when being used as subjects -

(E 38) Urk.I 198,13-15

prj.n=j m nw.t=j

h3j.n=j m sp3.t=j

jrj.n=j m3^C.t n nb=s

s:htp.n=j sw m mrr.t=f

dd.n=j m3^C

jrj.n=j m3^C

⋮

"Having practised Maat for the sake of its Master and satisfied him with what he likes, spoken truly and acted justly ..., I have come forth from my town and descended from my nome."¹¹⁸ . -

It appears to me to be less a question of tense relationship than of giving a reason in the broadest sense: Since everything has been nicely arranged and accomplished, I can leave the world calmly - the topic is death, presupposed the speaker's descent; uttered are the conditions of a happy descent: an exemplary life. It has been noted occasionally that verbs of motion may be accompanied by a statement of the purpose for which (or the reason why) the speaker has moved¹¹⁹; compare (E 39). Purpose/reason seems somehow to be present in (E 33), too, - "because you did such and such, I came here".

On the whole, we may now conclude that past perfect/"accompli d'antériorité" is a well attested secondary effect of the semantic/textual givenness of the nominalized verb in subject function, a phenomenon that well deserved the attention P.Vernus called to it; his explanation, however, is not con-

vincing: Whether temporally or aspectually marked, sdm.n=f acquires a semantic notion by syntactic positioning of the kind mentioned, not because it belongs to a "categorie énonciative d'incidente" of free syntactical positioning in front of or after "un énoncé de référence"¹²⁰.

3.3 Conclusion: Verb thematization and focal predicate

In summary, we may now state that Egyptian utterances, like those of other languages, can be divided into two parts, one of which connects the utterance - for the sake of the listener - with its context or preceding context¹²¹ and is textually, situationally or culturally "given"; this part is subject to the speaker's adding that knowledge to it that the other part conveys. The one part is the presupposition to a comprehension of the other part, the former is called "(logical) subject" or "theme", the latter "(logical) predicate" or "rheme". If the subject is represented by a nominalized form of the verb - especially, as very often, if represented by an action nominalization with all its participant roles -, the verbal phrase is "thematized"; in that case the translator is confronted with the problem that his language can use verbal phrases exclusively - or almost exclusively - in predicative function. Since the translation device of a focussing construction should be reserved for the genuinely "marked focussing construction" with jn or those cases when an "unmarked" focal stress may be present, as was, I think, amply demonstrated above (remember (E 10)b), another device must be found for the Egyptian "unmarked predicate quality". Now, one has to remember that a "thematization" of the verb was primarily under discussion here. If one takes, following A. Shisha-Halevy¹²², "thematization" seriously, that is, treats a verbal phrase connecting an utterance with its contextual, situational or otherwise discursively adequate "background" as the "theme" of this utterance, the needed device is at hand: One might render the relationship of a backgrounding verbal theme/subject to a rheme/predicate that is the information center not by stressing the rheme, as is usually attempted, but by "weakening" the infor-

mational weight of the theme. That this can reasonably and justifiably be done by rendering the verbal theme as an appropriate "subordinate clause" has been the topic of this chapter; balancing such a "thematic" subordinate clause by a proper rendering of the rheme usually leads to a complex sentence as a representation of the Egyptian sentence. It may even provide a translation method for Egyptian basic sentences; compare (E 24):

	Subject		Predicate
Egyptian	jrj.n=j st		hr wd=f
Translation	When I made it	I did it	under his orders
	Theme-	"Nexus"-	Rheme-
	r e p r e s e n t a t i o n		

Since the utterances in question - with nominalized verb in subject function - have been constructed in the mould of the adverbial sentence after all, they might be called "complex" adverbial sentences as opposed to the "simple" ones like (E 1), (E 34) or most of (E 25); how then can we describe the relationship between the adverbial sentence with "unmarked predicate quality" - more precisely: a "predicate unmarked regarding focus" - and the sentence with "marked focus"? At least one thing seems immediately evident: Concerning "thematic" value and the status "given"/"presupposed" and its operative effects in a text, the non-focal part of the cleft sentence and the subject of the of the adverbial sentence are alike; it is a natural conclusion to think of the non-focal part of the cleft sentence as its "logical subject" as well¹²³. But is the focus the "logical predicate"?

The answer to this question depends on one's opinion about whether the identifier of something to be identified is as much "predicate" as the predication proper in an affirmative/declarative "thematic" sentence. Or more precisely: If one considers how "thematic" sentence and focussing sentence are embedded in their respective cotexts, they differ characteristically. Somewhat simplified, a declarative sentence is

a link in the chain of the "thematic progression"¹²⁴ of the text. Its subject/theme takes up something explicitly or implicitly spoken of in the preceding sentences and "adds" its predicate; what the actual sentence says will then be part of a succeeding utterance. The focussing sentence, however, usually brings the thematic progression to a stop. Its non-focal part, its "logical subject" then, takes up something explicitly or implicitly spoken of before as well, but its focus is not, as the predicate of the declarative sentence, something the speaker wishes to add to but an item already present in the mind of the listener which is, however, specified, reaffirmed or rejected: It is not another "predication" on an item presupposed but a value of a variable of the item presupposed. So, the cleft sentence is a type of sentence differing considerably from the declarative one (i.e. the Egyptian adverbial sentence of the above defined kind), but of course, the focus "says" something "about" the non-focal part because one of its variables is specified, reaffirmed or rejected. Thus, it is a "logical predicate" after all. And finally, if it is possible to recognize a "rheme" as follows - a well know device in Egyptology¹²⁵: "Welche objektiven Kriterien gibt es für die Bestimmung von T(hema) und R(hema)? Ein Kriterium stellt ... die Ergänzungsfrage dar. Es zeigt sich, daß zu einer jeden Äußerung eine Ergänzungsfrage existiert, die (mit dem Fragewort) eben nach dem R der Äußerung fragt. Es ist eben das R, das die 'Ergänzung' der betreffenden Frage darstellt"¹²⁶ - if this is an adequate device, the predicate/rheme of the declarative sentence will emerge - as intended by the cited linguist - as well as the focus of a focussing construction¹²⁷.

3.4 Excursus: The so called "grammatical" subject

Although it seemed for a while as if in Egyptology the notion "grammatical" regarding subject and predicate had been effectively done away with, it is now clear that it still lingers on or is about to be revitalized. The idea of a "grammatical" subject is basically of attractive simplicity: It is that noun

phrase in a sentence which the predicate "agrees" with¹²⁸. Or differently stated: The noun the morphem that marks the predicative verb is coreferential with¹²⁹ is called "grammatical" subject, e.g. German "Ich sag-e; Du sag-st", English "I say∅; John say-s"¹³⁰. Languages like Latin or Italian can dispose of the subject noun if it is already "known" whether by situation (speaker : 1st person; listener: 2nd person) or by cotext: "amo; (vir) amat". In addition, being "the thing talked about", the grammatical subject coincides with the logical subject/ theme as defined above; the same is true of the grammatical and logical predicate.

Seen from the point of view of the semantics of the verb, the grammatical subject is identical with one of the "arguments", "deep case roles"¹³¹ or "valences"¹³² of the verb, either the "actor/agent"-role (active voice) or its "goal/object"-role (passive voice).

In languages of "Standard-Average-European" typology, two features are thus economically combined, which doesn't mean - as may be stressed - that this combination is logically called for; the two of them are the semantic need for having all valences/deep cases of a specific verb occupied in the utterance, and the need of grammar to build up a sentence by "logical" subject and predicate: The two features are combined in the "actor"/"goal" valence representing the "logical subject"¹³³.

In Egyptian, there are cases which can be analyzed the same way - cf. (E 34) - as

- (1) [tj sw]_{subject} [h3b(.w)]_{predicate} "He was sent";
 (2) [tj sw]_{subject} [jj=f]_{predicate} "He came".

The old perfective / stative of h3b agrees (-.w) with the subject sw, as does the sdm=f of jj by its suffix pronoun -=f. The nominal subject preceding the old perfective in (1), however, is obligatory first, and second, has to be coreferential with the verb agreement, while, when preceding a sdm=f as in (2), the nominal subject can either be "added" instead of the suffix -

- (3) jj=f or jj Z-n.j-wsr.t -

or the suffix pronoun of the sdm=f can differ in reference from the preceding noun as in

(4) Sh.S. 11 t3=n pḥ=n sw *"Our country, we have reached it".

There are, however, different ways of interpreting these facts, each of them having its consequences. If one keeps in mind the structural similarity of (1) and (2), (4) might be analyzed as consisting of a "logical" subject t3=n and a "logical" predicate pḥ=n sw: logical subject and "actor/agent"-role separate, and, since the logical subject is "goal"/object of the verb although the voice is active, the concept of a "grammatical subject" is exploded. (3) then, has to be an incomplete sentence, more precisely a clause, since there is no logical subject.

If one adheres to the identity of "actor/agent"-role of the verb and subject¹³⁴, one takes (3) to be the basic sentence as verbal predicate plus suffixal/nominal subject following, and (4) to be a case of "topicalization" by "fronting", as is (2). The structural similarity to (1) is lost or rashly explained as another case of topicalization¹³⁵.

Now, as long as the predicate is necessarily a verb (as in the Indo-European / "Standard-Average-European" languages), one may go along with the concept of the grammatical subject this far, but when non-verbal predicates come in, as in Egyptian and other languages, the "actor/agent"-role as much as disappears and only the logical layout of the sentence remains: logical subject and logical predicate - compare (E 1) - without any agreement between subject and predicate¹³⁶. Since "grammatical" subject/predicate then becomes nonsensical, one has to take recourse to two types: "grammatical" and "logical" subjects/predicates. In the only case of an accepted apparently adverbial predicate containing a verb - preposition plus infinitive - the logical subject is indeed the actor again, but now the verb-subject agreement is lacking.

As inconsistent as the concept of a "grammatical subject" has come to appear by now, it completely falls apart when action nominalization comes in: either the actor role can on-

ly be the "grammatical" subject of a subordinate clause¹³⁷ (geminating/prosp. sdm=f as a noun, after prepositions, as objects), or the concept of the "second tenses", that is the action nominalization together with its actor role as "logical subject" of an adverbial sentence, becomes meaningless and loses all its explanatory force. The last is one of the main reasons for the difficulty the "grammatical subject" supporters get into with their attempts at understanding and explaining the still reluctantly accepted "emphasizing" force of those nominal forms of the verb.

Since even verb agreement fails to be a sufficient general condition for subjecthood - there are languages in which the verbs agree with objects, no noun phrase at all, or noun phrases in addition to subjects¹³⁸ - the question of what is gained by the notion "grammatical subject" remains. Does it help to understand the structure or the meaning of the utterance besides marking the "actor/agent"-role of the verb, which is never difficult to perceive anyhow? Does it better the perception of the pragmatic context although interlocutive and delocutive roles are already amply marked otherwise? There is no reason that I can think of; one should surely stick to "the predominant view in linguistics today" that "perhaps ... the grammatical subject is only a syntactic phenomenon, lacking in cognitive significance altogether"¹³⁹, and leave things where they belong: the "actor/agent" role with the semantics of the verb and subject and predicate with grammar and discourse analysis.

(End of Excursus)

4. FOCUS, THEMATIZATION AND TOPICALIZATION

4.1 The notion of frontal exposition

The term "thematization" has been used here to mean that an expression is made to function as the theme/subject of an utterance; this, of course, is how it is used elsewhere, too, but more often than not it is combined with the notion of an extra mark for "themehood". In this case the term isn't thought to mean something that happens semantically when an item is

made subject to an utterance, but the idea is entertained that a part of the utterance is made theme by moving it from its original position into frontal position, and that it is thus given the prominence of a "marked theme" called "emphasis by anticipation" or "topicalization"¹⁴⁰. Formerly it was explained by a somehow "untidy" thinking in discourse¹⁴¹, nowadays "pragmatic" relevance is preferred¹⁴²; to "foreground" what is in the speaker's center of interest.

Now, if the idea of a topicalization by "fronting" is not merely a remedy for the problems evolving from the notion of "grammatical subject" (cf. Excursus), what is meant by "emphasis" here¹⁴³ surely can't be a focussing device like those discussed above: In an example like (E 25), the name Ptahhotep in the proposition Pth-ḥtp.w ḏd=f "Ptahhotep says" couldn't well be a contrastive (Ptahhotep, not the king) or specifying focus (Ptahhotep, nobody else), since the heading has already announced him as giving instructions and no other possible candidate is around besides the king. And even if the king should be considered a competitor to instructing wisdom, a focussing on Ptahhotep appears rather overmarked if - as it is here - a simple thematic statement is already sufficient. Moreover, if focussed, it should be the logical predicate.

As obviously impossible as that is a focal stress an sw in tj sw ... jj=f "He came now" in (E 34) since the king's son was named before and nobody else is talked about afterward with whom he would have to be contrasted¹⁴⁴.

The cases usually met with are of that kind, but there are examples one might quote with more confidence:

(E 39) Urk.IV 617,17-...618,7 (Amun-Re is speaking)

jj.n=j dj=j tjtj=k jwn.tjw ...

dj=j m3=sn ḥm=k mj sn.wj=f

...

sn.tj=k dj.n=j sn m z3 ḥ3=k

"That I have come was to make you defeat the Nubians ... and to make them see your Majesty be like your brothers (scil. Horus and Seth) ...; your sisters (scil. Isis and Neph-

thys), however, I put behind you as protection ..." -

There might be a contrast present between "brothers" and "sisters", but still, it is not a very convincing example: $jj.n=j$ $dj=j$ $tjtj=k$... $dj=j$ $m3=sn$ $hm=k$... is the tenth repetition of thus anaphorically introduced verses about making the king conquer a variety of countries "like" a variety of symbolic or godly powers. Starting with "sisters", the text becomes more peaceful at last, so a new topic is begun by naming the peacefully active goddesses. It is a great deal more "thematic" than "contrastive" to utter them here. And to be sure, it is not a "focussing on the object"¹⁴⁵ but another case of identity between subject/theme and one argument/valence/deep case role of the verb (dj) - instead of an "actor"-role now of a "goal"-role. More convincing is:

(E 40) Sh.S. 150-152 (The narrator promises to praise the godly snake, sacrifice animals on its behalf and have gifts sent, among them "incense" and "hkn.w-oil"; this makes the snake laugh and speak as follows)

n wr n=k ^Cntjw

hpr.t nb s:ntr

jnk js hq3 Pwn.t

^Cntjw

n=j-jm.j sw

hkn.w pf dd.n=k jnj.tw=f bw pw wr n.j jw pn

"No riches in myrrh and all kinds of incense belong to you while I am the lord of Punt: myrrh - it is mine, and that hkn.w-oil you spoke of sending - it is this island's very product". -

First, ^Cntjw und hkn.w (plus relative clause) are followed by obvious sentences, namely an adjective and a pw-sentence; second, the fronted nouns are subject/theme and moreover "textually given" in the preceding text; third, stressing them makes sense. Therefore they are textually given and somehow focussed, but they are neither contrastive - "myrrh, nothing else", "myrrh, not sacrificing geese" doesn't make sense - nor logical predicates: surely they are the topic of the "sententially" conveyed new information that follows. This is thus an example

of the pattern which may correctly qualify as "topicalization": a proposition with a "marked theme"¹⁴⁶. But what does "marked theme" mean functionally, if it differs from the focussing devices treated up to now?

A "marked theme" may be understood as being contrastive to all the other topics that could be spoken about at a given moment, a focus which might be paraphrased not as "myrrh and nothing else is mine" but as "myrrh and nothing else is the topic of my utterance here and now", "it is this that I am talking about". The devices the translation languages have at hand for themes thus marked are "Regarding myrrh ...", "As to", "Concerning" etc.; it helps to specify a theme within a general thematic frame or to "come back" to a specific topic after some digression or to single out one theme from among other possibilities - as in (E 40): It is characteristically used to "shift" attention to a subject from before and it is this which is possibly meant by Loprieno's "textuelle Hervorhebung"¹⁴⁷.

4.2 Theme focussing and topic shifting

The following may serve as a demonstration of what a focus on theme or a device to "shift" the topic is good for¹⁴⁸ -

- (E 41) a Cotext: "Once there was a wizard".
 b Anaphoric Pronominalization: "He lived in Africa".
 c Topic shift "(?) Now the wizard, he lived in Africa".
- (E 42) a Cotext: "Once there was a wizard. He had two sons. The first was clever, the second a fool".
 b Anaphoric Pronom.: "(?) He lived in Africa".
 c Topic shift: "Now the wizard, he lived in Africa".

While the anaphoric pronoun "he" in (E 41)b serves well enough, (E 41)c is a discourse device more marked than necessary; it is over-used. In (E 42) it is vice versa: (E 42)b is quite insufficient since the most natural coreferent for "he" is the

last mentioned son, so (E 42)c is wanted.

If now the Egyptian examples (E 25) and (E 34) are again put to the test, it is obvious that as in (E 41)c a topic shifting construction is over-used on "Ptahhotep" in "Ptahhotep says" and that the anaphoric pronominalization in (E 34) is quite sufficient while topic shifting would be very odd, indeed.

Neither is it fit for examples (E 15) or (E 16), jn-constructions claimed for topicalization¹⁴⁹: "I" in "I am not an ally of his", and "Rawoser" in "It is Rawoser who will compensate for it" are cognitively/semantically contrastive but surely not textually/pragmatically so - a paraphrase "'Speaking of' me", "'Speaking of' Rawoser" is rather impossible.

There are cases, however, that show a "marked theme" together with almost comparable unmarked ones in a cotextual relationship that may suggest an equal structural footing, which, nevertheless, I doubt:

(E 43) SinB 255-256 (Sinuhe has come back home; meeting the king, he is almost out of his senses)

b3=j zbj.w

h^C=j 3d.w

h3.tj=j n ntf m h3.t=j rh=j Cnh r mwt

"My ba was gone, my body grew weak and (as for) my mind - it was not¹⁵⁰ with me that I might recognize life from death". -

While the old perfectives/statives zbj.w and 3d.w are not to be used independently, that is, they require their respective nouns of reference, the negatived phrase following h3.tj=j is a syntactically independent sentence so that h3.tj=j is really fronted; although a focussed theme is not compelling, it makes tolerably sound sense.

Altogether, those cases that might be claimed for theme focussing by simple fronting are not abundantly attested in Middle Egyptian, and if they occur, then it is mostly in front of a pw-sentence¹⁵¹. The customary device is fronting by jr¹⁵²:

(E 44) Urk. IV 1109, 11-...-1110, 8 (From the rules for the administration of the vizier's office; the different items are very often introduced by jr)

jr zh₃ nb h₃b [t₃.tj hr=f n] sh nb

m ntj nn st hbs.w hr jtj.tw n=f hn^c šfd.w z3w-jr.j

.....

jr gr.t dbh=f zh₃.w hbs.w m rdj(.w) jt.t=f jn z3w.w-jr.j

jr gr.t jpw.tj nb h₃b t₃.tj r=f hr spr.tj nb

jw dj=f sm(.t) n=f

"As to every non-confidential document the vizier requests from any office, one brings (it) to him together with the papers of the responsible official ...;

as for his wanting confidential documents, however (> if he wants ...), it is not allowed to be brought by the responsible officials.

As to every deputy, however, whom the vizier sends to him (the official) because of any petitioner, he gives access to him." -

Different administrative topics are singled out by jr and comments made about them; they are again, however, no longer "textually given" in a strict sense but more abstractly subsumed under the "knowledge" about what belongs to the vizier's tasks - "culturally given" or elaborately qualified until recognized by the hearer. As might be noted and stressed in addition, jr plus qualified nouns or proper names and jr plus verbal forms (dbh=f) are both used for the same purpose - there is no functional difference in Egyptian between theme focussing and what is translated as "conditional protasis". This is nicely proved by the instructions of Ptahhotep who, by using jr, lines up his topics in about the same way as the "instructions to the vizier" do¹⁵³ although they are nearly exclusively verbally phrased. To be more precise: there is no "conditional sentence" in Egyptian, it is only a translational outcome of theme focussing on an expanded theme¹⁵⁴.

The topic shifting function of jr is most clearly attested in the "glosses" of BD 17:

(E 45) BD 17, 14-17¹⁵⁵

jnk J3h̄s (?) m prw.t=f

jw rd̄j(.w) n=j šw.tj=j m tp=j

ptr r=f sw

jr J3h̄s (?) Hr.w pw nd-hr-jtj=f

jr pr.wt=f msw.wt=f pw

jr šw.tj=fj m tp=f šm.t 3s.t pw hn^C Nb.t-h̄w.t

rd̄j.n=sn st m tp=f m wn=sn m dr.tj

"I am Iaheš in his procession. I have been provided with the plumage on my head.' What does that mean? As to Iaheš, it is Harendotes, his procession, it is his births, and his plumage on his head - it is the movement of Isis and Nephthys: When they put themselves on his head, it was while they were kites". - compare (E 42).

If the marked theme is of more complex - "sentential" - character, the referential relationship between theme and sentence commenting on it very often becomes somehow "oblique"¹⁵⁶ - see (E 44); although parts of the theme and parts of the comment might well be coreferential (they need not be) in a rather intricate way, that is not the point: This "oblique" appearance is already rather weakened by "stating" explicitly what the jr-phrase "is" (cf. (E 44)) - by paraphrasing: "'His wanting confidential documents'¹⁵⁷ is my topic now; speaking about this topic and in general presupposing the same procedure as before, it is to be noted: 'not the responsible official shall bring it'¹⁵⁸. So, since marked theme and following sentence have a "hyper theme-rheme" or topic-comment relationship, the point is that the marked theme has the effect of somehow polarizing the parts of the comment to semantically "emphasize" a part of it:

(E 46)a "Speaking of violence, S ne ad is the only Englishman who condones it".

b (?) "Speaking of violence, S ne ad is an Englishman who condones it".¹⁵⁹

In (E 46)a "Snead" is focus, not theme, of the comment; thus

it is easy to understand the whole comment part to be a statement about "violence", (E 46)b, however, is a bit odd, since "Snead" is not the focus but the theme - which contradicts what the beginning of the utterance implies, namely, that it is going to be about "violence"¹⁶⁰. The Egyptian counterpart pattern:

(E 47) Hatnub 49,10-12

a jr hmw.tj nb

s:qdw nb

rmt nb f3w.tj=snj ^C=sn n twtwpn jn ^Cntj hzj=f sw

b jr gr.t h_d.tj=fj rn=j hr twtw=j jn ntr.w n.w Wn.t hsf=sn
hr_d.w=f m j3w.t=f m s3
mwt=f

"As to every craftsman, traveller or person who will give reverence¹⁶¹ to this picture (graffito), it is Anti who shall favour him; but as to anyone who shall destroy my name in this picture, it is the gods of the 'Hare-nome' that will prevent his children from holding his office after his death" -

Although in (E 47)a the anaphoric pronoun of the comment is coreferential with the basic noun of the topic (the persons enumerated), it is the good that they have done that is "favoured"; it is assumed that doing good is rewarded, but this the more so since 'Anti' himself is the one who rewards. And again (E 47)b: The social punishment mentioned for misdeeds against remembrance is well known and feared, is "culturally given" - compare (E 14) -, worse still to be inflicted by those gods, and it is this that is conveyed.

Still more complex are those cases which show an "unmarked predicate", that is, the comment of which is an "emphatic" construction in terms of "standard theory":

(E 48) Urk.IV 1110,11-...-1111,1 ((E 44) directly precedes,

(E 7) is part of the same paragraph)

a jr gr.t spr.tj=fj nb n t3.tj hr 3h.wt

w_d=f sw n=f

m h3.w sdm n jm.j-r3 3h.wt ...

jjr=f w_df r=f hr 3bd 2 n 3h.wt=f m Sm^C

T3-mh.w

b jr swt 3h.wt=f ntj tkn(.w) n nw.t rsj.t

n hnw

jrr=f wdf r=f hr hrww 3 m ntt r hp

"Now what concerns everyone who shall make petitions to the vizier concerning fields, he, in addition to listening to the overseer of lands ..., summons him, and, if it is because of fields of his in Upper and Lower Egypt, he postpones in his case for two months.

But in respect to fields of his which are near Thebes and/or to the Residence, it is according to law when he postpones in his case for three days." -

This is an example fit to demonstrate how comparatively independent of each other "sentential" parts on the one side and anaphoric reference on the other side are. The "marked theme"/topic centers on the "petitioner" and his business ("fields"), while the subject/theme of the sentence to follow, nominal $w\bar{d}=f$ / $jrr=f$, shows coreference of its "actor"-role with the general topic of the text, the "vizier", who, however, is not the center of the jr-phrase but only an argument of spr ("indirect object" / prepositional adjunct). The center of the jr-phrase, the nominalized participle $spr.tj=fj$, on the other hand, is not the "actor" but another argument of $w\bar{d}$ "to command; summon" and $w\bar{d}f$ "to postpone", namely object and adverbial respectively; the business proper is only taken up in the rheme/predicate part of the comment. The second jr-phrase, (E 48)b, is not on the same footing as the jr-phrase of (E 48)a but takes up the rheme part of the foregoing sentence - compare (E 29), (E 30) -, is "topic shifting"; its main sentence exhibits - as desirable - a theme by now "textually given" and literally repeated, and a rheme that delivers the appropriate "news".

Example (E 48) is as complicated in internal reference relationship as it is most clearly structured in terms of "marked theme" / topic and comment which, being a sentence, is as well divided into theme and rheme.

4.3 Conclusion: "Marked" and "unmarked" theme

I think it is clear from the foregoing that not every "topic" apparently in first position in an utterance exhibits a "topicalization" in a stricter sense which means an "extra mark of themehood": a construction specifying the one topic that is chosen from among a larger number of possible candidates. The main condition for recognition is to have a complete sentence as the second part - compare examples (E 40), (E 43) - (E 45), (E 47), (E 48); the occurrences of propositions with nominals plus following sdm=f, sdm.n=f, old perfective / stative or adverbials, are neither focussing nor topic shift constructions.

A sequence of marked theme plus commenting following sentence is in fact a "pragmatic order", while unmarked theme plus adverbial phrase (in its broadest sense) is an order of syntax¹⁶².

Although a simple nominal topic is possible, an introduction of the marked theme by jr is habitually used in Middle Egyptian; later in the language's history, jr falls out of use and the bare nominal retains the function¹⁶³. It should be noted that although later - beginning from Late Egyptian through Demotic to Coptic¹⁶⁴ - there are constructions of nouns plus e.g. preterite sdm=f or other sentence conjugations as theme focussing constructions that look rather alike the Middle Egyptian construction noun plus sdm=f, they are quite different in structure: While the former are successors of the pragmatic theme focussing construction jr plus noun phrase plus sentence conjugation and an outcome of the gradual disappearance of jr in the "fronted" phrase, the latter are syntactical subject-predicate (theme-rheme) patterns. They should not be confused.

FOOTNOTES

1. Depuydt, Standard Theory.
2. James, Hekanakhte, cited by Johnson, Particle mk, 79;84.
3. Johnson, loc.cit.83. In Callender, Review (of Junge, Syntax), 156, J. Callender makes use of the argument (against my view) that there is no pronominalized form of the adverbial sentence of the type *sn m sh.t. "They are in the countryside". But of course there is, namely the one with mk: mk sn m sh.t. The prosodic necessity to have mk precede the "dependent pronoun" has nothing to do with the syntactic independence of the sentence - cf. Johnson, loc.cit.77ff. For another "independency marker" compare ntj/ntt (Gardiner, Grammar, §§ 44,2; 200,2; 328; 329; Johnson, loc.cit., Ex.E 17a; E 33.
4. Translation by Polotsky, Transpositions, § 2.4.1; compare Schenkel, Thesen,84; Depuydt, Standard Theory, § 1.3.
5. Johnson, Particle mk, 83.
6. J.L.Foster, RdE 34,1983,27ff.
7. Cf.Polotsky, Transpositions, § 2.1.4, for a kind of reminder.
8. Translation by A.H.Gardiner, JEA 9,1923,11.
9. Besides being forced to use tricky means in translation to overcome the problem of introducing the verb the second position asks for.
- 10.Polotsky, Transpositions, § 2.5 and elsewhere; Shisha-Halevy, Thématisation, 51f - and not the least: private communication of the latter.
- 11.Cf. the definition by Jespersen, English Grammar, 147f: "A cleaving of a sentence by means of it is (often followed by a relative pronoun or connective) serves to single out one particular element of the sentence and very often, by directing attention to it and bringing it, as it were, into focus, to mark a contrast."
- 12.Polotsky, Transpositions, § 2.5.2 (2); Schenkel, Fokussierung, 163, calls this a "qualifying focus" in complementary relationship to the jn-sentence.
- 13.Already elaborately treated in Polotsky, Etudes.
- 14.Cf. Polotsky, Verbalformen, 278.
- 15.Depuydt, Emphatic Nominal Sentence, § 3.

16. Vernus, *Formes emphatiques*, 75.
17. Satzinger, *Negative Konstruktionen*, § 20.
18. Geminating sdm=f for single acts.
19. Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 440,5.
20. loc.cit. § 446.
21. Westendorf, *Das geminierende passive sdm-f*, 147
22. Westendorf, *sdm-f-Theorie; compare Depuydt, Standard Theory*, § 1.2.1.
23. Polotsky, *Etudes*, § 29.
24. Polotsky, *Verbalformen*, 281.
25. Allen, *Tenses*, 20; cf. the author's comparable phrasing in *id.*, *Inflection*, 191 (§ 304).
26. Vernus, *Formes emphatiques*
27. Translation by Faulkner (*JEA* 23, 1937, 172) of pBremner-Rhind 26, 21-22, which differs only by the form of hpr (only the first one is sdm.n=f); the above text is quoted by Roccati, *Aspetti*, 230 (b).
28. Vernus, *Formes emphatiques*, 74 and 85 n.8.
29. Translation by Lichtheim, *Literature I*, 227; the following is quoted from Vernus, loc.cit. 79.
30. Polotsky, *Tenses*, § 18.
31. Depuydt, *Emphatic Nominal Sentence*, § 3.
32. Halliday, *Transitivity*, 201 and 207f.
33. *ibid.* 208.
34. Bolinger, *Contrastive Accent*, 87: "... in a broad sense every semantic peak is contrastive".
35. In the linguistic discussion, to be sure, the term "presupposition" is said to be defined in terms of focus: presupposition is a statement derived by replacing the focus with an appropriate semantic variable. A rather fitting formal means could be given as follows: Using x for a focus variable, example (E 10) c above might be rendered as [[x saw the play yesterday], [x = John]], or, as question "Who saw the play the play yesterday?", [[x saw play yesterday], [x = ?]]; in both cases the expression [x saw the play yesterday] states the presupposition; cf. Akmajian, *Focus*, 189ff; 194ff; Chomsky, *Deep Structure*.
36. Thus Halliday, *Transitivity*, 236, can use the rather delight-

- ful term "predicated theme" for the phrase "it is John" in "It is John who saw the play".
37. Cf. "Focus as 'Novel' Information", Akmajian, *Focus*, 222. For the entire complex cf. Halliday, *Transitivity*, 203ff (information focus); Chafe, *Givenness*, 33ff (contrastiveness). NB: In the discussion under the headings "new" and "given", Halliday and Chafe differ in position: while Halliday calls "new" all the information being delivered in a single speech act, even "anaphoric" items when in contrast (*Transitivity*, 202; 204; 206), Chafe calls all anaphorics "given" and treats "focus of contrast" under a different heading (*Givenness*, 35); cf. the use of personal pronouns in some languages like e.g. Italian: "io vedo" puts exactly "I" in contrast to others.
 38. Halliday, *Transitivity*, 206. This is to be stressed since A. Loprieno (*Semantik und Pragmatik*, § 9) has recently made use of the argument that jnk "I" in the Egyptian cleft sentence has nothing "new".
 39. Henry James, *Daisy Miller*, in: *The Turn of the Screw and other Short Novels*, New York (Signet Classics) 1962, 113. For the contradicted givenness of these examples cf. Akamjian, *Focus*, 238.
 40. Cf. Chafe, *Givenness*, 37; Akmajian, *Focus*, 10ff; 162ff; for the "verb agreement pattern" in the cleft sentence cf. Akmajian, *Focus*, 107ff.
 41. Akmajian, *Focus*, 10ff; 18ff; 104ff; the author derives cleft sentences proper from "pseudo-cleft" sentences.
 42. Halliday, *Transitivity*, 224.
 43. Cf. Junge, *Syntax*, § 5.1.
 44. Which I uphold as focus against Depuydt, *Emphatic Nominal Sentence*, § 5.2.4.4: There is a contrast for sure, and notably textual - "moving" as contrastive to "talking", etc.
 45. Explicitely Callender, *Middle Egyptian*, 93 (4.7.3).
 46. Compare S.I.Groll, *Non Verbal Sentence Pattern*, 58; the types of usage specified here are of course not at all new, Gunn, *Studies*, 61ff, has them listed already.
 47. Quoted by Schenkel, *Fokussierung*, 164 (2.1.1.1), with further evidence.
 48. Similar and further enriched by the focal question jn-m-... is

- the occurrence pWestcar 9,5-8, fully quoted by Loprieno, *Semantik und Pragmatik*, § 3.
49. Schenkel, *Fokussierung*.
 50. Quoted loc.cit.166 under the heading of qualifying; compare to this, however, Junge, *Syntax*, § 5.1, which I still believe to be of a certain value concerning the question here although I am now prepared to accept more sentence patterns of "subject-predicate" order than I was then.
 51. "... the focus, as in equative clauses generally, normally falls on the identifier ...", Halliday, *Transitivity*, 236.
 52. The example Denderah pl.XXV B, quoted by Schenkel, *Fokussierung*, 165, is of the same kind, the semantical paraphrase of a negation - dgj=f/Cfn.w "seeing"/"blindfolded" - still more evident in the "cultural" presupposition.
 53. If it is properly analyzable as negative - doubted by Gilula, *Review*, 209, reaffirmed as negation by Silverman, *Interrogative Constructions*, 82 n.470; if it is a writing of questioning jn, as Gilula, loc.cit., thinks: "Am I his ally?", it is still more evidently focal in a rhetorical sense: "As you well know, I am not his ally, so why would you ask me about his whereabouts!".
 54. Translation by Lichtheim, *Literature*, 227.
 55. A.Loprieno, who quotes the example (*Semantik und Pragmatik*, § 6) calls "I" the subject, "to be his ally" the predicate; his argumentation is as follows: "I" is the "grammatical subject" the verbal forms agree with and is "certainly not" cotextually "new" (loc.cit.§ 9); "to be his ally" is the predicate because it contains the information delivered. Now, first, "I" is of course neither textually nor cognitively "new" - scarcely will ever be - but "new" in the sense elaborately treated above: "Reference items however can be structurally new, not only in reference to the situation ... but also when used anaphorically; in the latter case, 'new' is always to be interpreted as 'contrastive' ..." (Halliday, *Transitivity*, 206; cf. Chafe, *Givenness*, 35). The value of a "grammatical subject" and verb agreement is a matter to be settled later (cf. 3.4 Excursus), until now, however, a little credited term in Egyptology (and by the way: More often

than not the non-focal part does not even show agreement with the focal part, cf. Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 373, and Urk. IV 12,12 jn sn.t̄=f s:ᶜnh rn=f "It is his sister who lets his name live"). And second: Why would a characterization of how an ally may gain information about a person be of any communicative interest to be conveyed as predicate when the speaker denies being an ally of that person? In fact Sinuhe rejects what he rhetorically suspects to be presupposed by the "ruler".

56. Translation by Lichtheim, *Literature*, 221.
57. *Semantik und Pragmatik*, § 6.
58. Gunn, *Studies*, 62 (2). Compare however Loprieno, *loc.cit.* § 6; the latter's assumption of the necessity for an argument on ontology in that case is misguided.
59. Cf. Akmajian, *Focus*, 270ff; 272ff.
60. Lakoff, *Presuppositions*; Chomsky, *Empirical Issues*.
61. Akmajian, *Focus*, 270.
62. *Nominal Pattern*, 170; compare Depuydt, *Emphatic Nominal Sentence*, ad (48).
63. And in that respect, it doesn't change a great deal to have a "circumstantial prj=j" in e.g. CT III 25b Variant B2B0, as Depuydt, *loc.cit.*, aptly explained; compare, too, *id.*, *Standard Theory*, § 1.3.
64. *Formes emphatiques*, 76f.
65. The same holds good for his example *loc.cit.* 78; not quite clearly so for example (5) *loc.cit.* 76, but in a rather distorted context - R has no such "protase".
66. Polotsky, *Etudes*, 81, tried to get over these difficulties by preferring the parallel variant; Westendorf, *sdm-f-Theorie*, on the other hand, made use of them for showing the imperfective character of ḏd=f.
67. *Emphatic Nominal Sentence*, § 3; see above.
68. *Fokussierung*.
69. Written n_{trr}=f which is clearly an indication of the reappearance of dissimilated -r- in syllable-first-position: *na_{tā}|raf. This second part of the example is quoted by Allen, *Emphatic Sentence*, 9.
70. Subordination by js, cf. Gilula, *Spell* 148, 16.

71. The peaceful picture might easily be changed by trying to define what "logical" means; I shall try it nevertheless: Every single language has its own means and methods of "encoding" what the language's speaker has in mind to "send" to the hearer/addressee, and the "meaning" of his "message" is intricately woven into its coding material - not simply "information unit" by "information unit", word by word, but by "word meaning", arrangement, mutual relationship etc.. Still, the message has a meaning somehow independently "real" which, if mentally understood, can be rendered in another language of quite a different encoding structure. This "extralinguistic" meaning of only mental reality has been a subject of "logic" (ontology) ever since along with how to convey it in a "language" universally valid without using a specific "natural" language. Thus a logical analysis of a "proposition" may serve as an "inter-medium" between the language translated from and the language translated into by assuming "that the abstract or underlying structure of sentences may be identified with their logical form" (Van Dijk, *Text Grammar*, 17) - compare Junge, *Syntax*, § 1.2.

It was, incidentally, quite bewildering to learn from J.Callender, *Review*, that I did not treat "semantics" in Junge, *Syntax*, although I certainly felt I had made up for the deficiencies he himself had noticed in older Egyptology (Or 42, 1973, 47ff), namely the undesirable mixture of form and meaning. Thus, if Callender had not simply forgotten his positions of earlier, I learned something more - that he had not even noticed the differences between the "semantics" of modern and extinct languages: The first I did not discuss (which he explains by what he calls my "rigidly" adhering "to Chomskyan orthodoxy"), the second is my subject, *passim*, which he did not take note of since he limited his considerations to the introduction and a few further glimpses.

72. *Thématisation*, 51 with n.3.

73. Cf. Daneš^V, *Semantic Structure*, 55ff and id., *Sentence Perspective*; Chafe, *Language*, 119ff; 123ff; Kuno, *Subject*, 444 n.10. It coincides with the semantic definition Halliday gives ("What I am talking about" or "what I am talking about

- now") but not with the exclusiveness theme is assigned initial position by him (Halliday, *Transitivity*, 212). - As it is, Loprieno, *Verbalsystem*, 83 n.45 quotes the same literature to back up his opinion that "subject" is a term which does not suit his purpose and should be substituted by theme/topic since pragmatical, not logical relations are meant. In any case, I did not see his opinion confirmed there. Compare n.86.
74. In the sense intimated here, Hockett, *Modern Linguistics*, 201.
75. Chafe, *Givenness*, 43; compare Gardiner, *Speech and Language*, 268, whose definition has about the same meaning.
76. Chafe, *Givenness*, 43; 44; similarly Daneš^V, *Sentence Perspective*, 112.
77. This could be said to reflect the common opinion in Egyptology, too (cf. e.g. Gunn, *Studies*, 61 n.1; Gardiner, *Speech and Language*, 268); it is only A.Loprieno who quite recently (*Semantik und Pragmatik*, § 3 with n.13) took - perhaps let down by equivocation - "logical subject" to be used in Egyptology as in some quarters of linguistics where the term has unfortunately been reduced to identity with "actor/agent" (Halliday, *Language Structure*, 164; Chafe, *Givenness*, 25). Equally undesirable and of little help seems to me to argue again (cf. Loprieno, *loc.cit.* § 6) in terms of Alexandrian (Aristotelian) "parts of speech", that is, in terms of substance, akzidences, entities of different orders, etc., which, I think, overdoes the notion "logic" in an unnecessary revival of scholasticism.
78. Givón, *Topic*, 152; cf. Loprieno, *Semantik und Pragmatik*, § 9.
79. Givón, *loc.cit.* 166f.
80. Cf. Gardiner, *Speech and Language*, 277ff (§ 70)
81. As Loprieno, *loc.cit.*, appears to assume; but compare again Gardiner, *loc.cit.*
82. This may be seen clearly exemplified, e.g. by (E 5) above and its nominalized participles as subjects.
83. Cf. Shisha-Halevy, *Thématisation*, 51 n.3, who himself calls it "propos"; the above is only approximately like Halliday's "rheme" (*Transitivity*, 211ff).
84. Noun + old perfective: Vernus, *Formes emphatiques*, 75; 80,

seems to think that "la construction Nom + statif ne peut constituer un énoncé autonome" - I wonder what he really means, but if it is that noun plus old perfective/stative does not occur initially as independent utterance/sentence, his statement is simply wrong; see besides the quoted examples e.g. Lebensmüder 119 (dispute of a man with his ba) - after question; Urk.IV 656,14-16; pWestcar 5,19 - beginning direct speech.

85. Keenan/Schieffelin, Topic, 337, call it the "given-new-contract": the speaker is responsible for marking the information syntactically as "given" that he thinks the listener already knows.
86. "While 'given' means 'what you were talking about' (or 'what I was talking about before'), 'theme' means 'what I am talking about'", Halliday, Transitivity, 212 (note the similarity of this definition of "theme" to Chafe's definition of subject given above, n.75). Chafe, Givenness, 48, argues against a "correlation of subject status with givenness" (although he had treated "extralinguistic givenness", loc.cit. 31), but his counter-example "What happened to the lamp? The dog knocked it over " is a pseudo-example in that respect since "the dog" is marked as given and even if not that way ("a dog"), it would have been an example of what I called "epistemological givenness".
87. It is to be noted, however, that, although the passage concludes somehow, two more statements follow that nonetheless take up parts of the body again.
88. Pragmatik und Semantik, § 8; this assumption is based on the so-called theory of "communicative dynamism" mainly connected with the name of Jan Firbas, cf. Firbas, Theme, 270 ("extent to which the sentence element contributes to the development of the communication").
89. Compare Chafe, Givenness, 33.
90. Cf. Polotsky, Transpositions.
91. Compare Weinrich, Tempus, 7ff; especially 23ff.
92. In the mould of the sentence type called "with adverbial predicate", cf. the examples (E 1)-(E 5); (E 7); (E 21)-(E 24); after jw and other "temps composés", cf. Polotsky, Transpositions, § 3.8.

93. The most fundamental and far reaching one is Loprieno, Verbal-system; as far as I see, the following titles may furtheron be cited: R. Hannig, Die neue Gunnsche Regel, in: Fs-Westendorf, 63ff; id., Tempussystem; Loprieno, Aspekt und Diathese im Ägyptischen, in: Fs-Westendorf, 87ff; Vernus, Sujet+sdm.f; id., Etudes III; other concepts by Chr. Eyre and P. Vernus are probably in print (papers of IVth ICE-Congress). in my opinion, these studies are too exclusively centered on sdm=f-forms (exception: Hannig, Tempussystem), while my own attempt concerning aspects, Junge, Studien zum Mittelägyptischen Verbum, Göttingen 1970, paid sdm=f too little attention; cf. Roccati, Konstruktionen.
94. $h_3q.n=j$ is sometimes said to continue $jnj.n=j$ (see translation "and"), thus being "continuative" $sdm.n=f$ - which is allright if understood to be a descriptive term of function not of form, see my forthcoming study on $jw=f$ hr (tm) sdm in JEA 72.
95. Both examples Polotsky, Transpositions, § 3.9.2; compare id., Tenses, § 26, for another example of the same kind.
96. And incidentally, excellent examples of something F. Daneš^v calls "Kontaktthematization", that is, the rheme (R) of a preceding sentence becomes theme (T) of the following one: $T_i=R_{i-1}$ (Daneš, Struktur des Kommunikats, 35; compare, too, id., Textstruktur).
97. Polotsky, Etudes, 24 n.8; 81 n.4; id., Tenses, § 26.
98. Compare, however, Vernus (Etudes III, 169), who considers an example like this one to be one for past perfect - "accompli d'antériorité" - because it is said to belong to another text level than the main narrative - "fonctionne comme une incidente retrospective"; I doubt this to be a convincing example for his case since the adverbial $n^{-C}3.t-n.j$ plus $sdm=f$ is no autonomous tense by itself but co(n)text bound ($sdm=f$ is a clausal tense while the preposition rules the relationship to the main sentence), so past perfect is less the outcome of a past tense form than one of the French translation.
99. Polotsky, Transpositions, § 2.6.7, with some more examples and others with jrj 's "passive" counterpart ($hpr.n$).
100. Gardiner, RdE 11, 1957, 43ff.
101. Translation by Vernus, Etudes I, 118f.
102. And had been proposed for the translation by Polotsky, Tenses, § 18, see above.

103. Vernus, *Etudes* I, 118; *id.*, *Formes emphatiques*, and see below; other examples Vernus quotes (*Etudes* III, 167), look alike but are of quite a different kind: Urk.IV 59,13-14/54, 15-17 *prj r p.t hnm.n=f m ntr.w* are, of course, not to be segmented into old perfective/stative plus *sdm.n=f* as he does, strangely enough (bare old perfective, unintroduced by a noun/pronoun, is never used initially unless "conative" (cf. Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 313 "exclamatory use")), but into participle plus *sdm.n=f* "The one gone to heaven has united with the gods" - thus noun plus *sdm.n=f*, correctly analyzed.
104. Weinrich, *Tempus*, 211ff; 221f. There is a certain similarity between Weinrich's concept and that of Emile Benveniste who differentiates between "histoire" ("L'énonciation historique ... caractérise le récit des événements passés") and "discour" ("toute énonciation supposant un locuteur et un auditeur, et chez le premier l'intention d'influencer l'autre en quelque manière"), each with a tense system of its own: "backgrounding" as it is used here has connections to "histoire" (cf. Benveniste, *Les relations de temps*; *id.*, *Problèmes*, ch.V, § 19; §§ 21 - 23).
105. Compare Givón, *Topic*, 170: "... main clauses (and in particular declarative-affirmative ones) are the most progressive innovative environment in language".
106. Cf. above and Vernus, *Formes emphatiques*, 73f.
107. To be sure, textually given, again, as: *jnk pw hpr.n=j m Hprj* "It is that I have come to existence as *Hepri*" which precedes, cf. Roccati, *Aspetti*, 230(b).
108. Translation by Johnson, *Particle mk*, 79 (E 23); evidently exactly that alternative is the correct one Vernus had doubts about (*premier schème*), cf. Vernus, *Formes emphatiques*, 78f example (10).
109. Vernus, *Etudes* III, 162; 163.
110. A very good example for an "unmarked" predicate construction in the sense of (E 10)b above: although there is a focus on the adverbial and it is of interest for the story that the king's son is away from the residence, one can either ask "Where was he sent to?" or "What had happened?".
111. Cf. Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 414,2; Vernus, *Etudes* III, 168.

112. It is not a very good example for the purpose (but quoted by Vernus within the frame work mentioned above, *id.*, *Etudes III*, 162) since its language is not well known as a system. Contrary to Vernus, *loc.cit.*, I am of the opinion that sw^Cq plus noun is a variant of circumstantial $sdm=f$, not a main sentence, compare Barta, *ZÄS* 112, 1985, 94ff for the time being.
113. Referred to by Vernus, *Etudes III*, 162 n.18 and *id.*, *Formes emphatiques*, 74 n.7.
114. Satzinger, *Umstandssätze*, 91; his examples with "fronted" $wn=j + sdm=f$, *loc.cit.*, are of course explainable on the same lines as (E 36): thematic nominal $wn=j$, rhematic circumstantial $sdm=f$; (E 23)b above, with fronted $wnn=f$ and following circumstantial negatived infinitive, is of a comparable kind.
115. G.Reisner, *ZÄS* 69, 1933, 27.
116. A part of the nbw-title of Thutmosis III.
117. Vernus, *Etudes III*, 169f, ex.(24); the example furthermore again demonstrates that there is not the least necessity for the concept of an independent " $sdm.n.f$ séquentiel ... comme narrative ponctuel", *loc.cit.* 165; 170.
118. Cf. for these types of occurrences Polotsky, *Tenses*, §§ 22ff.
119. Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 414,4; Westendorf, *MIO* 1, 1953, 38ff; Polotsky, *Etudes*, 84; *id.*, *Tenses*, §§ 22-24.
120. Vernus, *Etudes III*, 163-164; 168; 171; possibly Vernus' hypothesis is based on a rather ad-hoc transfer of Benveniste's terms "discour" and "histoire" - cf. n.104 above - to Egyptian; at any rate, it is accompanied by a strangely anti-grammatical gestus, for instance when he speaks of "une catégorie énonciative, et non syntaxique" or says that the difference between "le niveau énonciative et le niveau syntaxique" might be of help in solving Vernus' problems with the "subordonnées circonstantielle" (*loc.cit.* 163 and n.23); apparently he feels his translational liberty endangered by rules of grammar when he complains of "la restriction excessive de la catégorie du $sdm.n.f$ 'circonstantiel', telle que l'a bâtie Polotsky" (*loc.cit.* 168). Do utterances in human language really exist that do not depend on rules of syntax?
121. Cf. for this term Loprieno, *Semantik und Pragmatik*, § 1 n.1.

122. Thématisation, 52; cf. Polotsky, Transpositions, § 2.5.1.
123. Here a most interesting experiment may be quoted (from Hornby, Psychological Subject). Test instrumentation: Two pictures, the first one representing an Indian building his "tepe" (A), the second one an Eskimo building his "igloo", (B); a few sentences of varying meaning not completely fitting the picture representations, one of them read "The Indian is building the igloo" (1), another one "It is the Indian who is building the igloo" (2). On the request to find a proper combination of pictures and sentences, the test persons decided as follows: There was a tendency to choose the picture containing the thing referred to by the subject (that is, "Indian", by combining sentence (1) with picture (A)), but to choose the picture with the item not focal in the cleft sentence (that is, "igloo", by combining sentence (2) with picture (B)).
124. Daneš^V, Textstruktur.
125. Cf. recently Depuydt, Emphatic Nominal Sentence, § 2.
126. Daneš^V, Struktur des Kommunikats, 34.
127. Chafe, Givenness, 36; Akmajian, Focus, 266f.
128. To be sure - and marked as "nominative" case.
129. Nothing other than a pronominalization, cf. Givón, Topic.
130. It is of course more complicated in reality since these "pronouns" are tense markers, too.
131. Cf. Fillmore, Case.
132. Cf. Tesnière, Syntaxe structurale.
133. It is the reason for their being used equivocally so often, see above and n.77.
134. As the pre-Polotskian school of grammar used to and has now come to honour again with J. Allen, J. Callender or P. Vernus, to give names.
135. Interestingly enough, Gardiner, in his in other respects most illuminating treatise on "Speech and Language", 271ff (§ 69), mostly argues for the need of "grammatical subjects/predicates" on the basis of - focussing constructions!
136. And again, the subjects of non-verbal predicates are very often of the same categories the "actor/agent" roles are usually occupied by; namely persons, specific or defined entities, Aristotelian substances etc., but one should re-

- frain from attempts to define semantic categories of "subject suitability"; see n.77.
137. In fact, it is only another term for actor/agent since it cannot be "logical subject" anymore which is a sentence notion not a clause notion.
 138. Keenan, Subject, 316; Givón, Topic, 156f.
 139. Chafe, Givenness, 29.
 140. Gardiner, Grammar, §§ 146-148; Callender, Middle Egyptian, 91 (4.6); Vernus, Sujet+sdm=f, 197f.
 141. Cf. Hintze, Neuägyptische Erzählungen, 281ff, and the literature discussed there.
 142. Vernus, loc.cit.; Schenkel, Fokussierung, 162; Loprieno, Semantik und Pragmatik, § 8.
 143. Compare my general treatment of the question, Junge, Syntax. 38ff, and RdE 30,1978,96ff.
 144. Of course, some force may help sometimes, cf. Callender, Middle Egyptian, § 4.6, who simply makes the fronting noun of Sh.S.63 a focus, against the clear statement of Gardiner (Grammar, § 146) that the stress is upon the predicates in these cases.
 145. Cf. Schenkel, Fokussierung, 160.
 146. For the term see Halliday, Transitivity, 214; compare Shisha-Halevy, Coptic Nominal Sentence, 176: "'prominent topic' for the subsequent clause (this pattern, common in antitheses, is cotextually marked)".
 147. Semantik und Pragmatik, § 9 - his example pWestcar 9,5, however, exhibits a "logical predicate" focus, not a thematic focus; cf. Shisha-Halevy, loc.cit.
 148. Adapted from Givón, Topic, 153.
 149. Loprieno, loc.cit.
 150. Cf. Gilula, Review, 209.
 151. Cf. Westendorf, Nominalsatz, 12ff.
 152. Malaise, Propositions conditionelles, 155: "jr fonctionne comme une particule proclitique de thématization".
 153. Which I have not yet found reasons to doubt to be the "circumstantial form" I once thought it to be (Junge, Syntax, 71), contra Malaise, Propositions conditionelles.
 154. But see Frandsen, Outline, § 115, and Malaise, loc.cit. - M. Malaise, however, did not take notice of my elaborate study on the subject (Junge, loc.cit.66ff), apparently deliberately;

the relevance of the jr-construction for "theme marking" did not occur to me then, however; compare Callender, *Constructions with jn*, 18ff.

155. I make use of the "archetype" of the text as given by RÖbler-Köhler, Kapitel 17, see p.158 and 215, for text-critical remarks p.173; line numbering of the Nebseni-1-papyrus.
156. Cf. Junge, *Syntax*, 67f (6.1.2).
157. Stress by semantic complementarity with the foregoing.
158. Cf. Junge, *loc.cit.*
159. The example is taken from Kuno, *Subject*, 424.
160. *loc.cit.*
161. Scil. "who shall lift their arms".
162. Contra Vernus, *Sujet+sdm.f*, 198, who states: "... l'ordre non rhématisé est sujet + prédicat, ce qui correspond à l'ordre non marqué de la pragmatique de l'énonciation (à ne pas confondre avec la syntaxe)".
163. Compare Barta, *GM* 88,1985,7ff.
164. Cf. Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Nominal Sentence*, 176.

ABBREVIATED LITERATURE

- Akmajian, Focus = A.Akmajian, Aspects of the Grammar of Focus in English, MIT Diss. 1970
- Allen, Inflection = J.P.Allen, The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts, Bibliotheca Aegyptia 2, Malibu 1984
- Allen, Tenses = J.P.Allen, Synthetic and Analytic Tenses in the Pyramid Texts, in: Egyptologie en 1979. Axes prioritaires de recherches I, Colloques internationaux de CNRS, Paris 1982
- Allen, Emphatic Sentence = J.P.Allen, Is the "Emphatic" Sentence an Adverbial-Predicate Construction?, in: GM 32,1979,7ff
- Benveniste, Problèmes = E.Benveniste, Problèmes de linguistique générale, Paris 1972
- Benveniste, Les relations de temps = E.Benveniste, Les relations de temps dans le verbe français, in: Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris 54,1959,69ff
- Bolinger, Contrastive Accent = D.L.Bolinger, Contrastive Accent and Contrastive Stress, in: Language 37, 1961,83ff
- Callender, Nominal Sentence = J.B.Callender, Studies in the Nominal Sentence in Egyptian and Coptic, Near Eastern Studies 24, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1984
- Callender, Review = Grammatical Models and "Middle Egyptian", in: JEA 69,1983,154ff
- Callender, Middle Egyptian = J.B.Callender, Middle Egyptian, Afroasiatic Dialects 2, Malibu 1975
- Callender, Constructions with jn = J.B.Callender, Notes on Constructions with in, in: Studies in African Linguistics 2,1971,1ff
- Chafe, Givenness = W.L.Chafe, Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Point of View, in: Li, Subject and Topic, 25ff
- Chafe, Language = W.L.Chafe, Language and Consciousness, in: Language 50,1974,119ff
- Chomsky, Empirical Issues = N.Chomsky, Some Empirical Issues in the Theory of Transformational Grammar, in: id., Studies on Semantics in Generative Grammar, The Hague 1972
- Chomsky, Deep Structure = N.Chomsky, Deep Structure, Surface Structure, and Semantic Interpretation, in: id., Studies on Semantics in Generative Grammar, The Hague 1972
- Daneš, Struktur des Kommunikats = F.Daneš, Zur semantischen Struktur des Kommunikats, in: F.Daneš/D.Viehweiger

- (ed.), Probleme der Textgrammatik, Studia Grammatica XI, Berlin 1976, 29ff
- Daneš^V, Papers on FSP = F.Daneš^V (ed.), Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective, Prague 1974
- Daneš^V, Sentence Perspective = F.Daneš^V, Functional Sentence Perspective and the Organisation of the Text, in: Daneš^V, Papers on FSP, 106ff
- Daneš^V, Textstruktur = F.Daneš^V, Zur linguistischen Analyse der Textstruktur, in: Folia linguistica 4, 1970, 72ff
- Daneš^V, Semantic Structure = F.Daneš^V, Some Thoughts on the Semantic Structure of the Sentence, in: Lingua 21, 1968, 55ff
- Depuydt, Emphatic Nominal Sentence = L.Depuydt, The Emphatic Nominal Sentence in Egyptian and Coptic, in: Or (forthcoming)
- Depuydt, Standard Theory = L.Depuydt, The Standard Theory of the "Emphatic" Forms in Classical (Middle) Egyptian: A Historical Survey, in: OLP 14, 1983, 13ff
- Fillmore, Case = Ch.Fillmore, The Case for Case, in: E.Bach/R.Harms (ed.), Universals in Linguistic Theory, New York 1968
- Firbas, Theme = J.Firbas, On Defining the Theme in Functional Sentence Analysis, Travaux linguistiques de Prague 1, Prague 1966
- Frandsen, Outline = P.J.Frandsen, An Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System, Copenhagen 1974
- Fs-Westendorf = Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Band 1: Sprache. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern, Göttingen 1984
- Gardiner, Grammar = A.H.Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar. Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs, 3 London 1957
- Gardiner, Speech and Language = A.H.Gardiner, The Theory of Speech and Language, Oxford 1932
- Gilula, Nominal Pattern = M.Gilula, An Unusual Nominal Pattern in Middle Egyptian, in: JEA 62, 1976, 160ff
- Gilula, Spell 148 = M.Gilula, Coffin Texts Spell 148, in: JEA 57, 1971, 14ff
- Gilula, Review = M.Gilula, Review of Satzinger, Negative Konstruktionen, in: JEA 56, 1970, 205ff
- Givón, Topic = T.Givón, Topic, Pronoun and Grammatical Agreement, in: Li, Subject and Topic, 149ff
- Groll, Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns = S.I.Groll, Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns in Late Egyptian, London 1967

- Gunn, Studies = B.Gunn, Studies in Egyptian Syntax, Paris 1924
- Halliday, Language Structure = M.A.K.Halliday, Language Structure and Language Function, in: J.Lyons (ed.), New Horizons in Linguistics, New York 1970, 140ff
- Halliday, Transitivity = M.A.K.Halliday, Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English, in: Journal of Linguistics 3, 1967, 177ff
- Hannig, Tempusystem = R.Hannig, Zum mittelägyptischen Tempusystem, in: GM 56, 1982, 35ff
- Hintze, Neuägyptische Erzählungen = F.Hintze, Untersuchungen zu Stil und Sprache neuägyptischer Erzählungen, Berlin 1950-52
- Hockett, Modern Linguistics = C.F.Hockett, A Course in Modern Linguistics, New York 1958
- Hornby, Psychological Subject = P.A.Hornby, The Psychological Subject and Predicate, in: Cognitive Psychology 3, 1972, 632ff
- James, Hekanakte = T.G.H.James, The Hekanakte Papers and Other Early Middle Kingdom Documents, New York 1962
- Jespersen, English Grammar = O.Jespersen, A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, part VII Syntax, London 1961
- Johnson, Particle mk = J.Johnson, The Use of the Particle mk in Middle Kingdom Letters, in: Fs-Westendorf, 71ff
- Junge, Syntax = F.Junge, Syntax der Mittelägyptischen Literatursprache. Grundlagen einer Strukturtheorie, Mainz 1978
- Keenan, Subject = E.L.Keenan, Towards a Universal Definition of "Subject", in: Li, Subject and Topic, 303ff
- Keenan/Schieffelin, Topic = E.O.Keenan/B.B.Schieffelin, Topic as a Discourse Notion, in: Li, Subject and Topic, 335ff
- Kuno, Subject = S.Kuno, Subject, Theme, and the Speaker's Empathy - A Reexamination of Relativization Phenomena, in: Li, Subject and Topic, 417ff
- Lakoff, Presuppositions = G.Lakoff, Presuppositions and Relative Grammaticality, in: Mathematical Linguistics and Automatic Translation Report No. NSF 24, Harvard University (Computation Laboratory) 1970
- Li, Subject and Topic = Ch.N.Li (ed.), Subject and Topic, New York/San Francisco/London 1976
- Lichtheim, Literature = M.Lichtheim, Ancient Egyptian Literature.

Volume I: The Old and Middle Kingdoms, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1975

- Loprieno, Verbalsystem = A.Loprieno, Das Verbalsystem im Ägyptischen und im Semitischen. Zur Grundlegung einer Aspekttheorie, GOF IV 17, Wiesbaden 1986
- Loprieno, Semantik und Pragmatik = A.Loprieno, Der ägyptische Satz zwischen Semantik und Pragmatik: die Rolle von jn, in: Acts of the IV. ICE Congress, Beihefte SAK (forthcoming)
- Malaise, Propositions conditionnelles = M.Malaise, La conjugaison suffixale dans les propositions conditionnelles introduits par ir en ancien et moyen égyptien, in: CdE 60,1985,152ff
- Polotsky-Studies = D.W.Young (ed.), Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky, Gloucester Mass. 1981
- Polotsky, Transpositions = H.J.Polotsky, Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique, in: IOS 6,1976, 1ff
- Polotsky, Tenses = H.J.Polotsky, Egyptian Tenses, The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Vol.II No.5, Jerusalem 1965
- Polotsky, Verbalformen = H.J.Polotsky, Ägyptische Verbalformen und ihre Vokalisation, in Or 33,1964,267ff
- Polotsky, Etudes = H.J.Polotsky, Etudes de syntaxe copte, Cairo 1944
- Roccati, Konstruktionen = A.Roccati, Abgeleitete Konstruktionen des Ägyptischen, in: GM 36,1979,39ff
- Roccati, Aspetti = A.Roccati, Aspetti di Dio nella civiltà egizia, in: Dio nella Bibbia e nelle culture ad essa contemporanee e conesse, Turin (Leumann) 1980, 218ff
- Rößler-Köhler, Kapitel 17 = U.Rößler-Köhler, Kapitel 17 des ägyptischen Totenbuches, GOF IV 10, Wiesbaden 1979
- Satzinger, Negative Konstruktionen = H.Satzinger, Die negativen Konstruktionen im Alt- und Mittelägyptischen, MÄS 12, Berlin 1968
- Satzinger, Umstandssätze = H.Satzinger, Zu den Umstandssätzen im Altägyptischen, in: MDAIK 22,1967,84ff
- Schenkel, Fokussierung = W.Schenkel, Fokussierung. Über die Reihenfolge von Subjekt und Prädikat im klassisch-ägyptischen Nominalsatz, in: Fs-Westendorf, 157ff
- Schenkel, Thesen = W.Schenkel, Thesen zum ägyptischen Sprachunterricht, in: GM 40,1980,81ff
- Shisha-Halevy, Coptic Nominal Sentence = A.Shisha-Halevy, Notes on some Coptic Nominal Sentence Patterns, in: Fs-Westendorf, 175ff

- Shisha-Halevy, Thématisation = A. Shisha-Halevy, Quelques thématisations marginales du verbe en néo-égyptien, in: OLP 9, 1978, 51ff
- Silverman, Interrogative Constructions = D.P. Silverman, Interrogative Constructions with jn and jn-jw in Old and Middle Egyptian, Bibliotheca Aegyptia 1, Malibu 1980
- Tesnière, Syntaxe structurale = L. Tesnière, Eléments de Syntaxe structurale, Paris 1959
- Van Dijk, Textgrammar = T.A. van Dijk, Text Grammar and Text Logic, in: J.S. Petöfi/H. Rieser, Studies in Text Grammar, Foundations of Language. Supplementary series vol. 19, Dordrecht/Boston 1973, 17ff
- Vernus, Etudes III = P. Vernus, Etudes de philologie et de linguistique (III), in: RdE 35, 1984, 159ff
- Vernus, Sujet+sdm.f = P. Vernus, Sujet + sdm.f et sujet + pseudo-participe avec les verbes de qualité: Dialectique de l'aspect et de 'Aktionsart', in: Fs-Westendorf, 197ff
- Vernus, Formes emphatiques = P. Vernus, Formes "emphatiques" en fonction non "emphatiques" dans la protase d'un système corrélatif, in: GM 43, 1981, 73ff
- Vernus, Etudes I = P. Vernus, Etudes de philologie et de linguistique (I), in: RdE 32, 1980, 117ff
- Weinrich, Tempus = H. Weinrich, Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt, Stuttgart 1964
- Westendorf, Nominalsatz = W. Westendorf, Beiträge zum altägyptischen Nominalsatz, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1981, 77ff
- Westendorf, sdm-f-Theorie = W. Westendorf, Die sdm-f-Theorie im Licht neuerer Forschungen, in: Polotsky-Studies, 546ff
- Westendorf, Das geminierende passive sdm-f = W. Westendorf, Das geminierende passive sdm-f (mrr-f): imperfektiv oder emphatisch?, in: ZÄS 84, 1959, 147ff