Predicative Possession in Late Egyptian
(with special attention to incipient grammaticalization processes)

Stéphane Polis (F.R.S.-FNRS – ULg)

Goal. Provide a description of the various types of constructions used for expressing clausal (‘predicative’) possession in LEg.

0. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

LEg corpus. Comprehensively defined to include both literary and non-literary texts from the reign of Thutmos 3 (c. 1450 BC) down to abnormal hieratic texts (c. 600 BC), excluding most of the texts in Égyptien de tradition (i.e. purposely imitating various registers of EEg).

- The focus is on synchronic description, but acknowledging significant variation across time and text types:
  - Diachronic
  - Diaphasic (multiglossic situation during the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period)
- Which allows for explaining the occurrence of competing constructions in a functional sub-domain of predicative possession.

Data collection. Three steps: (1) LEg grammars and grammatical studies (Erman 1933; Černý & Groll 1993; Théodoridès 1970; Satzinger 1976; Shisha-Halevy 1981; Neveu 1996; Junge 2001; Depuydt 2008, 2010); (2) Collecting other possible types in texts; (3) Harvesting additional examples in Ramses (500 000 occurrences). The data presented here are not exhaustive in terms of tokens, but hopefully in terms of types: tried to enrich, specify and systematize the available grammatical descriptions.

Audience. Balance between a comprehensive presentation of the constructions found in LEg in the functional domain of predicative possession for typologists and a more detailed discussion of some examples likely to be interesting for Egyptologists.

Structure of the talk. The talk is structured in three sections that reflects both functional and structural features:

- The adjectival predicate pattern or the marked expression of ownership
- The comitative strategy or the unmarked expression of possession
- Other types of predicative possession in Late Egyptian
1. The Adjectival Predicative Pattern

It has long been acknowledged that *property* or *ownership* is expressed in LEg via two different patterns, depending on the nature of the subject (pronominal split):¹

- When the PR is a lexical NP or an Interrogative Pron.: *nsw* PR ‘it belongs to PR’
- When the PR is a Personal Pron.: *ink* PM ‘PM belongs to me’

Both patterns are inherited from EEg (see e.g. Gardiner 1957: 88-89 [§114-115]; Malaise & Winand 1999: 308-311 [502-503]) and are built on the same predicative pattern, the so-called ‘Adjectival predicative pattern’, where a nominal subject follows the adjectival predicate:

```
  nfr      NP
  good     NP
  PRED     SUBJ
  ‘NP is good’

  POSSESSOR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PM) nsw Lexic. NP (PM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘(the PM), it belongs to NP’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nsw Lexic. NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘it belongs to NP’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Fig. 1. Expression of ownership in LEg

1.1. The PR is a NP: ‘*nsw* PR’ pattern

Etymologically (< *n(j) PR* PRED – [Pron.] SUBJ),² this construction (lit. ‘it is that of PR/it belongs to PR’) is formed with 3 elements:³

- *n(j)* is the adjectival (*nisba*) form of the genitival relator (PRED, lit. ‘that of’)
- *sw* is the Dependent Pron. (SUBJECT, pronominal enclitic)
- PR is a lexical NP (governed by *n(j)*)

There are around 71 occurrences of the construction in the LEg corpus. Unlike in EEg, this construction is said to be limited to third person pronouns, which favored graphemic fusion, probably indexing some sort of phonetic reality: the spellings necessarily include a base *ns* (sometimes written without 𓊢, especially for texts of the late 20th dynasty and Third Intermediate Period).

```
1. *ns* (𓊢) pr-c3 𓊱.w.s
    POSS_3 Pharaoh
   “they belong to Pharaoh” (O. Nash 2, ν 3 = KRI IV, 319,3)
```

¹ As noted e.g. by Černý & Groll (1993: 26-27) or Neveu (1996: 235).
² See e.g. Loprieno (1995: 118-119).
³ See e.g. Erman (1933: 105 §233); Černý & Groll (1993: 24-27; 542-543).
This base (with a rare graphemic phenomenon of a hieroglyphic sign crossing morphemic boundaries) is most frequently (54 occurrences) expended by a y (nsy) with spelling like 𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚 : 

2. ir nly hmnty.w n-se (𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚) sm
    TOP these coppers POSS_3 Sem-priest
    bn n-se (𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚) pỉ hr
    NEG POSS_3 the Tomb
    “As for these pieces of copper, they belong to the Sem-priest, they do not belong to the Tomb”  
    (O. Berlin P 11239, r° 3-4 = KRI III, 545.3-5)

After both spellings of the base, understood then as a PM marker, one can find the writing of the dependent pronoun of the third person singular masculine sw (e.g. 𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚 ) or feminine st (e.g. 𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚 ) or plural st (e.g. 𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚 ) :

3. in=f nh3-n hnty
    bring\PST=3SM some copper
    iw nsy-se (𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚) pỉy pr-n-stˁ
    CIRC POSS_3 this portable_shrine
    “He brought some pieces of copper belonging to the portable shrine”  
    (P. Mayer A, r° 3,4-5 = KRI VI, 808,13-14)

4. ir nỉ h.wt i.dd PN
    nsy-se (𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚) PN tỉy=f sn.t
    POSS_3 PN his sister
    “As for the goods that PN mentioned, they belong to PN, his sister”  
    (P. Mayer A, r° 4,11 = KRI VI, 812,1-2)

5. hr ir tˁ rh.t lh.w i.dd=w n=k
    n-se (𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚𓊚) nly=w ms.w nty m-stˁ=w
    POSS_3 their offspring REL after=3PL
    “(I sent a message to bring the oxen in order to thresh the barley …), but concerning the amount of oxen that they mentioned to you, they belong to the (group of) their offspring that follow them”  
    (P. Anastasi IX, r° 3-4 = KRI III, 504)

As shown in the previous examples, when the pronoun se is fully written, its spelling does not consistently agree with its referent (in LÆg, sw, st, etc → se). In this paper, all the spellings will be simply transliterated as nse.

Before further analyzing this construction, one should note that it is particularly frequent in theophoric proper names, the frequency and variety of which is apparently higher at the end of the 20th dynasty and the TIP:

6. nse-b3-bn-dd
    “lit. He belongs to the ram, lord of Mendes”  
    (Wenamun 1,6 = LES 61,8)
    Cf. Greek Ἕσβενδητις, Ass. iš-.

The main types attested are: nsw-imn Nesamun (lit. ‘he belongs to Amun’); nse-imn-m-ip.t; nsw-dhwty; nse-mntw; nsw-mnw; nsw-mw.t; nse-pth; nse-sbk; nse-hri; nse-p3-rˁ; nse-in-hr.t; nse-hnsw. Other less common types are nsw-3̣y.t; nse-bs-n-mw.t.

---

See Gilula (1968: 60-61) for similar examples with the spelling of n(j)-wi (‘I belong to PR’, with previous literature) and compare with w3y ‘how’ in an adjectival predicative pattern in LÆg.
1.1.1. The PR is lexical NP or an interrogative pronoun equivalent to a NP

See supra for lexical NP as PR. Examples of interrogative pronouns are rare (only 1 example):

7. nse  lh  t3  ip.t
POSS_3 what the measure
m  ss  p3-sr  (i-)in  se
RHEM  scribe  Paser  bring\REL\PST  it
“He said: ‘to what (institution) does the measure belong?’, (and they said:)
‘It is the scribe Paser who brought it’”
(O. Leipzig 2, r° 5-6 = KRI V, 467,15-16)

It should be stressed that the (in)definiteness of the PR does not affect the construction:

8. ir  tly  nbd-šnj  nse  w”  šri.t  n  p3-r7-hr-3h.ty
TOP  this  plait  POSS_3  INDEF  daughter  of  Prâ-Herakhty
“As for this plait, it belongs to a daughter of Prâ-Herakhty”
(P. d’Orbiney, 11,4-5 = LES 21,4-5)

1.1.2. The PM is a third person pronoun or a NP

As shown in Fig. 1, the PM in this construction is supposed to be always a 3rd pers. pron. in Late Egyptian. When the context is self-sufficient for identifying the referent of this 3rd pers. pron., the PM need not necessarily be expanded lexically. So, for instance, in oracular questions, one finds examples such as:

9. nse  PN
POSS_3  PN
“It belongs to PN(?)”
(O. IFAO 392 = BIFAO 35)

In the oracular procedure of Ex. 9, the referent of nsw is clear enough for both parties.

The PM can also be expressed co-textually, like in Ex. 10. In such cases, nsw is of course anaphoric:

10. imy  tw  t3  t  in.n=k
nse  hry-mdly.w  PN
POSS_3  chief_policeman  PN
“Please give (back) the donkey that you carried off, it belongs to the chief policeman PN”
(O. Ashmolean Musem 165, r° 2-3 = KRI III, 548,10-11)

Most of the time, however, the lexical PM is expressed as a topic or anti-topic (Grossman 2009: 158). As a topic the PM is generally introduced by the particle ir (type 1: ir PM nse PR):

11. p3y=i  nb  nfr  ir  p3  mks  nse  PN
my  lord  good  TOP  the  mks  POSS_3  PN
“My good lord, as for the mks, does it belong to A?”
(O. IFAO 850 = BIFAO 41 [1942], p. 19)

12. dd  PN
ir  n3  h.wt  i.dd  PN  nse  PN  t3y=f  sn.t
TOP  the  goods  say\REL\PST  PN  POSS_3  PN  his  sister
“A said: ‘As for the goods about which B said that they belong to C, his
sister, (…)’”
(P. Mayer A, 4,11)

The topicalizing particle ir is however not always required (type 2: PM nse PR), as illustrated by:
13. pîy wdj³ nse H³ pîy=f it
   this storehouse POSS_3 Kha his father
   “This storehouse belongs to Kha, his father”
   (O. Geneva MAH 12550, i° 7 = KRI V, 452)

As extraposed (‘anti’) topic (type 3: nse PR, PM)

14. d³= w
   nse  pr-f³  ṭ.w.s pîy rm³
   POSS_3 Pharaoh L.P.H. this man
   “They said: ‘he belongs to Pharaoh L.P.H., this man’”
   (P. Mayer A, 5,14 = KRI VI, 814,6-7)

Finally, nse is sometimes purely cataphoric (note the spelling of nse with n):

15. (n)-se PN: lmt k³.h.t l
   POSS_3 PN copper k³.h.t 1
   “what belongs to PN: one k³.h.t of copper (which makes 10 deben, etc.)”
   (P. BM 10053, r° 5,6 = KRI VI, 511,11-12)

1.1.3. Conversion of the nsw PR pattern

The nsw PR pattern can occur after the circumstantial converter (e.g. Ex. 16) as well as after the relative converter:

16. iw=i nw r 11 n br iw=w m iw m p³ ym
   iw  nse  n³ ṭ-k-r
   CIRC POSS_3 the Tjekers
   “And I saw 11 boats coming over the sea which belonged to the Tjekers”
   (Wenamun 2,62-63 = LES 73,10-11)

17. […] nty nse w3h-mw PN
   […] REL POSS_3 choachyte PN
   “[…] that belongs to the Choachyte PN”
   (P. Vienna D 12004, 10 = RdÉ 25, p. 192-sq.)

This last example suggests that the semantic equivalence established by Černý & Groll (1993: 24-27) between the nsw PR and the dative expression of possession (see below) — as found in Ex. 18 — based on the unattested relative conversion of nsw PR in their corpus is to be reconsidered:

18. gs=f nse PR₃ (…) nty n PR₆
   half=3SM POSS_3 PR₃ (…) REL for PR₆
   “Half of it belongs to PR₃ (…) That which is for PR (…)”
   (O. DeM 586, r° 1-2)

1.1.4. Expanding the paradigm in LÉg

If one sticks to Fig. 1 and to the discussion in §1.1.2, then LÉg would lack an expressive means for 1st and 2nd pronominal PM when the PR is a NP ‘I/You belong to PR’. Even if examples are admittedly rare, the corpus offers 3 occurrences of the old construction n(j)-wi NP ‘I belong to NP’ that have gone quite unnoticed in the grammatical literature:
19. \(\text{twt (}) \) \(\text{wi m-mš}.t\) yours 1 truly
\(\text{bn} \) ‘br, \(\text{n(j)-wi nšy=k shr.w wn wn dy}\)
NEG_EXIST boasting, POSS_1 your offspring REL.PST here
“I am truly yours, without boasting, I belong to your offspring who have been here”
(P. Turin 1882, r° 4,6-7 = KRI VI, 74,16)

20. \(\text{n(j)-wi mw.t (…)}\) \(\text{n(j)-wi imy-dw.t}\)
POSS_1 Mut (…) POSS Imy-Djut
“I belong to Mut (…) I belong to Imy-Djut”
(O. BM EA 50725, r° 4-5 = Demarée 2002, 118)

21. \(\text{i.ir=i} \) \(\text{dd} \)
\(\text{yA ir pA iTAy i-TAy tw, ntk sw, nse (}}\)
\(\text{tAy=k} \) \(\text{br}\)
yours 3SM POSS_3 your boat
“As for the thief who robbed you, he belongs to you, he belongs to your boat”
(Wenamun 1,x+20-21 = LES 62,16-63,2)

1.2. The PR is a Pronoun: ‘\(ink\) PM’ pattern

The construction ‘\(ink\) PM’ (‘PM belongs to me’) is in complementary distribution with the \(nsw\) PR construction discussed in §1.1 (see Fig. 1), as appears in examples such as:

22. \(\text{yi ir p}i \) \(\text{ity i-tly tw, ntk sw, nse (}}\)
\(\text{tly=k} \) \(\text{br}\)
yours 3SM POSS_3 your boat
“As for the thief who robbed you, he belongs to you, he belongs to your boat”
(Wenamun 1,x+20-21 = LES 62,16-63,2)

23. \(\text{whš pšy=i} \) \(\text{hd} \)
\(\text{yi, ir pš hd, nsw (}}\)
\(\text{imn-rš nsw.t ntr.w (…)}\)
\(\text{nsw (}}\)
\(\text{nsw-bš-nb-dd}\)
\(\text{nsw (}}\)
\(\text{hršt-hr pšy=i nb, nš kthš.w }šš.w n km.t}\)
\(\text{mntk sw}\)
\(\text{nse (}}\)
\(\text{w-r-t}\)
\(\text{nse (}}\)
\(\text{m-k-m-r}\)
\(\text{nse (}}\)
\(\text{t-k-r-bš-r, pš wr n kpn}\)
“Watch out for my money! Indeed, the money belongs to Amun-Râ-Sonthar, it belongs to Nesu-Ba-Neb-Djej, it belongs to Herihor, my lord, and the other great ones of Egypt, it belongs to you; it belongs to Weret, it belongs to Mekmer, it belongs to Tjekerbâl, the prince of Byblos.”
(Wenamun 1,14-17 = LES 62,6-11)

On this construction in M\(Eg\), see Gilula (1968, with previous literature) who showed (mainly based on examples from the \(Coffin Texts\)) that the construction is likely to have been originally very similar to the \(nsw\) PR construction discussed in §1.1 (see Fig. 1), as appears in examples such as:

- \(n(j)\), the adjectival (‘nisba’) form of the genitival relator (PR\(ED\), lit. ‘that of’)
- \(ink\) the Independent Pron. (governed by \(n(j)\))
- PM is a lexical NP or a Dependent pronoun (SUBJECT)

Because of phonetic reasons (\(n\)-\(ink > ink\)), by diachronic replacement (\(n\)-\(ink \rightarrow ink\)), or because of the existence of two competing paradigms (\(n\)-\(ink = ink\)), the ‘tonic’ Independent Pronoun also assumed the role of sole predicate. In this respect, note the following LEg sentence, where the presence of \(n\) in front
of mntk could be understood as pointing to two different uses of the independent pronoun (cf. Vernus’ ‘linguistic dissimilation’):

24. kfr, iw=i wn

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{tr.} & \text{mntk ( } \overline{\text{mntk}} \text{ ) } p\text{iy}=i \ \text{dy}^o \\
\text{latch you my destiny}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{n-mntk ( } \overline{\text{mntk}} \text{ ) } dy^o \text{ ink }^o \\
\text{yours soul mine}
\end{array}
\]

“Bolt, I am going to open; latch, you are my destiny, the soul which is mine belongs to you [usually understood: ‘you are the soul of mine’]”

(P. Chester Beatty I, r\textsuperscript{o} 17,8-9 = Mathieu 1996: pl. 7)

1.2.1. What kind of Pronoun is used for expressing the PR?

In the LEg corpus, it is not the usual, homogenous, series of Independent Pronouns that is used in this pattern. It is rather a mixed paradigm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>ink</td>
<td>ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SM(2SF)</td>
<td>ntk/(ntt)</td>
<td>twt(/?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SM(3SF)</td>
<td>ntf/(nts)</td>
<td>swt(/?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>inn</td>
<td>inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>ntn</td>
<td>n=tn-imy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>ntw</td>
<td>sn-imy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. The possessive independent pronoun (a)

As it appears, in this paradigm (also used for adnominal possessive constructions), only the first person pronouns are similar to the Ind. Pronoun series. The other persons borrow either from an older paradigm of Indep. Pron. (for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} pers. sing. < OEg) or from another possessive construction (pl < dative preposition n followed by the suffix pronoun of the PR and by the nisba imy from the preposition m ‘in’; a possessive construction inherited from MEg). The reasons that led to this heterogeneous paradigm escape us almost entirely (dialectal and diaphasic parameters must have played a role here), but the use of these pronouns is very consistent throughout the Ramesside corpus. Examples of this paradigm for each person are as follows:

\textbf{1S = ink}

25. hr ir p\text{iy} ky, ink se

and TOP this other mine it

“And as for this other one, he belongs to me”

(O. Turin 57472, v\textsuperscript{o} 6-7 = Lopéz 1984, pl. 160)

26. iw ink sw, iw p\text{iy}=i sn \text{sr}i

CIRC mine he CIRC my brother little

“For he is mine (= related to me, of my family), that’s my little brother”

(P. Ashmolean Museum 1945.96, r\textsuperscript{o} 21 = KRI VI, 737,3)
27. wn md.t iw ink se m-dwn r-dd (…) 
EXIST word CIRC mine it continually namely (…) 
“There is an utterance which is continually mine, namely (‘DS’)” 
(P. Turin 1882, r° 2,3-4 = KRI VI, 71,14-15)

28. iw ink sw irm PN 
CIRC mine it with PN 
“It belongs to me and PN” (O. Lady Franklyn ro 11-12 = KRI VII, 342,6-7) 
Similarly, see also O. DeM 767, r° 3.

2SM = twt

29. ntk i.ir m zp tpy 
twt h3rw kš 
yours Syria Kush 
“It is you who acted during the zep-tpy, Syria and Kush belong to you” 
(Gr. DeB 2, 4-5 = KRI VI, 235,7-8)

30. yỉ ir nţi nty hr h/s.t, 
twt (₪$₲) sn, hr twt (₪$₲) nţi nty hr km.t 
yours they and yours the REL on Egypt 
“Indeed, the ones who are (living) in the desert are yours and yours are the ones (living) in Egypt (it is you who leads the policemen)” 
(P. Anastasi V, 26,7-27,1 = LEM 71,10-12)

3SM = swt

31. iw bn swt (₪$₲) se 
CIRC NEG his they 
“Although they were not his (i.e. the tombs where Paneb went)” 
(P. Salt 124, r° 1,17 = KRI IV, 410,4)

32. ir pỉ iry=f, iry nim rḥ mdw im=f 
swt (₪$₲) ḫḥ.wt=f 
his goods=3SM 
“What he did, who could discuss it: his goods belong to him (may he give them as he wishes)” 
(P. Turin 2021 + P. Geneva D. 409, r° 3,10-11 = KRI VI, 741,8-9)

1PL = inn

33. inn pỉy wt, nse nli=y=n rmṯ,f3:w 
OURS this coffin POSS,3 our ancestors 
“This coffin is ours, it belongs to our ancestors” 
(P. BM EA 10052, v° 10,6 = KRI VI)

34. inn tły=s psš n pỉ z 2 
ours its share for the man 2 
“Its sharing (i.e. of a place) belongs to both of us” (P. Louvre E 2432, r° 4)

---

5 Note the predicative use of n=f-imy in Urk. IV, 1278,19: n=f-imy pḥr.t sn-wr “what the ocean surrounds belongs to him”.

6 The […] n=n-imy r[…] is probably adnominal (“[…] our own […]”) in Astarte (P. BN 202 + P. Amherst 9, r° 1,x+12). It is translated by Collombert & Coulon (2000: 227) “notre propre”.
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2PL = n=tn-imy

35. hr m-dy ṭiṭy ṇt ṇṭi ly 5 b3k.wt i.di=i, ṇ=tṇ-imy sṭ ṛ-dṛ.w 
yoụṛs 3PL alḷ 
 ṛ-Ṣ-[ṃ hṛty.w ṇfṛy.t ṇ3 ṛmṭ-is.t ṛ-dṛ=ẉ 
And regarding the matter of these five maidservants whom I gave, they 
belong to you all [not they all belong to you], from the captains down to all 
the crewmen” (P. BM EA 10100, r° 10-12 = LRL 50.13-14)

3PL (no predicative example, one adnominal example of n=sn-imy)

After the end of the Ramesside period, one observes an alignment of this Possessive Paradigm with 
the Indep. Pron. series, as summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>ink</td>
<td>ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SM/(2SF)</td>
<td>ntk([ntt])</td>
<td>twt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SM/(3SF)</td>
<td>ntf([nts])</td>
<td>swt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>inn</td>
<td>inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>ntt n=tn-imy</td>
<td>ntt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>ntw sn-imy</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. The possessive independent pronoun (b)

2SM: twt → ntk

36. bn ntk w^ (m/n) ṇ'y=f wpwty.w, iw iw=k dd (…) 
NEG yours one among his messengers CIRC FUT=2SM say\INF 
“You do not have (under your authority) a single of his messengers to whom you could say (…)” 
(Wenamun 2,54 = LES 72,9-10)

37. iw ntk se, iw=w n^ n=k CIRC yours they CIRC=3PL NOTE\STAT for=you 
“since they are yours and are noted down for you” 
(P. Vienna D 12002, r° 1,9-10)

38. iw ntk w^ CIRC yours one 
“(that consists of 4 parts), one of which is yours” 
(P. Louvre E 3228 G, r° 4; similarly, see e.g. P. Louvre E 2432, r° 4-5)

---

7 Another example of n=tn-imy is found in the Will of Naunakhte, r° 2.2 (= P. Ashmolean Museum 1945.97) and quoted by Černý & Groll (1975: 18), but is adnominal: ‘these eight servants of yours’.

8 In the Late Egyptian corpus, I know of a single example of (n=)sn-imy in adnominal position, KRI VI, 571.7-8: [DATE] wsf n ṭis.t (n) p̣3 hr iw=sn hkr.w gb.w m htr.w=sn-imy “[DATE] no work by the gang of the Tomb: they were hungry and lacking their due wages”.

9 Černý & Groll (1975: 13): “Note that from the 21\th dynasty onwards ntk and ntf replace twt and swt in the predicative possession usage.” They suggest that ink and inn, since they belong to both paradigms might have helped to merge the pronouns in a single category of independent pronouns. This idea is clearly expressed again in Černý & Groll (1975: 26-27).
3SM\textsuperscript{10}: swt → ntf

39. iw n[t]/f p\textsuperscript{3}y 17 dîi.w n-w\textsuperscript{2}c.t
CIRC his this 17 loinclothes remaining
“since these 17 remaining pieces of loincloth are his”
(P. Berlin P. 8525, r\textsuperscript{°} 4-5 = Fischer-Elfert 132)

40. ntf p\textsuperscript{3} ym ḫr ntf p\textsuperscript{3} l-b-l-n
his the sea and his the Lebanon
nty tw=k ād ink sw
“The sea belongs to him and his is the Lebanon which you say ‘it is mine’.”
(Wenamun 2,24 = LES 69,7-8)

2\text{PL} (1 example): n=t-n-imy → ntn

41. bn ntn p\textsuperscript{1} pr iwn\textsuperscript{3}
NEG yours the house NEG_REINF
“The estate actually does not belong to you”
(Hennuttauy’s Oracular Decree, l. 24-25 = Winand 2003: Fig. 2)

3\text{PL} (no example)

1.2.2. The predicative possessive construction with focus on the PR

The pronominal PR can be focalized using the n-h\textsuperscript{5}(w) + suffix pronoun (lit. ‘of my flesh, body’, see Depuydt 2010) after the subject expression:

42. ink se n-h\textsuperscript{5}=i, bn nse p\textsuperscript{1} hm-ntr tpy
mine it myself NEG POSS_3 the prophet first
“(As for this ox that I gave to NP,) he was my own, he did not belong to the first prophet”
(O. Gardiner 143, r\textsuperscript{o} 5-8 = KRI VII, 376,10-11)

43. ink se n-h\textsuperscript{5}(=i), iw bn b\textsuperscript{3}h[t] w[?] imw w […]
mine they (my)self CIRC NEG thing single in=them […]
“They are mine, there is none among them [that is not mine]”
(O. Cairo CG 25800, r\textsuperscript{3} I,2 = KRI VI, 257,8)

44. n-se p[r-c\textsuperscript{a}]
Poss_3 Pharaoh L.P.H. INT his φ himself
“(as for the spikes that you said PN has stolen,) they belong to Pharaoh L.P.H. or do they belong to the guy himself?”
(O. Nash 2, v\textsuperscript{o} 1-3 = KRI IV, 319,1-3)

1.2.3. The expression of the PM

As largely exemplified in the above quoted examples, the PM can be a lexical NP or a pronoun belonging to the Dependent Pronoun series. It should be noted, as exemplified by Ex. 44 just above, the pronominal subject can be omitted under relevance.

The lexical PM can of course be topicalized (Ex. 45) or occur as a specification afterwards (Ex. 46) depending on the context.

\textsuperscript{10} A possible but very dubious (because of the lacuna) candidate is found in an unidentified Ramesside literary text: O. Leipzig 23, v\textsuperscript{o} 3 (″ HO 37″) * snD […] ntf dr.t″.
45. *ir pꜣ mꜣwd nty m tꜣ kꜣri, (in-)iw ink sw*
   TOP the carrying pole REL in the chapel INT mine it
   “The carrying pole that is in the chapel, does it belong to me?”
   (O. IFAO 869 = BIFAO 72 [1972], p. 60)

46. *ink sw, m hꜣ, sw(t) (⏰ heb) pꜣ hbn*
   mine it namely wood his the ebony
   “(…) that belongs to me as far as wood is concerned, but the ebony belongs to him”
   (O. Berlin 12343, v 4 = KRIVI, 165,4-5)

Furthermore, a slight, but indicative tendency should be underlined here: one observes a certain preference for the pronominal expression of the PM with an extraposed lexical NP, from the 20th dynasty onwards (see Winand in press):

47. *ink se ndm*
   mine it sweetness
   “Anok-se-nedjem (proper name, lit. ‘it is mine the sweetness’)”
   (P. Turin 2021, 2,2 = KRIVI, 739,7)

48. *ntk sw nꜣy=k ḫꜣw ḫnk=n n-tꜣ pꜣ hrw*
   yours it your fields offer\REL\PST\PST\PL since the day
   “Your field, (the one) that we offered, belong to you from this day onwards”
   (P. Turin 2121, r⁵ 8)

As illustrated inter alia by the last example, it should be noted that in judicial contexts the predicative possession is generally somehow presupposed by the possessive article preceding the PM. The double encoding in religious and judicial contexts seems to refer to full and complete possession of something (ownership and usufruct in the case of goods).

1.2.4. Replacement of the adnominal use of the independent pronoun

In the texts of the TIP, the construction INDEF/QUANT noun + Ind. Poss. Pron. (e.g. *wꜣ ṣmꜣsw ink ‘a servant of mine’) is frequently replaced by a relative clause (or its functional equivalent, i.e. the circumstantial clause when the antecedent is undefined) with a predicative possession pattern of the type *ink se: *wꜣ ṣmꜣsw lw ink se ‘a servant that is mine’:

49. *imy ḫn ṣmꜣsw iw ntk sw m-sꜣ=f*
   CAUS\IMP servant CIRC yours he after=him
   “Make a servant that belongs to you (i.e. a servant of yours) go after him”
   (P. Strassburg r⁹ 39,8-9 = HOP pl. 105)
   See also P. Strassburg 39,12 PN pyl ḫnms nty ntk sw ‘this friends of yours’.

50. *PN pyl ḫnms nty ntk se*
   PN this friend REL yours he
   “PN, this friend of yours”
   (P. Strassburg 39,v 2-3 = HOP pl. 105)

51. *iw PN, wꜣ wdpw iw mntf sw, ir iwd=i r-qq*
   SEQ,PST PN a butler CIRC his he do\INF between=me saying
   “And P, a butler who belongs to him, stepped in front of me saying (…)”
   (Wenamun 2.45-46 = LES 71,12)

52. *ir-iw ḫꜣ(=i)  s.t-hm.t PN tꜣy=i sn.t nty ink se*
   if throw\SBJV\PST woman PN my sister REL mine she
   “If I want to repudiate the woman PN (whose mother is PN), this sister of mine (i.e. to whom I am married), (…)”
   (P. Louvre E 7846, r⁴ 4)
1.3. The negation of the adjectival possessive pattern

Both the nsw PR pattern (‘it belongs to PR’) and the ink PM pattern (‘PM belongs to me’) are negated with the negative particle bn (EEg nn) which is the expected negation for adjectival predicate constructions.

53. iw bn nsw nfr
   CIRC NEG POSS_3 god
   “since it does not belong to a god”  (St. Amarna M)

54. mn hr nb hr-tp itrw iw bn nsw imn
   NEG_EXIST boat any on Nile CIRC NEG POSS_3 Amun
   “there is not a single boat on the Nile that does not belong to Amun”  (Wenamun, 2.23-24 = LES 69.6-7)

55. mtw=tw gm r-dd bn ink n1’h
   if=one find\INF that NEG mine the spikes
   “And if one sees that the spikes are not mine, (…)”  (O. Nash 2, v° 14 = KRI IV, 319.13-14)

One can notice that, especially in the literary registers, the circumstantial converter is frequently left out when introducing a negative adpositional clause:

56. imw nn ink sw
   boat NEG mine it
   “(I joined the crew of) a boat which is not mine (since mine had been stolen)”  (Tale of Woe col. 2.12)

57. wrš(=i) m niw.t bn ink se
   spend\_day\PST=1SG in town NEG mine it
   “I spent the day in a town that was not mine”  (Tale of Woe col. 3.7)

1.4. The semantics of the adjectival possessive pattern

The prototypical meaning of ownership, i.e. when an animate possessor has some property (PM), represents the vast majority of the occurrences:

58. bn ink se
   NEG mine it
   bn iw=i rl di.t=s n=k
   “(‘Please give me this ox that I may eat it’, then the shepherd said to him:)
   ‘It does not belong to me: I may not give it to you”  (Truth & Falsehood, r° 8.2-3 = LES 34.9-10)

59. imy tw n=n p3‘ tɔw, twt (3\okra) sw
   give\IMP please DAT=1PL the breath yours it
   “Please give us the breath, it is yours”  (Lybian War, I.f = KRI V, 48.10)

In the following example (on this text, see Kruchten 2000), it appears quite obvious that there is a well-established legal distinction between property and ususfruct (temporary possession). The 1st pers. was given a place (wqrs, a storehouse) that he uses, but is not his property:
St. Polis, Predicative Possession in Late Egyptian

60. \(iw=f\) \(\{h\}r\ di.t n=i\ tly\ s.t\)
\(iw\ \bn\ \inh\ \se\ \iw\bn\\nse\ \imm-ltp\ \w.s\ p\i\ nb\ \(n)\ \p\i\ \dni\)
CIRC NEG mine it at_all POSS_3 Amenhotep L.P.H.
“He will give me this place, but it won’t be mine at all, it will belong to Amenhotep, the lord of the city (May my elder build it in the name of Amenhotep)”
(O. Ashmolean Museum 103 A, 9-10 = KRI V, 572,1-2)

In order to explore further the semantics of this construction, we can distinguish four main subdomains\(^{11}\) depending on the nature, respectively, of the PR and PM:

When the PR is a [+human] and the PM a [-human], we are in the prototypical situation described above of ownership:

61. \(iw=i\ \nw\ r\ il\ n\ br,\ \iw=w\ m\ \iw\ m\ \p\i\ \ym\)
\(\nw\ \nse\ \n\3\ \thr.w\)
CIRC POSS_3 the Tjekers
“And I noticed 11 boats that were coming over the sea, belonging to the Tjekers”
(Wenamun 2,62-63 = LES 73,10-11)

When both the PR and the PM are [+human], the construction may refer to three types of relationships:

- Staff – owner

62. \(tty\ \w’\ rm\ ith\ \nw\ nsw\ \PN\)
\(\TT\ a\ \m\ \CIRC\ POSS_3\ \PN\)
“Tety, a man who belongs to PN’”
(P. Mayer A, 1,12-13 = KRI VI 804,15-16)

- Family member – patriarch (brother, sisters, wife and children, cf. e.g. Ex. 26)

- Individual – group

63. \(bwpw=f\ \ph\ \p\i\ \mr\ n\ \p\i\ \ns\w\)
\(\ns\w\ \p\i\ \17\ \n\ \it\sw\)
POSS_3 the 17 of thieves
“He did not penetrate the pyramid of the king, but he was one of (lit. belonged to) the 17 thieves (who were convicted of having robbed in the tombs of Western Thebes).”
(P. Léopold II-Amherst, 4,8 = KRI VI, 488,15-489,1)

When the PR is [-human] while the PM is [+human], it usually refers to a geographical origin:

64. \(hn\ \it\3\ \nw\ \nse\ (\cdot\ \w’\)\ \p\i\y\i\ \t\3\)
\(\IRR\ \\thief\ \CIRC\ POSS_3\ \my\ \land\)
\(\p\i\ \h\y\ r\ \ivy\=k\ \br\ \(\ldots\)\)
“If it was a thief belonging to my land who went down to your boat, (…)”
(Wenamun 1,x+18-19 = LES 62,13-14)

See also P. Turin 1892 \(\nu’\) col. I,1-2 (= KRI 390,6)

When both the PR and the PM are inanimates, the construction may refer to two main types of semantic relationships (see also Ex. 3, Similarly, see P. BM EA 10403, \(\nu’\) 3,18-19 = KRI VI, 832, 9-10):

\(^{11}\) Černý & Groll (1975: 24-27).
• parts – whole (objects)

65. \( sh3 \ t3 \ st.t \ n \ s3 \ (\ldots) \)

\( nsw \ p1 \ t3 \ [n] \ hd \ [n] \ nswt \ R2 \ p1 \ ntr \ ^{c}3 \)

POSS_3 the floor of silver of king R. 2 the god great

“Memorandum regarding the three boards of pine (that the scribe PN gave to the scribe NP) they were part of the silver floor of the king R. 2, the great god”

(P. BM EA 10053, v° 4.7 = KRI VI, 762.1-2)

• object – material

66. \( iw \ nse \ inr \ w^c \ m \ m3t \ rwd, \)

ASS POSS_3 stone one consisting in granite sturdy

\( nn \ sh.t \ nn \ dnw \)

“(the two great obelisks ...) they are made of a single stone of sturdy granite, without jointing or joint”

(Nothern obelisk of Hatshepsut, Karnak = Urk. IV, 366.17-367-2)

See also P. Anastasi III, 5,1 = LEM 25.10.

67. \( iw=i \ hr \ rdi.t \ kd \ [\ldots] \ w^c.t-n \ snw.t \ s3r \ p3 \ snw.t \ n \ mn-nfr \)

\( iw \ nse \ st.t \ 10+x \ [\ldots] \)

CIRC POSS_3 arourae 10+x [\ldots]

“And I made [them] build [for me] a big granary for the \( sn^3\) of Memphis which occupies 10+x arourae”

(O. Gardiner 86, v° 8-9 = KRI III, 140,5-7)

Finally, the ‘belonging to’ construction can be used with PM or PR, which leads to specific semantic relationships, like ‘to depend upon’ (Ex. 68) or ‘to be a matter for’ (Ex. 69):

68. \( ir \ p1 \ bt\t, \ nse \ p1 \ ntr \)

TOP the fault POSS_3 the divinity

\( sw \ htm \ m \ dbr=f \)

“The fault depends upon the divinity, it is sealed by his finger”

(Amenemope 19,20-21)

69. \( ir \ nbw, \ h^5w \ ntr.w, \ bn \ n-se \ hr.t=tn \)

TOP gold flesh gods NEG POSS_3 affair=2PL

“As for the gold, the flesh of the gods, it is not your business (lit. it does not belong to your affair)”

(Kanais Stela = KRI I, 68.1-2)

In this respect, the following example is especially interesting from a typological point of view, because it has a clear deontic modal meaning:

70. \( iw \ bn \ nse \ gr \ hr=w \ iwn\t \)

CIRC NEG POSS_3 be_silent\INF concerning=3PL at_all

“(some very serious matters) that can absolutely not be passed under silence (lit. that do not belong at all to being silent about them)”

(P. Abbott, 6.12 = KRI VI, 478.8)

See already the translation in Erman (1933^2: 106 §233) “mit denen man nicht schweigen kann” and Černý & Groll (1975: 26; 102) “Because they do not belong to (the category) that can be passed over in silence. (Lit. ‘They do not belong to being silent under them.’)”. 
1.5. Another type of predicative pattern for ownership?

In the LEg corpus, one does apparently not find any example of the Coptic preferred pattern for expressing ownership, namely the nominal sentence pattern with a possessor phrase as rheme ‘it is his, it belongs to him’ (see Grossman 2009: 157-165). One should however note a rare instance of a similar construction (with undefined PR as rheme) in the famous P. Salt 124:

71. iw bn s.t swt iwn3
CIRC NEG place his at_all
“even though the place does absolutely not belong to him (lit. ‘it is absolutely not a place of his’)” (P. Salt 124, r° 1,4 = KRI IV, 408,15)

2. The Comitative Strategy

In LEg, the unmarked possession is expressed by constructions involving the comitative preposition m-di (most probably a lexical doublet of EEg m-a, see Zeidler 1992: 208 and Loprieno 1995: 268 n. 89)13. On the polysemy of this preposition in LEg, see the discussion in Grossman & Polis (2012, with previous literature and the semantic map in Fig. 14).

As stressed by Černý & Groll (1975: 395), “[a]s far as the semantic connotation is concerned, wn m-di f ø-A is the nearest equivalent to the English ‘have got’ notion. The wn m-di + pronominal suffix + ø-A construction expresses the ownership of ø-A by the person referred to by the pronominal suffix.” Théodoridès (1970: 140) underlines the aspect of “possession matérielle, qui ne peut être que temporaire.”

It should be stressed that possession and ownership are of course logically compatible, but do not imply each other: possession does not imply ownership (it can, for instance be the result of theft, robbery, seizure, etc., cf. Ex. 72-74) and ownership does not imply possession (cf. e.g. Ex. 75-76 and Ex. 60 for the opposition between property and usufruct).

72. iw=i knkn=k, mtw=i nhm ni iwtn n p3y=k it
mtw=w hpr m-di=i
SEQ.MOD=3PL become\INF with=1SG
“I am going to beat you, and I will seize the cattle of your father, and it will be mine (lit. in my possession)” (Horus & Seth, 7,7)

73. sdm=i r-dd w° ksks=t iw=s mh,ti m nbw m-di PN
hear\PST=1SG that one basket CIRC=3SF fill\RES INST gold with PN
iw nsw p3 hr
CIRC POSS_3 the tomb
“I heard that a basket full of gold is in possession of A, while it belongs to the Tomb”
(P. BM EA 10052, r° 3,20-21 = KRI VI, 774,13-14)
See also P. BM EA 10052, r° 4,4-5 = KRI VI, 776,2-3

12 The emendation suggested by Erman (1933: 106 §233) iw bn nsw iwn3 “obgleich sie ihm doch nicht gehörten” is not necessary and would be weird anyway given the semantics of the nsw constructions in LEg (cf. §1.1).

13 On the diachronic relation of this preposition with the compound preposition m-ø in EEg, see already Edel (1967: 74-75) and the functionally-oriented discussion in Théodoridès (1970: 139-140).
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74. [...] pAy=tn  bd iw=f  w/th  m-di=î
[...] your  money  FUT=3SM  stay\NF  with=me
[sî]r-i.r=tn  gm  pî [...]“[…] your money will remain in my possession until you find the […]”
(Wenamun 1,31 = LES 64,5-6)

75. ptr  nîy=î  îh.w  m-di=k  r-dr=w  zp-2
look my oxen with=2SM all INTENS
imy  wî  im=w  n  pîy=f  nb
give\MP  one  in=3PL  DAT  his  lord
“Look, absolutely all my oxen are in your possession, (just) give one of them to its owner”
(Thrust and Falsehood, 8,3-4 = LES 34,11-12)

76. iTî  PN  tîy=i  tît  hmî  pîy=s  sk
st  nwt  m-di=f
they  die\RES  with=3SM
“PN took my donkey and its foal, they passed away in his possession”
(O. Gardiner 53 = HO 49,1)

In order to close this first overview of the semantics of the comitative strategy for expressing possession in LEg, one can notice that both the comitative strategy (with m-di/m-î) and the “adjectival” pattern (§1) are found in parallel in ideological texts, describing the mighty gods and kings:

77. tîw  m-î=îk,  twt  pî:  'nh
breath  with=2SM  yours  the  life
“Breath is in your possession, and yours is life”
(Syrian War, II,d = KRI V, 86,10-11)

2.1. A definiteness split: The comitative preposition in adverbial and existential patterns

The focus will be here on constructions where the comitative preposition is either directly predicative or extends an existential predication. As such, even if related to the topic dealt with here, examples such as the following will not be considered:

78. ir  ink  wn=i  m  hm.t  m-di  wî  mniw
TOP  me  PST=1SG  as  wife  with  one  shepherd
“As for me, I was the wife of a shepherd”
(Horus & Seth, 6,8 = LES 44,16-45,1)

For the comitative strategy, there is a split between two main types of constructions depending on the definiteness of the PM:

- When the PM is definite → Adverbial predicative pattern (§2.2)
- When the PM is not definite → Extended existential pattern (§2.3)

2.2. Definite PM: The adverbial predication pattern

The adverbial predication is an adverbial rheme construction that follows the patterns Subject – Predicate, namely PM m-di PR, ‘PR has PM’. As shown by the following example, the possession is contingent (true vs false, temporary).
79. se m-di=n n-m§.t
   3PL with=us truly
   “(Our father is right:) They are indeed in our possession”
   (P. Turin 2021 et al., 3,8 = KRI VI, 740)

80. sw m-di=s m p$i hrw
   3SM with=3SF in the day
   “He is (still) with her today (i.e. still married)”
   (P. Ashmolean Museum 1945.96, r° 22 = KRI VI, $$$)

81. se m-di=tAy=f S.t(.t)
   3PL with his daughter
   “They are in the possession of his daughter”
   (O. Gardiner 4 = HO 27,3)

Some clothes have been robbed, the oracle is asked to sort this matter out, when facing the house of the scribe Amenna khe, the statue of the god says this.

This construction can be found in interrogative sentences:

82. $h r m-dy p$i h3b i.i=r=k n=i t$i md.t n p$i ny
   (i)n se m-di=k (…) se m-di=i
   INT 3SM COM=2SM
   “As for the letter you sent me about the matter of the crown, do you have it?
   (…) ‘I have it’.”
   (P. Geneva D 407, v° 4-5 = LRL 15,5-7)

As well as all the converters: past converter (Ex. 83-84), relative converter (Ex. 85-86), past relative converter (Ex. 87-90), circumstantial, nominal wnn (Ex. 91):

83. p$i shr n p$i y in n hm.t
   i.d$i PN wn=f m-di=k
   say\REL.PST PN PST=3SM with=2SM
   “The matter of the ?in? of copper, which PN said that you had”
   (P. BM EA 10403, v° 3,11-12 = KRI VI, 832,2-3)

84. wn p$i $h n n PN m-di=i
   PST the chapel of PN with=1SG
   “I had the chapel of PN (while he, he had his tomb shaft)”
   (P. Berlin 10496, v° 9 = KRI V, 478)

85. nty m-di PN
   REL with PN
   “(You will claim the three pieces of cloth) that are in the possession of PN”
   (P. Leiden I,370, v° 3 = LRL 10-11)

86. s$h r t$i ih.t km(.t) nty m-di=f
   memorandum about the cow black REL with=3SM
   “Memorandum about the black cow which is in his possession”
   (P. Turin 1887, r° 1,2 = RAD 74; similarly, see P. Sallier I, 4,4 = LEM 80)

87. gmy.t m-di=f $h n 85, wn m-di PN 3, dmD 88
   found with=3SM picks 85 REL.PST with PN 3 total 88
   “(what was) found in his possession: 85 picks, what was in possession of PN:
   3, total 88”
   (O. Cairo CG 25803, ro 3-4 = KRI III, 510,10-11)
See also P. BM EA 10906, r° 5.
88. iw=n wdlb p3 wn m-di=n
SEQ.PST=1SG melt the REL.PST with=1PL
“And we melted down what we had”
(P. BM 10053, v° 3,22 = KRI VI, 761,8-9)

89. iw=i h3b n p3 rmT wn p=i i sd 2 m-di=f
SEQ.PST=1SG write\INF to the man REL.PST my loincloth 2 with.
“And I wrote to the man who had my 2 pieces of loincloth”
(O. Cairo CG 25725 et al., 6-7 = KRI IV, 417,13)

90. hr ir p3 rmT wn=f m-di=f m hry-c
and TOP the man REL.PST with=3SM as assistant
“And as for the man whose assistant he was, (…)”
(P. Anastasi 6, r° 28-29 = LEM 74,12-13)

91. ir m-dr wmn=i m-di=t m h3y
TOP since be\NMLZ=1SG with=2SF as husband
r=3f" p3 hrw, ir=i iw r=t
“Since you have me as husband until this day, what did I do against you?”
(P. Leiden I 371, r° 3-4)

The negation of this pattern is the one expected for the adverbial predicative pattern: NEG + Subject + Predicate → bn PM m-di PR:

92. mtw=n mdw (...) hr n3 it (...) y3 bn se m-di=f m w° ip.t
indeed NEG 3PL with=3SM as one oipe
“And we shall talk about the cereals, indeed, he does not have even one oipe”
(LRL, 15,5-7)

93. bn se m-di=i.
NEG 3SM with=1SG
i-ir.tw gm=s m p3y=f pr
“I do not have it’, but one found it in his house”
(P. Salt 124, v° 11 = KRI IV 413,15-16)

2.3. Non-definite PM: Extended existential pattern

When the PM is a bare (non-definite), it is not the adverbial predicative pattern which is used but an existential pattern extended by the preposition m-di,\(^{14}\) that one could translate literally ‘there is a PM with PR’ (see Gunn 1924; Satzinger 1984; Shisha-Halevy 2007).

The situation is however a bit more complicated than with the definite PM, since three different constructions are actually attested in the corpus (see Shisha-Halevy 1981; Grossman 2009):

- wn θ-PM m-di PR ‘there is a PM with PR’
- wn θ-PM im m-di PR ‘there is a PM there with PR’
- wn m-di PR θ-PM ‘there is with PR a PM’

\(^{14}\) The most detailed discussion to date for LEg is found in Černý & Groll (1993: 392-397).
2.3.1. When the PR is a Lexical NP → wn ø-PM m-di PR

94. p$i=i nb $fr, wn $nh m-di PN m n3y=w $nh,w
   my lord good exist goat with PN in their goats
   “My good lord, is PN in possession of one of their goats?”
   (O. DeM 574, r° 1-3 = Sauneron 1959: pl. 12)

95. m-ir $d
   wn pr m-di it mw.t=i
   “Do not say: ‘my father and mother have a house’” (Ani = P. Boulaq 4, 19,7)

2.3.2. A different semantics ‘at somebody’s disposal’ → wn ø-PM im m-di PR (spatial prox. deixis)

Černý & Groll (1993: 396) noticed that “when ø-A immediately follows wn, the adverb im is almost obligatory”, but only cited examples occurring with im, which made the understanding of the distribution of the whole system of non-definite PM much more complicated.

96. wn dht im m-di=tn r di.t $r n3 $hnty
   EXIST tin there with=2PL to give\INF on the copper
   “There is tin there at your disposal to add to the copper”
   (P. BM EA 10100, v° 5-6 = LRL 51,8)

97. mtw=tn ptr in wn ss.w is.w
   SEQ.MOD=2PL see\INF if EXIST writings old
   n p$i $hr im m-di=tn
   of the Tomb there with=2PL
   m n3 $hr.w n p$i $hr nty twtw $hr in.t=w m $hd (...)
   “And you will see whether you have at your disposal old writings of the Tomb concerning the wages of the Tomb that one brings sailing North (...)”
   (P. Turin 1978/208, r° 2-3 [Unpublished])

98. wn $hmt im m-di=k
   EXIST copper there with=you
   “(And you shall order the coppersmith to make spears, …:) there is copper at your disposal”
   (P. BM EA 10326, v° 10 = LRL 19,15)

2.3.3. When the PR is a Lexical NP → wn m-di PR ø-PM

This construction has attracted a lot of attention because of its verboid fate in Coptic (see recently Reintges & Lipták 2006). In LEg, this is by far the most common construction when the PM is indefinite:

99. wn m-di=n md.t n pr-$t
   exist with=1PL matter for Pharaoh
   “We have a matter for Pharaoh”
   (P. Turin 1880, r° 1,5)

   1. wn m-di=n w$bt $t3.t r $d=s
      exist with=1PL complaint big to say\INF=it
      “We have an important complaint to say”
      (P. Turin 1880, r° 2,16)
2. inn wn m-di=i šḥ.wt m šḥ.t
   if EXISTS with=1SG fields in countryside
inn wn m-di=i šḥ.t nb n pš tš
   if EXISTS with=1SG thing any of the earth
inn wn m-di=i šwty.w
   if EXISTS with=1SG trade-products
lw=w pš n pšy=l 4 hrđ.w
   “If I happen to have fields in the country side, if I happen to have any
property in the world, if I happen to have any trade-products, they will be
shared between my four children”
   (P. Ashmolean Museum 1945.96, v° 7-9 = KRI VI, 738,3)

3. ḫr wn m-di<→t> sn.w
   “You have brothers and sisters”
   (O. Prague 1826, r° 6-7 = HO 70,2)

4. is-bn wn m-di=k šš.w knw
   ḫr wn m-di=k šms.w knw zp-sn
   “Don’t you have many scribes and don’t you have very many servants?”
   (P. Anastasi V, 11,4-5 = LEM 61,12-13)

5. in-iw wn m-di=k mtry.w r-r=f, in m-bšt
   INT EXISTS with=2SM witnesses to=3SM in no
wn m-di=i mtry.w
   EXISTS with=1SG witnesses
   “Do you have witnesses against him or not? (What PN declared:) ‘I have
some witnesses’”
   (O. Nash 2, 6-7 = KRI IV, 318,4-6)

6. in wn m-di=s pš im=w
   “(As for the oxen that the woman asks for), does she have a share in them?”
   (O. IFAO 884 = BIFAO 72 [1972], p. 56, n° 54,3)

7. wn m-di=k 19 rmṯ
   exist with=2sm 19 men
   “You have 19 men (in the Dendera commission)”
   (T. Leiden I, 431; see already P. Bologna 1094, 10,9 = LEM 10,1-2)

Note that in LEg, only non-definite PM are attested with this construction\(^{15}\) and only three affirmative
examples, all from the post-Ramesside period, have wn-di=f (twice Wenamun and once Ani,
P. Bologna)\(^{16}\), e.g.:

8. hn wn-di=w ʾnḥ snb
   IF IRR EXISTS.COM=3PL life health
wn bn lw=w dl.t in.tw nš ʾḥ.t
   “If they had had life and health, they would not have sent such goods”
   (Wenamun, 2,29 = LES 69,15-16)

\(^{15}\) As Černý & Groll (1975: 393) note, it is not easy “to determine the grammatical relationship between the
groups wn m-di if and φ-A. Originally φ-A was the subject of wn, but since wn and m-di if have become an
inseparable unit, φ-A can not immediately follow wn. (…) However, since φ-A in Coptic is felt to be a direct
object, one can assume that the transition from subject to direct object started much earlier. The ‘bareness’ of A
is a necessary element.”

\(^{16}\) Erman (‘1933: 397 §784) already noted that the encounter of the final n of wn and the initial nasal of m-di
(Coptic ṳτφ-) led to spellings of the verboid-like possessive expression without m for the comitative preposition
m-di.
2.4. Negation of the extended existential pattern (with non-definite PM)

The negation of the comitative strategy with non-definite PM is perhaps even more complicated since six different patterns are to be distinguished (graphically at least):

- \( \text{nn n PR PM} \rightarrow \text{TYPE 1} \)
- \( \text{bn n PR PM} \rightarrow \text{TYPE 1} \)
- \( \text{nn wn m-di PR PM} \rightarrow \text{TYPE 2} \)
- \( \text{mn m-di PR PM} \rightarrow \text{TYPE 2} \)
- \( \text{nn wn PR m-di PM} \rightarrow \text{TYPE 3} \)
- \( \text{mn PR m-di PM} \rightarrow \text{TYPE 3} \)

These six patterns can be grouped into three main types given the functional equivalence (see Vernus 1985) between:

- \( \text{nn} \approx \text{bn} \)
- \( \text{nn wn} \approx \text{mn} \)

The variation in the spelling is mostly an index of ‘graphemic language ideology’ relating to the genre of the texts. Besides the non-definite PM, these constructions apparently all share the feature of having a pronominal PR. As a consequence, the PR in this construction refers anaphorically or cataphorically to a lexical NP given in the co(n)text.

It was already noted by Erman (1933: 397 §784-785) that, while after \( \text{nn wn} \) and \( \text{mn} \), one finds \( \text{m-di} \), it is a dative construction which is used after the predicative \( \text{nn} \) and \( \text{bn} \).

Regarding the alternation between TYPE 1 and TYPE 2, Depuydt (2008: 113) convincingly showed that they are functionally “synonyms”: their distribution corresponds roughly speaking to the opposition between literary and non-literary texts (at least until the end of the Ramesside period).

2.4.1. TYPE 1: \( \text{nn/bn n PR PM} \)

9. \( \text{iw=f m-sz=n hr w}\text{\textasciicircum} n\text{\textasciicircum} \text{NEG for=3SM pity} \text{He is after us, slaughtering, without having pity} \)
   (First Libyan War 28, 46 = KRI VI, 24,12)

10. \( \text{wn km.t mh.t} \)
    \( \text{n(n)} \text{\textasciicircum} \text{\textasciicircum} \text{n\textasciicircum}\text{\textasciicircum} \text{NEG for=3SF shepherd} \text{Egypt was then on the run, without having a shepherd} \)
    (First Libyan War 28, 46 = KRI VI, 24,12)

---

\(^{17}\) The explanation suggested by Groll (1970) is problematic in many respects: ‘The Pattern \( \text{mn m-di.f} \) \( \theta-A \) is in complementary relationship with the pattern \( \text{bn n.f} \) \( \theta-A \): the latter Pattern is used with abstract nouns to express the non-ownership of a characteristic, permanent quality, or a non-acquirable quality, whereas \( \text{mn m-di.f} \) \( \theta-A \) (or \( \text{nn wn} \) \( \theta-A \) \( m-di.f \) in literary texts) is used with concrete nouns to express the non-ownership of an object; or for a person, that he is not available.”
11. \( sm=k \ iw \ nn \ n=k \ tb.wt \)  
   go\textsuperscript{THMZ} = 2SM CIRC NEG for=2SM sandals  
   “When you went, you had no shoes, (I want to supply you with all the things 
   that other people are looking for)”  
   (O. OIC 12074, \( r^o 3 = KRI \) VI, 216,2)

12. \( hm \ inn, \ mk \ bn \ sw, \ bn \ n=f \ mni.t \)  
   ignore\textsuperscript{PTCP, IPFV} Amun look NEG.EXIST 3SM NEG for=3SM moor  
   “The one who ignores Amun, look, he does not exist, he has no mooring”  
   (O. DeM 1435, \( r^o 1 \))

13. \( i\{\} w> bn \ n=w \ sh\textsuperscript{circ} \textsuperscript{NEG} \) for=3PL constraint  
   “(without me knowing whether they are leaving the ploughed fields) since 
   they have no obligation”  
   (Tale of Woe 5,1)

14. \( p\textsuperscript{di} \ nk \ n=p\textsuperscript{ti} \ nty \ bn \ n=f \ \emptyset \)  
   the give\textsuperscript{PTCP, IPFV} bread for the REL NEG for=3SM \( \emptyset \)  
   “the one who gives bread to the one who has none”  
   (P. Anastasi 2, \( r^o 9,2\text{-}3 = LEM \) 17,16-18,1)

15. \( nty \ bn \ n=w \ kr\textsuperscript{lt} \textsuperscript{w} \)  
   REL NEG for=3PL foreskins  
   “who do not have foreskins”  
   (Karnak = Mariette 1875: 4,52)  
   Contrast with \( nty \ mn \ m-di=w \ krnt \textsuperscript{w} \) in 54 (see Erman 1933).

Consider the difference between the witnesses of Ani:

16. \( [i\textsuperscript{b}\textsuperscript{w} \textsuperscript{t}] \ nn \ n=s \ s\textsuperscript{ri} \)  
   office NEG for=it child  
   “(the office), it has no child”  
   (Ani = O. Gardiner 357, \( r^o 4 \))  
   Similar in P. DeM 1, \( r^o 4,6 \).

17. \( i\textsuperscript{b}\textsuperscript{w} \textsuperscript{t} \ nn \ wn \ -di=s \ s\textsuperscript{ri} \)  
   office NEG EXIST-COM=3SF child  
   “An office, it has no son (i.e. it is not hereditary)”  
   (Ani = P. Boulaq 4, 20,6)

Compare also the beginning of the so-called Adoption Papyrus (dated from Year 1 of Ramesses 11) 
with a later occurrence in the text (dated from Year 18 of Ramesses the 11):

18. \( iw \ bn \ n=f \ s\textsuperscript{ri} \ s\textsuperscript{ri} \textsuperscript{t} \ r-hrw-r \ ink \)  
   CIRC NEG for=3SM son daughter except myself  
   “(he made me a child of his, and wrote down unto me all that he possessed, 
   having no son or daughter apart from myself)”  
   (P. Ashmolean Museum 1945.96, \( r^o 4\text{-}5 = KRI \) VI, 735,15)

19. \( iw \ mn \ s\textsuperscript{ri} \ s\textsuperscript{ri} \textsuperscript{t} \ \emptyset \ \textsuperscript{inn} \ m\textsuperscript{nt}w \)  
   CIRC NEG.EXIST son daughter \( \emptyset \) except themselves  
   “(I took them [i.e. the three children of a slave], nourished them and brought 
   them up (…) and they dealt well with me), having no son or daughter except 
   for them”  
   (P. Ashmolean Museum 1945.96, \( r^o 19 = KRI \) VI, $$$)

2.4.2. **TYPE 2: nn wn/mn m-di** PR PM

Note that all the examples with the negation \( nn-wn \) are rather ‘old’ (not after Ramesses III).
20. \( mn \ wn \ m-di(=i) \ ø \ n-hrw \ hm.t \ PN \ wn=s \ m-di=i \)
   \( \text{NEG \ EXIST} \ with=(1SG) \ ø \ except \ servant \ PN \ PST=3SF \ with=1SM \)
   “I do not have anyone except for the servant PN who was in my possession”
   (P. BM EA 10568, col. 1,10)

21. \( mn \ wn \ m-di=sn \ diw \)
   \( \text{NEG \ EXIST} \ with=3PL \ rations \)
   “They don’t have rations”
   (O. Qurna 633, r6)

22. \( mn \ wn \ m-di=f \ §3y.t \)
   \( \text{NEG \ EXIST} \ with=3SM \ taxes \)
   “(About the scribe:) He does not have taxes”
   (P. Chester Beatty 5, r6,7)
   See also P. Sallier I, 6,9 = LEM 83,17-84,1; P. Anastasi V, 17,2 = LEM 65,6

23. \( mn \ wn-di=f \ is.t \ h3rw \)
   \( \text{NEG \ EXIST.COM}=3SM \ crew \ Syrians \)
   “He does not have a Syrian crew”
   (Wenamun, 1,x+23 = LES 67,3-4)

24. \( di=f \ hpr=i \ mi-kd \ rm\t \)
   \( \text{CAUS}=3SM \ become\text{INF}=1SG \ like \ man \)
   \( iw \ mn \ wn \ m-di=f \ hry \)
   \( \text{CIRC} \ \text{NEG \ EXIST} \ with=3SM \ chief \)
   “He made me become like a man that does not have a chief”
   (P. Anastasi 6,33 = LEM 75,2-3)

25. \( (i)n \ mn \ m-di=s \ im=w \)
   \( \text{INT} \ \text{NEG.EXIST} \ with=3SF \ \text{in}=3PL \)
   “Doesn’t she have some of them?”
   (O. IFAO 862)
   See also P. DeM 6, r6 5 (= KRI VI,267,1)

26. \( mn \ m-di=k \ it \)
   \( \text{NEG.EXIST} \ with=2SM \ father \)
   “(You are the son of whom?) You do not have a father!”
   (Truth and Falsehood, 5,3 = LES 32,14)

27. \( mn \ m-di=i \ bt \ m \ wdf, \ inn \ p/y=i \ htr-rnp.t \)
   \( \text{NEG.EXIST} \ with=1SG \ wood \ in \ storehouse \ except \ my \ aa \ incomes \)
   “I do not have wood in store, except for my annual additional incomes”
   (P. Mallet, 5,8-9 = KRI VI, $$$)

The first example of \( mn-di \ \text{PR} \ \text{PM} \), with the (graphemic) drop of the \( m \) at the beginning of the preposition \( m-di \) occurs markedly earlier (Ramesses 3, year 21) than the first affirmative example:

28. \( iw \ PN \ t/y=i \ mw.t, \ t/y=f \ sri \ r-ms=f \)
   \( iw \ mn \ di=f \ sri \ ’h3w(3y) \)
   “While PN, my mother, is the (lit. his) daughter whom he begot – he has no male child”
   (O. BM 5624, v6 3-4 = KRI V,476,3-4)

However all the other examples (35) are from the time of Ramesses XI onwards. Especially noticeable are the numerous examples in the so-called ‘abnormal hieratic corpus’ (c. 25 occurrences):

29. \( mn-di(=i) \ md.t \ r-hr=k \ n-tf \ p3 \ hrw \ r-hry \)
   \( \text{NEG.EXIST.COM}(=1SG) \ matter \ about=2SM \ from \ the \ day \ afterwards \)
   “I have no issue (anymore) with you from today and for the future”
   (P. Louvre E 7861, r7)
30. *mn-di(=l) md.t nb r ḏd=s irm PN (...)*
    NEG.EXIST.COM(=1SG) matter any to say\INF=it with PN (...)
    “I do not have anything to argue about with PN (...)”(P. Michaelides 2, r° 8-9)

2.4.3. TYPE 3: *mn wn/mn PN m-di PR*

To the best of my knowledge, TYPE 3 has received little attention so far. It is useful to first consider the two following examples:

31. *iw mn ḫt nb m-di=f*
    CIRC NEG.EXIST thing any with=3SM
    “(He brought me back the donkey) without anything with him (i.e. in his hands for the rent)”
    (O. DeM 67, r° 3-5 = Černý 1935: pl. 48)

32. *mn nkt n PN m-di=i*
    NEG.EXIST something of PN with=1SG
    “I have nothing of PN”
    (O. Cairo CG 25572, r° 14-15 = KRI V, 572,15)

Compare with the later construction:

33. *mn m-di[=i] md.t nb irm=k*
    NEG.EXIST with[=1SG] matter any with=2SM
    “I have no problem with you”
    (P. Louvre E 3168, v° 2,10 = Malinine 1982: 98)

Based on an opposition of negation scope/focus, namely “to have no PM” (TYPE 3) vs “not to have a PM” (TYPE 2), one could suggest an explanation for the following examples:

34. *mn ḫn m-di(=tn) r pr-ṣ  ṣ.w.s*
    NEG.EXIST utterance with(=2PL) to Pharaoh L.P.H.
    “(so) you have no discourse (to report) for Pharaoh L.P.H.? (If you hide it today and come back on it later, your nose and ears will be cut!)”
    (O. Cairo CG 25556, r° 7-8 = KRI IV, 303,7)

35. *mn btṣ m-di=f*
    NEG.EXIST crime with=3SM
    “(you are in a good situation with the general,) he has no complaint (and further no one accused you in front of him)”(P. BM EA 10419, r° 8 = LRLC 2)

Compare with:

36. *ḥr nṣy=k rmt ḏr=w ṣ.w.s mn-di=w btṣ, m ṣrī r ṣ*
    NEG.EXIST=3PL crime from small to big
    “And your men are doing fine, they do not have any harm, from small to big”
    (P. Turin 1973, r° 6 = LRL 3;6; P. Philipps, v° 10 = LRL 30,12-13; see also PBM EA 10284, v° 1 = LRL 49,6; P. BM EA 10411, r° 10 = LRLC 1; similarly see P. BN 199, 5-9 et al., v° 14 = LRL7,1). See also Amenemope 19,18 and the affirmative counterpart in O. Gardiner 250, r° 5.

37. *sdm=i r-ḥd sw rwi m-di=f*
    ḥr mn wn ih.w m-di=f
    and NEG EXIST oxen with=3SM
    “I have heard that he has departed from him and has no (more) cattle in his possession”
    (P. Boulaq 16, r° 4-5 = KRI III, 156)
3. OTHER TYPES OF CONSTRUCTION

Only four ‘minor’ types are mentioned here in passing, but more are of course to be discussed in the forthcoming publication.

3.1. Future possession with dative encoding of the PR

38. iw p' nty h n=s
   FUT the REL beneficial for=3SF
   “she shall have what is beneficial”
   (Neskhonsu l. 26 = JEA 41 [1955], p. 102; Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1981: 320)

39. iw=s n=f r hm.t
   FUT=3SF for=3sm as wife
   “He will have her as a wife”
   (P. Harris 500, v° 5,6 = LES 3,9)

40. iw=w n PN p'yi=i [āš]
   FUT=3PL for PN my [son]
   “(As for all my goods …,) they will be for PN, my son”
   (O. UC, 39619, r° 8-10)

3.2. The preposition r-hr and hr: possession, authority and control

41. hr ir nswt nb nty r ħpr shnn.t=f shr.w=i nb hr n=f dd
   t=t, w r-hr=i, ink sn mi wn=sn hr=f, lands under_authority=1SG mine 3PL like PST=3PL under=3SM
   zp ksn hr 1b ngr.w
   “And as for any king who shall be and will overthrow any of my plans and say: ‘The lands are under my authority, they are mine as they used to be under him.’ (It will be a painful thing in the eyes of the gods)”
   (Kanais Decree)

3.3. The preposition hr: possession, load and charge

42. inpw rn p' 3, iw b[i]-t rn (n) p'yi=f šri
   hr ir [i]npw, sw hr pr hr hm.t
   and TOP Inepu 3SM under house under wife
   iw p'yi=f sn šri m-d=t=f mi shr n šri
   “(Inepu was the name of the older, Bata the name of the younger), and Inepu,
   he was in charge of a house and a wife, (while his younger brother was living with him as would a child)”
   (P. d’Orbiney, 1,1-2 = LES 9,9-11)

3.4. The compound preposition m-dr.t:
   From physical/temporary possession (see Heine 1997: 34) to owing

43. iw i.ir=n wn n3 db3.t
   CIRC AUX.THMZ=1PL open\INF the coffins
   m n3 h3 w n hmyt i.wn m-dr.t=n
   INS the picks of copper REL.PST at-hand=1PL
   “for it is with the copper picks that were in our hands (physically) that we opened the coffins”
   (P. BM EA 100054, r° 2,10)
44. sw ṭnw pẖ ṣ ṭ n imn nty m-ḏr.t=k, sy ṭnw ṭbdb ṭ n pẖ ḫm nṯry tpy n imn nty m-ḏr.t=k
   FUT=3PL for PN my [son]
   “(Where is the dispatch of Amun) which you owe, where is the letter of the
   first prophet of Amun which you owe?”
   (Wenamun 1.x+16-17 = LES 66,9-10)

45. ḫr mk, ṣ ṭbdb ṭ, mn n-ḏr.t=k
   and look dispatch letter NEG.EXIST in_hand=2SM
   “And look, dispatch or letter, there is none in your hand”
   (Wenamun, 1x+18-19 = LES 66,12)

See ṭpy.t wn.t m-ḏr.t=f of M. Megally (Notions de compatibilité, p. 85-86) = « the amount still to be
paid ». See also M. Megally 1981: 300 n. 10 & 11.

4. CONCLUSIONS