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Abstract
After some general considerations regarding NP coordination, this study deals with multiple-subject coordination in Late Egyptian. As the second coordinand is often introduced by a preposition meaning “with” (*hnr* or *irm*), a central issue addressed in this paper is the complex inter-relationships between **CONJUNCTIVE** and **COMITATIVE**. The final section is devoted to the diachronic relations between *hnr* and *irm*.

0 Introduction
This paper deals with some cases of coordination in Late Egyptian (LEg), more specifically with coordination of nominal phrases (NP) in subject position. This is an admittedly limited focus if one considers the larger picture. First, coordination strictly speaking (“and”) is a part of a larger phenomenon called conjunction, which includes disjunction (“or”) and adversative coordination (“but”). Conjunction implies a relation between two members (also called the coordinands), which can be nouns, adjectives, phrases or clauses.

Two main related issues will be addressed here:

- the relations between **CONJUNCTIVE** and **COMITATIVE**,
- the respective domains, both semantic and syntactic, of *hnr* and *irm*.

Multiple coordination, i.e. coordination of more than two NPs, will be left out of the scope of this paper, because it uses a somewhat different strategy.

1 Coordination in Egyptian
Languages can vary to a considerable extent in the manner they express coordination according to the nature of the coordinands. In French, for instance, the coordinator *et* can be used to link two NPs, two Adjs, two phrases or two clauses. This is not the case in Ancient Egyptian: for instance, adjectives are never linked by a coordinator, being simply juxtaposed next to one another (asyndetic coordination):

Ex. 1  t ḫd šrī 10
bread white small 10
“Ten small white breads” (O. Nims, r° 10)
Ramses II – Administrative matters

---

* My thanks are due to Stéphane Polis and Eitan Grossman who made many useful suggestions. I am also indebted to Eitan Grossman for improving the quality of my English in many ways.
1 As rightly noted by Ernst (1994: 89), this topic has not been given much attention in Egyptology.
2 Haspelmath (2004: 1).
In Earlier Egyptian, clause linkage is usually left unmarked. In Late Egyptian, the particle *hor* can play a cohesive role, with different shades of meaning that are pragmatically conditioned (“and, then, thus, but”). In narrative, a chain of events is usually marked by a special pattern, called the Sequential *iw-f hr (tm) sdm* “and then he heard”, to which must be added some constructions that are characteristic of literary style, like *wn.in*/*hfr*n headed constructions. In discourse, a chain of events (typically, but not only, orders and instructions) is expressed by a dedicated pattern, called the Conjunctive (*mtw-f sdm*), grammaticalized from a construction already attested in Middle Egyptian involving the preposition *hr*, which expresses the COMITATIVE. Contrary to what can be observed in most modern Western European languages, the coordinating devices that are found for linking two NPs are not used for clauses.

Unsurprisingly, there are several means in LEg for coordinating NPs, which are now briefly presented.

### 1.1 Asyndeton

In spite of the lack of statistics one could confidently rely on, asyndetic coordination is probably one of the commonest ways for linking two NPs in Earlier Egyptian (EEg). In LEg, asyndeton of two (or more) NPs is rarely found, except in lists and enumerations of various kinds, where it is excessively common:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex. 2</th>
<th><em>iw w6h hr i w6h tt (hr) šm m grh</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seq priest Hori priest Tat [Seq] go:INF in night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The priest Hori and the priest Tat went out by night” (P. BM EA 10053, 3,16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramses XI – Tomb Robberies (See also Ex. 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2 Use of a preposition as a connector

When coordination needs to be unambiguously expressed, LEg can resort to different means that vary according to the textual genres and to the syntactic environment. Differences can be observed in terms of diachrony, textual genres, or syntactic compatibility. Except for some cases that will be briefly discussed below (1.3), coordination by means of a coordinator is always *monosyndetic* in the sense of Haspelmath,

---

4 See Neveu (2001).
7 In Late Egyptian, *m-mitt*t can be found before a conjunctive (*m-mitt mtw.k dlt šdī.tw p3 bt*t “and you will also cause that the honey be extracted”, P. Anastasi IV, r 14,10-11; cf. *LES* 11,3-5; P. Leyde I 368, r 10-13), but this has rather an adverbial force than a cohesive function; *m-mitt*t can also link other types of clauses, for instance a conditional system (*m-mitt*i *wr rmgt m p3 t3 n hlt* “and consequently if someone runs away from the land of Khatti” *KRI* II, 231,9); see also below, Ex. 88. As rightly pointed out to me by E. Grossman (p.c.), considerations like this could be enlarged to *k-fdf*, which can set off new topics of discussion, a role that can be assumed by *zway in Coptic. |
9 In Coptic, interclausal coordination by means of asyndeton is common, especially in narrative (chains of past tense forms) and in orders (chains of imperatives). In the latter case however, the conjunctive is also used as a cohesive device after an opening imperative.
that is, coordination is expressed by a single coordinator usually (but not obligatorily, see *senatus populusque romanus*) placed between the two co-ordinands.  

In pre-Coptic Egyptian, there is no specialized coordinator meaning “and” unlike in most modern Western European languages. As was already the case in EEg, LEg can rely on a large set of prepositions. The first two, *hn* and *irm*, basically expressing the COMITATIVE, are pervasive in the function of linking two NPs in any kind of syntactic environment; while *hn* is already well attested in EEg, *irm* is a newcomer in LEg, as shown, among others, by its syllabic writing.  

---


11 In Coptic, ς χψɒ (B υψνς) is probably what comes closer to the English coordinator “and” (Stern 1880: § 592; Layton, 2001: § 145), where it is used in interclausal environments. The coordination of NPs is expressed in Coptic by the preposition *m*n — (B *m*m), or ɔ in closely related NPs. Except in some syntactic contexts (Stern, *ibidem*), the presence of ς χψɒ remains exceptional in these cases, expressing some kind of emphasis.


13 On the use of a syllabic writing in Egyptian for indigenous words, see Winand (forthcoming a).

14 E.g., *mdw m-di X “to discuss with” (LES 12,14) or “to have an argument with “ (P. BM EA 10052, 6,10), where *m-di* is in variation with *irm* (LRL 24,7, in the sense of “discussing with”) and *hn* (P. Deir el-Bahari s.n., this latter one being exceptional with *mdw*). Other examples are offered by *hɔ “to fight” and *tt “to discuss”.*

15 *m-di* is also used to connect two distant NPs: *i.gd nbw i.kkwk w k n ρi pr-nbw n nsw X ρi ntr *3 ρi *m-di rmɔ nb i.wn irm Ok “tell (about) the gold you stripped from the king’s treasure, the great god, and also the men who were with you” (P. BM EA 10053, v6 2,9-10).
Ex. 5  

\[n_{342} n^3 \text{ gmy-} i m-\text{lmw} p^3 \text{ hrw} h_n^x [ktn]\]

3PL ART:PL find:REL.PST=1SG inside ART:M.SG enemy with [charioteer]  

\[m^j i p^3 \text{ kr}^x m-dl n^j y-i w_b/l.w\]

Menna POSS:M.SG=1SG shield_bearer with POSS:PL=1SG butler-M.PL  

“It is they that I found in the midst of the battle with charioteer Menna, my shield-bearer, as well as my butlers”  

(Qadech, Poem, § 272 L²)  

Ramses II – Poem of Qadech

Ex. 6  

\[i w-f \text{ in} n-i n^3 \text{ db.wt} <\text{hr-s}^\omega> \text{ bd}\]

SEQ=3SG.M bring:INF to=1SG ART:PL basket-F.PL [after] month  

\[n \text{ hrw.w} i w-f \text{ sw.w} \text{ irm} t^3 \text{ kr}^h.t\]

PGEN day-M.PL SBRD=3PL empty:RES-3PL with ART:F.SG fruit_basket-F  

\[m-mitt p^3 \text{ tl}^y\]

as_well ART:M.SG basket  

“And he brought me, after a full month, the baskets, empty, together with the fruit-basket and the tl˘y-basket as well”  

(O DeM 569, 4)  

Ramses III – Daily life

Coordination by means of \textit{m-mitt} would deserve a study of its own for the rich diversity of its uses. It can link two NPs (ex. 7), link the last two NPs in a sequence (ex. 8), stand after the last coordinand, like “as well” in English (ex. 9, 10), or before a preposition, when repeated, before the second coordinand (ex. 10):

Ex. 7  

\[p^3 \text{ h}^3 \text{ m-mitt} p^3 \text{ w}^b\]

ART:M.SG chisel as well ART:M.SG vase  

“The chisel and the vase”  

(O. Nash 1, v° 13)  

Sethi II – Judicial matters

Ex. 8  

\[t^v i \text{ hr} p^s X \text{ h}^n \text{ A, B m-mitt} C\]

PRS-1SG PRS divide:INF X with A, B as well C  

“I divide X among A, B, and C”  

(P. BM EA 10568, 6-8)  

Ramses II – Property division

Ex. 9  

\[n^j y-k \text{ sn.w} (r)-\text{dr.w} m \text{ t}^h \text{wty} m s-t-hm.t m\]

POSS:PL=2.SG.M brother:PL all LOC male LOC woman as_well  

“All your brothers, men and women alike”  

(P. Phillipps, v° 3)  

Ramses XI – Letter

Ex. 10  

\[i w-k \text{ dd} n A m-mitt n B m-mitt\]

SEQ=2SG.M say:INF to A as_well to B as_well  

“And you told (so) to A and also to B as well”  

(O. DeM 116, v° 1)  

Ramses II – Declaration

The prepositions \textit{mi} and \textit{mi-kd}, meaning “as, like” can also be used to connect two NPs. Although it is quite common cross-linguistically to find prepositions originally meaning a comparison also used for expressing coordination (cf. French \textit{comme}, German \textit{wie}, etc.),\textsuperscript{16} \textit{mi} and \textit{mi-kd} are only exceptionally used in L\textsc{eg} in this function:\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{16} One will note in French some hesitation as regards the agreement of the verb with subjects coordinated by \textit{comme}: \textit{La Belgique comme le Luxembourg fait/font partie de l’Europe}. If the verb remains in singular, it can imply that the PrepP introduced by ‘comme’ is presented as an afterthought \textit{(La Belgique — au même titre que le Luxembourg d’ailleurs — fait partie de l’Europe)}, but this explanation, favoured by some purists, would certainly not be accepted by the majority of French speakers.

\textsuperscript{17} See Peust (2006) for a general discussion of the preposition \textit{mi} in E\textsc{eg}, with a final section on ‘Koordinierendes \textit{mj}’ (Peust 2006: 514).
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Ex. 11  ist n‘ stty.w n dmi pn t³y.w mi
SBRD ART:PL Asiatic-M.PL  PGEN town DEM:SG man-M.PL and
hm.w tp sbty.sn
woman-F.PL  top wall-M.PL=3PL
“For the Asiatics of this town – men and women alike – were on top of the walls”  
(Urk. IV, 1312,4)
Amenhotep II

Ex. 12  mtw=k  ³ty n=w m-ššr mi-kd ³ty
CONJ=2SG.M  take care of  to=3PL ADV like  DEM:SG
šr.t n A ty.s mw.t tiy.s mn*.t
daughter-F  PGEN A  POSS:SG=3SG.F mother-F  POSS:SG=3SG.F nurse-F
“And you will take care of them like this daughter of A, her mother and her nurse”  
(P. Leiden I 370, v° 1; Cf. P. BN 197 VI, v° 5)
Ramses XI – Letter

The preposition hr “on, upon” (Coptic 21), already used in Egyptian I as a coordinator18, is found in LEg only in semantically tightly bound NPs, perhaps more specifically with mass nouns, and never in texts that closely emulate the colloquial register:

Ex. 13  iw=k (hr) ir.t hr.t(-i) m ³kw hr hnk.t
SBRD=2SG.M  [PRS]  do:INF need=[1SG] with  food and beer-F
“When you meet my needs with food and beer”  
(P. Sallier I, 8,3)
Merenptah – Miscellanies

Ex. 14  n³y=f  šn.wt mh m it hr bd.t
POSS:PL=3SG.M storehouse-F.PL  be_full:RES-3PL  of wheat and barley
“Its storehouses are full of wheat and barley”  
(P. Anastasi III, 2,4)
Merenptah – Miscellanies

A discussion on the coordination of two prepositional phrases might be here necessary. But as this has already been touched upon in a previous study, I here only give a list of the attested patterns:19

- Prep + def. art. Noun1 + def. art. Noun2

Ex. 15  irm p³ nbw p³ hd
with  ART:SG gold  ART:SG silver
“With the gold and the silver”  
(P. BM EA 10068, r° 1,9)
Ramses IX – Tomb Robberies

- Prep + def. art. Noun1 + Noun2 (for semantically strongly bound NPs)

Ex. 16  n n³ ntr.w ntr.wt nb.w
  to  ART:PL god-M.PL  goddess-F.PL all
“To all the gods and goddesses”  
(P. Leiden I 360, 4-5)
Ramses II – Letter

- Prep + NP1 + Prep + NP2

Ex. 17  iw=w ir ³.t hnk.t im irm-w irm p³-is
SEQ=3PL  do:INF room beer-F there(ADV) with=3PL and  Pais
“And they made an orgy with them and Pais…”  
(P. Turin jud., 6,1)
Ramses III – Judicial

18 See Malaise-Winand (1999: §86). The use of a connector meaning “on, upon” to express conjunction remains exceptional cross-linguistically, but consider some expressions in French like il commit gaffes sur gaffes, where the conjunctive effect results from the metaphor of piling things up.
19 See Winand (2009).
Ex. 18  irm n3 bry.w mn3 irm n3 šm
with ART:PL captain-M.PL ship with ART:PL go:PTCP
“With the ship captains and with those who are going …” (Wenamun, 1,23)

XXI\textsuperscript{st} dyn. – Tale

– Prep + NP\textsubscript{1} + irm/hn\textsuperscript{r} + Prep + NP\textsubscript{2} (very rare)

Ex. 19  h3ty-c n immt.t niw.t A hr/swd3-ib n n3 c3.w
with PGEN governor west-F town-F A PRS inform:INF to ART:PL chief-M.PL
n is.t [n] [n] is.t B n c3 n is.t C
with PGEN gang-F [to] chief PGEN gang-F B to chief PGEN gang-F C
hn\textsuperscript{r} n t3 is.t m-mitt r-dr= w
and to ART:SG gang-F as well(ADV) whole=3PL
“The governor of Western Thebes A informs the chiefs of the gang, the chief of
the gang B, the chief of the gang C, and the whole gang as well”

(O. Berlin 11238, 1-2)
Ramses II – Administrative matters\textsuperscript{20}

Ex. 20  wn-f m p1 hr hn\textsuperscript{r} m p1 pr-n-st\textsuperscript{3}
be.PST in ART:M.SG tomb and in ART:M.SG portable shrine
“He was in the tomb and in the portable shrine” (P. Mayer A, v\textsuperscript{o} 10,22)
Ramses XI – Tomb Robberies

Ex. 21  iw-w di.t=w n-i irm hr
SEQ=3PL give:INF=3PL to=1SG and Qar
“They gave them to me and Qar” (P. Mayer A, v\textsuperscript{o} 6,24)
Ramses XI – Tomb Robberies

Ex. 22  ky-dd ih-h3b-k n-i hr c3-k
another matter write:SBJV=2SG.M to=1SG about condition=2SG.M
hn\textsuperscript{r} ni.y.k
and POSS:PL=2SG.M man-M.PL
“Can you please write me about your condition and that of your men?”
(P. Ermitage 1118, 4; note here the elliptical construction)
Ramses II – Letter

There also exist other strategies for coordinating, or rather for underlining cohesion;
in the following example, circumstantial \textit{iw} has been repeated before the second
subject (for the repetition of the preposition, see \textit{supra}, exx. 17-18):

Ex. 23  (date) iw ipwy iw r\textsuperscript{r}-htp hr ir.t t3 f3d.t
(date) SBRD Ipouy SBRD Rahotep PRS do:INF ART:F.SG box-F
“(date) Ipwy and Rahotep are making the box” (O. CGC 25519, r\textsuperscript{o} 6)
Siptah – Journal de la Tombe

A similar strategy can be observed in the following example where the negation \textit{bn}
has been repeated:

Ex. 24  iw bn mš\textsuperscript{o}-f hn\textsuperscript{r}-f bn htr-f
SBRD NEG army=3SG.M with=3SG.M NEG chariotsry=3SG.M
“While his army was not with him nor his chariotsry” (Qadech, § 145 K\textsuperscript{1})
Ramses II – Letter

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Inscription of Mes, N3: \textit{iw} tw\textsubscript{f} hr ps\textsuperscript{3}.w n \n hnt\textsuperscript{r} sn.w\textsubscript{m} “and one shared them for me and my
brothers and sisters”.
2 The corpus

The present study is based on a corpus of *ca.* 300 examples in Leg. Leg has been here considered *sensu lato*, including both literary and non-literary texts, while the chronological limits have been arbitrarily set between the XVIIIth dyn. and the XXIst dyn. The heuristic part has been greatly facilitated by the use of the database currently developed by the Ramses project at the University of Liège.\(^{21}\)

3 Conjunctive vs. Comitative

From a typological perspective, **CONJUNCTIVE** and **COMITATIVE** are two domains that are inter-related in many respects.\(^{22}\) Historically, in many languages, the former is often a secondary development of the latter.\(^{23}\) In Ancient Egyptian, if there is an overt marker of coordination, it is formally identical with a corresponding marker for the **COMITATIVE**. As already stated, in Leg, the prepositions *hn* and *irm*, both basically meaning “with”, are used in this function.\(^{24}\)

3.0 Presentation of the data

In the corpus considered here, coordination of subjects can be expressed by asyndeton or by using a preposition meaning “with”. Coordination of the first type is badly represented in Leg, being attested only 11 times in the corpus. Here is a typical example:

Ex. 25

```
mtw A B C D in=k iw=k wd3.tw
CONJ A B C D bring:INF=2SG.M SBRD=2SG.M to be successful:RES-2SG
“And may A B C D bring you (back) in good health” (P. BM EA 75020, 4)
Ramses XI - Letter
```

As already said, Leg usually links two NPs with prepositions meaning “with”. The two most widely used are *hn* and *irm*. Both can express **COORDINATION**, but also **COMITATIVE**, as illustrated in the two following pairs of examples:

Ex. 26

```
di-i tw r t3 c.t-sh3* hn* ms.w wr.w
give:PST=1SG 2SG.M at ART:F.SG school with child-M.PL chief-M.PL
r sh3-k
to educate:INF=2SG.M
“I put you at school together with the offsprings of the nobles to educate you” (P. Anastasi V, 22,6)
Sethi II – Miscellaneies
```

Ex. 27

```
imy di.w n n3 rmt-m3* hn* n3 3pr.w
give:IMP corn_ration-M.PL to ART:PL soldier-M.PL and ART:PL Apirou
“Give corn-rations to the soldiers and the Apirou (...)” (P. Leiden 348, v\(^6\) 6,5)
Ramses II – Miscellaneies, Letter
```

\(^{21}\) See Winand, Polis & Rosmorduc (forthcoming).


\(^{23}\) Stassen (2000). The evolution from **CONJUNCTIVE** to **COMITATIVE** is not documented.

\(^{24}\) The preposition *m-di* can also be found in the same syntactic environments as *hn* or *irm*. But as it does not fully commute with them (and, as a matter of fact, is not widely used in the constructions discussed here), it has been left out of this study.
Ex. 28

iw bwpwy n\text{\textgreek{y}}=f sn.w ir irm=f
SBRD NEG POSS:PL=3SG.M brother-M.PL do:INF with=3SG.M

“Although his brothers did nothing with him” (O. Petrie 16, v° 2)

Ex. 29

ir=k wd dy m niw:t iw swd<
do:EMPH=2SG.M go out:INF here in town SBRD handle:PST=[1SG]
n=k hm.t A irm hm B \text{p}\text{\textgreek{y}}=s šri
to=2SG.M servant-F A and servant B POSS:M.SG=3SG.F son
iw dl=k sn n C
SBRD give:PST=2SG.M 3PL to C

“It is only after having handled to you the servant A and the servant B, her son, after you gave them to C, that you went out here to town” (P. Bankes I, 4)

From a typological point of view, languages that express coordination and comitative using the same preposition tend to more or less quickly specialize it for expressing one semantic domain while turning to a new device for the other one.\textsuperscript{26} LEg obviously never reached that stage, and, curiously enough, later stages of Egyptian (Demotic and Coptic) basically did not much change this situation either (see infra, conclusion).

One important issue that will be dealt with in this study is finding out whether there are some criteria to distinguish between coordination and comitative. Before proceeding to a detailed analysis of the corpus, one important remark needs to be made. From a syntactic point of view, two groups of predicates according to the relative position of the subject and the verb ought to be distinguished:\textsuperscript{27}

- Group I: (Aux) – A’ – V (– A” – PrepP)
- Group II: V – A’ (– A” – PrepP)

As will be clear in the following sections, the conclusions that can be gained from the second group are more limited.

3.1 Group I: (Aux) – A’ – V (– A” – PrepP)

The first group (subject before the verb) is undisputably the largest group in the corpus with 234 tokens. In LEg, all paradigms built with r/m/hr + infinitive or an old perfective (Present I, Sequential, Future II I) belong to this group. To this, one can add the paradigms that use the auxiliary irm (emphatic i.irm X “to do X”), but also a prepositional phrase (ph r X “to reach X”).

3.1.1 The pattern (Aux) – A’ A’ A’ V

As already observed, asyndeton is not very widespread (11/234 exx.). It is mostly found with NPs that can be treated as pairs (natural ones or cultural ones). Asyndeton is of course a very clear case of coordination:
When a language has several means for coordinating NPs, asyndeton is frequently reserved to coordinands that form a conceptual unit. This can be related to the conception of tight (vs. loose) association suggested by Moye-Faurie & Lynch (2004) for some Oceanic languages.

3.1.2 The pattern (Aux) – $A_1 \ hnt^e/irm\ A_2 – V$

This pattern, which is even less frequent (6/234 exx.), is another clear case of coordination. One will note that the coordinated NPs are semantically tightly bounded:

Ex. 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wn.in</th>
<th>in-hr</th>
<th>hnt^e</th>
<th>dhwty</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>sgh</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJVB:CNVS</td>
<td>Onuris and Thot shout</td>
<td>INF: cry big</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“And then Onuris and Thot gave a big cry” (Horus &amp; Seth, 4,6)</td>
<td>Ramses V – Tale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex. 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>t^3</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>km.t</th>
<th>irm</th>
<th>p^3</th>
<th>t^3</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>ht^3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART:M.SG</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>PGEN</td>
<td>Egypt-F and ART:M.SG</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>PGEN</td>
<td>Khatti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>htp</td>
<td>snsn</td>
<td>ml-ks-n</td>
<td>r nhh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be_in_peace:RES-3PL</td>
<td>be_unit:RES-3PL</td>
<td>as=1PL</td>
<td>to eternity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The land of Egypt and the land of Khatti are in peace and complete brotherhood for ever” (Hittite treaty = KRI II 227,14)</td>
<td>Ramses II – Royal inscription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The low frequency of this construction can be related to a marked tendency in Ancient Egyptian to avoid large nominal groups in the subject slot, especially in analytical patterns where there is an operator like *iw*, *mtw* or *wn.in/*h₇*n that would then be removed too far left from the verb. As a result, Egyptian gradually developed a strategy using in the subject slot a personal pronoun, which is peripherally expanded by a noun phrase (fronted thematised NP or post-posed AdvP introduced by *m*). ²⁸

3.1.3 The patterns of the type (Aux) – A₁’ – V – h₇nᵣ/irm A₂’

In this group, A₁’ and A₂’ are separated by the verb, while A₂’ is introduced by a preposition (*h₇nᵣ* or *irm*). This group, which is the largest one (217/234 exx.), can be subdivided in three categories:

- There is no other phrasal constituent: (Aux) – A₁’ – V – A₂’
- There is another phrasal constituent after A₂’: (Aux) – A₁’ – V – A₂’ – NP/AdvP
- There is another phrasal constituent before A₂’: (Aux) – A₁’ – V – NP/AdvP – A₂’

3.1.3.1 The pattern (Aux) – A₁’ – V – h₇nᵣ/irm A₂’

This pattern is ambiguous, but some criteria might help deciding between COORDINATION and COMITATIVE (see below):

Ex. 38

```
*iw=1* (hr) ʃm irm p; ‒ hr y-mdy n p; ‒ hr
SEQ=1SG [SEQ] go:INF with ART:M.SG chief_of_Madjoy PGEN the Tomb
```

“The chief of the Madjoy of the Tomb”

(O. Firenze 2621, v° 5)

Ramses III – Judicial matters

Ex. 39

```
in bn twk m ʃy irm n; ‒ hbs.w
Q NEG PRE:2SG.M PRS go:INF with ART:PL clothe-M.PL
```

“Are not you going with the clothes?”

(P. BM EA 10375, 26)

Ramses XI – Letter

Ex. 40

```
mtw=i ʃhr irm-k
CONJ=1SG stand:INF with=2SG.M
```

“And I shall stay with you”

(P. Turin 1977, 3)

XIXth dyn. – Letter

Ex. 41

```
sdm=i r-qdd ist-mnš ʃny (...) mwt h₇nᵣ n;y=f hrd.w
hear:PST=1SG COMP sailor Any (...) die:RES:3SG.M and his child-M.PL
```

“I heard that the sailor Any (...) and his children were dead”

(P. Anastasi VIII, 1,6-8)

Ramses II – Miscellanies, letter

---

²⁸ See Winand (forthcoming b).
This pattern is also found with non-verbal predicates:

Ex. 42  $p\hat{\imath} \ h_d \ <n> \ t\hat{\imath} \ ^c k \ (m)-di-i \ h_n^c \ p\hat{\imath}y\hat{\imath}-i$

ART:M.SG  money  [PGEN]  ART:F.SG  boat with=1SG  and  POSS:M.SG=1SG
$h_d \ n \ b_d.t$
money for  emmer
“The money of the boat belongs to me and my money for the emmer as well”
(P. Brooklyn 37.1799E, 5)

XXVIth dyn. – Letter to the dead

3.1.3.2 The pattern (Aux) – $A_1' - V - h_n^c/irm \ A_2' - NP/AdvP$

In this pattern, $A_2'$ is introduced by a preposition ($hn^c$ or $irm$); $A_1'$ and $A_2'$ are separated by the verb; there is another NP (or AdvP) after $A_2'$. This pattern is not attested in the corpus.

3.1.3.3 The pattern (Aux) – $A_1' - V - NP/AdvP - h_n^c/irm \ A_2'$

When $A_1'$ and $A_2'$ are separated by the verb, while $A_2'$ is introduced by a preposition ($hn^c$ or $irm$), and another NP (or AdvP) stands before $A_2'$, $A_2'$ is probably to be analyzed as a COMITATIVE:

Ex. 43  $m-dr \ wp-s \ \ wp\hat{\imath}w\hat{\imath} \ n\hat{\imath} \ md.t \ irm \ n\hat{\imath} \ h_m.wt$

since  to_be:SBJV=3SG,F  plot:INF:A RT:PL  word-M.PL  with  ART:PL  woman-F.PL
“As she was plotting with the women”
(P. Turin 1875, 5,7)

Ramses IV – Judicial matters

Ex. 44  $w_n=i \ shn.t(w) \ hr \ b\hat{\imath}k \ r-h\hat{\imath}t \ A$
to_be:PST=1SG  commit:RES-1SG  on  work:INF  under_the_authority.of  A
$i.wn \ m \ h_m-n\hat{\imath}r \ t\hat{\imath}y \ (\ldots) \ irm \ n\hat{\imath} \ k\hat{\imath} \ i\hat{\imath}r\hat{\imath}y.w$
to_be:PTCP  in  priest  first  (\ldots)  with  ART:PL  others  accomplice-M.PL
$b\hat{\imath}r\hat{\imath}y-n\hat{\imath}r \ i.wn \ irm=i$
stonemason-M.PL  to_be:PTCP  with=1SG
“I was committed to work under the authority of A who was then HPA (\ldots)
together the other accomplices, the stonemasons who were with me”
(P. Léopold II-Amherst, 1,14)
Ramses IX – Tomb Robberies

Ex. 45  $p\hat{\imath}-w_n \ tw.n \ dy \ h\hat{\imath}t\hat{\imath} \ m-mn.t \ h_n^c$
because  PRS-1PL  here  wore_out:RES-1PL  daily  with
$n\hat{\imath}y.n \ r\hat{\imath}m \ m-di \ n\hat{\imath} \ nty \ hr \ h_m.w \ wsr.w$
POSS:PL-1PL  man-M.PL  and  ART:PL  REL  PRS  make:INF  oar-M.PL
“For we are here, worn out daily with our men and those who make oars”
(P. Anastasi VI, 39-40)
Seti II – Miscellanies, Letter

Ex. 46  $w_n=w \ w\hat{\imath}h \ m \ p\hat{\imath} \ ^c r\hat{\imath}k \ irm \ n\hat{\imath} \ h_n^c$
to_be:RES-3PL  lay:RES-3PL  in  ART:M.SG  basket  with  ART:PL  vessel-M.PL
$\ n \ s\hat{\imath} \ PGEN$
alabaster
“There were laid in the basket with the alabaster vessels”
(P. BM EA 10052, v° 14,3)
Ramses XI – Tomb Robberies

See also O. DeM 581, 9: $m \ wp \ rm.w \ m-di-i \ h_n^c \ smw$ “I have no fish nor vegetables”.

3.2 Group II: V – A’ (∼ A” – PrepP)

3.2.1 The pattern V – A’ A’

In the corpus considered here, there is only one example where A’1 and A’2 immediately follow each other in asyndeton; this is a bit particular, as it is a case of multiple NP coordination showing the pattern A B hn C:

Ex. 47  (date) hrw pn iy ir.n wdwp A ss B hn
            (date)  DEM:M.SG come:INF do:REL.PST butler A scribe B and
tity  C r sh.t
vizier C to field-F.PL
“(date), on this day, the butler A, the scribe B and the vizier C went to the fields”
   (O. CGC 25504, r II,9)
   Merenptah – Journal de la Tombe

3.2.2 The pattern V – A’ hn irm A’

As already observed in a similar case (3.1.3.1. above), when A’1 and A’2 immediately follow each other, A’2 being introduced by a preposition, some ambiguity might arise, but some criteria help deciding between coordination and comitative (see below):

COORDINATION

Ex. 48  p3 bt3 i3 ir.n p3y=i m3 f4 hn  ART:M.SG fault great do:REL.PST POSS:M.SG=1SG army and
tiy=i m.t-htr i3 y r dd-f
POSS:F.SG=1SG chariots-F big to say:INF=3SG.M
“The great fault that my army and my chariots made is too big to say”
   (Qadech, § 192 = P. Raifé-Sallier III)
   Ramses II – Poem of Qadech

Ex. 49  mtw-k di.t in.tw n3 smd.t n  CONJ=2SG.M CAUS:INF bring:SBJV-PASS ART:PL collar-F.PL PGEN
thn.t i.hib<i> n-k hr=w hn n3
faience write:REL.PST=1SG n=k=2SG.M about=3PL and ART:PL
dbh.t n hrs.t requisite-F.PL PGEN cornelian(?)
“And you will have the collars of faience I wrote you about be brought and the
requisites of cornelian (?)”
   (P. Bologne 1094, 2,2)
   Merenptah – Miscellanies, Letter

Ex. 50  r t3 s.t hrw i.ir hr n4 sth  at ART:F.SG place-F do:REL.PST Horus and Seth
“At the spot where Horus and Seth had plunged”  (Horus & Seth, 8,13)
   Ramses V – Literary, narrative

Ex. 51  hdb p3 ms [hr] irm p3-b3ki shri i.wn irm-n
kill:PASS the auxiliary [Tomb] and Pabaki son to be:PTCP with=1PL
“The auxiliary from the Tomb and Pabaki junior who was with us have been
killed”  (P. Mayer B, 8-9)
   Ramses IX – Tomb Robberies

Ex. 52  wn A hn n3 rmt i.dd n3 kth i3 w
   to_be:PASS A and ART:PL man-M.PL say:REL.PST ART:PL others thief-M.PL
   p3y=w rnrn
   POSS:M.SG=3PL name-M.PL
“There were A and the men whose the other thieves said the names”

(P. BM EA 10052, 5,12)

Ramses XI – Tomb Robberies

COMITATIVE

Ex. 53  mtw-k  dl.t  lw.t-f  irm  p3  shs
CONJ=2SG.M  CAUS:INF  come:SBJV=3SG.M  with  ART:M.SG  courier
3s  zp  sn
quickly(ADV)  time  2

“And you will make him come with the courier very quickly”

(P. Anastasi IV, 11,7-8)

Merenptah – Miscellanies, Letter

Ex. 54  dd-f  dl.t  lw.t  sr.w  hnr=i
say:PST=3SG.M  CAUS:INF  come:SBJV=official-M.PL  with=1SG

“He said that the officials be let to come with me”

(O. CGC 25504, r° II,9)

Merenptah – Journal de la Tombe

3.2.3 The pattern V – A′  hnr/irm  A′′ – A″

This pattern and the following one contrast as regards the place of the second argument (or of an AdvP). In the first one, the position of the second argument (A″) after A′ strongly suggests that A′′ is a coordinated subject:

Ex. 55  hrr ptr  kfr  wsr-h3:t  hnr  p-n-t3-wr.t  f3  hrr  tbn
CORD  ATTN  remove:PST  Ouserhat  and  Pentaouret  stone  from  top
n  p3  is
PGEN  ART:M.SG  tomb

“But look W. and P. have removed a stone from the top of the tomb”

(P. Turin 1880, r° 4,5)

Ramses III – Strike Papyrus

Ex. 56  (date)  iry  md3y  I  hnr  md3y  B  fnh  n  nb  f,w,s
(date)  do:PST  policeman  I  and  policeman  B  oath  by  lord  lph

“(date) the policeman I. and the policeman B. made an oath by the Lord, lph”

(O. Gardiner 137, r° 1-3)

Ramses V – Oath

3.2.4 The pattern V – A′  – A″/AdvP – hnr/irm  A′′

This pattern is the mirror case of the preceding section as the phrase hnr/irm A′′ is separated from A′ by the second argument or an AdvP. As expected, A′′ is better understood as a COMITATIVE:

Ex. 57  di  in.tw-w  m  snn  n  sdr  r
CAUS:PST=1SG  bring:SBJV.PASS=3PL  in  document  PGEN  heading  to
p3  nty  p3y-i  nb  im  hnr  n3  kth
ART:M.SG  REL  POSS:M.SG=1SG  lord  there  with  ART:PL  others
rm.w  n  hrrw.w  (...)  name-M.PL  PGEN  day-M.PL  (...)

“I caused them to be brought in a document with headings to the place where my lord is together with the other names of the days (…)”

(P. Anastasi VI, 58)

Sethi II – Miscellanies, Letter
Ex. 58  
\[ \text{give} : \text{PST}=1\text{SG} \quad \text{ART: F.SG school with child-M.PL noble-M.PL} \]
\[ r \quad \text{educe:INF}=2\text{SG.M} \]
“I put you at school together with the offspring of the nobles to educate you”
(P. Anastasi V, 22,6)  
Seti II – Miscellanies, Educative letter

Ex. 59  
\[ \text{day DEM:M.SG come:INF do:REL.PST chief-PGEN gang Hay to} \]
\[ t\i \quad \text{knb.t} \quad \text{hn}^\circ \quad \text{A B C m-b'h} \quad \text{sr.w n} \]
\[ \text{ART:F.SG court-F with A B C in front of official-M.PL PGEN} \]
\[ t\i \quad \text{knb.t} \]
“On this day, the chief of the gang Hay came to the court with A B C in front of the court officials”
(O. CGC 25556, 1)  
Seti II – Judicial matters

Ex. 60  
\[ \text{CONJ}=2\text{SG.M CAUS:INF bring:SBJV.PASS to}=1\text{SG some PGEN} \]
\[ \text{dhr m} \quad \text{p3'y.k} \quad \text{di.t r} \quad \text{pt m'n.t hn}^\circ \]
\[ \text{hid-M.PL in POSS:M.SG=2SG.M give:INF for ART:M.SG jar with} \]
\[ \text{nkt n} \quad \text{kw m-dr.t A} \]
\[ \text{some PGEN bread by_the_hand_of A} \]
“And you will cause that some hides be brought to me when you pay for the jar together with some bread by the hand of A”
(O. DeM 322, 5)  
XIXth dyn. – Letter

There is an apparent exception when A′ 1 is nominal and the intervening argument or AdvP is pronominal; in this case, it is the norm in Ancient Egyptian that the pronominal phrases move as close as possible to the front. In the following example, one must also take into account the fact that the PrepP introduced by irm has itself an extension (nty irm-k); this meets another syntactic general tendency in Egyptian according to which longer constituents are moved at the end of the sentence:

Ex. 61  
\[ \text{POSS:PL=2SG.M instruction-M.PL write:REL.PST to}=2\text{SG.M} \]
\[ \text{p3'y.k} \quad \text{hry hry=w irm n3 hmtj.w nty} \]
\[ \text{POSS:M.SG=2SG.M superior about}=3\text{PL and ART:PL coppersmith-M.PL REL} \]
\[ \text{irm-k with}=2\text{SG.M} \]
“You instructions your superior wrote to you about and to the coppersmiths who are with you”
(P. Salt 1821/155, v\(^2\) 2 = LRL 19,3-4)  
XXth dyn. – Letter

4 Discussion

Although there are some patterns where the distinction between COORDINATION and COMITATIVE cannot be decided on purely syntactic grounds, some patterns clearly imply coordination:
- when A′ 1 and A′ 2 stand in asyndeton,
- when A′ 1 and A′ 2 are both before the verb, and
- when A′ 2 stands after the verb but before A″.
For the other patterns, other criteria can be advocated. In the next sections, the following points will be discussed:

- difference in the status of the coordinands,
- difference in the morphology of the coordinands (pronominal vs. nominal),
- anaphoric continuity,
- the scope of the negation,
- phraseology,
- principle of thematic continuity,
- diachrony.

4.1 Difference in the status of the coordinands

As has already been observed, the two parts of a coordination must have the same status: otherwise the PrepP is best explained as a COMITATIVE or as another semantic role (INSTRUMENTAL or MANNER). There do not seem to be counter-examples to this in Ancient Egyptian. In the following example, the difference of status between twk (animate) and n\textsuperscript{3} hbs.w (inanimate) leaves no other choice than analysing\textit{ jrm n\textsuperscript{3} hbs.w} as a COMITATIVE:

\begin{verbatim}
Ex. 62 in bn twk m n\textsuperscript{3}y irm n\textsuperscript{3} hbs.w Q NEG PRS-2SG.M PRS go:INF with ART:PL clothe-M.PL
\end{verbatim}

"Are not you going with the clothes?"

(P. BM EA 10375, 26)

Ramses XI – Letter

Another example is:

\begin{verbatim}
Ex. 63 iw=tw m\textsuperscript{3} h im.w irm p\textsuperscript{3} nbw p\textsuperscript{3} hd hnty […] SEQ=3SG.C take:INF in=3PL with the gold the silver copper […]
\end{verbatim}

"And one took hold of them with the gold, the silver and copper […]"

(P. BM EA 10068, r\textsuperscript{o} 1,8)

Ramses IX – Tomb Robberies

4.2 Difference of morphological classes (pronoun vs. noun)

When the coordinands A\textsuperscript{1} and A\textsuperscript{2} immediately follow each other, in asyndeton or with a preposition (\textit{hmr} or \textit{irm}), they are always nouns. The following cases do not seem to exist in LEg:

---


31 Coordination of NPs that do not have the same status (zeugma) can happen on purpose to create a comic effect: \textit{Sous le pont Mirabeau coule la Seine/ Et nos amours} (under the Mirabeau bridge flows the Seine / and our loves) (Apollinaire). The following example is perhaps to be understood this way: \textit{bs\textsuperscript{k} n\textsuperscript{4} irm h\textsuperscript{k} t hsy.w} \textit{pr m h\textsuperscript{5}.w} "may you present yourself to me with beer and musicians equipped of instruments" (O. Borchardt 1, r\textsuperscript{o} 2-3). Another case seems to be \textit{is bn twi rh.kw n\textsuperscript{3} hy n md\textsuperscript{3}y.w h\textsuperscript{n} n\textsuperscript{4}y=sn sln knw} "do I not know the inspectors of the Medjay and their numerous requirements/orders?" (P. Anastasi V, 26,4).
On the other hand, the following patterns are well-formed LEd sentences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A′₁ [pers. pron.]</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>hₙ / irm A′₂ [pers. pron.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*A′₁ [person]</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>hₙ / irm A′₂ [pers. pron.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A′₁ [noun]</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>hₙ / irm A′₂ [pers. pron.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A′₁ [person]</td>
<td>hₙ / irm</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>hₙ / irm A′₂ [pers. pron.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A′₁ [noun]</td>
<td>hₙ / irm</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>hₙ / irm A′₂ [pers. pron.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consequence of this is that

A′₁ [noun] V hₙ / irm A′₂ [pers. pron.]

does not necessarily have the same value as

A′₁ [noun] V hₙ / irm A′₂ [noun]

because, in the latter case, there are other options that are not available when pronouns are used.

The pattern

A′₁ [noun] V hₙ / irm A′₂ [pers. pron.]

is attested only once in the corpus, in a clear case of COMITATIVE, as evidenced by the presence of the second argument before the irm-headed PrepP:

Ex. 64 wn.in tî s.t-hm.t iy.t r km.t irm-s

CJVBCNSV ART:F:SG woman come:INF to Egypt with=3SG.F

“and the woman came to Egypt with her”  (Two Brothers, 12,2)

Seti II – Literary, Narrative

In the corpus, the patterns

A′₁ [pers. pron.] V hₙ / irm A′₂ [noun]

are exceedingly common. As will be clear below, hₙ / irm A′₂ [noun] can express COORDINATION or COMITATIVE.

4.3 Anaphoric Continuity

Very often, there is a thematic continuity between the sentence under consideration and the next one. Two cases must be considered:

a) If A₁ [sing] and A₂ [sing] are anaphorically resumed by a plural pronoun, A₂ is most often best understood as a coordinated NP:
When and meets with

Ex. 65 $iw=t\,di.t\,grh.tw\,m\,ty\,m3st\,hn^e$
SEQ=$2SG.F$ CAUS:INF finish:SBJV.PASS in dem:FG cupboards-F and
$p\,h^i\,t\,\dot{t}\,\dot{\overset{\dagger}{s}}i$
DEM:M.SG
wtn A (hr) iy $iw=t\,(hr)\,di.t\,in.tw\,w$
"... You shall cause this cupboard and this small bed to be finished up. When A will come, you shall let them be brought" (P. DeM 18, r° 8-v° 1)
Ramses IX – Letter

When the verb is between A$_1$ and A$_2$, A$_2$ has most often a coordinating value except if there is an intervening NP between the verb and A$_2$:

Ex. 66 $iw\,A\,(hr)\,pr\,hn^e\,n3y=fr\,rm3$
$iw=sn\,hr\,dd$
SEQ=$3PL$ SEQ say:INF
“A and his men went out and they said” (O. Caire CG 25556, 4)
 Sethi II – Journal de la Tombe

Ex. 67 $iw\,p\,ly\,ms-hr\,dd\,irm\,p3\,wh^e$
SEQ DEM:M.SG young worker say:INF and ART:M.SG fisherman
(discourse) $in=3w$
(discourse) say:PST=$3PL$
$iw=i\,tnf\,n3\,ip.wt\,iw=i\,dd\,n=3w$
SEQ=$1SG$ check:INF ART:PL oipe-F.PL SEQ=$1SG$ say:INF to=$3PL$
“This this young worker and the fisherman said: (discourse), and I checked the oipe, and I said to them” (P. Geneva D 191, 10-11)
Ramses XI - Letter

In some cases, slight variations in the position of the NP following the verb can be observed, which suggests that this criterion is not as straightforward as one can hope for:

Ex. 68 $ih\,p3\,shr\,n\,sm\,i.ir=k\,irm\,n3$
Q ART:M.SG manner PGEN go:INF do:REL.PST=$2SG.M$ with ART:PL
rm3,w i.wn irm-k
man-M.PL to_be:PTCP with=$2SG.M$
$iw=tn\,ir\,t\,h\,iw\,m\,n3\,pr-n-st3$
SBRD=$2PL$ do:INF business in ART:PL portable_shrine-M.PL
"How did you manage to make business in this portable shrine together with your accomplices, when you did some business in the portable shrines?" (P. Mayer A, r° 1,9-10)
Ramses XI – Tomb Robberies

Ex. 69 $i,dd\,n=i\,p3\,shr\,n\,sm\,i,ir-tn\,irm$
say:IMP to=$1SG$ ART:M.SG manner PGEN go:INF do:REL.PST=$2PL$ and
$n3\,iry.w\,twt\,r\,ph\,n3\,s.wt\,r3y=fr$
$iw=tn\,in\,p\,ly\,hd\,im\,r-bnr$
SBRD=$2PL$ bring:INF DEM:M.SG silver there outside
“Tell me how you and these accomplices of yours managed to reach those great places?” (P. BM EA 10052, r° 5,5-7)
Ramses XI – Tomb Robberies
The way NPs are resumed further in text is also critical in other syntactic slots, as shown in the following example where the personal pronoun in the second sentence refers to the undisputedly coordinate direct objects in the first one:

Ex. 71

iw-f 3tp t3 pipi.t p3 tp n t3
SEQ=3SG.M load:INF ART:SG keel ART:M SG head PGEN ART:SG
h3.t p3 tp n p3 ph.wy irm ky 4 ht
beginning ART:M SG head PGEN ART:M SG end and other 4 wood
mdh.w dmd 7
cut:RES-3SG.M total 7
iw-f di.t in.tw=w r km.t
SEQ=3SG.M CAUS:INF bring:SBJV PASS=3PL to Egypt

“And he loaded the keel, the prow, the stern and four other pieces of wood (total 7), and he shipped them to Egypt” 
(Wenamun, 2,37)

Other examples where the same effect can be observed are:

Ex. 72

sdm=i p3 h3b ir.n p3y-i nb
hear:PST=1SG ART:M SG write:INF do:REL PST POSS:M SG=1SG lord
r-dd imy diw n n3 rm-t-mis5 hn5 n3 pr.w (...) QUOT give:IMP food to ART:PL soldier-M.PL and ART:PL Apirou (...) iw-i hr di.t <n>=sn p3y=sn diw tww n ibd
SEQ=1SG SEQ give:[to]=3PL POSS:M SG=3PL food every PGEN month
“I have taken note of what my lord told me, saying ‘give some food to the soldiers and the Apirou (...), I thus gave them their food every month’”
(P. Leiden 348, v° 6,5-6)

Ex. 73

iw A (hr) p8=f n=f irm n’y=f
SEQ A [SEQ] divide:INF=3SG M to=3SG M and POSS:PL=3SG M
iry.w iw=w (hr) di.t n=i nbw kd.t 3
accomplice-M.PL SEQ=3PL [SEQ] give:INF to=1SG gold kite 3
“Then, A divided it for himself and his accomplices, and they gave me 3 kites of gold” 
(P. BM EA 10054, r° 3,9)

Ramses IX – Tomb Robberies

b) A1 is referred to in the following sentence, but A2 is not. In this case, A2 is best explained as a COMITATIVE:

Ex. 74

wn.in p3 hrd hr iy.t r pwy.t hn5 n3
CJVB:CNSV ART:M SG boy SEQ come:INF to jump:INF with ART:PL
hrd.w <n>=n3 wr.w

Ramses IX – Tomb Robberies

32 For the expression iri wง irm A, see below §4.5.

33 See also Horus and Seth 4,3: iw ง hr dd n hr hn5 sth: ‘t.dd rงn’ “and he said to Horus and Seth: ‘Speak out!’ ”.
When and meets with

When and meets with 357

iw=f hr pwy.t
SEQ=3SG.M SEQ jump:INF

“The then the boy went to jump with the children of the princes, and he jumped (...)
(Doomed Prince, 6,5)

XIXth dyn. – Literary, Narrative

Ex. 75 di-i tw r t3 c.t-sb3 hnc ms.w wr.w
give:PST=1SG 2SG.M to ART:F.SG school with child-PL noble-PL
r sb3=k (...)
to educate:INF=2SG.M (...)
ptr twi hr dd n-k p3 shr n ss
ATTN PRS-1SG PRS say:INF to=2SG.M ART:M.SG condition PGEN scribe
“I put you at school together with the offspring of the nobles to educate you (...)
look, I tell you the condition of the scribe”
(P. Anastasi V, 22,6)
Seti II – Miscellaneies

The following example is different because hnε X is part of the argument structure of dd in the phraseological expression “to argue against X” (see 3.3.5):

Ex. 76 (date) hrw pn dd ir.n A hnc B m-biḥ ss
(date) day DEM:M.SG say:INF do:REL:PST A and B before scribe
n tm3 C
PGN mat C
iw=tw hr swd n=f p3 c3 bin
SEQ=3SG.C SEQ give:INF to=3SG.M ART:M.SG ass bad
“(date) on this day A disputed against B before the scribe of the mat C. One gave
him the bad ass”
(O. DeM 73, r 1-3)
Ramses III – Judicial matters

4.4 Negation

As a general remark, one should note that in some languages (as in French or
English), the form of the coordinator can be directly affected by the presence of a
negation (Fr. ni, Eng. nor, neither, etc.). This is not the case in Egyptian, where,
broadly speaking, the negative system does not seem to affect the type of coordi-
nands: there is no alternation of the type quelque chose vs. rien or quelqu’un vs. ne ...
personne.

Two cases should be here considered: The scope of the negation can fall either on
A1 and A2 or on A1 alone.

a) The scope of the negation falls on A1 and A2. In this case, A2 is best explained as
the second coordinand:

Ex. 77 iw bw rḥ n3 imy.w-r ḫs.wt hnc
SBRD NEG know:PST ART:PL director-PL foreign_country-PL and
n3 wr.w (...) dd n=sn
ART:PL chief-PL (...) say:INF to=3PL
“While the directors of the foreign countries and the chiefs (...) were unable to
say to them (...)”
(Qadech, Bulletin, § 65 I)
Ramses II – Royal Inscription

Ex. 78  
\[ m^{-dy} \text{ } 'h^{-w} \text{ } m \text{ } 'h^{-c} \text{ } nb \text{ } hn^{-r} \text{ } PN \]

PROH:CAUS stand:SBJV=3PL in stand-by all and PN

“And do not let them stand in any stand-by, and PN as well”

(P. Berlin 10949, v^o 1)

Ramses XI – Letter

Ex. 79  
\[ mtw^{-k} \text{ } tm \text{ } di.t \text{ } i'd \text{ } hm^{-t} \text{ } šri \text{ } m \text{ } nkt \]

CONJ=2SG.M NEG CAUS:INF be_in_need:SBJV Hemetsheri in anything

hn^{-r} A \text{ } nšy.s \text{ } 'tdd \text{ } šri

and A POS:PL=3SG.F child-M.PL small-M.PL

“And you won’t let Hemetsheri be in need of anything nor A her small children”

(P. Leiden I 370, v^o 11)

Ramses XI – Letter

Ex. 80  
\[ is \text{ } bn \text{ } twi \text{ } rh.kw \text{ } n³ \text{ } hy \text{ } n \]

Q NEG PRS-1SG know:RES-1SG ART:PL inspector-M.PL PGEN

mdy.w \text{ } hn^{-r} \text{ } nšy.sn \text{ } šhn \text{ } knw

medjay-M.PL and POSS:PL=3SG.F requirement-M.PL numerous-M.PL

“Do I not know the inspectors of the Medjay nor their numerous requirements/orders?”

(P. Anastasi V, 26,4)

Seti II – Miscellanies

Ex. 81  
\[ iw \text{ } <mn> \text{ } bšy \text{ } mh.t \text{ } hn^{-r} \text{ } tbw \]

SBRD [NEG] bšy-vessel mh.t-vesSEL and tbw-vessel

“But there are no bšy-vessel, no mh.t-vessel, and no tbw-vessel”

(P. Berlin 10496, r^o 14)

Ramses III – Judicial matters

b) The scope of the negation falls A\textsubscript{1} alone. In this case, A\textsubscript{2} is best explained as a

COMITATIVE:

Ex. 82  
\[ iw \text{ } bwpw \text{ } nšy^{-f} \text{ } sn.w \text{ } ir \text{ } irm^{-f} \]

SBRD NEG POSS:PL=3SG.M brother-M.PL do:INF with=3SG.M

“But his brothers have not done (anything) with him”

(O. Petrie 16, v^o 2)

XX^th dyn. – Judicial matters

Ex. 83  
\[ hh \text{ } iw \text{ } bwpw^{-w} \text{ } krs \text{ } irm \text{ } pšy^{-i} \text{ } it \]

CORD SBRD NEG=3PL bury:INF with POSS:M.SG=1SG father

“although they did not make the burial with my father”

(P. Boulaq X, r^o 9)

Ramses III – Judicial matters

Ex. 84  
\[ iw \text{ } bwpw^{-f} \text{ } kd \text{ } im^{-f} \text{ } irm^{-i} \]

SBRD NEG=3SG.M build:INF in=3SG.M with=1SG

“But he had not built in it with me”

(O. BM EA 5625, r^o 8)

Ramses V – Oracular procedure

Ex. 85  
\[ iw \text{ } bwpw^{-w} \text{ } šm \text{ } r \text{ } tly \text{ } s.t \text{ } irm^{-f} \text{ } n \]

SBRD NEG=3PL go:INF to DEM:F.SG place-F with={3SG.M}1PL

“But they did not go to this place with us”

(P. BM EA 10052, r^o 5,19)

XX^th dyn. – Tomb Robberies

4.5 Argument structure and phraseology

The PrepP introduced by hn^{-r} or irm is part of the argument structure of the verb. In such cases, the preposition is not a coordinator. The most frequent expressions found in our corpus are listed below. Some have already a long history at the beginning of
When and meets with

the XIXth dynasty; they are first attested with *hn*, before shifting to *irm* during the XXth dynasty:35

- *iri w* *irm* “to act together with”;
- *ḥḥi hn*/ *irm* “to fight against”;
- *wpi hn*/ *irm* “to judge between”;
- *mdw hn*/ *irm* “to discuss with, to have an argument with”;
- *sḏm irm* “to hear a deposition against”;
- *tti* *hn*/ *irm* “to quarrel with”.

4.6 Principle of Thematic Continuity

In the flow of discourse or narration, a thematic subject tends to remain unchanged, which means that if a new actor is introduced, it will be preferably treated rather like a COMITATIVE than a coordinated subject. Thus, the following discursive or narrative chain (if the referent of A1 is identical)


is more natural – at least more frequently found – than


The following examples are illustrations of this phenomenon I have proposed elsewhere to call the Principle of Thematic Continuity (PTC):36

Ex. 86 *wnn tAy= i Sa.t Hr spr<br>when POSS: F. SG = 1SG letter PRS reach: INF <to>= 2SG M
iw=k hr šm.t irm A
SEQ= 2SG M SEQ go: INF with A
mwt=k sMi n ūty hr pš ḫd ḫš (…)
CONJ= 2SG.M make_report: INF to vizier about the silver numerous (…)
“As soon as my letter reaches you, you’ll go with A, and you make a report to the vizier about the excessive amount of silver (…)” (P. Bologna 1094, 6,3)
Merenptah – Letter

Ex. 87 *iw<s í> (hr) ptr nǐ s.wt
SEQ= [1SG] [SEQ] inspect: INF ART: PL place-F. PL
iw=i (hr) šm irm pš hry-mdšy. w n pš hr
SEQ= 1SG [SEQ] go: INF with ART: M. SG chief_of Madjoy PGEN the Tomb
iw=i hr dl t hšy hry-mdšy. w A r pš ḫ-hw. t
SEQ= 1SG SEQ CAUS: INF descend: SJ IV chief_of Madjoy A to the shaft-F
“I inspected the tombs, and I went with the chief of the Madjoy of the Tomb, and I caused the chief of the Madjoy A to descend in the shaft”
(O. Florence 2621, ν° 5-7)
Ramses III – Judicial matters

35 Some of these verbs will later replace *hn*/ *irm* by *m-di* (cf. above, fn. 14).
4.7 Diachrony

From the second half of the XXth dynasty onwards, \(hn^r\) is better understood as a coordinator when it stands in opposition to \(irm\) (see below).

4.8 Conclusion

The table below lists the points that have been discussed in the preceding sections. Although some patterns are clearly diagnostic of a COORDINATION or a COMITATIVE respectively, some configurations (like the last two shaded ones) are difficult to call and remain indecisive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Comitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A_1) (A_2) – V</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A_1) (hn^r/irm) (A_2) – V</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A_1) – V (hn^r/irm) (A_2) – NP</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A_1) – V – NP – (hn^r/irm) (A_2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in status</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC (A_1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td>Scope on (A_1) and (A_2)</td>
<td>Scope on (A_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diachrony</td>
<td>(hn^r) (from mid-XXth dyn.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(A_2\) is part of frozen phraseology | ✔

Anaphoric Continuity | ✔

From a typological perspective, some conclusions can be drawn:

- As regards coordination of NPs, Late Egyptian clearly belongs to the group of WITH-languages\(^{37}\), but one should also note that in later Egyptian (Coptic) there will be a new typological shift to verb-based coordination.
- Egyptian displays a strong tendency to avoid multiple NPs in the subject slot. This trend manifests itself, among others, in the segmentation of complex sentences (with multiple subject or multiple predicate) into small sentences.\(^{38}\)

---

38 This would of course justify a study of its own.
Ex. 89  
*m-mitt*  
twi  
*m-ḥsr*  

Furthermore  
PRS-1SG  
excellently  
ART:M.SG  
land [PGEN]  
Pharaoh

lḥ excellently

“The Furthermore, I am in good condition, the land of Pharaoh, lḥ, is in good condition” (P. Anastasi V, 13,1)

Merenptah – Miscellanies

Ex. 90  
4 *isw.t*  
iw=w  
k3  
sp 2  

4  
plank-F.PL  
SBRD=3PL  
be long:RES-3PL  
time 2  
iw:w  
nfr  
zp 2  
iw=w  
wsḥ

SBRD=3PL  
be good:RES-3PL  
time 2  
SBRD=3PL  
be large:RES-3PL

“4 planks, being very long, very good and very large” (P. Anastasi IV, 8,4-5)

Merenptah – Miscellanies

From a more general perspective, there is an evolution in Later Egyptian (Late Egyptian, Demotic, Coptic) to avoid nominal subject in (Aux) – S – V patterns in favour of a pronominal subject whose lexical referent is expressed outside the predicative core. This will eventually lead to something close to what is known as clitic doubling in general literature.\(^\text{39}\)

5  *irm* and *ḥn*\(^\text{c}\)

The last issue to be discussed is the relation between the two prepositions *ḥn*\(^\text{c}\) and *irm*. In our corpus, there are 144 examples of *ḥn*\(^\text{c}\) and 141 examples of *irm* that are relevant for the discussion (see figures). In the first figure, the piles represent the relative part of *ḥn*\(^\text{c}\) in the distribution; the numbers at the bottom are the combined sum of *ḥn*\(^\text{c}\) and *irm* for the period considered. Thus, the first pile (end of the 18\(^\text{th}\) dyn.) reads as follows: there are 7 tokens, all of them (100%) involving *ḥn*\(^\text{c}\). One should also note that the figures take into account the chronology: the width of the piles varies according to the duration of the reigns.

\(^\text{39}\) Cf. Winand (forthcoming b).
The second figure presents the same data in another way to show the contrastive evolution of the two prepositions. As expected, one can observe a regular decline in the use of $hn^c$ during the New Kingdom: from 100 % in the XVIII\textsuperscript{th}, it falls to 8 % in the XXI\textsuperscript{st} dynasty.

Fig. 2. The contrasted evolution of $hn^c$ and $irm$ during the New Kingdom and the XXI\textsuperscript{st} dyn.

From the first figure, one can see that although the respective evolution of $hn^c$ and $irm$ is quite regular, there are some interrupting peaks; their presence can be explained for good reasons:

- during the reign of Ramses V, $hn^c$ rises again up to 72 %: out of 18 tokens, 10 come from a literary piece of work, namely the tale of Horus and Seth, where $hn^c$ is attested 10 times;
- during the reign of Ramses II, there is a first significative presence of $irm$: it is probably not a coincidence that out of 7 cases, 5 come from the Hittite treaty, that is from a text which is a translation from Akkadian and thus is more open – to a certain extent – to some linguistic innovations.

The process of substitution of $irm$ for $hn^c$ can be substantiated by studying the argument structure in some phraseological expressions, for in such cases, there are obviously no possible difference of meaning between the two prepositions:

\textbf{Ex. 91} \begin{align*}
mtw-k & \quad ps-w & \quad 5k3 \\
CONJ=2SG.M & \quad divide:INF=3PL & \quad exactly
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
sp & \quad sn & \quad hn^c & \quad t3-md\beta t \\
time & \quad 2 & \quad with & \quad sculptor A
\end{align*}

“And divide them exactly with the sculptor A” 
(O. DeM 10097, r\textsuperscript{o} 3-v\textsuperscript{o} 1)

Ramses II - Declaration

\textbf{Ex. 92} \begin{align*}
iw-i & \quad r & \quad ps-f & \quad irm-k \\
FUT=1SG & \quad FUT & \quad divide:INF=3SG.M & \quad with=2SG.M
\end{align*}

“I shall divide it with you” 
(O. Geneva 12550, r\textsuperscript{o} 6)

Ramses III – Judicial matters

\textbf{Ex. 93} \begin{align*}
mdw & \quad hn^c & \quad whmw \\
speak:IMP & \quad with & \quad herald A
\end{align*}

“Speak with the herald A” 
(P. DeB 2, 3)

XVIII\textsuperscript{th} dyn. – Letter

\textbf{Ex. 94} \begin{align*}
m-ir & \quad mdw & \quad irm & \quad rmt & \quad n-c\delta \\
VET & \quad speak:INF & \quad with & \quad people-M.PL & \quad wrongly
\end{align*}

“Do not speak with people wrongly” 
(P. BM EA 10474, 13,15)

XX-XXI\textsuperscript{th} dyn. – Literature, Wisdom text
When and meets with

Ex. 95  iw=f hr sdr hnε tly=f hm.t m pid grh
SEQ=3SG.M SEQ sleep:INF with POSS:F.SG=3SG.M wife-F in ART:M.SG night
“And he went to sleep with his wife during the night”  (Doomed Prince, v° 4,2)
Early XIXth dy – Literary, Narrative

Ex. 96  iw=f hr sdr irm-s m pid grh
SEQ=3SG.M SEQ sleep:INF with=3SG.F in ART:M.SG night
“And he went to sleep with her during the night”  (Truth and Falsehood, r° 4,4)
Late XIXth dy. – Literary, Narrative

Ex. 97  p3-wn twi hr t(t)(t) hnε A
because PRS-1SG PRS quarrel:INF with A
“Because I am quarrelling with A”  (O. Prague 1826, 3)
XIXth dy. – Declaration

Ex. 98  [m] dy iry=i tt*t irm=k
PROH:CAUS do:SBJV=1SG quarrel:INF with=2SG.M
“Do not make me quarrel with you”  (P. Mallet VI,11)
Ramses IV – Judicial matters

Ex. 99  wnn p3 itn hr wbn iw=m hr wp.t
when ART:M.SG sun PRS rise:INF SEQ=1SG SEQ intend_an_action:INF
hnε-k m-b3h=f
with=2SG.M before=3SG.M
“As soon as the Sun rises, I shall intend an action against you before him”  
(Two Brothers, 7,1)
Seti II – Literary, Narrative

Ex. 100  wp=i irm rmt-is.t
intend_an_action:SBJV=1SG with member_of_the_crew A
“I shall intend an action against the member of the crew A”  (O. Petrie 21, r° 3)
Ramses III – Oracular procedure

Ex. 101  iw=f hms hnε tly=f hm.t
SBRD=3SG.M be sitting:RES-3SG.M with POSS:F.SG=3SG.M wife-F
“When he was sitting with his wife”  (Two Brothers, 1,6)
Seti II – Literary, Narrative

Ex. 102  iw=i dy hms.tw wε.kw irm {irm}
SBRD=1SG here stay:RES-1SG be_alone:RES-1SG with {with}
ss-m$s p-n-t3-hw.t-nht
army_scribe Pentahutnakht
“(They are in town) while I am presently staying alone with the army scribe Pentahutnakht”40
(P. Berlin 10494, 8-9)
End of the XXth dyn. – Letter

The respective semantic domains of hnε and irm can also be studied by considering the texts where both are used. From the available evidence, it is clear that irm is on the WITH-side and hnε is on the AND-side:

Ex. 103  iw=i thε.kw hr kd irm A hnε B
SBRD=1SG stand:RES-1SG PROG build:INF with A and B
“As I was working with A and B”  (P. Berlin 10496, r° 10)
Ramses III – Judicial matters

40 On dy as a temporal marker, see Winand (2006: 400-402).
In the late XX\textsuperscript{th} dynasty, Late Egyptian, texts that follow a higher linguistic standard seem to observe this “rule” rather strictly. For instance, in the Great Tomb-Robberies corpus, this is the case in P. Abbott, a document where several conservative features are still in use.\footnote{See Winand (forthcoming c, more specifically §2.2.4).}

In this respect, one can also note that the combination Prep NP\textsubscript{1} + \textit{irm} NP\textsubscript{2} is attested only twice, but Prep NP\textsubscript{1} + \textit{hn}\textsuperscript{f} NP\textsubscript{2} is found everywhere, which shows how long it took for \textit{irm} to take over in some syntactic slots. In the texts where \textit{irm} has been used, the combination Prep NP\textsubscript{1} + \textit{hn}\textsuperscript{f} NP\textsubscript{2} is also present in the same phraseological context:

\begin{verbatim}
Ex. 108 hr p3-ha tw hwt+f l i.ir-f hr p3-b3k-k3mn

because ART:M.SG hit:INF=3SG.M do:REL.PST=3SG.M with Pabakkamen
i.wn m c3 n c.t l irm n3 h/m.wt
to be:PTCP in chief PGEN department-F with ART:PL woman-F.PL
“Because he made a common cause with Pabakkamen who was chief of the
department together with the women” (P. Turin 1875, 4,3)
Ramses IV – Judicial matters
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Ex. 109 hr p3 hwt-f l i.ir-f hr ty h/m.wt

because ART:M.SG hit:INF=3SG.M do:REL.PST=3SG.M with Ty and
n3 h/m.wt <n> pr-hn\textsuperscript{r}
“Because he made a common cause with Ty and the women of the Harem”
(P. Turin 1875, 4,2)
Ramses IV – Judicial matters
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Ex. 110 iw l Šd-s m-dr.t shm.t l irm p3y-s Šri
FUT=1SG protect:INF=3SG.F from Sekhmet and POSS:M.SG=3SG.M son
“I shall protect her from Sekhmet and her son” (P. BM EA 10251, 59)
XX\textsuperscript{II}nd-XX\textsuperscript{III}rd dyn. – Oracular decree
\end{verbatim}
When and meets with

Ex. 111  lw=i  sd=s  m-dr.tn;i  ntr.w  <n>  t3
FUT=1SG protect:INF=3SG.F. from ART:PL god-M.PL  [PGEN] ART:F.SG
p.t  hn*r  sbly  nb.t  (...)  heaven and star-M.PL  all  (...)
“I shall protect her from the gods of the heaven and all the stars (...)”
(P. BM EA 10251, 35)

XXII*-XXIII*-dyn. – Oracular decree

But in other syntactic environments, irm is widely used from the second half of the XX* dynasty onwards to express coordination. For instance, in the same document coming from the Oracular Amuletic Decrees, a corpus of texts that is a bit later (XXII*-XXIII*-dynasty) than the corpus of reference as defined above, one finds:

Ex. 112  ir  p3  nb  nty  hr  p3y  dm*r  i,gd  GN  irm
TOPZ  ART:M.SG  all  REL  on  DEM:M.SG  document  say:REL.PST  GN  and
p3  nb  nty  bwphw  gm  hr  p3  dm*r  (...)
ART:M.SG  all  REL  NEG  find:INF  on  ART:M.SG  document  (...)
“As for whatever is on this document that GN said and whatever one could not find on the document (...)”
(P. BM EA 10251, v* 53-56)

XXII*-XXIII*-dyn. – Oracular decree

This suggests that during the Ramesside times irm gradually took over most of the uses of hn*r. The latter however was not eliminated, but rather confined to a specific semantic field (COORDINATION), and increasingly to a syntactic niche (Prep NP1 hn*r NP2), where irm was barely found. It is tempting to postulate that irm was originally used only as a means to express the COMITATIVE. But this is not supported by the available evidence, for from the reign of Ramses II onwards, irm can express COMITATIVE and COORDINATION. Of course, both functions do not seem to be on a par, as the examples of COMITATIVE definitely outnumber that of COORDINATION (16 vs. 3).
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