The genesis of a negative agentive nominalizer

The journey of jwtj between Old Egyptian and Coptic
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Towards a definition

- An **agentive nominalization construction** is defined here as
  1. a morphosyntactic construction
  2. that includes an action-denoting root
  3. refers to the agent of the action
  4. and behaves syntactically like a noun
Agentive nominalization constructions

Towards a definition

- An **agentive nominalization construction** is defined here as
  1. a morphosyntactic construction
  2. that includes an action-denoting root
  3. refers to the agent of the action
  4. and behaves syntactically like a noun

- Agentive nominalizations can denote semantic roles other than agent (English *kill-er*, but also *dream-er*).

- Others may be limited to a particular specialized type of agent, (Malay *tukang* ‘skilled craftsman,’ which in Papuan Malay was generalized (*tukang tipu* (NMLZ lie) ‘liar’).
Agentive nominalization constructions
Towards a definition

- An **agentive nominalization construction** is defined here as
  1. a morphosyntactic construction
  2. that includes an action-denoting root
  3. refers to the agent of the action
  4. and behaves syntactically like a noun

- However, for comparative purposes, a language-specific construction is considered to be an agentive nominalization if it meets the above definition

- It also has to be grammaticalized, i.e., the function is **coded** rather than a matter of **inference**
Agentive nominalization constructions

A typological approach to ANC

- ANCs are frequent in the world’s languages (Bauer 2002, Comrie & Thompson 2007, Baker & Vinokurova 2009, Luschützky & Rainer 2011) but not universal.

- For example, in Bauer’s sample, 24 out of 42 languages have ANCs (but notice that 18 don’t!)
Agentive nominalization constructions
A typological approach to ANC

- ANCs are cross-linguistically common because they
  1. Mostly develop from a very frequent type of change, grammaticalization (TYPE).
  2. Develop through numerous converging pathways of grammaticalization (PATH).
  3. Often do not require complex or multi-stage pathways of development (STAGE).
  4. Have cross-linguistically frequent source constructions (SOURCE).
  5. Tend to be stable, once grammaticalized (STABILITY).
  6. Tend to be borrowed (BORROWABILITY)

(Grossman 2016)
Agentive nominalization constructions
A typological approach to ANC

- A proposed universal of agentive nominalization constructions

  “agentive nominalizations do not have any verbal features,” explicitly excluding negation, valency, and adverbial modification (Baker & Vinokurova 2009)
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A typological approach to ANC

- A proposed universal of agentive nominalization constructions

  “agentive nominalizations do not have any verbal features,” explicitly excluding negation, valency, and adverbial modification (Baker & Vinokurova 2009)

- Valency/transitivity

(1) Giziga (Central Chadic)

\[ húf \text{ ‘farm’} \quad mù-húf \text{ ‘farmer’} \]

\[ mí-yí-dò-y \]
NMLZ-give.birth-1SG.POSS-PL
‘my parents’ (‘my birthers’)
Agentive nominalization constructions
A typological approach to ANC

- A proposed universal of agentive nominalization constructions

  “agentive nominalizations do not have any verbal features,” explicitly excluding negation, valency, and adverbial modification (Baker & Vinokurova 2009)

- Valency/transitivity

(2) Coptic (Afroasiatic, Layton 2004)

pa-ref-šop-t        ero-f
my-NMLZ-take-1SG.P  DAT-3SGM

‘My helper (he who takes me unto him)’
Agentive nominalization constructions

A typological approach to ANC

- A proposed universal of agentive nominalization constructions

  “agentive nominalizations do not have any verbal features,” explicitly excluding negation, valency, and adverbial modification (Baker & Vinokurova 2009)

- Valency/transitivity

(3) Coptic (Afroasiatic, Layton 2004)

at-nau
NMLZ.NEG-see
‘blind’ (‘one who does not see’)

at-nau       ero-f
NMLZ.NEG-see  DAT-3SG.M
‘invisible’ (‘one who (they) do not see him’)

Agentive nominalization constructions
A typological approach to ANC

A proposed universal of agentive nominalization constructions

“agentive nominalizations do not have any verbal features,” explicitly excluding negation, valency, and adverbial modification (Baker & Vinokurova 2009)

- Valency/transitivity
- Adverbial modification

(4) Ainu (isolate, Japan, Shibatani 1990)

$tunas \quad ek-\text{pe}$

fast \quad come-NMLZ

‘A fast comer, one who comes fast’
Agentive nominalization constructions

A typological approach to ANC

A proposed universal of agentive nominalization constructions

“agentive nominalizations do not have any verbal features,” explicitly excluding negation, valency, and adverbial modification (Baker & Vinokurova 2009)

- Valency/transitivity
- Adverbial modification
- Negation: (5) Matses (Panoan, W. Amazonia)

Table 4.24. Negative participant nominalizers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Tense/Aspect</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-esa</td>
<td>S/A</td>
<td>Habitual</td>
<td>‘one who does not V’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-témaid</td>
<td>O/Inst</td>
<td>Habitual</td>
<td>‘one that can’t be V-ed/is not for V-ing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-acmaid</td>
<td>O/Inst</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>‘one that has never been V-ed.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nédacmaid</td>
<td>O/Inst</td>
<td>Distant Past Perfect</td>
<td>‘one that has never been V-ed (despite having wanted to for a long time.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agentive nominalization constructions
A typological approach to ANC

- A proposed universal of agentive nominalization constructions

  “agentive nominalizations do not have any verbal features,” explicitly excluding negation, valency, and adverbial modification (Baker & Vinokurova 2009)

- Valency/transitivity
- Adverbial modification
- Negation: (5) Matses

(145) isan pe-esa shaē ne-e-c
    palm.species eat-Neg.S/A.Nzr giant.anteater be-Npast-Indic
    ‘Giant anteaters are ones that do not eat isan palm fruits.’

(146) abuc cani-esa mio ne-e-c
    high grow-Neg.S/A.Nzr palm.species be-Npast-Indic
    ‘The mio palm is one that does not grow tall.’
Agentive nominalization constructions

A typological approach to ANC

- A proposed universal of agentive nominalization constructions

  “agentive nominalizations do not have any verbal features,” explicitly excluding negation, valency, and adverbial modification (Baker & Vinokurova 2009)

- Valency/transitivity
- Adverbial modification
- Negation

(6) Coptic

ref-sôtm ‘hearer’
at-sôtm ‘unhearing one, disobedient one’

ref-sooun ‘knower’
at-sooun ‘one who does not know’
Agentive nominalization constructions

A typological approach to ANC

- A proposed universal of agentive nominalization constructions
  
  “agentive nominalizations do not have any verbal features,” explicitly excluding negation, valency, and adverbial modification (Baker & Vinokurova 2009)

- Valency/transitivity
- Adverbial modification
- Negation

Coptic *at-* has two distinct functions (Shisha-Halevy 1990):

- *at¹* – noun-to-noun (adjective?) privative derivational prefix, possibly paradigmatic with *rmn-*

  - *rmn-noute* ‘godly’
  - *at-noute* ‘godless’
Agentive nominalization constructions

A typological approach to ANC

A proposed universal of agentive nominalization constructions

“agentive nominalizations do not have any verbal features,” explicitly excluding negation, valency, and adverbial modification (Baker & Vinokurova 2009)

- Valency/transitivity
- Adverbial modification
- Negation

Coptic at- has two distinct functions (Shisha-Halevy 1990):

- at\(^1\) – noun-to-noun (adjective?) privative derivational prefix, possibly paradigmatic with rmn-
- at\(^2\) – deverbal negative agentive nominalizer (“who does not VERB”), paradigmatic with ref-
  - ref-nahte ‘believer’
  - at-nahte ‘unbeliever’
Negative agentive nominalizers

A typological point of view
Negative agentive nominalizers

A typological point of view

- They are not non-existent; they are, however, rare
- The only known source for negative agentive nominalizers is negative relativizers and similar constructions
- This type of source construction seems to be very rare, cross-linguistically
Negative agentive nominalizers

A typological point of view

Aguaruna (Jivaroan, Overall 2007)

a. yuwátsu
   yu-a-t₅au
   eat-HIAF-NEG:REL
   ‘one who has not eaten’

b. yútsau
   yu-t₅au
   eat-NEG:REL
   ‘one who does not eat’
Negative agentive nominalizers
A typological point of view

- They are not non-existent; they are, however, rare
- The only known source for negative agentive nominalizers is negative relativizers and similar constructions
- This type of source construction seems to be very rare, cross-linguistically
  - Cross-linguistically rare construction types are not ruled out by Universal Grammar-style constraints on learnability
  - They are the result of the convergence of diachronic factors
Negative agentive nominalizers

A typological point of view

- They are not non-existent; they are, however, rare

- The only known source for negative agentive nominalizers is negative relativizers and similar constructions

- This type of source construction seems to be very rare, cross-linguistically
  - Cross-linguistically rare construction types are not ruled out by Universal Grammar-style constraints on learnability
  - They are the result of the convergence of diachronic factors
  - The inherent semantics of such constructions makes them less likely to be talked about, and hence to be grammaticalized

‘(...) nouns describe natural classes, and ‘eaters’ is a natural class, because all ‘eaters’ have a property in common, that of eating. By contrast, ‘non-eaters’ is not a natural class, because they have no positive property in common, only lack of a property’ (Overall 2007: 417)
The Ancient Egyptian case is important for understanding ANCIs, because its lengthy attestation allows us to study its actual pathway of diachronic development.
The genesis and diachrony of a negative agent nominalizer

How did jwtj become at-?
The genesis and diachrony of $at$-

- $jwtj$: a negative relative adjective

$iw.t\ j \ D \ = \ 8$

(vom vorstehenden $iwt$ gebildet).
welcher nicht ... ist,
"welcher nicht ..." 1.

Kopt. $\alpha T-$. 

\[ \frac{\text{\(\text{\(iw.tj\)}\)}}{\text{\(\text{\(\alpha T\)}\)}} \] \(\alpha T- (\tilde{\text{\(N\)}} \text{\(\alpha T\)} \) "ohne"

($Wb.$ I, 46,1-47-3; $CD$ 18b; ČED 13; $KHWb$ 13 & 489; $DELC$ 17b)
The genesis and diachrony of *at-

- *jwtj*: a negative relative adjective

- “doubtless a *nisbe* adjective from the feminine of an obsolete equivalent *iw* surviving only in the O.E. negative particle ‘that not ……”” (Gardiner 1957: 152, §202)

For its etymology, see e.g. Edel (1955-1964: §345, 1054); Satzinger (1968: 63-64, §102-103); Gilula (1970: 213); Gilula (1971: 17); Allen (2014: 355) “[jwtj] is actually just a nisbe of the word *jwt* that marks negated noun clauses in Old and early Middle Egyptian.”
The genesis and diachrony of *at-

- *jwtj*: a negative relative adjective

- "doubtless a *nisbe* adjective from the feminine of an obsolete equivalent *iw* surviving only in the O.E. negative particle ‘that not ……’ " (Gardiner 1957\(^3\): 152, §202)

- For the reading *jwtj* (and the like), see already Erman (1893: 82-83), Sethe (1912) and Gardiner (1948). On the distinction between *jwtj* and *nj* (with negative-circumstantial value), see Gunn (1948). In favour of the (old scholarly) reading *jnjwtj* (and the like), see Hamza (1929) and Weill (1950).
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at-}

- Formal and functional evolution of the patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj} - between OEg and Coptic
- The loss of resumption
- The functions of \textit{jwtj}-headed phrases and clauses
The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

Formal and functional evolution between OEg and Coptic
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

For Gardiner (1957\textsuperscript{3}: 152, §203), “[t]he negative relative adjective is used like \textit{nty}, only more rarely, and with a few additional employments. The corresponding main clauses may be seen by substituting \textit{nn} (or \textit{n}) for \textit{iwty}.”

Satzinger (1968: §94) regards essentially \textit{jwtj} as a “Relativform für das negative Prädikat \textit{nn}”

Gilula (1970: 213) states that “\textit{iwty} (…) is the nominalization (the subordinated, substantivized form) of the negative word \textit{n} and possibly also \textit{nn}. \textit{iwty} enables the negative construction to function as a substantive or an attribute. (…) Nearly all the patterns which are found with \textit{n} are also found with its nominalized form \textit{iwty.”

For Loprieno (1995: 70) “These morphemes \textit{[jwtj, jwtt, jwtj.w]} represent a semantic fusion of relative element (\textit{ntj}) plus negative operator (\textit{nj} for verbal sentences, \textit{nn} for nominal and adverbial sentences)”
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

Resumption findet regelmäßig statt, unabhängig davon, welcher Satzteil zum Nukleus wird, auch im Falle des Objekts und sogar des Subjekts.

Beispiele:
- \(iw.tl \leftarrow n\) (auch: *n-sp*):
  
  \(iw.t(i) \hat{\&}r.n \, r(m)\hat{\&}t(w) \, \hat{\&}p(t(w)) \, (l)r\hat{\&}f\)
  
  »einer, dessen nicht derselbe hat die Nacht verbrachte«
  (BM 159,11 – negativer Generalis)

  \(iw.t(i)-sp \, ir\hat{\&}f \, sm.t \, m\hat{\&}c(w) \, nb.(w)\)
  
  »der niemals tat, was irgendwelche Menschen verstimmt«
  (Urk. I 47,5)

  \(iw.t(i) \, wn.t \, gm\hat{\&}t\)
  
  »eines, dessen Schwäche es nicht gibt« (Urk. I 192,14)

- \(iw.tl \leftarrow nm:\)

  \(iw.t(i) \, s\hat{\&}t\)
  
  »der keinen Sohn hat« (Urk. I 201,3)

  \(iw.tl \, n\hat{\&}f \, 5w\)
  
  »der ihn (einen, scil. bekannten, Vater) nicht hat« (Adm. 4,1)

Schenkel (2005; 2012)
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The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}
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The patterns introduced by $jwtj$
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The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

- OEv
- MEv
- LEv

REL.NEG

REL.NEG.EXIST
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

Finite verb forms

\[ jwtj \, zp \, sdm=f \]

\[ jnk \, (...) \, jwtj \, zp \, irj=f \, Snn.t \, rm\,t \, nb \] (Urk. I, 47,5)

“I am (...) one who never did what people would suffer from”
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

Finite verb forms

\[ jwtj \ zp \ sdm=f \]
\[ jwtj \ sdm(.w)=f \]

\( jnk (\ldots) jwtj \ zp \ irj=f \ snn.t \ rm\ t \ nb \) (Urk. I, 47,5)
“I am (…) one who never did what people would suffer from”

\( jwtj.t \ jn, 4 \) (P. Cairo 58063, tab. 54c, 2,3 [Abusir])
“what has not been delivered: 4 (units)”
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at-}

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

Finite verb forms

\textit{jwtj \textit{zp sdm}=f}
\textit{jwtj sdm(.w)=f}
\textit{jwtj sdm=f}

\textit{jnk (…) jwtj \textit{zp} \textit{irj}=f \textit{snn.t rmt nb} (Urk. I, 47,5)}
“I am (…) one who never did what people would suffer from”

\textit{jwtj.t \textit{jn}, 4 (P. Cairo 58063, tab. 54c, 2,3 [Abusir])}
“what has not been delivered: 4 (units)”

\textit{jwt(j) \textit{nhr jr.w t3} \textit{c}=f (Pyr. 1022a-b)}
“(This King NN is a hill of earth in the midst of the sea), whose arm those of the earth cannot grasp”

Allen (1984: 223-224, §341) “The negative relative \textit{jwtj} occurs with the \textit{sdm.f} in one passage in the Pyramid Texts. The tense is present (gnomic)”
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at-}

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

Finite verb forms

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG} & : \text{jwtj } zp \ sdm=f \\
\text{MEG} & : \text{jwtj } sdm(.w)=f \\
\text{LEG} & : \text{jwtj } sdm=f \\
\text{REL.NEG} & : \text{jwtj } sdm.n=f
\end{align*}

\text{REL.NEG.EXIST}

\begin{align*}
\text{jnk} \ (\ldots) \ \text{jwtj } zp \ irj=f \ s\!n.n \ rmt \ nb \ \text{(Urk. I, 47,5)}
\end{align*}

\text{“I am (\ldots) one who never did what people would suffer from”}

\begin{align*}
\text{jwtt.jn}, \ 4 \ \text{(P. Cairo 58063, tab. 54c, 2,3 [Abusir])}
\end{align*}

\text{“what has not been delivered: 4 (units)”}

\begin{align*}
\text{jwt(j) } n\!d\!r \ jr.w \ t3 \ ^c=f \ \text{(Pyr. 1022a-b)}
\end{align*}

\text{“(This King NN is a hill of earth in the midst of the sea), whose arm those of the earth cannot grasp”}

\begin{align*}
\text{twt } sb^j \ pw \ w^c tj \ (\ldots) \ \text{jwtj } r_d.n=f \ dt=f \ n \ \text{hrw} \ d3\!tj \ \text{(Pyr. 877c-d [P])}
\end{align*}

\text{“you are this unique star (\ldots) that does not give its body to Horus of the Netherworld”}

\text{Allen (1984: 298, §442) “The relative negation jwtj } sdm.n=f\text{ appears in the Pyramid Texts with transitive and intransitive verbs. All examples have generic sense”.}
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The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

**Finite verb forms**

- *jwtj zp sdm=f*
- *jwtj sdm(.w)=f*
- *jwtj sdm=f*
- *jwtj sdm.n=f*

**Substantival/Adverbial predication**

- *jwtj NP js pw*

---

“If he takes them away for any work which is not at all an offering for me, (then …)”

(Urk. I, 162,16)
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

Finite verb forms

- *jwtj* zp sdm=f
- *jwtj* sdm(.w)=f
- *jwtj* sdm=f
- *jwtj* sdm.n=f

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- *jwtj* NP js pw

Negative existential

- *jwtj* wn.t NP=f

---

**REL.NEG**

*jwtj* zp sdm=f

*jwtj* sdm(.w)=f

*jwtj* sdm=f

*jwtj* sdm.n=f

*jwtj* NP js pw

"If he takes them away for any work which is not at all an offering for me, (then …)"

*jwtj* wnt gnn.t=f (*Urk.* I, 192,14)

"(…) which has no weakness"

---

**REL.NEG.EXIST**
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by jwtj

Finite verb forms

- jwtj zp sdm=f
- jwtj sdm(.w)=f
- jwtj sdm=f
- jwtj sdm.n=f

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- jwtj NP js pw

Negative existential

- jwtj NP=f

Finite verb forms

- jr it=f sn <r> k3.t nb.t jwt(.t) pr.t-hrw n(=j) js pw (Urk. I, 162,16)
  “If he takes them away for any work which is not at all an offering for me, (then …)”

- jwtj wnt gnn.t=f (Urk. I, 192,14)
  “(…) which has no weakness”

- jw rdj.n(=j) t n hkr, hbs n h3y, sm3.n(=j) t3 m jwt(j) mhn.t=f (Urk. I, 122,6-8)
  “I gave bread to the hungry, clothes to the naked, I ferried across the boatless”
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

Finite verb forms

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{zp} \textit{sdm}=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}(\textit{w})=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm.n}=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{js} \textit{pw}

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{wn.t} \textit{NP}=f

Negative existential

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP}=f

Contractions negated by \textit{n}

REL.NEG

REL.NEG.EXIST
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The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

Finite verb forms

- *jwtj zp sdm=f*
- *jwtj sdm(.w)=f*
- *jwtj sdm=f*
- *jwtj sdm.n=f*

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- *jwtj NP js pw*

Negative existential

- *jwtj NP=f*

Contractions negated by *n*

Contractions negated by *nn*
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

Cf. Uljas’ (2015) analysis of the nominal vs verbal status of verb forms after *jwtj*, concluding that “Earlier Egyptian did not standardly embed clauses as syntactic complements of existential negation”
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

Finite verb forms
- \textit{jwtj \textit{zp sdm}=f}
- \textit{jwtj \textit{sdm}(w)=f}
- \textit{jwtj \textit{sdm}=f}
- \textit{jwtj \textit{sdm.n}=f}

Substantival/Adverbial predication
- \textit{jwtj \textit{NP js pw}}

Negative existential
- \textit{jwtj \textit{wn.t NP}=f}
- \textit{jwtj \textit{NP}=f}
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at-}

The patterns introduced by \textit{jw\textit{t}j}

Finite verb forms

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG:} & \quad \text{jwtj } & \text{zp } & \text{sdm}=f \\
\text{MEG:} & \quad \text{jwtj } & \text{sdm} (\text{w})=f \\
\text{LEG:} & \quad \text{jwtj } & \text{sdm}=f \\
\text{Negative existential:} & \quad \text{jwtj } & \text{sdm.n}=f
\end{align*}

Substantival/Adverbial predication

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG:} & \quad \text{jwtj } & \text{NP } & \text{js } & \text{pw} \\
\text{MEG:} & \quad \text{jwtj } & \text{wn.t } & \text{NP}=f
\end{align*}

```
\text{nrw} (...) \text{jwt(j) } \text{p}^3=\text{sn } \text{m}33 \text{ mrt.t } \text{jr(y).t} \text{ (CT I, 84-85 B1P)}
```

"the terror (...) which they never saw anything similar to it"

\(\text{REL.NEG.EXIST}\)
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

Finite verb forms

- **OEg**
  - *jwtj* *zp* *sdm=f* → *∅*
  - *jwtj* *sdm(.w)=f* → *jwtj* *sdm(.w)=f*
  - *jwtj* *sdm=f* → *jwtj* *sdm=f*
  - *jwtj* *sdm.n=f* → *nrw* (...) *iwt(j)* *p₂=f* *sdm* (*CT I, 84-85 B1P)*
    
    “the terror (...) which they never saw anything similar to it”

- **MEg**
  - *jwtj* *sdm(.w)=f* → *jwtj* *sdm(.w)=f*
  - *jwtj* *sdm=f* → *jwtj* *sdm=f*

- **LEg**
  - *jwtj* *sdm(.w)=f* → *jwtj* *sdm(.w)=f*
  - *jwtj* *sdm=f* → *jwtj* *sdm=f*

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- **OEg**
  - *jwtj* *NP* *js* *pw* → *wr* *iwt(j)* *rhw* *f* *in* *ntr.w* (*CT VI, 301o-p)*
    
    “The great one whose name is not known of the gods”
    Rem. Between the infinitive and the passive *sdm(.w)=f*, see Gardiner (1957: 232, §307) in favour of the former, based on Coptic *at-sont-f* ‘uncreated’

- **MEg**
  - *jwtj* *wn.t* *NP=f* → *jwt(j)* *rhw* *ntr.w* *rn=f* (*CT I, 340d)*
    
    “one whose name the gods do not know”

- **LEg**
  - *jwtj* *np=f* → *jwt(j)* *rhw* *ntr.w* *rn=f* (*CT I, 340d)*
    
    “one whose name the gods do not know”
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The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finite verb forms</th>
<th>OEG</th>
<th>MEG</th>
<th>LEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj zp sdm=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj p3=f sdm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj sdm(.w)=f</em></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm(.w)=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj sdm=f</em></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj sdm.n=f</em></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm.n=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantival/Adverbial predication</th>
<th><em>jwtj NP js pw</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj t mwt.n=s, jwt.t sk.n=s, jwt.t htm.n=s, jwt.t tm.n=s</em> (CT VII, 171u)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“(...) who does not die; who is not destroyed, who does not perish, and who does not come to an end”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative existential</th>
<th><em>jwtj wn.t NP=f</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj NP=f</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OEG</th>
<th>MEg</th>
<th>LEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finite verb forms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj zp sdm=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm(.w)=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm.n=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantival/Adverbial predication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj NP js pw</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative existential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj NP=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the negation *n sdm.n=f* and its relationship with modal meanings, see Vernus (1990)

"you are this star (…), which does not perish, which does not disappear" [CT I, 30d-31b [T9C]]

"your are this star (…), which shall not perish, which shall not disappear" [CT I, 30d-31b [B4B0]]

Rem. Compare with Ptolemaic *jwtj sk=f* “who is everlasting” (e.g. Edfou VI, 133,8)
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtk}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEng</th>
<th>MEg</th>
<th>LEng</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finite verb forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{jwtk} \text{zp} sdm=f</td>
<td>\text{∅}</td>
<td>\textit{jwtk} \text{p}^3=f sdm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{jwtk} sdm(.w)=f</td>
<td>\textit{jwtk} sdm(.w)=f</td>
<td>ntj n sdm=f l sdm.t(w)=f l sdm.n=f l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{jwtk} sdm=f</td>
<td>\textit{jwtk} sdm=f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{jwtk} sdm.n=f</td>
<td>\textit{jwtk} sdm.n=f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Substantival/Adverbial predication |
| \textit{jwtk} NP \text{js} pw |

| Negative existential |
| \textit{jwtk} \text{wn.t NP}=f |
| \textit{jwtk} NP=f |
The genesis and diachrony of \( at- \)
The patterns introduced by \( jwtj \)

**Finite verb forms**
- \( jwtj \ zp \ sdm=f \)
- \( jwtj \ sdm(.w)=f \)
- \( jwtj \ sdm=f \)
- \( jwtj \ sdm.n=f \)

**Substantival/Adverbial predication**
- \( jwtj \ NP \ js \ pw \)

**Negative existential**
- \( jwtj \ NP=f \)

**Examples:**

- \( jwtj zp sdm=f \)
- \( jwtj sdm(.w)=f \)
- \( jwtj sdm=f \)
- \( jwtj sdm.n=f \)

**Historical Note:**
Loprieno (1995: 218) “Historically, verbal and adverbial clauses controlled by \( jwtj \) tend to be superseded by analytic equivalents with \( ntj+ \) negative form”. Malaise & Winand (1999: 148) “Dès le moyen égyptien, \( iwtj \) est concurrencé par \( ntj \) suivi d’une négation de sorte que ce pronom déterminatif négatif ne survivra plus en néo-égyptien que dans des expressions stéréotypées (cf. copte -\( \Lambda T \)).”

**Malaise & Winand**
"Dès le moyen égyptien, \( iwtj \) est concurrencé par \( ntj \) suivi d’une négation de sorte que ce pronom déterminatif négatif ne survivra plus en néo-égyptien que dans des expressions stéréotypées (cf. copte -\( \Lambda T \))."

**Loprieno**
“Historically, verbal and adverbial clauses controlled by \( jwtj \) tend to be superseded by analytic equivalents with \( ntj+ \) negative form”.

**Malaise & Winand**
"Dès le moyen égyptien, \( iwtj \) est concurrencé par \( ntj \) suivi d’une négation de sorte que ce pronom déterminatif négatif ne survivra plus en néo-égyptien que dans des expressions stéréotypées (cf. copte -\( \Lambda T \))."
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

Finite verb forms

- **OEG**
  - *jwtj zp sdm=f*
  - *jwtj sdm(.w)=f*
  - *jwtj sdm=f*
  - *jwtj sdm.n=f*

- **MEG**
  - *jwtj p3=f sdm*
  - *jwtj sdm(.w)=f*
  - *jwtj sdm=f*
  - *jwtj sdm.n=f*

- **LEG**
  - *ntj n sdm=fi sdm.t(w)=fi sdm.n=fi*

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- *jwtj NP js pw*

Negative existential

- *jwtj wn.t NP=f*
- *jwtj NP=f*

"Üblich, da der negative Relativekonverter *jwtj* nicht mehr vorhanden ist; dennoch nur selten vorkommend" (Brose 2014: 392), *jr nty nn gm.tw=f* (P. Berlin 10024A, r5) "as for the one that shall not be discovered"
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by $jwtj$

**Finite verb forms**
- $jwtj \, zp \, sdm=f$
- $jwtj \, sdm(.w)=f$
- $jwtj \, sdm=f$
- $jwtj \, sdm.n=f$

**Substantival/Adverbial predication**
- $jwtj \, NP \, js \, pw$

**Negative existential**
- $jwtj \, NP=f$

About $iwt$ and its diachronic successor $ntt \, n$ for introducing asserted negative complement clauses, see Gilula (1971: 17); Doret (1986: 34, n. 263); Uljas (2007: 206-210).
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at-}

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

Finite verb forms

- \textit{jwtj} \texttt{zp sdm=f} → \texttt{\emptyset}

- \textit{jwtj} \texttt{sdm(.w)=f} → \texttt{jwtj p3=f sdm}

- \textit{jwtj} \texttt{sdm=f} → \texttt{jwtj sdm(.w)=f}

- \textit{jwtj} \texttt{sdm.n=f} → \texttt{\not\exists jw}

- \textit{jwtj} \texttt{sdm(.w)=f} → \texttt{\not\exists jw}

- \textit{jwtj} \texttt{pA=f sdm} → \texttt{\not\exists jw}

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- \textit{jwtj} \texttt{NP js pw} → \texttt{\emptyset}

Negative existential

- \textit{jwtj} \texttt{wn.t NP=f}

- \textit{jwtj} \texttt{NP=f}
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by \textit{jw\textit{tj}}

Finite verb forms

- \textit{jw\textit{tj} zp sdm=f} \rightarrow \emptyset
- \textit{jw\textit{tj} sdm(.w)=f} \rightarrow \textit{jw\textit{tj} p3=f sdm}
- \textit{jw\textit{tj} sdm=f} \rightarrow \textit{jw\textit{tj} sdm.(w)=f}
- \textit{jw\textit{tj} sdm.n=f} \rightarrow \textit{ntj n sdm=fi sdm.t(w)=fi sdm.n=fi}
- \textit{jw\textit{tj} sdm.n=f} \rightarrow \textit{jw\textit{tj} sdm.n=f}

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- \textit{jw\textit{tj} NP js pw} \rightarrow \emptyset
- (\textit{jw\textit{tj} NP PP}) \rightarrow \textit{jw\textit{tj} NP PP}

Negative existential

- \textit{jw\textit{tj} wn.t NP=f}
- \textit{jw\textit{tj} NP=f}

\textit{iw ø m jw\textit{tj} hnt W\textit{sjr}} (CT II, 302/303c)
“Indeed it’s what is not in front of Osiris”
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

Finite verb forms

**OEs**
- *jwtj zp sdm=f*
- *jwtj sdm(.w)=f*
- *jwtj sdm=f*
- *jwtj sdm.n=f*

**MEs**
- *jwtj p3=f sdm*
- *jwtj sdm(.w)=f*
- *jwtj sdm=f*
- *jwtj sdm.n=f*

**LEs**
- *ntj n sdm=fi*
- *ntj sdm(.w)=fi*
- *ntj sdm=fi*
- *ntj sdm.n=fi*

Substantival/Adverbial predication

**OEs**
- *jwtj NP js pw*
- *(jwtj NP PP)*

**MEs**
- *jwtj NP PP*

**LEs**
- *nty nn NP PP*

Negative existential

**OEs**
- *jwtj NP=f*

**MEs**
- *jwtj NP=f*

**LEs**
- *nn ntt nn st m-hnw=f* (Shipwrecked Sailor 51-52)
  "there was nothing which was not in it (i.e. the island)"

*iw ø m jwt.t hnt Wsjr (CT II, 302/303c)*
"Indeed it's what is not in front of Osiris"

REL.NEG

REL.NEG.EXIST
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

### Finite verb forms

- **OEng**
  - `jwtj zp sdm=f` → `jwtj p3=f sdm`
  - `jwtj sdm(.w)=f` → `jwtj sdm(.w)=f`
  - `jwtj sdm=f` → `jwtj sdm=f`
  - `jwtj sdm.n=f` → `jwtj sdm.n=f`

- **MEg**
  - `jwtj p3=f sdm`
  - `jwtj sdm(.w)=f`
  - `jwtj sdm=f`
  - `jwtj sdm.n=f`

- **LEg**
  - `ntj n sdm=fl`
  - `sdm.t(w)=fl`
  - `sdm.n=fl`

### Substantival/Adverbial predication

- **OEng**
  - `jwtj NP js pw` → `jntj NP PP`
  - `(jwtj NP PP)` → `jwtj NP PP`
  - `nty nn NP PP`

### Negative existential

- **LEg**
  - `jwtj wn.t NP=f` → `jwtj wn.t NP=f`
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by \( \textit{jwtj} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Finite verb forms} & \quad \text{OEv} & \quad \text{MEv} & \quad \text{LEv} \\
\text{Substantival/Adverbial predication} & \quad \text{OEv} & \quad \text{MEv} & \quad \text{LEv} \\
\text{Negative existential} & \quad \text{OEv} & \quad \text{MEv} & \quad \text{LEv}
\end{align*}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OEv</th>
<th>MEv</th>
<th>LEv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| \( \text{jwtj } zp \text{ sdm}=f \) |       |       | REL.NEG 
\begin{align*}
\text{jwtj } sdm(.w)=f & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{jwtj } p^3=f \text{ sdm} \\
\text{jwtj } sdm=f & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{jwtj } sdm=f \\
\text{jwtj } sdm.n=f & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{jwtj } sdm.n=f \\
\end{align*}

\text{Finite verb forms}:

\( ntk (\ldots) \text{ } \text{shndj}.t \text{ } n.t \text{ } \text{jwt}(j.)w \text{ } \text{mw}.t=f \) (Peas. B1,95)

“you are (…) a kilt of the motherless (lit., the one without his mother)”

Rem. Explicitly substantivized by \( .w/y \)

REL.NEG.EXIST
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at-}

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

Finite verb forms

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{zp} \textit{sdm=f} \quad \rightarrow \quad \varnothing
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm(.w)=f} \quad \rightarrow \quad \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm(.w)=f}
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm=f} \quad \rightarrow \quad \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm=f}
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm.n=f} \quad \rightarrow \quad \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm.n=f}

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{js} \textit{pw} \quad \rightarrow \quad \varnothing
- (\textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{PP}) \quad \rightarrow \quad \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{PP}

Negative existential

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{wn.t NP}=f \quad \rightarrow \quad \textit{jwtj} \textit{wn.t NP}=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP}=f \quad \rightarrow \quad \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP}=f
- (\textit{jwtj} \textit{n=f} [\textit{NP}]) \quad \rightarrow \quad \textit{jwtj} \textit{n=f} (\textit{NP})

\textit{n tni.n.tw s3-z r jwtj n=f sw} (\textit{Ipuwer 4,1})

“the son of a (well-born) man cannot be distinguished from the one who has no (such father)”

About \textit{jwtj} \textit{n=f}, see e.g. Weill (1950: 28); Gardiner (1957\textsuperscript{3}: 152, §203); Satzinger (1968: 59); Malaise & Winand (1999: 332, §532); Allen (2014: 356)
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The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

Finite verb forms

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG} &: j\textit{wtj} zp sdm=f & \rightarrow & \emptyset \\
\text{MEG} &: j\textit{wtj} sdm(.w)=f & \rightarrow & j\textit{wtj} sdm(.w)=f \\
\text{LEG} &: j\textit{wtj} sdm=f & \rightarrow & j\textit{wtj} sdm=f \\
\text{LEG} &: j\textit{wtj} sdm.n=f & \rightarrow & j\textit{wtj} sdm.n=f
\end{align*}

Substantival/Adverbial predication

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG} &: j\textit{wtj} NP js pw & \rightarrow & \emptyset \\
\text{LEG} &: (j\textit{wtj} NP PP) & \rightarrow & j\textit{wtj} NP PP & \text{nty nn NP PP}
\end{align*}

Negative existential

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG} &: j\textit{wtj} wn.t NP=f & \rightarrow & j\textit{wtj} wn.t NP=f \\
\text{LEG} &: j\textit{wtj} NP=f & \rightarrow & j\textit{wtj} NP=f \\
\text{LEG} &: (j\textit{wtj} n=f [NP]) & \rightarrow & j\textit{wtj} n=f (NP)
\end{align*}
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

---

**Finite verb forms**

OEG

- *jwtj zp sdm=*f
- *jwtj sdm(.w)=*f
- *jwtj sdm=*f
- *jwtj sdm.n=*f

MEG

- *jwtj p3=*f sdm
- *jwtj sdm(.w)=*f
- *jwtj sdm=*f
- *jwtj sdm.n=*f

LEG

- *jwtj n=*f (NP)

**Substantival/Adverbial predication**

- *jwtj NP js pw*
- *(jwtj NP PP)*
- *jwtj wn.t NP=*f

**Negative existential**

- *jwtj NP=*f
- *(jwtj n=*f [NP])*
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at-}

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

Finite verb forms

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{zp} \textit{sdm}=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}(w)=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}.n=f

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{js} \textit{pw}
- \textit{(jwtj} \textit{NP PP})

Negative existential

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{wn.t NP}=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP}=f
- \textit{(jwtj} \textit{n}=f \textit{[NP]})

Contructions negated by \textit{n} ⇒ \textit{ntj n}

Contructions negated by \textit{nn} ⇒ \textit{ntj nn}

Negative existential
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at}-

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\textbf{Finite verb forms}</th>
<th>\textbf{OEG}</th>
<th>\textbf{MEG}</th>
<th>\textbf{LEG}</th>
<th>\textbf{REL.NEG}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{z}p \text{sdm}=f}</td>
<td>\textit{jwtj p3=f \text{sdm}}</td>
<td>\textit{\emptyset}</td>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{sdm}(.w)=f}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{sdm}(.w)=f}</td>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{sdm}(.w)=f}</td>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{sdm}=f}</td>
<td>\textit{\emptyset}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{sdm}=f}</td>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{sdm}=f}</td>
<td>\textit{\text{jwtj \text{sdm}.n}=f}</td>
<td>\textit{\text{jwtj \text{sdm}.n}=f}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\textbf{Substantival/Adverbial predication}</th>
<th>\textbf{OEG}</th>
<th>\textbf{MEG}</th>
<th>\textbf{LEG}</th>
<th>\textbf{REL.NEG}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{NP} js \text{pw}}</td>
<td>\textit{\emptyset}</td>
<td>\textit{\text{jwtj \text{NP} PP}}</td>
<td>\textit{\text{jwtj \text{NP} PP}}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{(jwtj \text{NP PP})}</td>
<td>\textit{\text{jwtj \text{NP PP}}}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\textbf{Negative existential}</th>
<th>\textbf{OEG}</th>
<th>\textbf{MEG}</th>
<th>\textbf{LEG}</th>
<th>\textbf{REL.NEG.EXIST}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{wn.t} \text{NP}=f}</td>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{wn.t} \text{NP}=f}</td>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{NP}=f}</td>
<td>\textit{\text{jwtj \text{NP}=f (NP)}}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{NP}=f}</td>
<td>\textit{jwtj \text{NP}=f}</td>
<td>\textit{\text{jwtj \text{NP}=f (NP)}}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two significant consequences
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by jwjt

Finite verb forms

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG} & : jwjt \ zp \ sdm = f \\
\text{MEG} & : jwjt \ p3 = f \ sdm \\
\text{LEG} & : jwjt \ sdm = f
\end{align*}

Two significant consequences

1) Occurrences of the mrr = f after jwjt

\begin{align*}
lwjt \ b(3) ggg = f \ hr \ mn.w \ n nb \ ntr.w \ (Urk. \ IV, 410,6) \\
\text{“One who is not neglectful in (building) the} \\
\text{monuments of the Lord of the gods.”}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
lwjt \ thh = f \ rdy.t \ m \ hr = f \ (Urk. \ IV, 97,8) \\
\text{“One who does not infringe the charge laid} \\
\text{upon him”}
\end{align*}

Substantival/Adverbial predication

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG} & : jwjt \ NP \ js \ pw \\
\text{MEG} & : (jwjt \ NP \ PP) \\
\text{LEG} & : jwjt \ NP \ PP
\end{align*}

Negative existential

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG} & : jwjt \ wn.t \ NP = f \\
\text{MEG} & : jwjt \ NP = f \\
\text{LEG} & : (jwjt \ n = f \ [NP]) \\
\end{align*}

Negative existential
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The patterns introduced by jwtj

Finite verb forms

- **OEt**
  - `jwtj zp sdm=f` → ` jwtj p3=f sdm`
  - `jwtj sdm(.w)=f` → `jwtj sdm(.w)=f`
  - `jwtj sdm=f` → `jwtj sdm=f`
  - `jwtj sdm.n=f` → `jwtj sdm.n=f`

- **MEd**
  - `jwtj wn.t NP=f` → `jwtj wn.t NP=f`

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- **OEt**
  - `jwtj NP js pw` → `jwtj NP PP`

Negative existential

- **OEt**
  - `jwtj np=f` → `jwtj np=f`
  - `(jwtj n=f [NP])` → `jwtj n=f (NP)`

Two significant consequences

1) Occurrences of the `mrr=f` after `jwtj`

2) It opens up the way to a reinterpretation of the `sdm=f/sdm(.w)=f` forms as a subjunctive (= `ntj nn sdm=f`) or as an infinitive (or alternatively to the introduction of the infinitive), thanks to the semantics of the constructions introduced by `jwtj` (for `nn sdm=f`, see Gunn 2012: 166; Vernus 1990)
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The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEG</th>
<th>MEG</th>
<th>LEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finite verb forms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jwtj zp sdm=f</td>
<td>jwtj p3=f sdm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jwtj sdm(.w)=f</td>
<td>jwtj sdm(.w)=f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jwtj sdm=f</td>
<td>jwtj sdm=f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jwtj sdm.n=f</td>
<td>jwtj sdm.n=f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantival/Adverbial predication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jwtj NP js pw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(jwtj NP PP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>jwtj NP PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative existential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jwtj wn.t NP=f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jwtj NP=f</td>
<td></td>
<td>jwtj NP=f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(jwtj n=f [NP])</td>
<td></td>
<td>jwtj n=f (NP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

**Finite verb forms**

- OEd: *jwtj* zp *sdm* = f
- MEg: *jwtj* sdm(.w) = f
- LEg: *jwtj* sdm = f
- OEd: *jwtj* sdm.n = f

**Substantival/Adverbial predication**

- OEd: *jwtj* NP js pw
- MEg: (jwjt NP PP) → *jwtj* NP PP

**Negative existential**

- OEd: *jwtj* wn.t NP = f
- MEg: *jwtj* NP = f
- LEg: (jwjt n = f [NP]) → *jwtj* n = f (NP)
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at}-

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

### Finite verb forms

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{zp} \textit{sdm}=f → Ø
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}(,w)=f → \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}(,w)=f → \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}(,w)=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}=f → \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}.n=f → \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}.n=f

### Substantival/Adverbial predication

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{js} \textit{pw}
- (\textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{PP}) → Ø
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{PP}

### Negative existential

- \textit{jwtj} \textit{wn.t} \textit{NP}=f → \textit{jwtj} \textit{wn.t} \textit{NP}=f
- \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP}=f → \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP}=f
- (\textit{jwtj} \textit{n}=f [\textit{NP}]) → \textit{jwtj} \textit{n}=f (\textit{NP})

#### A single example

```
\textit{sdg sw, jwtj} \textit{jin} \textit{drw.w}=f (\textit{P. Leiden I 344, v}^0 \textit{II,8 [Hymn to Amun]})

“the one hiding himself, whose limit have not been reached”
```
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by jwtj

Finite verb forms

- \( jwtj \,zp \,sdm=f \)
- \( jwtj \,sdm(.w)=f \)
- \( jwtj \,sdm=f \)
- \( jwtj \,sdm.n=f \)

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- \( jwtj \,NP \,js \,pw \)
- \( (jwtj \,NP \,PP) \)

Negative existential

- \( jwtj \,wn.t \,NP=f \)
- \( (jwtj \,n=f \,[NP]) \)

Less than 10 examples

\( jwtj \,ssp=f \,sk3.w \) (O. Cairo CG 25207, II, l. 14)
“(god…), who does not accept gifts”

\( jwtj \,hfs=f \,m \,mr.t.n=f \) (O. DeM 1100, v° 5)
“who one cannot repel from what he wishes”
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by jwtj

Finite verb forms

- **OEg**
  - $jwtj\; zp\; sdm=f$ → $\emptyset$ → $\emptyset$
  - $jwtj\; sdm(.w)=f$ → $\emptyset$ → $jwtj\; sdm(.w)=f$
  - $jwtj\; sdm=f$ → $\emptyset$ → $jwtj\; sdm=f$
  - $jwtj\; sdm.n=f$ → $\emptyset$ → $jwtj\; sdm.n=f$

- **MEg**
  - $\emptyset$ → $jwtj\; p^3=f\; sdm$
  - $\emptyset$ → $jwtj\; sdm(.w)=f$
  - $\emptyset$ → $jwtj\; sdm=f$

- **LEg**
  - $\emptyset$ → $\emptyset$

- \( ntj\; nn\; sdm=f \)

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- **OEg**
  - $ jwtj\; NP\; js\; pw $ → $ \emptyset $ → $ \emptyset $
  - $(jwtj\; NP\; PP)$ → $jwtj\; NP\; PP$

- **MEg**
  - $\emptyset$ → $\emptyset$

Negative existential

- **OEg**
  - $jwtj\; wn.t\; NP=f$ → $jwtj\; wn.t\; NP=f$
  - $jwtj\; NP=f$ → $jwtj\; NP=f$
  - $(jwtj\; n=f\; [NP])$ → $jwtj\; n=f\; (NP)$

- **MEg**
  - $\emptyset$ → $\emptyset$

REL.NEG

REL.NEG.EXIST

The verb form can only be analysed as a subjunctive (active reading) or infinitive (both).
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at-}

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

Finite verb forms

- **OEG**
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{zp} \textit{sdm} = f
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}(.w) = f
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm} = f
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}.n = f

- **MEG**
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{p} = f \textit{sdm}
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}(.w) = f
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm} = f
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}.n = f

- **LEG**
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}(.w) = f
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm} = f
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{sdm}.n = f

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- **OEG**
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{js} \textit{pw}
  - (\textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{PP})

- **MEG**
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{PP}

- **LEG**
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{NP} \textit{PP}

Negative existential

- **OEG**
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{wn.t} \textit{NP} = f
  - (\textit{jwtj} \textit{n} = f [NP])

- **MEG**
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{np} = f
  - (\textit{jwtj} \textit{n} = f [NP])

- **LEG**
  - \textit{jwtj} \textit{n} = f (NP)

\textit{bw hrp.tw} = f r \textit{hw.t-ntr} p3 3pd bjn (...) \textit{jwtj jr.t wp.t}
(P. Lansing, r° 3,7-8)

“One cannot lead him to the temple, the bad bird (...) who does not do the job”
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

- **Finite verb forms**
  - OEG: *jwtj* zp *sdm=f* → *jwtj* *p3=f* *sdm*
  - MEG: *jwtj* *sdm(.w)=f* → *jwtj* *sdm(.w)=f*
  - LEG: *jwtj* *sdm=f* → *jwtj* *sdm=f*
  - OEG: *jwtj* *sdm.n=f* → *jwtj* *sdm.n=f*
  - MEG: *jwtj* *sdm(.w)=f* → *jwtj* *sdm(.w)=f*
  - LEG: *jwtj* *sdm=f* → *jwtj* *sdm=f*

- **Substantival/Adverbial predication**
  - OEG: *jwtj* *NP js pw*
  - MEG: *jwtj* *NP PP*
  - LEG: *jwtj* *NP PP*

- **Negative existential**
  - OEG: *jwtj* *wn.t NP=f*
  - MEG: *jwtj* *NP=f*
  - LEG: *jwtj* *NP=f*
  - OEG: *jwtj* *n=f [NP]*)* → *jwtj* *n=f (NP)*

REL.NEG

REL.NEG.EXIST
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by jwtj

Finite verb forms

- OEk: jwtj zp sdm=f
- MEg: jwtj p3=f sdm
- LEg: 

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- OEk: jwtj NP js pw
- MEg: jwtj NP PP

Negative existential

- OEk: jwtj wn.t NP=f
- MEg: jwtj NP=f

A single example

sj (hr) jn.t jwtj.w hr=s (P. Turin 1966, r° 2,5 [Love Song])
“(the small sycamore…,) it attracts who are not under it, (for fresh is its shade)”
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

**Finite verb forms**
- OEv: *jwtj zp sdm=f* → ∅ → ∅
- MEv: *jwtj sdm(w)=f* → *jwtj sdm(w)=f* → *jwtj sdm(w)=f*
- LEv: *jwtj sdm(f)* → *jwtj sdm(f)* → ∅
- *jwtj sdm.n=f* → *jwtj sdm.n=f*

**Substantival/Adverbial predication**
- *jwtj NP js pw* → ∅ → ∅
- *jwtj NP PP* → *jwtj NP PP* → *jwtj NP PP*

**Negative existential**
- *jwtj wn.t NP=f* → *jwtj wn.t NP=f* → ∅
- *jwtj NP=f* → *jwtj NP=f* → ∅
- *jwtj n=f [NP]* → *jwtj n=f (NP)*
# The genesis and diachrony of $\text{at}$-

## The patterns introduced by $\text{jwtj}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finite verb forms</th>
<th>OEG</th>
<th>MEG</th>
<th>LEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{jwtj zp sdm} = f$</td>
<td>$\varnothing$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj p}_3 = f \text{ sdm}$</td>
<td>$\varnothing$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{jwtj sdm}(.w) = f$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj sdm}(.w) = f$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj sdm}(.w) = f$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{jwtj sdm} = f$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj sdm} = f$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj sdm} = f$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{jwtj sdm.n} = f$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj sdm.n} = f$</td>
<td>$\varnothing$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantival/Adverbial predication</th>
<th>OEG</th>
<th>MEG</th>
<th>LEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{jwtj NP js pw}$</td>
<td>$\varnothing$</td>
<td>$\varnothing$</td>
<td>$\varnothing$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{jwtj NP PP})$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj NP PP}$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj NP PP}$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj NP PP}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative existential</th>
<th>OEG</th>
<th>MEG</th>
<th>LEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{jwtj wn.t NP} = f$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj wn.t NP} = f$</td>
<td>$\varnothing$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{jwtj NP} = f$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj NP} = f$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj NP} = f$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(\text{jwtj n} = f [NP])$</td>
<td>$\text{jwtj n} = f (NP)$</td>
<td>$\varnothing$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**REL.NEG**

$m\ jr\ z\ \text{jwtj h}_3\text{tj} = f jw\ bn\ n = f\ sb\text{ty}(t)$  
(P. Bologna 1094, 3,6)  
“Do not act as a foolish man who has no education”

**REL.NEG.EXIST**

$jnk\ w^w,\ \text{jwtj hnw} = f$  
(O. Gardiner 304, r° 12)  
“I’m a lonely person, without family”
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

Finite verb forms

- **OeG**
  - *jwtj* `zp` *sdm*=`f`
  - *jwtj* `sdm(.w)`=`f`
  - *jwtj* `sdm`=`f`
  - *jwtj* `sdm.n`=`f`

- **MeG**
  - *jwtj* `zp` *sdm`=`f`
  - *jwtj* `sdm(.w)`=`f`
  - *jwtj* `sdm`=`f`
  - *jwtj* `sdm.n`=`f`

- **LeG**
  - *jwtj* `zp` *sdm`=`f`
  - *jwtj* `sdm(.w)`=`f`
  - *jwtj* `sdm`=`f`
  - *jwtj* `sdm.n`=`f`

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- **OeG**
  - *jwtj* `NP js pw`
  - `(jwtj* NP PP)`

- **MeG**
  - *jwtj* `NP js pw`
  - `(jwtj* NP PP)`

- **LeG**
  - *jwtj* `NP js pw`
  - `(jwtj* NP PP)`

Negative existential

- **OeG**
  - *jwtj* `wn.t NP`=`f`
  - *(jwtj n=f [NP])* 

- **MeG**
  - *jwtj* `wn.t NP`=`f`
  - *(jwtj n=f [NP])* 

- **LeG**
  - *jwtj* `wn.t NP`=`f`
  - *(jwtj n=f [NP])* 

**REL.NEG**

**REL.NEG.EXIST**
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finite verb forms</th>
<th>O Eg</th>
<th>M Eg</th>
<th>L Eg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj zp sdm=f</em></td>
<td><em>jwtj p3=f sdm</em></td>
<td>∅</td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm=f</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj sdm(.w)=f</em></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm(.w)=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm=f</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj sdm=f</em></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm=f</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj sdm.n=f</em></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm.n=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj sdm=f</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantival/Adverbial predication</th>
<th>O Eg</th>
<th>M Eg</th>
<th>L Eg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj NP js pw</em></td>
<td>∅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(jwtj NP PP)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj NP PP</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative existential</th>
<th>O Eg</th>
<th>M Eg</th>
<th>L Eg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj wn.t NP=f</em></td>
<td><em>jwtj wn.t NP=f</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jwtj NP=f</em></td>
<td><em>jwtj NP=f</em></td>
<td><em>jwtj NP=f</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(jwtj n=f [NP])</td>
<td><em>jwtj n=f (NP)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>jwtj n=f (NP)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, in Late Egyptian:
- *jwtj* is functionally limited to REL.NEG.EXIST
- It is used with verbal roots with active or passive reading (e.g. 'he who does not accept' vs 'he who is not accepted')
- It is used with nouns with privative meaning (e.g. who is without heart < he whose heart does not exist).
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by jwtj

Finite verb forms

- OEk
  - jwtj *zp sdm*=f → ∅
  - jwtj *sdm(.w)=f* → jwtj *sdm=.w*=f
  - jwtj *sdm=* → jwtj *sdm=* → jwtj *sdm.n*=f
  - jwtj *sdm.n*=f → jwtj *sdm.n*=f

- MEk
  - jwtj *p3=sdm* → jwtj *sdm=* → jwtj *sdm.n*=f

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- JWTJ *NP js pw* → ∅
- (jwtj *NP PP*) → jwtj *NP PP*

Negative existential

- jwtj *wn.t NP=f* → jwtj *wn.t NP=f*
- jwtj *NP=f* → jwtj *NP=f*
- (jwtj *n=f [NP]*) → jwtj *n=f (NP)*
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by \textit{jwtj}

Finite verb forms

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG} & \quad \text{MEG} & \quad \text{Ég. de Trad.} \\
jwtj \ zp \ sdm=f & \quad \rightarrow & \quad jwtj \ p3=f \ sdm \\
jwtj \ sdm(.w)=f & \quad \rightarrow & \quad jwtj \ sdm(.w)=f \\
jwtj \ sdm=f & \quad \rightarrow & \quad jwtj \ sdm=f \\
jwtj \ sdm.n=f & \quad \rightarrow & \quad jwtj \ sdm.n=f \\
\end{align*}

Substantival/Adverbial predication

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG} & \quad \text{MEG} & \quad \text{Ég. de Trad.} \\
jwtj \ NP \ js \ pw & \quad \rightarrow & \quad \varnothing \\
(jwtj \ NP \ PP) & \quad \rightarrow & \quad jwtj \ NP \ PP \\
\end{align*}

Negative existential

\begin{align*}
\text{OEG} & \quad \text{MEG} & \quad \text{Ég. de Trad.} \\
jwtj \ wn.t \ NP=f & \quad \rightarrow & \quad jwtj \ wn.t \ NP=f \\
jwtj \ NP=f & \quad \rightarrow & \quad jwtj \ NP=f \\
(jwtj \ n=f \ [NP]) & \quad \rightarrow & \quad jwtj \ n=f \ (NP) \\
\end{align*}

- Werning (2011, I: 234-sq., §170-sq.)
- Kurth (2008: 976-sq., §263-sq.) according to whom *ntj \ n is not attested in Ptolemaic
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

**Finite verb forms**

- **OEG**
  - *jwtj zp sdm=f*
  - *jwtj sdm(.w)=f*
  - *jwtj sdm=f*
  - *jwtj sdm.n=f*

- **MEG**
  - *jwtj p3=f sdm*
  - *jwtj sdm(.w)=f*
  - *jwtj sdm=f*
  - *jwtj sdm.n=f*

- **Ég. de Trad.**
  - *jwtj sdm=f*

**Substantival/Adverbial predication**

- *jwtj NP js pw*
- *(jwtj NP PP)*

**Negative existential**

- *jwtj wn.t NP=f*
- *jwtj NP=f*
- *(jwtj n=f [NP])*

REL.NEG

REL.NEG.EXIST
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by jwtj

Finite verb forms

- $jwtj \ zp \ sdm=f \rightarrow \emptyset$
- $jwtj \ sdm(w)=f \rightarrow jwtj \ sdm(w)=f$
- $jwtj \ sdm=f \rightarrow jwtj \ sdm=f$
- $jwtj \ sdm.n=f \rightarrow jwtj \ sdm.n=f$

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- $jwtj \ NP \ js \ pw \rightarrow \emptyset$
- $(jwtj \ NP \ PP) \rightarrow jwtj \ NP \ PP$

Negative existential

- $jwtj \ wn.t \ NP=f \rightarrow jwtj \ wn.t \ NP=f$
- $jwtj \ NP=f \rightarrow jwtj \ NP=f$
- $(jwtj \ n=f \ [NP]) \rightarrow jwtj \ n=f \ (NP)$

See $jwtj \ wrd=f \ hft \ t3j=f \ wsr$ (Urk. IV, 1279,17) “one who is not tired when he seizes the oar”
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by *jwtj*

**Finite verb forms**

- \(jwtj \text{ zp sdm}=f\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(\emptyset\)  
- \(jwtj \text{ sdm.(w)}=f\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ sdm.(w)}=f\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ sdm.(w)}=f\)
- \(jwtj \text{ sdm}=f\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ sdm}=f\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ sdm}=f\)
- \(jwtj \text{ sdm.n}=f\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ sdm.n}=f\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ sdm.n}=f\)

**Substantival/Adverbial predication**

- \(jwtj \text{ NP js pw}\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(\emptyset\)  
- \((jwtj \text{ NP PP})\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ NP PP}\)

**Negative existential**

- \(jwtj \text{ wn.t NP}=f\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ wn.t NP}=f\)
- \(jwtj \text{ NP}=f\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ NP}=f\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ NP}=f\)
- \((jwtj \text{ n}=f [NP])\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ n}=f (NP)\)  
  \(\rightarrow\)  
  \(jwtj \text{ n}=f (NP)\)

**REL.NEG**

\(jwtj \text{ gm wn}=f\) (Cairo CG 42254 = JE 37374, v° 2)  
“who is not found guilty”

**REL.NEG.EXIST**
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by jwtj

Finite verb forms

OEG

jwtj \text{zp} \text{sdm}=f \rightarrow \emptyset

jwtj \text{sdm}(.w)=f \rightarrow \text{jwtj sdm}(.w)=f \rightarrow \text{jwtj sdm}(.w)=f

jwtj \text{sdm}=f \rightarrow \text{jwtj sdm}=f \rightarrow \text{jwtj sdm}=f

jwtj \text{sdm}.n=f \rightarrow \text{jwtj sdm}.n=f \rightarrow \text{jwtj sdm}.n=f

MEG

Ég. de Trad.

REL.NEG

n \text{hpr sdm jwtj shm}=f \text{ m-}\text{hn}t=f \text{ (Dendera VI, 112,14)}

"there is no sanctuary in which his (i.e. Horus')

t_image is not"

Substantival/Adverbial predication

(jwtj \text{NP} PP) \rightarrow \emptyset

(jwtj \text{NP} PP) \rightarrow \text{jwtj NP} PP \rightarrow \text{jwtj NP} PP

Negative existential

(jwtj \text{wn.t} \text{NP}=f) \rightarrow \text{jwtj \ wn.t NP}=f

(jwtj \text{NP}=f) \rightarrow \text{jwtj \ NP}=f \rightarrow \text{jwtj \ NP}=f

(jwtj \text{n}=f [NP]) \rightarrow \text{jwtj \ n}=f (NP) \rightarrow \text{jwtj \ n}=f (NP)
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The patterns introduced by jwtj

Finite verb forms

- **O Eg**
  - jwtj zn sd=m=f
  - jwtj sd=m(w)=f
  - jwtj sd=m=f
  - jwtj sd=m.n=f

- **M Eg**
  - jwtj zn sd=m=f
  - jwtj sd=m(w)=f
  - jwtj sd=m=f
  - jwtj sd=m.n=f

- **Ég. de Trad.**
  - jwtj zn sd=m=f
  - jwtj sd=m(w)=f
  - jwtj sd=m=f
  - jwtj sd=m.n=f

Substantival/Adverbial predication

- **O Eg**
  - jwtj NP js pw
  - (jwtj NP PP)

- **M Eg**
  - jwtj NP js pw
  - (jwtj NP PP)

- **Ég. de Trad.**
  - jwtj NP js pw
  - (jwtj NP PP)

Negative existential

- **O Eg**
  - jwtj NP=f
  - (jwtj n=f [NP])

- **M Eg**
  - jwtj NP=f
  - (jwtj n=f [NP])

- **Ég. de Trad.**
  - jwtj NP=f
  - (jwtj n=f [NP])


- nswt nhh jwtj whm.tj=fj (Dendera V, 85,2)

  “(Harsomtus the child is) the king of eternity, whom no-one will repeat”
The lost of resumption

About contexts and frequency
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The loss of resumption

Resumption findet regelmäßig statt, unabhängig davon, welcher Satzteil zum Nukleus wird, auch im Falle des Objekts und sogar des Subjekts.

Schenkel (2005; 2012)
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The loss of resumption

- A first example already in OEs

\[ jn.n(=j) \ jn.w \ m \ h3.s.t \ tn \ r ^c3.t \ wr.t, \ jwtj \ zp \ in.t(w) \ mrt.t \ jn \ t^n \ pn \ dr-b3h \ (Urk. \ I, \ 125,6-7) \]

“I have brought back tributes from this country in great quantity, without anything similar having ever been brought back to this land in the past.”
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The loss of resumption

- A first example already in OEG

\[ jn.n(j) \ jn.w \ m \ h3s.t \ tn \ r \ c3.t \ wntj, \ jwtt \ zn.t(w) \ mrt.t \ jn \ t3 \ pn \ dr-b3h \ (Urk. \ I, 125,6-7) \]

“I have brought back tributes from this country in great quantity, without anything similar having ever been brought back to this land in the past.”

- Two examples from Mo\(^c\)alla

\[ jnk \ pw \ tj \ jwtt \ wn \ kj \ (Mo\(^c\)alla, I, \ \beta \ , 3) \]

“I was a male without equal”
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The loss of resumption

- A first example already in OEG

\[ jn.n(=j)\ jn.w\ m\ h3.t\ tn\ r\ c3.t\ wn.t,\ jwtj\ zp\ in.t(w)\ mrt.t\ jt\ t3\ pn\ dr-b3h \quad (Urk.\ I,\ 125,6-7) \]

“I have brought back tributes from this country in great quantity, without anything similar having ever been brought back to this land in the past.”

- Two examples from Mo\(^{c}\)alla

\[ jnk\ pw\ t\ jw\ jwtn\ k\ jk \quad (Mo^{c}\alla,\ I,\ \beta,\ 3) \]

“I was a male without equal”

RELATIONAL NOUNS
see the notes by Werning
(2013: 247-248)
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The loss of resumption

- **A first example already in OEG**

  \[ jn.n(=j) jn.w m h3s.t tn r c3.t wr.t, jwj zp in.t(w) mrt.t jr t3 pn dr-b3h \]  (Urk. I, 125,6-7)
  “I have brought back tributes from this country in great quantity, without anything similar having ever been brought back to this land in the past.”

- **Two examples from Mo\textsuperscript{c}alla**

  \[ jnk pw t3j jwj wn kj \] (Mo\textsuperscript{c}alla, I, \( \beta \), 3)
  “I was a male without equal”

  \[ jw dj.n(=j) hm.t n jwt hm.t \] (Mo\textsuperscript{c}alla, IV, 6-7)
  “I gave a wife to the single man (lit. ‘wifeless’)

- **In MEG**

  \[ jwtj swjw \] (Peas. B1, 154)
  “the rich (lit. ‘with no lack’)”

**RELATIONAL NOUNS**

see the notes by Werning (2013: 247-248)
The genesis and diachrony of \( at- \)

The loss of resumption

- **A first example already in O\(E\)g**

\[ jn.n(=j) \ jn.w \ m \ h3.s.t \ tn \ r^c.3.t \ wr.t, \ jwtj \ zp \ in.t(w) \ mrt.t \ jr \ t3 \ pn \ dr-b3h \ (Urk. \ I, 125,6-7) \]

“I have brought back tributes from this country in great quantity, without anything similar having ever been brought back to this land in the past.”

- **Two examples from M\(o\)\(c\)alla**

\[ jnk \ pw \ t3j \ jwtj \ wn \ kj \ (M\(o\)\(c\)alla, I, \(\beta\), 3) \]

“I was a male without equal”

\[ jw \ dj.n(=j) \ hm.t \ n \ jwt \ hm.t \ (M\(o\)\(c\)alla, IV, 6-7) \]

“I gave a wife to the single man (lit. ‘wifeless’)

- **In M\(E\)g**

\[ jwtj \ swjw \ (Peas. \ B1, 154) \]

“the rich (lit. ‘with no lack’)”

---

**RELATIONAL NOUNS**

see the notes by Werning

(2013: 247-248)

**GENERIC REFERENTS**
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*. The loss of resumption

- A first example already in OEc

  \[ jn.n (=j) jn.w m h₃.s.t tn r c₃.t wr.t, jwtj zp in.t(w) mrt.t jr t₃ pn ḏr-ḥ₃h \]  
  "I have brought back tributes from this country in great quantity, without anything similar having ever been brought back to this land in the past."

- Two examples from MoCALLA

  \[ jnk \text{pw} t₃j \text{jwtj} \text{wn kj} \]  
  "I was a male without equal"

  \[ jw dj.n (=j) hm.t n jwt hm.t \]  
  "I gave a wife to the single man (lit. ‘wifeless’)"

- In MEC

  \[ jwtj šwjw \]  
  "the rich (lit. ‘with no lack’)"

**Generic referents**
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The loss of resumption

- In LEd, c. 25% of the occurrences of the construction *jwtj NP(=f)* lack resumptive pronouns (mostly 20th Dyn. and after, but already attested during the Amarn period)
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at-}

The loss of resumption

- In LEg, c. 25\% of the occurrences of the construction \textit{jwtj NP}(=f) lack resumptive pronouns (mostly 20\textsuperscript{nd} Dyn. and after, but already attested during the Amarna period).

- Note that several of the \textit{jwtj NP\textsuperscript{x}} constructions are also attested as \textit{jwtj NP\textsuperscript{x}=f}.

\begin{quote}
\textit{m ir irj ḫsb (n) jwtj (\textsuperscript{Chef}) nkt (Amenemope 16,3)}

“Do not make account for the one who has nothing”
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{jnkj s\textsuperscript{3}w-\textsuperscript{c}, nmḥ jwtj nkt=f} (O. BM EA 50720, r\textsuperscript{o} 4-5)

“I’m a weak one, a poor one who has nothing”
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{bn jnk jwtj ḫtj jwn\textsuperscript{3}} (O. Gardiner 273, r\textsuperscript{o} 6)

“I am not a heartless person at all”, cf. Coptic \textit{αὐστός}
\end{quote}
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The loss of resumption

- In LEg, c. 25% of the occurrences of the construction \(jwtj\) NP\((=f)\) lack resumptive pronouns (mostly 20\(^{\text{nd}}\) Dyn. and after, but already attested during the Amarna period)

- Note that several of the \(jwtj\) NP\(^x\) constructions are also attested as \(jwtj\) NP\(^x\)=\(f\)

- As already seen for MEg, the occasional presence of a phrase classifier shows that the group \(jwtj+NP\) was certainly understood as a single lexical unit

\[\text{hr h3=k \(jwtj-fnd\)} (\text{P. Chassinat III, r\(^{\circ}\) 6})
\]

“And the nose-less ones cried”
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The loss of resumption

- In the Late Period hieratic wisdom text of P. Brooklyn 47.218.135 (26th dyn.), no resumptive pronoun is used, whether for *jwtj*+Noun or *jwtj*+Verb

\[(j)mj p\dot{3}y=k nkt n p\dot{3} nfrjwtjdbr (l. 2,20)\]
\[“give your property to the god without need”\]

\[t3 hm.t jwtj ms(t) (l. 5,15)\]
\[“the wife who does not give birth”\]
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The loss of resumption

- In the Late Period hieratic wisdom text of P. Brooklyn 47.218.135 (26th dyn.), no resumptive pronoun is used, whether for *jwtj+Noun* or *jwtj+Verb*

  (j)mj p3y=k nkt n p3 ntr jwtj dBr (l. 2,20)
  “give your property to the god without need”

  *t3 hm.t jwtj ms(.t) (l. 5,15)*
  “the wife who does not give birth”

- In Demotic, the only construction with the resumptive pronoun is *jwtj-r’ =f* (cf. Coptic ɾⲧⲣⲟⲩⲏ; *CD* 288a & *KHWb* 160)

  *n p3 smt jwtj r3=f, jw wn mtw=f h3tj=f, jw bn-jw=f rh w$8b r n3.w-nfr*
  (P. Vienna 3877 [Harper], III,12 [Roman]; *CDD* I, 75)
  “(he is) like a mute, but having his mind, however being unable to give a correct answer”
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at-}

The loss of resumption

REL+NEGATION

O\textit{Eg} \quad M\textit{Eg} \quad L\textit{Eg} \quad D\textit{em}
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*. The loss of resumption.

Diagram:

- REL+NEGATION
- REL.NEG
  (VP)
- REL.NEG.EXIST

Stages:
- OEg
- MEg
- LEg
- Dem
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The loss of resumption
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The loss of resumption

REL.NEG (VP) → REL.NEG (VP) → Ø

REL.NEG.EXIST → REL.NEG.EXIST + NP=f
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The loss of resumption

OEG  MEg  LEg  Dem

REL.NEG (VP)  REL.NEG (VP)  Ø  REL.NEG.EXIST + VP  REL.NEG.EXIST + NP=f
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The loss of resumption

REL.NEG (VP) → REL.NEG (VP) → Ø

REL.NEG.EXIST → REL.NEG.EXIST + VP

REL.NEG.EXIST + NP=f → NEG.EXIST

Loss of resumption
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The loss of resumption

REL.NEG (VP) → REL.NEG (VP) → Ø

REL.NEG.EXIST → REL.NEG.EXIST + VP → REL.NEG.EXIST + NP=f

REL+NEGATION

NP *jwtj ḥm.t=f*  
NP who has no wife

NP *jwtj ḥm.t*  
NP without wife, wifeless NP

NEG.EXIST
The genesis and diachrony of *at-.*

The loss of resumption

Loss of resumption

\[ \Rightarrow \]

Privative uses
The functions of *jwtj*-headed phrases and clauses
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The functions of *jwtj*-headed phrases and clauses

- Gilula (1970: 213) states that “*iwty* (…) is the nominalization (the subordinated, substantivized form) of the negative word *n* and possibly also *nn*. *iwty* enables the negative construction to function as a substantive or an attribute
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The functions of jwty-headed phrases and clauses

Gilula (1970: 213) states that “iwty (...) is the nominalization (the subordinated, substantivized form) of the negative word n and possibly also nn. iwty enables the negative construction to function as a substantive or an attribute.

```
mk sw m jwty jb=f (P. Chester Beatty 1, v° C2,2)
“Look, he is like a fool”
```

```
jst bw sh3.n=k p3 jwty dr.t=f (O. Florence 2619, r° 2)
“don’t you remember the butterfinger? (one does not know his name; he is loaded like a donkey …)”
```
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The functions of jwtj-headed phrases and clauses

- Gilula (1970: 213) states that “iwty (…) is the nominalization (the subordinated, substantivized form) of the negative word n and possibly also nn. iwty enables the negative construction to function as a substantive or an attribute.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{mk sw m jwtj jb=f} (P. Chester Beatty 1, ν° C2,2)
  \textit{“Look, he is like a fool”}
\item \textit{jst bw sh\textit{3}.n=k p\textit{3} jwtj dr.t=f} (O. Florence 2619, r° 2)
  \textit{“don’t you remember the butterfinger? (one does not know his name; he is loaded like a donkey …)”}
\item \textit{ksn w3.t jwtj mw=s} (KRI I, 66,2 [Kanais])
  \textit{“the water-less road is tiresome”}
\end{itemize}
The genesis and diachrony of \( at- \)

The functions of \( jwtj \)-headed phrases and clauses

- Gilula (1970: 213) states that “\( iwty (\ldots) \) is the nominalization (the subordinated, substantivized form) of the negative word \( n \) and possibly also \( nn \). \( iwty \) enables the negative construction to function as a substantive or an attribute.

- Werning (2013: 244-248) traces the semantically circumstantial use of \( jwtj \) in the \textit{Netherworld Books} back to FIP and OK texts.
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The functions of jwtj-headed phrases and clauses

Gilula (1970: 213) states that “iwty (…) is the nominalization (the subordinated, substantivized form) of the negative word n and possibly also nn. iwty enables the negative construction to function as a substantive or an attribute.

Werning (2013: 244-248) traces the semantically circumstantial use of jwtj in the Netherworld Books back to FIP and OK texts.

\[
\text{jn.n(=}j \text{jn.w m } \text{h3s.t tn r } \text{3.t wr.t, jwtj zp in.t(w) mrt.t jr } \text{13 pn } \text{dr-b3h (Urk. I, 125,6-7)}
\]

“I have brought back tributes from this country in great quantity, without anything similar having ever been brought back to this land in the past.”

\[
\text{(...)jwt(}j \text{hkr.n=}\text{tn hr=s, jwt(}j \text{hw3.n=}\text{tn hr=s (Pyr. 1513c [P])}
\]

“(food…) thanks to which you do not starve, nor go bad.”

Consecutive reading in Werning (2013: 248) “so that …”
The functions of \textit{jwtj}-headed phrases and clauses

- Gilula (1970: 213) states that “\textit{iwty} (…) is the nominalization (the subordinated, substantivized form) of the negative word \textit{n} and possibly also \textit{nn}. \textit{iwty} enables the negative construction to function as a substantive or an attribute.

- Werning (2013: 244-248) traces the semantically circumstantial use of \textit{jwtj} in the \textit{Netherworld Books} back to FIP and OK texts.

- Hypothesis: Attributive \textit{jwtj} > Adjunctal \textit{jwtj}, loss of NP internal coherence as with
  - Absence of resumption.
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*

The functions of *jwtj*-headed phrases and clauses

- Gilula (1970: 213) states that “*iwty* (…) is the nominalization (the subordinated, substantivized form) of the negative word *n* and possibly also *nn*.* iwty* enables the negative construction to function as a substantive or an attribute

- Werning (2013: 244-248) traces the semantically circumstantial use of *jwtj* in the *Netherworld Books* back to FIP and OK texts

- Hypothesis: Attributive *jwtj* > Adjunctal *jwtj*, loss of NP internal coherence as with
  - Absence of resumption
  - Co-reference and/or relative tense

*jwtj*  *jwtj* = *f* (Stela Louvre C 256, l. 13-14)
“he who crosses the sky without being tired”
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The functions of jwtj-headed phrases and clauses

- Gilula (1970: 213) states that “iwty (…) is the nominalization (the subordinated, substantivized form) of the negative word n and possibly also nn. iwty enables the negative construction to function as a substantive or an attribute.

- Werning (2013: 244-248) traces the semantically circumstantial use of jwtj in the Netherworld Books back to FIP and OK texts.

- Hypothesis: Attributive jwtj > Adjunctal jwtj, loss of NP internal coherence as with
  - Absence of resumption
  - Co-reference and/or relative tense

\[ mwt=f \ di.t \ irj=w \ dnn \ jwtj \ ^{c}h^{c} \ (P. \ Brooklyn, 47.218.135, 1. 6,13) \]
“and he will have them tormented non-stop”
The genesis and diachrony of \textit{at-}

The functions of \textit{jwtj}-headed phrases and clauses

- The situation in Demotic

Token frequency

- 167 (90\%: Substantive /Attributive)
- 18 (10\%: Adjunct)
The genesis and diachrony of at-

The functions of jwtj-headed phrases and clauses

- The situation in Demotic

Token frequency

Without delay; without going to court; completely; without objection; without tax; without receipt
The genesis and diachrony of *at-*
The functions of *jwtj*-headed phrases and clauses

- The situation in Demotic

**Token frequency**

- Adjunct: 18 (10%)
- Substantive / Attributive: 167 (90%)

**Type frequency**

- Adjunct: 6 (29%)
- Substantive / Attributive: 15 (71%)
The genesis and diachrony of *at*-
The functions of *jwtj*-headed phrases and clauses

- The situation in Demotic

Token frequency

- 167 (90%)
- 18 (10%)

Type frequency

- 15 (71%)
- 6 (29%)

\[ [m]tw=n \ jr \ md.t \ nb \ n \ p3 \ t \ jwtj \ šn.tj=f \ (Petub. \ 10/7-8) \]

“(It did not happen) [th]at we did anything on earth without asking him”
Conclusions
Conclusions

- In this talk, we have traced the history of *jwtj* from Earlier Egyptian to Later Egyptian

- We have shown that the development of a negative relativizer into a negative agentive nominalizer is both complex and gradual, involving:
  - The loss of compatibility with a wide range of verbal and non-verbal clause types, resulting with only the negative existential function remaining stable (pivot period MEg)
  - The loss of resumption (pivot period LEg)
  - Which leads to the development of adjunctal functions out of attributive contexts (pivot period Demotic)
In this talk, we have traced the history of *jwtj* from Earlier Egyptian to Later Egyptian.

We have shown that the development of a negative relativizer into a negative agentive nominalizer is both complex and gradual.

The occurrence of the infinitive in this construction does not seem to be a direct continuation of earlier *jwtj + VP* constructions, but rather seems to have been facilitated by the construction’s restriction to the negative existential function.
Conclusions

- More broadly, the case of Ancient Egyptian *jwtj* is valuable for the general understanding of the diachronic typology of agentive nominalization constructions.
Thank you for your attention!
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