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Late Egyptian, the language of ancient Egypt during the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period, is attested in written form in a large array of literary and non-literary genres, mainly in the hieratic script on papyri and ostraca, but also in hieroglyphic monumental epigraphy. Late Egyptian is the first stage of the second major phase of Egyptian, according to the widely accepted division of the history of the language into Earlier and Later Egyptian. Typologically, Late Egyptian reflects major differences with respect to earlier stages of the language. Being more analytical in character, Late Egyptian thus displays a marked tendency to separate morphological from lexical information. It also tends to be more explicit in the articulation of sentences at the macro-syntactic level (Conjunctive and Sequential) and more time-oriented in its system of grammatical tenses than the aspect-oriented system of Classical Egyptian.

1. Introduction

Late Egyptian, attested in written form from c. 1450 – 600 BCE, is the first stage of “Later Egyptian” following the general subdivision of Egyptian-Coptic language history into “Earlier Egyptian” (or “Egyptian I,” comprising Old and Middle Egyptian) and “Later Egyptian” (or “Egyptian II,” comprising Late Egyptian, Demotic, and Coptic) (e.g., Vernus 1988; Loprieno 1995; Allen 2013).

As a written idiom, Late Egyptian gradually emerged in the 18th Dynasty (Kroeber 1970; Kruchten 1999). It lasted more than 800 years
before evolving into Demotic. However, the traditional view of this evolution hides problematic issues that await further study. Some lexical, phonological, and grammatical data suggest that the succession from Middle to Late Egyptian was not direct. This prompts the difficult question of whether Middle and Late Egyptian may have been based on geographical variations—that is, dialects (Winand 2015). The transition between Late Egyptian and Demotic is not better understood. As a writing technique, and indeed a new scribal tradition, Demotic originated in the north before spreading throughout Egypt. Whether the diffusion also applied to grammar remains a topic for discussion. Two features are generally taken as diagnostic of Demotic in comparison with, and in contrast to, Late Egyptian: narrative sequences consisting of chains of perfectives (or Present I tenses with the Old Perfective of verbs of directed motion), instead of the Late Egyptian sequentials (below, § 10.2 and 11), and the nfr-f construction replacing the older adjectival-predicate construction nfr sw (Shisha-Halevy 1989, on Papyrus Vandier). Although these features are emblematic of Demotic, it should be noted that chains of perfectives quite commonly occur already in Late Egyptian, and indeed the new pattern nfr-f is found in onomastic formations in the Third Intermediate Period (§ 9).

During its long history, Late Egyptian underwent major changes: a letter from Amenhotep III’s reign is only remotely related linguistically to a letter from the beginning of the 21st Dynasty. Considering verbal morphology as a diagnostic, the development of Late Egyptian can be divided into three major phases (Winand 1992: 3-30): from the 18th Dynasty to Ramesses II; from Merenptah to the 21st Dynasty (with two major subdivisions, taking the reign of Ramesses III as a turning point); and from the 22nd to the 25th dynasties.

As a medium for written communication, Late Egyptian was never used in all domains: Traditional Egyptian, a language intended to emulate literary texts written in Earlier Egyptian, remained in use down to Ptolemaic and Roman times and was employed for royal and religious epigraphic texts, rituals, and, more generally, texts composed with the conscious intent of manifesting a link with the multisecular tradition of a glorious past (see, in this publication, Vernus 2016 and Engsheden 2016). Although they constituted two distinct written idioms, Late and Traditional Egyptian were often interactively blended in texts (e.g., Jansen-Winkeln 1995; Winand and Gohy 2011). Nor was Late Egyptian itself a monolithic entity. In the 1970s, major differences were recognized between what was then termed “literary” and “non-literary” Late Egyptian (Israël-Groll 1975-1976; Goldwasser 1999; and as early as Hintze 1950 and 1952). While this general perception remains valid, the picture that gradually emerges from recent studies is considerably more complex. Written production in Late Egyptian spans a wide variety of genres, each displaying internal linguistic variation according to register. In letters, for example, the address, well-wishing formula, discourse, and narrative sections are all linguistically differentiated (Winand 1992: 23-25; Sweeney 2001; Gohy 2012). A close study of the material from Deir el-Medina and the Theban area reveals moreover the existence of sociolects (e.g., slang) and idiolects (Winand & a).

The distance, as it were, in morphology, syntax, and the lexicon between Late and Middle Egyptian can be measured, for example, in a religious ritual (Ritual for Repelling the Aggressive One; see Schott 1954) that has been transmitted in two versions, one in Traditional Egyptian (thus closely mirroring Middle Egyptian), and one in an advanced stage of Late Egyptian (Vernus 1990a). The latter has definite articles (pA), whereas the former has none, and a relative clause introduced by nty-jw (an analytic strategy), whereas the former employs a nfr-HR construction (a synthetic strategy). Lexical differences are also visible, the latter containing ḫswty, while the former has ḫtj.
Late Egyptian is documented in a wide variety of texts, which lend themselves to the fine-grained study of numerous linguistic features (Dorn and Polis 2016; Winand 2018, for some striking examples). The extant record can thus be subdivided into several functional spheres, or domains of written performance, which correspond to different degrees of interpenetration of Late Egyptian with more conservative written varieties of the language (Junge 1985; Winand 1992: 3-30, introducing the notions of *néo-égyptien complet*, *néo-égyptien mixte*, and *néo-égyptien partiel*).

The record is presented below according to a scale exhibiting Late Egyptian’s decreasing importance as the core linguistic system. The genres at the top of the list thus adopted Late Egyptian as a written idiom somewhat earlier than the genres at the bottom, which were prone to retain conservative features, or features of Traditional Egyptian, and were thus resistant to innovations more rapidly adopted by genres at the top of the list:

**Letters.** The Late Ramesside Letters (*LRL*) (Černý 1939; translation Wente 1990); Letters to the Dead (Gardiner and Sethe 1928; translation Wente 1990); some letters from the Late Egyptian Miscellanies (*LEM*) (Gardiner 1937; translation Caminos 1954 and Tacke 2001);

**Administration.** Instructions, reports, lists, etc. (for instance, the texts published in the Ramesside Administrative Documents [Gardiner 1948] and the Turin Strike Papyrus [pTurin 1880; translation Frandsen 1990]);

**Late Egyptianal Matters.** Sales, wills (e.g., the Inscription of Mose [Gaballa 1977] and the Will of Naunakhte [Černý 1945]), actions before the court, and inquests (e.g., the Harem Conspiracy [De Buck 1937; Koenig 2001] and the Great Tomb Robberies [Peet 1930]);

**Tales.** The Late Egyptian stories (*LES*) (Gardiner 1932; translation Simpson 2003), with a special mention of the Report of Wenamun (see Winand 2011 for a linguistic analysis), and the Letter of Wermut (Quack 2001);

**Wisdom Literature.** For example, the Wisdom of Ani (Quack 1994), the Wisdom of Amenemope (Laïsney 2007; see Vernus 2013 for a linguistic analysis), the Wisdom of Amenemkhete (Bickel and Mathieu 1993; Dorn 2004), and poetry (e.g., the so-called Love Poems [Mathieu 1996; translation Vernus 1992]);

**Royal Inscriptions.** For example, the boundary stelae of Akhenaten (Murnane and Van Siclen 1993), the Poem of Qadesh ([KRI II, 2-101; translation Lichtheim 1976: 60-72]), the Chronicle of Prince Osorkon (Caminos 1958);

**Religious Texts.** Oracles (the oracular decrees for Djehutymose [Kruchten 1986], Henuttauy, and Maatkara [Winand 2003]), prayers, and hymns (e.g., the Great Hymn to Aten [translation Lichtheim 1976: 96-100]).

This rich diversity of texts should not obscure the geographic imbalance of the sources, which remains a major obstacle for studying the dialectal varieties (Winand 2015). According to most recent statistics, texts from the south outnumber those from the north. The Upper Egyptian material overwhelmingly derives from the Theban area, and more specifically from the workers’ village of Deir el-Medina. Such an imbalance could distort the perception of Late Egyptian as regards its geographical diversity and its historical evolution. For instance, letters and administrative texts from Memphis are poorly represented, and virtually nothing has survived from Pt-Ramesse, the seat of the central government in Ramesside times. Material from the border areas (oases, deserts) is exceedingly rare and scattered.
The provenance of the written production can remain problematic as shown by the still elusive place of origin of the “el-Hiba” archive (Lefevre 2008; Müller 2009). Moreover, the archaeologically proven location of a text is not per se a guarantee that it was composed in that particular locality. This is self-evident for the royal epigraphic texts (the copies of the Qadesh poem from temples all over Egypt remain the best example). Letters—and more generally the administrative archives—raise another issue. First, it is sometimes difficult to identify the sender and the recipient. But, more importantly, one must keep in mind that officials often took with them their archives when moving from one location to another, which can only add to the confusion as regards our assessment of dialectal features.

3. Studies

Of the various stages of Egyptian, Late Egyptian was the first to be described as such, in the late nineteenth century (Erman 1880/1933). The 1970s saw major improvements in the understanding of significant domains of Late Egyptian grammar (Israelit-Groll 1967, 1970), which led to the first comprehensive grammar of Late Egyptian (Černý and Israelit-Groll 1975/1984; also Frandsen 1974). From the 1990s on, major developments have concerned the study of verbal morphology (Winand 1992), reported speech (Peust 1996), emphatic forms (Cassonnet 2000), and the modal system (Polis 2009). There are today excellent standard grammars, mostly for instructional purposes, in French (Neveu 1996) and German (Junge 1996/2008), both now with English translations (Junge 2001; Neveu 2015).

Late Egyptian studies have been recently given a new impetus by the development of a dedicated database of Late Egyptian texts with a complete set of grammatical annotations (the “Ramses Project” at the University of Liège: Rosmorduc, Polis, and Winand 2010; Polis and Winand 2013; Winand, Polis, and Rosmorduc 2015; Polis, Honnay, and Winand 2013). This will hopefully lead to a new grammar and a comprehensive dictionary.

Regarding lexicography, despite the pioneering enterprise of Lesko and Lesko (1982 – 1990), the lack of a modern dictionary of Late Egyptian is sorely felt. Encouragingly, the on-going project “Verbs of Motion and Verbs of Transfer in Late Egyptian,” also headquartered at the University of Liège, can be considered a case study for the development of a new kind of dictionary—one essentially at the intersection of lexicon and grammar—that will present the data in a dynamic and interactive way (Winand fc. b).

4. Orthography and Phonology

Late Egyptian underwent many phonological changes with respect to older stages of Egyptian (Vernus 1988; Loprieno 1995: 28-50; Peust 1999; Allen 2018). The present remarks concern only those changes that are reflected in or had a significant impact on orthography; in view of the complexity of the processes involved, a limited summary overview is offered here.

As a result of various processes of neutralization, graphemes representing once-distinct phonemes could become interchangeable, for example ḫ and ḥ, ṝ and ṣ, g and k. Dentals in particular underwent notable modifications that would become fully observable in Coptic. The voiced dental /d/ became voiceless, eventually collapsing with /t/ (Crooked hd[t] “sail northwards,” LRL 2.7, cf. Coptic ḡrt; ẖbḥ “ask,” Papyrus el-Hiba 1, 3, cf. ṭwḥ2); /t/ could subsequently also be reduced to zero (compare ḡḏḏ-[j]w-tj-wf-f-nḥ PN with ḡḏḏ-f, LES 6.1, cf. ḡt=f=q). Depending on its position in the word, and according to the stress, the old palatalized voiced dental /d/ remained stable in some words (ḏḏ “say,” cf. ḡḏḏ), but was depalatized in others ( phéḏḏ “be weary”), a process already observable in Middle Egyptian, and could eventually be devoiced (ḥḏḏ “grind,” pLansing 9.9, cf. ṭḥḏ=q). A similar fate befell its voiceless correspondent /t/: ḡḏḏ “load,” cf.
Various phenomena of phonetic reduction, with consequences on the written forms of words, are observed in word-final position, some of them having already begun in Middle Egyptian. Weak consonants, like –j, –w, and –s, are strongly reduced, and are regularly omitted in writing (\textit{bw-nb} “everyone,” \textit{LEM} 12.10; \textit{m} \textit{th(z)} “transgress,” \textit{KRI} II, 227.15). The voiceless dental /t/ could be reduced to zero in word-final position (see above), mostly with nominal and verbal endings (§ 6, 10). The consonant \textit{r} is also regularly omitted in final position \( (\text{\textit{hrw}}) \) “day” (\textit{OE} 10474, 24.9, cf. \textit{w} \textit{be}).

Before plosives, \textit{m} was not infrequently written \textit{n}, especially before a voiceless stop: \textit{m} (\textit{hrw} “on this day” (pDeir el-Medina 6,1)).

As an overall result of these historical processes of neutralization and loss, the correlations between graphemes and phonemes were themselves altered. For instance, some morphs continued to be written, although they had already been dropped in pronunciation. This is notably the case for the prepositions \textit{r} (Future III) and \textit{hr} (Present I and Sequential). When combined with other phenomena (like the form of the 3rd-person plural of the suffix pronoun \( [\textit{sn} \textit{v. – w}] \), the spelling of the plural definite article \( [\textit{n} \textit{v. ns}] \), or the spelling of some negations \( [\textit{t} \textit{v. bw}, \textit{nn} \textit{v. bnt}] \)), their gradual disappearance in writing constitutes a solid criterion for the dating of texts (Winand 1995).

5. Lexical Morphology and Vocabulary

The lexicon of Late Egyptian is relatively well known but poorly understood as a network of semantic relations (Winand fc. b and fc. c), a state of affairs that indeed holds for the entire Egyptian lexicon.

The Late Egyptian lexicon displays instances of lexical replacement and renewal. Some words have replaced older ones, such as \textit{ptr} “see” (Earlier Egyptian “perceive”), which became the generic verb of seeing in Late Egyptian instead of the earlier \textit{ms}, and \textit{sfr} “son” (Earlier Egyptian “little”), instead of Earlier Egyptian \textit{s}. New (or at least newly attested) words also appeared, like \textit{jrm} “(lit.) set,” which gradually superseded Earlier Egyptian \textit{hr} (Winand 2014b). The earlier derivational morphology was no longer productive in Late Egyptian. The old causative pattern with \textit{s}-, inherited from Afroasiatic, was still understood but gradually replaced by analytic strategies for causativization based on \textit{rdj} “(lit.) set,” followed by a form of the Subjunctive, a process that had already begun in Earlier Egyptian (for the much rarer construction \textit{rdj} + Infinitive, see Winand 2015: 248; and fc. a). Analytic strategies are also seen spreading in the domain of nominal derivation, with new forms of nominal compounding that would later fully develop into prefixing derivational
morphology: *md.t- “(lit.) word” for abstract nouns, as in *md.t-wn.t “Egyptian (language); rmt- “(lit.) man,” as in *rmt-js.t “crewwman”, shr-(n)- “(lit.) manner,” as in m pswj shr-n-jsw “in my manner of robbing”; aj-n Infinitive as in aj-n mr st “the fact of binding them” (Papyrus Anastasi I, 24.6; for Demotic, see Simpson 1996: 89). Regarding transitivity, verbs of quality, like *nfr “to be good,” were sometimes used transitively in Late Egyptian, thus with a factitive meaning (*jw j [r] snb jr.t=f “I shall make his eye healthy,” pBM 10321, 11; for Earlier Egyptian, see Schenkel 1999 and Stauder 2014: 178-183), a tendency that would increase in Demotic (and, reflecting the Demotic development, in Traditional Egyptian of Ptolemaic and Roman times; see Kurth 2008: 757-759). This phenomenon is best analyzed as an internal development of Egyptian (as can be observed cross-linguistically in several languages, for instance in French), rather than a reflex of the Pi’el-formation known in Semitic languages (Winand 2006a: 132-135).

In the lexicon, the technical vocabulary (fauna, flora, weaponry, tools, etc.) is particularly rich and well documented, especially by the evidence coming from Deir el-Medina. The New Kingdom was receptive to lexical borrowing, mostly Semitic—i.e., words that came into Egyptian through Semitic languages (Hoch 1994, with critical reviews of Meeks 1997 and Ward 1996; Winand 2017)—but not exclusively (Schneider et al. eds. 2004). These words are usually spelled syllabically (Schenkel 1986; Zeidler 1994), as were some words of genuine Egyptian origin that appeared for the first time in writing during the New Kingdom (e.g., [jrm “with”] or whose written tradition was broken after the Old Kingdom (e.g., the independent pronoun of the 3rd-person masculine singular, swf). In all these cases, the syllabic spelling demonstrates the lack of a historically transmitted conventional orthography, because there was none or because it had been lost (Winand 2017). While loanwords are numerous in the New Kingdom record, only a tiny minority of these survived into Demotic and Coptic. Except for some xenisms (i.e., words that apply to realities foreign to Egyptian culture, like *mrkb.t “chariot”) that made their way into the lexicon, most of the loanwords were used in literary compositions (e.g., the Satirical Letter of Papyrus Anastasi I), being apparently fashionable at these times among certain elite circles (Winand 2017).

6. Gender, Number, and the Syntax of the Noun Phrase

Earlier Egyptian was characterized by a complete set of morphs for gender and number inflection. Late Egyptian presents a clear contrast, mostly relying on a fully developed set of determinants for these specifications.

6.1. The endings for the feminine and plural are no longer systematically written and one can observe numerous inconsistencies, for instance masculine nouns written with a –t ending ([pA xr “the tomb,” KRI IV, 153,3-4]). When a feminine noun was followed by a suffix pronoun to indicate possession (§ 8), the –t ending was most often retained for phonological reasons, and indicated by a special, full spelling ([tw or tj: [hr.t-k “your affairs”] that was also characteristic of the pronominal state of some infinitives (§ 10.2). Gender could also be graphically suggested by the classifier ([jw bn jr šrj šr.t mdw “as no son or daughter will contest,” KRI I/1, 741,14), or by the apposition of nouns meaning “male” or “female” ([n< n] ntr m ntr.w ḫswty m ntr.w hm.t “thousands of divinities, male divinities and female divinities,” KRI II, 229,12).

When a personal pronoun points to a neutral referent, the masculine form is preferred in Late Egyptian, in contrast to Middle Egyptian, where the feminine was consistently used.

The dual forms are mostly relics except for some natural pairs, such as nouns expressing parts of the body. In the spelling, the dual ending (–wj or –tf) can appear, while the
doubling of the classifier or of the logogram is exceptional and mostly found in monumental inscriptions. One will also note that the article, if any, usually remains in the singular (ps3rd. wj “my two Late Egyptians,” pAbbott, r° 6,19). In the vast majority of cases, the dual is expressed by the cardinal number 2 (ps3 ss-mš 2 “the two army scribes,” LEM 74,10).

The plural is most often indicated by the article (or the possessive article), but one sometimes finds the ending

-  (m.) or - (f.):

-  “fathers” (eiores);

-  “favors.”

### 6.2. Cardinal numbers

stand between the determinant and the noun (but remain after the noun in accounts: hd bn 1 kd.t 5 “one silver deben and 5 kite” [pBM 10052,2A,13]). They are inflected for gender, while the determinant remains in the singular (the noun can be either singular or plural): ps3 4 dbn “these 4 debens”; ts 3.t dd “the 3 girls.” Above 10, the cardinal number is usually linked to the noun by the connector n(y): m tsy-f 65 n rnp.t “during his 65 years” (KRI I, 19,15). Cardinal 2 usually follows the noun, as in Middle Egyptian. Thus:

\[ jw=n jr.t s m 6 dnj.t, jw=n dj.t dnj.t \]

2 n X “we made it in 6 parts, and we gave 2 parts to X” (pBM 10052,3,6-7)

The old suffix -nw for constructing ordinal numbers is no longer found (except in sn.nw “second,” which was by then lexicalized). Late Egyptian uses the participial form of the verb mH “fill” (generally) before the cardinal: jw=j <m> mH 4 hm.t “while I am the fourth wife” (pBM 10052,15,7).

### 6.3. The system of determination

in Late Egyptian is not fully understood and needs further investigation (see Kroober 1970; Loprieno 1980). To summarize, in the first evolutionary stage of Late Egyptian one observes a regular opposition between Ø-NP (noun phrase) and ps3-NP, while in a later stage the opposition becomes a ternary one between Ø-NP, ps3-NP, and w-Ø-NP, the latter being increasingly used for undefined nouns (Winand 2009), although the so-called indefinite plural article nh most often keeps its original meaning of “some, a quantity of” (j jr nh s hrw dy qsr-nj “pass some days here with me,” LES 63,2); consequently indefinite plural nouns usually remain without determinant. The definite article is used before a noun: 1) that has already been introduced (jw f dj.t w s.t, jw ss A šsp ts s.t “he gave a letter and the scribe A received the letter,” LRL 45,11-12); 2) that is determined by what immediately follows (jh p3 nty hr šm.t m ss p3 s’ s nty m j.j.t hr ts mj.t “What is that which is going after the great person who is coming on the road?” LES 2,4-5); and 3) that is already known contextually (jrrj ts 3.t, jw dj.t.s n PN “I made the letter, and I gave it to PN,” LRL 32,6) or by some shared general knowledge (m jr jfj. j j nj t s qnb.t “Do not take me to the tribunal,” KRI I, 238,12). The application of the definite article also extends to nouns used generically (mwt-f n p3 mšh m-r-pw p3 hfs w mj.t p3 jw “he will die by the crocodile, or by the serpent, or also by the dog,” LES 1,6-7). The article (definite and indefinite) can transform a mass noun into a countable noun (h “wood,” w h “a piece of wood,” p3 h “the wood”; compare jw f hr jn w-n gzy n Ø-Ø nbh [...] jw jst jf 5 m nбл mw “and he brought a cup of fresh water … and his heart drank the water,” LES 23,10-13).

Except when the noun is indefinite and plural (as mentioned above), the absence of the article is standard in the following cases: 1) when the noun is followed by a suffix pronoun for marking possession (Ø-Ø.wj “his two Late Egyptians,” LES 3,13); 2) when the noun is followed by the quantifiers nb “all, every” and qnw “much” (m Ø-l.t nb n šj.t “with all the products of the field,” LES 13,7); 3) when the noun is an attribute (ps3 smsw djdjr r Ø-jhwj “the senior is placed as cultivator,” pAnastasi II, 7,4); 4) when an indefinite noun is the predicate of a nominal predication (Ø-bjsj.t s.t t3y hpr.tj “this is a great miracle that
has happened,” LES 25,2-3; 5) in some temporal expressions (m  Datagram “by night”); 6) with mass nouns left unspecified (mntf dj.t Datagram “it is he who pours water on his hands,” KRI IV, 156,2-3; 7) with singular or discrete entities, such as abstract nouns (hr j. jr Datagram “and excellence came therefrom to where I am,” LES 69,2), but the presence of the definite article is also known (jn jw=n r rx pr A grg “Shall we not recognize falsehood?” LES 38,6); 8) when a negation is present (compare, in the same text, jw gm=j wa br “after I had found a boat,” LES 65,6-7, with jn bn Datagram “with,” see Winand 2014b), possession (m -dj Datagram “in the hand of”), addition (hr “on”), or comparison (m-mjt.t “like,” mj “as, like” > mj-qd). Disjunction is expressed by m-r-pw, which is usually placed between the two noun phrases (in contrast to Earlier Egyptian, where r-pw is placed after the second member).

6.6. Direct dependency (also called the direct genitive in Egyptological tradition) is no longer productive in Late Egyptian, necessitating that formations of this kind be analyzed, rather, as compound nouns. The indirect construction (an appellation to be preferred to the so-called indirect genitive inherited from the grammatical tradition in Classical studies, since there was no case system in Late Egyptian) uses the morph n(j) between the two juxtaposed noun phrases. This morph was originally inflected for gender and number, but this is no longer the case in Late Egyptian, where it has become invariable: t3 hm.t n psj.j ji “the wife of my father.”

6.7. A member of another class can be treated as a noun, usually by the addition of an article; this is well known with adjectives (nfr “good” > ns nfr.w “what is good”), but also with some prepositional phrases (my jtw n sj w’-n mj-qd=f “let be brought to me one like it,” LES 2,6).

7. Pronouns
Late Egyptian features an extensive choice of personal pronouns, whose uses are conditioned by syntax.

7.1. The suffix pronouns are primarily the same as those of Earlier Egyptian, with some minor exceptions. The 1st-person singular pronoun can sometimes be omitted in writing, especially when the noun or verb it is attached to ends with a –t, as is often the case with feminine nouns and weak verbs, such as the 3ae (tertiae infirmae, i.e., third weak) Infinitive (for example Xn.t[=j] “to ferry me”). This tendency leads to a later reanalysis of the –t as the mark of the 1st-person pronoun (Coptic –r). In the 3rd-person plural, one observes a major change in Late Egyptian: the old pronoun –sn is gradually replaced by –w (Coptic [o]Y, see Edel 1959: 30-37; Winand 1995; Winand fc. a; Stauder 2015: 522-527).

The suffix pronouns express nominal possession (§ 8); can be the subject of various verbal forms (Perfective, Subjunctive, auxiliated forms); can be attached to several types of conjugation bases (Sequential and Future III jw, Conjunctive, narrative auxiliaries...
7.2. The morphology of Late Egyptian **dependent pronouns** is little changed from that of Middle Egyptian, except that, for phonological reasons, pronouns in the 3rd person—sw, sj, st > /sɛ/ (that is, phonetic form)—are now sometimes confused in spelling (one will note some occasional curious spellings such as ṭ for 3rd-person plural). The use of dependent pronouns is more limited in Late Egyptian than in Middle Egyptian: these pronouns are rarely found outside their role as direct object of the Perfective, the Subjunctive, the Imperative, and the participle, since the suffix pronoun is used in all patterns where the lexical verb takes the form of an infinitive. As subject of an adverbial predicate, the dependent pronouns are replaced by the new subject pronouns (§ 10.2), except in some texts of the 18th, and the beginning of the 19th, Dynasty, in which the old pattern mk + dependent pronoun can still be found. In the 3rd person, the dependent pronoun is still used in a frozen pattern (ns-sw NP) for expressing possession (§ 8).

7.3. Late Egyptian **independent pronouns** are characterized morphologically by a graphic device combining initial m and n, which probably served to note a degree of fluctuation in its phonological value (Uljas 2005). In the 3rd-person plural, the independent pronoun underwent an evolution analogous to that of the suffix pronoun: Middle Egyptian ntsn > Late Egyptian mntw. For the 2nd- and 3rd-person singular, Late Egyptian also reintroduced archaic Old Egyptian pronouns (twt and swf), but only for expressing possession. The independent pronouns are found in nominal predication (both as subject and predicate), in cleft sentences (as subject), in some patterns expressing predicative and adnominal possession (§ 8), after another personal pronoun to provide emphasis (pAy=j jH jnk “my own ox,” LES 35,2), and in a thematic role after jr at the beginning of a sentence (jr jnk, dj.tw n-j wʃ f 3 n ḫr “as for me, one has given me a load of skins,” KRI IV, 228,14), or, generally after gr, at the end of a sentence (jḥ ptr-k pʃ gr mntk “Please, you too should consider the situation!” LES 58,2).

7.4. To express the subject of the Present I (the historical successor of the adverbial predicate), Late Egyptian introduced a new set of pronouns—specifically, **new subject pronouns**—characterized by a base tw- followed by a suffix pronoun (including impersonal twf), except for the 3rd persons (masculine singular sw; feminine singular sj; plural st). This new set probably constitutes a morphologically split paradigm, with two different sources for the 1st and 2nd persons on the one hand, and the 3rd persons on the other (Stauder 2016). The new subject pronouns are found in autonomous clauses and in relative clauses introduced by nty (where they will be replaced during the Third Intermediate Period by a new pattern, nty-jw=f, reinterpreted later as nty + circumstantial jw; see Winand 1992: 428-438).

7.5. Late Egyptian had a last set of personal pronouns of a much more limited use: the so-called **direct object pronouns** (Borghouts 1980), which are morphologically constructed, for all persons, on a base tw- followed by a suffix pronoun (thus 3rd-person masculine singular twf, etc.). The direct object pronoun is the product of different and independent phenomena that conspired in producing, by artificial and un-etymological segmentations, a new set of forms (Winand 1992: 263-266 for detail). This pronoun, which is more widespread in Demotic, can be found as the object of an imperative, a perfective, a subjunctive, a participle, or even an infinitive (mntw-k šp tw.w <r/m> nš “ńr.”w 40 “and you will load them into 40 boats,” pTurin P.R. 74,3).

7.6. Late Egyptian has a number of interrogative words that can be used either adjectivally or pronominally, such as njm “Who?” (Coptic nhn), jḥ “What?” (probably a
borrowing from Semitic; see Winand 2017), jḥ “What?” (Coptic χαψ), wr “How many?” (Coptic ωυς), and tww “Where?” (Coptic ΤΩΝ).

8. Possession

8.1. Historically, adnominal possession in Egyptian evolved from a scheme where possession was expressed by the suffix pronoun directly appended to the noun, to a pattern where possession was expressed by a set of fronted determinants to which the suffix pronouns were added (pAy=f “his”). This new form is called the possessive article. In Coptic, the older scheme is still observed, as a mere remnant, with some classes of nouns (body parts, essentially). In this respect, Late Egyptian is at a transitory stage, the older scheme still being used with some classes of nouns: nouns expressing body parts, family ties, or what is called non-alienable entities, which are, at least partly, culturally specific. Notable variations occur during the history of Late Egyptian, according to genre, repertoire, and style, and also to some semantic considerations (see Winand fc. d for a detailed analysis).

For special needs, Late Egyptian resorted to other patterns (for exceptionally rare patterns, see Winand fc. d and Neven 2011, 2013). When the noun was left undefined, the usual pattern was (w)-NP + independent pronoun (including the old pronouns ωψ and ωτ): hr w’ pr jnk “about a house of mine” (PMayer A, v° 8,7). The same device applied when there was a need to express deixis and possession: pAy NP + independent pronoun (pAy bAk swt “this servant of him,” pStrasburg 21, v° 2). One also observes some occurrences of the combination of the possessive article and the independent pronoun: pAy=j jnk “my own (goods).” With a nominal possessor, the pattern is usually (w)-NP + m-dj NP (w’ dsjw shm nfr m-dj) X “a fine garment of linen belonging to X,” PMayer A, r° 5,13). One must also note the construction p(∫)-n (Coptic πα-) to express the subordinated link between two NPs (p∫-n s nb “what is due to every man,” pDeM 28, r° 10; n∫-n p∫ t∫ n Km.t “those of the land of Egypt,” KRI II, 229,13).

8.2. To express predicative possession, Late Egyptian turns to patterns derived from non-verbal predications (there is no Late Egyptian verb meaning “to have”). When the subject is defined, the regular construction is the so-called Present I with the preposition m-dj (other prepositions can also be used, such as hmr “with,” hr “under,” m-dr.t “in the hand of,” or hr-dr.t “under the hand of”). If the possession is viewed as unalienable and if the possessor is pronominal, the pattern of independent pronoun + possessee (mntf p∫ jm “the sea belongs to him,” LES 69,7; swt p∫ hbn “ivory belongs to him,” oBerlin 12343, v° 4) or of nj-sw … jm (tsy 5 bsk …, n∫ jm jm st r-dr=w “these 5 slaves …, they all belong to you,” LRL 50,13) is used. Consequently, in the preceding examples, the possessed entities must be considered, for whatever reasons (social, Late Egyptian, political, or religious), as the permanent possessions of their owner. If the possessor is nominal, the pattern nj-sw + possessor [+ possessee] is employed, which shows the growing trend in Later Egyptian of using a pronominal index close to the predicate instead of the lexical subject, which appears right-extraposed at the end of the clause (nts-sw pr-∫ p∫ jm “the man belongs to Pharaoh [lit. He belongs to Pharaoh, the man],” pMayer A, 5,14; see Winand 2016). The two patterns are contrasted in the following example:

```
(as for the silver) … ns-sw Hr-Hr, pAy=j nb (…) mntk sw

“it belongs to Herihor, my lord (…), it belongs to you” (LES 62,6-9)
```

If the subject (possessee) was indefinite, Late Egyptian opted for the so-called predication of existence (more correctly, of presence; see Winand 2007): wn ω-NP m-dj=f or wn m-dj=f ω-NP, negation m∫ m-d∫ f (Coptic ωυς, mυς). The old negative relative pronoun jwty is still found in lexicalized entities (p∫ jwty hstj=f “the heartless one [lit. the one which not exists his heart]”; cf. Coptic ωυς).
9. Non-verbal Predicates

Non-verbal sentences remain an important part of the grammatical system of Late Egyptian, but with some significant modifications (see Winand 2006b, 2006a). As regards terminology, the adverbial predication of Middle Egyptian is part of the so-called Present I in Late Egyptian, by analogy with Coptic. This comprises the adverbial predication, *stricto sensu* (AdvP and PrepP, i.e., adverbial phrase and prepositional phrase), and some etymological verbal extensions (*hr/m* + Infinitive, and Old Perfective). The old pattern S (subject) + r + Infinitive to express future underwent a separate evolution to emerge as a new paradigm, called Future III, also by analogy with the terminology of Coptic (§ 10.2).

9.1. The *substantival predicate* in Late Egyptian has two main patterns, roughly specialized for expressing identification (A is B) and classification (it is [an] A), respectively. Identification is expressed by the direct juxtaposition of the subject and predicate; if the subject is pronominal (for the 1st and 2nd persons), the independent pronouns are used. As shown by the formal variations found in Coptic (*AN* v. *AH* for the 1st-person singular), these pronouns had stressed and unstressed forms (but note that *mntf* is always stressed; see Coptic *HTOQ*). The negation is *bn … (jwn*):

- *p3 prtrj p3 gđ-j* “what I have seen is what I have said” (pBM 10052, r° 5,8-9)
- *mntk jsw sššš* “You are an old fool!” (pBM 10052, 10,8)
- *bn jnk s.t-hm.t* “Am I not a woman?” (LEM 9,8)

When the 3rd-person independent pronoun is used, it always expresses emphasis:

- *hr jr Jmn-Rc …, mntf p3 nb n p3 śnh snb* “as for Amun-Ra …, he is the lord of life and health” (LES 70,1-3)

To express membership in a class, the deictic *psy*, which is an index of the subject, is used. In contrast to Middle Egyptian, but in accordance with Old Egyptian (possibly indicating some common dialectal background [see § 4]), the deictic varies in gender and number:

- *psy-k jt psy* “it is your father” (LES 33,4)
- *bjšj.t ś.s. tšy hpr.tj* “this is a great miracle what has happened” (LES 25,2-3)

The deictic can be lexically expanded into what is commonly called the subject (which is probably correct synchronically, but remains debatable historically):

- *hr sn jnk psy* PN (proper noun) “for he is a brother of mine, PN (= PN is a brother of mine)” (LRL 43,4)

In Late Egyptian, it is not exceptional for the subject’s index to be omitted. This most often happens in expressive contexts (and is thus negated by *bn … (jwns*):

- *hr ọ-rmj <n >-hš tʃf ọ* “for he was a human himself” (LES 72,10)
- *hr bn md.t sřj.t jwns tšy j.gd psy* ĥṣty-ẹ n njw.t “but this is not a small affair at all what this prince of the city said” (pAbbott 6,8)

9.2. The *adjectival predicate* remains in use but significantly recedes, at least in non-literary documents, becoming limited to a few adjectives like *nfr* “good,” *bjn* “bad,” *msțj* “right,” *gdś* “wrong,” *s* “big,” *sl* “useful”:

- *jn nfr pș jḥ* “Is the ox good?” (oIFAO 682)

There are in the documentation clear indications that the Present I with quality verbs in the Old Perfective is gradually gaining precedence:
The new pattern $n3-nfr=f$, which passes for diagnostic of Demotic, is not present in Late Egyptian texts, but can already be found in onomastics (e.g., $n3-nfr$ [KRI VI, 735,13], $n3-ng3-jtrw$ [pBM 10053-I, r° 4,11], $n3-mnh-ps-R^*$ [pTurin 2118, r° 2]), which shows that the formation and the development of this paradigm is far from understood.

As in Middle Egyptian, the adjectival predicate can be reinforced by the suffix –$wj$, or by the particle $wsj$ (possibly a coalescence of –$wj$ and the 3rd-person dependent pronoun), which is characteristic of some Late Egyptian literary texts. When the referent of the subject is neutral, it is generally omitted ($jn mAa$ Ø, $jn aDA$ Ø “Is it right or wrong?” KRI III, 500,9 ). The adjectival predicate is also found in various patterns for expressing possession (§ 8.2).

The negation is made by $bn ... jwnA$. Examples are scarce and seem to suggest that the substantival predicate was dominant (cf. already in positive examples like $Ax n.k pAy$ “it will be useful for you,” LES 12,11):

$$bn nfr jwnA \ O \ pA \ jr=k \ r=j \ m \ dwn \ sp \ 2 \ sp \ 2 \ “it \ is \ not \ at \ all \ good \ what \ you \ endlessly \ did \ to \ me” \ (pDeM 5, \ ^v^ 3)$$

9.3. Adverbial predication follows the pattern S + AdvP/PrepP. If the subject is pronominal, Late Egyptian uses a new set of pronouns (§ 7), which can stand at the head of a sentence without being introduced by an enunciative particle, as was the case in Middle Egyptian ($jw$ or $mk$). The old interlocutive particle $mk$ is normally superseded by $ptr$ “Look!” As for Earlier Egyptian $jw$, it split into three distinct morphs in Late Egyptian: circumstantial $jw$, used with a large array of predicative patterns; $jw$ as a morph of Future III; and $jw$ as a morph of the so-called Sequential (§ 10.2).

9.4. Non-verbal predication can be syntactically converted by using $jw$ (circumstantial) or $ntj$ (relative). Adverbial predication (much more rarely adjectival) can also take the so-called past converter $wn$:

$$wn=j \ m \ p3 \ hr \ n \ hm.t-nswt \ 3s.t$$

“I was in the tomb of royal wife, Isis” (pAbbott 4,16)

Inclusion of adverbial predication in the flow of narrative and temporality can be achieved by using some semantically light auxiliary verbs like $jrj$ “do” and $hpr$ “become,” or verbs of position, such as $hr$ “stand,” $hmsj$ “sit,” and $sdr$ “lie” (Winand 2000):

$$p2-wn \ nn \ jw=j \ (r) \ jr= j \ m \ s.t \ jw.k \ jm=s \ “for \ I \ shall \ not \ be \ in \ a \ place \ where \ you \ are” \ (LES 17,10-11) \ to \ be \ compared \ with \ nn \ jw=j \ r \ hpr \ m \ s.t \ jw.k \ jm=s \ (LES 16,5-6)$$

10. Verbal Morphology and Predication

10.1. General remarks

Late Egyptian displays changes that wrought significant diachronic consequences in the later stages of the language. One must first note a drastic reduction of the inflected (synthetic) verbal forms to a handful that remained fully productive—specifically, the Perfective, Subjunctive, Emphatic $j-sDm=f$, and Old Perfective. Except in some tenses, the verbal predicative system is essentially made of inflected patterns with the auxiliary $jrj$ “do” (the lexical verb being in the infinitive), and of compound analytical patterns where a specific base is followed by the Infinitive (or Old Perfective).

Another important development is the reduction of the rich set of adjectival forms (§ 10.2.5), and of the passive tenses (§ 12). One must also observe the emergence of full-fledged Emphatic tenses ($j-sdm=f$ and $j\cdot jr=f$ $sDm$ [§ 14]).
10.2. The forms

10.2.1. From a statistical viewpoint, the most important verbal form in Late Egyptian is definitely the **Infinitive**, which accounts for more than half of the occurrences of any verbal form. Due to phonological changes, some verbs have moved to new classes (e.g., all triliteral verbs having the scheme A-A-C have become bilateral: *hšb* “send” > Coptic *gw.b*). The weak verbs (i.e., with final -j or -w) usually have dropped the ending –t, except some of them when in the status pronominals, where the ending is noted by a fuller writing, e.g. or ḫm.t=f “finding it” (§ 6).

10.2.2. In the **Old Perfective**, the personal endings underwent a consistent decline during the New Kingdom: at the beginning of the 20th Dynasty, the endings were –k* (1* singular), –t* (2* singular, 3* feminine singular, 1* plural, 2* plural), and –j or Ø (3* masculine singular, 3* plural); at the beginning of the 21st Dynasty, the ending –k was replaced by –t*. The old endings –w(j)n and –t(j)wn(j) for the 1* and 2* plural are only exceptionally found and disappear after the reign of Ramesses III. Thus the paradigm of the Old Perfective was by then reduced to a binary opposition between /t/ and Ø (Winand 1992: 134-138). The Old Perfective marks a new, resultative situation, which can be observed from the viewpoint of the direct object (transitive verbs) or of the subject (intransitive verbs).

10.2.3. The **inflected forms** are as follows (for a complete presentation, see Winand 1992):

a) The Perfective *sdm-f* (or *jr-f sdm* with verbs having more than 3 radicals), with transitive verbs, is mainly found in autonomous sentences and in circumstantial clauses converted by *jw* (the Perfective *sdm-f* is not yet standard in relative clauses converted by *nty*, although the negative pattern *bw-pw-f sdm* had already superseded the participial and relative forms of the verbal negative auxiliary *tn*). With intransitive verbs, the Perfective *sdm-f* is usually replaced by the Present I with Old Perfective (§ 11), although some rare examples can be found (Winand and Gohy 2011) in circumstances that still await comprehensive study.

b) The **Subjunctive** *sdm-f* (or *jr-f sdm* with verbs having more than 3 radicals) is found in autonomous sentences for expressing shades of modality (see Polis 2009); in non-autonomous sentences for conveying goal or consequence; after the verb *r’dj* to express causality; and after some prepositions. In autonomous sentences it is negated by *bn* (< Middle Egyptian *nn*) and in non-autonomous ones by *tm*. The Subjunctive is found after the particle *jh* for expressing an invitation and after *hr* for expressing contingency. This latter pattern would eventually express the *inaccompli général* (see Vernus 1990b)—expressed in Late Egyptian by the Present I—and ultimately become one of the four main tenses of Coptic (*hr-sdm-f > hr-jr-f sdm > qa ‘q-cwtw*).

c) The **Terminative** *sdm-t=f*, already known in Old Egyptian, is still found in Late Egyptian in two patterns, both of which survive until Coptic: 1) the *r-sdm-t=f* pattern “until he has heard” (written Ù wŒ, Ù), which was replaced in the Ramesside Period by an analytical pattern with the auxiliary *j(e)r, jr-t=f sdm*, which was finally superseded in the 21st Dynasty by a new pattern involving the preposition (*r*)-nfr “until,” *nfr-t=f sdm* (*qa ‘q-cwtw*); and 2) the negative pattern *bw-jr-t=f sdm* “he has not heard yet” (*mnfr ‘q-cwtw*), often found in circumstantial clauses.

d) For the **Emphatic** *j.sdm-f* and *j.jr-f sdm*, see § 14.

e) For the passive forms, see § 12.

f) The **Imperative** usually takes a *yod prostheticum* with bilateral verbs Ù Ù *j.dd* “Say!” and assimilated verbs Ù Ù *j.jr* “Do!”; Ù Ù *j.h(s)b* “Send!”). By the end of the 20th Dynasty, while some autonomous forms with jussive meaning might perhaps be analyzed as infinitives instead of imperatives (a situation that would prevail in Coptic), the
Imperative remains fully in use, as shown by the selection of the dependent pronoun for expressing the direct object ([ḥr] s[w “Let him!” Wenamun, 2,47 [21st Dynasty]).

10.2.4. The compound patterns comprise: 1) old narrative formations already attested in Middle Egyptian, and 2) new formations that paradigmatized in Late Egyptian.

1) Old narrative constructions are built on specialized auxiliaries like *[ḥr]*, *(ḥr)*, and *wn ḫn* followed by the Middle Egyptian Perfect *sdm n-f* (more rarely *sdmn-f*) or, more frequently, by the compound *S + ḥｒ + Infinitive*, or *S + Old Perfective*. These formations express sequentiality in narratives, effectively structuring the text into larger units (Winand 2000); they are mainly found in tales in the New Kingdom (yet are conspicuously absent in *Wenamun*), and in some judicial and oracular texts until the 21st Dynasty.

2) The new Late Egyptian patterns are the Present I, the Future III, the Sequential, and the Conjunctive. The first three are the offspring of the so-called pseudo-verbal construction of Middle Egyptian. The pattern of the Present I is: *S + ḥr/m + Infinitive* or *S + Old Perfective*. If the subject is pronominal, the new subject pronoun is used (§ 7.4). The Future III has two complementary constructions according to the nature of the subject: *jwj + ḥr + Infinitive*, or *jrj + NP + (r) + Infinitive*. However, *jw + NP + r + Infinitive* is also found in the southern Late Egyptian dialect (see Winand 1992: 498-504; 2015; Kruchten 2010; Vernus 2013); it can occasionally take an old perfective or a prepositional phrase as its predicate to express a state in the future (Winand 1996a). The pattern of the Sequential is *jw + S + ḥr + Infinitive*. One will note that the preposition *ḥr* or *r* in these three paradigms will gradually disappear from writing in the course of the 19th Dynasty to become virtually absent by the reign of Ramses IX (Winand 1995; the preposition *r* of the Future III will reappear in some circumstances during the Third Intermediate Period: Winand 1992: 500-504; see *e-qa-crtw*). The Conjunctive has the following pattern: *mtw + S + Infinitive*, being the ultimate development of a construction already known in Middle Egyptian for expressing sequentiality in discourse (*ḥn + Infinitive > ḥn + Infinitive + independent pronoun > ḥn + independent pronoun + Infinitive > mtw + Infinitive*). By analogy with the Sequential and the Future III, scribes occasionally inserted the un-etymological preposition *ḥr* or *r* before the Infinitive of the Conjunctive (Winand 1992: 471-472).

10.2.5. In Late Egyptian the number of participial and relative forms (the so-called adjectival forms) declines, the forms still fully productive being the perfective participle (*j jr* and related form *j Jr.f*). Imperfective forms are occasionally found in literary texts, but they are usually replaced by a present I, converted into a relative (*nty* or a circumstantial (*jw* ) clause according to the nature of the antecedent (§11.6). The same phenomenon occurs in the negative, even for perfective forms: the old negative auxiliary *tm* is replaced by a converted *bw pst-sdm* pattern. The Earlier Egyptian prospective participle *sdm tj fj* “who will hear” has been replaced by the converted Future III (*nty jw-f r sdm*).

A remarkable feature of Late Egyptian is the so-called *yod prostheticum*, which stands at the beginning of certain verbal forms (Imperative, Emphatic *j.sdm-f*, perfective participle, and perfective relative form). This grapheme probably originally noted a prosodic pattern, for it first appeared with biliteral verbs (relative form *j dd-f* “that he said”), and then extended to verbs that were assimilated to biliteral verbs, like 3rd infinitive *jrj > jr*, thus participle *j jr* “the one who did”), or triliteral medial - Hawthorne Coptics *qub*, thus relative form *j hsbf “whom he sent”). Later, in the second half of the 20th Dynasty, this *yod* was reanalyzed as a full-fledged morph, appearing with strong triliteral verbs (*j qnd “the one who became angry”*). As has been frequently noted, this *yod* constitutes one of the remarkable features that link Old Egyptian and Late Egyptian, bypassing Middle Egyptian (Edgerton 1951; Winand 2015), but the significance of this spelling for the
reconstruction of the history of the Egyptian language probably needs to be re-evaluated.

11. Time, Aspect, and Modal Features, and General Syntax

The expression of time and aspect underwent major changes in Late Egyptian, typologically and semantically.

11.1. The present in Late Egyptian is basically expressed by the Present I. While there is no longer any marked difference in the affirmative, between progressive and non-progressive aspect, there are still two distinct negative patterns: bw jr-f sDm (< bw sDm-f < Middle Egyptian n sDm.n-f) for the non-progressive, and bn sw hr sDm for the progressive. In the affirmative, some constructions exclusively express the progressive or the immediate present, although they never fully grammaticalized. The most important pattern was an expansion of the Present I: § + Old Perfective of ʿḥr/ḥmsj/sDr + hr + Infinitive (“lit.”) he is standing/sitting/lying doing X,” which is typologically reminiscent of some strategies observed in other languages (Kruchten 1982; Winand 2006a: 337-338). Another pattern combined the Present I with the adverb dy “here” (sw dy hr sDm “[lit.] he is here hearing”). Occasionally both strategies occurred in the same sentence:

\[ \text{twtn dy ḥms.tj hr jr.t jḥ m-r-ṛ} \]

“What are you still doing?” (Horus and Seth, 8,3)

One must also note that the preposition m could be substituted for hr, mostly with verbs of movement for expressing an ongoing activity:

\[ \text{yṣ sw m ḥd r pṣ ḥb-sd “actually, he is going north to the Heb-Sed festival” (KRI II, 283,16)} \]

For expressing the non-progressive, Late Egyptian could use the pattern hr-sDm-f, which began losing its original function of contingent tense. With roots of three or more radicals, in participial constructions, the periphrastic participle expresses non-progressive activity. Contrast:

\[ \text{jḥ pṣ ḥjr bn nty twwt hr jṛ-f} \]

“What is this bad plan you are doing?” (KRI II, 383,9)

\[ \text{mntf j.jr ṣdjej m-dj-w wnw.t wnw.t r-ṭnw priy-j “it is he that protects me from them each hour, each time I go out” (L.EM 49,2)} \]

Otherwise, the time setting of a clause is often indicated by temporal adjuncts like m pṣ hrw “today,” r ṣ nb “every day,” m-dwn “continuously,” etc.

When the predicate is an old perfective, it expresses a resultant state (with telic verbs) or situation. The negation is expressed by bn. Some patterns already seen above still apply:

\[ \text{twj ʿnh.kwj m pṣ hrw “I am alive today” (LRL 1,7)} \]

\[ \text{twj ḥms.kwj ʿsw.kwj r-ṣṣr pṣ hrw “I have been deprived (of my donkey) until this day” (oGardiner 54)} \]

\[ \text{bn st ṣs.w “they (your sentences) are not well articulated” (pAnastasi 1, 4,8)} \]

\[ \text{ḥr ptr bn twt ṭḥ.tw ṭḥr jṛj-t jmn-t “but look, you are not aware of the good I have done for you” (pLeiden I 371, v° 26)} \]

11.2. Roughly speaking, the past, but also the perfect, is conveyed by the Perfective sDm-f for transitive verbs, and by the Present I with Old Perfective for intransitive verbs, though the situation is not entirely clear-cut (§ 10.2.3.a). In both cases, the negation is made by bwpw-f sDm (§ 13[1]). In narrative chains, Late Egyptian usually avoided sequences of sDm-f’s or of Present I tenses with the Old Perfective. It rather preferred to use the so-called Sequential jw-f hr sDm. This special tense, typical of Late Egyptian, can be used after any
construction that can appear in initial position (often an autonomous tense, but not necessarily so, as shown by example 27, below, where the Sequential follows a topicalized adverbial phrase of time):

\[ r-nty\ swD=j\ pA\ Htr\ n\ pA\ xr\ (\ldots),\ jw\ ns\ rwdw\ n\ bnr\ ssP=f,\ jw=sn\ hr\ jtf=r\ pA\ hr \]

“I sent the salary of the tomb (\ldots), the administrators of the Outside received it, they took it to the tomb” (KRI III, 29,12)

\[ hr\ jr\ hr-sA,\ jw=j\ Hr\ dj.t\ n=f\ Xnw \]

“and thereafter, I gave him a skin” (KRI IV, 229,1)

In some genres, ancient compound constructions (§ 10.2) could also be used for expressing sequentiality; they could also command chains of sequentials \( jw-f\ hr\ sdm \).

It should be noted here that Late Egyptian had basically two constructions for expressing sequentiality: the so-called Sequential pattern, discussed in this section, and the Conjunctive \( mtw=f\ sdm \) (§ 10.2.4). The two constructions can be contrasted as regards their respective aspectual, temporal, and modal values. Fundamentally, the Sequential expressed a state of affairs that happened once (perfective) in the past, and whose truth-value could be ascertained (indicative). It was thus exclusively found in narrative. The Conjunctive was used to add (in a rather cumulative manner) actions without necessarily considering their chronological sequence. It was used in discourse and in future-oriented contexts, most frequently in letters wherein instructions were given after an imperative, an exhortative (\( jh-sdm-f \) pattern), or a future III. By contrast, when used in narrative, the Conjunctive, in opposition to the Sequential, could express an activity that could be repeated (imperfective) and whose truth-value could not be plainly ascertained (for the evidential, see Winand 2001).

11.3. The future was mainly expressed by the Future III. In the 21st Dynasty, the first signs of a new paradigm appeared in texts; the newcomer, designated the Future I, was the result of a grammaticalization process, still in progress at that time, built on a verb of movement, \( n'f\ “go” \) (etymologically “sail”), followed by \( r + \) Infinitive (cf. French \( je\ vais\ aller \) and English “I’m going to go”; see Grossman, Lescuyer, and Polis 2014): \( twj\ m\ n'f\ r\ sdm \) “he is going to hear” (>Coptic \( \text{ṣ-nā-cwt} \)).

11.4. The jussive modality was basically expressed by the Imperative. As was the case for the Sequential in narrative, Late Egyptian preferred to use conjunctives to expand an imperative. Conjunctives could also expand a future III, a \( jh-sdm-f \) pattern, or any form that was modally marked or future oriented:

\[ wh3\ ps\ ksr\ (\ldots)\ mtw-k\ dj.t\ wh3.tw+w\ n-f \]

“seek these two boats (\ldots) and let them be sought for him” (KRI I, 239,9-10)

\[ hr\ jw+j\ r\ šm.t\ m\ ḫd\ (\ldots)\ mtw-j\ dj.t\ “m\ pr-\ɛs\ m\ ĥt.t\ m\ hr.t\ “and I shall go to the north (\ldots) and let Pharaoh know your situation” \]

(KRI III, 46,2)

In narrative, the Conjunctive could also be used in place of the Sequential to express events that were modally (non-indicative) marked, habitual, or whose truth could not be fully ascertained, thus belonging to what is termed evidentiality in general linguistics (Winand 2001).

11.5. It is important to note that Late Egyptian, in contrast to Earlier Egyptian, tended to match forms and functions one-to-one. For instance, Middle Egyptian \( sdm.n-f \) could appear in autonomous sentences, in circumstantial clauses to express anteriority, in narrative to express sequentiality, or with emphatic function. In Late Egyptian, these four functions are assumed by different tenses/patterns—the Perfective \( sdm+f \), \( jw\ sdm+f \), Sequential \( jw-f\ hr\ sdm \), and \( j.jr=f\ sdm \), respectively. Due to phonetic evolution, some constructions superficially appeared to conflate into one, as was the case for the circumstantial Present I, the Sequential, and the Future III (\( jw-f\ sdm \)). Indeed it would be more accurate to state that the ambiguity could only exist in
affirmative constructions \((jw \ bn \ sw \ sdm, jw-f \ tm \ sdm, and \ bn \ jw-f \ sdm)\) can only be a circumstantial present I, a sequential, and a future III, respectively; only in some syntactic environments (for the Future III, \(jw \ jw-f \ sdm\) and \(ntj \ jw-f \ sdm\) are non-ambiguous); and only with an infinitive in the predicative slot \((jw-f \ jj.kwj\) can only be a circumstantial present I).

11.6. While Late Egyptian retained some aspectual oppositions inherited from Earlier Egyptian (with some adaptations, see § 11.1), it is important to note that, in the later phase of its development, oppositions of time (and hence tenses) took on increasing relevance, which would eventually contribute to reshaping the predication system in Demotic and Coptic (Winand 2014a).

11.7. Late Egyptian could transform the basic autonomous tenses into circumstantial or relative clauses by using the so-called converters \(jw\) and \(nty\). A similar strategy was also employed to render a clause into the past by using the past converter \(wn\). Thus, the Present I could be converted to a circumstantial clause \((jw-f \ hr \ sdm\) “while he hears”) or to a past circumstantial clause \((jw \ wn-f \ hr \ sdm\) “while he was hearing”). As this system was not fully developed, some limitations can be observed. The following table presents the main patterns found in non-literary Late Egyptian for the active voice, in both the affirmative and negative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
<th>Circumstantial</th>
<th>Relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present I</td>
<td>(sw \ hr \ sdm)</td>
<td>(jw-f \ hr \ sdm)</td>
<td>(nty \ hr \ sdm/nty \ sw \ hr \ sdm-f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bn \ sw \ hr \ sdm)</td>
<td>(jw \ bn \ sw \ hr \ sdm)</td>
<td>(nty \ bn \ sw \ hr \ sdm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bw \ jr-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(jw \ bw \ jr-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(nty \ bw \ jr-f \ sdm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sw \ jj.w)</td>
<td>(jw-f \ jj.w)</td>
<td>(nty \ jj.w/nty \ sw \ jj.w \ jm-f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bn \ sw \ jj.w)</td>
<td>(jw \ bn \ sw \ jj.w)</td>
<td>(nty \ bn \ sw \ jj.w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bwpw=f \ jj.t)</td>
<td>(jw \ bwpw=f \ jj.t)</td>
<td>(nty \ bwpw=f \ jj.t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(wn-f \ hr \ sdm)</td>
<td>(jw \ wn-f \ hr \ sdm)</td>
<td>(wn \ hr \ sdm/wn-f \ hr \ sdm-f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(wn-f \ jj.w)</td>
<td>(jw \ wn-f \ jj.w)</td>
<td>(wn \ jj.w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>(sdp=f)</td>
<td>(jw \ sdm=f)</td>
<td>((j.)sdm/(j.)sdm=f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bwpw-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(jw \ bwpw=f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(nty \ bwpw-f \ sdm=f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>(sdp=f)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bn \ sdp=f)</td>
<td>(jw \ bn \ sdp=f)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(tm=f \ sdm)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future III</td>
<td>(jw-f \ sdm/jrj \ NP \ (r) \ sdm)</td>
<td>(jw \ jw-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(nty \ jw-f \ sdm=f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bn \ jw-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(jw \ bn \ jw-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(nty \ bn \ jw-f \ sdm=f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(wn \ jw-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(jw \ wn \ jw-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(wn-f \ sdm=f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminative</td>
<td>(bw \ jr.t-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(jw \ bw \ jr.t-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>((j.)sdm)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(m \ sdm &gt; m \ jr \ sdm)</td>
<td>(jw \ m \ jr \ sdm)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic</td>
<td>(j.jr-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(jw \ j.jr-f \ sdm)</td>
<td>(nty \ j.jr-f \ sdm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bn \ j.jr-f \ sdm )</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(j.jr-f \ tm \ sdm)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bn \ j.jr-f \ tm \ sdm )</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following observations can be made:

1) As already noted, some tenses are complementary: for instance, Perfective sDm=f and Present I with Old Perfective can alternate, mainly according to the orientation of the verb (transitive v. intransitive, but see § 10.2.3.a); this is also the case with the Future III and the Subjunctive, under certain circumstances, for expressing modality (see Polis 2009).

2) Some tenses are attested with circumstantial jw, but only in the negative (Subjunctive, Imperative, bw jr.1-f sdm).

3) The relative clauses are expressed either by an introductory nty, by participles or relative forms, or by an introductory jw. The choice is made according to the nature of the predicate and the definiteness of the antecedent. The participles and the relative forms are only used for the perfect (except when negative). The other tenses combine with nty if the antecedent is definite or with jw if it is indefinite:

\[ \text{ns jh.w nty m t3 md.t m-šsr} \] “the oxen that are in the stable are well” (pLeiden 348, v° 9,5)

\[ \text{hr jn=f w" jh jw-f sb} \] “and he brought an ox that had been branded” (pTurin 1880, r° 4,6)

Although this “rule” will be fully observed only later, it already accounts for most of the cases of relativization in Late Egyptian, notwithstanding some exceptions made primarily for semantic reasons (Sojic 2017; see also Müller 2015 for a different perspective). For instance, even with a definite noun, jw is preferred when it has its full circumstantial force:

\[ \text{jr psj sn jw-f mwt} \] “as regards this brother, as he is now dead” (oAshmolean 166, v° 1-2)

\[ \text{jw jtš=f t3 mr.t jw-s m psj-f dmj} \] “after having taken the work-force that was in his town” (pAnastasi VI, 14)

11.8. As regards subordinate clauses, Late Egyptian had several options: for expressing a goal or consequence, the Subjunctive or the pattern r + Infinitive was used; for temporal and causal clauses, jw-converted constructions were common, but there were also special connectors to clearly express some temporal relations, like m-dr “when,” m-ht “after,” r-jnw “every time,” etc. More broadly, patterns comprising a preposition followed by a definite infinitive underwent a remarkable development for expressing clauses that are normally rendered as subordinate clauses in modern languages. Except for the present, time was expressed by a relative form of the auxiliary verb jrt “do”: \[ \text{hr psj.f sdm} \] “because of his hearing, since he hears” (possessive article), \[ \text{hr ps sdm jrj-f} \] “because he has heard” (relative form), \[ \text{hr ps sdm nty jw=f r jrf-f} \] “because he will hear” (relative pronoun + Future III). Two special constructions (correlative constructions with a system of protasis/apodosis) also conveyed temporal/causal relations: 1) wnn=k hr + Infinitive, jr-w=k hr + Infinitive, mtw=k + Infinitive “as soon as you have done X, you shall do X, and you shall do X” in discourse, and 2) jr-kr twj hr + Infinitive, jnw-f hr + Infinitive, jw=f hr + Infinitive “once he did this, he did this, and he did this” in narrative. In both cases, the apodosis was expressed by a sequential, but if the apodosis needed to be expanded with supplementary clauses, the Conjunctive was selected in discourse, and the Sequential in narrative, as expected.

The expression of conditionals was based on a correlative system where the protasis could be introduced by jr, jn, or hn, according to the conditional’s semantics (Collier 2006).

12. The Expression of the Passive

Expression of the passive by dedicated morphological means is considerably reduced in Late Egyptian (for a general overview in Earlier Egyptian see Stauder 2014). The old synthetic formation (the so-called sdm.w-passive) is still found with the Perfective sdm.w-f (the morph –w being consistently omitted in writing) of transitive verbs
(intransitive verbs are scarcely found), but only exceptionally with a pronominal subject, in which case the Present I with Old Perfective, which triggers an inversion of the diathesis (§ 10.2), is preferred. The eventual expression of the agent is made with a prepositional phrase introduced by jn, as in Earlier Egyptian, or m-ĝr.t.

jr psy-w smtr jn A “their interrogation was made by A” (KRI V/1, 482,4)

In the Subjunctive, the form sðm.tw=f is regularly found, directly after rdj in the causative pattern (rdj sðm.tw=f “cause him to be heard”), but also after conditional jr.

In the other patterns, active forms are preferred with the impersonal suffixal pronoun –tw (which etymologically derives from the old passive morph –tw; see Winand 1992: § 522 and, for a complete analysis, Stauder 2014: ch. 5; Id. 2015). From the 20th Dynasty onwards, there is an increasing number of examples of the 3rd-plural suffix pronoun with a non-specific referent as subject, which will subsequently become standard in Demotic and Coptic:

jn ts nty bwpwy.w jn.t-s n-j “it is the one that has not been brought to me” (LRL 7,12)

One will note that passive participles are still found in Late Egyptian, but only with a reduced number of verbs (jř “do,” jnj “bring,” rdj “give,” sjp “examine,” šsp “receive”), at least in non-literary texts. This is in accordance with a general trend that will eventually lead to the disappearance of the participle in Coptic:

rmṯ jř.t n=ws sbṣj.t “people against whom a punishment was done” (KRI V/1, 351,7)

As already noted, “equivalents” of the passive can be rendered by other constructions. Such is the case of the patterns where the Old Perfective of transitive verbs is involved: Present I, but also compound constructions introduced by ıntf.n or wn.jn (§ 10.2), and the Future III (Winand 1996a).

13. Negations

In comparison to Earlier Egyptian, the system of negations in Late Egyptian tends to align with positive patterns. Strictly speaking, there is no new negative word in Late Egyptian. On the contrary, the number of negative words is declining (we note the disappearance of the old negative markers w, ıntn, and nfr, and of the compound n-sp sðm-f). The six main negations of Late Egyptian are bw (including bwpw), bn, tm, mn, m, and jmj:

1) bw (< n) is found in the pattern bw jr=f sðm (non-progressive unachieved aspect), as successor of Middle Egyptian n sðm.n=f (> bw sðm-f until the beginning of the 19th Dynasty), and in the pattern bw jr.t=f “he has not heard yet.” Underlying the form bwpw (< n-ps-f sðm; Coptic mpe = f swtM; for the spellings of bwpw, see Winand 1992: 203-207), it became the standard negation of the Perfective sðm-f and (but not exclusively) of the Present I with Old Perfective. As such, it replaced the negative verb tm with the perfective participle and relative form (nty bwpw-f sðm-[f]);

2) bn (< nn) is the negation of non-verbal predicates, of the Subjunctive in autonomous sentences, of the Future III, and in emphatic patterns (§ 14). It can be associated with the post-marker jwns, which originally added emphasis to the negative in Late Egyptian (“absolutely not,” “not at all,” etc.) before grammaticalizing in Demotic and Coptic, following a path reminiscent of the evolution of the post-markers pas and plus in French (Winand 1996b);

3) The negative verb tm is found with the Infinitive, the Sequential, the Conjunctive, the Subjunctive in dependant constructions, and in some emphatic patterns (§ 14);

4) mn (< nn wn) expresses non-presence (viz. non-existence) with undefined subjects; it is also found in possessive constructions (§ 8.2);
5) The negative verb *m* is used to express the vetitive (but was quickly replaced by an analytic construction involving the auxiliary verb *jrf*:*m jrf sdm*; see Vernus 2010);

6) The negative verb *jmj* is the negative counterpart of *jhsedmk*. Its use is limited to certain (mainly literary) genres.

### 14. Emphasis

Although its word order is rather strict, Late Egyptian has various means for structuring information and adding emphasis. In the interest of brevity, the current overview will be limited primarily to discussion of the processes of thematization and rhematization.

#### 14.1. Topicalization

mainly consists in the front (rarely rear) extra-position of a noun phrase, which is then resumed in the clause by a personal pronoun. Late Egyptian inherits from Earlier Egyptian the so-called *jrt*-thematization pattern (Satzinger 1976). If the thematized element was a personal pronoun, the independent pronoun was used:

\[ jr\ p\ y\ rny,\ p\ j\ y\ n\ \text{PN} \] “as for this man, he is the accomplice of PN” (pMayer A, 3,23)

\[ jr\ jnk,\ twj\ sgr.kwj\ m\ tsy.j\ jsb.t \] “as for me, I was lying in my hut” (KRI IV, 302,16)

Although this pattern is historically used for topicalizing, it is also a frequently employed strategy in Late Egyptian to avoid placing a nominal subject in its normal syntactic slot, a trend that would eventually grammaticalize in some Coptic dialects (Winand 2016).

Rear extra-position (cataphoric thematization) is also found but is mostly limited to personal pronouns (for the presence of *gr*, see Chantrain and Winand 2012):

\[ jh\ ptr-k\ p\ shr\ gr\ mntk \] “Please, you too should consider the situation!” (LE$\$ 58,2)

#### 14.2. To put emphasis on an adverbial phrase, Late Egyptian used a specialized conjugation pattern, namely the so-called **Emphatic tenses** *j.jrf sdm* or *j.sdm-f*. While the former one is temporally and modally neutral, the latter is a modal form, usually future oriented (Winand 1992; Cassonnet 2000). How these forms are connected to the Middle Egyptian *mrf*, *sdmmf*, and *sdmwf* forms is still open to discussion (Winand 1992; Kruchten 1998).

\[ j.jrf\ dm.tj\ jw=s\ n=k\ m\ sdmw\ tw \] “it was the 1st month of Shemu, 2nd day, that I sent it back to you” (pBM 10411, v° 5)

\[ j.jrf\ gm.t+s\ wntj\ n \] “I found it already open” (pBM 10052, 1,16-17)

One will note that these forms are scarcely employed outside their emphatic role, in sharp contrast to what we observe in Middle Egyptian for the abovementioned “predecessors.” Nevertheless, the occasional use of Emphatic tenses in complement clauses implies a survival of the more widespread employment of these tenses in that function in earlier times.

\[ mtw\ hpr\ j.jr\ mw\ &)\ r=s\ jw=s\ wdhtw \] “and it will happen that water will enter it after having been planted” (LRL 55,16-56,2)

Certainly by the end of the 20th Dynasty, and perhaps earlier, other constructions that cannot be analyzed as such survivals are found in the same syntactic environments (for a striking example, see Papyrus Neville v° 5: *mtw hpr bw jhrw=k pr r-bnr* “and it happens that your voice does not come out”).

Bare Emphatic tenses can also be found as the first member of complex constructions where they play the role of the protasis, a
function that is still to be found in Demotic (see Grossman 2007 and Popko 2013):

\[ \text{jr} \text{ pjs=k jt, j jr p3 jt n pjs=k jt, jw=k (r) jr=f m-r-c} \] “if your father did (it), if your father’s father did (it), you shall do it too” (Wenamun, 2,4-5)

The Emphatic tenses are negated by \( \text{bn} \ldots jwn3 \) when the negation’s scope focuses on the adverbial phrase; by \( \text{tm} \) when the verbal lexeme itself is negated (the whole sentence remaining affirmative); and (exceptionally) by a combination of the two:

\[ \text{bn} \text{ jr=j tm Sm.t (r) jn=s r sdj pA Dd=k} \] “it was not at all when he was in my home that he brought this silver” (pBM 10052, 15,6-7)

\[ \text{jr=j tm Sm.t (r) jn=s r sdj pA Dd=k} \] “the reason I did not bring it was to hear what you said” (oLeipzig 16, v° 4-5)

For giving emphasis to other syntactic elements, Late Egyptian might use the cleft sentence (already known in Earlier Egyptian) or the “new” cleft sentence (also called the pseudo-cleft sentence: Neveu 1994). The pattern of the Late Egyptian cleft sentence is \( \text{jn/m} + \text{nominal phrase (or independent pronoun)} + \text{participle/j.sdj=f/jjr=f sdj} \):

\[ \text{mntf pA nty jw=j (r) dd=f} \] “it is this that I will say” (pMayer A, 9,15-16)

\[ \text{mntw n3 ptr-j q3} \] “it is exactly them that I saw” (pMayer A, 2,14)

14.3. In non-verbal constructions (substantival, adjectival, and adverbial), the two main constituents—subject and predicate—can occasionally receive a special emphasis. As part of the communication strategy of the speaker, this can be best observed in discourse.

The subject can be \textbf{topicalized} by frontal extraposition (rear extraposition, at the end of the sentence, although attested with verbal predication, is not documented with non-verbal predicates). This mainly happens when the subject is pronominal. Late Egyptian uses in this case the independent pronoun (§ 7.3) preceded by the thematic particle \textit{jr}:

\[ \text{jr jnk, jnk jhwty n pr Jmn} \] “as for me, I am a farmer of Amun’s estate” (pBM 10052, r° 1,8)

\[ \text{jr sš mntf pjs-sn tpj} \] “as for the scribe, he is their chief” (pChester Beatty IV, v° 2,4)

\[ \text{jr ḥ.t wsh sw r śn.w.t} \] “as for the belly, it is larger than a granary” (pDeM 1, 5,2)

A nominal subject can also be thematized, appearing at the end of the sentence in apposition to the pronominal subject that announces it cataphorically. This is particularly frequent with nominalized relative clauses:

\[ \text{sw m šsr pjs j.jr=k} \] “it is nice what you have done” (LRL 73,13)

When the tone is highly emotional, different rhetoric modes can be combined:

\[ \text{jr jnk gr jnk jn jnk pjs=k bsk} \] “As for me, yes for me, am I your servant?” (Wenamun, 2,12)
The subject of a nominal sentence can also be rhematized. In this case, Late Egyptian uses the stressed form of the independent pronoun. For the first and second persons, there is no observable difference in the spellings, but the forms *mntf*, *mnts*, and *mntsn* are used in this case for the third-person pronouns, instead of the bi- or tripartite construction (see § 9.1). In the negative, the presence of the focalizer *jwn3* is a good indication that the sentence receives special emphasis:

\[
\text{hr} \text{ jr} \text{ Jmn-Rc} \text{ nsw.t nfr.w} \text{ mntf pÅ nb n pÅ} \text{ ñnh snb} \quad \text{“as for Amun-Ra, the king of the gods, it is he, the lord of life and health” (Wenamun, 2,30-31)}
\]

\[
\text{hr} \text{ jnk psy-tn nfr, bn jnk psy-tn bjn jwn3} \quad \text{“for I (really) am your good, I am not your evil at all” (I.R.L 2,1)}
\]

In adjectival sentences, for expressing possession, the pattern *mntf* + subject, instead of *ns-sw* + subject, indicates a focus on the possessor:

\[
\text{hr mntf pÅ lbn nty tw-k qd jnk sw} \quad \text{“and it is he who owns the Lebanon that you say is yours” (Wenamun, 2,24)}
\]

The adverbial predicate can be emphasized by using the third person of the independent pronoun, introduced by the particle *gr*:

\[
jw tsj-f m\text{ñh}.t jw ns shn.w n Ps-bsk m-dj-f gr mntf “although his tomb and
\]

Pabak’s orders are completely his property” (pBerlin P 10496, v° 9-10)

Another possibility is to adapt the so-called pseudo-cleft sentences (Neveu 1994). In the next example, the construction is the marked counterpart to *wn-j m ns-n s.wt wn psij hy (hr) rwδ-sn* “I was in the places my husband used to administer”:

\[
\text{ns-n s.wt wn psij hy rwδ-sn ° ns wn-j <jm>} \quad \text{“it is the places my husband used to administer that I was in” (KRI II, 381,15-16)}
\]

In what could be a manifestation of the Theban dialect, or of a sociolect proper to the non-elite classes in Western Thebes, are rare occurrences of the emphatic auxiliary *j.jr-f* used with new types of predicate, for example in adverbial predication (Winand fc. e: 3.2.3.3):

\[
j.jr ns tbw r psy hδ’s j.dd-j n=tn ñn “it is to this big treasure, of which I have already told you, that those vessels belong” (pBM 10052, r° 5,21-23)
\]

\[
j.jr=j m-dj Jmn-hc psy hrd n Mwt-m-hb tsy.i hnw.t “it is with Amenkhay, this child of Mutemheb, my mistress, that I was” (pBM 10052, r° 7,8)
\]

**Bibliographic Notes**

The standard grammar of Late Egyptian remains that of Černý-Israelit-Groll (1975/1984). The grammars of Neveu (1996, 2015) and Junge (2001, 1996/2008) are excellent introductions. The verbal system as exposed by Frandsen (1974) is still worth considering (especially for the number and the quality of the examples there quoted), but is limited, as the title implies, to verbal predication. The studies by Satzinger (1976) present the grammar of Late Egyptian from a very specific point of view (*jr*-introduced clauses and sentences), but nevertheless embrace several issues crucial to a more general understanding of Late Egyptian. For verbal morphology, the study by Winand (1992), though in need of updating, remains the standard publication. Specific aspects of the grammar are treated, for example, by Israelit-Groll, who focuses on the negative system (1970) and the nominal-predicate
construction (1967)—a topic more recently elaborated upon by Loprieno, Müller, and Uljas (2017); by Cassonnet, who considers the Emphatic tenses (2000); and by Winand, who addresses the study of time and aspect (2006a). As regards lexicography, the *Late Egyptian Dictionary* by Lesko and Lesko (1982 – 1990) is more a glossary than a dictionary. It can be complemented to some extent by Meeks’ *Annie Lexicographique* (1976 – 1979), and by online databases such as the *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* ([http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla](http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla)) and *Ramses-on-Line* ([http://ramses.ulg.ac.be](http://ramses.ulg.ac.be)). Studies on several aspects of Late Egyptian can be found in the specialized literature, particularly in dedicated journals such as *Lingua Aegyptia*, *Revue d’Égyptologie*, and *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, and in the proceedings of conferences on Egyptian linguistics (e.g., the series *Crossroads*, published in *Lingua Aegyptia*, with the exception of the first volume).
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