THE JOURNAL OF
Egyptian Archaeology

SOME USES OF THE RESUMPTIVE PRONOUN IN LATE EGYPTIAN RELATIVE CLAUSES*

By JEAN WINAND

The focus of this paper is the presence or absence of the resumptive pronoun in relative clauses in Late Egyptian. Particular attention is given to the causative construction (*rdi sḏm.f/sḏm.tw.f*) when *rdi* is itself conjugated in a relative form. In LEg, the resumptive pronoun is conspicuously absent. The construction *rdi* + infinitive is also investigated, which appears to be quite common in Late Egyptian. It is suggested that this construction might have developed in Upper Egypt, where it tends to supersede the pattern *rdi* + subjunctive with otherwise very common verbs, like *bȝk*, *šsp*, *ḫdb*, and *grg*.

In Earlier Egyptian, it is well known that the antecedent of a relative form is, as it were, absorbed into the relative form if it functions as its direct object (*md.t sḏm.t.n.f* 'an affair he has heard'). However, if it has another function, it appears in the relative clause as a resumptive pronoun (*rmṯ mdw.n.i ḥnꜥ.f* 'a man with whom I have spoken').[1] This is also the rule in Late Egyptian:[2]

(1)   *RAD*, 15.2:

      mtw.w rḫ ir pȝ ḏd.tw n.w nb
      And they can do all that is said to them.

(2)   *LRL*, 57.7:

      sḏm.i md.t nb.t i.hȝb.k n.i ḥr.w
      I have heard all matters you wrote to me about.

(3)   P. Abbott, 5.6:

      wpw tȝ s.t 2 i.wȝḥ.f ḏr.t ḥr.w
      Except the two tombs he laid hand upon.

A particular case is offered by verbs that have another verb (finite or non-finite) as their complement clause, or more correctly as their argument clause.[3] This is the case with declarative verbs, jussive verbs, and also with the verb *rdi* in the so-called causative construction (*rdi sḏm.f/sḏm.tw.f*).[4] In Late Egyptian, if the main verb is

---

  [1] A. H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* (3rd rev. edn; Oxford, 1957), §383 (henceforth: G*EG*).

  [2] J. Černý and S. I. Groll, *A Late Egyptian Grammar* (3rd rev. edn; Rome, 1984), ch. 51 (henceforth: Č*G*LEG).

  [3] Following a suggestion of E. Grossman (personal communication), although the term, as noted by a referee, is rather inappropriate for examples with the imperative, cf. below (14–16).

  [4] For a discussion of Earlier Egyptian examples, see S. Uljas, 'A Note on Prononimal Resumption in Earlier Egyptian Relative Clauses', this volume.

in the relative form, a resumptive pronoun appears in the relative clause, even if it functions as the direct object of the dependent verb:

(4)   O. OIC 16991, vso 1–2:

nꜣ ḥr.w n msw-nj-swt i.šḥn pꜣy.i nb r ir.w
the tombs of the princes which my lord commanded to be made.

In Late Egyptian texts, this complex construction is well attested with the verb *ḏd* 'say'.[5] I first consider the examples where *ḏd* has a declarative force, before turning to the cases of *ḏd* as an injunctive verb. With the declarative *ḏd*, the resumptive pronoun can be in any position inside the clause introduced by *ḏd*. In the following examples, the resumptive pronoun can be:

the direct object of the complement clause:

5)   P. Abbott, 6.17–18:

ḥr bw rḫ.i pḥ n nꜣ md.wt ꜥꜣy i.ḏd pꜣ ḥꜣty-ꜥ n niw.t ḏd st n.i nꜣ sš.w
but I do not know the final word of these serious matters which the prince of Thebes said that the scribes said (them) to him (lit. me).

(6)   O. Nash 2, vso 1–2:

[nꜣ ḫꜣ.w] i.ḏd.k tꜣy sn ḥy sꜣ ḥy-nfr
[the chisels] that you said that Hy son of Hy-nefer stole (them).

(7)   P. BM EA 10068, 6.20:

ḥn.w n wḏḥ i.ḏd nꜣ iṯꜣ.w n pꜣ ḥr in.n st m tꜣ s.t i.thꜣ.w
offering vessels which the thieves of the tomb said that they (lit. we) brought (them) from the place they violated.

(8)   *LRL*, 9.9–10:

ḥr m-di tꜣ md.t n nꜣ ꜥꜣ.w i.ḏd.k di.i st n PN
and as regards this matter of the donkeys which you said you (lit. I) gave (them) to PN.

(9)   P. Abbott, 7.11–12:

nꜣ s.wt i.ḏd pꜣ ḥꜣty-ꜥ n niw.t pḥ st nꜣ ḥmwty.w
the tombs which the prince of Thebes said that the coppersmiths have reached (them).

the subject of a Present I (here with the past converter wn):

(10) P. BM EA 10052, 14.3:

nꜣ ḥn.w n ḥḏ i.ḏd.w wn.w wꜣḥ m pꜣ ꜥrḳ
the vessels of silver which they said (they) were lying in the basket.

used after a preposition:[6]

(11) P. Abbott, 5.2:

pꜣ ḥr i.ḏd.k in.i nꜣ ꜣḫ.t im.f
the tomb which you said you (lit. I) took the things from.

---

[5] Although the clause under the scope of *ḏd* is not strictly speaking a dependent clause, it has some embedding qualities as shown by the very fact that a resumptive pronoun is needed when the matrix verb is in a relative form, and by some (albeit limited) constraints for adapting the deictic elements in indirect speech.

[6] In the following example, the absence of the resumptive pronoun after the preposition *m* is common enough in any type of relative clauses: P. BM EA 10052, 5.21: *ir tꜣ s.t i.ḏd.k in(.w) nꜣ ṯb.w n ḥḏ im Ø k.t s.t* 'as for the tomb you said the vases of silver were brought from, it is another one'.

(12) *LRL*, 9.8–9:

> *tȝ md.t n nȝ ẖn.w wȝḏ rḥb 2 i.ḏd.k twi di.t grḥ.w im.w*
>
> the matter of the vessels of malachite and the two recipients which you said that you (lit. I) were having (them) finished.[7]

embedded in the possessive article and used after a substantive:

(13) K*RI* III, 533.11–13:

> *pȝ ib 2 n ṯḥn i.ḏd.i n.k di.i swn.t n pȝy.sn nb m pȝ nty nb iw.f r wḥȝ.f r swn.t.w*
>
> the two hearts of faience that I said to you I would pay their owner with whatever he shall ask for their price.

When *ḏd* has an injunctive force, Late Egyptian does not use an infinitive—this is in sharp contrast with Earlier Egyptian I—but an autonomous pattern, like the imperative. This is exceedingly common in letters; here are some examples:

(14) *LRL*, 6.5–6:

> *ḥr m-di tȝ md.t n tȝ ḳd.t 2 n nbw i.ḏd[.i n.k] imy st r pȝ pi*
>
> and as regards this matter of the two kite of gold which I told you: put them into the socle(?).

(15) *LRL*, 20.2:

> *ir pȝ ʿ i.ḏd.i n.k i.ir sw*
>
> make the shaft which I told you: make it.

(16) *LES*, 11.6:

> *wn.in pȝy.f sn šri ḥr ir.t sḥr.w nb i.ḏd n.f pȝy.f sn ʿȝ i.[ir] st*
>
> and his younger brother did all the tasks his older brother told him: do them.

Examples with an infinitive, however scarce, do nevertheless occur:

(17) Ani, 22.19:

> *bn šri iwnȝ nȝy.n md.wt i.ḏd.k ȝb šd im.sn*
>
> they are not small at all, our words, which you said one has to stop reading them

The rules governing the use of the resumptive pronoun do not change if the main verb is in a relative clause introduced by *nty*, instead of being conjugated in a relative form:

(18) *LEM*, 6.4–5:

> *mtw.k smi n ṯȝty [ḥr] pȝ ḥḏ ʿšȝ nty šmsw iȝy ḥr ḏd imy twf*
>
> and you shall report to the vizier [about] this excessive amount of silver that the retainer Iay keeps saying: give it.

It is clear that in the examples involving the verb *ḏd* the completive seems to be treated as a direct discourse, although there are sometimes traces of a formal grammatical integration as shown in (13) where the pronoun *sn* is an adaptation to accommodate the fronting of *pȝ ib 2 n ṯḥn*.[8] This surely explains why the pronominal object is regularly found. Curiously enough the number of verbs conjugated in a relative form (or used in a relative clause introduced by *nty*) and followed by a completive is rather limited. The rule seems to be that the resumptive pronoun is consistently present:

---

[7] For the word *rḥb*, a kind of vessel, see J. E. Hoch, *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period* (Princeton, 1994), 207 (no. 281).

[8] On this, see Peust, *Indirekte Rede*, 75.

(19) P. Rollin, 3–4:

    bt3 nb bin nb i.gm ḥ3ty.f r ir.w
    all crimes and all evil deeds that his heart found to do.[9]

(20) O. OIC 16991, rto 11–vso 2:

    twi ḥr b3k m n3 ḥr.w n ms.w-nswt i.sḥn p3y.i nb r ir.w
    I am working in the tombs of the royal children that my lord ordered to do.

(21) *LRL*, 14.16:

    iry.(i) sp 2 p3 nty nb iw.i rḫ ir.f n.w
    I will do, I will do what I will be able to do for them.

Now it is worth considering the particular case of the causative construction (*rdi sḏm.f/sḏm.tw.f*), when the verb *rdi* is itself conjugated in a relative form.[10] Here is a list of examples I have been able to collect. The resumptive pronoun is omitted where it might have been expected:

as the subject of a subjunctive passive:

(22) K*RI* II, 229.10:

    p3 ꜥnw n ḥḏ i.di wr ꜥ3 n ḫt3 PN in.tw Ø r pr-ꜥ3 m-ḏr.t wpwty.f PN
    the silver tablet the great prince of Khatti PN caused to be brought to Pharaoh by his messenger PN.[11]

(23) K*RI* II, 283.5:

    idr ḳnw n i3w.t rdi.n.f in.tw Ø n nswt-bity
    numerous herds of cattle that he caused to be brought to the King of Upper and Lower Egypt.

(24) K*RI* II, 911.9:

    it3.tw t3 šꜥ.t i.di.i in.tw Ø n PN
    one has taken the letter that I caused to be brought to PN.

(25) K*RI* VI, 521.2–3:

    t3y ḫr.t i.di.i in.tw Ø n.tn
    these supplies that I caused to be brought to you.

(26) *LRL*, 9.16–10.1:

    iw.k (ḥr) šsp n-ḥ3.t n t3y ꜥḳ3y i.di.i in.tw Ø n.k
    You shall receive in charge this boat that I caused to be brought to you.

(27) *LRL*, 16.14–15:

    p3 17 n niw i.di s3w kr in.tw Ø <r> rsy
    The 17 spears that the guardian Kar caused to be brought <to> the South.

---

  [9] Cf. P. Anastasi V, 27.5–6: *ink p3 gm.tn r sꜥḥꜥ.f m t3 š.t.*

  [10] There is already a short note in ČG*LEG*, 51.6.8, with the conclusion that *i.di.f stp.f* must be classified as a single unit. Earlier works on relativization in Late Egyptian include J. F. Borghouts, 'Some Remarks on Relativization in Late Egyptian', *GM* 31 (1979), 9–18 (esp. p. 15 and n. 24) ; M. Collier, 'The Relative Clause and the Verb in Middle Egyptian', *JEA* 77 (1991), 23–42 (esp. n. 32).

  [11] On the use(s) of Ø in Egyptologists' transcriptions, I refer to a forthcoming article of mine to be published in the proceedings of *Crossroads* IV (Basel, 20–22 March 2009) in *LingAeg*.

(28) *LRL*, 52.7–8:
    ir šꜥ.t nb i.di pꜣy.k sn in.tw Ø n.i rn.k r.w
    As for all letters that your brother caused to be brought to me, your name is on them.

(29) *LRL*, 58.8–9:
    nꜣ it swt i.di.k in.tw Ø
    The grain belonging to him which you caused to be brought.

(30) P. BM EA 75019 + 10302, 11:
    nꜣ i.di pꜣ šri [n] PN in.tw Ø n.i
    Those which the son [o]f PN caused to be brought to me.

(31) *LES*, 83.11–12:
    iw.f ḥr di.t in.tw pꜣ 200 n tḥbs.t i.di.f iry.tw Ø
    And he caused to be brought the 200 baskets that he had caused to be made.

as the object of a transitive verb:

(32) *LES*, 69.4–5:
    iḫ nꜣ mšꜥ.w swg i.di.w iry.k Ø
    What are the foolish enterprises that they made you do?

(33) *KRI* III, 252.7–8:
    ir tꜣ mḏꜣ.t n pꜣ ḥḏ i.di.k sfḫ.i Ø
    As for the letter of the credit which you caused me to liquidate.

as the subject of an intransitive verb:

(34) *LRL*, 59.10–11:
    iw bwpw nꜣ sr.w wꜣḥ n.f nfr [nb] <m> pꜣ kr i.di.i ḥn Ø n.f ꜣtp <m> ḥmꜣ.t
    Although the officials did not leave anything good for him <in> the boat which I had sent to him loaded <with> salt.

The last case seems to be exceptional. In other cases where the antecedent's function in the relative clause is that of the subject of an intransitive verb, the resumptive pronoun appears. In the next two examples, the verb *ḥn* 'go', which was present in the previous example, is used once again, but this time with a resumptive pronoun. Thus, if not a scribal error, the absence of the resumptive pronoun in ex. (34) should probably be explained by the relatively late date of the document.[12]

(35) *LEM*, 46.16–47.1:
    iw.k ḥr ir šꜥ.t n pꜣy sš twt i.di.k ḥn.f r pꜣ tꜣ n wḥꜣ.t
    (When the order of Pharaoh reaches you) you shall make a letter for this scribe of yours whom you let go to the land of the oasis.

(36) P. BM EA 10052, 7.10–11:
    iḫ ḥr.k tꜣ md.t n nꜣ s.wt i.pḥ.k irm nꜣ rmṯ i.di iw.f-n-imn (…) ḥn.w
    What do you have to say about this affair of the places that you reached with the men whom Iuefenimen (…) caused to go?

(37) *KRI* I, 369.4:
    pꜣ iḥ i.di.k wnm.f
    The ox which you had fed.

---

[12] One could also tentatively analyse *ḥn* as an infinitive. In this case, it should be added to the list given below.

(38) P. BM EA 75020, 12:

[   ] *šrì ink ì.dì.k ꜥḥꜥ.f dy*

[   ] son of mine whom you caused to stay here.

In Late Egyptian, the absence of the resumptive pronoun in the kind of situation described above, though widespread, is not systematic. There are some rare examples where the resumptive pronoun shows up:

(39) *RAD*, 14.10:

mì-ḳd nꜣy rmṯ ì.dì pꜣy.ì nb ꜥ.w.s ìn.tw.w

Like those men whom my lord l.p.h. caused to be brought.

(40) O. DeM 554, vso 5:

ìr nꜣ rm.w ì.dì.k ìn.tw.w n.w

As for the fish that you caused to be brought to them.

(41) O. DeM 554, vso 7:

pꜣ dì.k ìn.f sw r [ḥry]

What you caused him to bring [up].

All three examples date from the first half of the Nineteenth Dynasty.[13] In Egyptian I, the presence of a resumptive pronoun also seems to be the rule in the causative pattern:

(42) P. UC 32115C, 6–7:

md.t [n.t sš pn] rdì.t.n nb ꜥ.w.s ìn.t(w).f n bꜣk-ìm

The affair [of this letter] that the Lord l.p.h. caused to be brought to the humble servant.

(43) *Urk*. I, 179.13:

ìw mꜣ.n ḥm.(ì) sš pn nfr nfr rdì.n.k ìn.t(ì).f m stp-sꜣ m hrw pn nfr

My Majesty has read this very beautiful letter that you caused to be brought to the palace on this beautiful day.

But exceptions do already occur in Middle Egyptian as shown in this passage of the Ikhernofret stela:[14]

(44) Berlin 1204, 3–4:

… r smnḫ bs.f štꜣ m ḏꜥm dì.n.f ìn.t Ø ḥm.ì m-ḫnt tꜣ-sty

… in order to embellish his secret image with fine gold that he caused my Majesty to bring from Ta-sety.

The inescapable conclusion is that the disappearance of the resumptive pronoun, limited to the causative pattern *rdì sḏm.f/sḏm.tw.f*, is a distinctive feature of Late Egyptian. It should probably be connected with the lexicalisation process the causative construction had been undergoing during the New Kingdom. However, this process had not yet been completed, as shown by the possibility of having the subject of *rdì* inserted between *rdì* and its complement verb.

---

[13] For the date of O. DeM 554, see J. Winand, 'La grammaire au secours de la datation des textes', *RdE* 46 (1995), 187–202.

[14] Cf. *GEG*, § 385. Note also the following example in which the matrix verb is not a relative form: P. Reisner II, pl. 10, G2: *ìmj ḥꜣb.f n.ì ḥr ḥm.wt.f nḥ[m].t, ìḫ dì.ì dì.t(w) Ø n.f* 'Let him write to me about his craftsmen that have been taken away, so that I can have (them) given back to him'; cited by P. Vernus, *Future at Issue: Tense, Mood and Apect in Middle Egyptian: Studies in Syntax and Semantics* (YES 4; New Haven, 1990), 108.

It will also be noted that if *rdi* is used in a relative clause introduced by *nty*, the resumptive pronoun seems always to be present. But this needs further confirmation, as there are only a few examples of this construction:[15]

(45)   *LEM*, 49.16–50.1:

r rdi.t rḫ.k p3 nty nb iw.k r di.t grg.tw.f

To let you know all that you shall cause to be prepared.

(46)   K*RI* VI, 448.11:

m-mitt p3 nty nb iw.k di.t in.tw.f [n.i]

Like all that you will cause to be brought [to me].

The lexicalisation process of the causative construction is perhaps less straight-forward than is usually accepted; in the Late Egyptian material, *rdi* is sometimes followed by an infinitive instead of a subjunctive. Although the pattern with the infinitive is not as widespread as the one with the subjunctive, it is not exceptional in Late Egyptian. As this construction has not received the attention it deserves,[16] here are the examples I have been able to collect so far:

(47)   P. Berlin 10463, vso 1.4:

ḥnꜥ ntk ḥn n n3-n mniw r rdi.t di.sn grg irtt m ḥnw n m3w.t r-ḫ3.t.i m p3y.i iy.t

And you shall order the herdsmen to ensure that they make fresh milk ready in jugs at my disposal when I come.

(48)   Stela of Penniut, 13:[17]

y3 m di sfḫ.i m ky

Actually, do not let me be replaced by another.

(49)   K*RI* III, 501.7:

r-ḏd: di.i grg p3 50 ḥn [ ] p3 h3b.k nb ḥr.f

I have caused the making ready of the fifty ḥn[ ] all that you wrote about.

(50)   K*RI* III, 502.9:

ptr di.i grg n.sn rmṯ r is.t

Look, I will cause to be equipped for them men as a crew.

(51)   K*RI* IV, 81.8:

mtw.k ꜥm m p3 nty nb iw.i r di.t iry se n.k

And you shall understand everything I will have done for you.

(52)   K*RI* IV, 417.8–10:

iw.s ḥr in wꜥ ms ḥr dby.t, iw.i ḥr di.t b3k.f, iw.i ḥr sḫt.f, iw.i ḥr di.t.f n.s

And she brought a basket of *dby.t*-plants, and I had it worked, I wove it, and I gave it back to her.

(53)   K*RI* VI, 67.8–9:

imy grg p3y h3 n ḫt

Make ready those thousand woodsticks.

---

[15]   One could also add the pseudo-personal name of one of the convicted felons in the Harem conspiracy: PN *nty bwpw p3-rꜥ di.t iry.f ꜥ3-n-ꜥ.t* 'PN whom Pre did not allow (him) to be chamberlain' (P. Rollin, 2).

[16]   See J. Winand, *Temps et aspect en ancien égyptien: Une approche sémantique* (PdÄ 25; Leiden, 2006), 77.

[17]   See J. C. Darnell, 'A Stela of the Reign of Tutankhamun from the Region of Kurkur Oasis', *SAK* 31 (2003), 82.

(54) *KRI* VI, 671.10:

wnn t3y.i(?) šꜥ.t [spr r p3 nty] twk im, iw.k di.t grḥ p3 ḥti šri ḥnꜥ t3 m3s.t

as soon as my letter [reaches the place] where you are, you shall have the small bed finished and the *maset* as well.

(55) *LES*, 6.13:

imy di.tw ḫdb p3 iw nty m-s3.k

Let the dog be killed which is behind you.

(56) *LES*, 6.14:

nn iw.i r di.t ḫdb p3 iw i.ir.i sḫpr.f iw.f m šri

I will not let the dog be killed which I have been feeding since it was a pup.

(57) *LES*, 11.2:

imy grg n.n ḥtr r sk3

Let some seed to cultivate be readied for us.

(58) *LES*, 22.4:[18]

imy šꜥd p3 ꜥš

Cause the pine to be cut.

(59) *LES*, 26,11:

iw.f ḥr di.t h3ꜥ n.f ḏfḏf 2 n snf r-gs p3 nšw 2 n ḥm.f ꜥ.w.s

He managed to let fall two drops of blood beside the two doorposts of his Majesty, l.p.h.

(60) *LES*, 47.2:[19]

i.ir.k di.t ḏ3y.s ḥr iḫ

Why did you make her cross?

(61) *LRL*, 1.11–2.1:

ir iry.i ḥḥ n bt3, bw ir.{i} wꜥ nfr di.t sḫm.w

Even if I have committed a million wrongs, can't one good make them forgotten?

(62) *LRL*, 11.6:

mtw.k di.t iry.s wꜥ.t šꜥ.t, mtw.k di.t in se n.i

And you shall cause her to make a letter, and you shall make it to be brought to me.

(63) *LRL*, 54.12–13:[20]

mtw.t in pḥwy <n> n3y.w md.wt m šsr, mtw.t di.t ḫdb<.w>, mtw.t di.t h3ꜥ.w <r> p3 mw m grḥ

And you shall put an end <to> their charges in an excellent way, and you shall have <them> killed, and you shall have them thrown <into> the water at night.

---

[18] Further on, a similar expression occurs: *LES*, 27.16–28.1: *imy šꜥd.tw p3y šwb 2* 'let these two persea-trees be cut', which might cast some doubt on the first example. The case is still more complicated as the spelling *-tw* at the end of the verb could be a means to convey the phonological shift from voiced to voiceless (cf. Coptic ϣⲱⲱⲧ).

[19] The interpretation of this example is ambiguous: one can analyze *ḏ3y.s* either as an active subjunctive, in which case the example falls out of our corpus, or as an infinitive with a direct object. The verb *ḏ3i* allows both argumental structures: one can cross a river, or one can make somebody cross (a river). In the preceding lines referring to this episode, *ḏ3i* is always used transitively (*LES*, 43.10; 43,13; 43.15; 44.1; 44.2; 44.5).

[20] This letter's formulation contrasts with what is found in P. Berlin 10488, where the sender did not use a causative construction: *mtw.k ḫdb<.w>, mtw.k h3ꜥ.w <r> p3 mw m grḥ* (*LRL*, 54.2).

(64) *LRL*, 56.6:

imy snḳ pꜣ iḥ i.ir.t(.i) iy <r> ṯꜣy.t.f n pꜣy.f nb[21]

Have the calf fed until I return <to> take it to its owner.

(65) *LRL*, 57.14:

iw.i di.t šsp nꜣ it

And I caused the grain to be received.

(66) P. CGC 58032, 49:[22]

iw.i di.t iry n.s md.t nb nfr nty ḫpr m-di rmṯ …

I will cause to be made for her any good deed that happens to people.

(67) P. CGC 58033, 59:

iw bn iw.i di.t fḳꜣ.s

I will not allow it to be taken away.

(68) P. BM EA 10252, 101.10:

ntf i.ir di.t mdw nꜣ sš.w

It is he who cuases the writings to be spoken aloud.

(69) *LEM*, 116.11–12:

iḥ di.k ḥr.k r di.t grg pꜣ rks n ḥtr nty iw.f r ḫꜣrw

Can you apply yourself to make ready the team's steed which is destined for Khor?

(70) *LEM*, 119.1:

iw.k ḥr di.t grg pꜣ inw m ḥ.t.f nb

(When my letter reaches you), you shall make ready the tribute in its every aspect.

(71) *LEM*, 134.16:

r rdi.t rḫ pꜣy.f rn

To let its name to be known.

The 25 examples[23] are evenly distributed across the New Kingdom and the beginning of the Twenty-first Dynasty, with a slight concentration in the second part of this period. As this reflects the general distribution of the Late Egyptian data, no conclusion can be drawn. As is clear from our examples, the pattern *rdi sḏm.tw.f* has been challenged (but never replaced in terms of a substitutional process) by a pattern where the verb form after *rdi* is treated as an active: thus, *iw.i di.t šsp nꜣ it* (ex. 65) contrasts with *imy šsp.tw šb.t.s* 'cause its payment to be received' (P. Louvre E 3230, vso 4–5). This form is most probably an infinitive, as shown by the examples with a suffixal direct object (exx. 46, 50, 58, 59, 61, 65).[24] These examples seem to exclude

---

[21] The last part of the sentence could also be read *ṯꜣy.tw.f*, taking the verb as a passive subjunctive depending of the opening *imy*, but this seems to be less convincing.

[22] But note, later on in the same text (l. 63), the use of the generic, neutral 3rd pl. pronoun in the same syntactic environment: *iw bn iw.i di.t di.s iry.w n.f md.t nb*.

[23] One should perhaps add to the list: *imy ꜥrḳ n.i n nṯr* (*LES*, 27.14), and *twn di.t šm iw.n tḥtḥ* (*LRL*, 47.16). But, to my mind, these examples need further investigation and a deeper understanding of their valency structures.

[24] Exx. 48 and 58 are not counter-examples, for the object pronoun is most probably to be analysed as the neutral dependent pronoun *st > se*.

the possibility of analyzing *rdi sḏm* NP as cases of *rdi sḏm*.(*w*) NP, with an unwritten 3rd pl. suffix pronoun (cf. the variant cited in note 21).[25]

There remains a problem, a diachronic one. It was recognized very early in Egyptology that the second part of the Coptic causative pattern is what remains of the subjunctive *sḏm.f*. Compare, for instance, the Coptic infinitive ⲙⲓⲥⲉ 'give birth' (Eg. *msi*) with ⲧⲙⲉⲥ(ⲉ)ⲓⲟ. This important discovery led Egyptologists to take a fresh look at the morphological pattern of one of the most widely used suffixal conjugation forms.[26] How can we reconcile this uninterrupted chain of *rdi* + subjunctive (active and passive), from the earliest records of Egyptian language down to Coptic, with the Late Egyptian evidence?

Two possible solutions come to mind: either the new construction is deemed to replace the former one in the long run, or the newer construction stands in parallel (maybe in competition) with the older one. The Coptic data strongly suggest that the first option should be safely discarded.

In Late Egyptian, there were thus two nearly analogous causative formations. The new pattern, which always constituted the minority of examples,[27] was probably influenced by the very general trends in Egyptian of eliminating the morphological passive in favour of other, active, solutions. One can also suspect that the two constructions did not exactly cover the same semantic field. In French, for instance, a distinction is made between 'faire en sorte que quelque chose soit fait' and 'faire faire quelque chose'. The latter construction, using an infinitive, is more object oriented, leaving the potential agent in the dark; in other words, one could say that the agent is denied any cognitive salience.

I cannot exclude the possibility that this new formation was typical of the Southern variant of Late Egyptian, as the bulk of our evidence come from Upper Egypt. This reminds me of two other cases where some observable differences inside Late Egyptian can be correlated with southern Coptic dialects.[28] In the present case, the formation (*r*)*di* + infinitive does not seem to have left traces in Coptic. The passive counterpart of the ⲧ- Coptic causative is either a pattern with a suffix -ⲏⲟⲩⲧ (best preserved in Bohairic)/-ⲁ(ⲉ)ⲓⲧ that has been tentatively derived from the passive formation (*r*)*di sḏm.tw* NP,[29] but not without some serious problems,[30] or with a suffix -ⲏⲩ. This last one probably derives from the active pattern (*r*)*di sḏm.w*, with the subject 3rd pl. suffix pronoun.

[25] When the verb is intransitive, other strategies can be applied as in *LRL*, 9.8–9: (the two vessels) *i.ḏd.k twi di.t grḥ.w im.w* 'about which you said you (lit. I) were having them finished', using a 3rd pl. as a non-referential subject of the active subjunctive *grḥ*.

[26] Cf. A. Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian: A Linguistic Introduction* (Cambridge, 1995), 82, 224.

[27] According to the data found in *Ramses*, the proportion is 1:8.

[28] In the Future III with nominal subject, Late Egyptian sometimes displays a *iw NP r sḏm* pattern, cf. Akm. ⲁ-NP-ⲁ-ⲥⲱⲧⲡ, instead of the more common *iri* NP (*r*) *sḏm*, cf. Sah. ⲉⲣⲉ-NP-ⲉ-ⲥⲱⲧⲡ; see J. Winand, *Études de néo-égyptien*, I: *La morphologie verbale* (AegLeod 2; Liège, 1992), §§771–84. Another case is the possibility of having the past converter *wn* after the relative *nty*, see J. Winand, 'Encore Ounamon 2,27–28', *LingAeg* 15 (2007), 302–3.

[29] See A. I. Elanskaya, 'The T-causativa in Coptic', in D. W. Young (ed.), *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky* (East Gloucester MA, 1981), 80–129.

[30] See A. Stauder, *La détransitivité, voix et aspect: Le passif dans la diachronie égyptienne* (PhD thesis; Basel, 2007), 562–4, where Elanskaya's proposition is challenged. Stauder strongly suggests a return to Till's opinion that the -ⲧ suffix should be analysed as an analogical formation opinion; see W. C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik (Saïdischer Dialekt) mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen* (2nd rev. edn; Leipzig, 1961), §226.

As some examples undoubtedly come from the Memphite era (the three exx. from the *LEM* and the literary exx. from the *Two Brothers*), it becomes more difficult to explain the facts along strict dialectical lines, even if the examples from Lower Egypt do not come from texts representative of vernacular Late Egyptian. This problem probably deserves a closer look, for it seems more complicated than first acknowledged. Take for instance the case of the verb *grg* 'establish'. This verb is attested seven times in the pattern (*r*)*di̯.t* + infinitive. But what is more intriguing is that the pattern (*r*)*di̯.t grg.tw* NP seems extremely rare; actually I was unable to find an attestation of it except for three occurrences in the *LEM* (P. An. IV, 13.10, P. Koller, 5.6; 5.8). The formation (*r*)*di̯.t šsp.tw* NP is no better attested either: only one example, coming from the time of Thutmosis III (P. Louvre E 3230, vso 4). And the same can be said of collocations that could a priori be assumed to be common: (*r*)*di̯.t b3k.tw* NP is not attested outside the *LEM* corpus and (*r*)*di̯.t ḫdb.tw* NP is only attested in the *Two Brothers* tale. Of course collocations like (*r*)*di̯.t ini.tw*, (*r*)*di̯.t iri.tw* or (*r*)*di̯.t di.tw* (resp. *didi.tw*) are trivial enough in the whole Late Egyptian corpus, even in the material coming from the South.[31] But it strikes me that *rdi̯* + infinitive is much better represented in Upper Egypt, and that correspondingly *rdi̯* + passive subjunctive of otherwise common verbs (*b3k*, *šsp*, *ḫdb*, *grg*) is virtually absent in Upper Egypt.

Be that as it may,[32] it would not be the first case of an innovative pattern not leaving any offspring in later stages of Egyptian, at least in standard idioms. Take for instance the construction *twi ꜥḥꜥ.kwi ḥr sḏm* for expressing the progressive in Late Egyptian in constrast with the neutral *twi ḥr sḏm* pattern (Praesens I).[33] Although it came very close to being grammaticalised, given the great number of examples, it never fully crystallised as a grammatical pattern of its own. The same can be said of what I have called elsewhere the analogical formation of the Future III (i.e. with an adverbial predicate or a pseudoparticiple instead of an infinitive).[34] One can also consider how erratic the behaviour of *wn* was before indefinite nouns until it grammaticalised in Praesens I and related patterns.[35]

[31] Actually these three verbs (*ini*, *iri*, and *rdi̯*) are responsible for more than 90 percent of the attestations of the causative pattern (*r*)*di̯.t sḏm.tw*. Furthermore, they mostly appear in formulaic expressions like (*r*)*di̯.t in.tw n.k šꜥ.t*, *imy didi.tw n.k*, etc. This strongly suggests that the causative pattern (*r*)*di̯.t sḏm.tw* was probably recessive already in Late Egyptian. This is much in agreement with Stauder's remark on the difficulty of linking the -ⲧ suffix in the Coptic causative to the passive subjunctive *sḏm.tw* (see preceding note).

[32] To be complete, one should here mention the still rarer pattern *rdi̯* + NP + PsP, cf. C. Peust, '*rdj* + Pseudopartizip—eine mögliche Konstruktion', *GM* 211 (2006), 67–70; to the exx. cited, add perhaps the following: *r-ḏd ib.i <r> di̯.t b3k.k sḫ3 n.k m-mn.t* 'I'd like to have your ba remembered for you everyday' (*LRL*, 68.9).

[33] See J. Winand, *Temps et aspect* (cited n. 16), 311–13 and 337–8. The difference was of course retained in the negative (*bn sw ḥr sḏm* vs. *bw ir.f sḏm*).

[34] See J. Winand, 'Les constructions analogiques du futur III', *RdE* 47 (1996), 189–215. As E. Grossman has pointed out to me, there are some instances of a PsP in the Future III in Bohairic; see A. Shisha-Halevy, *Topics in Coptic Syntax: Structural Studies in the Bohairic Dialect* (OLA 160; Leuven, 2007), 452.

[35] See J. Winand, 'L'expression du sujet nominal au Présent I en néo-égyptien', *CdE* 64 (1989), 159–71.