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 sdm.f/sdm.tw.f) when rdi is itself conjugated in a relative form. In LEnc, 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 bik, 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 sdm.t.n.f ‘an affair he has heard’). However, if it has another function, it appears in the relative clause as a resumptive pronoun (rmT mdw.n.i Hna.f ‘a man with whom I have spoken’). This is also the rule in Late Egyptian:2

(1) RAD, 15.2:
mtw.w rh ir pt dd.tw n.w nb
And they can do all that is said to them.

(2) LRL, 57.7:
sdm.i md.t nb.t i.hib.k n.i hr.w
I have heard all matters you wrote to me about.

(3) P. Abbott, 5.6:
wpw ts s.t 2 i.xsh.f gr.t hr.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 sdm.f/sdm.tw.f).4 In Late Egyptian, if the main verb is

* This study has benefited substantially from the database Ramses, under development in Liège, for which see J. Winand, S. Polis, and S. Rosmorduc, ‘Ramses: An Annotated Corpus of Late Egyptian’, in P. Kousoulis (ed.), Proceedings of the Xth IAE Congress (Louvain, forthcoming). Examples with indirect speech can also be found in C. Peust, Indirekte Rede im Neuägyptischen (GOF IV/33; Wiesbaden, 1996). I warmly thank Eitan Grossman (Jerusalem), Stéphane Polis (Liège), and Andréas Stauder (Basel and Chicago) for their insightful comments on the draft of this paper. I also thank the two anonymous referees for their comments and suggestions.

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 Pronominal Resumption in Earlier Egyptian Relative Clauses’, this volume.
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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:

\[ n hr.w n msrw-nj-sut i.shn psy.i nb r ir.w \]

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 *dd* ‘say’. I first consider the examples where *dd* has a declarative force, before turning to the cases of *dd* as an injunctive verb. With the declarative *dd*, the resumptive pronoun can be in any position inside the clause introduced by *dd*. In the following examples, the resumptive pronoun can be:

the direct object of the complement clause:

(5) P. Abbott, 6.17–18:

\[ hr bsr rh.i ph n n mdw.t \tau y i.dd pi hst ty-s n niw.t dd st n.i m s.s.w \]

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:

\[ [n\ h.t.w] i.dd.k t\i y sn hy st hy-nfr \]

[the chisels] that you said that Hy son of Hy-nefer stole (them).

(7) P. BM EA 10068, 6.20:

\[ hn.w n x\t h i.dd.k tt\i y n tt st s.t i.dhs.w \]

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:

\[ hr m-di tt md.t n n \tau :w i.dd.k di.i st n PN \]

and as regards this matter of the donkeys which you said you (lit. I) gave (them) to PN.

(9) P. Abbott, 7.11–12:

\[ n sbt i.dd.k pi hst ty-s n niw.t ph st n hmtw.t.w \]

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:

\[ n hnt.w n hd i.dd.w wn.w wnh m pi r\k \]

the vessels of silver which they said (they) were lying in the basket.

used after a preposition:

(11) P. Abbott, 5.2:

\[ pi hr i.dd.k in.i m sh.t im.f \]

the tomb which you said you (lit. I) took the things from.

---

5 Although the clause under the scope of *dd* 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 tt s.t i.dd.k in(w.) n ths.w n hd i.im.Ø k.t s.t* ‘as for the tomb you said the vases of silver were brought from, it is another one’.
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(12) LRL, 9.8–9:

\[ \text{the matter of the vessels of malachite and the two recipients which you said that you (lit. I) were having (them) finished.} \]

embedded in the possessive article and used after a substantive:

(13) KRI III, 533.11–13:

\[ \text{the two hearts of faience that I said to you I would pay their owner with whatever he shall ask for their price.} \]

When \( dd \) 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:

\[ \text{and as regards this matter of the two kite of gold which I told you: put them into the socle(?).} \]

(15) LRL, 20.2:

\[ \text{make the shaft which I told you: make it.} \]

(16) LES, 11.6:

\[ \text{and his younger brother did all the tasks his older brother told him: do them.} \]

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

(17) Ani, 22.19:

\[ \text{they are not small at all, our words, which you said one has to stop reading them} \]

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:

\[ \text{and you shall report to the vizier [about] this excessive amount of silver that the retainer Iay keeps saying: give it.} \]

It is clear that in the examples involving the verb \( dd \) 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 \( ps ib 2 n \, \text{thn} \).

7 For the word \( rHb \), 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:
\[ bti \ nb \ bin \ nb \ i.gm \ hnty.f \ r \ ir.w \]
all crimes and all evil deeds that his heart found to do.\(^9\)

(20) O. OIC 16991, rto 11–vso 2:
\[ twi \ hsr \ bk \ m \ hr.w \ n \ ms.x-nswt \ i.shn \ pty.i \ nb \ r \ ir.w \]
I am working in the tombs of the royal children that my lord ordered to do.

(21) \[ LRL, \ 14.16: \]
\[ iry.(i) \ sp \ 2 \ pty.i \ nb \ ir.f \ n.w \]
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 \((rdi \ sdm.f/sdm.tw.f)\), 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) \[ KRI \ II, \ 229.10: \]
\[ pty \ nac \ n \ hdy \ i.dia \ in.tw \ O \ r \ pr-\tau \ m-drt \ wptw.y.f \ PN \]
the silver tablet the great prince of Khatti PN caused to be brought to Pharaoh by his messenger PN.\(^{11}\)

(23) \[ KRI \ II, \ 283.5: \]
\[ ntr \ kw \ n \ isw.t \ rdi.i.nf \ in.tw \ O \ n \ nswt-bity \]
umerous herds of cattle that he caused to be brought to the King of Upper and Lower Egypt.

(24) \[ KRI \ II, \ 911.9: \]
\[ ntr.i.ttw \ ts \ s-t \ i.dia \ in.tw \ O \ n \ PN \]
one has taken the letter that I caused to be brought to PN.

(25) \[ KRI \ VI, \ 521.2–3: \]
\[ ntr \ htr.t \ i.dia \ in.tw \ O \ n \tn \]
these supplies that I caused to be brought to you.

(26) \[ LRL, \ 9.16–10.1: \]
\[ ntr.k \ (hr) \ sp \ n-hst \ n \ ir. \ kry \ i.dia \ in.tw \ O \ n.k \]
You shall receive in charge this boat that I caused to be brought to you.

(27) \[ LRL, \ 16.14–15: \]
\[ pty \ 17 \ n \ ntw \ i.dia \ stw \ kr \ in.tw \ O \ <r> \ rsy \]
The 17 spears that the guardian Kar caused to be brought <to> the South.

\(^{9}\) Cf. P. Anastasi V, 27.5–6: \(ink \ pty.gn.ttw \ r \ yr.f \ m \ ts.t\).

\(^{10}\) There is already a short note in ČGLEG, 51.6.8, with the conclusion that \(i.dia \ stp.f\) 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. 22).

\(^{11}\) 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 \(LingAeg\).
as the object of a transitive verb:

(32) **LES**, 69.4–5:
\[ \text{ih mš.t} \text{swg} \text{id} \text{w} \text{iry} \text{k} \]
What are the foolish enterprises that they made you do?

as the subject of an intransitive verb:

(33) **KRI** III, 252.7–8:
\[ \text{ir ts mds.t} \text{n} \text{pt} \text{hd} \text{id} \text{y} \text{sfh} \text{i} \]
As for the letter of the credit which you caused me to liquidate.

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 \( \text{hn} \) ‘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:
\[ \text{iw.k hr ir š.t} \text{n} \text{pt} \text{sš twt id} \text{y} \text{k hn.f r} \text{pt} \text{ts n whš.t} \]
(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:
\[ \text{ih hr.k} \text{ts md.t} \text{n} \text{ni s.wt id.p.} \text{k irm m} \text{rm} \text{t} \text{id} \text{iw.f-n-imn} \text{…} \text{hn.w} \]
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:
\[ \text{pt ih id} \text{y} \text{wm.f} \]
The ox which you had fed.

¹² One could also tentatively analyse \( \text{hn} \) as an infinitive. In this case, it should be added to the list given below.
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:

\[\text{mi-kd nty rmt i.di pty.i nh r.w.s in.tw.w}\]

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

(40) **O. DeM 554**, vso 5:

\[\text{ir m rm.w i.di.k in.tw.w n.w}\]

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

(41) **O. DeM 554**, vso 7:

\[\text{pi di.k in.f sw r [hry]}\]

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:

\[\text{md.t [n.t sš pn] rdi.t.n nb r.w.s in.t(w).f n bik-im}\]

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

(43) **Urk. I**, 170.13:

\[\text{iw m.n hm.(i) sš pn nfr nfr rdi.n.k in.t(i).f m stp-sš m hrw pn nfr}\]

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 Ikhernefret stela:14

(44) **Berlin 1204**, 3–4:

\[\text{... r sminh bs.f ści m gd.m di.n.f in.t ō hm.i m-hnt ti-sty}\]

\[\text{... in order to embellish his secret image with fine gold that he caused my Majesty to bring from Ta-sety.}\]

The inescapable conclusion is that the disappearance of the resumptive pronoun, limited to the causative pattern **rdi sdm.f/sdm.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 **rdi** inserted between **rdi** and its complement verb.

---


14 Cf. *GRG*, §385. Note also the following example in which the matrix verb is not a relative form: P. Reisner II, pl. 16, G2: *ijm hbb n.i br hm.wt.f nh(w)m.t, ih di.i di.t(w) ō 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 Aspect 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:
\[ r \text{ rdi.t } rh.k \text{ pt } nty \text{ nb } iw.k \text{ r } di.t \text{ grg.tw.f } \]
To let you know all that you shall cause to be prepared.

(46) KRI VI, 448.11:
\[ m-mitt \text{ pt } nty \text{ nb } iw.k \text{ di.t } in.tw.f [n.i] \]
Like all that you will cause to be brought [to me].

The lexicalisation process of the causative construction is perhaps less straightforward 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:
\[ hr'n tnt hn n n-mn ntw m rdi.t di.sn grg irTt m hnw n mtw.t r-h.t.i m pty.i iy.t \]
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
\[ y3 m di sfr.i m kyi \]
Actually, do not let me be replaced by another.

(49) KRI III, 501.7:
\[ r-Dd: di.i grg n.t 50 hn [ ] pt hib.k nb hr.f \]
I have caused the making ready of the fifty hn[ ] all that you wrote about.

(50) KRI III, 502.9:
\[ ptr di.i grg n.sn rt m r ist \]
Look, I will cause to be equipped for them men as a crew.

(51) KRI IV, 81.8:
\[ mts.k m m h.t nty nb iw.i r di.t iry se n.k \]
And you shall understand everything I will have done for you.

(52) KRI IV, 417.8–10:
\[ iw.s h.r in w* ms hr dbyt.t, iw.i hr di.t bsk.f, iw.i hr shr.t, iw.i hr di.t.f n.s \]
And she brought a basket of dbyt.t-plants, and I had it worked, I wove it, and I gave it back to her.

(53) KRI VI, 67.8–9:
\[ imy grg pty hs n hK \]
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 hAw.p pt-r di.t iry.f t-n-a.t "PN whom Pre did not allow (him) to be chamberlain" (P. Rollin, 2).
17 See J. C. Darnell, 'A Stela of the Reign of Tutankhamun from the Region of Kurkur Oasis', SAK 31 (2003), 82.
as soon as my letter [reaches the place] where you are, you shall have the small bed finished and the maset as well.

Let the dog be killed which is behind you.

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

Let some seed to cultivate be readied for us.

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

Why did you make her cross?

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

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

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.

Further on, a similar expression occurs: LES, 27.16–28.1: imy ṣdt cw ṣtw 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 ḫwrt).

The interpretation of this example is ambiguous: one can analyze gty-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 gty 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, gty is always used transitively (LES, 43.10; 43.13; 43.15; 44.1; 44.2; 44.5).

This letter’s formulation contrasts with what is found in P. Berlin 10488, where the sender did not use a causative construction: mtw.t ḥdb<.w>, mtw.t ḥr<.w> pt mw m grh (LRL, 54.2).
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(64)  LRL, 56.6:
   imy snkh pš i.śr.t(i) iy <r> tšy.t.f n pyš.f nb
   Have the calf fed until I return <to> take it to its owner.

(65)  LRL, 57.14:
   iw.i di.t ššp nš it
   And I caused the grain to be received.

(66)  P. CGC 58032, 49.22
   iw.i di.t ēry n.s md.t nb nfr nty ḥpr m-di rmḫ ... 
   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 ḥkš.s
   I will not allow it to be taken away.

(68)  P. BM EA 10252, 101.10:
   ntf i.śr di.t mdw nš šš.w
   It is he who causes the writings to be spoken aloud.

(69)  LEM, 116.11–12:
   ih di.k ḫr.k r di.t ēry pš rks n ḥtṛ nty iw.f r ḥsrw
   Can you apply yourself to make ready the team’s steed which is destined for Khor?

(70)  LEM, 119.1:
   iw.k ḫr di.t ēry pš i̓n ḥ.t.f nb
   (When my letter reaches you), you shall make ready the tribute in its every aspect.

(71)  LEM, 134.16:
   r rdš.t Ṣḥ ḥyš.f nš
   To let its name to be known.

The 25 examples 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 ṭdš sdšm.tvw.f has been challenged (but never replaced in terms of a substitutional process) by a pattern where the verb form after ṭdš is treated as an active: thus, iw.i di.t ššp nš it (ex. 65) contrasts with imy ššp.tw ššb.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). These examples seem to exclude

---

21 The last part of the sentence could also be read ṭšy.t.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 ēry.s ŋu n.f md.t nb.
23 One should perhaps add to the list: imy ‘rḫ n.i n nṯp (LES, 27.14), and ŋw di.t ŋu ŋu nṯḥb (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 > š.
the possibility of analyzing \textit{rdi sdm} NP as cases of \textit{rdi sdm.(w)} NP, with an unwritten 3rd pl. suffix pronoun (cf. the variant cited in note 21).  

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 \textit{sdm.f}. Compare, for instance, the Coptic infinitive \textit{mice} ‘give birth’ (Eg. \textit{msi}) with \textit{thec(e)io}. This important discovery led Egyptologists to take a fresh look at the morphological pattern of one of the most widely used suffixal conjugation forms.  

How can we reconcile this uninterrupted chain of \textit{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, 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. In the present case, the formation \textit{(r)di + infinitive} does not seem to have left traces in Coptic. The passive counterpart of the \textit{T-} Coptic causative is either a pattern with a suffix -\textit{hoyt} (best preserved in Bohairic)/-\textit{e(c)it} that has been tentatively derived from the passive formation \textit{(r)di sdm.tw} NP, but not without some serious problems, or with a suffix -\textit{hy}. This last one probably derives from the active pattern \textit{(r)di sdm.xw}, with the subject 3rd pl. suffix pronoun. 

\textsuperscript{25} When the verb is intransitive, other strategies can be applied as in LRL., 9.8–9: (the two vessels) \textit{i dd.k twi di.t grh.sw 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 \textit{grh}. 

\textsuperscript{26} Cf. A. Loprieno, \textit{Ancient Egyptian: A Linguistic Introduction} (Cambridge, 1995), 82, 224. 

\textsuperscript{27} According to the data found in Ramses, the proportion is 1:8. 

\textsuperscript{28} In the Future III with nominal subject, Late Egyptian sometimes displays a \textit{ic} NP r \textit{sdm} pattern, cf. Akm. \textit{\textsuperscript{A}-NP-\textit{cotti}}, instead of the more common \textit{iri} NP (r) \textit{sdm}, cf. Sah. \textit{epe-NP-e-cotti}; see J. Winand, \textit{Études de néo-égyptien}, I: \textit{La morphologie verbale} (AegLeod 2; Liége, 1992), §§771–84. Another case is the possibility of having the past converter \textit{wn} after the relative \textit{nty}, see J. Winand, ‘encore Ounamon 2,27–28’, LingAeg 15 (2007), 302–3. 


\textsuperscript{30} See A. Stauder, \textit{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 -\textit{T} suffix should be analysed as an analogical formation opinion; see W. C. Till, \textit{Koptische Grammatik (Säidischer 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)di.t + infinitive*. But what is more intriguing is that the pattern *(r)di.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)di.t ššp.tw NP* is no better attested either: only one example, coming from the time of Thutmose 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)di.t bšk.tw NP* is not attested outside the LEM corpus and *(r)di.t lbdb.tw NP* is only attested in the Two Brothers tale. Of course collocations like *(r)di.t ini.tw* or *(r)di.t di.tw* (resp. didi.tw) are trivial enough in the whole Late Egyptian corpus, even in the material coming from the South. But it strikes me that *rdi* + infinitive is much better represented in Upper Egypt, and that correspondingly *rdi* + passive subjunctive of otherwise common verbs (*bšk, ššp, lbdb, grg*) is virtually absent in Upper Egypt.

Be that as it may, 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 *twiḥr*.twi ḫrw sdm for expressing the progressive in Late Egyptian in constrast with the neutral *twi ḫrw sdm* pattern (Praesens I). 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). One can also consider how erratic the behaviour of *wn* was before indefinite nouns until it grammaticalised in Praesens I and related patterns.

---

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

32 To be complete, one should here mention the still rarer pattern *rdi* + NP + PSp, cf. C. Peust, ‘*rdj* + Pseudopartizip — eine mögliche Konstruktion’, *GM* 211 (2006), 67–70; to the exx. cited, add perhaps the following: *r-dḏ ib.i <r> di.t bšk šḥ 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 ḫrw sdm* vs. *bn ḫr.f sdm*).

