Overview

— I. Predicate focus constructions
A. Tw-t pw lr-n=f
B. The “complementary infinitive” construction

— II. Thetic constructions and constructions with thetic effects
C. Subjectless passives
D. Pw-marked thetic constructions: N pw hr-ṣdm
E. Tw-less constructions:
   E.1 Tw-less constructions of subject-first patterns
   E.2 ‘I ti npr ‘Here comes the god’

Background

Earlier Egyptian (Afroasiatic):
- Old Egyptian: ca. 2700-2100 BCE
- Middle Egyptian: ca. 2100-1300 BCE

- VSO (mostly); rigid word-order

Constituent focus constructions in Earlier Egyptian

(a) Active subjects

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{in N ~ ink/ntk/…} & \text{unmarked participle}_{\text{no AGRM}} & \text{(past)} \\
\text{marked/imperfective participle}_{\text{no AGRM}} & \text{(present)} \\
\text{prospective ṣdm=f} & \text{(future)} \\
\end{array}
\]

- NB. In: also e.g. to introduce the full noun Agent of a passive and after the infinitive; as a quotative index; to mark sentence questions; and in a variety of other, less common constructions — originally a quotative/presentative index
- also N PART (without in) with participants of high discourse prominence (e.g. the speaker in a letter; the deceased in funerary/mortuary corpuses)
- in early times, also with agreement on the participle

(On the Earlier Egyptian cleft construction:

(On in:
(b) Other nominal constituents, particularly direct objects and passive subjects

- Mainly: ‘Pseudo-cleft’ construction (with agreement)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{NP} & \text{pw} & \text{REL}_{\text{AGR}} \\
\text{Focus} & \text{Presupposition} & (\text{relative form, relative clause, passive participle})
\end{array}
\]

Based on the classifying pattern: ‘B is an A’

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
A & \text{pw} & B & \text{Predicate} \quad \text{Copula} \quad \text{Subject}
\end{array}
\]

- Various other patterns


(c) Adverbial constituents

- The so-called ‘emphatic’ construction

  - no initial iw (only a handful exceptions)
  - contrasts in verbal morphology

Unaccomplished

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{all events} & mrr=f & \text{contrasting with } N(P) \ mrr=f
\end{array}
\]

Accomplished

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{non subj.-affecting act.} & \text{—}[\text{no contrast}]— & \\
\text{subj.-affecting intr.} & ii.n=f & (\text{as contrasting with } NP_{S} \ RES)
\end{array}
\]

passive: EEg. I, P V-pass P (as contrasting with \(P_{O} \ RES\))

N —[no contrast]—

(\(sdf.m.t\non-P\) as contrasting with \(V\)-pass non-\(P\))

EEg. II \(sdf.m.t=f\) (as contrasting with \(P_{O} \ RES\)

\(~V\)-pass non-\(P\))

(Thus e.g., in the accomplished in EEg. II:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
P_{O} \ RES & sdf.m.t \ P & \\
V\text{-pass } non-P & sdf.m.t \ N
\end{array}
\]

— the \(sdf.m.t=f\) contrasting with both the Resultative and the perfective \(V\)-passive to express that an accomplished passive event, even though passive, is not perfective (that is, is not oriented on its Endpoint).)

- with negative events: is
 Predicate Focus and Thetic Constructions in Earlier Egyptian

Andréas Stauder (Universität Basel and Swiss National Science Foundation)

- Complex functional profile:
  - In general: Perspective on the event as it relates to the circumstances of its unfolding (rather than on the nexus between the subject and the event)
  - *Not* a narrow focus construction per se:
    - The narrow focus reading (with a backgrounding of the verbal event) is not uncommon in text, particularly in the unaccomplished, and in negative constructions; it is less common with positive accomplished events. In all cases, it is a contextual interpretation (possibly with additional stress in the spoken chain??).
    - More generally, functional profile of the construction is variable depending on aspect, polarity, event-semantics, and voice.
  - Also as a strategy of inter-clausal integration (particularly in the accomplished, when the perspective is on the event as it relates to another event expressed in an adjunctal clause of some sort)

(Among a great many discussions:


I. PREDICATE FOCUS CONSTRUCTIONS

---

A. *iw-t pw ir-n=f*

Morphosyntax

iw-t(come-INF)  pw(COP)  ir-n=f (do(REL)-ANT=3MSG)

*Cf. the ‘pseudo-cleft’ (above, b)*

NP    pw     RELAGRM
Focus Presupposition

Events

- Distinguished associated with events of directed motion:
  - *iw* ‘come’, *ḥk* ‘go in, enter’, *pri* ‘go out, come forth’, *spr r* ‘reach’, *šš* ‘go, walk’, *wḏt* ‘proceed’, *ḥl* ‘go down, descend’

- Uncommonly with other intransitives:
  - *gr* ‘be silent’ (*Eloquent Peasant* B1 80-81), *snḏm* ‘relax’ (*Urk. IV* 1542, 12)

- Also once with a secondary intransitives (O-detransitivized transitives)
  - objectless *msi* ‘give birth’ (*Hammamat* 110, 5)
**Written registers / Types of written discourses**

- First documented in early Middle Kingdom expedition accounts from the Wadi Hammamat (from ca. 2050 BCE on)
  
  (developing alongside other narrative constructions, e.g. ‘ḥr.n ṣdm.n=f; ‘narrative’ construction of the infinitive; broader use of wn.in=ḏ ṣdm)

- Then in Middle Kingdom and later literature (from ca. 1950 BCE on, e.g. Sinuhe; Eloquent Peasant)

- In the ‘Royal Tale’ (/ ‘Künstlerroman’: a type of written discourse, or ‘Sprechsituation’, or ‘generative matrix’ in which the king and his courtiers dialogue with one another, and the king eventually makes a decision)
  
  (from ca. 1700 BCE on, first in Neferhotep’s *Great Abydos Stela 6-7*)

- In other types of written discourses that make a generic reference to the ‘Royal Tale’:
  - in Middle Egyptian literature (e.g. Neferti; Cheops’ Court)
  - in New Kingdom royal inscriptions

**Thus:**

- A narrative construction;

- A construction limited to certain types of written discourse, arising and developing in relation to broader developments in written textuality;

- In combination with other narrative constructions, a linguistic index of a certain type of written discourse (‘Royal Tale’); more generally, a construction that is generically bound.

**In text**

- Sequence-initial / discontinuative: resuming the narrative after direct speech (1-2) or introducing a new stage in the a protagonist’s progress (3)

1. Neferhotep’s *Great Abydos Stela 6-7* (royal inscription, ‘Royal Tale’, ca. 1700 BCE)

   (‘(...) May Your Majesty proceed to the temples of the writings. May Your majesty see all the godly words.’)

   \[\text{wḏ\̣3\ pw lr-n} \ ḥm=f\ r\ pr\ mḏ\̣t\]

   proceed\-INF COP do(REL)-ANT Majesty=3MSG to house roll

\[\text{wn.in ḥm=ḏ ṣdw n n smrw}\]

\[\text{ḥr.n gm.n ḥm=f ṣdw n pr wsir ūnt-imntw}\]

   ‘His Majesty proceeded to the house of rolls.’

   And His Majesty opened the writings with these courtiers.

   Then his Majesty found the writings of the temple of Osiris foremost of the Westerners.’
(2)  *Eloquent Peasant* 80-81 (literary, ca. 1850 BCE; transl. R.B.Parkinson)

(‘And they said to him “Surely it’s only a peasant of his who’s come away to someone else beside him. Look, this is what they do to their peasants who’ve run off to others. Look, this is what they do. This is a case to punish this Nemtinakht for a little natron and a little salt? Order him to repay it, and he’ll repay it.”’)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
 & gr & pw \\
\text{be silent:INF COP do(REL)-ANT} & ir-n & \text{im-r3 pr-wr} \\
\text{High_steward Meru’s son Rensi} & s3-mrw rnsi \\
\end{array}
\]

‘The High steward Meru’s son Rensi was silent.

(He did not anser these officials, or this peasant. And this peasant came to petition the High steward, Meru’s son Rensi and said (...))’

(3)  *Sinuhe* B 241-242 (literary, ca. 1900 BCE)

(‘I was allowed to spend a day in Iaa (viz. a fictional landscape outside Egypt) handing over my property to my children; my eldest son was in charge of my clan, mand all my property was his, my servants, all my cattle, my fruit and all my orchard trees.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
 & lw-t & pw \\
\text{come-INF COP do(REL)-ANT servant} & ir-n & b3k \\
\text{this} & \text{in travel_southwards} & \text{m hntyty} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘This humble servant (viz. the speaker, Sinuhe) came southwards

(and I halted at the Ways of Horus (viz. the border to Egypt). The commander there who was in charge of the patrol sent a message to the Residence (viz. the Egyptian royal capital) to inform them.’

- *Sim.*, after fronted temporal expressions:

(4)  *Cheops’ Court* 3.10-11 (literary; ca. 1700-1500 BCE)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
 & hr & m-h\text{t} \\
\text{he commoner came} & mshrw & hpr \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
 & lwt & pw \\
\text{Sim. e.g. 2.15-16} & \text{ir-n} & p3 ngs \\
\text{the commoner came} & (...) & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Now, after the evening had set, the commoner came (...’)

- After similar fronted temporal expressions, contrast with other narrative constructions used with other event types:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
 & hr & m-h\text{t} \\
\text{Tale of P. Lythgoe ro} & m[s]rw & hpr \text{he gave} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \text{Sim. e.g.} & \text{Cheops’ Court 12.8-9} \\
\text{Ruddjedet} & \text{he} & \text{quarrelled} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \text{Now, after days had passed on this,} & \\
\text{..., after fronted temporal expressions:} & \text{Ruddjedet} & \text{quarrelled} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \text{he} & \\
\text{Now, after the evening had set,} & \text{he gave} & \\
\end{array}
\]
- Sim., with \(\text{INF}\) \(\text{pw}\) \(\text{ir-n}=\text{f}\) in sequence

(5) \(\text{Neferti 1a-e}\) (literary, ca. 1500 BCE (?); the beginning of the composition)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hpr.n swt wnn hm n nsw bity snfrw m}\,\text{?}-\text{hrw m nsw mnkh m t}\,\text{p n r-}\text{dr}=\text{f} \\
\text{w}\,\text{f} \,\text{m}\,\text{nn n hrw hpr} \\
\text{t}\,\text{k}\,\text{pw}\,\text{ir-n}\,\text{knbt nt hnw r pr}-\text{f3}\,\text{,w.s.}\,\text{r}\,\text{nd}-\text{hrt} \\
\text{prt}\,\text{pw}\,\text{ir-n}=\text{sn}\,\text{nd<.n>}=\text{sn}\,\text{hrt mi nt}-\text{w=sn}\,\text{nt}\,\text{r}\,\text{f}\,\text{nb}
\end{align*}
\]

‘It occurred, then, that the Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Snefru, justified, was an efficient king in this entire land.

One of these days, the Council of the Residence entered the Palace L.P.H. to pay their respects; They went out having paid their respects according to their daily custom.’

Sim. Thutmosis IV’s Sphinx Stela 8 (Urk. IV 1542, 10-12; ca. 1400 BCE)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{w}\,\text{f} \,\text{m}\,\text{nn n hrw hpr} \\
\text{lwt}\,\text{pw}\,\text{ir-n}\,\text{s}\,\text{t}\,\text{nsw dhwti-}\text{ms}\,\text{hr}\,\text{swtwt}\,\text{hr}\,\text{tr}\,\text{n}\,\text{mtrt} \\
\text{sn}\,\text{dm}\,\text{pw}\,\text{ir-n}=\text{f}\,\text{n}\,\text{sic}\,\text{swt}\,\text{nt}\,\text{tr}\,\text{pn}\,\text{f3}
\end{align*}
\]

‘One of these days, the royal son Thutmosis went out strolling at the time of noon;
He relaxed in the shadow of this great god (viz. the sphinx in Giza).’

- With stronger thetic force, in the passive:

(6) \(\text{Sinuhe B 236}\) (the speaker reacting enthusiastically to the king’s letter)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lw-t}\,\text{pw}\,\text{tr-y}\,\text{r}\,\text{b3k}\,\text{lm}
\end{align*}
\]

come-INF COP do-PASS.PERF to servant this

‘There has been coming to this servant (viz. the speaker)!’

(May your Majesty does as she desires: men live on the breath you give (...)

Digression: a very brief note on the ‘narrative’ use of the infinitive

- In isolated annalistic notations: outside continuous discourse since Dynasty 1 (ca. 3000 BCE), e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{skr} \,\text{(strike\,INF)}\,\text{lwntiw} \,\text{‘Striking the Asiatics.’} \\
\text{ms} \,\text{(fashion\,INF)}\,\text{skr} \,\text{‘Fashioning (the statue of) Sokar.’}
\end{align*}
\]

- Heading a narrative sequence (in expedition accounts, from the First Intermediate Period on, then in related types of written discourse), e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DATE — INF — finite forms}
\end{align*}
\]

- In sequence: in expedition accounts and in annals (from the early Middle Kingdom on)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{INF — INF — INF — INF (...)}
\end{align*}
\]

- On a par with narrative constructions, including after fronted temporal expressions (innovation of the written language of the Eighteenth Dynasty)
(7) Hammamat 110, 1-9 (expedition account, ca. 2050 BCE)

nsu-bity nb-štwyr-r*nśli dét
bšt in ḫpt n ḫm=f
hšt(INF) n=f in ḫm ḫṣwt
lw(INF) in gḥst bšt hr šmt ḫm=s r ḫtw ḫt-hr=s
lw štyt=s hr m=t (...)

mst pw lr-n=s hr=f
lw mš=m n nsw hr m$t
ḥš-n štw nbtr=s wdn.t ḫm=f m sbn n sḏt

hšt pw lr-n=f m ḥtp
lst ḫn in ḫm n nth pn ḫs (...)

‘The King of Upper and Lower Egypt Nebtauire living forever—
This wonder that happened to His Majesty—
The coming of wild game down to him.
The coming of a pregnant gazelle walking with her face toward the people in front of
her.
Her eyes were looking (...)
She gave birth upon it (viz. the stone).
The troops of the king were looking.
And her neck was cut and placed upon it (viz. the stone) as a burnt-offering.
It (viz. the stone) came down (viz. to the Nile Valley) in peace
It was the Majesty of this august god who (...’

(8) Sinuhe B 109-110

lw(INF) nht n ṭnw
mš=m i ḫm n ms=i

‘Coming of the strongman of (Re)tenu,
provoking me in my tent.’

Introducing a new episode, and a turning point, in the narrative. Contrast with

Sinuhe B 241-242 (above, (3))

lw-t pw lr-n bšk im m ḫnty (...’

‘This humble servant (viz. the speaker, Sinuhe) came southwards (...’,
introducing a new stage in the progress.

———B. The “Complementary infinitive” construction


Morphosyntax and diachronics

- -t in all inflectional classes; a deverbal noun of some sort (distinct from the infinitive)
- not filling a nominal slot (of subject or direct object) —> an ‘adverbial’ expansion
- diachronics:

> (i) directly after the V, before full noun subject:

(9) Pyr. 1272a-b² (PT 534) (ca. 2250 BCE)

lw  lw-t  3st  m lw-t=s  itw  dwt (...)  
come\IPFV  come-COMPL_INF  Isis  in  coming=3FSG  DEM  bad  
m  wn=k  rwy=k  n=s  
NEG_IMPR  open=2MSG  arms=2MSG  to=3FSG  
‘Should Isis come a coming in that bad coming of hers—
Do not open your arms to her!
(but let there be said to her her identity of Putrid Crotch: “Barred! Go the the houses of Manu! Enough! Go to Hedjbet, to where you will be beaten”
Should Nephthys come a coming in that bad coming of hers—(…)
Should those of the nighttime and those of old age come a coming in that bad coming of theirs—(…)
Should Pepi and his ka come a coming—open the doors of his gods (…’)

> (ii) after the full noun subject, in the ‘adverbial’ tail of the clause

(10) Pyr. 375a-b⁵ (PT 268)

mnḥ  wnis  pn  mnḥ-t  
efficient  Wnis  DEM  efficient-COMPL_INF  NEG  go_off  arm=3MSG  
ḥnt  wnis  pn  ḫnt-t  
foremost  Wnis  DEM  foremost-COMPL_INF  reach  ka=3MSG  to=3MSG  
‘This Wnis will become truly efficient — his arm will not go off.
This Wnis will become truly foremost — his ka will reach him.’

> (iii), in the same position, with the ‘complementary infinitive’ substituted with an adverbial phrase m INF (‘in a X-ing’)

(11) P. Ebers 49.22 (medical; ca. 1500 BCE)

ṣm=f  st  m  ṣm  
swallow=3MSG  3FSG  in  swallow\INF  
‘May he swallow it in a swallowing.’
Event types
- mostly with intransitives, e.g.

(12) CT IV 180f G1T (spell 334)
\[ ^{9}nḥ=\text{i} ^{9}nḥ-\text{t} \]
\[ \text{live=1SG live-COMPL\_INF} \]
\[ wnn=\text{i} wnn-\text{t} \]
\[ \text{exist=1SG exist-COMPL\_ING} \]
‘As I will truly live, (likewise) I will truly exist.’

- also with secondary intransitives (O-detrisitivized events)

(13) James 1962, I vso 16, 30 (early Middle Kingdom letter; Vernus 2001: 196, ex.9)
\[ mḥ \text{ tw } mḥ-\text{t} \]
fill\text{\_IMPR 2MSG fill-COMPL\_INF}
‘Fill, you, a filling! (viz. Do your job!’

- with transitives, only in the passive, e.g.:

(14) Urk. I 73, 2 (Djenwen; ca. 2500 BCE)
\[ mk-\text{t} \text{ mk-}\text{t} \text{ ht } zbt n k3=\text{s} \]
\text{protect\_SUBJ-PASS protect-COMPL\_INF property gone to ka=3FSG}
‘May the property of the one who has gone to her ka be well protected!’

(15) Pyr. 360a\text{p} (PT 266)
\[ gḥ-\text{t} \text{ pipi pn im } gḥ-\text{wt} \text{ ir } ḏḥt ḥr ḥr ḥḥṭi \]
ferry\text{\_SUBJ-PASS Pepi DEM there ferry-COMPL\_INF to horizon (...)
‘May this N there be ferried across in a ferrying to the horizon to Horus-of-the-horizon.’

Constructions
> (a) In complement clauses:
- subjunctive after verbs of ordering, etc.;

(16) CT I 287a-b Sq3C (spell 67)
\[ n rd=\text{i} \text{ mwt=} t \text{ mwt-}\text{t} \]
\text{NEG give\_ANT=1SG die\_SUBJ=2FSG die-COMPL\_INF}
‘I have not caused you to die a (true) death.’
- *mrr=f* (roughly: imperfective) after verb of perception

(17)  
Cheops’ Court 5.3-4

\[
i_{\text{b}} \ n \ h_{\text{m}}=k \quad r-kbb
\]
heart of Majesty=2MSG FUT-cool

\[
n \ m_{3} \ h_{\text{n}}-n=sn \quad h_{\text{n}}-t \quad m-hd \ m-\text{nt}
\]
on see\INF row~IPFV=3PL row-COMPL-INF up and down

‘Your Majesty’s heart will be cool
at seeing how they row a rowing trip up and down!

> (b) *In main clauses, with modal force:*

in the imperative (above, (13)), in the subjunctive (above, (14)), and in the prospective (below, (29)).

> (c) *In main clauses, otherwise in the ‘emphatic’ and related constructions (always?)*

- in the ‘emphatic’ construction:

(18)  
Pyr. 1163c^{PN} (PT 512)

\[
rm_{\text{m}}=i \quad rm-yt \quad it=i \quad ih
\]
weep-IPFV=1SG weep-COMPL-INF father=1SG Ah!

‘I weep a weeping, my father: “Ah!”

- in the setting construction: above, (9)
- in the balanced pattern (‘Wechselsatz’): above, (12)

> (d) *In the negative ‘emphatic’ construction, with focusing *is*:

(19)  
CT I 344/5c S1C and mult. mss.

\[
n \ ms-n-t=i \quad is \ ms-yt
\]
NEG give_birth-ANT-PASS=1SG FOC give_birth-COMPL-INF

‘I was not born through birth.’

V-passives in G1T *n msy=1* is *msyt* (sim. A1C; M4C); also *n ms.t=i* (…) (S2C, S14C, T3C, BH2C); further CT II 3g B1C, B2L, B1P *n lwr=i* is *lwrt* ‘I was not conceived through a conception’; B1Bo *n ms=f* is *m msyt*; G1T *n msw=i* is *msyt*. 
II. THEletic CONSTRUCTIONS AND CONSTRUCTIONS WITH THEtic EFFECTS

——C. Passives from intransitives

(not a thetic construction, but often: perspective set on the event itself, thus ‘thetic-like’)


NB: Various discourse functions of EEg. passives from intransitives

- Agent-backgrounding:

(20) Heqanakht II, ro 27-28

\[ \text{mtn } \text{s3f-w } m \ wnm \ rmt } \text{?} \]

Look begin-PASS.PFV in eat\(\text{INF} \) people here

’Look, one has begun to eat people here!’

- Discourse-continuity, on oblique and/or on unexpressed Agent

(21) Semna Stela, Year 16 (Berlin 1157), 13-15

\[ \text{iw } m^t-n \ s.t \ h.m=i.i \ nn \ iv-w-ms } \text{ (A}_i > O_j \]

\[ h.k-n=i.i \ h.mw=t=sn_j \ in-n=i.i \ hrw=sn_j \]

\[ \text{pr } r \ hnmw=t=sn_j \ h.w k^3=sn_j } \text{ (OBL}_{j,r} [A_i] – O_{j,r} [A_i]) \]

\[ \text{wh3 } l=t=sn_j \ rd \ lt \ im_j } \text{ (O}_{j,r} [A_i] – OBL}_{j,r} [A_i]) \]

’My Majesty has seen it—no untruth—

I have captured their wives, I have brought their dependents;

Their wells have been gone to, their cattle has been stricken,
their wheat has been pulled out, it has been set on fire.’

The perspective on the event itself

(> The oblique phrase is anaphorically linked to the preceding segment of discourse:

(22) Mo’alla II.η.2 (Inscription #7)

\[ n \text{ pr.n.t n snd=f } \]

NEG go_out-ANT-PASS for fear=3MSG

’There was no going out for fear of them (scil. the troops).’ )
The oblique phrase is not anaphorically linked, nor does it include a topical participant:

(cf. *bibitur estur quasi in propina* ‘There is drinking and eating like in a tavern’ (Plautus, *Poenulus* 635))

- part of the argument structure of the verb:

(23) *Ipuwer* 12.8

\[\text{śk r hwt-nty} \ldots\]

enter::PASS.PFV to temple

‘There has been entering the temple \ldots’

(24) *Ipuwer* 6.3

(‘But now, barley has perished on every road:)  
\[\text{šh3-w} \quad m \quad hbsw\]

strip::bare-PASS.PFV of clothes  
\[\text{ḥs3} \quad m \quad mrḥt\]

anoint::PASS.PFV of oil

There has been stripping people of their clothes,

There has been making them unanointed with oil.’

- not part of the argument structure of the verb:

(25) *Pyr.* 179a\(^{WNN}\) (PT 219)

(‘Nut, this one here is your son of whom you have said:

\[\text{ms-n-t} \quad n(=i)\]

give::birth-ANT-PASS to(=1SG)

\[\text{i.t tn}\]

‘There was birth for me’

—so you said.’

> The clause does not include an oblique phrase

(NB: not licensed in some languages, e.g. Classical Arabic *julisā fi-1-xadjīgatī* ‘there was sitting in the garden’, but *julisā* ‘there was sitting’)

(26) *Debate of a Man and His Soul* 111-113

(‘To whom can I speak today?)  
\[\text{lw} \quad ḫḏ3-tw\]

AUX plunder::PRS-PASS

There is plundering,

(everyone is robbing their brothers.’)
(27) CT II 166k-167b B2L

‘The gods speak of this(?) great eye of Horus:

\[\text{smn} \, \text{iry}\]

establish\(\text{PASS.PFV}\) make\(\text{PASS.PFV}\)

\[\text{lw} \, \text{htp} \, \text{hr}=s\]

AUX \ be\_\text{content} about=3FSG

There has been establishing,
there has been creating—
One is content about it.’

(28) Ipuwer 2.4

(‘But now, wives are barren:

\[\text{n} \, \text{lw}[r]-n-tw\]

NEG \ conceive-\text{ANT-PASS}\]

There is no conceiving.’

> With the “complementary infinitive” construction (above, B):

(29) Pyr. 1905c\textsuperscript{N} (PT 665A)

(‘The earth will tremble for you,
an offering will be laid down for you,)

\[\text{rw-w} \, \, n=k \, \, \text{rw-wt}\]

dance\(\text{PASS.FUT}\) \ for=2MSG \ dance\(\text{COMPL\_INF}\)

there will be danced a dance for you.’

> Also with an expression of the Agent:

(30) Qaw Bowl, inside, 4

\[\text{in} \, \, \text{ir-r-t} \, \, r=i \, \, r-gs=k\]

INTR \ do\(\text{IPFV-PASS}\) against=1SG next\_to=2MSG

\[\text{n} \, \, \text{ir-t-n} \, \, \text{ddt-n} \, \, s3=k \, \, \text{im}\]

NEG \ do\(\text{REL-FEM-ANT}\) say\(\text{REL-FEM-ANT}\) son=2MSG there

\[\text{in} \, \, \text{sn}(=i) \, \, \text{krs-n}(=l)-sw\]

by \ brother(=1SG) \ bury\(\text{ANT}(=1SG)-3MSG\)

‘Is there acting against me next to you
—even though there is nothing that your son did or said—
by my brother, whom I buried?’

(In setting the perspective on the event itself and in introducing the Agent only in the rhematic tail of the sentence, the passive construction contributes to underscoring the paradoxy of the situation that is complained about.)
In text

> Discourse-discontinuative in narrative:

(31)  

_Sinuhe_ R 22-24

(‘(…) He did not delay at all.)

\[\text{Ist hib m nsw-nsnw w m-hf=f m mšn pn}\]

\[\text{nš-n-tw n \text{w}^\circ \text{ im}}\]

Now, there had been sending to the royal children who where after him in this expedition, and only one of them was summoned.’

(32)  

_Sinuhe_ B 246-249

(‘I took to set sail, with kneading and brewing accompanying me until I reached the harbor of Itju.)

\[\text{hd n rt t dwi sp 2}\]

\[\text{iw \text{iw} t3š n=i}\]

AUX come\textsc{\textit{PASS.PFV}} call\textsc{\textit{PASS.PFV}} to=1SG

When it had dawned very early in the morning,

one came and summoned me—

(ten men coming, ten men going, introducing me to the palace. I touched the ground (…)’)

(On Sinuhe’s way home, his first encounter with Egyptians)

> Common in administrative language: events en bloc, cf. format of listing

(33)  

_Stèle Juridique_ 18-19

‘hš.n mšr w m hš n wšmn n w\textsc{\textit{rt mht}}t (…)’

‘kš n rt wšm hšn dd’

‘There was discussion about it in the office of the herald of the northern district (…).

There was acquiescing to it likewise, and saying: (…)

There was questioning in these terms: (…)’

Sim. e.g. P. UC 32166, ro II.3 \_hr hr=š khr=š ‘There was agreement about it. There was swearing about it.’ With secondary intransitives, e.g. Urk. I 4, 15-16 (Metjen) iw zḥm r n-snw nmn=sn r=š r n-snw ‘There was production of a piece of writing according to a royal document, their names (scil. of the “foundations of Metjen”) being in the royal document.’ Sabnu son of Mekhu 11 ḏd r wē pn (…) ‘There was said in this decree: (…)’; P. Bulaq 18, XIX.2.2-3 imj fš.tw n nš n rmt pr [mnšt] nty nfr pw fš.tw n=sn m sf ‘Cause that things be brought to these people of the House of the nurse to whom there was no bringing yesterday.’
- With the perfective V-passive used for an event yet to come:

(34)  \textit{Urk. I 224, 6 (Pepyankh-Heryib)}

\begin{verbatim}
  lw   tr   hft   mr~r-t=sn
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
AUX  act\PASS.PFV  according_to  wish\~IPFV.REL-FSG=3PL
\end{verbatim}

‘There shall be acted (lit. it has been acted) according to what they wish.’

- With a $sgm-n-r=t$ exceptionally combined with $lw$:

(35)  P. Brooklyn 35.1446 pl.IV, ro 31.f

\begin{verbatim}
  lw   \textit{\textbf{kn}(-n)-tw}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
AUX  complete-\textbf{ANT-PASS}
\end{verbatim}

‘There has been completion.’

> In literary laments (e.g. above, (23)-(24), (26)): the situation as such is lamented

> In mortuary literature, also in part reflecting the performative nature of these texts

(36)  \textit{Pyr. 345a-346b}$^\text{TP}$ (PT 264)

\begin{verbatim}
  lw   nw   pn   bk\^{}3  (...)  
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
  nis-t  ir  N  in  r\^{}
\end{verbatim}

‘When the time comes tomorrow, (...) There will be summons to N by Re, (...)’

(37)  \textit{Pyr. 1473a-1474b}$^\text{M}$ (PT 572)

\begin{verbatim}
  lrw   n=f  in  tm  mr  irt  n=f
\end{verbatim}

‘There will be acted for him by Atum like what has been done for him:

(He has fetched for you the gods who belong to the sky, he has embraced for you
the gods who belong to the earth, so that they can place their arms under you and
that they can make for you a ladder, and that you can climb to the sky.’)

(38)  \textit{CT I 73d-74f B1P}

\begin{verbatim}
  lw   \textit{h\^{}3}   n=k  in  bik  lw   ng   n=k  in  smn
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
  lw   \textit{\textbf{d\^{}3}}   n=k  \textit{\textbf{r}}  in  dhw\textit{ti}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
  lw   \textit{s\^{}h}   n=k  hp\^{}3  n  hftiw=k
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
  lw   \textit{h\^{}3}   n=k  in  \textbf{drtv}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
  3st  pw  h\textit{\textbf{n}}\textit{\textbf{r}}  nb\textit{\textbf{t}}=hwt  (...)\end{verbatim}

‘There has been screaming for you by the falcon, there has been cackling for you
by the \textit{semen}-goose;

An arm has been extended to you by Thoth, a strong arm has been struck for your
enemies;

There has been screaming for you by the two kites— it is Isis and Nephtys (...)’

> Priscian: ‘When I say \textit{curritur}, I mean \textit{cursus}’

(after Pierre-Yves Lambert, L’impersonnel, in: Jack Feuillet (ed.), \textit{Actance et valence dans les langues
D. *nw hr-sdm*, etc.


Uljas & Stauder, *Thetic Constructions in Earlier Egyptian*, in prep.)

\[ \text{A} \quad \text{away} \quad \text{it/this is } \text{A} \]

Various construction types, e.g.

\>

\[ \text{INF} \quad \text{away} \]

(introducing new episode in narrative (not common)

\[ \text{(39)} \quad \text{Chapelle Rouge}, \text{p.107: III.14-15 (HHTI 13, 5/6-7/8)} \]

\[ m-	ext{hit } mn \quad \text{w}s \quad \text{away} \quad r \quad h^3 \]

\[
\quad \text{after this proceed} \quad \text{INF} \quad \text{away} \quad \text{to outside} \\
\]

\[
\quad \text{‘After this, it is proceeding to the outside.} \\
\quad \text{(And Her Majesty was before her father (…))} \\
\]

\>

\[ \text{The ‘glossing construction’: } \text{mr}=\text{f} \quad \text{away}, \text{etc.} \]

\[ \text{away} \text{ referring back to a preceding segment of discourse,} \]

\[ \text{- often in glosses: this in medical texts and in mortuary literatures (often etiological)} \]

\[ \text{(40)} \quad \text{P. Ebers 102, 15-16 (medical)} \]

\[ \quad \text{‘As for “his heart is flooded”,} \]

\[ \text{mhh } l_b=f \quad \text{away} \quad m\text{n ty } hr \quad s\text{h}t \quad k\text{t} \quad m\text{dt} \]

\[
\quad \text{this means that his heart is oblivious like one who is thinking of something else.} \]

\[ \text{(41)} \quad \text{P. Smith 16, 14-16 (medical)} \]

\[ \quad \text{‘As for “their colouring does not sparkle”,} \]

\[ \text{tm } nblbw \quad \text{in}=\text{s} \quad \text{away} \]

\[
\quad \text{this means that their skin does not shine.} \]

\[ \text{(42)} \quad \text{Book of the Dead 17, 108-109 Nu} \]

\[ \quad \text{‘As for the “few ascend to them”,} \]

\[ \text{wnn smlyt stwy } \text{away} \quad hr \quad t\text{kn} \quad \text{in}=\text{s} \]

\[
\quad \text{this means that the cronies of Seth were approaching her.} \]

\[ \text{(43)} \quad \text{Book of the Dead 18, 5-6 Nu} \]

\[ \quad \text{‘As for “guarding the rebels”,} \]

\[ \text{htm-n-tw smlyt stwy } \text{away} \]

\[
\quad \text{this means that the cronies of Seth have been annihilated.} \]
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- \( mrr = f \, pw \) (40)
- \( tm = f \, sdm \, pw \) (41)
- \( wnn = f \, pw \, hr-sdm \) (42)
- \( sdm-n-t = f \, pw \) (43)

\((mrr = f): \) a form often associated with imperfective semantics and/or non-assertion
\((tm): \) a negation associated with non-assertion
\((wnn): \) an auxiliary itself in the \( mrr = f \), to introduce progressive \( NP \, hr-sdm \)
\((sdm-n-t = f): \) a form expressing that an accomplished event, even though passive, is not viewed from its Endpoint, that is, is not viewed as perfective

> and other constructions (…)

**Pw-marked thetic constructions**

\[ N \, pw \, hr-sdm \] (progressive)
\[ N \, pw \, r-sdm \] (future)
\[ N \, pw \, PsP \] (resultative; accomplished with events of direct motion)
\[ N \, pw \, sdm.n=f \] (accomplished, with other types of event)

\[ N \, pw \, hr-sdm \quad \leftarrow \quad N \, hr-sdm \]
\[ N \, pw \, sdm.n=f \quad \leftarrow \quad sdm.n=f \]

- distinct from the above:
  - form: e.g. \( N \, pw \, hr-sdm \), as differing from \( wnn \, N \, pw \, hr-sdm \)
  - environments: e.g., not as the B part of \( ir \, A, B \)
  - \( pw \) not anaphorically indexing, nor with any referential content (Uljas, Vernus)
- a marked topic construction?
- however:

(44) **Cheops’ Court 6.4-6**

(‘Then I said to her: “Why do you not row?” And she said to me:

\[ nh3w \, pw \, n \, mfk3t \, m3t \, hr \, mw \]

“A pendant of new malachite fell into the water.”’

(45) **Shipwrecked Sailor 89-91**

(‘He (viz. the serpent) opened his mouth while I was prostrate in front of him. Then he said to me: “Who brought you? Who brought you, young man? Who brought you to this island of the sea, with water on all sides?” ‘I answered this to him, my arms bent in from of him. I said to him:)

\[ ink \, pw \, h3.kw \, r \, bi3 \, m \, wpwt \, ity \] (…)

(What happened/The thing is that) I had gone to the mine in a mission of the Sovereign (…)’

- (cf., à la Lambrecht (1994: ch.1): ‘why are you taking the bus?’ — ‘my car broke down, mi si è rotta la macchina, …’)
> further exx. in various environments:

(46)  \[ \text{Khakheperereseneb ro 10} \]

\[ \text{ink pw hr nk3} \{=i\} \ m \ hprt \ shrw \ hpr \ ht \ t3 \]

‘I am pondering on what happens, on the state that is through the land.
(Changes are happening: it is not like the preceding year, a year is heavier than the other. The land is in uproar (…)’)

Introducing the lament proper.

(47)  \[ \text{Neferti 13a} \]

\[ \text{nsw pw r lyt n rsy imny m3}\mbox{-}hrw \ rn=f \]

‘(The fact is:) A king from the south is to come, Ameny, justified, by name.’

Introducing the closing, affirmative section of the composition, after the lament.

(48)  \[ \text{Ahmose’s Abydos Stela for Tetisheri 7-8 (Urk. IV 27, 14-15)} \]

\[ \text{ink pw sh3-n=i mwt mwt= i mwt it(=i) hmt-nsw wrt mwt-nsw tti-}\]

\[ \text{tti-m= hrw} \]

‘I thought of the mother of my mother and the mother of my father, the great royal wife, the royal mother, Tetisheri, justified.’

Introducing a new development in narrative. Sim. e.g. Hatshepsut’s Northern Obelisk, Basis D 14 (Urk. IV 364, 16-17) \[ \text{ink pw sndm-n=i m c} \]

\[ \text{h sh3-n=i km}\mbox{-}w1 \]

‘I relaxed in the palace and I thought of the one who created me.’ Passim, not uncommon.

(49)  \[ \text{CT II 280d} \]

\[ \text{r\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde}i, pw hp-n} \]

\[ \text{sw1} \]

\[ \text{imy-ins=f} \]

Re \[ \text{pw} \]

encounter-\text{ANT 3MSG} \text{the_one_in_his_wrapping} \n

> Rise of the construction: cf. colloquial French: ‘C’est ma voiture qui s’est cassée’ > …

———

E. \textit{iw}-less constructions

E.1  \textit{iw}-less constructions of subject-first patterns

(Uljas & Stauder, \textit{Thetic Constructions in Earlier Egyptian}, in prep.


> *Tw*: many complexly interrelated functions, among which:

- signaling that the clause is asserted of a subject
- with subject-first patterns particularly, relating the clause to preceding discourse

\[ \text{Sinuhe R 5-11} \]
\[ hsbt 30 išd 3 išt sw 7 \]
\[ \text{tw} \ \text{hsw m sgr} \]
\[ ibw m gmw \]
\[ rwty wrtw htmw(...) \]

‘Year 30, month 3 of Inundation-Season, day 7:
Ascending of the god to his horizon (...)
The Residence was in silence
The hearts were in mourning
The Great Double Gate was shut (...’

Hammamat 110, 3-7 (expedition account, ca. 2050 BCE)
\[ hšt n=f in \text{tw} \ hws \]
\[ iwt in gšt bkšt hr šmt \ hr=s r \ rmtw \ hšt-hr=s \]
\[ \text{tw} \ irty=s \ hr mš3 (...) \]
\[ mst pw ir-n=s \ hr=f \]
\[ \text{tw} \ mš3 pn n nsw \ hr mš3 \]
\[ \text{tw} \ hr-n sʾ w šmt=s \ wdn.t \ hr=f \ m \ sbi \ n \ sdt \]

‘The coming of wild game down to him.
The coming of a pregnant gazelle walking with her face toward the people in front of her.
Her eyes were looking (...)
She gave birth upon it (viz. the stone).
The troops of the king were looking.
And her neck was cut and placed upon it (viz. the stone) as a burnt-offering.

> discourse-initial:

(50)  **Eloquent Peasant B1 135-136**
\[ dd \ in \ shty \ pn \]
\[ hšw n \ \text{hr-sit} \ n=f \]
measurer of heaps PROG-cheat for=3MSG

‘And this peasant said:
“The measurer of heaps is cheating for himself!”’

(51)  **Nubkheperre Antef’s Coptos Decree (D.17), 4-5**
\[ (...) \ r-dd \]
\[ lʾn \ bin wš r \ hrpr \ m \ pš \ r-pr (...) \]
matter bad come\'RES to occur in this temple

‘(...) thus:
“A bad matter has come to occur in this temple (...!”’
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> in captions:

(52)  
\[ \text{wh}^5 \text{w } \text{hr-} \text{hm } \text{[rm]} \text{w} \]
\[ \text{fishermen PROG-snare fishes} \]
\[ \text{‘Fishermen are snaring fishes.’} \]

- sim., under the scope of ‘presentifying’ \[m\] (‘see!’):

(53)  
\[ \text{hw}^6 \text{kw } \text{hr-} \text{h'k } \text{m phwy m} \text{srw} \]
\[ \text{barber PROG-shave in end evening} \]
\[ \text{‘The barber is (still) shaving at the end of the evening.’} \]

- sim., in a literary ‘prophecy’, also under the scope of ‘presentification’ (\[d=\text{i n}=k ... \text{‘I will give (viz. show) you ...’}\):

(54a)  
\[ \text{Neferti 14a-e} \]
\[ s^3 \text{n s r-irt } \text{rn=f(...)} \]
\[ \text{son of man FUT-make names=3MSG} \]
\[ \text{hw } c^{smw} \text{r-hr n } s^t=f(...) \]
\[ \text{AUX Asiatics FUT-fall to massacre=3MSG} \]
\[ \text{‘The son of a man will make his name (...);} \]
\[ \text{(And) the Asiatics will fall to his slaughtering (...)} \]

(54b)  
\[ \text{Neferti 15a-e} \]
\[ \text{tw } r-\text{kd } \text{inbw } \text{hk};^7 \text{c.w.s. (...)} \]
\[ \text{IMPRS FUT-build} \]
\[ \text{hw } m^8 \text{t r-liit } r \text{ st=s (...)} \]
\[ \text{AUX Maat FUT-come} \]
\[ \text{‘One will build the Walls of the Ruler L.P.H. (...);} \]
\[ \text{(And) Maat will return to its place (...)} \]

(54c)  
\[ \text{Neferti 8f-9a} \]
\[ \text{tw } r-\text{8sp } \text{hw}^5 \text{w nw } \text{h}^3 \]
\[ \text{IMPRS FUT-receive} \]
\[ \text{\'nh t3 m sh3} \]
\[ \text{live\SUBJ land} \]
\[ \text{hw=tw } r-\text{irt } \text{h}^3 \text{w m bli} \]
\[ \text{AUX=IMPRS FUT-make} \]
\[ \text{dbh-tw \{m\} t1 <m> snfw} \]
\[ \text{ask\SUBJ-PASS} \]
\[ \text{‘Weapons of combat will be taken up,} \]
\[ \text{the land will live in uproar.} \]
\[ \text{(And) arms will be made of copper,} \]
\[ \text{bread will be asked with blood.’} \]
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(55) Neferti 7g-h
    tw r-lsḫ mḥkt m grḥ
    tw r-cšk ḫnwrwt
    tw r-snbt ḳḍd m ʿrty
    ‘A ladder will be waited for at night!
    Strongholds will be entered!
    Slumber in the eyes will be swept away!’

E.2 ʿli ntr ‘Here comes the god!’
    (Stauder, ʿli ntr ‘Here comes the god!’), in prep.
    Uljas & Stauder, Thetic Construction in Earlier Egyptian, in prep.

> With weather events:

(56) Pyr. 393a-395aWT (PT 273-4)
    gp pt ĕḥy sbj
    nnmm pdt sdj qs ṣkrw
    gr r=sn gnmw
    mi-n= sn NN ḫc bt
    m ntr ṃḥw m ṭw=f ṃwš b m mwtt=f
    NN pi nb zšb ṭm.m mwtt=f źm=f
    lw ṣpšw ṣpšw NN m pt
    lw wsr=f m ṭḥ (...)  
    The sky grows (has grown) cloudy, the stars obscure (have obscured);
    the (sky’s) arcs quake (have quaked), the bones of the earth shake (have shaken);
    and those who move (the decans: Eyre) grow (have grown) still,
    having seen NN, apparent and ba
    as the god who lives on his fathers and feeds on his mothers.

    Unis is the lord of jackal-like rapacity, whose (own) mother does not know his identity:
    for Unis’s nobility is in the sky
    for his power is in the Akhet, (...)

> Events of motion, of appearing into the scene

(57) Pyr. 956a-cP (PT 447)
    ʾd pt nwrt t;
    l ḫr ḫc dhwtk
    ts=sn wšš ḫr gs=f ṣd= sn ḫc=f m psdtk
    ‘The sky becomes dishevelled, the earth trembles
    Horus comes, Thot appears,
    That they might rise Horus from off his side and make him stand up in the Dual Ennead.’
Predicate Focus and Thetic Constructions in Earlier Egyptian
Andréas Stauder (Universität Basel and Swiss National Science Foundation)

(58) Pyr. 1799a-b^N (PT 637)

\[ \text{i} hr m\tilde{h} m m\text{dt} \]
\[ s\text{hm-n}=f \text{it}=f \text{wsir} (...) \]
‘Here comes Horus, filled with oil.
He has sought his father Osiris (...)’

(59) Pyr. 17a-c^WN (PT 25)

\[ \text{z z} \ h\text{n}^f k\tilde{z}=f \]
\[ \text{z} \ hr \ h\text{n}^f k\tilde{z}=f \quad \text{z st}\$ h\text{n}^f k\tilde{z}=f \]
\[ (...) \]
\[ \text{z} \ t \ \text{dd}=k \ h\text{n}^f k\tilde{z}=k \]

“Someone (lit. a goer) goes with his ka!
Horus goes with his ka! Seth goes with his ka!
(...) You too, be gone with your ka!”

> Events
- \( s\text{d}\text{i} \) ‘shake’, \( \text{nmmn} \) ‘quake’, \( n\text{wr} \) ‘tremble’, \( f\tilde{d} \) ‘become dishevelled’ (of the sky or the earth); also \( hr \ s\text{d}\text{i} \) ‘trembling falls’
- \( \text{iwi} \) ‘come’, \( p\text{rt} \) ‘come forth’, \( z\text{i} \) ‘go’, \( p\text{sl} \) ‘fly off’, \( h\tilde{m} \) ‘descend’, \( h\text{f} \) ‘stand up’, \( h\tilde{f}\text{i} \) ‘appear’,
\( rs \) ‘awake’
- \( m\text{dw} \) ‘speak’, \( sr \) ‘announce’

> Subjects
- always full noun
- no referential autonomy (weather events) — divine entity, newly introduced to the scene (events of appearing, etc.)

> Very strong propensity to be spell-initiality

> Formally contrasting with
- If present tense: \( \text{Subject} \ \text{ii}=f \)
- If past tense: \( \text{Subject} - \text{Resultative} \) (for most events); \( s\text{dm-n}=f \) (for the others)

Either way, V-S pattern contrasting with regular S-V patterns
(NB: also: \( \text{iw}-\text{less}; \) cf. above E.1)

\( (\text{here comes the king} / \text{viene il re} — — \text{squilla il telefono}) \)