

## DEMOTIC NOMINAL SENTENCES<sup>1</sup>

*By* JANET H. JOHNSON

Nominal sentences, by which are meant sentences consisting of two, or three, nominal elements, generally have been analyzed in terms of the relative positions of the subject and predicate.<sup>2</sup> But there are no formal marks on the elements indicating which is the subject, which the predicate, so that the designations subject and predicate are based on the translation into a modern language. This paper will attempt to establish formal rules of word order for the elements of such sentences based on the elements themselves, not on the translation and not on any semantic arguments. The rules will be derived by studying the composition of nominal sentences involving at least one pronominal element and the formal rules of word order so derived will be extended to those involving only nonpronominal nominal elements. Then the rules of word order for nominal sentences will be compared to the rules of word order for other, i.e., verbal, sentences in Egyptian. The basic rules will be derived using Demotic examples,<sup>3</sup> but they will then be compared with earlier, and later, stages of Egyptian to see whether the rules so determined have validity in other stages of the language.

In bipartite nominal sentences, nominal sentences involving two nominal elements, both elements may be pronouns, one may be a pronoun and the other not, or neither may be a pronoun. In those cases in which one element is a pronoun, the other not, a copula<sup>4</sup> will always appear as the second of the two elements while all other pronouns always appear as the first element. If both elements are pronouns, a copula will always appear as the second element, an independent pronoun will always appear as the first element, and an interrogative pronoun will follow the independent pronoun but precede the copula.<sup>5</sup> Thus, in bipartite nominal sentences pronouns other than the copula always precede nouns, independent pronouns precede all other pronouns, and the

copula follows all other pronouns.<sup>6</sup> This order is based solely on the type of nominal elements composing the sentence; the function of the elements, as subject or predicate in the translation, is irrelevant. For instance, in the construction *ink psy*, both the independent pronoun and the copula can be translated as the subject or as the predicate, i.e., "It is I" or "I am he." The ordering of elements by type of nominal, rather than by function, is similar to the ordering of subject, direct object, and indirect object after a conjugated verb where a suffix pronoun always precedes a dependent pronoun and both always precede a noun.

In tripartite nominal sentences, which include two nominal elements and the copula pronoun, the operation of such a rule governing word order is not so obvious. There are two basic patterns: A B *pw* and C *pw* D. The former is by far the more common. In the construction A B *pw* the copula always occurs last, agreeing in number and gender with the second element (B). Within the corpus under consideration both independent and demonstrative pronouns are found in the A position and an interrogative pronoun is found in position B.<sup>7</sup> But in the construction C *pw* D the copula is in the middle and may agree in number and gender with D.<sup>8</sup> Independent, interrogative, and possessive pronouns are all attested as element C, the demonstrative as element D (including an example in which an interrogative is element C).<sup>9</sup> On the basis of these examples, we can conclude that, in tripartite as in bipartite nominal sentences, the independent pronoun always comes first; the interrogative only appears in the position immediately before the copula (B in type 1, C in type 2); the demonstrative only occurs in the other position (A in type 1, D in type 2). The position of interrogative and demonstrative pronouns suggests that A is syntactically related to D and B to C. Since in all nominal sentences involving the copula except the relatively rare construction C *pw* D the copula comes at the end of the sentence, it seems likely that D has been added in apposition to the copula *pw* and that the core sentence is simply C *pw*.

Likewise, the fact that the imperfect converter *wn-n3* appears between A and B of type 1 tripartite nominal sentences suggests that A is in anticipatory emphasis, outside the core sentence, which here is B *pw*.<sup>10</sup>

E 4: 'Onchsheshonqy 3/17 *p3y.f it<sub>x</sub> wn-n3 p3 iry n p3y.y it<sub>x</sub> p3y*  
 "His father was the companion of my father."

If B and C are parts of the core of their sentences, and A and D are extraposed elements, then in the corpus under consideration interrogative pronouns occur within the core of nominal sentences but demonstratives never do. The independent pronoun alternates, sometimes functioning within the core, sometimes in extraposition. Thus the rule that the independent pronoun must come at the beginning of the sentence seems to take precedence over any other rules of position within nominal sentences.

The above suggestion that B *pw* and C *pw* are the cores in tripartite nominal sentences is supported by the evidence of negatives of nominal sentences. As with other present tense sentences, *bn . . . in* is used to negate the present tense nominal sentence. *Bn* should precede the clause, *in* follow the predicate.<sup>11</sup> In bipartite nominal sentences using the copula, *bn* precedes the non-copula element and *in* follows it, before the copula. Bipartite sentences involving some pronoun other than the copula are negated by prefixing *bn* to the (initial) pronoun and inserting *in* after the second element, whether a noun or a second pronoun. In tripartite nominal sentences of type 2, C *pw* D, the negative *bn* precedes the initial element and *in* is inserted after that element, before the copula, i.e., just as one would negate C *pw* alone.

E 5: Krall 23/11 *bn iw 3hy in p3y p3 rmt*  
 "The man is not a reed."

E 6: Siut 23/11 *bn iw mtws in t3y t3y*<sup>12</sup>  
 "This is not hers."

But in tripartite nominal sentences of type 1, A B *pw*, the negative *bn* is inserted between A and B and the *in* between B and *pw*, as one would negate B *pw*.

- E 7: Krugtexte A/11 *p3 hl m.f bn iw p3y.y šr in p3y*  
 "The above-named youth is not my son."
- E 8: II Khaemwast 3/10 *t3 md.t . . . bn iw n md.t iw šw wn.s r*  
*šm.t in t3y*  
 "The thing . . . is not a thing which should  
 be revealed to a lady."
- E 9: Siut 3/22 *t3y bn iw md.t r-wm-mtws m3<sup>c</sup> n-im.s in t3y*  
 "This is not a thing in which she has justification."

Since *in* is, in other types of sentences, normally placed after the predicate, as noted above, it seems likely that the element preceding *pw*, and *in*, should be considered the predicate, in which case the copula is serving as subject. The noun in apposition to the copula, or the noun in anticipatory emphasis, would then serve as subject in the translation. Thus, although it is the type of element which decrees word order in bipartite nominal sentences involving at least one pronoun, tripartite nominal sentences also indicate the function of the nominal elements. In addition, the word order predicate followed by copula/subject as the core of nominal sentences corresponds to the word order found in verbal sentences, in which the verb precedes the subject.<sup>13</sup>

This leaves one major category of nominal sentences unexplained: those consisting of two nonpronominal nominals without a copula pronoun. This first nominal can be an undetermined noun or a noun preceded by the definite, demonstrative, or possessive article or followed by a suffix pronoun or *nb* "all, every."<sup>14</sup> The second nominal has the identical range with the exception that there are no examples in the corpus of noun plus *nb* as the second element and there are examples of the noun *w<sup>c</sup>* "one" and the possessive prefix plus noun as the second nominal. Word order here is not determined by the type of elements, since neither is a pronoun and there is no copula pointing out which element is the predicate. In many cases the second nominal is the noun *m* "name" with a suffix pronoun or possessive article.<sup>15</sup> There are some examples of *m* in tripartite nominal sentences where *m*, preceded

by the possessive article, occupies the D position in a C *pw* D construction. Since D is here the subject, assuming that the above argumentation is correct, *m* may be the subject in the examples without the copula. If so, the word order of such sentences is predicate-subject.<sup>16</sup>

Other bipartite nominal sentences without a pronoun, however, are better analyzed as A B *pw* nominal sentences from which the copula has been omitted. In some cases there are exact parallels between such bipartite and tripartite nominal sentences.<sup>17</sup>

E 10: Siut 2/16 *p3 sp n3y.y m3<sup>C</sup>.w*  
 "The rest are my justification."

E 11: Siut 5/12-13 *p3 sp n3y.y m3<sup>C</sup> n3y*  
 "The rest are my justification."

In other cases, although the exact wording of a bipartite nominal sentence without pronouns is not repeated in an A B *pw* tripartite nominal sentence, the bipartite examples occur in contexts where it seems likely that they are abbreviated forms of A B *pw* constructions. For example, in Petubastis the opening preserved page of the Spiegelberg text identifies parts of a bark with various divinities or properties of theirs. Five such sentences are A B *pw* tripartite nominal sentences but one has no final copula. It seems safe to assume that this is simply a scribal error.<sup>18</sup> In other cases the simple juxtaposition of the two nominals may be (archaic) legal terminology, often involving the repetition of the same noun in the two nominals.<sup>19</sup>

E 12: Siut 4/7, 5/11-12, 9/24, 10/2 *n3y.y m3w.t n3y.y m3w.t Cn*  
 "My words are my words again."

E 13: Siut 6/11 *hrw.f hrw.y*  
 "His voice is my voice."

Only three texts, 'Onchsheshonqy, Insinger, and Magical, make what appears to be free use of the direct juxtaposition of two nonpronominal nominal elements without the copula.<sup>20</sup> All three of these texts also use both A B *pw* and C *pw* D tripartite nominal sentences.<sup>21</sup> A B *pw* is throughout Demotic much more common than C *pw* D and C *pw* D was somewhat

late in developing in Demotic.<sup>22</sup> These facts, combined with the examples mentioned above where there are actual parallels between examples with and without the copula, suggest, although do not prove, that bipartite nominal sentences without pronouns are defective, and to some scribes optional, variants of A B *pw* tripartite nominal sentences. If so, the first nominal can be translated as the subject, the second as the predicate.<sup>23</sup>

There is one anomalous class of nominal sentences, those found in what Lüddeckens calls clause 6 of marriage contracts, in which three nonpronominal nominals are apparently identified. Usually the three nominals are just strung out in direct juxtaposition, but there is a parallel in which the copula is inserted between the second and third elements.<sup>24</sup>

E 14: Lüddeckens 6/18 *pzy.y šr c3 pzy.t šr c3 p3 nb nty nb*  
 "My eldest son is your eldest son and  
 the possessor of everything."

E 15: Lüddeckens 6/10 *pzy.y šr c3 pzy.t šr c3 pzy p3 nb n nty nb*  
 "My eldest son is your eldest son and the  
 possessor of everything."

There are also examples in which the first two elements form a standard A B *pw* nominal sentence.

E 16: Lüddeckens 6/26 [*pzy.y šr c3 pzy.t*] *šr c3 pzy*  
 "[My eldest son] is [your] eldest son."

If we analyze these anomalous examples as A B *pw* nominal sentences to which a third nominal has been added at the end in apposition,<sup>25</sup> they would be parallel to examples of nominal sentences indicating possession in which a noun has been added at the end of the sentence, in apposition to the dependent pronoun.

E 17: Hermopolis Legal Code 6/4 *ink st p3 wrḥ*  
 "The open land is mine."

E 18: Siut 8/26 *mtwk st nzy.k nkt nty ḥry*  
 "Your property above is yours."

One special type of nominal sentence which has not been touched upon here is the so-called cleft sentence, which seems to be a transformation of a verbal sentence.<sup>26</sup> In Demotic such sentences consist of a noun, with or without modifiers, a nominalized participle or relative, or a pronoun (independent, interrogative, or demonstrative) plus the definite article, usually agreeing in number and gender with the preceding noun or pronoun, plus a participle or relative.<sup>27</sup> Some texts sometimes omit the definite article when the first element is a pronoun.<sup>28</sup> There are examples in which a noun is set in anticipatory emphasis before the first element of a cleft sentence.<sup>29</sup> Such sentences are negated by prefixing *bn* to the sentence and infixing *in* after the noun or pronoun, before the definite article. Such sentences look like C *pw* D tripartite nominal sentences in which the definite article is serving both as the nominalizer for the participle or relative and as the copula. However, there are a smaller number of cleft sentences in which the *in* element of the negation is placed after the participle or relative, rather than in front of the article,

E 20: Insinger 25/11 *bn iw p3 rmt rh nty snt p3 nty hrh in*  
 "The wise man who fears is not the one who protects."

E 21: Petubastis 11/18 *bn iw ink p3 nty sš n-im.w in*  
 "I am not the one who insults them."

or before an adverbial modifying the initial nominal.

E 22: Insinger 23/17 *bn iw n lh in hn 3h p3 nty iw 3h t3y rd. t.f*  
 "A fool in misery is not the one whom misery sets on his feet."

Since in present tense sentences with "adverbial predicates" the negative particle *in* occasionally moves forward within, or even in front of, a long adverbial, and since there is evidence, E 22, of the negative particle *in* moving toward the front of the sentence occasionally in cleft sentences, it is possible that the examples in which *in* precedes the article and participle or relative are the result of this forward shift of the negative particle.<sup>30</sup> Therefore the examples with

negative *in* before the definite article cannot be used to argue that the initial nominal was considered the predicate.

Very similar rules of word order seem to apply to Coptic nominal sentences as to Demotic ones. In bipartite nominal sentences the independent pronoun always precedes the second element, the copula always follows the other element, and interrogative pronouns are found after an independent pronoun but before a copula.<sup>31</sup> In tripartite nominal sentences both the A B *pw* and C *pw* D constructions are found.<sup>32</sup> The rhetorical question particle *mē*, the imperfect converter *ne*, and the initial negative particle *n* all intervene between A and B of an A B *pw* nominal sentence.<sup>33</sup> The negative particle *an* precedes the copula, both in bipartite and tripartite nominal sentences.<sup>34</sup> However, unlike Demotic, Coptic has many examples in which C of C *pw* D is a demonstrative pronoun.<sup>35</sup>

Although the formation of nominal sentences in Late Egyptian seems much more restricted than in Demotic, the tripartite constructions using the copula not existing,<sup>36</sup> the system in Middle Egyptian looks rather like the Demotic system. Indeed, taking as a corpus the examples cited by Gardiner,<sup>37</sup> one can see that, in Middle Egyptian, as in Demotic, in bipartite nominal sentences using pronouns the order of the elements is fixed by a rule of word order without reference to the functioning of the elements. But the specific word order is different. In Middle Egyptian, if one of the two elements is an interrogative pronoun, it stands first. If the second nominal is a personal pronoun, the dependent pronoun is used. In all other cases, if one of the two nominals is a personal pronoun, the independent pronoun is used and stands first. If one of the two nominals is a demonstrative pronoun, it will always follow the other nominal unless the other nominal is the copula pronoun, which always comes second. Thus, in Middle Egyptian it is the interrogative pronoun which takes precedence of place over any other pronoun or any noun. There is also a basic difference between Middle Egyptian and Demotic tripartite nominal sentences. In



Middle Egyptian almost all such sentences using *pw* are of the form C *pw* D, almost never A B *pw*.<sup>38</sup> The negation of nominal sentences in Middle Egyptian involves either *n* or *n . . . is*.<sup>39</sup> When *is* was used, its placement was identical with that of *in* in Demotic and presumably pointed to the predicate as did *in*. Therefore the present author would see Middle Egyptian tripartite nominal sentences as identical with the Demotic C *pw* D, with C the predicate and D the subject, in apposition to the copula.

It has long been noted that there are strict rules of word order for the elements of verbal sentences, presumably because there are no case endings on nouns to indicate function and therefore word order serves this purpose. The only deviations involve pronouns, which can distinguish subject and object of a verb. Therefore it is not surprising that we find the same strict adherence to word order for nominal sentences, the nouns of which do not incorporate endings or modifications indicating their function, and the same modification of this word order when pronouns are involved. Thus, although it is possible that a given C *pw* D nominal sentence in Middle Egyptian might "sound" better when C is translated as the subject,<sup>40</sup> it seems best to assume that syntactically, to the Egyptian, C was always the predicate.

Thus it can be concluded that, based on the analysis of the ordering of the elements of nominal sentences rather than the translation thereof, Demotic nominal sentences, and perhaps all Egyptian nominal sentences, involve a strict word order in which the subject follows the predicate. However, this underlying word order is modified in the surface form of the sentence by an overriding rule which decrees that pronouns, except for the copula pronoun, must precede nouns and which establishes the relative order of different pronouns.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> It is a privilege for me to be able to offer this article in honor of H. J. Polotsky, whose studies have been so fundamental to our knowledge of Egyptian grammar. His "Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Koptischen," *Or* 31 (1962) 413-30, is a study to which all later discussions of these constructions, including the present one, owe a basic debt.
- <sup>2</sup> In addition to discussions of nominal sentences in various grammars, many individual studies on nominal sentences, or specific types of nominal sentences, exist. Aside from Polotsky's article mentioned in n. 1, among the most important are K. Sethe, *Der Nominalsatz im Ägyptischen und Koptischen* (Leipzig 1916); M. Chaîne, *La proposition nominale dans les dialectes coptes* (Paris 1955); S. I. Groll, *Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns in Late Egyptian* (London 1967); J. B. Calender, "Coptic Nominal Sentences and Related Constructions" (unpubl. Ph. D. dissertation; University of Chicago 1970); and M. Gilula, "An Unusual Nominal Pattern in Middle Egyptian," *JEA* 62 (1976) 160-75. See also the summary in H. J. Polotsky, "Coptic," in *Linguistics in South West Asia and North Africa* (Current Trends in Linguistics 6; The Hague 1970) 563-65. A. H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*<sup>3</sup> (London 1957) further distinguished between the grammatical and logical subject and predicate. For a discussion of the problems of terminology, see Polotsky, "Nominalsatz," § 2. For the distinction between nominal sentences and sentences with "adverbial predicates," and arguments on the analysis of the latter as a subset of sentences with verbal predicates, see J. H. Johnson, "Remarks on Egyptian Verbal Sentences," *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 5 (1978) 3-5.
- <sup>3</sup> The corpus chosen tries to maintain a balance between literary and nonliterary texts and to include a fair sampling of texts from each of the three major chronological subdivisions of Demotic (early, Ptolemaic, and Roman). The early Demotic texts considered include P. Rylands IX [F. Ll. Griffith, *Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester* (Manchester 1909)], P. Lonsdorfer [H. Junker, "Papyrus Lonsdorfer I," *SKAW* 197 (1921) 3-56], the Plea to Thoth in the Michaelides collection [G. R. Hughes, "A Demotic Plea to Thoth in the Library of G. Michaelides," *JEA* 54 (1968) 176-86], and various Persian period contracts (the last collected by Eugene Cruz-Urbe). Ptolemaic texts considered include Setne Khaemwast I [F. Ll. Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis: The Sethon of Herodotus and the Demotic Tales of Khamuas* (Oxford 1900)], 'Onchsheshonqy [S. R. K. Glanville, *The Instructions of 'Onchsheshonqy* (*British Museum Papyrus 10508*) (Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the British Museum 2; London 1955)] and the Louvre variant of 'Onchsheshonqy [A. Volten, "Die moralischen Lehren des

demotischen Pap. Louvre 2414," in *Studi in Memoria de I. Rosellini* 2 (1955) 269-80], the Hermopolis Legal Code [G. Mattha, *The Demotic Legal Code of Hermopolis West*, ed. G. R. Hughes (Bibliothèque d'Etude 45; Cairo 1975)], the *Family Archive from Thebes* [M. el-Amir (Cairo 1959)], the *Family Archive from Siut* [Sir H. Thompson, *A Family Archive from Siut from Papyri in the British Museum* (Oxford 1934)], the Theban archive in the British Museum [S. R. K. Glanville, *A Theban Archive of the Reign of Ptolemy I Soter* (Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the British Museum 1; Oxford 1939)], the "Cautionnements" [F. de Cenival, *Cautionnements démotiques du début de l'époque ptolémaïque* (Paris 1973)], and "Associations religieuses" [F. de Cenival, *Les Associations religieuses en Egypte* (Bibliothèque d'Etude 46; Cairo 1972)], the decrees of Raphia [H. Gauthier and H. Sottas, *Un décret trilingue en l'honneur de Ptolémée IV* (Cairo 1925)] and Rosetta [W. Spiegelberg, *Der demotische Texte der Priester-Dekrete von Kanopus und Memphis (Rosettana)* (Heidelberg 1922)], the *Embalmer's Archive from Hawara* [E. A. E. Reymond (Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the Ashmolean Museum 1; Oxford 1973)], and the Hawara texts being published by G. R. Hughes (these last ranging from the early period into the Ptolemaic period). The Roman period texts considered include Krugtexte [W. Spiegelberg, *Demotische Texte auf Krügen* (Demotische Studien 5; Leipzig 1912)], the various late Roman magical texts [see J. H. Johnson, "Louvre E3229: A Demotic Magical Text," *Enchoria* 7 (1977) 55-56], *Mythus vom Sonnenaug* [W. Spiegelberg, *Der ägyptische Mythus vom Sonnenaug (Der Papyrus der Tierfabeln-"Kufi") nach dem Leidener demotischen Papyrus I 384* (Strassburg 1917)], P. Insinger [F. Lexa, *Papyrus Insinger: Les enseignements moraux d'un scribe égyptien du premier siècle après J.-C.* (Paris 1926)] and the Carlsberg variants of P. Insinger [A. Volten, *Kopenhagener Texte zum demotischen Weisheitsbuch* (Analecta Aegyptiaca 1; Copenhagen 1940)], II Khaemwast [F. Ll. Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests*], and various versions of the Petubastis story [W. Spiegelberg, *Der Sagenkreis des Königs Petubastis nach dem Strassburger demotischen Papyrus sowie den Wiener und Pariser Bruchstücken* (DemStud 3; Leipzig 1910); E. Bresciani, *Der Kampf um den Panzer des Inaros (Papyrus Krall)* (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer 8; Vienna 1964); and A. Volten, *Ägypter und Amazonen* (MPON 6; Vienna 1962)]. The legal text collections above were supplemented by texts included by K.-T. Zauzich, *Die ägyptische Schreibertradition in Aufbau: Sprache und Schrift der demotischen Kaufverträge aus Ptolemaischer Zeit* (Äg. Abh. 19; Wiesbaden 1968), and E. Lüddeckens, *Ägyptische Eheverträge* (Wiesbaden 1960). Finally, W. Spiegelberg, *Demotische Grammatik* (Heidelberg 1925) and F. Lexa, *Grammaire démotique* (Prague 1949) were searched for examples of types not exemplified in the above corpus.

<sup>4</sup> I do not intend to discuss here what a copula is. According to

Groll (*Non-Verbal*, p. 11) "the copula is an abstract concept which describes the relation between two parts of a sentence." It need not be an additional morpheme but may be, e.g., "the inequality of the (two) members in the possibilities of their substitution." For Callender ("Coptic Nominal Sentences," § 89, p. 155) a copula is a "special device which obligatorily occurs in the predicate of sentences whose predicate would otherwise be something other than a verb." But this definition seems to get Callender into semantic difficulty. He refers to the lack of an overt subject in bipartite nominal sentences using the copula (1st § 62, p. 116), calls the "missing" nominal the subject (§ 87, p. 149), and states that the other nominal in such sentences is always the predicate (§ 63, p. 120). He then concludes that *pe* is obligatory in such sentences and is therefore the copula (§ 92, p. 162). But by his definition given above, the copula occurs in the predicate. If so, such bipartite nominal sentences have only predicates, no subjects. But if the "missing" subject is being resumed in the copula (as is implied in § 137, p. 244), then perhaps the copula should be seen as the subject of the sentence. I here use the term "copula pronoun" because the element *pꜣy/tꜣy/nꜣy* derives historically from a demonstrative pronoun and because it obeys the general rules of pronominalization found in Egyptian (in general, that a nominal is pronominalized in second and succeeding references).

- <sup>5</sup> Dependent pronouns are found only as the second element after an independent pronoun where the combination indicates possession. The only possible example of a demonstrative or a possessive pronoun in a bipartite nominal sentence within the corpus under consideration has the demonstrative preceding the noun.

E 1: Siut 5/6 *nꜣy md.t n <sup>c</sup>d*      Siut 5/8 *tꜣy md.t n <sup>c</sup>d*  
 "These are false."                      "This is false."

But elsewhere in the same text an otherwise identical sentence includes the copula.

E 2: Siut 4/25 *nꜣy md.t n <sup>c</sup>d nꜣy*      Siut 3/26 *tꜣy md.t n <sup>c</sup>d tꜣy*  
 "These are false."                      "This is false."

Therefore the examples in 5/6 and 5/8 are probably defective versions of the tripartite construction A B *pw*, where the demonstrative, element one, corresponds to A, but the copula *pw* has been omitted. See below for a discussion of this form.

- <sup>6</sup> Although the relative order of interrogatives, demonstratives, and possessives cannot be worked out because of a lack of examples, it seems safe to assume that a fixed order existed.
- <sup>7</sup> Both defined and undefined nouns are found in position A and both may have either a defined or undefined noun in position B.

- <sup>8</sup> The corpus contains only one example in which C and D do not agree in number and gender, in which C is feminine (*t3* N), D is masculine (*p3* N), and the m. singular copula *p3y* is used.
- E 3: Insinger 19/12 *t3 rhn.t n p3 rmt ntr hn st-d3 p3y p3 ntr*  
 "God is the support of the man of God in trouble."
- Callender ("Coptic Nominal Sentences," § 37, p. 66) argues that, in Coptic, the neuter copula *pe* was used in C *pw* D nominal sentences in which C and D differed in number or gender and the first member was definitely determined. (When the first member was indefinite, the copula agreed with D.) But he took C in such sentences as the subject, which is not the case in Demotic. See further discussion in n. 32, below.
- <sup>9</sup> Both defined and undefined nouns are found in position C and both may have either a defined or undefined noun in position D.
- <sup>10</sup> The same pattern appears in P. Rylands IX 5/15-16, as noted by Spiegelberg, *Grammatik*, § 171, 3.
- <sup>11</sup> J. H. Johnson, *The Demotic Verbal System* (SAOC 38; Chicago 1976) 81 and 122.
- <sup>12</sup> Note the use of the demonstrative pronoun as D in conjunction with the independent pronoun in position C. The *iw* here and in later examples is graphic and has no syntactic or semantic meaning. The same is true of the *n* in E 8.
- <sup>13</sup> On word order in sentences with verbal and "adverbial predicates," see Johnson, "Remarks," section 2.
- <sup>14</sup> The examples with noun plus *nb* come from legal documents in which it is being stated that *nty nb . . .* is the pledge (*t3 iwy.t*) for something. In addition to the examples written as bipartite nominal sentences are examples where the preposition *n < m* (of predication) is written (e.g., Hawara 25259/3) and examples where the copula *n3y* has been added after the second nominal element (i.e., A B *pw*) (e.g., Siut 24/6-7, 27/6).
- <sup>15</sup> Both names and nominal sentences involving the word *m* were written without the copula from the Old Kingdom on; see Edel, *Altägyptische Grammatik*, § 947; Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 125.
- <sup>16</sup> The reverse could, of course, also be argued: since examples with and without *pw* exist in the same text (Magical), the examples with *pw* may be marking a deviation from the more normal word order. If so, such sentences without *pw* would, like those A B sentences discussed below, have a word order of subject-predicate.

- 17 Also compare E 1 and 2 in n. 5, above.
- 18 Petubastis Spiegelberg 1/4-5, 1/5-6, 1/9, 1/11/12, and 1/22 in contrast to 1/2-3.
- 19 For identical sentences in Middle Egyptian, see Gilula, "Unusual Nominal Pattern," pp. 170-71.
- 20 Callender's claim ("Coptic Nominal Sentences," § 137, p. 244, based on Sethe, *Nominalsatz*, § 117) that, in Demotic and Late Egyptian, "identificational" nominal sentences consist of C *pw* D nominal sentences without medial *pw* derives from his mistaken assumption that C in such sentences is the subject (see below, n. 32) and does not fit the evidence in Demotic. Such "identificational" nominal sentences would consist, for him, of two definitely determined members directly juxtaposed. But within the corpus under consideration such sentences are very rare (accounting for only a small percentage of A B nominal sentences) and occur almost exclusively in the three texts noted. It is unlikely that "identity" was indicated only in these three texts, and it is best to treat this small group of examples within these three texts the same way as the rest of the A B nominal sentences in the texts are treated.
- 21 Although 'Onchsheshonqy has only one difficult example of C *pw* D and eight examples of A B *pw*. Insinger has two examples of each; Magical shows a decided preference for C *pw* D.
- 22 Although not as late as Spiegelberg (*Grammatik*, § 459) and Sethe (*Nominalsatz*, § 118) thought; see R. J. Williams, "Grammatical Notes on the Demotic of Papyrus Insinger," *JEA* 38 (1952) 63, and Lüddeckens, *Eheverträge*, p. 280. It is possible that at least part of the impetus behind the formation of the construction C *pw* D was the desire to mark an independent pronoun as predicate in nominal sentences. In bipartite nominal sentences using an independent pronoun, the independent pronoun may serve as subject or as predicate, but nothing in the sentence indicates which is which, as shown above. In A B *pw* nominal sentences, the independent pronoun, which must come first, i.e., as A, is always the subject. The development of the construction C *pw* D, in which an independent pronoun would appear as element C and be marked as the predicate because of the following copula, filled the gap. This construction was obviously not limited to examples involving independent pronouns, but it should be noted that in the corpus under consideration, C is a pronoun over half of the time, almost always an independent pronoun.
- 23 It is possible that such sentences should be seen as the direct outgrowth of what Groll (*Non-Verbal*, p. 22) calls the "A B" pattern

for Late Egyptian nominal sentences. But in Late Egyptian the two elements are unequally defined and usually the second element has no article at all. Examples in which the first element has no article and the second is defined do not exist (*ibid.*). But in the Demotic examples the two elements may be equally determined and it may be the second element that has the article, not the first. But note Groll's conclusion that "it is not its position, but whether it is defined or not, that determines which of the members is the subject and which the predicate" (*ibid.*, p. 28). Thus it is better to see all Demotic nominal sentences (except those such as independent pronoun plus noun which are identical in Late Egyptian and Demotic) as the direct outgrowth of the Late Egyptian construction A *pw* (see Groll's list of Late Egyptian patterns [*ibid.*, p. 4]).

- 24 The examples called "Lüddeckens" are all cited from table 5, clause 6, of his *Eheverträge*. In addition to the examples cited here are examples in which the first two nominals are switched and examples in which the third nominal has the plural, rather than the masculine singular, definite article. See Lüddeckens' discussion of these clauses (*ibid.*, pp. 276-86).
- 25 As if one combined A B *pw* with B *pw* C to produce A B (*pw*) C.
- 26 The cleft sentence which can be translated "X is the one who does Y" is clearly related to the verbal sentence which can be translated "X does Y."
- 27 Note also that nominalized participles and relatives occur within the present corpus in both A and B positions of A B *pw* nominal sentences and in position D of a C *pw* D nominal sentence. In such sentences there is both the definite article (or its equivalent) nominalizing the participle or relative form and the copula pronoun *pw*. A similar example was pointed out by Williams ("Demotic of P. Insinger," pp. 63-64), where a nominalized relative is A in an A B bipartite nominal sentence. However, the other examples he cites, both positive and negative, are cleft sentences.
- 28 The definite article serves two functions in such sentences: it nominalizes the relative clause and it serves as the copula pronoun. When it is omitted after an initial pronoun, the scribe was presumably interpreting it as the copula pronoun, which was unnecessary in nominal sentences consisting of pronoun plus noun.
- 29 E.g., II Khaemwast 4/21-22, 5/24, and 6/32-33 (all identical).

E 19: II Khaemwast 4/21-22 *nꜣy sꜣy sꜣ-wsir pꜣ nty ir n-im.w*  
 "These sayings, Saousir is the one who is doing them."

Similar examples in Coptic are used by Callender ("Coptic Nominal

Sentences," § 112, p. 119) to argue that extraposition and clefting have two different functions, the former narrative, the latter argumentative. He (*ibid.*, § 116, p. 205) compares the use of the copula in cleft sentences to its use after imperfect tense sentences rather than its use in nominal sentences.

- <sup>30</sup> For much more detailed studies of cleft sentences and their relation to nominal and verbal sentences, see Polotsky, "Nominalsatz," pp. 413-30, and Callender, "Coptic Nominal Sentences," pp. 166-205. On the forward shift of the negative particle *in* in sentences with "adverbial predicates," see Johnson, *Demotic Verbal System*, pp. 81-83.
- <sup>31</sup> See the examples in W. C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik (Säidischer Dialekt)* (Lehrbucher für das Studium der orientalischen und afrikanischen Sprachen I; Leipzig 1966) §§ 243-44.
- <sup>32</sup> Till, *Grammatik*, § 246. Polotsky ("Nominalsatz," pp. 426-27) derives most tripartite nominal sentences in Coptic from the bipartite pattern predicate plus copula. But Callender ("Coptic Nominal Sentences," pp. 125-43) argues that bipartite forms derive from tripartite ones. Both Polotsky (*ibid.*) and Callender (*ibid.*, pp. 53-98), however, consider C of C *pw* D the subject, and D the predicate, in "identificational" vs. "descriptive" C *pw* D nominal sentences. As defined by Callender (*ibid.*, p. 303), in C *pw* D sentences in which C is defined, C is the subject, not the predicate. But this claim, based ultimately on the translation of the sentence, can certainly not be held valid for Demotic. Even the translation of such sentences in Demotic seems "better" when C is taken as the predicate.
- E 23: Magical 15/28 *pzy.f* <sup>C</sup>*š n md.t rmt n kmj* <sup>C</sup>*n pzy pzy nty hry*  
 "This which is above is its spell in Egyptian, also."
- See also Krall 23/11, E 5, above.
- <sup>33</sup> Till, *Grammatik*, p. 117, and G. Steindorff, *Lehrbuch der koptischen Grammatik* (Chicago 1952) §§ 374, 1 and 418, 7.
- <sup>34</sup> Steindorff, *ibid.* Polotsky ("Nominalsatz," p. 429) unfortunately considered the placement of *an* "mechanical" and denied its value in pointing out the predicate.
- <sup>35</sup> Till, *Grammatik*, § 246, a.
- <sup>36</sup> See above, n. 23, for a discussion of the forms of Late Egyptian nominal sentences and the suggestion that Demotic tripartite nominal sentences using the copula derive from Late Egyptian bipartite nominal sentences using the copula.



- 37 *Grammar*, chapter 11.
- 38 For an example of A B *pw* in Middle Egyptian, in which *pw* comes within the B clause, proving that A was felt by the scribe to be in anticipatory emphasis, see Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 147, l. Edel (*Altäg. Gramm.*, § 972) cites three examples of the construction *ir* A B *pw*, where A is clearly in anticipatory emphasis, and one example of A B *pw*. These examples were called to my attention by K. Baer.
- 39 As noted by E. F. Wente; see the range of examples quoted by B. Gunn, *Studies in Egyptian Syntax* (Paris 1924) 170. See also M. Gilula, review of H. Satzinger, *Die negativen Konstruktionen in Alt- und Mittelägyptischen* (Berlin 1968) in *JEA* 56 (1970) 208.
- 40 And note that what one person wants to translate "C is D" another happily uses as an example of the translation "D is C" [J. B. Calender, *Middle Egyptian* (Afroasiatic Dialects 2; Malibu 1975) § 4.3.1, p. 67, vs. Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 131].