

Created 2011 Apr 18  
Last updated on 2011 Apr 28

## NOTICE

Items designated with a pound sign, #, followed by a number or "H." are references to sections in Hoch. Thus #31 and #H.31 refer to the same section in Hoch. Similarly, "A." and "G." followed by numbers refer to sections in Allen and Gardiner respectively.

There is much duplication in this document. Many sections in the original grammars are appropriate to more than one category. The intention is to make each category contain a complete summary.

## VERB FUNCTIONS

When the subject of an Egyptian verb is pronominal, it is almost always attached directly to the end of the verb and, despite the fact that for clarity's sake it is transliterated with an introductory dot, is considered an integral part of the word. Because Egyptian did not normally revert to the infinitive in place of a finite verb where a nominal usage was required, the conjugated Egyptian verb can have a nominal function. Example: "He said he would go". The whole clause "he would go" is the direct object of "he said" and is represented in Egyptian with a finite verb. Note also, in this case that inserting the word "that" in the English sentence does not change the situation at all. The word "that" is merely a place holder, it delays the onset of the direct object and by itself adds no meaning to the sentence.

As a direct object, the clause "he would go" is acting nominally. But there is no denying that it also has a verbal quality. The two do not act simultaneously although their meaning impinges upon the hearer pretty much simultaneously. In fact, the clause first acts as a direct object This nominal usage is its initial function. In Middle Egyptian, the entire clause is represented by one finite verb. So this finite verb actually functions initially as a nominal, as the direct object. It then takes on its own verbal function.

Infinitives can work the same way. "I told him to go". The infinitive "to go", again one word in Egyptian, is the direct object of "told" and it is therefore nominal. The action "go" then becomes apparent as a verbal.

It also has its normal verbal function. What I call the initial function of the verb is the function it has when it is first encountered in a sentence. If the verb has a nominal function then that is always the initial function. The same verb then functions as a verbal in its own clause.

## EGYPTIAN INDEX

### *ii*

#174 can be an auxiliary verb meaning "so how it turned out was...". e.g.: *ḥ̄.n.s grt.ti nn ḥnt ii.n ḥd̄.n.s p̄3y.s rmn* = "Then she became silent, there was no rowing. This is the way she ended up ruining her side (of the rowing). (*ḥdi* = "destroy, injure", *p̄3y.s* = "her", *rmn* = "gang (of rowers in this case)"). *ḥd̄.n.s* is an n/v word, as a nominal it is the subject of *ii.n*.

### *wn*

#103 *nn wn*, or just *nn* is the negation of existence ("there is / are no")

*nwnt* is quite rare.

*nn wn* is always the initial clause, *nn* by itself can occur in initial or subsequent clauses.

*nn wn ib n s rhn tw hr.f* = "There is not a man's heart which one can rely upon."

### *ḥḥ.n sdm.n.f*

#90 The narrative past tense construction. = "then he heard". Never preceded by *iw* or *m.k*. The element in the *sdm.n.f* position is adjunctival. There's nothing adverbial about it, unless you subscribe to the definition that adverbs include all words we can't think of any other way to classify and that we are limited to the classical "eight parts of speech". I don't.

P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
	<i>ḥḥ.n</i>						<i>sdm.n.i hrw qri</i>
	<i>sdm.n</i>	<i>.i</i>				<i>hrw qri</i>	
"Then I heard the sound of thunder"							

These are not purely adjectival sentences, however. In fact, they can look like so-called "circumstantial" forms except for the lack of *iw* and *m.k*. Here's an example:

P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
	<i>ḥḥ.n</i>				<i>rdḏt</i>		<i>wḥb.n.s m wḥb n(i) hrw 14</i>
	<i>wḥb.n</i>	<i>.s</i>					<i>m wḥb n(i) hrw 14</i>
"Then Redjedet purified (herself) with a purification of 14 days."							

In #153 Hoch says that *ḥḥ.n* is a 2nd tense form and that makes this an "explicatory" sentence. But I fail to see the nominal aspect of this unless he's arguing that in the first sentence there should be a line before the first one that appears there with *ḥḥ.n* in the S slot. But that won't work at all for the second sentence which already has a subject.

#91 *ḥḥ.n sdm(w).f* passive. *ḥḥ.n rdi(w) ḥḥ.n.f q3q3 2 ḥnḥ ist.sn* = "Then two ships were caused to stand (made ready) for him together with their crews. Westcar 8,4.

#92 *ḥḥ.n.f šm(w)* with verbs of motion. *ḥḥ.n* always takes a subject in this construction. The stative pronoun, of course, matches its referent in number and gender. *ḥḥ.n dpt tf ii.t(i)* = "Then that boat came".

#93 *ḥḥ.n.f hr sdm.*, the progressive past tense. Uses *hr* + infinitive. *ḥḥ.n.i hr i3š n mšḥ* = "Then I was calling out to the crew." This seems to deemphasize the change of status. I wonder if *iw i3š.n.i n mš3* is identical in meaning except for the fact that the continuity or sequentiality provided by *ḥḥ*, "then" is lost.

#94 *ḥḥ.n.f rdi(w)* - quasi-passives and states. Used with transitive verbs to produce a sort of passive sense. *ḥḥ.n(i) ini.kwi r iw pn in w3w* = "(Then) I was brought to this island by a wave". But how do you distinguish between this example and #92? The way you do it is to realize that *ini* does not fit the definition of "verb of motion" because it is transitive! (We have to come up with better terminology for this particular type of verb.) A clearer example is the next one: *ḥḥ.n.s gr.ti* = "(then) she became motionless".

#95 *ḥḥ.n sdm.n.f* with following parallel clauses. Here Hoch distinguishes carefully between "subordinate clauses" and the ones in the example which go unnamed. One of the reasons why I prefer terminology such as "initial" and "subsequent" clauses. Anyway, his example (in three lines):

- *ḥḥ.n.i šm.kwi* = "(then) went" - this line certainly looks like it could be #92. I don't know how you tell the difference. *šm.kwi* is a stative, not a *sdm.n.f* form.

- *rdi.n(i) wi hr ht k3* = "and I got myself up a tall tree". Statement of fact in a subsequent clause.
- *si3.n.i ntiw m-hnw.s* = "and I recognized those who were in it (the ship)." Statement of fact ... etc.

In fact, the last two lines could be argued, in Hoch's terms as being "adverbial" and in mine "adjunctival". See the grid following:

P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
	<i>ʕhʕ.n</i>	<i>.i</i>					
		<i>šm.kwi</i>					<i>rdi.n(i) wi hr ht k3   si3.n.i ntiw m-hnw.s</i>
	<i>rdi.n(i)</i>			<i>wi</i>			<i>hr ht k3   si3.n.i ntiw m-hnw.s</i>
	<i>si3.n</i>	<i>.i</i>				<i>ntwi</i>	<i>m-hnw.s</i>

There's nothing else to do with the last two lines except to put them in the 'A' slot.

### *iw* and *m.k*

- #9 *iw* always at the start of a sentence which is presented as a statement of fact. In verbal sentences it is followed by the main verb. Always the main clause.
  - #16 the absence of *iw* in a statement of fact sentence normally indicates a "subordinate" clause (I would call this a continuing statement).
  - #17 *m.k* works like *iw* in statements of purported fact.
  - #36 they do not precede the verb in the construction preposed noun + *sdm.f*.
  - #37 *iw.f sdm.f*, a variation on the "statement of fact".
  - #90 Not included in the *ʕhʕ.n sdm.n.f* construction.
  - #131 Do not introduce *sdm.in.f*, *sdm.hr.f*, or *sdm.k3.f* constructions, nor apparently any of the *wn.in.f*.. or *wnn.hr.f* or *wn.hr.f* constructions.
  - #147 *iw* never precedes the 2nd tense relative present or past. *m.k* does so but rarely.
  - #155 *iw* can precede the n *sdm.t.f*.
- Hypothesis: It seems that *iw* marks the verb form as being initially verbal as opposed to initially nominal, a function it does not share with *m.k*. But there must be another initial function for a verb form in addition to verbal and nominal unless *ʕhʕ.n* in the *ʕhʕ.n sdm.n.f* is already serving as a particle, marking the following verb as a verbal, as well as supplying a context of continuance from the preceding statement.
- #161 *sdm(w).n.f* is a past relative form. = "it is a hearing that he did". Never preceded by *iw* or *m.k*. This emphasizes the verb.

### *in*

#134 Appears in the participial statement:

- *in* + agent + perfect (past) participle = "it is x who heard"
- *in* + agent + imperfect (present) participle = "it is x who hears / is hearing"
- *in* + agent + 2nd prospective *sdm(w).f* = "it is x who will hear"

The interrogative pronoun *m* became fused with *in* producing *nm*, "who?".

#168 Precedes questions which ask for corroboration ("yes" or "no" responses). Less common than the construction *in iw*.

### *in iw*

#168 Usually questions which ask for corroboration ("yes" or "no" responses) use *in iw*. Perhaps any kind of sentence can follow, including those which normally cannot use *iw*.

Existential ("is there...") questions can be phrased as follows:

- *in iw wn* + noun
- *in iw* + noun

### *in nn* + prospective *sdm.f*

#168 Won't he hear?

### *iri*

#171 as an auxiliary verb. Used in any of its forms with infinitives of less commonly used verbs (whatever they are) and with the less common verb classes (presumably those identified in #170). = "to do". e.g. *iw ib.f iri.f dbdb* = "his heart pounds"

### *iri.f* + infinitive.

#171 Rare in ME, common in LE. All forms of *iri* can be employed. Hoch seems to restrict its usage to being coupled with infinitives of less commonly used verbs and the less common verb classes with more than three consonants. It almost sound like were talking about someone who was unfamiliar with the language! e.g.: *iw ib.f iri.f dbdb* = "His heart pounds". This is a type *iw.f sdm.f*? Possibly somewhat emphatic, Hoch denies that it involves repetition, although the example given could support that notion.

### *wn*

#103 existential sentences are negated by *nn wn*. Such constructs are always initial clauses. *nn* + noun can occur in initial and in subsequent clauses.

Otherwise *wn* probably does not appear or at least very seldom in the indicative present (my view).

#131 "then he heard" and related constructions.

In the following set the suffix pronoun, as usual, stands in for any type of subject.

- *wn.in.f* + prepositional phrase
- *wn.in.f* + adverb or adjunct
- *wn.in.f hr* + infinitive
- *wn.in.f* + stative.
- *wnn.hr.f* is more common than
- *wn.hr.f* which may be related to the prospective *sdm.f* or the past tense *sdm.n.f*. Quite a disparate pair of possibilities.

#168 can occur in the interrogative *in iw wn* + noun asking for a "yes / no" answer. In this case I might argue that although *wn* might not be better classified as a subjunctive than as a prospective (Hoch does not claim it is a prospective but I don't know what else it could be).

### *p3(w)*

#173 an auxiliary verb = "to have done in the past", followed by an infinitive.

### *pri*

#174 an auxiliary verb = "so how it turned out..." + *sdm.n.f*? e.g.: *pr.n fq3.n.f hry-hbt hry-tp* = "So it

turned out that he rewarded the chief lector-priest."

### *m*

#166 Negative commands use *m* + negational complement. *m* is the imperative of 'imi' (= "not do"). An adjective verb can appear as the negational complement. In the example on the top of page 186 I do not understand why it does not start as *m* ʕ(w).

### *rh*

#89 "learn, find out". The past tense meaning uses both the *sdm.n.f* form and the stative where it means "know". If the direct object is an infinitive that indicates "know how (to do something)".

### *rdi*

#76 *rdi* + prospective adjective verb, "caused that Her Majesty be great".

#77 *rdi* + *m* of status ("appointed as") or + *r* of futurity ("appointed to be") = "appoint, place in the capacity of".

### *hpr*

#172 as an auxiliary verb. Different kinds of constructions, both nominal and verbal, follow. = "it happened" or "will happen". The past 2nd tense *hpr.n* does not require a subject. The prospective *hpr* can have a noun-phrase lead off by another prospective, *hpr sdm.f* = "it may happen that he will hear"

### *šmt pw ir(w).n.f*

#163 "It is a going that he did." An emphatic, I think.

### *sdm.f* forms

All forms listed are *sdm.f* and related forms.

The negative forms are true for Middle Egyptian only.

#29 present tense *sdm.f*. Negative: #108.1, *n sdm.n.f* ("old indicative")

#30 past tense *sdm.n.f*. Negative: #107.1, *n sdm.f* ("old indicative")

#34 present passive *sdm.tw.f*. Negative: #108.2, *n sdm.n.tw.f* ("old indicative")

#35 past passive *sdm(w).f*. Negative: #107.2 *n sdm.tw.f*, ("old indicative") there are some older *n sdm(w).f* forms.

#71 prospective *sdm.f*. Negative: #109 *nn sdm.f*

#71 prospective passive *sdm.tw.f*. Negative: #109 *nn sdm.tw.f*

#138 2nd tense prospective *sdm(w).f*.

#147 2nd tense relative present *sdm.f*. Passive: *sdm.tw.f*

#147 2nd tense relative past *sdm.n.f*. Passive: *sdm.n.tw.f*

### *sdm.f pw*

#143 "It is that he hears", an emphatic. This construction can employ a 2nd tense form with the meaning "this is how he hears..."

### *sdm.in.f*

#131 "Then he heard" begins initial clauses.

### *sdm.hr.f*

#131 "Then he heard" begins what are probably subsequent clauses.

#180 Negated by *tm.hr.f* + negational complement + noun subject if one exists.

### *sdm.k3.f*

#131 "Then he heard" begins what are probably subsequent clauses.

### *sdm.t.f*

Two uses

- #155 actually *n sdm.t.f* "before he heard / had heard. *iw* can precede.
- #156 as object of a preposition
  - *r* = "until"
  - *dr* = "since, until, from the time that, before"
  - and maybe these but the forms following them may be infinitives.
    - *m-ht* = "after"
    - *m* = "when"
    - *mi* = "like"
    - *hft* = "when"

#180 The negative is provided by *tm* (*tmt* actually) + the negational complement + a noun subject if one exists.

### *smt pw iry*

#136 *iry* is the perfect passive participle. = "it is a going that was made", very rare.

### *smt pw sdm(w).n.f*

#136 *sdm(w).n.f* is a past relative form. = "it is a hearing that he did". Never preceded by *iw* or *m.k*.

### *tm*

#164 *tm* as a prospective + negational complement, e.g. *tm sdm(w)* = "You should not hear".

#175 negate purpose clauses (= "in order that he might not do..."). The sequence is *tm* in the prospective + negational complement + noun subject (if there is one).

#175 also appears as an ordinary verb = "be complete, finished (form?). Frequently in the stative = "complete". (Also a noun = "everything, the universe").

#175 also = "perish, fail, cease". *n tm.f* = "he did not fail (to do)."

#176 *tm* negates prospectives which are the direct objects of verbs and prepositions. It appears that when negating a prospective *tm* appears as the prospective followed by a negational complement. *is wd.n gb, it wsir, tm.i wnm(w) hs* = "Geb, Osiris' father, commanded that I not eat excrement".

#177 *tm* negates both the 2nd tense *sMd(w).f* and the regular prospective *sdm.f*. It is the "if" clause that is negated. *ir tm.sn rdw nn msy(t).s(t)* = "if they do not grow then she will not give birth". If *ir* does not appear, *tm* appears as a prospective.

#178 *tm* as an infinitive + negational complement negates the infinitive.

#179 negative participles and relative verb forms. *tm* as a participle, including the *sdm.ty.fy* + the negational complement.

#180 the general rule is that *tm* assumes the form of the verb it is negating, the verb itself is transformed into the negative complement and is then followed by the noun subject, if there is one.

This includes the *sdm.t.f* and *sdm.hr.f*.

#184 Negation of 2nd tense forms

- *tm.f sdm(w)* + adjunct, *tm* is a 2nd tense form followed by the negational complement. In this case something was not done and the speaker says why.

## *dr*

#174 auxiliary verb = "so how it turned out was...". This verb can also occur in the *dr.in.f* form. *ist r.f ir p3 mw iw.f m mh 12 hr i3t.f, dr.in.f mh 24 r-s3 wdb.f* = "Now as for that water that had been 12 cubits deep straight across (lit: upon it's back) it then ended up 24 cubits deep after being folded over (magically to double its depth)."

## ENGLISH INDEX

### adjective verbs

#76 I almost think that English is simply defective in these but in fact there are some differences applied in Egyptian to adjective verbs.

For example: adjective verbs are not used in the circumstantial *sdm.f* and related forms in statements of fact, instead the initial zero-grade adjective construction is used instead.

But it can be used in several prospective cases where it is nominal (curious), "may you be happy", after *rdi* "caused that Her Majesty be great", and in purpose clauses "in order that it be splendid".

#82 When used in the stative they indicate the state or condition of something, "was hungry", etc. But they are intransitive and so I can't see the difference between these and so-called "regular" verbs. They were not used in the factual *sdm.f*, initial adjectives were used instead, but....

#106 *n sdm.f* (past active) negates initial adjectives, it is the "old indicative" *sdm.f*.

#145 Imperative usage: *hd hr.k* = "be cheerful (lit: bright of face)".

### auxiliary verbs

#### *ii*

#174 can be an auxiliary verb meaning "so how it turned out was...". e.g.: *h<sup>c</sup>.n.s grt.ti nn hnt ii.n hd.n.s p3y.s rmn* = "Then she became silent, there was no rowing. This is the way she ended up ruining her side (of the rowing). (*hdi* = "destroy, injure", *p3y.s* = "her", *rmn* = "gang (of rowers in this case)"). *hd.n.s* is an n/v word, as a nominal it is the subject of *ii.n*.

#### *iri*

#171 as an auxiliary verb. Used in any of its forms with infinitives of less commonly used verbs (whatever they are) and with the less common verb classes (presumably those identified in #170). = "to do". e.g. *iw ib.f iri.f dbdb* = "his heart pounds"

#### *p3(w)*

#173 an auxiliary verb = "to have done in the past", followed by an infinitive.

#### *pri*

#174 an auxiliary verb = "so how it turned out..." + *sdm.n.f*? e.g.: *pr.n fq3.n.f hry-hbt hry-tp* = "So it turned out that he rewarded the chief lector-priest."

#### *hpr*

#172 as an auxiliary verb. Different kinds of constructions, both nominal and verbal, follow. = "it happened" or "will happen". The past 2nd tense *hpr.n* does not require a subject. The prospective *hpr* can have a noun-phrase lead off by another prospective, *hpr sdm.f* = "it may happen that he will hear"

## *dr*

#174 auxiliary verb = "so how it turned out was...". This verb can also occur in the *dr.in.f* form. *ist r.f ir p3 mw iw.f m mh 12 hr i3t.f, dr.in.f mh 24 r-s3 wdb.f* = "Now as for that water that had been 12 cubits deep straight across (lit: upon it's back) it then ended up 24 cubits deep after being folded over

(magically to double its depth)."

### circumstantial *sdm.f* form

#29 the usual form employed in statements of purported fact. They do indeed appear in clauses of circumstance. Hoch calls these forms adverbial, he means 'used adverbially', as seen by his comment in #35. They cannot stand on their own, they always depend upon something even if it's only *iw*. A note on an example in #35: *iw m3(w).f in hr nb* = "He was seen by everyone (lit: every face)". I can see nothing at all adverbial about *m3(w).f*. The thought of the main verb acting as an adverb to ... what? ... itself? is something I can't understand.

#32 used in "subordinate" clauses without introductory particles.

#30 past tense is *sdm.n.f*. There are three *sdm.n.f* forms, this is one of them. #31 Pm/i verbs never appear in this form. They use the stative instead.

#34 passive present - *sdm.tw.f*. The agent can also be expressed by *in*. The *tw* component usually appears after the determinative.

#35 past tense passive - *sdm(w).f*. Weak verbs can show *-y* instead of *-w*. rdi shows *rd(w)* and *d(w)*.

#38 see relative meanings.

#76 adjective verbs are not used in the circumstantial *sdm.f* and related forms in statements of fact, instead the initial zero-grade adjective construction is used instead.

#106 special notice: Hoch argues that the negative *n sdm.n.f* and *n sdm.f* are not circumstantial forms, possibly because they can occur in initial as well as subsequent clauses. He goes on to say, in a footnote (#11) to #29 that they are the "old indicative". Unfortunately neither his index nor his table of contents mentions the term "old indicative". It is covered in #106 and #107.

### conditional sentences

#137

- *ir* + *sdm.f* form, "if he hears...". *grt*, "now, however" and *swt*, "but, however"
- "then..." could be a prospective (for a wish or exhortation), imperative, future (*iw.f r sdm* or *sdm.hr.f* - the last mostly in medical texts).

#138 because *ir* is a preposition, the following phrase must be nominal. Any verbs in such phrases are almost always prospective *sdm.f*, but an occasional second tense also happens. The second tense *sdm(w).f* form is somewhat more common. I don't understand the table on the top of page 157. The heading tells us that it is describing 2nd tense prospective *sdm(w).f* forms, but none of the transliterations shown have the *(w)* except for *in(w)* and *rd(w)*. Also, neither of the examples following have a *(w)*. This form may not exist! See #147 under **prospectives**. I really don't understand this at all.

#139 conditional clauses without *ir* have prospective *sdm.f* forms in the "if" clause.

#177 negation: when the 2nd tense *sdm(w).f* and the regular prospective *sdm.f* form appear here they are negated by *tm* + (presumably) the negational complement. When the particle *ir* is not present it can be negated by *tm* alone in the prospective.

### forms

present tense

- "circumstantial"
  - active
    - #29 present active *sdm.f*.

- #30 past tense *sḍm.n.f*
  - passive
    - #34 present *sḍm.tw.f*
    - #35 past *sḍm(w).f*
- prospective
  - active
    - #71 *sḍm.f*
    - #109 *nn sḍm.f* negativizes.
    - #138 2nd tense *sḍm(w).f* prospective
- "old indicative"
  - active
    - #108.1 *n sḍm.n.f* negativizes present active "circumstantial"
    - #107.1 *n sḍm.f* negativizes past active "circumstantial"
  - passive
    - #108.2, *n sḍm.n.tw.f* ("old indicative") negativizes present "circumstantial" active
    - #107.2 *n sḍm.tw.f*, ("old indicative") there are some older *n sḍm(w).f* forms.passive
- 2nd tense
  - active
    - #147 2nd tense relative present active *sḍm.f*
    - #147 2nd tense relative past active *sḍm.n.f*
    - #138 2nd tense prospective *sḍm(w).*
  - passive
    - #147 2nd tense relative present passive *sḍm.tw.f*
    - #147 2nd tense relative past passive *sḍm.n.tw.f*
- relative
  - perfect (I call it the past)
  - imperfect (I call it the present)
  - prospective
  - past with the past tense marker *n* called the *sḍm(w).n.f* relative form.
- stative

### future tenses

- #62 three or four constructions:
  - *iw.f r sḍm. m.k wi r nḥm. sḍm* and *nḥm* are infinitives. (In #A.15.3 Allen sees compulsion in this example ("I have to take away..."), Hoch doesn't and neither do I. I note also that the other two examples that Allen gives do not show compulsion in his translations.) See #107 for the negative.
  - noun + *r sḍm*, e.g.: *ib n ḥm.k r qbb* = "Your Majesty's mind will be refreshed". Possible emphatic because there's nothing to prevent the construction *iw ib n ḥm.k r qbb*. Both are statements of fact.
  - *tw r sḍm*, e.g.: *tw r šsp ḥ<sup>c</sup>w nw ḥ<sup>3</sup>* = "One will take up weapons of war."
  - *iw tw r sḍm*, because Hoch also shows *iw tw r šnt st r pr-ḥd* = "One will investigate it at the treasury." He does not indicate any difference between the last two constructions.
- #71 Prospective *sḍm.f*. The passive is *sḍm.tw.f*. Nominal in nature therefore never introduced by *iw*.
  - #25 One of the 5 verb forms Hoch lists in the suffix conjugation.

- #71 as a *sdm.f* form: prospective *sdm.f*. Negative: #109 *nn sdm.f*
- #71 as a *sdm.f* form: prospective passive *sdm.tw.f*. Negative: #109 *nn sdm.tw.f*
- #72 Used to express wishes, exhortations, compulsion.
- #73 Used to express obligation, necessity, requests.
- #74 Used to express purpose and result.
- #75 As the object of verbs of speech, perception, causation and as the subject of verbs. As the object of prepositions. As the subject of verbs: *m.k wd(w) sw<sup>c</sup>b.k p3 r-pr n(y) 3bdw* = "See it has been commanded that you purify the temple of Abydos." But I might argue that it means: "See the commandment: (that) you cause that the temple of Abydos be purified", i.e. *wd* is a noun and it is in apposition to the rest of the sentence which is simply one huge noun clause. But it would be wrong because if *sw<sup>c</sup>b* is an imperative its subject must be a dependent pronoun, not the suffix that is shown. One of Hoch's examples on page 92 is *sh<sup>m</sup>.k m mw r htp ib.k* which he translates as "May you have access to water so that your heart might be satisfied." The translation is fine but I would think that *htp* is an infinitive with *ib.k* as its direct object. Hoch says that the prospective passive is formed with *.tw* and there ain't one in sight.
- #110
  - *n sp* + prospective *sdm.f* or (I think) *n sp* + prospective *sdm.tw.f* = "he never heard" and "it was never heard", also "he will never hear" and (I think) "he will never be heard". Hoch says that *sp* is from the verb *spi* = "remain over", presumably this is an "old indicative" form. But then what? What is the relationship of the prospective *sdm.f* to *spi*? Is it a direct object? Probably not. Is it then the topic? i.e. "the hearing of him would not be remained over ...", indicating the future in English by "would the hearing", out of sequence because English grammar is so different..
  - *n sp* + prospective passive *sdm.tw.f* = "it was never heard" =? "what would be heard of him did not remain over". This comes like a relative, could it be one? I guess I'm failing to see why a prospective was used here unless it's supposed to incorporate all of time from the moment of the negated action until at least the present and possibly imply the future as well, but all of those moments would be in the future of the negated action.
- #131 *wn* in *wn.hr.f* may be related to the prospective *sdm.f* or the past tense *sdm.n.f*. Quite a disparate pair of possibilities.
- conditionals
  - #137 "then" clause of a conditional
  - "then..." could be a prospective (for a wish or exhortation), imperative, future (*iw.f r sdm* or *sdm.hr.f* - the last mostly in medical texts).
  - #138 because *ir* is a preposition, the following phrase must be nominal. Any verbs in such phrases are almost always prospective *sdm.f*
  - #139 conditional clauses without *ir* have prospective *sdm.f* forms in the "if" clause.
- #160 Prospective Relative Verb Form means "that/which/what one might/could/should do". *h<sup>c</sup>.n dwn.n.i rdwy.i r rh dit.i m r.i* = "Then I stretched my legs to find out what I might put in my mouth."
- #176 *tm* negates prospectives which are the direct objects of verbs and prepositions. It appears that when negating a prospective *tm* appears as the prospective followed by a negational complement. *is wd.n gb, it wsir, tm.i wnm(w) hs* = "Geb, Osiris' father, commanded that I not eat excrement".
- #188 2nd tense prospective *sdm.(w).f* forms and their uses. In the first paragraph in this section Hoch says that the regular prospective and the 2nd tense prospective were likely

merging during the time of the Middle Kingdom.

- The difference between the two is that the "regular" prospective discusses a future that "would, should, might" happen while the 2nd tense puts emphasis on an actual future, one of surety, I think, and the *iw.f r sdm* also indicates such a future but without emphasizing it. *iw.f r smr m-m srw rdi(w).tw.f m-q3b šnyt* = (I think) "He will be a companion among the officials and it is in the midst of the courtiers that he will be placed".

P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
	<i>iw</i>	<i>f</i>					<i>r smr   m- m srw   rdi(w).tw.f m q3b</i>
					<i>rdi(w).tw.f</i>		<i>m q3b</i>
	<i>rdi(w).tw</i>	<i>f</i>					<i>m q3b</i>

- This is the only way to make the 2nd tense *rdi* a nominal. Both Hoch and Allen argue that the regular prospective form would have to be *di*, not *rdi*. The second line above makes sense as an adjunctival sentence only if you agree that *rdi* is to be translated as above.
- Much easier to see is as the object of a preposition in the second example (page 221): *dd.k st r h3w snf* = "it is for the purpose of the blood flowing that you place it"
- #109 *nn sdm.f*, future passive. This is the negative of *iw.f r sdm*. Hoch denies that this was used for negative wish and purpose clauses.
- #137
  - *ir* + *sdm.f* form, "if he hears...". *grt*, "now, however" and *swt*, "but, however"
  - "then..." could be a prospective (for a wish or exhortation), imperative, future (*iw.f r sdm* or *sdm.hr.f* - the last mostly in medical texts).
- #160 Prospective Relative closely resembles the prospective participles. Express mood similar to that of the Greek subjunctive and optative but the time indicated for the action which the verb describes is always in the future.
- #164 Negation of wishes and exhortations use negative auxiliary verbs meaning "to not do". There are two. In each case, the negative verb is a prospective and is followed by the negational complement, which is nominal form. When the subject is a noun it comes after the negational complement possibly because the verb + complement formed a bound pair.
  - *tm*
  - *imi* (which must be distinguished from *imi*, the imperative of *rdi*. The meaning is something like "you should not do, may you not do".

### imperative

#145 No subject is usually expressed.

#146 Polite requests using *imi*, the imperative of *rdi*. e.g.: *imi di.tw n.i w3 n(y) q3q'w* = "Let one of the barges be given to me".

#166 Negative commands use the imperative of *imi*, which is: *m*.

### interrogatives

#168 corroborative sentences ask for a yes/no answer:

- *in iw*. Even in sentences which don't allow *iw* by itself.

- existential ("is there...") questions can be phrased as follows:
  - *in iw wn* + noun
  - *in iw* + noun
- *in*
- *in nn* + prospective *sdm.f*

### narrative construction

#136 *smt pw iry, iry* is the perfect passive participle. = "it is a going that was made", very rare. A narrative construction.

#163 *smt pw iry(w).n.f* "it is a going that he did". A narrative construction.

### negation

#101 as a general rule *n* negates verbal elements, *nn* negates nominals

#103 existential sentences are negated by *nn wn*. Such constructs are always initial clauses. *nn* + noun can occur in initial and in subsequent clauses.

#106 negation of initial zero-grade adjectives: *n hđ hr.f* = "do not be cheerful"

#107

- *n sdm.f* (past active) of statements of fact, also negates initial adjectives, this form is the "old indicative" *sdm.f*.
- *n sdm.tw.f* (negativized past passive), "old indicative".
- *n.sdm(w).f* (past passive), is older than the *n sdm.tw.f* and much rarer, another "old indicative"

#108

- *n.sdm.n.f* (present active), possibly an "old indicative" but it is identical in form to all other *sdm.n.f* forms. In the footnote 11 to #29 on page 37 he referenced #106 thereby implying that these definitely are *sdm.n.f* forms.
- *n sdm.n.tw.f* (present passive), again "old indicative" I presume.

#109 prospective tense, Hoch denies that this was used for negative wish and purpose clauses.

- *nn sdm.f* (future active), *nn* + prospective *sdm.f*. The *nn* is another indicator that this form is initially nominal.
- *nn sdm.tw.f* (future passive)

#110

- *n sp* + prospective *sdm.f* or (I think) *n sp* + prospective *sdm.tw.f* = "he never heard" and "it was never heard", also "he will never hear" and (I think) "he will never be heard". Hoch says that *sp* is from the verb *spi* = "remain over", presumably this is an "old indicative" form. But then what? What is the relationship of the prospective *sdm.f* to *spi*? Is it a direct object? Probably not. Is it then the topic? i.e. "the hearing of him would not be remained over ...", indicating the future in English by "would the hearing", out of sequence because English grammar is so different..
- *n sp* + prospective passive *sdm.tw.f* = "it was never heard" =? "what would be heard of him did not remain over". This comes like a relative, could it be one? I guess I'm failing to see why a prospective was used here unless it's supposed to incorporate all of time from the moment of the negated action until at least the present and possibly imply the future as well, but all of those moments would be in the future of the negated action.

#164 Negation of wishes and exhortations use negative auxiliary verbs meaning "to not do". There are two. In each case, the negative verb is a prospective and is followed by the negational complement, which is nominal form. When the subject is a noun it comes after the negational complement possibly because the verb + complement formed a bound pair.

- *tm*
- *imi* (which must be distinguished from *imi*, the imperative of *rdi*).

The meaning is something like "you should not do, may you not do".

The diagram of the first sentence in the second example on page 185 looks like this:

P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
	<i>imi</i>	(.k)				<i>m33(w) rmt</i>	
	<i>m33(w)</i>				<i>rmt</i>		

"May people not see."

#166 Negative commands use *m* + negatival complement. *m* is the imperative of '*imi*' (= "not do"). An adjective verb can appear as the negatival complement. In the example on the top of page 186 I do not understand why it does not start as *m ʕ3(w)*, and subsequently in the same example why not *m mh(w)*?

#168 *in nn* + prospective *sdm.f* = "Won't he hear?"

#175 *tm* negates purpose clauses (= "in order that he might not do..."). The sequence is *tm* in the prospective + negatival complement + noun subject (if there is one).

#175 *n tm.f* = "he did not fail (to do)."

#177 negation of conditional sentences: *tm* negates both the 2nd tense *sMd(w).f* and the regular prospective *sdm.f*. It is the "if" clause that is negated. *ir tm.sn rdw nn msy(t).s(t)* = "if they do not grow then she will not give birth". If *ir* does not appear, *tm* appears as a prospective.

#179 negative participles and relative verb forms. *tm* as a participle, including the *sdm.ty.fy* + the negatival complement.

#180 the general rule is that *tm* assumes the form of the verb it is negating, the verb itself is transformed into the negative complement and is then followed by the noun subject, if there is one.

This includes the *sdm.t.f* and *sdm.hr.f*.

#182 *w*, placed after the prospective *sdm.f*, indicates prohibition. *srw(i).tn w mʕhʕt tn m st.s tn r nhh* = "You shall not remove this funerary monument from this its place for all time."

#184 Negation of 2nd tense forms, Hoch identifies four types

- *tm.f sdm(w)* + adjunct, *tm* is a 2nd tense form followed by the negatival complement. In this case something was not done and the speaker says why.
- *n sdm.n.f is* (past tense) + adjunct and *n sdm.f is* (present tense) + adjunct. In this case the action was done, but the circumstances for it are denied. The reason why, for example, the *n sdm.n.f is* refers to past time (and vice versa) is because the *sdm* is a 2nd tense form.
- *n sdm.f is* (present 2nd tense) or *n sdm.n.f* (past 2nd tense) + subject + adjunct. Just some of the circumstances are denied.
- *n sdm.f* (present 2nd tense) or *n sdm.n.f* (past 2nd tense) + subject + adjunct. The action took place despite the fact that some of the circumstances did not take place.

### old indicative

#107 All of the examples Hoch gives involves negatives, i.e. the *n sdm.f* form. This seems to involve what Gardiner calls the "perfective" (cf. #G.447 ff.) and Allen calls the "perfect" (cf. #A.18.14). The identification with Gardiner's "perfective" is less precise.

- *sdm.n.f* (present active)
- *sdm.f* (past active)
- *sdm.n.tw.f* (present passive)
- *sdm.tw.f* (past passive)

### participial statement

#125 *sdm.ty.fy* forms are not used here.

#134

- *in* + agent + perfect (past) participle = "it is x who heard"
- *in* + agent + imperfect (present) participle = "it is x who hears / is hearing"
- *in* + agent + 2nd prospective *sdm(w).f* = "it is x who will hear"

If the agent is a pronoun it is an independent pronoun.

If the sentence is interrogative it was, earlier, *in m* (*m* being the agent). These later merged into one word *nm* "who?".

### passive forms

#34 passive present - *sdm.tw.f*. The agent can also be expressed by *in*. The *tw* component usually appears after the determinative.

#35 past tense passive - *sdm(w).f*. Weak verbs can show *-y* instead of *-w*. rdi shows *rd(w)* and *d(w)*.

#38 see relative meanings.

#71 prospective passive - *sdm.tw.f*. Negative is *nn sdm.tw.f*.

#107 "Old indicative". All of the examples Hoch gives involves negatives, i.e. the *n sdm.f* form. This seems to involve what Gardiner calls the "perfective" (cf. #G.447 ff.) and Allen calls the "perfect" (cf. #A.18.14). The identification with Gardiner's "perfective" is less precise.

- *sdm.n.tw.f* (present passive)
- *sdm.tw.f* (past passive)

#109 *nn sdm.tw.f* - future passive.

#147 2nd tense relative present passive: *sdm.tw.f*

#147 2nd tense relative past passive: *sdm.n.tw.f*

### past tenses

#30 *sdm.n.f* is a circumstantial form.

#35 past tense passive - *sdm(w).f*. Weak verbs can show *-y* instead of *-w*. rdi shows *rd(w)* and *d(w)*.

#136 *šmt pw ir(w).n.f* - a narrative past tense construction, used almost always with verbs of motion. The first element is the infinitive of the verb. *šmt pw ir(w).n.f* = "It is a going that he did". i.e. it is a nominal sentence with *šmt*, the infinitive, as the first nominal and a form like *ir(w)*, a past relative, as the second nominative. The translation certainly seems emphatic to me. This is never preceded by *iw* or *m.k*, nothing surprising there. See Allen 14.14.3 where he identifies the second element as a verb form, *ir.n*.

See #91, #92, #93, #94, #95 ( I have doubts about this one, it may be caused by improper terminology such as "main" and "subordinate" clauses.).

#91 *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n sdm(w).f* passive. *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n rdi(w) ḥ<sup>c</sup> n.f q3q3 2 ḥn<sup>c</sup> ist.sn* = "Then two ships were caused to stand (made ready) for him together with their crews. Westcar 8,4.

#92 *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n.f šm(.w)* with verbs of motion. *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n* always takes a subject in this construction. The stative pronoun, of course, matches its referent in number and gender. *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n dpt tf ii.t(i)* = "Then that boat came".

#93 *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n.f hr sdm.*, the progressive past tense. Uses *hr* + infinitive. *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n.i hr i3š n mš<sup>c</sup>* = "Then I was calling out to the crew." This seems to deemphasize the change of status. I wonder if *iw i3š.n.i n mš3* is identical in meaning except for the fact that the continuity or sequentiality provided by *ḥ<sup>c</sup>*, "then" is lost.

#94 *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n.f rdi(.w)* - quasi-passives and states. Used with transitive verbs to produce a sort of passive sense. *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n(i) ini.kwi r iw pn in w3w* = "(Then) I was brought to this island by a wave". But how do you distinguish between this example and #92? The way you do it is to realize that *ini* does not fit the definition of "verb of motion" because it is transitive! (We have to come up with better terminology for

this particular type of verb.) A clearer example is the next one: *ʕḥ.n.s gr.ti* = "(then) she became motionless".

#95 *ʕḥ.n sdm.n.f* with following parallel clauses. Here Hoch distinguishes carefully between "subordinate clauses" and the ones in the example which go unnamed. One of the reasons why I prefer terminology such as "initial" and "subsequent" clauses. Anyway, his example (in three lines):

- *ʕḥ.n.i šm.kwi* = "(then) went" - this line certainly looks like it could be #92. I don't know how you tell the difference
- *rdi.n(i) wi hr ht k3* = "and I got myself up a tall tree". Statement of fact in a subsequent clause.
- *si3.n.i ntiw m-ħnw.s* = "and I recognized those who were in it (the ship)." Statement of fact ... etc.

In fact, the last two lines could be argued, in Hoch's terms as being "adverbial" and in mine "adjunctival". See the grid following:

P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
	<i>ʕḥ.n</i>	<i>.i</i>					
		<i>šm.kwi</i>					<i>rdi.n(i) wi hr ht k3   si3.n.i ntiw m-ħnw.s</i>
	<i>rdi.n(i)</i>			<i>wi</i>			<i>hr ht k3   si3.n.i ntiw m-ħnw.s</i>
	<i>si3.n</i>	<i>.i</i>				<i>ntwi</i>	<i>m-ħnw.s</i>

There's nothing else to do with the last two lines except to put them in the 'A' slot.

#107

- *n sdm.f* (negative past active) of statements of fact, also negates initial adjectives, "old indicative" *sdm.f*.
- *n sdm.tw.f* (negative past passive), "old indicative".
- *n.sdm(w).f* (negative past passive), is older than the *n sdm.tw.f* and much rarer. "Old indicative".

#131 These three forms are never introduced by *iw* or *m.k*.

- *sdm.in.f* = "then he heard"
- *sdm.hr.f* = "then he heard", not very common
- *sdm.k3.f* = "then he heard", not very common

#131 (also) "then he heard" and related constructions.

In the following set the suffix pronoun, as usual, stands in for any type of subject.

- *wn.in.f* + prepositional phrase
- *wn.in.f* + adverb or adjunct
- *wn.in.f hr* + infinitive
- *wn.in.f* + stative.
- *wnn.hr.f* is more common than
- *wn.hr.f* which may be related to the prospective *sdm.f* or the past tense *sdm.n.f*. Quite a disparate pair of possibilities.

#134 *in* + agent + perfect (past) participle = "it is x who heard". If the agent is a pronoun it is an independent pronoun. This emphasizes the subject.

#136 *sdm(w).n.f* is a past relative form. = "it is a hearing that he did". Never preceded by *iw* or *m.k*. This emphasizes the verb.

#136 *šmt pw iry, iry* is the perfect passive participle. = "it is a going that was made", very rare. A narrative construction.

#163 *šmt pw iry(w).n.f* "it is a going that he did". A narrative construction.

#172 *hpr.n*, a 2nd tense form, does not require a subject.

### present tenses

#77 *rdi + m* of status ("appointed as") or + *r* of futurity ("appointed to be") = "appoint, place in the capacity of".

#29 present tense *sdm.f*. Negative: #108.1, *n sdm.n.f* ("old indicative")

#34 present passive *sdm.tw.f*. Negative: #108.2, *n sdm.n.tw.f* ("old indicative")

#29 the usual form employed in statements of purported fact. They do indeed appear in clauses of circumstance. Hoch calls these forms adverbial, I think he means 'used adverbially'. As seen in #35, he does. They cannot stand on their own, they always depend upon something even if it's only *iw*.

#32 used in "subordinate" clauses without introductory particles.

#103 existential sentences are negated by *nn wn*. Such constructs are always initial clauses. *nn* + noun can occur in initial and in subsequent clauses. Otherwise *wn* probably does not appear or at least very seldom in the present tense (my view).

#108 n *sdm.n.f* the negative "old Perfective" present active negates the present active "circumstantial" *sdm.f*.

#108 n *sdm.n.tw.f*, the negative "old Perfective" works similarly for the "circumstantial" present passive.

#147 2nd tense relative present *sdm.f*. Passive: *sdm.tw.f*.  
Statives.

### prospectives

See under future tenses.

### purported statements of fact

#31 three constructions:

- *iw sdm.f* (see section on *iw* and *m.k* above)
- *m.k sdm.f* (see section on *iw* and *m.k* above)
- noun + *sdm.f*, Hoch gives an example: *it.i sdm.f* = "my father hears". Not very common, he says. #36 not preceded by *iw* or *m.k*.

### purpose clauses

#74 prospective *sdm.f* without introductory participles or prepositions in subsequent clauses of purpose = "in order that one might do..."

#175 negation is performed by *tm* (as prospective) + negational complement + noun subject (if there is one).

### relative forms

#157 always have an expressed or understood subject. There are four forms:

- perfect (I call it the past)
- imperfect (I call it the present)
- prospective

- past with the past tense marker *n* called the *sdm(w).n.f* relative form.

#158 Perfect Relative is identical in form to the perfect participle. Expresses time prior to the main verb.

#159 Imperfect Relative expresses time contemporaneous with the main verb. Looks like the imperfect participle.

#160 Prospective Relative closely resembles the prospective participles. Express mood similar to that of the Greek subjunctive and optative but the time indicated for the action which the verb describes is always in the future.

#161 *sdm(w).n.f* refers to past time.

### relative meanings

#38 I'm kind of lost on this one. A so-called "undefined" or "indefinite" noun can be followed by a *sdm.f* form acting nominally. *iw rh.n.i ndh hmsi.f m dd-snfrw* = "I have learned of a commoner who lives in Djed-Senefru". This is NOT the relative form he discusses in #H.162. The reason we can tell is that the past passive of this form is *sdm(w).f* whereas in #H.162, Hoch notes that all passive relatives are formed with *.tw*. He does not mention in #H.162 ff anything about the noun having to be "defined" or "definite". The most obtuse example Hoch gives is *iw gmi.n.i shty w3(w) hnw.f* = "I have found a peasant whose property has been stolen" where *w3(w)* is a passive verb and *hnw* is the subject. I think I would at first have taken the verb *w3* as stative but such a stative verb can't have a direct object. I note that none of the examples Hoch gives in #H.162 ff include the particle *iw* although one has *m.k*.

### result clauses

#74 prospective *sdm.f* without introductory participles or prepositions in subsequent clauses of purpose = "in order that one might do..."

#190 2nd tense forms, after the genitival *n(y)*, a relative clause. ... *ht nbt nfrt n(y)t šsp hm.f* = "all sorts of fine things which His Majesty receives". After a genitival adjective the next item must be a nominative.

### second tense

This is a set of verbs that really needs new, and descriptive, terminology.

#134 the second tense in the participial statement (see "participial statement" for further constructions)

- *in* + agent + 2nd prospective *sdm(w).f* = "it is x who will hear"

#138 Their initial function is always nominal, as is indicated by their negations (#177). They are somewhat common in the "if" clause of conditionals. But see #147. In #188 Hoch says that 2nd tense forms are "somewhat more" frequent in conditional clauses.

#147 They mean "the way something is done". Often called "emphatic" but it is not. I wonder if "demonstrative" might not be a better term. There are two forms: the relative present *sdm.f* and the relative past *sdm.n.f*.

They never follow *iw*, *m.k* is rare.

#148 Explicatory sentence construction highlights the adjunct which can consist of a prepositional phrase, a true adverb, a so-called "circumstantial" clause, a stative, a purpose clause with prospective *sdm.f* or *r* + infinitive, or a noun-phrase used "adverbially" - really temporal locatives. In such cases the 2nd tense + its subject form the topic of the highlighted clause. Explicatory sentences regularly contain 2nd tense *sdmn.n.f* forms of pm/i verbs which otherwise use the stative. This construction is used frequently, which frequency seems like it would dilute its power, and perhaps that adds to my wondering about what it was really used for because it just doesn't seem like it's worth the effort to construct it.

#149 The independent use of the 2nd tense forms. In other words, these do not occur in explicatory sentences but are seen in things like monumental titles, maybe similar to the use of infinitives in those

cases.

I don't understand the second paragraph on page 173 where Hoch objects to the explicatory interpretation of *di.n(i) n.k t3w nb(w)*. He thinks that the indirect object can't support explicatory status here and goes on to say that another reason it's not explicatory is because the direct object follows the "dative" (indirect object) - that's where its supposed to go in this instance. I can't see any reason why this isn't "It is to you that I have given all lands". Perhaps Hoch thinks that the spotlight has to fall on the last element in an explicatory sentence, but he doesn't actually say so.

The *sdm.f pw* construction can use 2nd tense forms meaning, e.g. "this is how he hears..."

#150 2nd tense forms as objects of prepositions. *prt pw in s r mrr.f m hrt-ntr* = "It is the going out of a man from the necropolis according to the manner he wishes".

#151 The 2nd tense forms as the direct object of verbs (or in this case, verbals). *ib n(y) hm.k r qbb n m33 hnn.sn* = "Your Majesty's mind will be refreshed at seeing how they row." *hnn.sn* is the direct object of *m33*.

#152 reciprocal sentences are formed by two clauses placed together, clauses which contain 2nd tense forms. *nh re, nh.i* = "as Ra lives, so I live". I don't know what's reciprocal about this. But in *rdi.n.i w3t n rdwy.i m hd dmi.n.i inbw-hq* = "No sooner did I set out going north than I reached Ramparts of the Ruler. Hoch feels that these are loosely bound explicatory sentences

#153 Hoch says that *hc.n* in *hc.n sdm.n.f* is a 2nd tense form and that makes this an "explicatory" sentence. See diagram under *hc.n sdm.n.f* above. But I fail to see the nominal aspect of this unless he's arguing that in the first sentence charted there should be a line before the first one that appears there with *hc.n* in the S slot. But that won't work at all for the second sentence charted which already has a subject.

#184 Negations, Hoch identifies four types

- *tm.f sdm(w)* + adjunct, *tm* is a 2nd tense form followed by the negational complement. In this case something was not done and the speaker says why.
- *n sdm.n.f is* (past tense) + adjunct and *n sdm.f is* (present tense) + adjunct. In this case the action was done, but the circumstances for it are denied. The reason why, for example, the *n sdm.n.f is* refers to past time (and vice versa) is because the *sdm* is a 2nd tense form.
- *n sdm.f is* (present 2nd tense) or *n sdm.n.f* (past 2nd tense) + subject + adjunct. Just some of the circumstances are denied.
- *n sdm.f* (present 2nd tense) or *n sdm.n.f* (past 2nd tense) + subject + adjunct. The action took place despite the fact that some of the circumstances did not take place.

#188 2nd tense prospective *sdm.(w).f* forms and their uses. In the first paragraph in this section Hoch says that the regular prospective and the 2nd tense prospective were likely merging during the time of the Middle Kingdom.

The difference between the two is that the "regular" prospective discusses a future that "would, should, might" happen while the 2nd tense puts emphasis on an actual future, one of surety, I think, and the *iw.f r sdm* also indicates such a future but without emphasizing it. *iw.f r smr m-m srw rdi(w).tw.f m-q3b snyt* = (I think) "He will be a companion among the officials and it is in the midst of the courtiers that he will be placed".

P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
	<i>iw</i>	<i>f</i>					<i>r smr   m-m srw   rdi(w).tw.f m q3b</i>
					<i>rdi(w).tw.f</i>		<i>m q3b</i>
	<i>rdi(w).tw</i>	<i>f</i>					<i>m q3b</i>

This is the only way to make the 2nd tense *rdi* a nominal. Both Hoch and Allen argue that the regular prospective form would have to be *di*, not *rdi*. The second line above makes sense as an adjunctival sentence only if you agree that *rdi* is to be translated as above.

Much easier to see is as the object of a preposition in the second example (page 221): *dd.k st r h3w snf* = "it is for the purpose of the blood flowing that you place it"

#190 2nd tense forms, after the genitival *n(y)*, a relative clause. ... *ht nbt nfrt n(y)t šsp hm.f* = "all sorts of fine things which His Majesty receives". After a genitival adjective the next item must be a nominative.

### stative

#31 Pm/i verbs never appear in the *sdm.n.f* form. They use the stative instead.

#82 Not part of the *sdm.f* conjugation. Focuses on the result of an action, not on the action itself.

When adjective verbs are used in the stative they indicate the state or condition of something, "was hungry", etc. But they are intransitive and so I can't see the difference between these and so-called "regular" verbs. They were not used in the factual *sdm.f*, initial adjectives were used instead, but see negation #106.

#83 They take their own set of endings.

#85 Hoch calls them "adverbial", I would call them "adjunctive" but they are actually adjectival, anyway they can serve in non-verbal sentences which are often introduced by *iw*. Sentences that start with a noun can be followed by a stative do not have to have (or might never have) *iw* or *m.k* as intros. e.g. the example Hoch gives of *iw.f ḥ(.w) hr w3t* may be approximately equivalent to *s3 ḥ(.w) hr w3t* or even *s3 hr ḥ hr w3t* although this is my conjecture. Observation: The initial function of a stative is adjectival.

#86 When they appear in subsequent clauses *iw* and *m.k* are not present, naturally. *iw ph.n.f wi ḥ.kwi hr w3t* = "He reached me as I was standing on the road." Single underlining marks the original nominal, double underlining identifies the subsequent clause. The stative is in bold face.

P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
<i>iw</i>	<i>ph.n</i>	<i>f</i>				<i>wi</i>	
						<i>ḥ.kwi</i>	<i>hr w3t</i>
	<i>ḥ.kwi</i>						<i>hr w3t</i>

#87 Describes another adjectival use of statives, in this case a bit closer than in #86. e.g. *šm.w ḥd(.w)* = "damaged Upper Egyptian barley". It also covers the use of statives as direct objects: *gm.n.i st wp(.w)* = "I found them open". Actually this use is also adjectival, describing *st*.

#89 *rh*, "learn, find out". The past tense meaning uses both the *sdm.n.f* form and the stative where it means "know". If the direct object is an infinitive that indicates "know how (to do something)".

#92 *ḥ.n.f šm(.w)* with verbs of motion. *ḥ.n* always takes a subject in this construction. The stative, of course, matches its referent in number and gender.

#94 *ḥ.n.f rdi(.w)* - quasi-passives and states. Used with transitive verbs to produce a sort of passive sense. *ḥ.n(i) ini.kwi r iw pn in w3w* = "(Then) I was brought to this island by a wave". But how do you distinguish between this example and #92? The way you do it is to realize that *ini* does not fit the definition of "verb of motion" because it is transitive! (We have to come up with better terminology for this particular type of verb.) A clearer example is the next one: *ḥ.n.s gr.ti* = "(then) she became motionless".

#95 *ḥ.n sdm.n.f* with following parallel clauses. Here Hoch distinguishes carefully between "subordinate clauses" and the ones in the example which go unnamed. One of the reasons why I prefer terminology such as "initial" and "subsequent" clauses. Anyway, his example (in three lines):

- *ḥ̄.n.i šm.kwi* = "(then) went" - this line certainly looks like it could be #92. I don't know how you tell the difference. This entire section is shown here among statives only because the example Hoch gives uses a stative, not a *sdm.n.f* form. I don't understand this.
- *rdi.n(.i) wi hr ht k3* = "and I got myself up a tall tree". Statement of fact in a subsequent clause.
- *si3.n.i ntiw m-ḥnw.s* = "and I recognized those who were in it (the ship)." Statement of fact ... etc.

In fact, the last two lines could be argued, in Hoch's terms as being "adverbial" and in mine "adjunctival". See the grid following:

P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
	<i>ḥ̄.n</i>	<i>.i</i> <i>šm.kwi</i>					<i>rdi.n(.i) wi</i> <i>hr ht k3</i>   <i>si3.n.i ntiw</i> <i>m-ḥnw.s</i>
	<i>rdi.n(.i)</i>			<i>wi</i>			<i>hr ht k3</i>   <i>si3.n.i ntiw</i> <i>m-ḥnw.s</i>
	<i>si3.n</i>	<i>.i</i>				<i>ntwi</i>	<i>m-ḥnw.s</i>

There's nothing else to do with the last two lines except to put them in the 'A' slot.

#98 The independent use of the 1st singular stative. Hoch argues that it doesn't require an antecedent and doesn't use *iw*. Both of these are true, but I find fault with the concept. Statives are always adjectival which means there is always some nominal stated or understood. It doesn't have to be immediately prior to the stative. If words intervene then the stative is also utilizing its subsequent verbal function. In both of the examples Hoch gives the nominal referent is explicitly stated prior to the employment of the stative.

#99 the exclamatory use of the stative forms. Restricted to 2nd and 3rd person. Again, in all examples shown, the topic is expressed or understood prior to the use of the stative.

#175 *tm* in the stative = "complete"

### suffix "conjugation"

#25 There are five basic "conjugated" verb forms in this group. Conjugation is probably not the right word to use. Hoch lists them in his appendix 1 as

- circumstantial
- prospective
- second tense
- old indicative
- *sdm.n.f*, noting that all *sdm.n.f* forms (circumstantial, "old indicative", 2nd tense) are identical in their written forms.

### verbs of motion

#92 definition: A verb of motion indicates motion. Inference: but in Egyptian grammar, per Hoch, the class is further restricted to intransitive verbs. They are called pm/i verbs. See above under

## TERMINOLOGY.

#31 Pm/i verbs never appear in the *s<sub>d</sub>m.n.f* form. They use the stative instead.

#88 Instead of \**iw pr.n.f* we find *iw.f pr.w* = "He went out (lit: he is gone out)". This is an example of past-time using a verb of motion in stative form.

#92 usage: *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n.f šm(.w)* with verbs of motion. *ḥ<sup>c</sup>.n* always takes a subject in this construction. The stative, of course, matches its referent in number and gender.

## ADDITIONAL ITEMS

### miscellaneous

#26 verb tenses are relative to their context.

### verb classes

#28

- bi-consonantal, form AB. Strong.
- tri-consonantal, form ABC. Strong.
- third weak, ABi or ABw. Hoch argues that transliterations should always show the weak component, whether written or not. Some verbs geminate, some don't. Belong to the "mutable verbs". Weak.
- second geminating. ABB. Some geminate, some don't. Belong to the "mutable verbs". Doubling.
- fourth weak. ABCi. Weak.

#170

- quadri-consonantal, includes s-causatives of tri-consonantals. Strong.
- third geminating, form ABCC. Includes s-causatives of 2nd geminators. All forms show all four consonants. Strong.
- fourth weak, s-causatives of 3rd weak are the only examples Hoch shows. Some infinitives in *-t*, others not. Weak.
- quinquiconsonantal, form ABCBC where A can be any consonant including *n-*. Strong.

## ANNEX

Contained herein are items which are not strictly verbs, but which nevertheless have verbal attributes which apply. All of these items are actually nominal in nature when first encountered in a sentence. They then can take on additional qualities which are verbal. The sequence is important: first - they are nominals, second - they are verbals. This is not to deny that some items which are truly verbs are not themselves initially nominal in usage, for example, the prospective and the stative, however, none of the following are regularly associated with pronominal subjects..

### infinitives

#171 *iri* as an auxiliary verb. Used in any of its forms with infinitives of less commonly used verbs (whatever they are) and with the less common verb classes (presumably those identified in #170). = "to do". e.g. *iw ib.f iri.f dbdb* = "his heart pounds"

#171 *iri.f* + infinitive. Rare in ME, common in LE. All forms of *iri* can be employed. Hoch seems to restrict its usage to being coupled with infinitives of less commonly used verbs and the less common

verb classes with more than three consonants. It almost sounds like were talking about someone who was unfamiliar with the language! e.g.: *iw ib.f iri.f dbdb* = "His heart pounds". This is a type *iw.f sdm.f*? Possibly somewhat emphatic, Hoch denies that it involves repetition, although the example given could support repetition.

#173 follow the auxiliary verb *p3(w)* "to have done in the past". I take the infinitive as a direct object of *p3(w)*. *n sp p3.tw irt st dr h3w nswt-bity snfrw m3<sup>c</sup> hrw* = "There had been no doing it since the time of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Senefru, True of Voice". *iw p3.n sdm mitt* "We heard the like". #178 *tm* as an infinitive + negatival complement negates the infinitive.

### participles

#125 *sdm.ty.fy* forms are never used initially, nor are they used in the "participial statement".

#179 negative participles and relative verb forms. *tm* as a participle, including the *sdm.ty.fy* + the negatival complement.

### negatival complements

#165 shows the forms. Has a *-w* ending which is not normally written.

#173 *p3yt* is the fem. sing. past active participle of *p3(w)*.

#175 negation is performed by *tm* (as prospective) + negatival complement + noun subject (if there is one).

#178 *tm* as an infinitive + negatival complement negates the infinitive. As a passive participle its form is *tmm*, e.g.: *tmmt m33(w)* = "that which is not seen"

## TERMINOLOGY

I restrict the term "adverb" to be parallel to that of "adjective" in that "adverb" only includes words that describe a quality of the verb. Where the verb takes place is not a quality, so such words and phrases are not adverbial. e.g.: "I sing loudly and badly in the shower", 'loudly' and 'badly' are adverbs, 'in the shower' is not adverbial, never will be, it is locative. Which means that many prepositional phrases, instead of being considered adverbs, are really locatives among other things and will be so designated here. This has no impact on the set of sentences called "circumstantial" except to reduce the number of items identified as adverbial.

In another case, consider the sentence "I told him to go home". Although many grammarians label "home" in this case as an adverb, unwilling or unable to think of any better term, it does not actually have anything to do with any quality of going so it can't be an adverb. It is a locative, and because locatives are nominal, it is consequently a nominal. A fuller appreciation can be gained from the equivalent "I told him to go to home" exactly the same meaning but where in this case "home" is the object of the preposition "to". Objects of prepositions must be nominal. Nothing adverbial about "home".

Other words and phrases which have been previously dumped haphazardly into the "adverb" bin for lack of anything else to call them are now called "adjunctival" or "additional information" without claiming that they are functionally related, which claim has falsely been made for adverbs under the prior definition. Thus "adverbs" now have a tight and coherent definition.

The words in an Egyptian sentence generally decline in importance from beginning to end. The same is true, therefore, of clauses. Most of the time the initial clause is the main clause. Other clauses are subsequent clauses. This obviates the necessity of having to worry about the often fine, and often quite

arbitrary, depiction of some clauses as "main" and others as "subordinate".

A "intransitive verb of past motion" or "pm/i verb" is an intransitive verb which depicts motion. Such verbs use the stative for their past tense except in explicatory sentences (see **second tense** verbs). A rather lengthy title but one which assists the memory. I'd welcome any suggestions.

In the early days of Egyptology, Assyriology, and the like, it was part of the usual linguistic academic curriculum, in all disciplines actually, to expose all students to Greek and Latin. I abandon terms borrowed from the grammar of these classical languages in view of the fact that today only rarely do we encounter students with that experience.. Arcanities such as those which apply, for example, to the aspects "perfect", "perfective", "imperfective" and the like should be replaced as needed by descriptive modern English words or phrases. They and other terms will appear in this document only to provide reference to statements in Hoch, Allen, and Gardiner. Often they will appear in quotation marks.

Although this is a collation of discussions relating to verbs in Hoch, comparisons with Allen naturally arise. This document then ineluctably contains terminology employed by both authors. So a few words about Allen's phraseology are in order.

Allen correctly applies the term "perfect" to the modal concept of "completed action". He also correctly describes the form as tenseless and naturally goes on to compare it to the stative. The stative's emphasis is on the result of an action whereas the perfect emphasizes the action itself, a distinction, which, he notes, is absent in English and therefore very difficult to differentiate in translation. Unfortunately, "perfect" doesn't mean that in modern, spoken English and is therefore arcane terminology, peculiar to the grammatical community. It needs to be replaced. Being by itself suggestive, stative, on the other hand, suffers from no such deficiency. Since they are so closely related in concept and both connote completed action, I suggest the terms "stative focused on the result" or "s/r" for the stative and "stative focused on the action" or "s/a" for the perfect. I welcome suggestions for better terminology.

Allen deprecates the use of the word "indicative" to refer to the particular form he calls the "perfective". I agree with him that since "indicative" properly indicates a modal quality possessed by several Middle Egyptian forms, it should not be applied to any one form. But "perfective" is not a good choice. It is meaningless in modern English and too apt to be confused with the other terms "perfect" and "imperfective". Perhaps a better term would be "ongoing" or maybe "repetitive".

Allen replaces the term "circumstantial", a term I find to be unhelpful, with "imperfective" which is hardly an improvement since, in modern parlance, there is nothing imperfect about the action being described. I tend to call it the "present" although that is rather misleading itself. .

Nevertheless, terms like "perfect" and "imperfect" when applied to participles could be just as well called "past" and "present" participles, without much, if any, loss of accuracy.

In other words, I don't care what "standard grammatical terminology" is. If the terminology is arcane or misleading it must be replaced. The important thing is not to use terminology which grammarians approve of and have used but rather that which a beginning student who has had no contact with other languages can quickly and intuitively understand, easily identify and apply to grammatical concepts. The student's present needs are paramount. As the student progresses through his or her studies of languages, the other terms will become familiar as an ineluctable matter of course, at least until those terms die their well-deserved deaths.

*iw.fpw h3t r ph(wy).fy mi gmyt m sš m ib.i*