CHAPTER I. THE ACTIVE $\text{Dr sDm.t=f}$ CONSTRUCTION

At present there is no general consensus about the uses and the meaning of the $\text{sDm.t=f}$ verb form, although the form is now commonly recognized as a finite verb form. To begin this study of the verb form, I shall in the present contribution concentrate on only one construction, i.e. $\text{Dr sDm.t=f}$, which might occupy a crucial position for the understanding of the meaning of the verb form in its indubitable uses.

§ 1. Gardiner's Grammar and the $\text{sDm.t=f}$.

As the point of departure I take Gardiner's opinion on the subject in his monumental standard reference grammar, which has dominated the study of Middle Egyptian for almost three quarters of this century, and which has not as yet been replaced by a comprehensive and more modern one. Three uses are described: 1) the $\text{n sDm.t=f}$ construction; 2) the so-called narrative $\text{sDm.t=f}$; 3) its use after a number of prepositions/conjunctions.

About $\text{n sDm.t=f}$ Gardiner states that its chief meaning is "he has/had not yet heard" and that the construction is particularly common as a virtual adverb clause with the meaning "before he has/had ...", lit. "he has/had not (yet)". Furthermore, he remarks that the temporal significance "not yet", "before" is only very rarely absent. He considers the use of the $\text{sDm.t=f}$ as a narrative tense rather doubtful, because all examples but one might well contain the infinitive.

Gardiner makes the following statements on its use after prepositions. Examples [of this use] are found from immutable verbs, where no alternative explanation seems possible, but doubt occurs in the IIIae inf. and anomalous verbs, where the verb-form is indistinguishable from the infinitive. In all certain examples the time of the action appears to be relatively past, i.e. anterior to the time of the main verb. Quite certain examples, i.e. examples from immutable verbs, have been found only with the prepositions $r$ "until" and $\text{Dr}$ "since", "from the moment that", but also "before", "until". The use after $m$ "when", $m$-xt "after", xt "when" and $m$ "like, according as" is more doubtful, since instances are forthcoming only from IIIae inf. and anomalous verbs. There is nothing to prevent such instances being interpreted as infinitives, though again there is no positive evidence in favour of this view. The analogy with $r$ and Dr favours a provisional classification under the heading of the $\text{sDm.t=f}$ form.

---

1 Gardiner, EG, 316-322 (§401-9).
2 Gardiner, EG, 320-322 (§407).
3 The selection of the prepositions goes back to Sethe, Verbum II, 158 (§353). Note that the only example of a purported $\text{sDm.t=f}$ after the preposition $m$, i.e. $\text{mi wDA.t}$ $\text{ib}$ in Urk. IV 1143,7 is based on an incorrect reading. Verification of the passage in Davies, Tomb of Rekh-mi-Re II, pl. 50, lower reg., right revealed that there is no -t-affix; this observation is confirmed in Verdes, Études VI, RdE 38 (1987), 170, n.40. Furthermore, note that in religious texts of the New Kingdom written in Neo-Middle Egyptian the writings are sometimes incorrect. For example, Perdu, Préposition xt, RdE 30 (1978), 112 (n.96) claims the existence of $\text{xxt sDm.t=f}$, on the basis of a text published by Nagel, Pap. fun. Louvre 3292, BIFAO 29 (1929), 83. This text Q, line 1 reads $\text{xt sprwt=f r Xrt-nTr}$; the -t-ending points rather to a nomen actionis, such as the better known $\text{prw}$. On the other hand, the writing of the $\text{t}$ might be redundant, which finds confirmation in another text D, line 1 $\text{sprt pwy r.n=t=f}$ (Nagel, op.cit., 23; ref. Perdu, op.cit., 112, n.97), where the form seems to be the infinitive, to judge from the construction. Interesting in this respect is the text of the Destruction of Mankind (ed. Hornung, Himmelskuh), version SI, 7-8 (ed. p.3), which reads $\text{mdw n=n r sDm.t=n}$ st "speak to us, so that we may hear it" and SI, 29 (ed. p.11) $\text{mn t=} r \text{ph.t}$ $\text{w XY}$ "I shall not return so that someone may attack me" versus version SI, 9-10 (ed. p.4) $\text{smA.n=i r sDm.t=f}$ DdL.t=Tn r=t-s I cannot kill them, until I have heard what you have to say about it". While the first two constructions translated with "so that" are written with just a $\text{t}$ and contain instead the Prospective $\text{sDm.t=f}$, the second one with the writing $\text{tw}$ has the typical meaning "until" of the $\text{sDm.t=f}$. This difference seems significant to me: while in the first construction the $\text{t}$ is redundant, the pronounced $\text{t}$ of the genuine $\text{sDm.t=f}$ in the second is written $\text{tw}$, to indicate this; note that, according to Guilhou, Vieilles des dieux, 58-59 (5), in all three examples the meaning of the constructions is "tant que ... ne ... pas".
§ 2. Present opinions on its uses and their meanings.

For a long time now there has been unanimity about the identification of the verb form in the n sDm.t=f construction as occurring in Middle Egyptian, where the verb form cannot be interpreted differently. However, there is no general consensus about the uses in which the form is formally indistinguishable from the feminine infinitive. But from the feminine infinitive.

In 1973 the use as an independently occurring narrative tense was reconsidered, and in fact eliminated by Schenkel. Shortly before, the only example of the indubitable use of the form from an immutable verb had been found not to contain the crucial t. Only a few scholars still hold this to be a use of the sDm.t=f, and I consider it to be nonexistent.

With respect to the number of prepositions after which the verb form is used, a majority of authors do consider Gardiner’s opinion to be correct, despite his own doubts. Others see the use after prepositions as restricted to the indisputable uses after r and Dr only.

Differing from Gardiner’s opinion that in r sDm.t=f the preposition has the meaning “until”, some scholars also consider a translation with “so that/in order that” possible. Others opt for only one of the two possibilities.

---

4 I have doubts about the validity of Vernon’s argument, op. cit., 168-174 (particularly 173-174), that with the help of the analogy of the sDm.t=f verb form, which expresses the “accompli” in n sDm.t=f, the -t-afixed infinitive becomes specialised to express the “accompli”: from feminine -t-afixed infinitive to an infinitive in which the -t-ending comes to express the “accompli”. In the present study, the infinitive, masculine or feminine, will be shown to be semantically quite separate from the sDm.t=f, as far as the construction with the preposition/conjunction Dr is concerned.

5 Schenkel, Ende des narr. sDm.t=f, GM 4 (1973), 23-28. The main argument in Satzinger’s study of the meaning of the sDm.t=f in id., sDm.t=f, JEA 57 (1971), 58-69 is based on this narrative use; see also Satzinger, Rund um sDm.t=f, GM 27 (1978), 45-49, written after the elimination of the narrative use of the sDm.t=f and in reaction to Junge, sDm.t=f, GM 1 (1972), 32-34.

6 Baris, Some Readings, JEA 58 (1972), 160-161 (3).


Remarkably, the preposition Dr is omitted in Callender, Middle Egyptian, 76-77, and Brunner, Abriss mitteläg. Grammatik, 32 (§54). Thus also in Schenkel, Tübingen Einführung, 164: “nach einigen Präpositionen, so nach m ‘während’, m-xt ‘nachdem’, mi ‘wie’, r ‘bis’”, but from personal correspondence I know that this will be rectified into uses after r and Dr only in the next version of his introductory grammar.

9 Borghouts, Egyptisch I, 102 (§47.a.2). Loprieno, sDm.t=f, GM 37 (1980), 20 (4). Vernon, Études VI, RdE 38 (1987), 168-174. Gaskins, Notes M.Eg. Syntax, 167-171. De Buck, Grammaire élémentaire, 90 (§175), with the note “À après les autres prépositions n’apparaissent que des formes de verbes faibles, qui peuvent donc aussi bien être des infinitifs”. Allen, Inflection, 319 (§471). Edel, AÄG, 368-370 (§734); he also included the only example known to him of m wnt “als”. Thus also Satzinger, Zu den Umstandssätzen, MDAIK 22 (1967), 93. From Gunn’s remarks, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 181 (C) I infer that he only thought of r and Dr. I am not sure about Gilula’s opinion in JEA 56 (1970), 207 (A III): “and only in the construction r sDm.t=f is it the nominal form of the verb”; this seems to exclude Dr.


12 See my notes 8, under Hoch, and 9, under de Buck (“depuis que, avant que”). Possibly Loprieno, sDm.t=f, GM 37 (1980), 20-21, where only examples with the meaning “until” are given, but see p. 29, n.14 for “since”. However, in his latest publication Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 78, 151, 201: exclusively “since”.

---
The opinions of Anthes and Westendorf deserve special mention. The former devotes particular attention to the problem of the meaning of Dr in a study concerned with the prepositions m and Dr, which will be dealt with further on. The latter scholar is particularly important for the present study, because his opinion on the sDm.t=f form lies at the basis of the hypothesis put forward here.

In his grammar of the medical texts Westendorf has expressed strong doubts about the connection of the verb form with the past, a characteristic claimed in several standard reference grammars. He points out that in his opinion the sDm.t=f expresses that the subordinate action, which is located in the future relative to the main action, has not (yet) taken place (see, for example, Sh. Sailor, 97-98 sr=sn Da n iy.t=f nSNy n xpr.t=f "they foretold a storm when it had not yet come, a tempest when it had not yet occurred"). It is the same with the form after prepositions (see, for example, Sinuhe B, 247 Sbb(w) atx(w) tp-mAA=i r ph.t=i dmi n ITw "mixing and straining were done in my presence, until I reached the town of Itju"): reaching the capital lies in the future with respect to sailing to it. Indeed, he only admits a meaning "before" for Dr sDm.t=f.

In his grammar Borchouts has approached the sDm.t=f verb form, named there the "terminative", somewhat differently from the usual treatments. In his view those forms n.sDm.t=f and in.t=f which are generally reckoned to be anomalous forms of the (Subjunctive) Prospective sDm=f are sDm.t=f forms.

§ 3. The hypothesis of a common characteristic of the uses of the sDm.t=f.

The two generally accepted translations of n sDm.t=f are "before he hears/(has/had) heard" and, more literally, "while he has/had not yet heard", which takes the negation into account. Thus, a translation with "before" is evidently adequate and equivalent in effective meaning to "while not yet". However, that the translaton of n sDm.t=f with "while he has/had not yet heard" may be deceitful as to its time reference is well illustrated in the opening lines of Loprieno's study of the verb form, where it is stated that r sDm.t=f "until he hears/has heard" has a (relative) future time

---

12 "Before": see my note 8, under Graefe, Menu and Westendorf, and note 9, under Borchouts, Gaskins, Edel (p. 369, §735) and Satzinger. "Since/from the moment that": see note 8, under Grandet - Mathieu, Bakir and Lefebvre; note 9, under Vernus (particularly p. 173) and Allen ("since" with causal sense), and note 11, under Loprieno. The other studies mentioned in the preceding notes 9-11 either have no opinion on the meaning or omit Dr altogether. As regards the dictionaries, Wb. V 593 (2-9) neither mentions a meaning "before" nor its use before sDm.t=f. Faulkner, Concise Dictionary, 323 mentions "before/until", with reference to Gardiner, EG. "Before" is absent in Hannig, Grosses Handwörterbuch, 1011.


14 Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 191-192 ($264$); see also note 8, under Westendorf.

15 See Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 191 ($264$); with reference to this also Polotsky, Transpositions, IOT 6 (1976), 7, n.15: "la forme (n) sDm.t est sans doute une forme substantive personelle du prospectif". For the past time reference, I quote here only the statements in the most important reference grammars and studies of the verbal system in Old and Middle Egyptian. (1) Gardiner, EG, 317 ($402$; note the remarks "Present/past perfect, past tense"); 318-319 ($405$; derives from "feminine perfective passive participle"); 321 ($407$; "the time of the action appears to be relatively past, i.e. anterior to the time of the main verb, agreeing with the origin proposed for the sDm.t form in §405"); cf. also Gardiner, EG, XXVIII, ref. p. 321: "I should now be inclined to claim relative past time for all cases of proposition sDm.t. Indeed, the sDm.t in all its uses [my italics, LZ] appears to be a substitute for the sDm.nf form, or rather for that form in its past or past relative meaning, and its frequency after prepositions may account for the rarity of sDm.nf in the same case". (2) Lefebvre, GEC, 212 ($419$): "elle a toujours la signification d’un temps passé et doit se traduire en conséquence, c’est-à-dire le plus souvent par le passé simple, dans une proposition principale, et, dans une proposition subordonnée, par un temps de l’indicatif ou du subjonctif qui marque clairement que l’action est antérieure à celle du verbe de la proposition principale, à quelque temps que soit ce dernier". (3) Edel, AÄG, 368 ($732$, Anm.): "wobei .... allerdings die besondere Beziehung dieser Konstruktion auf die Vergangenheit unerklärt bleibt". (4) Allen, Inflection, 320 ($473$): "the tense of the sDm.t form can be understood as past (present perfect, pretetite, or pluperfect) in examples after prepositions or as object of verbs. The same range of tenses appears in the negation n sDm.t, whether as temporal ‘before he (has/had) heard’ or, in Middle Egyptian, after particles, with the sense ‘not yet’.

16 Borchouts, Ägyptisch I, 102-105 ($47-48$); so also Englund, Middle Egyptian, 72. For the term "Terminativ" as restricted to r sDm.t see Junge, [Sprache], in: LÄ V, 1185 (1.2.2); id., Einführung Neuägyptisch, 243; Simpson, Demotic Grammar, 120 (7.5.2).

17 See also my note 39 below.
reference, but \( n \text{sDm.t=f} \) "before he has heard" a (relative) past time reference. Since "until" means no more than "all the time before", it is obvious that Loprieno's analysis of the relative time reference of the 'before'-clause is wrong. It seems to me that this analysis has been influenced by that of "while he has/had not yet heard" as relative past.\(^{18}\) A translation trap can be seen to be at work in Loprieno's analysis. Since this 'not yet' notion may have an obscuring effect on the issue at stake here, I shall for our purposes provisionally proceed from the translation with "before".

Furthermore, owing to the identification problems of the use after prepositions, I shall only proceed from the indisputable uses after \( r \) and \( Dr \), and leave aside all the prepositions after which the \( s\text{Dm.t=f} \) of verbs with masculine infinitive does not occur.

Whereas the meaning of the construction \( r \text{sDm.t=f} \) is consistent with that of \( n \text{sDm.t=f} \)--if the claimed modal meaning "so that/in order that" is considered to derive from the temporal "until/before"--this is different in the case of \( Dr \text{sDm.t=f} \).

Among the meanings given for \( Dr \text{sDm.t=f} \) is that of "before/until", in addition to "since/from the moment that". Despite the fact that the former meaning is not recognized by a number of scholars, it is one in perfect tune with the other two certain uses, i.e. \( n \text{sDm.t=f} \) ("while not yet = "before") and \( r \text{sDm.t=f} \) ("until"). Thus, of the meanings claimed for \( Dr \text{sDm.t=f} \), "before" is shared with \( n \text{sDm.t=f} \) and "until" with \( r \text{sDm.t=f} \). These two constructions do not share the other meaning claimed for \( Dr \text{sDm.t=f} \), i.e. "since/from the moment that".

This makes it most attractive to return to Westendorf's hypothesis, albeit provisionally in a slightly modified form, and exclusively on the basis of the indisputable uses.

It is postulated here that the constructions in which the \( \text{sDm.t=f} \) indisputably occurs, share, on the basis of exclusivity, the translation with "before/until" (and, provisionally, also the derived "so that/in order that"), and further that they have only relative future time reference in common. With respect to the uncertain uses after prepositions other than \( r \) and \( Dr \), of which Gardiner said that there is nothing to prevent an interpretation as the infinitive, it is pointed out here that, indeed, their meanings do not suit my hypothesis. This does not appear to be fortuitous, and encourages a test of the hypothesis.

This hypothesis is somewhat more cautious than that of Westendorf, who noticed a connection between this time reference and the verb form itself. Although this is not an illogical thought at all, in the case of constructions it is necessary to first determine the roles of the constituents in acquiring this meaning. Therefore, I do not attach this property to the verb form itself without reserve, but provisionally only to the constructions in their entirety.

Constructions translated with "before/until" can be said to be subordinate temporal clauses, the time reference/tense of which is located in a future relative to the time of the main clause. Thus, the constructions \( r \text{sDm.t=f} \) with the meaning "until" and \( Dr \text{sDm.t=f} \) with the meaning "before/until" contradict Gardiner's statement that all constructions of preposition + \( \text{sDm.t=f} \), including \( r \) and \( Dr \), have a relative past meaning, i.e. anterior to the time of the main verb.\(^{19}\) A relative past meaning would require a translation with temporal "since/from the moment that" or "after".

Apparently, the concept of relative time reference/relative tense tends to cause confusion, and it seems necessary to elucidate it in some detail.

§ 4. Relative versus absolute tense/time reference.

Before describing the characteristics of relative tense/relative time reference, I would like to introduce a working distinction between the terms "tense" and "time reference", to avoid possible terminological confusion. The term "tense" will be exclusively reserved for verb forms, which are tenses, either absolute or relative. The term "time reference" will be used as a general term, or when it concerns subordinate clauses. Instead of saying that a temporal subordinate clause has a specific "relative time reference", it can also be referred to as having "relative tense". This latter use of the term "tense" is avoided in this study.

The concept of relative time reference is best clarified by contrasting it with absolute time reference. In the case of absolute time reference the present moment of speech is the deictic centre. Present time reference means coincidence (simultaneity) of the time of the situation and the present moment of speech; past time reference means location of the situation before (prior, anterior to) the present moment; and future time reference means location of the situation after (posterior,

\(^{18}\) See my note 15 above and the end of this section §3.

\(^{19}\) See §1 above [p. 4].
subsequent to) the present moment.\footnote{Comrie, Tense, 36. For a brief general summary see Comrie, \textit{Tense}, in: Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 4558-4563. For criticism of the tense model developed by Reichenbach, Elements of Symbolic Logic, 287-298, which also includes a reference point for what is called here absolute tense, see Comrie, Reichenbach’s approach, in: Papers from the Seventeenth Regional Meeting, 24-30. For an application of Reichenbach’s model to Egyptian tenses see Reintges, \textit{Verbal Tenses}, GM 149 (1995), 83-97.}

Whereas in the case of absolute time reference the reference point for the location of a situation in time is the present, this is different with relative time reference: the reference point for the location of a situation is some point in time given by the context, which is not necessarily the present moment.\footnote{Comrie, Tense, 56. For relative time reference with particular attention to Egyptian see Allen, \textit{Tense}, \textit{in: Essays on Eg. Grammar}, 5-11. See also Depuydt, \textit{Conjunction}, \textit{XII-XIV}.} For relative time reference all that is required is the identification of a reference point, the range of potential reference points being in principle all those compatible with the given context. Thus, the present moment, unless barred by context, is always available as a reference point for relative time reference; it is one of the possible reference points.

A relative tense is a verb form grammaticizing relative time reference.\footnote{The formulation about “relative Tempora” in Ritter, \textit{Verbalsystem}, 62 ("Verbalkonstruktionen, bei denen die Referenzzeit entweder vor oder nach der Sprechzeit liegt, nennt man ’relative Tempora’") implies the grammaticalization of relative time reference, but seems to exclude the existence of a relative present "Tempus".}\footnote{Comrie, Tense, 58.} In other words, its basic meaning is to locate a situation relative to a reference point in the context; the relative time reference is part of the meaning of the form in question. Thus, a relative tense is quite strictly one which is interpreted relative to a reference point provided by the context.\footnote{Comrie, op. cit., 125.} The meaning of a relative tense does not contain any reference to the anchoring in time of the reference point itself.\footnote{For the exclusion of the existence of a relative present "Tempus" see Ritter, \textit{Verbalsystem}, 62.}

A relative present tense grammaticizes simultaneity (coincidence) with the reference point in the context,\footnote{For a similar approach with respect to subordinate clauses see Ritter, op. cit., 203.} and can be defined as "I hear/am hearing relative to a reference point in the context"; when a subordinate temporal clause has relative present time reference, it is primarily translated with "while", "when".\footnote{Note the remarkable statement in Grandet – Mathieu, \textit{Cours d’égyprien II}, 112 that the conjunctions m-xt and r-sA “after” are “conjunctions exprimant postériorité”. I have to assume that this switch is a regrettable printer’s error; see also my next note.} A relative past tense grammaticizes location anterior to (prior to, before) the reference point, and can be defined as "I have already heard relative to a reference point in the context"; when a subordinate temporal clause has relative past time reference, it is primarily translated with "since", "after".\footnote{See my preceding note. In this case they claim that tp-a ”before” is a conjunction expressing anteriority.} A relative future tense grammaticizes location subsequent to (posterior to, after) the reference point, and can be defined as "I am to hear yet relative to a reference point in the context"; when a subordinate temporal clause has relative future time reference, it is primarily translated with "before", "until".\footnote{20
\footnote{Comrie, Tense, 36. For a brief general summary see Comrie, \textit{Tense}, in: Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 4558-4563. For criticism of the tense model developed by Reichenbach, Elements of Symbolic Logic, 287-298, which also includes a reference point for what is called here absolute tense, see Comrie, Reichenbach’s approach, in: Papers from the Seventeenth Regional Meeting, 24-30. For an application of Reichenbach’s model to Egyptian tenses see Reintges, \textit{Verbal Tenses}, GM 149 (1995), 83-97.}
In terms of absolute time reference, the "reference point/situation" can coincide (be simultaneous with) the present moment, and then has absolute present time reference; it can be located before (prior, anterior to) the present moment of speech, and then has absolute past time reference; it can also be located after (subsequent, posterior to) the present moment, and then has absolute future time reference.

Furthermore, tenses may combine absolute and relative time reference. The English pluperfect (e.g., "John had already finished his manuscript yesterday") and future perfect (e.g., "John will have finished his manuscript by tomorrow") are absolute-relative tenses. The pluperfect indicates a time point before some reference point in the absolute past, and the future perfect indicates a situation prior to a reference point in the absolute future.

After this theoretical exposition I will now turn to some examples of sentences combining absolute and relative time reference. In the following examples this combination is, for the sake of the central issue in this study, deliberately confined to the possibilities with "before/until". However, in reality this combination offers a host of possible time relations in the sentence.

It can, for example, be said of "I washed myself, before/until I entered the temple" that the subordinate clause with "before/until" has a relative future time reference with respect to the time of the main clause, which is absolute past: thus, relative future in the absolute past. A general statement "I wash myself, before/until I enter the temple" contains a subordinate clause, the time reference of which is future relative to the absolute present time of the main clause: thus, relative future in the absolute present: Finally, a sentence "I shall wash myself, before/until I enter the temple" contains a subordinate clause, the time reference of which is also future relative to the absolute future time of the main clause: thus, relative future in the absolute future.

To avoid possible confusion between the reference time and the time of the context, I would like to point out that these do not necessarily coincide. Thus, for example, when the last example above is embedded in a narrative past context, e.g. "(yesterday) he said: 'I shall wash myself, before I enter the temple'". In such a case the reference time is the absolute future time of "I shall wash myself", but the time of the context is absolute past.

§ 5. The strategy with respect to Dr sDm.t=f required for the investigation of the hypothesis.

After this section on time reference and tense I would like to return to the general hypothesis on the sDm.t=f constructions, the verification and disproval of which must concentrate on the construction Dr sDm.t=f. For a derived hypothesis that this construction has exclusively a relative future time reference, the following strategy of investigation is required.

1) To produce convincing evidence that the translation of Dr sDm.t=f admits, preferably exclusively, "before", in the first place on the basis of indisputable examples, but also in examples where it can be inferred that it must concern the sDm.t=f.

2) Vice versa, it must be ascertained that in examples requiring a translation with "before/until", the verb form can be explained as a sDm.t=f.

3) It must be ascertained as far as possible whether indubitable examples of Dr sDm.t=f claimed to mean "since/from the moment that" are actually best, or may only be, translated with "before/until".

4) To reconsider the formally ambiguous examples claimed to contain Dr sDm.t=f with the required meaning "since/from the moment that", and to present an alternative solution of the use of a feminine infinitive.

5) To determine in cases of Dr + -t-affixed form where the verb form is ambiguous and the meaning is debatable--at least to some extent--whether the verb form can be a sDm.t=f, if opting for "before/until", or a feminine infinitive, in the case of "since/from the moment of".

It is remarked here in advance that examples of Dr sDm.t=f, not only the indubitable ones but also the inferred ones, are very sparse in Old and Middle Egyptian compared with the two other certain uses of sDm.t=f.

As a general remark valid for the whole study of the sDm.t=f I would like to point out here that I share the rather general reserve towards identifying "verbal nouns" (also called "verbal abstracts" or "gerunds"). With respect to the present issue, -t-affixed forms should only be identified as verbal

29 Comrie, Tense, 65.
30 Comrie, op.cit., 70.
31 See also Patanè's remarks, Miscellanea, VA 2 (1986), 139.
nouns, defectively written (sDm(w/y)t) or not (sDm(t)), when no other alternative seems possible. This is particularly relevant since my approach to the sDm.t=f verb form is to a large extent based on presenting alternative identifications of alleged sDm.t=f forms.

§ 6. The other verb forms following the conjunction Dr.

That with a verbal substantive like the infinitive following Dr the meaning is "since", "from the moment of" is a well-known and generally recognized fact, since this is in accordance with the meaning of the use with a normal substantive (e.g., Dr (nk) nTr "since [the time of] the god"). From a number of examples it has become evident that Dr followed by the Prospective sDm=f also has the meaning "since". Rightly, Anthes claims a meaning of causal "since" for Dr + Substantival sDm=f, but this causal meaning is of no further concern to our issue of relative time reference.

In connection with the above alternatives, it may be convenient to dwell on some points of syntax and morphology. The first one I shall deal with is the expression of subject and object with the rivals sDm.t=f and feminine infinitive. There is, theoretically, a fundamental difference between the semantic roles of the sole suffix pronoun or substantive, i.e., when it concerns the infinitive of a transitive verb as object, and when it concerns a suffix conjugation form as subject. However, in practice this difference does not play any significant part, since an object is usually present in both cases and the expression of the semantic subject and object is identical with that in the suffix conjugation.

Other points of interest are the two active (Subjunctive) Prospective sDm=f forms iw.t=f and in.t=f, with the anomalous t-morpheme, and the stem of the verb iw/iy in the verb forms infinitive, sDm.t=f and (Subjunctive) Prospective sDm=f. The always identifiable sDm.t=f form after the negation n in Middle Egyptian proves the sDm.t=f form of the verb iw/iy to be iy.t=f. The form iw.t is

---

32 Reserve on Gardiner’s part seems to appear from the fact that remarks on the verbal abstracts are 'hidden' in the introduction to the infinitive in Eg., 223-223 (§298). Lefebvre, GEC, 209-210 (§413) grants them a special place. See further the brief remarks in Borghouts, Ägyptisch I, 93 (§42.d).
34 Anthes, op.cit., 11, ex. 22 (Dr xay.w=k). Borghouts, Ägyptisch I, 59 (§29.d.15), 114 (§51.e, n.213) and 127-128 (§58). Vernus, Future at Issue, 16, n.64 (Dr mAn=-i) and 30 (i.1). Polotsky, Transpositions, IOS 6 (1976), 24 (2.7.2), quoting CT [1055] VII 308 c/B1C/B31/B2L (Dr ir.w=k xT nh t=f), translates with "if" (French "si"); "as soon as" would have suited the meaning of Dr better. Further, CT [1103] VII 429 d/B1C (Dr iw.w=k xT nh m=i; var. B9C iy.w). The Prospective sDm=f in Middle Egyptian can with sufficient justification be seen as one unitary suffix conjugation form which covers two originally different forms; I label this form simply the Prospective sDm=f. This term is used in Vernus, Future at Issue, 15 ff. to indicate a separate form which is distinct from the Prospective sDm.w=f (I consider the latter name to be unfortunate because of the absence of the -w-affix in the Ilae gem. verbs). Given the interchangeability in many of the uses of these forms, the circumstance that the w-morpheme of the Prospective sDm.w=f is quite often absent in Middle Egyptian and, consequently, the forms are identical but for a few exceptions with different stems, it is quite often impossible to decide which of the original forms is being used. Whenever the distinction is necessary, I label Vernus's Prospective sDm=f the Subjunctive Prospective sDm=f (because dependent usage is the original characteristic) and his Prospective sDm.w=f the Emphatic Prospective sDm=f (see the chart in Vernus, op.cit., 52). For my Subjunctive Prospective sDm=f see Vernus, op.cit., 15-16; see particularly Schenkel, Verbalflexion PT, Bior 42 (1985), 488-489 (§4.3) on the sDm.f as occurring in Middle Egyptian in the syntactic environment of the Subjunctive Prospective sDm=f. The merged Prospective sDm=f is treated as one form in Borghouts, Ägyptisch I, 105-115 (§§49-51); for a characterization see pp. 105-106 (§49.a).
35 Anthes, op.cit., 9 (IV) and 11-12 (exs. 25-34); omitted as a shade of meaning in Gardner, EG, 131 (§176.3). Evidence supporting Anthes comes from the CT, where the deceased speaks of himself, or is spoken of, as an accepted intimate, "because he knew", e.g. CT [630] VII 252 c/Sq6C; [1058] VII 311 d; [1063] VII 320 c; [1081] VII 354 b; [1087] VII 365 b-c; [1113] VII 444 b; [1168] VII 511 a; for the negative with tm, see CT [1109] VII 438 d.
36 It does, however, in the example from the temple of Seti I at Abydos discussed in Appendix B below [*p. 24*].
37 For the verb iw/iy as a semantic unity see Winand, Verbe iy/iy, LingAeg 1 (1991), 383 (§41). Add to his listing of studies advocating two distinct, though related verbs Borghouts, Ägyptisch I, 102-103 (§47.4.1 + c), opting for two verbs with distinct meaning: iy/iy "vertrekken" ["to leave"] versus iy "aankomen" ["to arrive"].
38 Winand, op.cit., 378 (§38). Schenkel, Tübingener Einführung, 164 (7.3.1.1.3). Borghouts, Ägyptisch I, 103 (§47.b), Gardner, EG, 318 (§403). Lefebvre, GEC, 211 (§416 and §417). For iy.t=f as a sDm.t=f form see Depuydt, Prospective sDm=t, JARCE 30 (1993), 23.
typical for the (Subjunctive) Prospective $sDm=t=f$,\textsuperscript{39} and the infinitive admits both the forms $iwt$ and $iyt$.\textsuperscript{40}

The form written int=f can, of course, either represent the suffix conjugation forms $sDm.t=f$ or (Subjunctive) Prospective $sDm=f$ (int=t=f), or the infinitive (int).

\textbf{§ 7. Anthes's opinion on the meaning of Dr and Dr $sDm.t=f$.}

It is fortunate that the meaning of Dr $sDm.t=f$ has been studied in some detail by Anthes, although his conclusions radically contradict the above hypothesis.\textsuperscript{41} His point of departure is the local meaning of the substantive Dr "limit" and the derived (almost) exclusively temporal meaning of the preposition/conjunction Dr, which denotes a "time point" (German "Zeitpunkt") and should theoretically include the expression of directions in relation to it, as the preposition m does. This theory of a meaning involving direction led him to assume that Dr as a conjunction could only mean "since" or "until", the meanings "after" and "before" being excluded.

Nevertheless, while accepting the meaning of temporal "since", he takes an impartial position towards the textual evidence and assesses whether "until" or "before" is the more suitable translation for Dr $sDm.t=f$. Partly based on his observation of the sluggish and inert attitude of subordinates, who only tend to start working when confronted with the presence of a superior, he argues that both "before" and "until" should be dropped in favour of German "dieweil" (now obsolete), "denn" (English "for"), "wel" (English "because"). Thus, the possible translation of a sentence like "hurry up with the execution of your task, before/until this overseer arrives/has arrived" is considered by him to be inferior to "hurry up with the execution of your task, because the overseer has arrived". In this solution Dr $sDm.t=f$ has the causal meaning "since".

As may be learned from English "since", which can have both a purely temporal and a derived causal meaning, this meaning of Dr $sDm.t=f$ would actually affiliate it instead with the temporal dimension of a relative past meaning "since". The analogy with English "since" was also noticed by Anthes.\textsuperscript{42}

It will be sufficient to recall here the passage from Sinuhe B, 32-33 Dr n=f nn rx.n=f qd=i $sDm.n=f$ SsA=i "it was after/because he had come to know my character and after/because he had heard of my skill that he said this".

As Anthes's argument concerning the meaning of Dr $sDm.t=f$ is actually the opposite of my hypothesis, extra attention must be paid to the translations of the examples collected by him in the presentation of the evidence.

\textbf{§ 8. Three indubitable instances of Dr $sDm.t=f$ in Coffin Texts spells.}

\textsuperscript{39} Winand, op. cit., 375 ($\S$30). I reject the opinion of Borghouts, Egytisch I, 102 ($\S$47.a.2. (1+4) that the $sDm.t=f$ form occurs in an independent use (op. cit., 103 ($\S$47.c) or after rad (op. cit., 105 ($\S$48.c)) while being restricted to only three verbs, namely iw (the form iw.t=f), ini (the form in.t=f) and iy (no evidence for iy.t=f is given). The use of iw.t=f (and in.t=f) is in every respect in tune with that of the (Subjunctive) Prospective $sDm.t=f$. It is inconceivable to me that only three verbs are admitted to these purported uses of the $sDm.t=f$, independent as well as after rad, while, moreover, there seems to be no evidence for the form iy.t=f with future time reference in these uses. Further remarkable consequences would be that the verb iw "to leave" would occur only once in the use after the negation n as against many examples of n iy.t=f. Actually, Borghouts's view of the forms iw.t=f/in.t=f--and iy.t=f with future time reference--in independent use or after rad is divergent from all modern studies. Even at the time when only the dichotomy between Perfective and Imperfective $sDm.t=f$ was recognized, important grammars like Gardiner, EG (see p. 365 ($\S$448)), Lefebvre, GEC (see p. 129 ($\S$246)) and Edel, AÄG (see p. 216 ($\S$473)) considered the $-t$-affixed form to be an anomalous form of the $sDm.t=f$, now generally accepted to be the Subjunctive Prospective $sDm.t=f$. For a survey of the history of the Prospective $sDm.t=f$ forms in Middle Egyptian see Depuydt, op. cit., 11-31 (for the form iw.t=f particularly 23-24, sub 6-7).

\textsuperscript{40} Gardiner, EG, 224 ($\S$299), nn.17-18. Contra Winand, op. cit., 384 ($\S$45.b) and 387 (table), who makes a distinction between the verbal noun iw and the infinitive iy. For evidence of iw as infinitive see: infinitive in narrative use iw (Sinuhe B, 109), iw + agential in (Inscr. Wadi Hammamat 110, 3), iw=t=f (Inscr. Wadi Hammamat 17, 15); infinitive in the Pseudoverbal Sentence with m + infinitive ($s$ 10 $m$ iw s 10 $m$ Smt in Sinuhe B, 248) and in concomitant use ($m$ iw=t=f) in Urk. IV 89,8); infinitive in the construction iw pw it.n=f/iry (Sinuhe B 236, B 242, R 156; Pap. Westcar, 8,4 and 12,6).

\textsuperscript{41} Anthes, Präpositionen m und Dr, in: Stud. Wilson, 4-13.

\textsuperscript{42} Anthes, op. cit., 7.
First I shall deal with the examples in CT Spells 420 and 769.

CT [420] V 257 b-c/B1L. ha. y=ti a=a=f] wi m S n Hsmn Dr aq.t=f i] iwnyt "I shall go down and wash myself in the Lake of Natron, before/until I enter the columned hall". A translation with "until" would entail that the deceased has descended and purified himself all the time before entering the iwnyt; this is not very likely. Continuing the past time reference of aq.t=f in section "a"—note that the parallel B1Y has here the Indicative sDm=f form aq.t=f!—Faulkner translated "I have gone down so that I may wash myself in the Lake of Natron, since I have entered into the pillared hall".

This translation forces one to the improbable assumption that the iwnyt is not a sacred part of the temple proper, because the deceased has entered it before going down to the sacred lake for the purification needed for entry into the temple.

CT [769] VI 404 f-n. sS.y n=Tn mAw=t=Tn Dr swA= Dr Wsir Hr=Tn Dr swA=t N. pn Hr=Tn "lay down your staffs, before Osiris passes by you, before this N passes by you". Whereas in dictionaries and grammars the verb swA is generally regarded as a caus. 2-1it. swA 48—which would have a feminine infinitive—or a caus. IIIae inf. swA 49—which may have a feminine or masculine infinitive—Allen has pointed out that the verb is not a causative formation, but a IVae-inf., which may have a masculine or feminine infinitive. 50 It would indeed be surprising to find causative verbs written abbreviated without the s- of causation, which is very often the case with swA written with just the cross sign (Z9) representing the whole consonantal value. Further evidence seems to be forthcoming from the same corpus of the Coffin Texts in the spell title "spell for passing by...". This type of title is generally considered to contain the infinitive, and this verb consistently shows the form swA here. 51

The next example is the only indubitable one in a series of similar phrases in two related Coffin Texts spells.

CT [404] V 186 f-g/B10C. Dd rni in sAtw Dr xnd.t=k Hr=f "say my name, says the ground, before/until you tread on me".

In my opinion, the only possible translation of Dr xnd.t=k is with "before", as was also the opinion of D. Mueller, who discusses Spells 404 and 405 in detail. 52 The punctual Aktionsart of the verb "to say" precludes a translation with "until". We have here a relative future time reference for the subordinate clause with respect to a reference point in the absolute (immediate) future, set by the injunction. Here the deceased has to show that he knows the secret password of the name of the ground, since you would tread on me), because it is practically the same as the adequate translation with causal "since" + future verb form, as Faulkner does ("tell my name, says the ground, since you would tread on me")...
translation with "now that you are going to step on me". The planned stepping on the ground by the deceased takes place later in time than pronouncing the name, and the time relations of the main and the subordinate clauses relative to one another are the same as in a translation with "before".

The same situation of a series of trials for the deceased about his knowledge of the names of the gate to be passed occurs in Book of the Dead ch. 125. It will be sufficient to deal with only the first trial, since the series is repeated again and again in the same wording.

BD ch. 125, 89-90/Nu (P. BM 10,477).

"we will not let you enter past us, say the jambs of this gate, unless after you have told our name".

Note that Dd.n=k is a Circumstantial sDm.n=f after focal n-is. The threat is here explicit, and makes it clear that the deceased will not be admitted unless he says the password. When adapted to the CT formula, the wording would be as follows: "say our name, say the jambs of this gate, before you enter past us".

§ 9. The inferred examples of Dr sDm.t=f in Coffin Texts Spell 405.

In the related Spell 405 a trial similar to Spell 404 occurs. The verb forms after Dr can now also be identified with certainty as sDm.t=f forms, although the verbs used all have a feminine infinitive.

CT [405] V 203 l/M 1C. [djm m n dpt tn Dr hAy.t=k r=t s "pronounce the name of this boat, before you descend into it".

CT [405] V 207 b-c/M 1C. idm m n itrw Dr hAy.t=Tn r=t s "pronounce the name of the river, before you descend to it".

CT [405] V 207 g-h/M 1C. idm m n TAw Dr fA.t=Tn im=f "pronounce the name of the wind, before you sail with it".

CT [405] V 207 k-l/M 1C. idm m n axmt Dr pr.t=k [Hr=s] "pronounce the name of the riverbank, before you go out on it".

CT [405] V 207 k-l/M 1NY. dm m n ixmt Dr hA.t=k Hr=s "pronounce the name of the riverbank, before you descend on it".

Faulkner translated the first passage (203 l) with "when you go" and the others with causal "since" + present tense.

The spells are the predecessors of Book of the Dead ch. 99, one copy of which has preserved the Dr sDm.t=f constructions almost literally.

BD ch. 99, 28-30/Nu (P. BM 10,477).

"tell me my name, says the wind, before you sail with me ... tell me my name, says the river, before you cross (on) me ... tell me my name, says the ground, before you tread on me".

Anthes, who translates only the first two passages with "because you have set sail with me ... because you cross (on) me", explains his choice here by remarking in a note that wind and water...
have the deceased already in their power, and extort his answer. The absence of the t in xnd[t]=k and the mistaken replacement by xnd.n=k can be explained by confusion on the part of the copyist caused by the coalescence of the dental d and the t marking the verb form.

Of some interest for this point is that it can safely be assumed that the Dr sDm.t=f construction had already become extinct in the Neo-Middle Egyptian of the New Kingdom, because there is only one other instance—at least as far as I know—from a historical inscription to be discussed in some detail in Appendix A. It had no successor in Late Egyptian, and the poor understanding that New Kingdom scribes obviously had of the construction and its meaning is very understandable under these circumstances.

§ 10. Two indubitable examples from the Pyramid Texts.

Whereas Dr sDm.t=f has virtually disappeared from Neo-Middle Egyptian, the construction does occur in Old Egyptian, the first phase of Classical Egyptian. I shall turn first to two indubitable examples from the Pyramid Texts.

PT [541] §1334a. See Griffiths, ch. 137 before "the earth dawns."

If the verb sHw is referring to defeating and finishing Seth rather than to prolonged fighting with an ultimate victory only gained at the time of dawn, "until" is not very appropriate; but with prolonged fighting, it is all right. "Until!" fits the prolonged action of protection until dawn, but "before" would be all right in any case. Seth, who translates Dr HD.t A with "as soon as" + past tense, remarks in his commentary that the text was conceived of as spoken during the night, the time that Osiris is asleep. The night as the time of chaos is Seth’s finest hour, in which he feels most comfortable, and the night would, therefore, tend to be the time during which most danger on his part can be expected. Since the king as Osiris will awaken at dawn and can then take better care of himself, the protective activities of the Sons of Horus should concentrate on the night, i.e. before "the earth dawns."

Another example containing the sDm.t=f of an immutable verb is the following:

PT [667] §1936b = Revised Number §1938c/N.t. See Borghouts, Études VI, 23/Nu (P. BM 10,477), which has Dr HD tA. However, the absence of t occurs here again with a verb stem with a final dental, but, at that, the following word tA also begins with a t.

Another example containing the sDm.t=f of an immutable verb is the following:


Anthes, op. cit., 9, ex. 6; see also Anthes, Das objektlose iri n, JEA 55 (1969), 44 (5).

The grammatical analysis of the preceding clause PT §1333d, which happens to contain another Dr construction--syntactically unconnected, so it seems--is somewhat ambiguous, which results in uncertain translations; cf. Sethe, Übersetzung und Kommentar PT V, 256 and 257-258, and Faulkner, Pyramid Texts, 210.

Schott, Löschen von Fackeln, ZÄS 73 (1937), 9: "bis(?)". Junker, Giza III, 93.


See Barta, Unt. zum Götterkreis, 184 on protective activities. On the enmity between Seth and the king as Osiris see Griffiths, Conflict of Horus and Seth, 4-7.


Publ. Lapp, Papryrus Nu, pl. 77; Budge, Book of the Dead, 307 [23/ sheet 26]; id., Book of the Dead. Facsimiles, pl. 56/Nu; Naville, Totenbuch 1, pl. 150 (137A, 11). Allen, Book of the Dead, 114 (137A, S 2): "from dawn on".

Faulkner, Pyramid Texts. Supplement, 39. For the Revised Number see Allen, Inflection, 316 (§466).

Faulkner, Pyramid Texts, 260: "since the sky [and earth] became at peace". Allen, Inflection, 316 (§466): "since the sky [and earth] has gone to rest"; it is noted that version P has Htp pt. However, Allen, Cosmology PT, in: Religion and Philosophy, 25: "in the sky’s [and earth’s] resting place."
speaker may have said that he is unable to locate him (the king as Osiris), even after sky and earth have come to rest, this in order to indicate how very hidden he is. Although the case is semantically somewhat ambiguous and either case is defendable, a translation with "before" is the one that, in my opinion, gives the better sense: that he hopes to find him is implied in what the speaker says, and, explicitly, he states that he is unable to do so as long as sky and earth are not yet at peace.

§ 11. One indubitable and five inferred examples in Old Kingdom tomb inscriptions.

This concerns the type of sentence that induced Anthes to favour a translation with causal "since". Tomb of Idu, Qasr el-Sayed. Aṣr sin Dr xpr.t wnm t "roast, hurry up, before/until the meal takes place". Edel and Junker translate with "before", which is, in my opinion, the only possible translation because the food has to be prepared in advance—particularly when a long process such as the roasting of meat is involved!—and has to be finished before the workers arrive from the fields to have their meal. On this practical ground the translation with "until" and that of Anthes with "for it is (the time of) the meal" can be excluded.

This point of having finished before people arrive is also crucial in the following situations where, moreover, it concerns persons of superior rank. The legends to these scenes must all contain Dr sDm.t=f constructions, although the forms are morphologically ambiguous, all the verbs involved having a feminine infinitive. Tomb of Ankhmahor, Saqqara. aHa wn nty-Hna=i sxp=k Drww pn Hr pr Dr iy.t Xry-Hb r it xit "stand up, hurry, my fellow, in order that you transport this rib piece from the house, before the lector-priest arrives to perform the rite". It is barely conceivable that for something as important as the funerary offering by the lector priest things would not have been fully prepared in advance. With a verb denoting very short duration like aHa "to stand up" and the limited duration of the transport "until" would be very awkward.

Tomb of Ankhmahor, Saqqara. di iwt n=i mAHD pn Dr iy.t Xry-Hb "bring this antelope to me, before the lector priest arrives." "Until" is not a good alternative.

Tomb of Ti, Saqqara. sSr wn Tw Dr iy.t awty pw "milk, hurry up, before this herdsman arrives". Egyptian Museum Cairo Painting CG 1784. mniw pw anx Hr=k r Sy pw iw=f m Sp Dr hA.t=sn r mw "O herdsman, let your look be alert (lit., lively) against this creature, which approaches furtively, before/until they (= the herd) descend/have descended into the water". Here too, "before/until" provides the only reasonable sense. Furthermore, Anthes's choice of causal "since"--or "now that" with the same sense--seems out of the question because, in the context of the tomb scene, admitting in its legend a situation of carelessness—i.e. watching out for a crocodile only as late as the herd is already in the water—would refer to the most improper behaviour of endangering the lives of livestock. For this reason such an exclamation can hardly be part of the repertoire of scenes and their accompanying texts. The rather inexact correspondence between text and scene in this case presents no real problem: the scene of the herd crossing the water belongs to the standard repertoire of the Old Kingdom mastabas, while the recordings of such exclamations as the above come from the realm of flexible and lively actual speech situations.

Tomb Chapel of Pepiankh-Heny the Black (A, no. 2), Meir. m(i) iqr.(w) Dr iy.t sr "come diligently, before the official arrives". Because this identification see Allen, op.cit., 25.

74 For this identification see Allen, op.cit., 25.
75 See §7 above. Anthes, Präpositionen m and Dr, in: Stud. Wilson, 9, exs. 1-5. For "before" see Junker, Giza III, 93.
76 Published Montet, Tombeaux Kasr-el-Sayed, Kémi 6 (1936), 118.
77 Junker, Giza III, 93. Edel, AĀG, 371 (§739). Verhoeven, Grillen, kochen, backen, 37: "well".
78 Capart, Rue de tombeaux, pl. 56, 2nd col. right.
79 Capart, op.cit., pl. 45, lower reg.
80 Steindorff, Grab des Ti, pl. 111, 3rd reg., right end.
82 Erman, op.cit., 30: "ehel(?)".
83 Blackman - Apted, Meir V, pl. 31, lowest register, right.
84 Blackman - Apted, Meir V, 40: translated "mind your steps when the noble comes". The example is noted in Hannig, Grosses Handwörterbuch, 1011 (3).
No examples of this type seem to be forthcoming from the following period, the First Intermediate Period up to the Second Intermediate Period.

§ 12. Four morphologically and semantically ambivalent examples in the Pyramid Texts.

According to the hypothesis, the verb forms should be identified either as sDm.t=f forms, when "before/until" is to be translated, or as as feminine infinitives in the case of "since".

PT [440] §815b-c.\(^{15}\) xtm=k w aAway pt xsf=k w xsf=s Dr SDm.t=f/k SDt=k ka N r pt in "you must not close the double door of heaven, you must not bar its bars, before/until you have carried away//since (/after) your carrying away the ka of this N to this heaven". The translations with "before" and "until" are both possible, owing to the negation in the main clause. On the one hand, Horus may be invoked not to close the doors of heaven before/until the king's ka has arrived, because the king's ka will plead there for the king's admission and lead him to the great god.\(^{87}\)

Since, obviously, the king himself has not yet arrived, it is, on the other hand, imaginable that, though the king's ka is inside, Horus is advised not to close the doors because the king himself has yet to arrive.\(^{87}\) In this case Dr "since" in the slightly different sense of "after", "now that", which also express a relative past time relation, would be suitable. Faulkner, who, in general, translates similar constructions with causal "since", opts here for "before/until that you have taken".\(^{89}\)

A variant version of this spell is PT Spell 726.

PT [726] §2252b.\(^{90}\) xsf=k w xsfwy=s Dr pr.t/spr kN ir pt "you must not bar its double bar, before/until the ka of N has gone out into heaven//since (/after) the going out of the ka of N into heaven". In this spell, too, the king's mounting up to the great god is referred to in the following passages. Thus, both translations "before/until" and "since" ("after/now that") are also possible here.

Two further ambiguous instances are the following.

PT [553] §1355a-b.\(^{91}\) ifdt=k Smwtp iptw ptpt-away HAT 1 tr Smt(i) Smt im n NTr Dr hAT /hAT ra NDr=n=f n=f a=k "these four paths of which lie in front of the tomb of Horus, make your departure on them to the god, before/until the sun has set//since the setting of the sun, that he might take your arm".\(^{92}\) While Edel translates with "before (/until)" here,\(^{92}\) a number of others, including Sethe and Allen, opt for temporal "since/once".\(^{94}\)

PT [689] §2091a-c. 5w wTs Nwt wTs n=k ir 1w ir sHdw pt Dr Hms.t /Hmst 1w Hr xnd=f pw biA "Shu who raises Nut, raise the Eye of Horus to the sky, to the starry firmament of the sky, before Horus has seated himself//since(alter) Horus' sitting on that metal throne of his". In contrast to options for "since" without further commentary on the contents,\(^{95}\) Schott places his translation with...
"until" in the context of the pyramid cult with the king in the role of Horus.\textsuperscript{96}

§ 13. Two cases with Dr \textit{wnt}/Dr \textit{wn.t} in Old and Middle Egyptian.

The examples with the writing \textit{wnt} require particular caution, owing to the occurrence of the nominalizing particle \textit{wnt} after Dr.

Pap. (med.) BM 10059. 14,7... n ph\textit{wyt} Xt mi ... Dr \textit{wn.t} \textit{wn.ti} "... the hind parts and (of) the belly like ... before that which was destined to exist existed" is how Westendorf originally translated this very unclear and fragmentary passage.\textsuperscript{97} Influenced by Anthes's article, he later changed "before" later into "until" or, alternatively, causal "since".\textsuperscript{98} Grammatically, the passage is clear enough to establish that a feminine-neuter Future/Prospective Participle \textit{wn.ti} must be the subject and \textit{wn.t} a conjugated verb form. According to our hypothesis, this must be a Dr \textit{sDm.t=f} construction.

This is different in the following instance.

\textit{Urk. I} 195,10. \textsuperscript{99} Dr(-)\textit{wnt} ity rx(w) (qd=i). This passage clearly has the causal shade "because the sovereign knows my character".\textsuperscript{100} According to Edel, \textit{wnt} functions here as the nominalizer of the following Pseudoverbal construction.\textsuperscript{101} Thus, we are dealing here with causal Dr-\textit{wn.t}, in Middle Egyptian normally Dr-\textit{ntt}.

This type of construction is comparable with a case which Gardiner regarded as a clear example of s\textit{Dm.t=f}.

\textit{Stela Cairo JE 46048}. m(-)\textit{wnt} xryt Hna 6A-wr "when there was war with the Thinite nome".\textsuperscript{102} Here an Adverbial Sentence as main clause \textit{iw} xryt Hna 6A-wr seems to be converted into a subordinate one with the help of the nominalizer \textit{wnt} after the preposition \textit{m}.\textsuperscript{103} It must be said that this is an unusual construction, not only because of the combination of the preposition \textit{m} with archaizing \textit{wnt} instead of \textit{ntt}-combinations of preposition + \textit{ntt} normally have a causal shade--but also because the much simpler and more common construction of an Adverbial Sentence without \textit{iw} in circumstantial function could have been used. In my opinion, this purported case of \textit{m sDm.t=f} with the verb \textit{wnn} is most doubtful.


The example below is morphologically ambiguous, but the correct translation with "before" may be inferred from the context.

\textit{Ptahhotep}, 37-38/L2. sbA ir=k sw r mdwt Xr-HAt Dr Hms.t=k "teach him (now) in the sayings of the past, before/until you settle down".\textsuperscript{104} The preceding lines 28 ff. clearly indicate that Ptahhotep wants to retire but has not yet done so. Thus, it must be before/until the retirement of the sage that Ptahhotep is to acquaint the pupil with his wisdom, at the request of the king.

§ 15. Conclusions concerning the meaning of the Dr \textit{sDm.t=f} construction and the hypothesis.

In the discussion above I have proceeded from the general hypothesis that the three constructions in which the \textit{sDm.t=f} form indisputably occurs (n \textit{sDm.t=f}, r \textit{sDm.t=f}, Dr \textit{sDm.t=f}) share a common characteristic, i.e. relative future time reference expressed in a translation with "before" or "until". This hypothesis is contradicted by the claim that Dr \textit{sDm.t=f} can mean "since/from the moment that"

\textsuperscript{96} Schott, Pyramidenkult, 188.
\textsuperscript{97} Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 194 (§267,2).
\textsuperscript{98} Von Deines - Grapow - Westendorf, Ergänzungen, 145, ref. VIII.194 (§267,2).
\textsuperscript{99} Anthes, Prädpositionen m und Dr, in: Stud. Wilson, 10, ex. 9.
\textsuperscript{100} Thus also Anthes, ibid.: "denn". Doret, Narrative Verbal System, 84, ex. 143: "because".
\textsuperscript{101} Edel, AÄG, 538 (§1043).
\textsuperscript{102} Edel, AÄG, 370 (§735) = Gardiner, EG, XXXIV (ref. p. 321).
\textsuperscript{103} Thus also Allen, Inflection, 315 (§464,2.2.2). Cf. Edel, AÄG, 539 (§1043), ref. Petrie, Abydos I, pl. 54, fragment right below, 5 (m=a mnt). For \textit{wnt} as a syntactic counterpart of \textit{iw} see Allen, Tense, in: Essays on Eg. Grammar, 11-13.
\textsuperscript{104} Zába, Maximes de Ptahhotep, 71 and 111, sub 38: "avant de".
and by Anthes's argument that Dr sDm.t=f does not have the meaning "before/until".

Based on the material presented, my conclusions concerning Dr sDm.t=f are the following:

1. There are no examples disproving the hypothesis that Dr sDm.t=f means "before/until he (has/had) heard" and has a relative future time reference.

2. A translation with "before" is possible in all instances, but with "until" only in a number of cases. Therefore, I opt for "before" as the essential meaning, which in affirmative clauses generally involves "(at) some time before", and "until" as the implied meaning "all the time before" in the appropriate cases. One remark must be repeated here: the special situation of the presence of negation in the main clause admits both "before" and "until". Further, I shall demonstrate that "until"-clauses are the domain of r sDm.t=f instead. The r sDm.t=f construction will be elaborated on in detail in the next study.

3. The very few occurrences of Dr sDm.t=f are confined to two phases of Classical Egyptian, i.e. Old and Middle Egyptian from the Middle Kingdom. The construction occurs in some spells from the Book of the Dead that go back to, or make use of, Pyramid Texts or Coffin Texts material, but it was poorly understood because it had already disappeared from use in the historical texts in Neo-Middle Egyptian of the New Kingdom and later. Appendix A of the present study is devoted to the one exception to this.

4. All examples of Dr sDm.t=f but one (PT [667] §1936b) occur in contexts which in the main clause contain injunctions or self-exhortations. Thus, in almost all instances there is relative future time reference in an absolute (immediate) future time context. Whether this is accidental or not cannot be determined with certainty.

5. Cases of the writing Dr wnt may contain the particle wnt--later superseded by ntt--or the sDm.t=f form wn.t, this depending on the construction following.

On the basis of the results it is postulated that no examples of Dr sDm.t=f of verbs with masculine infinitive can occur with the indisputable meaning "since", and that all examples with -t- affixed forms and the meaning "since" can be explained as feminine infinitives. For some evidence to support this postulate see the appendices B and C. Until indubitable examples disproving the hypothesis of the meaning of Dr sDm.t=f are brought forward, the general hypothesis holds.

Given the rarity of Dr sDm.t=f--and, at that, almost exclusively in immediate-future contexts--and of other constructions with the meaning "before" (such as with tp-a),105 this can hardly be accidental. It would seem probable that it is the construction n sDm.t=f "while he has/had not yet heard" which covers the 'before'-notion, a point apparent from its very adequate translation with "before". This matter will also be elaborated upon in the third study on the sDm.t=f.

§ 16. The role and meaning of the preposition/conjunction Dr with verb forms.

We must now take a closer look at the individual roles of Dr and sDm.t=f in acquiring the meaning "before".

I proceed from Anthes's observation that the preposition/conjunction Dr derives from a substantive with the spatial meaning "limit" (German "Grenze") and soon acquired an exclusively temporal meaning.106 On the basis of this sense, "ultimate time point" is the closest equivalent to spatial "limit".107 It may be safely assumed that the preposition/conjunction goes back to a substantive used absolutely in an adverbial function, in a way fully comparable to the use of English "the moment that", which is interpreted as "from/since the moment that" if located at the starting point of the part on the time line occupied by the time situations in the sentence. Thus, for example, in an imaginary example like "the moment that he was born he has appeared as king", which does not require the addition of "from" or "since".

Because Dr can always be translated with "since/from the moment that"-- provisionally with Dr sDm.t=f as only exception! --I postulate that "(at) ultimate time point" is indeed the basic meaning of Dr and that this time point is always located on the left of the time line, which usually yields the

105 The ex. with sDm=t=f in Gardiner, EG, 137 (§181) and Lefebvre, GEC, 360 (§724; but see his Obs. 1 for the infinitive) contains, in my opinion, an infinitive with expression of the semantic subject and object according to the suffix conjugation.


107 For the concept of Dr(w) in contrast to IAS see Hornung, Von zweierlei Grenzen, Eranos Jahrbuch 49 (1980), [1981], 393-427.
implied meaning "since/from the moment that".\footnote{108} Judging from the equivalence in translation of Dr + infinitive and Dr + Prospective sDm=t=f with "since", "from the moment that/ of" and their interchangeability in parallels,\footnote{109} it would seem quite probable that the roles of these two verb forms do not differ much here.

The use of the Prospective sDm=t=f after Dr may be explained under the assumption that Egyptian has a very refined way of expressing sentence-internal time relations.\footnote{For example, the example "(from/since) the moment that he was born he has appeared as king" may rather more exactly be "(from/since) the moment that he was about (/going) to be born he has appeared as king". This could express that the time point involved in Dr was the beginning of the birth-giving, an event of very short duration on the time line and brought to completion very soon after: the completion lies, however, still in the future with respect to the initial moment expressed by Dr.\footnote{The punctual meaning of Dr causes this explicit formulation of the situation connected with the time point to be presented as a perfective.\footnote{The futurity with respect to Dr is of no consequence for the time relations in the sentence. This seems to me to be the reason why Dr + infinitive, which is a verb form devoid of the expression of mood or time reference, can interchange with Dr + Prospective sDm=t=f.} This explanation may account for the relative future relationship of the Prospective sDm=t=f with respect to Dr within that subordinate clause construction, but does not explain why the verb form does not locate its time situation in a future relative to the main clause situation. I suggest that this is because the Prospective sDm=t=f is essentially an absolute future tense which only receives relative time reference when occurring in a subordinate temporal clause, but does not possess the property of relating itself to the reference situation in the main clause.}

§ 17. The hypothesis refined: the verb form in Dr sDm.t=f as a relative future tense.

If we now attempt to reconcile the basic meaning "(at) the starting point" of the preposition/conjunction with Dr sDm.t=f, then "before" as a literal translation must be abandoned.

In the case of a translation with "before", the expression of the time relations between the main and the subordinate clauses proceeds from the former as the point of departure. What is expressed is that the main clause Event "A" and the implied interval are located "before" the time point of realisation of Event "B" in the subordinate clause. However, from the standpoint of the subordinate clause, its Event "B" is located "after" the time point of the main clause Event "A", with the interval following the latter.

For reasons of convenience, I now should like to slightly simplify the example CT [420] V 257 b-c into ia=i wi Dr aq,t=f i wnyt and introduce an explicit reference point in the translation. "I shall wash myself before the time point that I enter the temple hall" can be rephrased into "I shall wash myself at a time point that I am to enter the temple hall yet". Nothing has changed in the mutual time relations of the Events and the position of the interval: Event "A" is still located before Event

\footnote{108} Note that the meaning of Egyptian Dr as "starting point" is not unlike that of the Biblical Hebrew word têrêm, which as a substantive means "the very beginning, infancy, newness, freshness": see Klein, Etymol. Dict. of Hebrew, 251; Koehler - Baumgartner, Lexicon in Vet. Test. Libros, 356; Gesenius - Buhl, Handwörterbuch Alte Testament 17, 279; Gesenius - Donner, op.cit.\footnote{15}, Lief. 2, 428. It is also mainly used as a conjunction translated with "while not yet" or "before", occasionally main clause "not yet": Joüon - Muraoka, Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, 347 (§104,b), 370 (§113,j) and 607 (§160,n:VIII); Waltke - O’Connor, Introduction to Hebrew Syntax, 643 (38.7a).

\footnote{109} See for this Appendix C \[p. 26\].

\footnote{110} See Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 191 (§264), n,5, with reference to Heckel, Eigenschaftsverbum, ZÄS 82 (1957), 44.

\footnote{111} Vernus, Future at issue, 31 ("the Prospective sDm.w.f after a preposition/conjunction is not bound to convey future meanings, but can convey past ones as well") offers no explanation for the phenomenon of the future form Prospective sDm=t=f in relative past subordinate clauses of time.

\footnote{112} Cf. Loprieno, sDm.t=f, GM 37 (1980), 17 on Dr as a preposition of "punctual application". Cf. Roccati, Abgeleitete Konstr., GM 36 (1979), 40, who connects the concept "momentary/punctual" with "perfective aspect". Loprieno, Verbalsystem, 49-50 regards the verb form in Dr sDm.t=f as expressing "die realisierte perfektive [Aspekt]"; see also id., Ancient Egyptian, 151 (67.3.1).

\footnote{113} See Appendix C \[p. 26\]. I reject the opinion of Vernus, Études VI, RdE 38 (1987), 170-174 that the infinitive can be invested with perfective value. Precisely because of its indifference to tense and mood the verb form is simply an easily available alternative for finite verb forms. See already my note 4 above.}
"B", with the interval in between. However, the Reference point is now located on the left, coincidental with Event "A", and the interval is located after that time point. This reconciles the meaning of Dr in Dr sDm.t=f with the postulated basic meaning of "(at) the starting point", but entails that the verb form must be interpreted as a future tense. It expresses the situation that an Event "B" is located in a future relative to a time point that is coincidental with the main clause Event "A".

This situation suits an interpretation of the sDm.t=f as a relative future tense perfectly and necessitates abandoning the old hypothesis, which concerned the time reference of the construction, in favour of a more refined one. The new hypothesis entails three considerations: 1) the sDm.t=f verb form is a relative future tense; 2) Dr denoting an empty "time point" functions as the Reference point; 3) the main clause provides the explicit absolute time reference situation in the context.

In Dr + Prospective sDm=t this future verb form makes explicit what happened at the coincidental time point Dr. Its future time reference is only related to the 'empty' time point of Dr, and not to a main clause reference situation in the context--which would have resulted in a relative future time reference with respect to it. Because this relative location in time is not part of the meaning of the verb form, its futurity vanishes, it is 'reduced' to a punctual presentation.

It is precisely the opposite with Dr sDm.t=f. In this case it is the reference situation in the main clause which, by its temporal coincidence with the time point of Dr, denotes what happens then, and it is the Event of the sDm.t=f which is at some distance in time from the reference situation. It seems to me that, irrespective of the perfectivity or imperfectivity of this main clause situation, it merely functions as a punctual reference situation for the sDm.t=f, because the Reference point Dr with its punctual meaning is the channel through which the reference situation is only indirectly related to the Event of the sDm.t=f. This difference in relative future time location with respect to the main clause situation which exists between the two future verb forms can be satisfactorily explained if the sDm.t=f is considered to be a relative tense, part of the meaning of which is to locate its Event relative to a reference situation in the context.

The relative future tense sDm.t=f as occurring in the subordinate construction Dr sDm.t=f can be defined as follows: "it is asserted that the Event of 'hearing' is located in a future relative to a Reference point (devoid of absolute time reference, but located at the starting point of the time situations within the sentence), which is coincidental with a reference situation in the main clause (providing the absolute future time reference)".

Finally, it is noted here that the above interpretation of the sDm.t=f precludes its being a future perfect, because the future perfect, a tense combining absolute and relative time reference, locates its Event in a past relative to a Reference point in the absolute future.114

§ 18. The rarity and disappearance of Dr sDm.t=f.

Except for the rare instances of Dr sDm.t=f, the essential meaning of Dr "the moment that/of" always implies "from the moment that/of". Eventually this caused Dr to simply mean "since", "from the moment that/of". The preponderance of this developed and more restricted meaning went along with--or was responsible for--the rarity of Dr sDm.t=f and its subsequent disappearance from usage. However, it may also be that by the combination of rare usage and unusual meaning Dr sDm.t=f, in a manner of speaking, destroyed itself.

The construction could easily have disappeared for the following reason. There is another, much more frequent and flexible sDm.t=f construction, i.e. n sDm.t=f, which covers the relative future 'before'-notion and operates in any absolute time field, as will be demonstrated in the third study on the sDm.t=f. As has been pointed out, Dr sDm.t=f is, very predominantly, restricted to operating in the absolute (immediate) future time field,115 which makes it comparable to a tense combining absolute and relative time references. However, it would be going too far to consider this restriction essential to the construction, because there is one exception among the examples and because the constructions n sDm.t=f and r sDm.t=f, which supposedly contain the same verb form, are not subject to this, a point also to be elaborated in the next two studies.

---

114 In extenso concerning this: Comrie, Tense, 69-74. Contra Borghouts, Egyptisch I, 102 (§47.a.1) : "'perfect' ... sDm.t=f 'hij zal gehoord hebben' [he will have heard]; 104 (§48.a.1): n sDm.t=f "'hij heeft nog niet gehoord', eigl. 'hij zal niet gehoord hebben' ['he has not yet heard', strictly speaking 'he will not have heard']".

115 See §15 above, sub (4) [p. 19].
Finally, it is rather likely that the Egyptians encountered the same problem as the Egyptologists: how to recognize a rare Dr sDm.t=f construction in writing, with so many IIIae inf. verbs hampering an immediate correct understanding. Not only could they be in doubt, they could even be led astray towards an interpretation involving the opposite relative time reference. This may have been another reason for its disappearance.

When dealing with the simple prepositions in his grammar, Gardiner states that the meaning of Dr with sDm.t=f is ‘since’, but also strangely ‘before’, ‘until’! Indeed, in the light of the much richer evidence for Dr “from the moment that/of”, “since”, a meaning “before, until” would have seemed strange. I hope that the translation of Dr with “before” when followed by the sDm.t=f, which is accepted by some scholars, is no longer surprising, now that it has been demonstrated that it is merely an adequate rendering of the time relations in the main and the subordinate clauses, but not a literal translation of the Dr sDm.t=f construction, and that Dr to all intents and purposes, whether used with the sDm.t=f or with the infinitive/ (Subjunctive) Prospective sDm=f, has only one meaning.

Given the rarity of Dr sDm.t=f it is, however, surprising to note that the sister constructions r sDm.t=f and n sDm.t=f which are much more frequent in Middle Egyptian are of rare occurrence in the Old Kingdom. Doret has noted that the sDm.t=f does not belong to the narrative verbal system of Old Egyptian, and Edel has remarked that evidence of indubitable examples of r sDm.t=f, i.e. ones containing verbs with the masculine infinitive, turn up as late as the Middle Kingdom. The slender evidence presented for active n sDm.t=f—that is, if n wnt is left out of consideration—comes from the Pyramid Texts, but, remarkably, the passive counterpart of this construction seems to be more frequent. This passive form is the subject of the fourth study.

§ 19. Concluding words on the sDm.t=f as a relative future tense.

If the verb form in Dr sDm.t=f is accepted as a relative future tense, then the fairly complete repertoire of the future verb forms in Classical Egyptian as given by Vernus is enriched by one in the specific use studied here. For a more general statement, the question of whether the verb form in the sister constructions n sDm.t=f and r sDm.t=f can also be analysed as sharing the characteristic of being a relative future tense must first be solved. Only then can the verb form as it occurs in its three indubitable constructions definitively join the group of Classical Egyptian relative tenses. The better known members are the Circumstantial sDm=f and sDm.n=f. While these verb forms are, respectively, the relative present and the relative past tenses—which can function as absolute present and past in combination with a main clause initial particle like iw or aHa.n in the role of reference point of the present—it looks as if this relative future tense sDm.t=f, at least as far as the results for Dr sDm.t=f suggest, is anything but a circumstantial verb form.

Appendix A: a passage on Senenmut’s statue Berlin 2296 (Urk. IV 405,8).

There is a passage with an indubitable Dr sDm.t=f construction in the inscriptions on the block statue Berlin 2296 showing Senenmut with Hatshepsut’s daughter Neferure. To my knowledge, this is its only occurrence in the Neo-Middle Egyptian of the XVIIIth Dynasty. The passage is

---

116 Gardiner, EG, 131 (§176,4).
117 Doret, Narrative Verb System, 16.
118 Edel, AÄG, 368 (§734). The two examples in Allen, Inflection, 314 (§463) concern verbs with feminine infinitives. Their identification by him as r sDm.t=f constructions rests on the only partially correct assumption that “jr before the infinitive has the meaning ‘in order to’. In my opinion justifiably, Edel also attributes the meaning “until” to r + infinitive; see Edel, AÄG, 369 (§734). I will go into this point in more detail in the second study, devoted to r sDm.t=f.
119 Edel, AÄG, 370-371 (§737-8). Allen, Inflection, 312-313 (§460) and 358-359 (§530).
120 Vernus, Future at Issue.
121 Already proposed—without detailed argumentation, however—in Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 191 (§264) and in Zonhoven, M-Eg. gramm., 99 (§40.a).
discussed in some detail by Anthes, who argues that Gardiner's translation with "before" has to be rejected in favour of his earlier translation with temporal "since".123 The passage and its context read as follows.

Urk. IV 405,5-9.124 iw i n=i Hry-tp n Hryw imy-r n imyw-r-kAt iw=i m tA pn Xr wD=f Dr xpr.t mni tp-awy=f(?). iw=i m anx xr nbt tAwy nswt-bity MAAat-kA-Ra anx.ti Dt "I acted as chief of the chiefs, as overseer of the overseers of building, when I was in this country under his command, before death occurred 'in days past' (/'upon his hands'?). I am (now) in (the floruit of) life under (by?) the Mistress of the Two Lands, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Ma'atkare--may she stay alive eternally".125

The statue must be dated to a regnal year between Hatshepsut's accession and the demise of her daughter Neferure.126 In the second sentence of the passage under study Senenmut refers to the heyday of his career under Hatshepsut as reigning queen with the words iw=i m anx. The lines of this biographical part of the inscriptions preceding our passage mention no other royal person than Hatshepsut, and therefore the suffix pronoun =f in iw=i m tA pn Xr wD=f most probably refers to the queen, who in the lines preceding the passage is presented as a male as well as a female king. Senenmut gives here a very vague and general description of his early career in the service of Hatshepsut as consort of Tuthmosis II.127 by using the titles Hry-tp n Hryw and imy-r n imyw-r-kAt, and states that he had been in her service already before death occurred "in days past"--or "upon his hands", if the suffix pronoun is to be accounted for. However, it is possible that the suffix pronoun is used here cataphorically, referring to Senenmut serving the person "whose death has occurred".

This mention of the death of an unnamed person can only implicitly refer to Hatshepsut's late husband Tuthmosis II.128 It is the only death relevant, because it would be absurd and improper, in my opinion, to refer beforehand to the death of his beloved mistress in this official private monument. This avoidance of mentioning him by name may be due to reticence on account of the tragic early death of the king or, on the other hand, because of the unusual succession of his queen.

Thus, in my opinion, in this first sentence of the passage Senenmut relates his early career, before Hatshepsut succeeded her husband as queen-regent and later as reigning queen. References to the early career of Senenmut, such as this one--however vague!--are extremely rare.129

Once there was also a second suffix pronoun present, the =f in tp-awy=f. If this =f is accounted for, it can only refer to Tuthmosis II. According to Anthes and, recently, Krauss, this suffix pronoun was very carefully erased from the inscription.130 Therefore, I take it to be certain that its presence was a mistake on the part of the scribe, who may have misunderstood the meaning of the original Dr xpr.t mni tp-awy in the model, taking it to be a prepositional expression "upon his hands", and added =f for that reason. This mistake may have been noticed by Senenmut, who had it subsequently corrected by erosion of the suffix pronoun.131 In my opinion, Senenmut meant to say 'in days past', but why? It gives the impression of being some superfluous addition, and could have been left out without an essential change of meaning.

The unique use of the construction in the Neo-Middle Egyptian of the XVIIIth Dynasty historical inscriptions seems to indicate that it had fallen into oblivion or disuse in this text genre. That its meaning was no longer properly understood seems to be well illustrated by the use of certain Dr sDm=f constructions in BD ch. 99, where a translation with "before" would be most suitable.132 Senenmut, who may have composed the whole--or part of the--inscription himself,133

---

122 Anthes, Präpositionen m und Dr, in: Stud. Wilson, 6.
124 Anthes, op.cit., 10-11, ex. 15.
125 The translation of tp-awy as "predecessor", as a variant meaning of "ancestor", is to be rejected in any case; cf. for this translation Meyer, Senenmut, 165; Dorman, Monuments of Senenmut, 123. The word tpyw-a, plural "ancestors" occurs accidentally in the same inscription and is there written differently (Urk. IV 406,11).
126 Meyer, op.cit. 138-139. Id., [Neferure], in: LÄ IV, 382-383. See Vandelson, Guerres d'Amosis, 222 for the possibility that Neferure did not die young.
127 Meyer, op.cit., 286.
128 Thus also Meyer, op.cit., 289.
131 Thus also Krauss, op.cit., 52-53 with a different solution for the awkward tp-awy. He takes the time adverb as standing in anticipatory emphasis at the head of the next sentence.
132 See §9 above [p. 14].
133 There is evidence that Senenmut engaged himself in at least some of the formulations of the statue inscriptions; see Meyer, op.cit., 289.
may have selected the construction for that special reason, in order to display his erudition. An explicit mark of this pride in his originality seems to be a minor line in the same inscription which accompanies some special signs.

When selecting the construction Dr sDm.t=f, his problem was that he could not determine whether the construction could be used in absolute past time contexts: among all the examples I have collected none comes from a narrative context. All but one they have the (immediate) future time reference of injunctions and self-exhortations. In my opinion, Senenmut deliberately included an adversial expression of absolute past time, i.e. tp-away "formerly, in the past", to make sure that the Reference point Dr would be located in an absolute past time context. This is indeed an admirably clever thought, if he discovered it himself, because the corpus in which the construction occurs is quite extensive, the occurrences are rare and the construction even seems to have been extinct by the time he used it.

Appendix B: Dr + purported sDm.t=f signifying "since/from the moment that" in Anthes's study and reference works on Old and Middle Egyptian.

It would not only be arduous but also fruitless to present the feminine infinitive as the alternative identification for the sDm.t=f in all the cases where a -t-affixed verb form after Dr with the meaning "since/from the moment that/of" has been identified as a sDm.t=f. In an attempt to disprove my hypothesis, I will limit myself to those examples in the standard reference grammars and in the special study by Anthes which have been adduced as evidence for this meaning of the construction.

In his article on the prepositions m and Dr Anthes distinguishes between Dr sDm.t=f with the meanings of temporal and of causal "since" and Dr + infinitive with only the meaning of temporal "since". Of the six examples of purported Dr sDm.t=f the only one with a sDm.t=f of an immutable verb is the one just discussed above in appendix A.

With respect to the two claimed to have the causal meaning "since", he wonders whether the verb forms are correctly identified as the sDm.t=f. One of these, PT §1355a-b (ipi=k Smw tpyt-away HAit tA Sm.t(i) Sm tm n nTr Dr hAit=Dr hAit ra), is discussed above. The other is from the Abydos temple of Seti I, in a scene where Horus says to give the king iAit=i nst=i st=t tp IA Dr rdit=i n st t(t)="my office, my seat, my throne upon earth, since my being installed on the throne of (my) father". Indeed, from the morphosyntactic point of view, Dr hAit ra and Dr rdit=i may equally well contain infinitives, and Anthes's opting for their identification as possible sDm.t=f forms depends solely on his translation with causal "since". The construction Dr rdit=i n st t(t) is translated by him with "denn ich habe die Einsetzung auf den väterlichen Thron vollzogen", in order to fulfil the obligation of the suffix pronoun to be the subject. There can be little doubt that the example must simply be translated as above, and that the verb form is an infinitive with the suffix pronoun denoting the semantic object.

The three other examples of purported sDm.t=f with the temporal meaning "since" could just as well contain infinitives.

134 Meyer, op.cit., 288-290; Dorman, op.cit., 174-175. For the choice of unusual funerary liturgies for his tomb see Meyer, op.cit., 293; Dorman, op.cit., 175.
136 For a possible inferiority complex for Senenmut see Meyer, op.cit., 291.
137 For creativity in selecting statues types see Meyer, op.cit., 74-93, 280; Dorman, op.cit., 174-175.
138 Slightly differently translated by Meyer, op.cit., 288. Note that a relative form int=n=i would have been expected.

Was it thought by Senenmut to be a masculine word like twt?

139 Anthes, Präpositionen m und Dr, in: Stud. Wilson, 8-11.

140 Anthes, op.cit., 10, exs. 10-11.
141 See §12 above [p. 17].
142 Wb. V Belegstellen, 103*, sub 593 (7).
143 Anthes, op.cit., 10, ex. 11. On the issue of semantic object or subject see my note 36 above.
Urk. IV 1409,1-2. Anthes, op.cit., 10, ex. 12. "I will let you hear what has happened to me since the first [day?], since my coming forth from the womb [lit., thighs] of my mother".

Urk. IV 386,1-2. Anthes, op.cit., 10, ex. 13. "my guard that was once without equipment is now carrying [lit., under] precious things since my appearing as king".

Urk. IV 1073,8-11. Anthes, op.cit., 10, ex. 14. "my form of yesterday, it has distinguished itself since my coming forth in the ornaments [....], having been appointed as priest of Ma’at".

Whereas one of the two examples of Dr + infinitive which Anthes presents cannot but contain the infinitive without semantic subject (Dr prt), the verb form in the other is provided with a suffix pronoun.

Instruction of Amenemhat I for his Son, IXe/Mill. Ed. Helck, Lehre Amenemhet, 65.

It will be clear that Anthes's identification strategy is inconsistent. The verb forms where the suffix pronoun is both the semantic and the grammatical subject are ranged under the sDm.t=f, whereas there is no sound reason not to identify the forms as the infinitives of intransitive verbs. The verb form rdi=i in the Abydos inscription even requires an awkward translation in order to have the suffix pronoun denoting the subject of a purported sDm.t=f form. Why not consider the forms rdi=i and mst=i, both of transitive verbs, to be infinitives with the suffix pronoun denoting the semantic object? Taking his examples of Dr + (Prospective) sDm=f with the meaning "since" also into account, I note that the verb forms written rdi(i)=i, mst(i)=i and mst=f are now identified by him as the passivized and defectively written sDm.t(w)=f forms rdi.t(w)=i, mst.t(w)=i and mst.(w)=f.

Since Anthes's study and Lefebvre's reference grammar use the same citations as given in Gardiner's grammar, this is all the evidence given in the major studies of Middle Egyptian to support the meaning "since/from the moment that/of" for Dr sDm.t=f.

With respect to Old Egyptian, no examples of Dr sDm.t=f can be found in the recent study by Doret of its narrative verbal system. However, Edel's grammar of Old Egyptian and Allen's study of the verbal system in the Pyramid Texts both include the form. Edel connects the active verb form only with Dr having the meaning "before", whereas Allen notes its occurrence after Dr with only the meaning "since". Actually, Allen does deal with the description of the sDm.t=f in Gardiner's grammar, but he does not refer to the meaning "before/until" given there. He mentions Edel's description, but without referring to the latter's opinion about the meaning of Dr + sDm.t=f. Apparently, this is because he agrees with Anthes's arguments in favour of causal "since".

Only one of Allen's examples has not yet been dealt with in the present study. I have no reason to doubt the correctness of its translation with "since", and the verb form can be identified as the infinitive.

PT [261] §324c-d. N pi nsr m-tp TAw (i)r Drw pt (i)r Dr TA Dr Swt awy Hnbw m N "N is the flame before the wind, to the limits of the sky, to the limit of the earth, since the lightning's hands having become empty of N".

Since a number of the examples in the standard grammars scrutinized in this appendix in fact go back as far as Sethe’s Verbum, I would like to end by noting that all the occurrences of Dr sDm.t=f offered there, whether purported or genuine, have been dealt with.

Appendix C: some parallel Coffin Texts versions with Dr + infinitive and Dr + Prospective sDm=f signifying "since/from the moment that/of".

Of interest for the present study is that Dr + the -t-affixed verb form identifiable as the infinitive and Dr + Prospective sDm=f interchange in parallel versions of passages when a translation with

---

144 Anthes, op.cit., 10, ex. 12. For further references see PM I/1², 204.
147 Anthes, op.cit., 11, ex. 16.
150 See my note 3 above.
"since/from the moment that/of" (or another conjunction signifying relative past time reference) is required. I present here three passages from the Coffin Texts where this interchange occurs in the variants.

In contrast to my hypothesis, Loprieno has pointed out the interchangeability between the (Prospective) sDm=f and the sDm.t=f in such parallel texts, on account of a semantic parallelism he sees between the verb forms.\textsuperscript{151} Thus, the verb form written Hrt in the following example is considered by Loprieno to be the sDm.t=f, but it could equally be the infinitive of a IIIae inf. verb.

CT [53] I 242 f/B10C. my rm=n n Wsir N Dr Hr=f r=n "come, that we may weep for Osiris N, now that he is far away from us". Note that in this speech situation the Reference point for the relative past time is not the absolute future time of the injunction in the main clause, but the present of the speaker. Osiris being distant was already past relative to the present, which is always available as a Reference point.\textsuperscript{152}

CT [53] I 242 f/B12C. my m rm=n Wsir N Dr Hrt=f ir=n "come now, that we may lament Osiris N, now that he is far away from us". I have here to choose the translation "now that" instead of one that does full justice to the infinitive because English does not seem capable—as far as I am aware—of using a prepositional phrase equivalent in meaning to "now that", which is the most suitable here.

This parallelism of forms with and without t also occurs elsewhere.

CT [6] I 17 a-b/B6C. dr.(w) dAwt=k Dr srd=k Swt r Axt "your trembling is driven away, since you have planted the plume at the horizon".\textsuperscript{153}

CT [6] I 17 a-b/B1P. dr.(w) dAwt=k Dr s<r>dt=k Swt r Axt "your trembling is driven away since your planting the plume at the horizon". The form can be the feminine infinitive of a caus. 2-lit. verb, with expression of semantic subject and object according to the manner of the suffix conjugation.\textsuperscript{154}

Thus also in the following example.

CT [76] II 5 b-c/B1C. iw=i wrD.kwi Hr sTsw 5w Dr fA=i sAt=i Nwt tp=i "I have become weary of the Support-of-Shu, since I have lifted up my daughter Nut above me".\textsuperscript{155}

CT [76] II 5 b-c/B1Bo. iw=i wrD.kwi Hr sT[s]w 5w Dr fAt=i sAt=i Nwt tp=i "I have become weary of the Support-of-Shu since my lifting up my daughter Nut above me".\textsuperscript{156}

\textsuperscript{151} Loprieno, sDmt.f, GM 37 (1980), 28, n.14. For a parallel between infinitive and sDm.t=f see Vernus, Études VI, RdE 38 (1987), 173.

\textsuperscript{152} See §4 above [p. 8].

\textsuperscript{153} Borghouts, Magical P. Leiden 348, 85.

\textsuperscript{154} The form without t in var. B6C is explained as a case of coalescence of the dental radical and the dental affix by Borghouts, Early Book of Gates, in: Funerary Symbols and Religion. Essays Heerma van Voss, 18, n.11. Although this suggestion is quite plausible, there is in fact no need for emendation.

\textsuperscript{155} De Buck, Plaats en betekenis van Sjoe, 18-19. Zandee, Hymnen aan Amon, 130 (sub VI): "daar" ["because"]. Barta, Unt. zum Göttlerkreis, 198 translated the act of the "Lifting by Shu" with "Erhobenen des Schu", possibly confusing this expression with that of the Heh gods as wTsw 5w.

\textsuperscript{156} Grandet - Mathieu, Cours d'égyptien II, 115: "Var. B1Bo avec la forme wnmt=f".