CHAPTER V. THE RELATIVE FUTURE TENSE sDm.t=f

In the preceding studies on what are generally acknowledged to be the only three certain sDm.t=f constructions, I have argued that the verb form can be defined as a relative future tense. Now that this common characteristic has been established, I would like to turn to the verb form proper as a unity. A further analysis of a number of issues concerning the sDm.t=f is best served by a comparison with the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f. Thus, before embarking on the sDm.t=f verb form some remarks must be devoted to the arguments supporting this comparison and to questions concerning the syntax of the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f.

After the preliminaries on these verb forms I shall discuss the remarkable differences between them and the sDm.t=f. It is indeed remarkable that the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f belong to a verb form category to which I shall demonstrate that the sDm.t=f does not belong. In connection with n sDm.t=f, the question of the negation of these verb forms is also of importance.

§ 1. The forms of the stem of the active and passive sDm.t=f.

Now that the bulk of the evidence on the sDm.t=f in my studies has been presented, this is the appropriate place to present a survey of the stem of the verb form. The mutable and anomalous verbs show the following stems. First, the IIae gem. (mAa and wnn are ranged here under the anomalous verbs), which show reduplication of the second and third radical. For the IIIae inf. there is vast evidence for the non-reduplicated stem. Rare evidence also shows the IVae inf. to have this stem. As far as the anomalous verbs are concerned, there is rare, but certain evidence that the verb rdi has the stem rdi, but owing to the remarkable rarity of this verb in the n sDm.t=f construction the possibility of the stem rdi cannot be excluded with certainty. There is ample evidence for the stem iy.t of the verb iw/iy.1 The verb mAa displays both the stems

1 See Studies sDm.t=f I (Dr sDm.t=f); op. cit. II (r sDm.t=f); op. cit. III (n sDm.t=f); op. cit. IV (passive sDm.t=f/ms.(y)t=f).
2 Contra Loprieno, sDmtf. GM 37 (1980), 18 (1.2).
3 Note that the forms after the negation n and after r and Dr are presented separately in Gardiner, EG, 318 ($403$-$404$) and 322 ($§409$), but treated as a unity in Lefebvre, GEC, 211 ($§416$-$417$).
4 Urk. IV 1090, 10: n iw.t=f (quoted in the present study, Appendix B [p. 92]); CT [162] II 401 a and CT [1012] VII 228 q: n mAA.t=f (quoted in Studies sDm.t=f IV (passive sDm.t=f/ms.(y)t=f), §4 [pp. 58-59]); PT [607] §1701b sAA.t=f (quoted op. cit. III (n sDm.t=f), §1 (p. 42)). I have not been able to trace the evidence for the non-reduplicated stem qbb of the IIae gem. verb qbb, for which see Lefebvre, GEC, 211 ($§417$). Borghouts, Egyptisch I, 102 ($§47.b$) states that the IIae gem. verbs have the non-reduplicated stem, presenting the stem mA of the verb mAa as evidence for this (ranged by me under the anomalous verbs).
5 Instr. of Amenemhat I, VIIIa-c/Mill.: Hms.t=f (quoted in the present study, §17 (p. 83)).
6 *Early Middle Kingdom Account*, 19: n iw.t=f (cited in Studies sDm.t=f II (r sDm.t=f), n. 75). Pap. Berlin 10025, 6: n iw.t=f (quoted in op. cit. III (n sDm.t=f), §9 (p. 49) and op. cit. IV (passive sDm.t=f/ms.(y)t=f), §6 (p. 62)). Thus also Schenkel, Tübinger Einführung, 164 (7.3.1.1.3).
7 See my op. cit. I (Dr sDm.t=f), n.39. Note that the existence of n iw.t=f has also been suggested; see Inscr. Hatnub 24, 1-2 (publ. Anthes, Hatnub, 54-56, pl. 24; Readingbook, 73-74): n dwA(w) [n] iw.t=f mA n nHH "who knows tomorrow when it has not yet come, who has a view on eternity". This would be the only instance of the stem iw in the n sDm.t=f construction in Middle Egyptian that I know of; see, however, De Buck’s special note in Readingbook, 127 (73,4): "the reading n iw.t=f is due to Dédau", which seems to express doubts, probably on the same grounds; see also Janssen, Trad. eg. autobiografie I, 75 (B141). Indeed, the writing n iw.t=f is so uncommon that suspicion arises about the correctness of the reading; the negation in particular may be a guess, though a good one on account of the parallel in the Eloquent Peasant B1, 183 (see Studies sDm.t=f III (n sDm.t=f), §1, end [p. 43]). I suggest reading dwA(w) iw(ty).f(y) "tomorrow that is yet to come"; for a comparable construction with a participle see Ptahhotep, 260 hrw iy HrsA "the day which comes next". For a more certain example of nj iw.t with the meaning "while not yet" in the PT see Allen, Inflection, 313 ($§460$).
mAn and mA.\textsuperscript{8} Because existential n wnt is not reckoned to be a true n sDm.t=f construction,\textsuperscript{9} there is only scarce evidence for the stem wn.\textsuperscript{10}

Some instances of the verb hAi "to descend" where a -y-affix appears do exist.\textsuperscript{11} Since nowhere in good Middle Egyptian does this -y-affix show up among the active sDm.t=f of verbs other than hAi, whether ult.inf. or not, we must be dealing here with a peculiarity of this verb which may show in the writing of the stem and which may well be connected to its being, to some extent, a middle-and-ult.inf. verb. The verb mA with a middle and final aleph also shows peculiarities which range it under the anomalous verbs.\textsuperscript{12} I do not consider the writing hAy to be an exceptional plene writing—thus in principle present in all sDm.t=f forms of the verb hAi—as was Edel's opinion.\textsuperscript{13} Possibly, we have here a glimpse of the phonological mechanism leading to a consistent writing iy.t of the sDm.t=f form of the verb iw/y.

The aleph as some sort of weak radical\textsuperscript{14} also seems responsible for the occurrence of a -y-affix in the passive construction written n qmA(m)y in a Book of the Dead papyrus,\textsuperscript{15} which should orthographically correctly have been written n qmA.t.

§ 2. The relations of the sDm.t=f with the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f: introduction.

In my first study, on Dr sDm.t=f, I briefly and provisionally related the Circumstantial sDm=f and Circumstantial sDm.n=f to the sDm.t=f as, respectively, the relative present, the relative past and the relative future tense.\textsuperscript{16} If correct, this indicates the probable existence of a set of finite relative tenses for each of the possible locations in time, i.e. present, past and future—which I hope to have demonstrated convincingly for the latter form.

Therefore, I shall first point out that the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f in all their uses share the property of being relative tenses with the sDm.t=f. Since the constructions Particle + Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f have recently been deployed to shake the transpositional foundations of the Standard Theory of Polotsky,\textsuperscript{17} the syntax of iw sDm=f/sDm.n=f and aHa.n sDm.n=f must be discussed here. Because the relative tense concept of the sDm.t=f may also be relevant for the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f, I shall consider their interplay with the Indicative sDm=f/sDM.n=f in this light.\textsuperscript{18}

§ 3. The Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f in the circumstantial clause functioning as relative tenses and as adverbial verb forms.

---

\textsuperscript{8} The stem mAn: CT [79] II 25 b/B1C and the stem mA: CT [720] VI 348 c (both quoted in op.cit. IV (passive sDm.t=f/ms.(y)t=f), §3 [pp. 57-58]). For the stem mA of the passive see CT [79] II 25 b/B1Bo (quoted in op.cit. IV, §4 [p. 59]).

\textsuperscript{9} See op.cit. III (n sDm.t=f), Appendix A [pp. 52-53].

\textsuperscript{10} Ptahhotep, 87: wn (quoted op.cit. II (r sDm.t=f), §3 [p. 32]). Pap. BM 10059, 14,7: wn (quoted op.cit. I (Dr sDm.t=f)), §13 [p. 17]).

\textsuperscript{11} CT [405] V 203 I/M 1C (Dr hAy.t=k r=s) and CT [405] V 207 c/M 1C (Dr hAy.t=Dr n=s); both quoted in op.cit. I (Dr sDm.t=f), §9 [p. 13]. An instance with -w instead of -y may be CT [40] I 173 1/B16C, which may read bwt=i pw m(w)t r hAy.t=iAwW.t r sb.t=i r imAx† "to die is my abomination until my old age has come, until I pass to the blessed state"; the parallel B13C\textsuperscript{15} has only r iAwW.t= "until my old age". Vernus, Études III, RdE 35 (1984), 185 (3) reads r hAy iAwW.t=; however, according to De Buck, a small t was added later, which may belong to the verb form. The word for "old age" has a masculine and a feminine form; see Faulkner, Concise Dictionary, 8. Reading the substantive hAy "period, time" seems less probable to me, since no determinative is present. For another occurrence of hAy see Pap. Berlin 3038, 12,9 (quoted op.cit. III (n sDm.t=f), §8 [p. 48]).

\textsuperscript{12} See De Cenival, Écritures mAA, RdE 29 (1977), 21-37.

\textsuperscript{13} Edel, AÄG, LXXIX, ref. (§731).

\textsuperscript{14} Most recently Satzinger, Aleph-Phonem, in: Zwischen Ewigkeiten. Fs. Thausing, 192 (4).

\textsuperscript{15} See op.cit. IV (passive sDm.t=f/ms.(y)t=f), §4 (Pap. Iouiya) [p. 59]). Cf. also r sDm.t=f ms.yt=f in op.cit., §4 (BD of Ani) [p. 59]. Note that Gardiner, EG, 318, ex. 13 transliterates the form in Pap. Iouiya as qmA(yt), but ranges the verb under the 3-lit. verbs.

\textsuperscript{16} Studies sDm.t=f I (Dr sDm.t=f), §19 [p. 22].

\textsuperscript{17} See §5 below [pp. 70-73].

\textsuperscript{18} For the Indicative sDm.n=f see further §6 below [p. 74].
In the preceding articles on the sDm.t=f constructions I have argued that a finite relative tense relates its Event to a reference time and that these two time points are grammaticized as part of the meaning of such a tense. The Reference point as such is not attached to a specific absolute time reference, i.e. the absolute past, absolute present and absolute future, but is available for each of them.

The Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f in the circumstantial clause are translated with, respectively, "while he hears/heard (simultaneously)" (relative present time reference) and "after (/while already) he has/had heard" (relative past time reference). It is evident that these verb forms have a relative time reference there, mostly with respect to the main clause situation.

At first sight such a relative time reference may look like an implication deriving from the context, but for the positive identification of the verb forms as true relative tenses it is, as is also the case with the sDm.t=f constructions. Thus, for example, also "after" for Circumstantial sDm.n=f as a relative past in the absolute future, as in the following example.

Ptahhotep, 366/Pr. mdw.y=k rx.n=f wHa=k "may you speak, after you have come to know that you can find out".

Proceeding from Polotsky's theory, the property of the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f of being able to exercise a circumstantial clause function asyndetically qualifies them as inherently adverbial in this function. This is also possible for inherently adverbial sentence types such as the Adverbial Sentence and the Pseudoverbal Sentence.

A point to be stressed here is that it is only the combination in the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f of being relative tenses and having an adverbial nature which in this 'true' circumstantial evokes adequate translations with "while (simultaneously)" resp. "while already", "after". Thus, these notions are only a means of translation to render its adverbiality, but are not intrinsic to the meaning of the verb forms as relative tenses.

§ 4. The Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f also in iw sDm=f/sDm.n=f and aHa.n sDm.n=f as relative tenses.

Allen has recently pointed out that at least part of the function of the exemplary particle iw in the so-called compound verb forms in the main clause is to provide the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f expressing relative time reference with the absolute time anchor point par excellence, the present.

What is true for this role of iw, "here-and-now", is also valid for aHa.n. In the meaning of aHa.n as a particle with absolute present time reference there still seems to be an echo of its verbal origin as a Present Perfect. In English in particular, the Present Perfect not only refers to an absolute past Event but also to its present relevance. The substantival verb form aHa.n would then...

---

19 Studies sDm.t=f I (Dr sDm.t=f), §§ [p. 8]; op.cit. III (n sDm.t=f), §§ [p. 46].
20 I disagree with Vernus, Études III, RdE 35 (1984), 159-161 (§2) that the flexibility of the reference point with the Circumstantial sDm.n=f deems the form to be an aspect; see also the criticism of this viewpoint by Callender, Existential Paragraph Markings, in: Akten München 1985, 3, 145-146.
21 As far as it concerns the Circumstantial sDm.n=f, I agree with Allen's remark in Tense, in: Essays on Eg. Grammar, 7: "though the sDm.n=f generally expresses past taxis [relative past time reference, LZ], it does not do so in the negation n sDm.n=f". His remark does not contradict my argument in favour of the Circumstantial sDm.n=f as a relative tense, since n sDm.n=f definitely does not contain this verb form.
22 For another example see Vernus, Future at Issue, 3 (c).
23 I do not share Satzinger's doubts, Protasis ir sDm.f -- Afterthoughts, LingAeg 4 (1994), 274, about the existence of a morphological category of adverbial sDm=f/sDm.n=f forms.
24 For the separate case of the circumstantialization of certain negative constructions with n or nn see my note 80 below.
26 With regard to the meaning of iw as reference point, "here-and-now" is most suitable; see the term "nyéngéncririsme" used by Polotsky, op.cit., 36 (3.8.4). Other aspects of iw are not considered here.
27 Comrie, Tense, 52 on the Present Perfect: "more generally, the perfect indicates the continuing present relevance of a past situation"; see also p. 56 (3.1). The meaning of the Preterite or Simple Past does not include this present relevance; see for this option Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 186. In my opinion, Loprieno is right with regard to the
originally have had the meaning "that it has stood up and stands now". Just as the Stative \textit{rx.kwi} expresses the present state of "knowing" as the result of "having come to know", thus in \textit{aHa.n} "having stood up" has resulted in "standing" presently. Apparently, the action of "standing up" has receded into the background and the resulting situation has become the more dominant feature. Given that \textit{aHa.n} normally has no suffix pronoun expression, its use must be impersonal, and I suggest its meaning as a particle to be literally "as it (has come to stand, and) stands now" and in practice temporal "now".

The obligatory combination of particle and verb form in what are with justification called the "compound verb forms" \textit{iw sDm=f/sDm.n=f} and \textit{aHa.n sDm.n=f} yields absolute present and absolute past time reference.\textsuperscript{29} "Compound" is indeed the adequate term, because, syntactically as well as semantically, the verb forms cannot function without the particle.

§ 5. The syntactic analysis of the verb forms in \textit{iw sDm=f/sDm.n=f} and \textit{aHa.n sDm.n=f} and of the constructions.

Essentially, the discussion in this section centres around the terms "adverbial" and "verbal", not only as having reference to the morphology of verb forms but also to their syntactic function.

In a reconsideration of the substitutional procedure in the Standard Theory of Polotsky, Collier has recently argued that after the particles \textit{mk} and \textit{isT} the verb forms generally called the Circumstantial \textit{sDm=f/sDm.n=f} \textsuperscript{30} do not submit to a substitutional analysis as adverbial forms and explanation of the absolute present time reference of \textit{n sDm.n=f} owing to the \textit{sDm.n=f} functioning there in its original meaning of Present Perfect, for which see op. cit., 77 (4.6.3.1.a) and 209 (7.8.1). This may, of course, also be the case with \textit{aHa.n}. For Preterite versus Present Perfect see the references to the discussion in Binnick, Time and the Verb, 456.

\textsuperscript{29} Compare Polotsky, op. cit., 33 (3.8.2) "qu'il s'est mis débout"; I do not share his criticism (op. cit., 34 (3.8.3.1)) of LeFebvre's opinion (GEC, 161 (§319) concerning the impersonal use of \textit{iw} [and, consequently, also \textit{aHa.n}]. I disagree with Polotsky's formulation, op. cit., 36 (3.8.4), who sees a time reference difference between \textit{iw} "état actuel (est)" and \textit{aHa.n} "était à ce moment-là (se trouva)". Given that both \textit{iw sDm.n=f} and \textit{aHa.n sDm.n=f} are compound narrative verb forms working on the same principal of an absolute present Reference point function of \textit{iw} and \textit{aHa.n}, it would not be in accordance with the relative tense theory if \textit{aHa.n} in these compound narrative verb forms were to represent an absolute past Reference point. In that case there would be a sequence of past Events on the time line, but without a location in time relative to the absolute present, thus leaving a time gap between the Reference point of the past Events and the absolute present. If Polotsky's view of \textit{aHa.n} is understood in the sense of a Present Perfect, his idea does not essentially differ from mine. I disagree with Ritter, \textit{Particles}, LingAeg 2 (1992), 134 (2a): "2. [particles] indicating the text relation, a) posterior text relation: \textit{aHa.n} ".

\textsuperscript{30} For the term "compound narrative verb forms" see Gardiner, EG, 382-384 (§460). It seems to me that the examples of \textit{iw sDm.n=f} as indicating the future which are presented by Vernus, Études III, RdÉ 35 (1984), 160-161 to support his argument that the verb form is an aspect, and not a tense, form no problem. In his example No. 3 (Pap. Ebers, 53,18-19), the time reference seems to be a general present ("it is put in water: it is made a paste") rather than the future. The parenthetic \textit{iw rdi.n=f} means "you have then already placed (two pots on the fire)-", and signifies a preceding action with present relevance for the preparation of the medicine. Vernus's example No. 5 (stela BM 101, 3rd reg., 1-5; publ. Blackman, Stela Nebipusenwosret, JEA 21 (1935), 1-9), equally parenthetic, may well be interpreted in terms of the absolute past: "(presently) the great god has already commanded that you are upon earth under his praise". Incidentally, of the other three examples presented as proof for future time reference of the \textit{sDm.n=f}, No. 1 (Neferty XIV a.d/Pet, ed. Helek, Nfr.tj), where the alleged form is embedded among prospective/future verb forms and constructions, rather contains a Passive \textit{sDm=f} + dative (\textit{sxr.(w) n=sn}), because with a \textit{sDm.n=f} the verb \textit{sxr} "to fell" would force the literal translation "[the plotters], they have felled their (own) mouth for fear of him". This verb does not signify self-injury, but rather injury inflicted by another person; I suggest "[the plotters], to them their mouth will be struck on account of the fear of him, where the "fear of him" is the agent. Vernus's No. 4 (BD ch. 133, rubr./P.Brocklehurst II; publ. Naville, Totenbuch 2, 344: Axa,1) \textit{isk ir.n=f} ... \textit{isk rdi.n=f} clearly contains the Circumstantial \textit{sDm.n=f}; "nota bene after you have made ... and nota bene after you have placed". Example No. 2 (CT 1219 f. - 220 a/[SIC]) is even translated by Vernus himself as a Circumstantial \textit{sDm.n=f}, which verb form in the circumstantial clause is relative past with respect to any absolute time reference. Note that Ritter, Verbalsystem, 63 comes to the conclusion that Vernus's examples can all be analyzed as the relative past.

The Circumstantial \textit{sDm.n=f} is morphologically distinct from other \textit{sDm.n=f} forms, but the Circumstantial \textit{sDm.n=f} only in an indirect sense, since it possesses no \textit{sDm.n.tw=f} form like the Substantival \textit{sDm.n=f} (and, possibly, also the Indicative \textit{sDm.n=f}; see my Polotsky, Sinuhe, Negation, in J EOL 33 (1993-1994), 1995, 39-108, part. 90-91) and on account of its complementary distribution with the Stative of verbs of motion and other intransitives, and with the
that in this construction they instead belong substitutionally with initial main clause formations, which are unconverted/non-transposed patterns. According to him, this suggests that, in terms of their syntax, the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f after mk and isT should be analysed as unconverted/non-transposed patterns—in other words, as "verbal verb forms" according to Polotsky's terminology. Furthermore, he has suggested that his analysis can be shown to account for the well-known "adverbial" properties of these forms without invoking adverbial substitution.

For the following discussion it is important to note that it is evident that his analysis is not only valid for the occurrence after the "particles" mk and isT, but also when the "auxiliaries" iw and aHa.n are involved, on which the present contribution concentrates.

In his study Collier has, somewhat surprisingly, not drawn a comparison with other verbal/non-transposed finite verb forms, notably the form generally called the Indicative sDm=f (and, as I propose, also the Indicative sDm.n=f). It is this morphologically distinct sDm=f form with a characteristic independent ("bare") affirmative use in the main clause which Polotsky has long since provided with the label "verbal". Because there is this fundamental syntactic difference with the Circumstantial verb forms in iw sDm=f/sDm.n=f and aHa.n sDm.n=f, Collier's label "verbal verb form" is most unfortunate as a characterization of these verb forms, as it evidently has reference to Polotsky's theory.

Moreover, Collier's discussion concerns the only use of the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f where they seem to defy an identification as an adverbial "transposition". In all other uses of the verb forms it concerns the typically adverbial/circumstantial syntax. Particularly instructive is the regular construction iw=n=I/subjective + Circumstantial sDm=f, from which, according to general opinion, iw sDm=f/subjective derives.

It is, however, quite understandable to me that Collier had a major problem with the Polotskyan substitutional analysis of iw sDm=f/sDm.n=f and aHa.n sDm.n=f, which requires a Subject - Predicate order in accordance with the Adverbial Model. Satzinger and he are, in my opinion, correct in claiming that in iw sDm=f/sDm.n=f/subjective and aHa.n sDm.n=f/subjective the order is Predicate - Subject. This is the order in the Verbal Sentence containing non-transposed verb forms. In a syntactic surface analysis, these adverbial verb forms cannot be analysed as "transpositions" in the

Passive sDm=f.
Collier, Circ. sDm.f/sDm.n.f, JEA 76 (1990), 73-85; see particularly p. 73 (summary), p. 74 (sub 1.) and pp. 84-85 (6).
Collier, op. cit., 73 (last line of abstract) and 83-84 (5).
Collier, op. cit., 74, n.7, with reference to his unpublished dissertation, where it is argued that "even after auxiliaries, the Circumstantial sDm.f/sDm.n(f) are to be analysed as verbal verb-forms". From his remark referring to Polotsky's article on the transpositions it is clear that the auxiliaries iw and aHa.n are meant, because these are the auxiliaries mentioned there. His distinction between "particle" and "auxiliary" may be based on "particles" as a term for unbound elements and "auxiliaries" as one for bound elements.
See my note 30 above.
See Polotsky, Transpositions, IOS 6 (1976), 46 (4.1.5): "ces formes [the Indicative sDm=f forms rdj=f, maT=f, LZ] représentent, en toute probabilité, la catégorie proprement verbale (‘factive’), ... On connait deux cas où ‘donner’ et ‘voir’ revêtent précisément les formes rdj=f et maT=f: l’un, en ancien égyptien (avec des survivances) en fonction de passé narratif"; see also id., Eg. Tenses, 94 (50). Note also the remark by Doret, Narrative Verbal System, 15: “However, in certain narrative texts from the Xth Dynasty, the narrative sDm.f form is used for the third person past indicative of transitive verbs, as it is in texts dating to the Old Kingdom”. It is my conviction that in Middle Egyptian the Indicative sDm=f in affirmative use is by no means only a "remnant, archaic" form (see Depuydt, Standard Theory, OLP 14 (1983), 42); see my article Polotsky, Sinuhe, Negation, JEOl 33 (1993-1994), 1995, 85-86.
For more on this issue see my note 59 below.
See Collier’s remark in Predication, LingAeg 2 (1992), 64: "Of course, there is much that still remains to be done in promoting the N[ot] S[O] S[Standard] T[heory] account of the circumstantial sDm.f/sDm.n(f) as verbal verb-forms, notably in terms of a detailed defence of the extension of this analysis to other usages of these forms". A most compelling argument concerning the adverbial nature of Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f is presented by Polotsky, Transpositions, IOS 6 (1976), 26-27 (3.1.2, sub 1 and 2). In this light I am surprised about Satzinger’s confession, Protasis ir sDm.f -- Afterthoughts, LingAeg 4 (1994), 274 that he has never really believed in the existence of a morphological category of adverbial sDm=f/sDm.n=f.
For rare examples of iw=n=I/subjective + Circumstantial sDm.n=f see Edel, ÀàG, 451 ($890) and Polotsky, op. cit., 36 (3.6.5); add CT [75] 387 c/Bersha versions and CT [759] V1 389 d. For aHa.n/subjective + Circumstantial sDm.n=f see Gardiner, EG, 392 (§479); the latter construction does not occur before the First Intermediate Period, see Doret, Narrative Verbal System, 126.
Collier, Circ. sDm.f/sDm.n.f, JEA 76 (1990), 80-82 (4); Satzinger, Anm. jw.f/sDm.f, GM 115 (1990), 100.
strict sense of the word\textsuperscript{40} without invoking a number of ad hoc explanations.\textsuperscript{41} It is thus only with respect to this syntactic aspect of order that Collier's label "verbal" for the verb forms is justified, but not with regard to that of the independent use.

Given the fact that the particle is an obligatory constituent of the constructions iw sDm=n=f\footnote{Depuydt, Standard Theory, OLP 14 (1983), 50 (3.4) considers the explanation of this phenomenon to be a task of the Standard Theory.} and aHa.n sDm.n=f\footnote{Particularly the subject role for the particle/auxiliary, see Polotsky, op.cit., 6 (1976), 35 (3.8.4): "un temps 'indicatif' de l'égyptien classique est donc une phrase à prédicat circonstantiel. Il se compose d'un auxiliaire sujet et d'un auxillié prédicat"; Junge, Gebrauch von jw, in: Fs. Edel, 271. I agree with Satzinger's implicit argument, op.cit., 99-100, that the "auxiliaries" iw/aHa.n argued by the above authors as able to function as the subject cannot have that role and that it is the suffix pronoun or substantive following the verb form which is the subject.} respectively, with "while (simultaneously)" and "after" (= "while already"), just as is done when they are used in the subordinate clause.\textsuperscript{42} These usual translations for iw sDm=n=f\footnote{As regards the particle as an obligatory constituent, I do not agree with Johnson's analysis of mk as an unbound particle in mk sDm=n=f in \textit{id}. Use of mk, in: Stud. zu Sprache und Religion, Westendorf, 71-85, which construction would be the surface appearance of a deep structure mk iw sDm=n=f, with an always deleted iw; rather, mk replaces iw as particle. For the compound verb forms see Depuydt, Standard Theory, OLP 14 (1983), 50: "on the strictly synchronical level, it is preferable to view the compound forms as genuine verb forms". This may explain why}, and aHa.n sDm.n=f, respectively, with "while (simultaneously)" and "after" (= "while already"), just as is done when they are used in the subordinate clause.\textsuperscript{43} Proceeding from the semantics of these compound verb forms, the literal translations are quite simple and leave the syntactic analysis beautifully intact: \textit{iw sDm=f substantive "relative to here-and-now he/substantive hears already heard"} and \textit{aHa.n sDm=n=f substantive "relative to as it has come to stand, and stands now" he/substantive has already heard}.

It seems to be common practice to translate the verb forms in \textit{iw sDm=f} and \textit{iw/aHa.n sDm=n=f}, respectively, with "while (simultaneously)" and "after" (= "while already"), just as is done when they are used in the subordinate clause.\textsuperscript{44} These usual translations for \textit{iw sDm=f/substantive}, \textit{iw sDm=n=f/substantive} and \textit{aHa.n sDm=n=f/substantive} go together with Collier's problem of the syntactic analysis, because they force the postulation of an unexpressed subject in the deep subject which precedes the predicate and, furthermore, a shift of the expressed substantival subject to a position after the verb form. The problem of these translations is that an adverbial verb form is translated as if it is used circumstantially. The concepts "adverbial" and "circumstantial" have, admittedly, close affinities, but, with respect to the verb forms under discussion, "adverbial" refers to their nature as a verb form category functioning as that part of speech, and "circumstantial" to a function which may be exercised by forms or constructions of an adverbial nature. Drawing an analogy with the Stative as an adverbial predicate in the Pseudooverbal Sentence, e.g., \textit{iw aHa.n sDm=f substantive "relative to 'as it (has come to stand, and) stands now' he/substantive has already heard"}, its adverbial nature in Egyptian \textit{iw=aHa.n sDm=f} is taken for granted in the translation, and remains unexpressed. The analogy does, however, not go beyond this aspect of translation, because in \textit{iw=aHa.n sDm=f} the verb form does indeed exert an adverbial function, which seems to be different to those in \textit{iw sDm=f/substantive} and \textit{aHa.n sDm=n=f}.

The analysis of the compound verb forms \textit{iw sDm=f/substantive} and \textit{aHa.n sDm=n=f/substantive} as "verbal" accounts for their Predicate - Subject order, but requires accepting a 'suppression' of the adverbial function of the verb forms proper here. In other words, \textit{iw sDm=f/substantive} and \textit{aHa.n sDm=n=f} are "verbal" compound verb forms which contain formally adverbial, but functionally 'reduced' Circumstantial \textit{sDm=f/substantive} forms.\textsuperscript{45} This may explain why
with the verb rdi not only the expected iw/aHa.n di.n=f occur but also iw/aHa.n rdi.n=f, which latter constructions contain a non-adverbial form: the stems rdi and di in the sDm.n=f of rdi, which are normally distinctive for the expression of the opposition of substantival versus circumstantial forms, are evidently of no concern in the compound verb forms iw/aHa.n sDm.n=f.46 The 'suppression' of the typically adverbial syntax of Subject - Predicate seems to have been influenced, not to say elicited, by the situation that with suffix conjunction forms the order is Predicate - Subject.

The adverbial nature of the verb forms can still be seen as overtly working in the common Adverbial Model construction iw=f/substantive + Circumstantial sDm=f. In this case a literal translation "here-and-now he/substantive is while he hears" does most justice, because then the subject must be accounted for twice and the adverbial nature of the verb form must be expressed in the best possible way.

I note that the analysis of iw sDm=f/sDm.n=f and aHa.n sDm.n=f as "verbal" compound verb forms accounts for the fact that they have the "predicative/indicative"/non-emphatic/rhematic role in common with the verbal Indicative sDm=f/sDm.n=f.

To sum up, the principle of a relative tense as working in an identical manner in Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f in both the subordinate and in the main clauses is in accordance with the fact that in both uses it concerns the same morphologically adverbial verb forms. Whereas the forms in the subordinate clause and in iw=f sDm=f exercise adverbial function, this role is suppressed in iw sDm=f/sDm.n=f and aHa.n sDm.n=f owing to the circumstance that they are "verbal" compound verb forms themselves. The frequent construction iw/aHa.n rdi.n=f seems to illustrate this eloquently.47

§ 6. The presupposition in finite relative tenses related to the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f.

In the study on n sDm=t=f I suggest that from the fact that the negation asserts only non-holding of the occurrence of the Event at the time of the Reference point, it may be inferred that the (relative) future occurrence of the Event is a presupposition, which is immune to negation.48 Because the verb form grammaticizes a Reference point to which an Event is related as part of its meaning, the Event is presupposed. For Middle Egyptian this would entail the absence of clauses containing the negation n + Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f with the meaning "relative to a Reference point he does not hear; he has not heard", just as n sDm=t=f does not mean "relative to a Reference point he will not hear". This is, indeed, not the case.

The presuppositional restriction may explain certain syntactic phenomena regarding the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f. For the assertion of nonoccurrence of the Event in the main clause the negative counterparts of iw + Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f are n + Indicative sDm=f/sDm.n=f, which constructions also have this negative counterpart role with respect to Circumstantial...
sDm=f/sDm.n=f in the circumstantial clause.\textsuperscript{50} Considered from the semantic viewpoint of the type of tense, this may well be because as absolute tenses the Indicative sDm=f and the Indicative sDm.n=f are not subjected to the presupposition of the occurrence of the Event, and negation of these verb forms can thus assert the nonoccurrence of their Events.

However, some scholars have suggested that the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f in the circumstantial clause are negated by n-is.\textsuperscript{51} According to them, main clause iw + Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f are negated by n + Indicative sDm=f and n + Substantival (or Indicative?) sDm.n=f, but bare Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f in the circumstantial clause by n-is + Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f. In my opinion the latter point is not correct, as it seems to say that, syntactically, n-is is the negation of the verb form in the circumstantial clause: n-is does not assert the nonoccurrence of the Event of the Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f ("contradictory negation"), and does not function in the subordinate clause as the negation of the verb form. On the contrary, it functions at sentence level to dissociate a part of it for a negative scope/focus ("contrary negation"): it is the adverbial phrase—which may well consist of only a circumstantial verb form!--which is brought under the scope of the negation.\textsuperscript{52} This is something completely different from the negation of the verb form.

In other words, the version of BD ch. 26, 2/Nu (BM 10,477)\textsuperscript{53} iw n=ib= Htp=f im=i n-is wnm=i Satt nt Wsir must be translated with "I have my heart; it is content in me, but not when/if I eat the shatet-food of Osiris", but an imaginary adapted version *iw n=ib= Htp=f im=i n wnm.n=i Satt nt Wsir would have to be translated as "I have my heart; it is content in me, while I do not eat the shatet-food of Osiris".\textsuperscript{54} § 7. The sDm.t=f is not an adverbial verb form.

From the two subordinate constructions Dr sDm.t=f and r sDm.t=f it is evident that the verb form cannot independently exercise adverbial function, but syntactically needs to be preceded by a preposition/conjunction, which then entails a substantival function of the verb form. The fact that the sDm.t=f is syntactically bound to a preposition/conjunction in an 'ideal' situation for bare circumstantial use makes it clear that the verb form cannot be an inherently adverbial verb form.

If it were, it should, like the related verb forms Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f, be able to occur independently in the asyndetic circumstantial clause as *sDm.t=f, with an in-built relative future meaning conveniently translated with "while yet" or "before", "until". Also, it should be able to occur in the main clause after the particle iw (or suchlike) as Reference point, combining into an

\textsuperscript{50} There are rare instances where the Circumstantial sDm=f of the negative verb tm is used instead of circumstantialised n sDm.n=f. For example, Pap. Ram. III, B 10-11 (publ. Barns, Five Ram. Pap., pl. 12) rdt Sap Xrd tm=f sDm.f snq.w "making that a child takes, when it does not suck"; Pap. Ebers, 49.8 [Eb 266] (publ. Grapow, M. ed. T., 239) kt smAa mwyt tm=f sDm.f "another (prescription) to put right the water, when it is not in order"; Merikare, E 87 (ed. Quack, Stud. Merikare = XXXIII[a] ed. Helck, Merikare) nn mn n-k tapy tm=f iw.n.w "the Inundation will not be troublesome for you, when it does not come". With reference to Quack's remark, op. cit., 53 (b), that tm is assumed to negate substantivized forms, I note that this circumstance does not exclude its negating circumstantial forms—however rare! cf. Zohnven, M.—Eg. gramm., 166 (r), where it is argued that tm is used as 'internal' negation when the syntax does not allow the use of m or n, and 167 (1. c-NB), where it is noted that normally n sDm=t=tm sDm.n=f in circumstantial function are used. On the use of the verb tm in this vein also Borghouts, Ägyptisch I, 245 (§106.g).

\textsuperscript{51} Gilula, JEA 56 (1970), 210 (sub A): "n-is sDm.f is the negation of the circumstantial sDm.t, and n-is sDm.n.f is the negation of the circumstantial sDm.n.t." Junge, Adverbialbast, GM 33 (1979), 74 ("...is negiert vielmehr das Prädikat mw.t.k ... 'indem du nicht stirbst'"), 75 ("...is ist also nichts anderes als die konjunktivische Form der diskontinuierlichen Negation n...js"); thus also id., Syntax mitteläg. Literatursprache, 43 (4.4), where n+ is infinitive is related to n-js sDm.f as differing only with respect to the presence of a new subject in the latter construction. Loprieno, sDm.t=f, GM 37 (1980), 26: "negative relative present n js sDm.f/sDm.n.f." for the verb forms as the circumstantial see p. 25, bottom. For a more recent, different view see Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 127 (c), 170 (A).

\textsuperscript{52} See Loprieno, op. cit., 127 (bottom; "n-js immediately precedes the negated syntagm, which is often an adverbial adjunct or an adverbial clause") and 170 (6.5.2.A: "the continuous n-jjs is used with true adverbial phrases involving a sharp contrast or is immediately prefixed to the scope of the negation"). Collier, Circ. sDm.f/sDm.n.f, JEA 76 (1990), 76, n.17 recognizes that "n sDm.f/n sDm.n.f(n) negate the bare Circumstantial sDm.t=f/sDm.n.f(n) in addition to iw sDm.f/sDm.n.f", but adds "rather than n-is sDm.f/sDm.n.f(n)", which seems to indicate that he in principle sees no syntactic difference between negation of the phrase in focus and of the verb form.

\textsuperscript{53} Publ. Lapp, Papyrus Nu, pl. 13; Budge, Book of the Dead. Facsimiles, pl. 7/Nu [sheet 5].

\textsuperscript{54} See Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 187 (6): ", but not if...". Wrongly, e.g. Graefe, Mittlæg. Grammatik, 159 (§66b): "n js Dd.n=k rmw=n "Wenn du nicht unsere Namen gesagt hast". 
There is no evidence for either! On the empirical grounds of an argumentum ex silentio, this seems to exclude the verb form from being adverbial.

However, with respect to n sDm.t=f, Loprieno has argued that this construction contains an adverbial verb form, that is, a "transposition". 55 In the light of my argument that the sDm.t=f is one verb form--which is not Loprieno's opinion-- 57 and my observations just above, the correctness of his argument is most doubtful. Moreover, it seems to me that in his analysis circumstantial function of a negative construction is confused with the inherent adverbiality of its verb form. Drawing an analogy with other negated constructions that can function circumstantially, the argument that the verb forms in n sDm=t/sDm.n=f are circumstantial, in the case that the constructions exercise this function, would probably find little support. This is true particularly for mn + infinitive, which, like n sDm.t=f, is almost always in circumstantial function and which most definitely does not contain an adverbial verb form.

I have recently suggested that the negation n cannot be used to negate circumstantial verb forms. 58 This would explain why the negative counterparts of iw + Circumstantial sDm=t/sDm.n=f are n + Indicative verbal sDm=t/sDm.n=f, irrespective of their occurrence in the main or in the circumstantial clause. Indirect indications that the negation n is incompatible with adverbial forms may be that also the Adverbial Sentence is not negated by n either, and that in classical Middle Egyptian the Passive sDm=t is only occasionally found to be negated by n. 59 I am inclined to connect the latter phenomenon with the fact that one of the most important uses of the Passive sDm=t is its use as counterpart of the Circumstantial sDm.n=f, thus in an adverbial function.

Assuming that my suggestion is correct, the sDm.t=f verb form cannot be adverbial.

§ 8. The sDm.t=f is probably not a substantival verb form.

It cannot be denied that the sDm.t=f after r and Dr exercises substantival function. The vital question is whether this entails that it is a substantival verb form, a "transposition" there. 60 In other words,

55 The construction as such seems to be considered possible on principle in Callender, Existential Paragraph Markings, in: Akten München 1985: 3, 145, though there with past tense.
56 Loprieno, sDm.t, GM 37 (1980), 23-25.
57 See my note 2 above. See also Studies sDm.t=f III (n sDm.tw), §4 [p. 45].
58 See Zonhoven, Polotsky, Sinuhe, Negation, EOL 33 (1993-1994), 1995, 51. With respect to the Circumstantial sDm=t see Borghouts, Egyptisch I, 242-243 (§106.b): "De partikel n. Aangetroffen bij alle vervoegde werkwoordsvormen, behalve de prospectieve en circumstantiële sDm=t" [The particle n. Found with all conjugated verb forms, except the Prospective and the Circumstantial sDm=t].
59 Westendorf, Gebrauch Passivs, 61 (1.27.1). For instances with future time reference see Vernon, Future at Issue, 138-140.
60 To avoid any confusion about what I understand to be a "transposition" as presented in Polotsky, op.cit., 1-50, I present here my stance in this matter. On p. 2 the title "notion de 'transposition du verbe" (1.1) and the remark "en égyptien ... la morphologie verbale ... fournit des formes [my italics, LZ] destinées à faire passer, sans l'aide de moyens extérieurs, l'idée verbale dans les catégories du substantif, de l'adjectif et de l'adverbe de façon à remplir les fonctions syntaxiques de celles-ci" are clear statements about what a "transposition" is: a verb form with one specific syntactic function for a part of speech other than the verbal. Thus, when a verb form can exercise more than one syntactic function, e.g. genuinely "verbal" in addition to "adverbial", it is no longer a "transposition". When Polotsky, op.cit., 1 (3.3-4 of table of contents) labels the Passive sDm.w=f and the Stative "formes adverbiales (circstantielles)", he must thus be referring to verb forms. Indeed, as regards the Stative (op.cit., 29 (3.4)), he states "la nature adverbiale (circstantielle) du statif est évidente et universellement reconnue", with reference to Gardiner, EG, 237 (§311) and Lefebvre, GEC, 176 (§347). However, Gardiner and Lefebvre have pointed out that there is also the independent, thus non-adverbial use of the 1st person singular. Admittedly, the adverbial use of the Stative is most important, but not exclusive to it, which is, in my view, a prerequisite for qualifying as a "transposition". If not, there would be no difference between the terms "transposition" and "function". It is not clear to me whether Polotsky implicitly thought, at least originally, of two different forms hidden under the "Stative", i.e. the independent, verbal "Old Perfective" and the adverbial Pseudoparticiple; see now Kammerzell, Funktion und Form, GM 117/118 (1990), 181-202 and id., Augment, Stamm und Endung, LingAeg 1 (1991), 165-199 (for criticism on the morphological foundation of this subdivision see Jansen-Winkeln, Pseudopartizip, BSEG 15 (1991), 43-56; for Perfect versus Stative see Schenkel, scm.t-Perfekt und scm.ti-Stativ, in: Quaerentes scientiam. Fs. Westendorf, 157-182) (for remarks on this issue see Depuydt, Stative Ending, OLP 26 (1995), 21-27). Furthermore, from Polotsky's remarks on the Passive sDm=t (op.cit., 29 (3.3)), it can be inferred that he indeed thought of the Passive sDm=t in circumstantial use as...
whether in Classical Egyptian a verb form is automatically transposed when it exercises the function of a part of speech other than the verbal one. I argue that this need not be so, witness the Passive sDm=f. This verb form cannot be considered as adverbial/circumstantial by nature, because its function as the passive counterpart of the Circumstantial sDm,n=f is not exclusive to it. The very fact that the Passive sDm=f can also function independently, thus as a verbal verb form, proves that it is not a transposition. What is true for the Passive sDm=f may on principle also be true for the sDm,t=f: after r and Dr it need not be a substantival verb form. This point is stressed because the argument that the verb form in its other use, in n sDm,t=f, is not substantival by nature would entail that the sDm,t=f could no longer be spoken of as one verb form. There would then be two verb forms hidden under the same appearance. On the basis of the evidence presented, such an option seems to me to be implausible.

§ 9. The sDm,t=f is probably essentially a verbal verb form.

Loprieno has stated that the negation n is never linked to a nominal "transposition" of Egyptian conjugation. Although, in my opinion, this is correct, Polotsky's long-standing claim that n sDm,n=f contains the substantival verb form should not have been passed over without further argument.

I have recently argued that n sDm=n=f is, which contains the Indicative sDm=f, and n sDm,n=f, which needs no adverbial vedette, are serious obstacles to Polotsky's identification of the verb form in n sDm,n=f (is) as the substantival transposition. There is a simple solution solving both of Polotsky's problems, that is, to assume that both n sDm=n=f (is) and n sDm,n=f (is) contain an Indicative, genuinely verbal verb form, although on morphological grounds the point cannot be really proved with respect to the sDm,n=f. I have suggested that the negation n only combines with verbal verb forms, and expressed the suspicion that, at least in Middle Egyptian, n cannot function as negation of the substantival verb forms, for which the absence of *n sDm,n=f seems to be a clear indication. Another indication supporting this view seems to me to be that in the classical Middle Egyptian verb system the common negation of the future is nn sDm,f, which contains a substantival verb form, and not n sDm,f.

The analogy with n sDm,n=f supports the view that the verb form in n sDm,t=f is verbal, too, a point defended by several scholars. Indeed, when noting his problem with n sDm,n=f, Polotsky

different from the Passive sDm=t=f in independent use. If I have understood Loprieno, sDmt,f, GM 37 (1980), 17-29 properly, he sees the sDm,t=f as consisting of two forms = "transpositions" with syntactically and semantically separate functions: a Nominal sDm,t=f (see p. 20(4)) and an Averbal sDm,t=f (see p. 23 (5)), whereas I see the form as a unity.

For extensive evidence see Westendorf, Gebrauch Passivs, 13-52, passim. See further Hannig, sDm,w-Passiv, GM 103 (1988), 20, 23-26.

Loprieno, op.cit., 28.

Loprieno, op.cit., 18 is concerned with n sDm,n=f is, where n ... is negates the vedette, but does not deal with Polotsky's problem in Emphatic sDm,n=t, RDe 11 (1957), 116.


Zonhoven, op.cit., 51.

For the development from Old to Middle Egyptian see Vermus, Future at Issue, 121-122: "the twofold origin of Middle Egyptian sDm,t=f"; the Old Egyptian constructions n+ Prospective sDm,=f and n+ Prospective sDm,f "seem to have progressively merged into the Middle Egyptian negative construction nn sDm,f."


Since Old Egyptian does not have the difference between n and nn as it exists in Middle Egyptian, the issue cannot be studied with respect to this language phase; the question is whether 'archaïc' n sDm,w=f when used as negative future counterpart of nn sDm=f in the Coffin Texts within the framework of the Middle Egyptian transposition system, worked as a verbal or a substantival verb form. See the interesting remarks by Vermus, op.cit., 131 on its distribution in parallel or in alternation with n sDm,n=f. This could mean that this sDm,w=f was felt to belong to the same category as the verb form in n sDm=f/n sDm,n=f, which--as I have argued--is for both the Indicative/verbal. Note the remark by Schenkel, Verbaflexion PT, BiOr 42 (1985), 485 (§4.1): Old Egyptian "n sDm,w=f 'er wird nicht hören' (klassisch-ägyptisches nn sDm,f).

Gardiner, EG, 316-317 (§401): "under the name of the sDmt form we shall deal with a verb-form which is partly verbal and partly nominal". Satzinger, Neg. Konstr., 29 (§39): "die indikativen Form liegt nach der Negation vor"; reviewed by Gilula, JEA 56 (1970), 207 (A III): "in my opinion, the form which is found in the construction n sDmt is a regular verb form". Satzinger, sDmt,t, JEA 57 (1971), 60 commenting on Gardiner's formulation "partly verbal":
connects this with the construction n sDm.t=f.\textsuperscript{70}

However, if one adheres to the Polotskyan view that, like n sDm.n=f, n sDm.t=f also contains a substantival verb form, one may speak of the sDm.t=f as such a verb form in all its uses.\textsuperscript{71}

On the basis of the semantic unity of the sDm.t=f my conclusion can only be that the sDm.t=f is one verbal verb form, which assumes substantival function in the use after the prepositions/conjunctions r and Dr.\textsuperscript{72}

§ 10. The relationships between the constructions n sDm.t=f, nn sDm=f and iw=f r sDm.

From the translation with "before" or "(while) not yet" of n sDm.t=f it is clear that the construction does not assert nonoccurrence of its future Event. For this, Middle Egyptian uses the main clause construction nn + (Subjunctive) Prospective sDm=f.\textsuperscript{73} The affirmative main clause counterpart of n sDm.t=f is the Pseudoverbal Sentence iw=f r sDm.\textsuperscript{74}-- and not *iw sDm.t=f-- which is used for the expression of the objective absolute future.\textsuperscript{75} Whereas there is no obstacle to its relatives, the Pseudoverbal constructions iw=f Hr/m sDm, being used circumstantially with the meaning "while he is/was hearing simultaneously", this is different for the construction with r, which does not-- or hardly ever--\textsuperscript{76} occur in the circumstantial clause with the meaning "while he is yet going to hear".\textsuperscript{77} Since syntax cannot be the reason, there must be another cause. In my opinion, this is because the sDm.t=f constructions fulfil that role on account of their semantics.\textsuperscript{78}

Thus, while on the one hand iw=f r sDm does not occur in the subordinate clause, on the other the occurrences of n sDm.t=f in the main clause seem to be very rare.\textsuperscript{79} This suggests that the two constructions are in complementary distribution.

It seems to me that when n sDm.t=f occurs in the main clause its choice is then motivated by the presence of arguments in the preceding discourse which elicit its use on account of the need for an explicit or implicit ("as yet not") reference situation in the context.\textsuperscript{80}

§ 11. Like n sDm=f/sDm.n=f, n sDm.t=f is also essentially a main clause construction.

The construction n sDm.t=f shares with n + Indicative sDm=t/sDm.n=f the fact that they can function circumstantially, owing to the semantic dependence of negative constructions on arguments in the

\textsuperscript{70} "wobei wir ‘verbal’ insofern näher präzisieren können, als unter dem Gemeinden zumindest teilweise eine indikativische oder Hauptsatz-Konstruktion verstanden werden muss. Dies gilt insbesondere für die durch n verneinte t-Form ‘noch nicht’, ‘bevor’.

\textsuperscript{71} Allen, Inflection, 320 (§ 472): “the sDm.t=f can therefore be analyzed as syntactically nominal in all its uses”. Cf. Polotsky, Transpositions, IOS 6 (1976), 7, n.13: “la forme (r) sDm.t est sans doute une forme substantive personnelle du prospectif”.

\textsuperscript{72} Compare for cases of relative present time reference the use of the Substantival mrr=f and the Indicative mr=f in the stock phrase of the Appel aux Vivants m mrr=Tn vs. m mr=Tn; cf. Gardiner, EG, 357 (§44,2) and 374 (§5,4,4) and Borghouts, Egyptisch I, 118-119 (§54,c).

\textsuperscript{73} See Vernus, Future at Issue, 121-126; for nn sw r sDm see pp. 130-131. Schenkel, Verbalflexion PT, BiOr 42 (1985), 485 (4.1). See also Winand, Constructions analogiques, RDeE 47 (1996), 117.

\textsuperscript{74} Vernus, op.cit., 126.

\textsuperscript{75} Vernus, op.cit., 9-15.

\textsuperscript{76} The claim that the example CT [1017] VII 237 l is a circumstantial clause of Substantive + r sDm, as argued by Vernus, op.cit., 7, n.12, cannot easily be substantiated.

\textsuperscript{77} The relative time reference “while yet to” is equivalent to “until”, “before”.

\textsuperscript{78} The almost exclusive use of iw=f r sDm in the main clause may well have been the main reason why the construction iw=f r sDm is the only one in which the particle iw became a bound constituent in XVIIIth Dynasty Neo-Middle Egyptian and Late Egyptian; see Vernus, op.cit., 7. One of its consequences was the renewal of the negative objective future in the early XVIIIth Dynasty in nn iw=f r sDm, see Vernus, op.cit., 130-131 and Winand, op.cit., 118.

\textsuperscript{79} See Studies sDm=t=f III (n sDm.t=f), §9 [pp. 49-50].

\textsuperscript{80} A good example of the obligatory use of n sDm.t=f instead of iw=f r sDm (or another construction with future time reference in the main clause) seems to me to be letter Pap. Berlin 10016 from the Illahun archive (see Studies sDm.t=f III (n sDm.t=f), §9 [p. 49]) which contains a question about the sending of female workers who have not yet been received. The sending is beyond the control of the recipient. See also the next note.
preceding context in general.\textsuperscript{81} Syntactically, this would explain the common use in Middle Egyptian of negated constructions in asyndetic circumstantial function.\textsuperscript{82}

Whereas the main clause verbal patterns $n\text{ sDm}=f/s\text{Dm},n=f$ may exercise circumstantial function, this is different with $n\text{ sDm},t=f$, which hardly ever appears to be used in the main clause. This difference may be explained from the circumstance that the Indicative $s\text{Dm}=f/s\text{Dm},n=f$ are absolute tenses and, thus, on account of their semantics naturally belong in the main clause. In contrast, the $s\text{Dm},t=f$ as a relative tense is ideally suited for use in the circumstantial temporal clause.

Nonetheless, just like the two other negative constructions of $n\text{ sDm}=f/s\text{Dm},n=f$, $n\text{ sDm},t=f$, too, from the syntactic viewpoint, is essentially a main clause construction.\textsuperscript{83}

\section*{§ 12. The syntax of the relative tense constructions $\text{iw}\text{ sDm}=f/s\text{Dm},n=f$ and $n\text{ sDm},t=f$ compared.}

The way the particle $\text{iw}$ functions syntactically in the main clause as Reference point for the Circumstantial $s\text{Dm}=f/s\text{Dm},n=f$ is, to some extent, comparable with the role of the negation in $n\text{ sDm},t=f$. By asserting the nonoccurrence of the Event at the reference time the negation is linked to the reference situation and expresses the time reference coincidence with it. Whereas the Circumstantial $s\text{Dm}=f/s\text{Dm},n=f$ are syntactically admitted to the use of $\text{iw}$ as Reference point because of their adverbial character, the $s\text{Dm},t=f$ as a non-adverbial verb form is, in my opinion, barred from this.

For explicit linking with the reference situation the verb form has to take resort to other means, namely a particle that can syntactically combine with verbal verb forms: the negation $n$. In turn, the negation $n$ seems syntactically incompatible with adverbial verb forms, which could be one of the reasons why, unlike $n\text{ sDm},t=f$, the constructions $^*n + \text{ Circumstantial } s\text{Dm}=f/s\text{Dm},n=f$ do not occur to express nonoccurrence of the Event of these relative tenses at reference time.\textsuperscript{84} As $n\text{ sDm},t=f$ proves, it is not the relative tense property as such of the verb forms that excludes them from combination with the negation $n$.

In addition to the syntactic comparability of $\text{iw}$ and $n$ as Reference point, there is also the fact that both $\text{iw} + \text{ Circumstantial } s\text{Dm}=f/s\text{Dm},n=f$ and $n\text{ sDm},t=f$ in a past context refer to actual Events, and that both $\text{iw}=f r\text{ sDm}$ and $n\text{ sDm},t=f$ in a non-past context presumably refer to real Events.

\section*{§ 13. Why can the $s\text{Dm},t=f$ not occur independently in the main clause?}

In § 7 I have remarked that, in contrast to the Circumstantial $s\text{Dm}=f/s\text{Dm},n=f$, the bare $s\text{Dm},t=f$ cannot exercise circumstantial function, which explains the absence of bare $s\text{Dm},t=f$ in the circumstantial clause.

In § 9 I have argued that the $s\text{Dm},t=f$ is essentially a verbal verb form. Since such a verb form is capable of occurring independently in the main clause, this raises the question of why the $s\text{Dm},t=f$ needs the negation $n$ to function as a main clause construction. Why can it not perform there independently as $^*s\text{Dm},t=f$ "relative to a reference point in the context he is yet to hear", while relating itself to a reference situation which is either implicitly the absolute present of the speaker or is explicitly provided in the preceding context? After all, the main clause is exactly the syntactic environment for the independent use of verbal verb forms, as the Indicativel/verbal) $s\text{Dm}=f/s\text{Dm},n=f$, among others, in the main clause prove.

\textsuperscript{81} For the greater discourse dependency of negative clauses see Givón, On Understanding Grammar, 103 (3.2.1): “negative clauses are not used for introducing new referential arguments into the discourse, but rather, they are used in contexts in which a referential argument has already been mentioned in the preceding discourse”. For adverbial verb forms and sentence types, I see a fundamentally different motivation for their occurrence in circumstantial function, namely that adverbiality entails circumstantial function. Note that Ritter, Verbalsystem, 243 (2-3) has argued that the word category of negations is prepositional rather than substantival.

\textsuperscript{82} For Old Egyptian $ny$ as typically functioning in the negative circumstantial clause see now the survey by Møers, Negation $n$, LingAeg 3 (1993), 34-37. See also my note 100 below.

\textsuperscript{83} See my Studies $s\text{Dm},t=f$ III (n $s\text{Dm},t=f$), §9 [pp. 49-50].

\textsuperscript{84} There may also be semantic reasons for their absence. The very existence of $n\text{ sDm},t=f$ proves that whilst using a relative future tense it is sensible to state that "at a certain time an Event which is/was located posterior to it does/did not occur" (compare an English expression like "it is/was not departure time yet"), but this may be different for the relative present and relative past tense.
It looks as if the bare sDm.t=f is barred from this position for semantic reasons, owing to its being a relative tense. This is corroborated by the related forms Circumstantial sDm=f/sDm.n=f, which only occur in the main clause in cooperation with a syntactically compatible particle functioning as Reference point.\footnote{In my article Polotsky, Sinuhe, Negation, JEOL 33 (1993-1994), 1995, 78-81 I have suggested that the construction Substantive + Circumstantial sDm=f is instead a circumstantial clause construction and is not to be confused with the main clause use of the alternative construction Substantive + Indicative sDm=f.}

In other words, it seems that in Middle Egyptian a relative tense can only function in the main clause in dependence on a syntactic element serving as Reference point. In the rare cases of use of the sDm.t=f in the main clause, there must also be an element forming the link with the reference situation. It is the negation n which represents the time coincidence with the reference situation.

To conclude this section, I would like to remark that the above answer to the question of why n sDm.t=f, and not the bare sDm.t=f, occurs in the main clause in Egyptian seems to be unconnected with the remarkable parallel of a main clause usage for reference to the future in a number of the familiar Indo-European languages. Also, these languages then often use negative constructions with "pas encore", "noch nicht", "nog niet" (Dutch) comparable with "he has (/had) not yet heard". The future Event might equally well have been referred to with the affirmative construction "he is yet to hear", with absolute future time reference, or with the affirmative "he was to hear yet (then)" (with relative future time reference in the absolute past time field). It is precisely these usages of "has (or, had) not yet" etc. which lie at the root of the idea that "(while) he has/had not yet heard" is the literal translation of n sDm.t=f.

§ 14. Brief conclusion listing parallels and contrasts between the sDm.t=f and other forms.

The sDm.t=f cannot function independently in the circumstantial clause because it is not an adverbial verb form; hence, either adverbial function is realized by the use of the prepositions/conjunctions r and Dr, or the main clause pattern n sDm.t=f is used in circumstantial function (compare n sDm=f/sDm.n=f).

The form cannot function independently in the main clause because it is a relative tense. In Egyptian, a relative tense can only function in the main clause if the Reference point is included (compare iw sDm=f/sDm.n=f).

Because the sDm.t=f is a verbal verb form, the syntactically compatible negation n (compare n sDm=f/sDm.n=f) serves as Reference point (contrary to iw sDm=f/sDm.n=f).

In n sDm.t=f the negation does not assert the future non-occurrence of the Event (contrary to nn sDm=f), but only asserts nonoccurrence at reference time because with a finite relative tense the Event is presupposed (contrary to n sDm=f/sDm.n=f).

Generally speaking, owing to its being a relative tense construction, n sDm.t=f does not occur in the main clause, which is the domain of absolute future iw=f r sDm.

§ 15. Has the sDm.t=f perfective meaning or perfective aspect?

From my study it is evident that I define the sDm.t=f as a relative future tense, and that I consider the grammatical category of tense involved as its main characteristic.\footnote{Thus also Depuydt, Cat. of Coordinates, 163 (2.1.1.5). Remarkably, however, the 'until, (not) yet' notion (2.1.1.5) is set apart from the future (2.1.1.3).} Verb forms may also be involved in the aspectual distinctions of perfective and imperfective meaning, and languages may even have special verb forms to indicate these.\footnote{Comrie, Aspect, 3 (bottom) and 7-9.} Such verb forms have perfective or imperfective aspect, they grammaticize it. Verb forms may also combine the distinct grammatical categories of time reference and aspect.\footnote{See Comrie, op.cit., 9 and ch. 4. With respect to the sDm.t=f Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 80: [Tense] Past, [Aspect] Perfective.}

The sDm.t=f has been labelled "perfective" by several scholars,\footnote{Graefe, Mittl. Grammatik, 101-102 (§41.II): "Perfektiv", "Bedeutung: abgeschlossene Handlung (zukünftig oder vergangen)". Englund, Middle Egyptian, 72: "the sDm.t=f is a form of the verb with an inserted t-element that marks perfective aspect". Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 302: "sDm.t=f (perfective 'he has [been] heard')". See also} and this label must then

\footnote{\textsuperscript{85}In my article Polotsky, Sinuhe, Negation, JEOL 33 (1993-1994), 1995, 78-81 I have suggested that the construction Substantive + Circumstantial sDm=f is instead a circumstantial clause construction and is not to be confused with the main clause use of the alternative construction Substantive + Indicative sDm=f.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{86}Thus also Depuydt, Cat. of Coordinates, 163 (2.1.1.5). Remarkably, however, the 'until, (not) yet' notion (2.1.1.5) is set apart from the future (2.1.1.3).}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{87}Comrie, Aspect, 3 (bottom) and 7-9.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{88}See Comrie, op.cit., 9 and ch. 4. With respect to the sDm.t=f Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 80: [Tense] Past, [Aspect] Perfective.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{89}Graefe, Mittl. Grammatik, 101-102 (§41.II): "Perfektiv", "Bedeutung: abgeschlossene Handlung (zukünftig oder vergangen)". Englund, Middle Egyptian, 72: "the sDm.t=f is a form of the verb with an inserted t-element that marks perfective aspect". Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 302: "sDm.t=f (perfective 'he has [been] heard')". See also}
indicate that in their view the \(sDm.t=f\) has perfective aspect as its primary feature. Since so far I have worked solely with the concept of tense and time reference, this question deserves attention.

Proceeding from the definition of relative tense, which essentially concerns the location in time of an Event relative to a Reference point in the context, it seems to me that such a tense has perfective meaning. The term "perfective" is used according to Comrie's definition: "perfectivity indicates the view of a situation as a single whole, without distinction of the various separate phases that make up that situation."\(^90\)

Generally speaking with respect to Classical Egyptian finite verb forms, it is more difficult to establish whether they grammaticize an aspect\(^91\) than to determine their time reference.\(^92\)

My argument that the \(sDm.t=f\) only has perfective meaning is based on the circumstance that the perfectivity is only a feature derived from its meaning as a relative tense, in which two time points are mutually related.\(^93\) I postulate that its \(t\)-morpheme marks (relative) future location in time, as it does in other prospective/future forms too,\(^94\) and does not grammaticize perfective aspect, as is the opinion of others, particularly Loprieno. In several studies he has related prospectivity to perfectivity as a subcategory of perfectivity, among other things with reference to the \(t\)-morpheme present in \(sDm.t=f\), but under this viewpoint he has so far not explicitly related prospectivity to the \(sDm.t=f\).\(^95\)

§ 16. The presupposition held by the speaker and grammaticized in the \(sDm.t=f\).

In the preceding study on \(n\ \(sDm.t=f\) I approached the phenomenon of presupposition solely from the viewpoint of its grammaticalization in the verb form.\(^96\) I have not discussed the use of the \(sDm.t=f\) as part of an utterance made by a speaker in discourse, since this is an issue concerned with the verb form proper. This aspect will now receive closer attention. My starting point is my conclusion that in the \(sDm.t=f\) a presupposition of an Event located in a future relative to a Reference point is being grammaticized.

In making an assertion, the speaker assumes or presupposes that something is so.\(^97\) What is presupposed is what the speaker takes for granted and what he assumes to be taken for granted by

---

\(^{90}\) Comrie, Aspect, 16 (1.0). See also Ritter, Verbalsystem, 65-67.

\(^{91}\) For the difference between "perfective meaning" and "perfective aspect" as a grammatical category see Comrie, Aspect, 6-9.

\(^{92}\) The reconstruction of an 'original' aspectual system as made in Loprieno, Verbalsystem, 38-50 is highly hypothetical; cf. the remark by Junge, Emphasis, 32.

\(^{93}\) See Comrie, Aspect, 10-11 for the point of the general characterization of the meaning of verb forms.

\(^{94}\) More explicit on this point is §20 below [p. 89].

\(^{95}\) Only in his first contribution does Loprieno, sDm.t,f, GM 37 (1980), 17 (0.0a) and 26 (6.a) refer to future and prospectivity; on p. 23 (4), in the context of the discussion of an exceptional writing with \(j\) of a \(sDm.t=f\) construction, he draws only marginal attention to "a \(t\)-suffix with prospective value largely attested in two other forms, i.e. the participle \(sDm.tj=tj\) and the prospective \(sDm.t\) of the verbs \(jwj\) and \(jnj\)." Id., Aspekt und Diathese, in: Stud. zu Sprache und Religion. Westendorf, 92 (§2.a) speaks only of "'perfektive' Bedeutung" of the verb form after \(nj\) and \(jDr\, marking\ it\ off\ from\ 'prof" perfektive" Bedeutung\ in the forms \(iw.t=f\ and \(in.t=f\ (sub\ b)\). Thus also in id., Verbalsystem, 44 (1-2); ibid., n.57 he refers to Westendorf's proposal of the \(sDm.t=f\) as a relative future without committing himself. Prospectivity is not related to the \(sDm.t=f\ in id., Ancient Egyptian, 78, 80, 151 either. For the issue of the \(t\)-morpheme as prospective or passive see also Roccati, Coniugazioni derivate, Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino 105 (1970-1971), 48-53.

\(^{96}\) See Studies sDm.t=f III (n sDm.t=f), §3 [p. 44] and §6 [pp. 46-47].

\(^{97}\) Lyons, Semantics, 599.
the addressee. On the basis of Comrie’s analysis of an affirmative verb form and its negative in Luganda, one might add that in assertions the presupposition held by the speaker may find expression through the use of a verb form grammaticizing this presupposition.

The use of such a verb form in an assertion has two sides. On the one hand, the fact that the presupposition inherent in the meaning of the verb form is held by the speaker permits him to use the verb form and, consequently, it underlies his assertion. But, on the other hand, the felicity of an assertion containing such a verb form must rest on the validity of the presupposition held by the speaker.

By the very nature of the location of Events posterior to the present, the presupposed occurrence of the Event cannot be more than an expectation of fulfilment on the part of the speaker. For this expectation there is a wide spectrum of possible motivations. There is a probability scale ranging from the general human experience concerning the recurrence of cyclic phenomena, such as the next sunrise and daily renewal of the existence of the cosmos or the course of human life, via the effectivity of certain remedies “used a million times” and divine acts of justice, to the other end, where personal convictions about the realization of private human actions are found.

Let us turn to some examples, in the first of which the king asks the sun god a question.

Let us turn to some examples, in the first of which the king asks the sun god a question.

Stela Metropolitan Museum of Art New York 13.182.3, 2. 100 sDAt=f tr it=i Ra n wD.t=k wi Hbs Tw tr pt n wD.t=f wi tr “will you then depart, my father Re, while you have not yet summoned me? Will the sky then conceal you, while you have not yet summoned me”? This is surely a rhetorical question on the part of King Wah-ankh, because royal dogma and the Ma’at ideology exclude real doubts of this kind. Surely the king believes that he will be summoned by his father, the sun god.

Evidence for the ‘(relative) future Event’ presupposition held by private persons in non-past contexts is primarily dependent on contracts and letters. Most fortunately, there is a Middle Kingdom archive of a private person, the famous Hekanakhte Papers. Hekanakhte’s convictions at the basis of his presuppositions may concern himself, who knows best that he will, is about, intends or wishes to make something happen, of course all within the limits imposed by the future.

In the next example the presupposition concerns Hekanakhte’s own return home, about which he no doubt feels certain.

Hekanakhte Letter II, 28-29. inn=Tw n=sTw w ib qn r pH.t=i Tw “it is until I have reached you that you shall conduct yourselves with stout hearts”. 103 In another example it concerns the lives of the addressees, whom he may reasonably assume will reach summer.

Hekanakhte Letter I, vo. 8. di int=f/in.t=f n=s swt XAr 3 Hna gmt=k m it-mH m swt HAw aqw=Tw r pH.t=f Tw Smw “get him to bring me three khar of wheat together with what you can find of barley -- but only in excess of your allowances until you reach the summer”. 104

Presupposition about realization of an Event which is subject to the will of another person rests on a less certain basis. The realization of Events that are brought about by the actions of close relatives, friends or dependents may well score as high on the probability scale as those brought about by the speaker himself. Also, promises made by a reliable character create higher expectations than those of a less trustworthy person, etcetera, etcetera. Central to all these possibilities is that the speaker presupposes occurrence of the Event. To conclude the remarks on the presupposition in non-past contexts, I present a last example from the Hekanakhte Papers.

Hekanakhte Letter II, 5-6. xAA.tw aqw n 4A-nb-niwt m it-mH=Tr wn n=s m xtw=Tr r nw.t=f r Pr-hAA “it is until he departs for Per-haa that rations should be measured for Sinebnut from his barley which he had on his threshing floor(?)”. 105

In the frequently occurring case of absolute past contexts, the presupposition of the speaker is

---

98 Lyons, op. cit., 605. See further, Studies sDm.t=f III (n sDm.t=f), n.18.
99 Quoted in Studies sDm.t=f III (n sDm.t=f), §3 [p. 44].
100 Publ. Clère - Vandier, T. Prem. Per. Interm., 9-10 (no. 15); Winlock, The XIth Dynasty, J NES 2 (1943), pl. 36 (pp. 260-261). Photograph in Hayes, Scepter of Egypt, I, 152 (fig. 190).
102 Following James, Hekanakhte Papers. See also Goedicke, Studies Hekanakhte.
103 James, op. cit., 14 leaves Smw untranslated (see p. 58, n.65). Goedicke, op. cit., 44 translates “harvest”.
104 I follow James’s translation, op. cit., 32. Goedicke, op. cit., 17 and 25-26, n.(h) reads wnn=s m xtw=Tr “while he is among his followers”.
105 Publ. James, Hekanakhte Papers. See also Goedicke, Studies Hekanakhte.
that the Event has indeed occurred between the time of the Reference point and the absolute present. The Event is presupposed to be a fact which may, quite objectively, be confirmed by the context.

The confirmation of the fact as true may be explicitly given, so, for example, in the following examples.

CT [775] VI 409 b-c. mT rx(n).n=1 m=S n iw.t=f “see, I knew your name (already), when I was not yet boatless”.\(^{106}\) Horus is addressing his mother Isis. Confirmation of the present situation that Horus is indeed boatless is given earlier in the spell: CT VI 408 n 1r iw “so said the boatless Horus”.

But the confirmation may also be implicit, as in the following examples.

CT [384] V 51 c-d/B6C. iw Dd.n N pn m=k pAwt=k ny xpr.t=k\(^{207}\) “this N has said your name and your primordial origin, when you had not yet come into existence”.\(^{108}\) The very fact that the speaker is addressing a being confirms the existence of the latter.

In autobiographical retrospective the tomb owner looks back on his life, in which coming of age was an important milestone for him.

Another possibility is that, owing to some intervening situation, the relative future Event has not happened at some expected time in the absolute past and that the postponed Event is still expected to occur at some point beyond the present. In such cases the \(\text{sDm.t=f}\) construction (“still not yet”) must be used. In these instances the ‘relative future Event’ presupposition of the speaker is still alive.

Pap. (med.) Berlin 3038, 12,8-9. kt nt dr Sna m Xt hAy.t=f “another (remedy) to drive off a constipation in the belly which as yet has still not gone away”.\(^{110}\)

Pap. Berlin 10016, vo. 4a. (n) iw rdi.n=k int/in.t(w) iwAw(t) (3?) n Ssp.t=ø “have you caused the (three?) women workers to be brought? As yet they have still not been received”.\(^{110}\)

In the study on \(\text{sDm.t=f}\) I have provisionally referred to examples where there is no question of postponement of the occurrence of the Event, but where the Event is purely and simply irreal owing to its abortion by the action at a reference time located in the absolute past. Such instances seem to defy my argument on the ‘relative future Event’ presupposition as part of the meaning of the \(\text{sDm.t=f}\).\(^{111}\)

§ 17. Excursus: conditional sentences and the expression of irreal events.

Before turning to these examples, I would like to discuss the various types of conditional sentences, particularly with respect to the issue of their ability to express the unfulfilled condition. They are discussed here in connection with such a--much debated--sentence in the passages in the Instruction of Amenemhat I for his Son which relate the murderous attempt on the king’s life. This passage will serve as the introduction to the other famous one on the question of the coregency, which contains \(\text{sDm.t=f}\) constructions. The interpretation of the latter as realis or irrealis is dependent on that of the passage presented next. It is of great grammatical as well as of historical importance, because its translation as an irrealis or realis is vital for the important historical issue of whether the old king describes an assault which he survived or to which he succumbed.

---

\(^{106}\) For general remarks on Horus being boatless see Borghouts, Magical P. Leiden 348, 85-86.

\(^{107}\) For another Middle Kingdom example of archaic \(\text{ny sDm.t=f}\) see stela Cairo CG 20328, a.12 (publ. Lange - Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine I, 341): \(\text{ms.n=k N ny xpr.t sDb} “\text{you have engendered N, when impediment had not yet come into being”)}\); quoted by Edel, AÄG, 571 (§1098). See now the survey by Moers, Negation n, LingAeg 3 (1993), 34-37. See also my note 81 above.

\(^{108}\) I follow Barguet, Textes des sarcophages, 206. Faulkner, Coffin Texts II, 15 takes the writing \(\text{pAwt=k}\) to stand for \(\text{pA{t}.k(wi)}\).

\(^{109}\) For another \(\text{n sDm.t=f}\) construction with \(\text{Xrd}\) as antecedent compare (in a broken context) Tomb Siut III, 5 (publ. Brunner, Texte aus den Gräbern von Siut, 42) .... Xrd n xpr.t=f, in which according to Brunner, op. cit., 20, *n.11 the meaning is “... the child when it had not yet come into existence” rather than “... the child when it had not yet grown up”. See also Jansen-Winkeln’s remark, Spätmitteläg. Grammatik, 72 (§113). For other expressions relating to childhood see Studies sDm.t=f IV (passive \(\text{sDm.t=f/ms.(y)=f}\)), §5 [pp. 60-62].

\(^{110}\) See already Studies sDm.t=f III (n sDm.t=f), §8 [p. 48].

\(^{111}\) Studies sDm.t=f III (n sDm.t=f), §7, last paragraph [p. 48].
Instruction of Amenemhat I, VIIc-d/Sall.\[112\] It has been convincingly demonstrated that there is no substantial evidence for a coregency between Amenemhat and Sesostris I.\[113\] There can now be little doubt that the old king did not survive the attempt and fell victim to a harem conspiracy. It seems, therefore, hardly possible to find convincing arguments defending a translation in the realis: “now, after I had quickly got to grips, with weapons in my [sic, ‘his’] hand, I have made the cowards retreat from the attack(?).”\[114\] The version of Pap. Millingen reads ir sDm.n=f.

Recently, it has, in my opinion, been convincingly demonstrated that there is no substantial evidence for a coregency between Amenemhat and Sesostris I.\[115\] There can now be little doubt that the old king did not survive the attempt and fell victim to a harem conspiracy. It seems, therefore, hardly possible to find convincing arguments defending a translation in the realis: “now, after I had quickly got to grips, with weapons in my hand, I have made the cowards retreat.”\[116\]

Proceeding therefore from the interpretation of successful regicide, the conditional sentences in both versions of the text must express the irrealis of the past. Since the verb forms in the protasis are different, their choice is, apparently, not essential in this respect. Evidently, not only the protasis but also the verb form in the apodosis must be involved to achieve the notion of unfulfilled condition.\[117\]

In an abstract sense the time of the event in a subordinate conditional protasis is always the past relative to the reference time in the apodotic main clause, because the fulfillment of the condition given in the protasis entails the consequence of this expressed in the apodosis. From this viewpoint of relative time reference it is of no concern whether the protasis contains ir sDm.n=f or a construction with ir wnn, but it is when the present moment of speech is also taken into consideration, a moment that is necessarily present in any utterance because it is the absolute deictic centre for time reference.

I shall turn first to the protasis with the absolute deictic centre for time reference. Also taken into consideration, a moment that is necessarily present in any utterance because it is the absolute deictic centre for time reference.

I shall turn first to the protasis with the ir sDm.n=f construction, which has indeed been argued to denote the unfulfilled condition.\[118\]

Although the Pap. Sallier II text is less trustworthy than Pap. Millingen, there is occasional evidence that ir sDm.n=f is a regular construction.\[119\] The use of ir sDm.n=f in the medical texts gives Westendorf good reason for his contention that the construction cannot be convincingly argued to

---


\[113\] For Ssp As as an expression for “to make haste”, see Gardiner, EG, 117 (§151) and Faulkner, Concise Dictionary, 271. Pointing out that the meaning of the verb Ssp in Dutch is “aannemen, aanpakken” (German “annahmen, anpacken”), I am inclined to see in the present passage an analogy with a specific meaning of Dutch “aanpakken” in the sense of English “to get to grips”. The word written As must either be taken as a substantive “haste” (thus Gardiner and Faulkner) for which there is no other evidence, or it is used as the adverb As(w), as is usual. Assuming, therefore, that As(w) is an adverb here, it is not likely to precede xaw as the object of Ssp.n=ï (for some counterexample see Gardiner, EG, 413 (§507.2)); moreover, if xaw is taken as the object, and not as the subject of a circumstantial Adverbial Sentence, what is then the sense of adding “in my hand”, which seems to me the only member qualified to grab weapons with? Thus, the verb should rather be taken here as having no object, just as ir “to act” might do without; for another occurrence of this use without object see n.50 above (ex. Pap. Ram. III, B,10-11) and, possibly, Pap. Berlin 10016, vo. 4a (n Ssp.n=ï), if an active form is identified therein (see Studies sDm.t=ï III (n sDm.t=ï), n.54). For a different translation of As as “overwelmier” see Goedicke, Instructions Amenemhet I, 1, 18, 23-24. For the latest discussions of the hapax legomenon bABA see Burkard, Textkritische Umt., 308-309 and Goedicke, Instructions Amenemhet I, 1, 25.

\[114\] Note that this writing in Pap. Millingen is considered to be the only trustworthy one by Lopez, Pap. Millingen, RdE 15 (1963), 32-33 (II,3); Ssp.n=ï in Pap. Sallier and the other Ramessean variants is rejected as grammatically incorrect.

\[115\] Obsomer, Sesostris I, 112-135. For the king’s intention to establish a coregency see Blumenthal, Koregenz, ZÄS 110 (1983), 104-121. For a new opinion not challenging the murder but suggesting a later date for the composition itself see Grimal, Corégence et association, BIFAO 95 (1995), 273-280. Parkinson, Tale of Sinuhe, 204 disconnects the historical question of the ten-year coregency between Amenemhat I and Sesostris I—which seems probable to him—from its representation in the Instruction; see also p. 22 (in particular n.22), where the motive for Sinuhe’s panic and flight is connected with the unexpected death of the old king.

\[116\] Most recently defended by Jansen-Winkeln, Attentat auf Amenemhet I., SAK 18 (1991), 253-254; see the refutation of this by Obsomer, op.cit., 118-120.

\[117\] In essence this is also Lopez’s argument, Pap. Millingen, RdE 15 (1963), 33 and 33, n.6.

\[118\] Gardiner, EG, 331 (§414,3) and 117 (§151): “doubtless this [ir sDm.n=f] was the construction regularly employed to express an unfulfilled condition. Examples are, however, of extreme rarity”; thus also Lefebvre, GEC, 362 (§727,b). Malaize, Propositions conditionnelles, CdE 60 (1985), 160-161 and 167 (table) leaves open the problem of reals or irreals with regard to the present example.

\[119\] For the evidence see Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 172-173 (§242,1). For other unusual constructions after ir see now Westendorf, Doppelfunktion des jr, GM 151 (1996), 109-111.
express the irrealis of the past (including the present passage!). In my opinion, ir sDm.n=f can not only perfectly express the fulfilled condition in the examples from the medical texts, but also the irrealis, the unfulfilled condition, in the passage under discussion.

According to present opinion after ir it must concern a substantival form, thus the Substantival sDm.n=f in the passage under discussion. This identification is confirmed by the passivized sDm.n-tw=f in the only other example of the ir sDm.n=f construction in literary Middle Egyptian, that is, if a reading ir is accepted, and not the alternative iw.

Admonitions, 12.6. ir snm.n-tw=n n gm.n.i Tw n iaS.n.tw w n. In the spirit of Gardiner's translation, "if we had been fed(?), I would not have found you, a call on me would not have been made". Because of the lacunose nature of the context and the obscure contents of the passage, I shall refrain from discussing the issue of reals or irrealis.

Although the Substantival sDm.n=f is not a relative but an absolute tense, in contrast to the Circumstantial sDm.n=f, a substantival verb form is not barred from receiving relative time reference as a contextual feature. For this the use of the Prospective sDm=f after conditional ir and after prepositions/conjunctions, notably Dr "since" and m-xt "after", are eloquent testimony.

With regard to the absolute time reference of the condition expressed by the speaker in the protasis there are two possibilities.

Case A: location of the time of the protasis after the moment of speech, i.e. in the absolute future. Necessarily, the apodosis also has absolute future time reference because the protasis is past relative to it. Both the fulfilment of the condition and the ensuing consequence are potentially real. This is the best known and normal type of conditional sentence with the Prospective sDm=f in the protasis, and it needs no further consideration here.

Case B: location of the time of the protasis before the moment of speech, i.e. in the absolute past. In this case there are two possibilities with the absolute time reference in the apodosis.

Case B.1: location of the time of the apodosis before the moment of speech. Necessarily, the protasis has absolute past time reference, because it is past relative to the apodosis. This is the situation in the passage from the Instruction of Amenemhat I under discussion, expressing the unfulfilled condition in the past, both in the version Pap. Millingen with ir Ssp=i and in Pap. Sallier with ir Ssp.n=i. I shall return to the question of these verb forms below.

Another example of this construction expressing unfulfilled condition is known from the Coffin Texts.

CT (587) V I 208 p-r. ir di.n=k sw n tm=Ø (/w?) m aHA n Htm=Ø (/w?) n X[nw] pXr sAbwt n=sn "if you would have left him [Seth] (free), then one would not have refrained from fighting, one would not have abstained from turmoil, and the speckled snakes would not have rolled themselves up (?)". I take the negative construction to have absolute past time reference, and I consider the wrtings tm and Htm to be impersonal active Indicative sDm=Ø forms rather than impersonal Passive sDm=f forms. The next example from one of Hekanakhte's letters is somewhat difficult owing to its double entendre.

---

120 Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 172-173 (§242.1). There is no convincing support for his approval of the translation "I drove back the cowards with a lance".

121 M.alaise, op.cit., 167 (table) and Sztzinger, Pratosis jr sDm.f, LingAeg 3 (1993), 132 (table).

122 For the alternative reading iw see Westendorf, Gebrauch Passivs, 99 (ex. 215).

123 Gardiner, Admonitions, 83. In taking the verb snm to mean "to feed", I follow Lichtheim, Literature I, 160.

124 Prof. Burkard has personally communicated to me that in a recent paper delivered at the Posener symposium, Leipzig 1996 he proposed identifying the verb form in ir Ssp=i as the infinitive. In principle, there is no objection to this, but if I am right in seeing in the writing As an adverb As.w rather than a substantive "haste" as object, then the suffix pronoun wi is bound to denote the semantic object with the infinitive of a transitive verb. Under this viewpoint his interpretation is less likely. See my note 110 above.

125 I broadly follow the translation by Borghouts, Magical Pap. Leiden 348, 201. Translated somewhat differently by Faulkner, Coffin Texts II, 190; see also p. 190, n.1.

126 For a similar construction with the preposition m + infinitive see Hekanakhte Letter II, 27-28: mTn SAa.w m wnm mT A A "see, they have started to eat people here"; translated with impersonal "they" by Goedicke, Studies Hekanakhte, 18, Baer, Eleventh Dynasty Farmer, JAO 83 (1963), 8, James, Hekanakhte Papers, 39 (21), and Allen, Colloquial Middle Egyptian, LingAeg 4 (1994), 5, n.26. Note that James and Allen identify the Passive sDm=f; for the interpretation of similar constructions as impersonal passives see Reintjes, sDm-tw=f, GM 153 (1996), 89-92.
Hekanakhte Letter I, vo. 3-4.127 ir wnn rdi.n=f int/in.t(w) n=i it-mH is r abt pA it-mH mA xy Ddt=s
fr.w(y) st "if it would have been to preserve this new barley that you had let to be brought to me
the old barley, what is it that I could have said (then) but 'how clever it is!".128 Satzinger has
convincingly argued that in the present example ir wnn sDm.n=f is not the conditional conversion
of main clause iw sDm.n=f,129 but rather of the emphatic main clause,130 with the Emphatic Prospective
sDm=f form wnn as 'nominalizer' after ir.131 As is apparent from the beginning of the verso of his
letter, Hekanakhte is unpleasantly surprised to receive old instead of new barley from M erisu
through the hands of Sahathor.132 With grim cynicism, in my opinion, he says that if M erisu had
done this for the purpose of finishing the old barley first, he could only have said how wise to do
so in meagre times was. But Hekanakhte suspects that M erisu is eating the new crop himself, and
fobbing him off with the old stuff. If Hekanakhte's words are viewed in this light, we may well be
dealing with an irreal condition in the protasis, not irreal in the sense that the barley had not been
seen sent, but irreal because of the reason presented as vedette: a reason which Hekanakhte makes
up but does not believe to be M erisu's motive.

Case B.2: location of the time of the apodosis after the moment of speech. Thus, the protasis
has now absolute past time reference, but the abode of the event is in the present future. However, in this
case the location of the present moment between the time of the protasis and that of the apodosis is
of importance.

Of the three passages in question from the medical texts, formally all conditional sentences, I shall
only deal with the two that are complete, the third having a lacuna at the place of the apodosis.133
Pap. Edwin Smith, 8,12-13.134 ir nis.n=k n=f iw=f dgm.(w) n mdw.n=f Dd.in=k "when (if) you have
called him in a situation where he has turned out to be (lit., while he is) unconscious and unable to
(lit., while he cannot) speak, then you must say:".135 Note that Dd.in=k has future time reference
here, as is often the case in the medical texts.136
Pap. Berlin 3038, 13,6-7.137 ir Ts.n=f im=m xpr.n=f m Sna ir.xr=k "when (if) it has become
constricted in him and it has become an obstruction, then you must do ...".

In these examples the condition in the protasis is, evidently, presented by the speaker as
absolute past, as fulfilled before the present moment. However, the subsequent medical procedure in
the apodosis is presented as being located after the present moment. In the medical text corpus
such examples with absolute past ir sDm.n=f in the protasis are a small minority when compared
with those with absolute future ir + Prospective sDm=f.138 Nevertheless, they have approximately
the same meaning. I suggest that the same principle is at work here as shows up in "if you will find
such-and-such symptoms, then you must apply the following treatment", where, without essential
difference in meaning, the protasis can be replaced by "if you have found such-and-such
symptoms".

What really counts in the Egyptian as well as in the English versions, is that the examination
precedes the diagnosis or the prescribed treatment, thus the past time location of the protasis
relative to the apodosis. The absolute time reference, i.e. the location of ir + Prospective sDm=f
after the present moment of speech and that of ir sDm.n=f before it, is of no essential significance.
Evidently, Egyptian has a general preference for ir + Prospective sDm=f.

In the above examples from the medical texts I have presented the speaker as pretending that the
examination had taken place before the present moment (fulfilled condition under speaker's

127 James, op.cit., pl. 3.
128 My translation is slightly different from James's, op.cit., 14. For Ddt=s as Perfective Relative Form see James,
op.cit., 26, n.56.
129 Thus Malaise, Propositions conditionnelles, Cde 60 (1985), 163-164.
130 Satzinger, Protasis jr sDm=f, LingAeg 3 (1993), 131 (30). Supported by Allen, op.cit., 4, n.15.
131 For my terminology "Emphatic Prospective sDm=f" for what by others is called the Prospective sDm,w=f see
Studies sDm,t=f l (Dr sDm,t=l), n. 34.
132 For a summary of the contents of this section of the letter see James, op.cit., 16.
133 See W estendorf, Gramm. med. T., 173 ($242,1).
134 Case Sm 22 (Pap. Edwin Smith, 8,9-17; publ. Grapow, Med. T., 324).
135 For the suitability of the translation with both "when" and "if" in this and the next example see also Lopez, Pap.
Millingen, RdE 15 (1963), 32-33, n.6.
137 Case Bln 154 (Pap. Berlin, 13,3-8; publ. Grapow, op.cit., 182).
138 Westendorf, op.cit., 144-145 ($208).
assumption), but a speaker may also be uncertain about the fulfilment or not of an Event that should have taken place before the present (possibly fulfilled condition under speaker's assumption). Such examples seem to me to include the following, the first of which does not contain an ir sDm.n=f construction, but rather a negative construction with possible absolute past time reference.

Hekanakhte Letter I, vo. 4-5: this is the direct sequel to the passage from the Hekanakhte Letter dealt with just above. ir nfr A Hsb=k n=i it-mH wat m it-mH mA nn Hsb=i n=k s(y) r nhH "but if you have not (at all) reckoned for me a single (hekat) of barley from the new barley, I shall not reckon it to you forever". Hekanakhte now seems to be pondering whether Merisu has been so foolish as to allot to him no new barley at all and threatens to treat him likewise in the future, if he has indeed been so foolish. Thus, while the condition of Merisu's not taking care to allot proper provisions could have been fulfilled before the present moment, the consequence of this behaviour is located after the present. However, a translation with "but if you will not reckon" is equally plausible.

Hekanakhte Letter I, 4-5. ir grt wnn Sd.n=f Snat m DbA n nA n bd(y) nuy m Pr-hAA didi=sn st im grctb "now if it would be that (or, 'if possibly') they have already collected value in exchange for the emmer that is in Perhaa, then they (shall) give it [the emmer] there also". Satzinger's suggestion that ir wnn introduces an emphatic sentence is less convincing here. It may be that ir wnn is used here, somewhat tautologically, in connection with the uncertainty factor in Hekanakhte's mind ("if it would be that", "if possibly") with regard to the execution of his orders.

From the use of ir + Prospective subDm=t=f it is clear that it is ir which gives the whole sentence its formal conditional status. From Cases B.1-2 it is clear that it is not the verb form in the protasis that determines the status of the condition, but rather the tense in the apodotic main clause. With the usual absolute non-past tense in the apodosis the condition in the protasis is free to be fulfilled (Case A)--or to have reached fulfilment (Case B.2)--and to entail the consequence given in the apodosis. But if the consequence described in the apodosis is presented in terms of the absolute past (Case B.1), then the condition itself is, necessarily, barred from reaching fulfilment.

Thus, in the passage under discussion it is only the combination of a protasis introduced by ir and an apodosis with an absolute past tense iw sDm.n=f which determines the unfulfilled condition.

In addition to the very rare instances of the expression of the unfulfilled condition in a conditional sentence, the unrealis can also be expressed in a single main clause. Then the subDm=n=f form or its negative counterpart n subDm=f are used in conjunction with the optative particle HA. As regards the verb form or construction used in a clause denoting irreal conditions, it is here again evident that Egyptian has no other means but to use a form normally denoting actual past Events. One could say that both ir and HA have the semantic role of converting into the unrealis when cooperating with a main clause past tense, but differ syntactically, ir functioning in the subordinate protasis and HA in the main clause.

§ 18. The use of the n subDm,t=f construction when describing irreal events.

After this long exposition on the irreality of the Events described in the protasis and the apodosis of the above passage in the Instruction of A menenhat I, I shall now turn to the passage concerning the question of the coregency, which is referred to with n subDm,t=f constructions. In connection with the irreality of this Event it is most interesting to note that for this passage and the one presented next, in either of which the Event is ‘aborted’ by the action at reference time, a translation with “before” is more felicitous than “while/when had not yet”.

---

139 See James, op.cit., 14. For the discussion of the difficult negative compound nfr A see James, op.cit., 104-105 (7).
141 James, op.cit., pl. 1.
142 James, op.cit., 13 and 104 (5). Allen, op.cit., 3 (ex. 6a). Slightly differently interpreted by Baer, op.cit., 3-4 and n.11.
143 Satzinger, Protasis jr subDm,f, LingAeg 3 (1993), 131 (31); see Allen's remarks, op.cit., 4, n.15.
144 Gardiner, EG, 180 (§238), 331 (§414,3) and 375 (§455, bottom).
145 Gardiner, EG, 331 (§414,3): "the subDm,n=f form is used in reference to unfulfilled action".
146 Also in the English example presented in Studies subDm,t=f III (n subDm,t=f), n.4, where it equally concerns abortion of occurrence, “before” cannot easily be replaced by “while/when had not yet”: "* John got to the safety handle, when
irreality is denoted with the construction consequence is ‘aborted’ by the unfulfilledness of the condition in the past and is made irreal, this
Just as in the passage VIIc-d/Mill. + Sall. from the Instruction of Amenemhat I, where the
description of irreal Events.
a detachment from the actualities of the context would permit using the construction for the
speaker’s utterance may be, this truth cannot be cancelled by the context. It seems to me that such
absolute truth value. Whatever the actualised or potential imagined realisations present in the
As such the meaning of this construction seems rather a platitude, self-evident, but it has
Reference point an Event located in a future relative to it does/did not hold”.

There is another example with reference to an unfuilled action.
Dispute of a Man with his Ba, 77-80. mh.y=f Hr msm=s sDw m swHt mAw Hr n 2nty n anx.t=sn "I
shall feel sorry for her children who were broken in the egg and saw the face of the Crocodile,
before (/when not yet) they had lived".

These examples seem to bring my definition of the verb form as involving a presupposition of a
relative future Event into serious problems, because it is precisely here that translations with "when
had not yet" are less suitable. It looks as if the use of n sDm.t=f in the above contexts is at the very
edge of possibility, and it may well not be accidental that in the following instance, which also
refers to an irreal event in the past, a different and rare construction with the meaning “before” is
used.
Sh. Sailor, 32-34. Da prw iw=n m wAD-wr tp-a sAH=n tA "when the storm had broken out, we
were at full sea, before we could reach land (lit., before our reaching land)". Without being able to
prove the identity of the verb form sAH, I surmise this rare construction of preposition tp-a +
infinite to have been used because the infinitive is a verb form devoid of the expression of mood
and time reference, and as such most suitable here.148
To explain the use of n sDm.t=f in these examples and to defend my hypothesis, I see only one
plausible option. On account of the evidence that for unfulfilled action in the past Egyptian uses the
sDm.n=f, a verb form normally denoting fulfilled action, or even a n sDm=f construction, this will,
on principle, be no different for n sDm.t=f. This possibility to indicate, unusually, unfulfilled action
may well have been supported by the circumstance that in Middle Egyptian n sDm.t=f can be
considered a fixed construction in its own right, with a bound negation and a standard meaning.149
In this way the meaning of n sDm.t=f can be reduced to a context independent, abstract essence: "at
Reference point an Event located in a future relative to it does/did not hold”.

As such the meaning of this construction seems rather a platitude, self-evident, but it has
absolute truth value. Whatever the actualised or potential imagined realisations present in the
speaker’s utterance may be, this truth cannot be cancelled by the context. It seems to me that such
detachment from the actualities of the context would permit using the construction for the
description of irreal Events.
Just as in the passage VIIc-d/Mill.+ Sall. from the Instruction of Amenemhat I, where the
consequence is ‘aborted’ by the unfulfilledness of the condition in the past and is made irreal, this
irreality is denoted with the construction iw sDm.n=f, so too can the construction n sDm.t=f in the
same text (VIIa-c/M ill.) be used to denote this.150

§ 19. Remarks on the history of the sDm.t=f.

147 For example, the translation in Erman - Blackman - Simpson, The Anc. Egyptians. A Sourcebook, 73 (‘when I
had quickly taken weapons in mine hands, I drove back the roques’; “when I did not yet dwell with thee’). Although I
am well aware that this is Blackman’s translation, I assume that Simpson would have added a note if he had not agreed
with Blackman’s interpretation and translation; cf. op.cit., XXVII (4), where he explicitly refers to this question, and
id., [Sesostris I], in: LÄ V, 895 (C): “an unsuccessful assassination attempt some ten years earlier before S. I had been
designated coregent’.
148 Another example of the use of tp-a + possibly infinitive is Admonitions, 16,1 (ed. Gardiner, Admonitions, 93 =
ed. Helck, Admonitions, 67 (section L)). Relying on Gardiner’s commentary of these final obscure passages, he opts
for an imaginary description of the king, which would fit the irreality issue.
149 See the next section.
150 The version Pap. Sallier has here nn sDm.n=f and iw Hms.tw Hn=f=k.
Old Egyptian provides slender, but certain evidence for the existence of Dr $s\text{Dm}. t=f$, which construction soon virtually disappears from Middle Egyptian and is, no doubt, superseded by n $s\text{Dm}.t=f$.\footnote{See Studies $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ (Dr $s\text{Dm}.t=f$), §18 [pp. 21-22].} In this light it is remarkable that for $r s\text{Dm}.t=f$, which is a regular construction in Middle Egyptian, there are no certain examples in Old Egyptian.\footnote{Edel, AÄG, 368 ($\S$734). A possible example is Urk. I 216, 7 (quoted by Edel, AÄG, 369 ($\S$734)), if $ir s<$w$>A.t=sn$ is read instead of it $s<$D$>A.t=sn$; see Studies $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ II (r $s\text{Dm}.t=f$), §7 [p. 38].} Whereas Doret could not discover certain evidence for the $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ in any of its indubitable constructions in the narrative verbal system of the private inscriptions, Allen and Edel have collected the few examples of active and passive n $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ in the corpus of the Pyramid Texts.\footnote{Doret, Narrative Verbal System, 16.} This situation changes greatly for the better for n $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ and $r s\text{Dm}.t=f$ in Middle Egyptian, where they occur in a variety of text genres, whereas Dr $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ is restricted to the Coffin Texts and, remarkably, the Instruction of Ptahhotep.

This period forms the floruit of the $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ as a verb form in its own right, and I am much inclined to connect this with the circumstance that at the same time in Middle Egyptian the core of the narrative verbal system is formed by two other relative tenses, i.e. the use of the Circumstantial $s\text{Dm}=f$ and $s\text{Dm}.n=f$ after the exemplary particles iw and aHa$n$.

Ritter has shown that in the XVIIIth Dynasty Neo-Middle Egyptian of Urk. IV., n $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ and $r s\text{Dm}.t=f$ still live on.\footnote{Edel, AÄG, 370-371 ($\S$737-738). Allen, Inflection, 312-313 ($\S$460) and 358-359 ($\S$530).}

Although the current Middle Egyptian constructions n $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ and $r s\text{Dm}.t=f$ have shown a remarkable tenacity by surviving into Late Egyptian and Demotic, and even as late as Coptic--while not losing the typical tenacity by surviving into Late Egyptian and Demotic, and even as late as Coptic--there is also the seemingly contradictory fact that in the Classical Egyptian inscriptions of the Third Intermediate Period and later the typical t-morpheme is absent in writings, when translations of temporal clauses with "until" or "before/while not yet" are required.\footnote{Ritter, Verbal system, 211-212, where n $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ is said to be rare; pp. 234-235 ("r ir.i.t=f nicht sehr häufig"; see ex. 254 with r wb:n:). p. 229 (four occurrences of r ir.i.t=f). Unfortunately, the example given of $r s\text{Dm}.t=f$ (ex. 246 on p. 231) contains the infinitive after the 'conjunction' sb:$tw$; for the identification of the $t$-affixed form as the infinitive see already Gardiner, EG, 136 ($\S$181).}

Jansen-Winkeln has described a similar phenomenon in the $s\text{Dm}.t=f$, on the same occasion drawing attention to the analogy with the $s\text{Dm}.t=f$.\footnote{However, De Meulenaere, Notable mendésien, in: Mélanges Mokhtar I, 193, n.(k) has drawn attention to a $t$-affixed form $Htp.t$ in certain orthographically very correct Saite texts (the phenomenon is not mentioned in Manuelian, Living in the Past). Remarkably, in all four examples mentioned by him it occurs in syntactic environments in which the Middle Egyptian Prospective $s\text{Dm}=f$ (nota bene the forms $iw\text{Dm}=f$ and $in.i=t=f$) is to be expected, i.e. after the preposition/conjunction $m\text{x}$ or as object clause after the verb $rd$: First, the two examples with $m\text{x}$: 1) Statue Durham 509, II, a, 3 (publ. De Meulenaere, op. cit., 187-197, esp. 191-192): $ix Dd.(w)$ mitt n Hm=Tn $m\text{x}(t)$ is Htp.t=Tn m anh "puis que pareille chose être dite pour vos propres personnes après que vous reposez dans la vie (étérnelle)". 2) A dopotion Stela of Nitocris, 15-16 (see Caminos, Nitocris Adoption Stela, JEA 50 (1964), p. 9 between pp. 74-75, and Manuelian, Living in the Past, 302): $m\text{x}$ $spr=m\text{x}$ r Hm=nTr $5p\text{m-wpt} m\text{An}=s s(y)$ Htp.t=s $Hn=s m\text{r}=s s(y)$ r xt nb, which I would prefer to translate with "now after she had approached the God's Wife Shepenupet, (and) she had seen her and had become pleased with her, she loved her more than anything". Secondly, Htp.t=f after the verb $rd$ in the Serapeum texts nos. 63,2 and 64,3 (publ. Chassinat, Textes du Sérapéum, RecTrav 22 (1900), 20-21). I owe these references to Prof. De Meulenaere.}

To explain this anomaly, it seems necessary to me to make a sharp distinction between the form and its two constructions. It is owing to the restricted use of the verb form that its two constructions have become the more conspicuous. It is precisely owing to the circumstance that these constructions are bound to a specialization for a specific meaning and use, i.e. the expression of the temporal clauses with "until" or of the main clause with "not yet" (the latter as temporal clause with the meaning "before" also preceded by circumstantializing iw), that they have survived.\footnote{Jansen-Winkeln, Verbaladjektiv, SAK 21 (1994), 127-129; id., Spätmittelāg. Gramm., 72 ($\S$113). Manuelian, Living in the Past, 282 ($\S$6; r $s\text{Dm}.t=f$); the construction n $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ "while not yet" seems to be missing.} Because the constructions became standardized, the understanding of the verb form as the essential part of both has gradually waned, up to the point that it was no longer understood that the Middle Egyptian verb form $s\text{Dm}.t=f$ preceded by either n or r was the ancestor of Late Egyptian
§ 20. A morpheme written t or ti/y in verb forms marking the future: a final remark.

Now that it has been demonstrated that the sDm.t=f is a future verb form, the pattern of a cluster of verb forms emerges in which a morpheme written t or ti/y is a marker of the future. In addition to the sDm.t=f form and the Subjunctive Prospective sDm=f forms iw.t=f and in.t=f, where this morpheme is written with just t, there is also a writing with ti/y, occurring in participial forms with future time reference.

It will suffice here to draw attention to these forms: the sDm.ty.fy form; a very rare active participial form written sDm.ty occurring with masculine and feminine antecedents; and a remarkable -ti-ending optionally showing in the feminine passive Prospective Participle sDmt.i and the feminine Prospective Relative Form sDmt.i=f. This complex will receive attention in the next study.

Appendix A: disparate alleged uses of the sDm.t=f.

A primary concern of my studies of the three sDm.t=f constructions has been to identify -t-affixed verb forms that did not fit the hypothesis as different verb forms. The feminine infinitive has been by far the best candidate for alternative identification, but also the relative form in the purported r sDm.t=f construction *r Hs.t=f.\(^{160}\) In the study of the passive sDm.t=f the defective writing of the passive morpheme .t(w) has been another factor to reckon with.\(^{161}\) Alternative identification of alleged sDm.t=f forms as a nomen actionis has so far not been necessary,\(^{162}\) though in my preceding study of the passive sDm.t=f I have done the reverse by identifying an alleged nomen actionis as a passive sDm.t=f form.\(^{163}\)

It is the coherence of the relative future meaning of the sDm.t=f in its three indubitable constructions which, in my opinion, disqualifies all identifications by others of the form outside the three familiar uses. These identifications as the sDm.t=f by others have no doubt been supported by the circumstance that no coherent picture of the verb form has been elaborated so far.

First, I would like to turn to the nomen actionis as an alternative identification.\(^{164}\) I shall start with an example which shows that a member of the frequently occurring group of the immutable verbs, the class of the 3-lit. verbs, may form a -t-affixed nomen actionis.

Pap. Turin 54003, r., hor. above cols. 13-18.\(^{165}\) r n Snat n HfAw "spell of the repelling of a snake".\(^{166}\) The indirect genitive leaves no doubt about the identity of the form.

As the following examples illustrate, not all cases are that unequivocal.\(^{167}\) A suffix pronoun may be attached to the form or there may be a direct genitive link with a substantive, and those prepositions/conjunctions that are thought by several scholars to be used in sDm.t=f constructions may be involved.

Pap. Ramesseum VII, r., A, 7-9.\(^{168}\) HAgAg= Tn Hr=i mi HAgAgt Ast Hna Nbt-Hwt Hr sn=sn Wsir "may you jubilate over me like the jubilating of Isis and Nephthys over their brother Osiris".

---

\(^{159}\) Ray, DE 36 (1996), 142.

\(^{160}\) For the discussion of this latter construction see Studies sDm.t=f II (r sDm.t=f), §5 [pp. 34-35].

\(^{161}\) See Studies sDm.t=f IV (passive sDm.t=f/ms.(y)t=f), §2 [p. 56].

\(^{162}\) See my introductory remarks in Studies sDm.t=f I (Dr sDm.t=f), §5 [p. 10].

\(^{163}\) See Studies sDm.t=f IV (passive sDm.t=f/ms.(y)t=f), §7: Stela Cairo CG 20539, 1,b,6 wAH-lb r sDmt mdwt "patient of heart until the words have been heard" [p. 64]. Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 177 (2) identified a "feminine infinitival form" sDmt.

\(^{164}\) Cf. Lefebvre, GEC, 209-210 (§413); Borghouts, Egyptian I, 93 (§43.d). See also Gardiner's remarks, EG, 222-223 (§298).

\(^{165}\) Publ. Roccati, Papiro ieratico, pl.

\(^{166}\) See Roccati's commentary, op.cit., 26 (n.(a)).

\(^{167}\) For more examples of sDmt only see Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 177 (2); Lefebvre, GEC, 209 (§413). See my note 154 above.

\(^{168}\) Publ. Gardiner, Ramesseum Pap., pl. 22.
Hymnen an das Diadem, 14, 5 - 15, 1.\textsuperscript{169} HA\textsuperscript{a}Ag k\textsuperscript{a}Aw=\textsuperscript{a}Tn Hr b\textsuperscript{a}tn pn 4bk-Sdty-\textsuperscript{y}1R-Hry-ib-5dt mi HA\textsuperscript{a}AgT Ast Hr s\textsuperscript{a}=s 1r-Xrd-m-\textsuperscript{a}Ax-bit "may your kas jubilate over this king Sobek-Shedty-Horus-who-resides-in-Shedet like the jubilating of Isis over her son Horus-child-in-K-hemmis".

These two examples have recently been discussed by Vernus in a rejoinder.\textsuperscript{170} Although he notes in an earlier study that the alleged s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=t=f construction mi r\textsuperscript{a}dt=f actually contains the infinitive,\textsuperscript{171} he produces these counterexamples of possible uses of the s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=t=f since they contain a t-affixed form of a verb with a masculine infinitive.

The bare use of the s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=t=f in Old Egyptian as an object after certain verbs of perception has been claimed by several scholars.\textsuperscript{172} An example with an immutable verb is the following.

\textit{PT} [246] §252a. m\textsuperscript{a} A\textsuperscript{a}Hat N pn m b\textsuperscript{a}Ar(?)"see the standing of this N as a ram(?)".\textsuperscript{174} The identification of the form in this use in fact rests only on the form a\textsuperscript{a}Hat; all other instances presented allow identification as the feminine infinitive.\textsuperscript{175}

Two examples in the Coffin Texts suggested by Junge to contain the s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=t=f in free use will not be dealt with here, since Junge himself conceives that "We interpretation freilich möglich ist".\textsuperscript{176}

Particularly suspicious are verb forms where the writings of the suffix or dependent pronouns =\textsuperscript{Tn and =\textsuperscript{T} are preceded by an anomalous t. Therefore, I see no convincing reason to identify a s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=t=f in the following example.

CT [644] VI 264 a-c/A1C.\textsuperscript{177} N\textsuperscript{a}t psS Tn Hr=\textsuperscript{i} Xnm=\textsuperscript{a}(t)T wi m anx X\textsuperscript{y}r=T Ts=\textsuperscript{a}T ay=T Hr st=\textsuperscript{i} tn "Nut, spread yourself over me, may you enfold me with the life which is yours, may you fold your arms over this seat of mine". Faulkner identified a s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=t=f here,\textsuperscript{178} but that something may be wrong is indicated by the confusion in the parallel G\textsuperscript{a}IT, which reads X\textsuperscript{a}xn=\textsuperscript{a}T Tw n anx X\textsuperscript{y}r=T.

This instance does not stand alone in the Coffin Texts,\textsuperscript{179} and is also known from careless writings in the Appel aux Vivants.\textsuperscript{180}

Inexplicable along the above lines is a case where two alleged s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=t=f forms in 'anomalous' bare use (p\textsuperscript{a}r.t=f and w\textsuperscript{a}nn.n=t=f) have been identified by Faulkner.\textsuperscript{181} I suggest a different solution, taking the forms to be defectively written s\textsuperscript{a}Dm.ty.ty participles.

CT [874] VII 79 g - 80 d/S2C.\textsuperscript{182} Hv.w H\textsuperscript{a}m b\textsuperscript{a}A= anx pr.(t)\textsuperscript{y}(t)\textsuperscript{y} tp [t\textsuperscript{a}A] wn[n.(t)\textsuperscript{y}]=\textsuperscript{a}(t)\textsuperscript{y} im "indeed, reported will be my living ba which will go forth upon earth and which will be there".\textsuperscript{183}

In the following instance an active translation seems preferable to a passive one.

CT [277] IV 20 d/B1Bo. n sp wp(t)? N pn nma m-m H\textsuperscript{a}w=y "this N has never taken sides between the Two Companions".\textsuperscript{184} Following the usual analysis of the construction n sp s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=f as containing

\textsuperscript{169} Publ. Erman, Hymnen an das Diadem, 46.

\textsuperscript{170} Vernus, Derechef mi, R\textsuperscript{a}E 40 (1989), 199-200.

\textsuperscript{171} Vernus, op.cit., 168-174.

\textsuperscript{172} Against the evidence produced by Coptic as presented by Vernus I would like to draw attention to the evidence for this word as a feminine; cf. Westendorf, Kopt. Handwb., 369: Vycichl, Dict. étym. copte, 298 (2nd col., bottom). For a similar gerund of a verb with reduplication in the root see Pap. Westcar, 7, 19 nn k-khHt (t)\textsuperscript{a}ryt, where the indirect genitive follows.

\textsuperscript{173} Sethö, op.cit., 241; Edel, A\textsuperscript{a}G, 371-372 (§739); Allen, Inflection, 317-319 (§467-469). Allen, op.cit., 317 (§469) notes that the version N\textsuperscript{a}t has the s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=t=f form a\textsuperscript{a}Hat (it might also be a masculine infinitive, LZ).

\textsuperscript{174} I follow the reading ba "ram" (sign W 10 for W 10*) as suggested by Allen, Inflection, 318 (§469). See further the discussion in the word Sethö, Übersetzung und Kommentar PT I, 241-242.

\textsuperscript{175} Allen suggests the infinitive as an alternative identification. Faulkner, Pyramid Texts, 59, n.1 identifies a\textsuperscript{a}Hat as a feminine relative form.

\textsuperscript{176} Junge, s\textsuperscript{a}Dm.t,f, GM 1 (1972), 34. This concerns CT [509] VI 95 g (89C gm.n=Tn versus B1Y gm.t=Tn) and CT [482] VI 49 f (S1C\textsuperscript{a} m\textsuperscript{a}A\textsuperscript{a}=sn wi versus S1C\textsuperscript{a} m\textsuperscript{a}A\textsuperscript{a}=sn wi).

\textsuperscript{177} For a translation of the spell see Willems, Coffin of Heqata, 485-486.

\textsuperscript{178} Faulkner, Coffin Texts II, 220 (644, n.1); Willems, op.cit., 485, n.(a) rejects the identification as a s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=t=f.

\textsuperscript{179} For further examples see Willems, op.cit., 405, n.(n).

\textsuperscript{180} See Garnot, Appel aux Vivants, 72-73 (X V\textsuperscript{l}llb,10 (= Urk. I 224,14)): Dd=\textsuperscript{a}(t)Tn). Further, rock inscr. Kumm\textsuperscript{a}a 120, [5-6] (publ. Dunham - Janssen, Semma - Kumm\textsuperscript{a}a, 166): m\textsuperscript{a}=Tn Hs (\textsuperscript{a}(t)Tn n\textsuperscript{a}Tw=T Dd=\textsuperscript{a}(t)Tn); stela Zagreb 8, 5-7 (publ. J. M. net Saleh, Antiq. ég. Zagreb, 22-23): m\textsuperscript{a}=\textsuperscript{(t)Tn Hs Tn Wp-w\textsuperscript{a}wtf nb 6A-Der Dd=\textsuperscript{a}sn; stela Cairo CG 20515, b,4 (publ. Lange - Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine II, 106): m\textsuperscript{a}=\textsuperscript{(t)Tn anx msd\textsuperscript{a}=\textsuperscript{a}sn xpt Dd=\textsuperscript{a}sn); stela Cairo CG 20329, a,4 (publ. op.cit. I, 342): m\textsuperscript{a}=\textsuperscript{(t)Tn anx msd\textsuperscript{a}=\textsuperscript{a}sn xty m Dd=\textsuperscript{a}sn).\textsuperscript{181}

\textsuperscript{179} Faulkner, Coffin Texts III, 44, n.4.

\textsuperscript{181} There is also a slacker evidence that the s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=t=f form of w\textsuperscript{a}nn is w\textsuperscript{a}nn.t=f; see §1 above [p. 68].

\textsuperscript{182} Note that the source SIC has pr.n=t=f. In the repetition of the passage in CT VII 80 c-d, source SIC has pr.n=t=f tp TA w\textsuperscript{a}nn.t\textsuperscript{y}(t)\textsuperscript{y}(t)\textsuperscript{y} m-m m\textsuperscript{a}T, which is a somewhat unexpected combination.

\textsuperscript{183} For the active translation see Faulkner, Coffin Texts I, 208 and 209, n.11 (w\textsuperscript{a}pt instead of the expected s\textsuperscript{a}Dm=f as containing
sDm=t=f as subject clause,” it cannot be excluded that the form wpt is here a form that is also suitable for noun slots, i.e. the infinitive, in this case a transitive verb with expression of both the semantic subject and object.

Above I have presented alternative identifications for a number of alleged sDm.t=f forms I have come across, and I have given some examples where the writing of t=f can be explained as redundant, particularly when it concerns dental environments. I shall conclude by stating that, in my opinion, stronger evidence is needed to undermine my hypothesis concerning the sDm.t=f as a relative future tense, and I look forward to the presentation by those who reject it of a coherent counterhypothesis based on a substantial body of counterexamples.

Appendix B: the use of the sDm.t=f constructions after a negative main clause.

Examples of sDm.t=f constructions with a negation in the main clause can be found dispersed over the individual studies of the constructions. It has been remarked that in such cases both translations with "before" and "until" are possible, despite the fact that "until" differs from "before" in that it signifies "all the time before". Reversing the matter and proceeding from a translation of n sDm.t=f and Dr sDm.t=f with "before" as opposed to r sDm.t=f with "until", it is interesting to see whether Egyptian is also capable of freely using these constructions under the condition of a negative main clause. For this I present the following evidence.

Urk. IV 1090,9-10. m wn.(w) spr wN n mw.t=k mdw=f "do not disregard a petitioner before/until you have attended to his words".

PT [667] §1936b. n gm.t=f sw Dr Htp.t pt Dr Htp.t tA "I cannot find him before/until the sky has become peaceful, before the earth has become peaceful". 189

Pap. Turin 54003, r., 16. 190 m pH.(w) qs m pH.(w) m t r pH.t=k wDA r=f "do not attack a bone, do not split open a vessel(?), before/until you have attacked the protective spell(?) of my mouth". 191

Kamose Stela II, 23. 192 n di=f n=f wAt r spr.t=k "I shall not give way to him before/until you have arrived". 193

Taking into account all the examples dealt with in my sDm.t=f studies, six examples using the vetitive m sDm.(w) have turned up, five of which are followed by r sDm.t=f and one by n sDm.t=f. A seventh example (Eloquent Peasant B1, 183 m sDm.(w) dwAw n iy.t=f is somewhat suspect, because the suffix pronoun has dwAw as referent, which rather points to use of n iy.t=f as a virtual relative clause ("which has not yet come"). 195 The two examples with the im=f sDm.(w) construction are both followed by the r sDm.t=f construction. Of the six examples with the negations n or nn three

form wpt; cf. also wHmt in IV 21 a(B1B0); Grieshammer, Jenseitsgericht, 150 (18). Source B2Be also has wpt. For the choice in favour of the passive see Zandee, Death as an Enemy, 276-277. In the parallel CT [277] IV 21 a, only source B1B0 has n sp wHmt(?) N pn m pr Hr inw n iw=f r sDm.t=f mdw=sN, which is unintelligible to me; sources B2Be and BH2C have wHmt here.

188 Gardiner, EG, 377 (§456). It is somewhat discomforting to notice that the construction is not discussed in Verbus, Future at Issue.

189 Although not properly belonging to this study of the verb form proper, the phenomenon could not be studied earlier owing to the separate treatment of the constructions.

185 See Smith, Meaning and Negation, 14-15. Klima, Negation, in: Structure of Language, 289: "simple absence would then also involve a span of time".

186 See also Smith - Smith, Studies III, 91 (137).

187 "Until" is an adverbial of duration which leaves no room for an interval between the two situations referred to, see Smith, Meaning and Negation, 14-15. Klima, Negation, in: Structure of Language, 289: "simple absence would then also involve a span of time".

188 See Studies sDm.t=f (Dr sDm.t=f), §10 [p. 15].

189 See also Smith - Smith, Kamose Texts, ZÄS 103 (1976), 61.

190 Dr sDm.t=f: Ptahhotep, 126 and 266-267/Pr.; Stela London UC 14333, 14 (all quoted in Studies sDm.t=f 14) (passive sDm.t=f/ims.(y).t=f), §7 [pp. 62-64]; Stela king Neferhotep from Abydos, 13 (quoted in Studies sDm.t=f II) (r sDm.t=f), §3 [p. 32]; and the example Pap. Turin 54003, r. 16 (quoted above). n sDm.t=f: Urk. IV 1090,9-10 (quoted above).

191 Quoted in Studies sDm.t=f III (n sDm.t=f), §1 [p. 43].

192 Ptahhotep, 453/Pr. (quoted in Studies sDm.t=f IV (passive sDm.t=f/ims.(y).t=f), §7 [p. 64]); Letter to the Dead Naga ed-Deir, 5-6 (quoted in Studies sDm.t=f III (n sDm.t=f), Appendix B [p. 54]).
are followed by n sDm.t=f constructions, one by Dr sDm.t=f, and two by r sDm.t=f. One example from the Pyramid Texts stands apart, since it uses the rare negation w and the equally rare Dr sDm.t=f.

Apparently, Egyptian has a free choice, but shows a slight preference for the r sDm.t=f. This is in accordance with the preference in English for "until", but I suggest that a further motive is the avoidance of a negation in the main and in the subordinate clause, the use of which is stylistically somewhat less refined.

Appendix C: the 'not yet' notion in Egyptian, Luganda and English and the question of presupposition or implicature.

At several points in my studies on the relative future tense sDm.t=f, which means "he is yet to hear (relative to a Reference point in the context)" and in which the morpheme t is the tense marker, I have dealt with the phenomenon of the presupposition of the occurrence of an Event in the relative future. This presupposition is grammaticized in the verb form and is disclosed by the translation of the negative construction n sDm.t=f with "not yet".

A similar case of a presupposition grammaticized in a verb form and its negative counterpart is provided by the affirmative 'still' tense in Luganda (mu-ka-tuddde "we are still seated") the negative counterpart of which does not mean "we are still not seated", but is the "no longer" tense (te-mu-ka-tuddde "we are no longer seated"). The fact that negation results in this translation reveals that "having been seated in the past up to the present" is a presupposition.

Indeed, presuppositions surface in a negation test as remaining untouched by it, and the time adverbials "still" and "no longer" have been attributed to a type of presupposition which is as yet little studied and ill-defined for want of a clear characteristic.

I have been able to demonstrate that the precise meaning of n sDm.t=f must be rendered in uncommon or unacceptable English as "he is/was not to hear yet", and that the usual translation "he has/had not yet heard" is no more than adequate. I have pointed out that the latter translation is even deceptive if it leads to the analysis that in n sDm.t=f the verb form is a past tense.

Comrie, too, has analysed a 'not yet' tense in Luganda (te-tu-nna-genda 'neg-we-not:yet-go') and translated it with "we have not yet gone". This Luganda tense might in principle conceal the same trap. It occurs only in the negative and contains the same negation (relative to a Reference point in the context) and in which the morpheme t is the tense marker. In Comrie's opinion, its meaning is that a certain "situation" (= my "Event") did not hold in the past and does not hold in the present, i.e. that it is no longer tense and is usual with finite verb forms. In Comrie's opinion, its meaning is that a certain "situation" (= my "Event") did not hold in the past and does not hold in the present, i.e. that it is no longer tense and is usual with finite verb forms. In Comrie's opinion, its meaning is that a certain "situation" (= my "Event") did not hold in the past and does not hold in the present, i.e. that it is no longer tense and is usual with finite verb forms. In Comrie's opinion, its meaning is that a certain "situation" (= my "Event") did not hold in the past and does not hold in the present, i.e. that it is no longer tense and is usual with finite verb forms. In Comrie's opinion, its meaning is that a certain "situation" (= my "Event") did not hold in the past and does not hold in the present, i.e. that it is no longer tense and is usual with finite verb forms. In Comrie's opinion, its meaning is that a certain "situation" (= my "Event") did not hold in the past and does not hold in the present, i.e. that it is no longer tense and is usual with finite verb forms.
form, as is equally the case with the English expression "not yet".

This analysis of only an implicature of the future occurrence of an Event stands in contrast to mine of n sDm.t=f as revealing this to be a presupposition. Essentially, my analysis of n sDm.t=f may also be valid for the Luganda 'not yet' tense, since this tense equally contains a common negation meaning simply "not" and a tense marker (-nna-).

As it is an inference largely dependent on the context, an implicature in an utterance has a more or less accidental character and does not partake in the meaning of a verb form. This appears to contradict the denomination of the Luganda verb form as the 'not yet' tense, which would only make sense if the form typically has this meaning and grammaticizes "not yet".

It is important to note that "we have not gone", which according to Comrie is the essential meaning of te-tu-nna-genda, is radically different from "we have not yet gone", since the latter always contains an additional semantic component of reference to "our going" in the future, which in the translation is brought about by "yet". Evidently, the presence of "yet" is indispensable in the translation of the Luganda 'not yet' tense. Therefore, what is evoked by the addition of "yet" as used in "not yet", i.e. the reference to a future Event, must form part of the meaning, and this reference cannot be an 'accidental' implicature. Though part of the meaning of the tense, this future occurrence of the Event is not affected by the negation. What is asserted in the negative tense is that this Event to occur in the future does not hold in the present.

I therefore conclude that, just like Egyptian n sDm.t=f, the Luganda 'not yet' tense grammaticizes the future occurrence of the Event as a presupposition unaffected by the negation, as well as the location of this Event relative to a Reference point, at which time the Event is asserted not to occur. Thus, in this case too the translation with "not yet" instead of "not" is the outcome of a negation test.

I hope to have demonstrated that Comrie's analysis of the Luganda 'not yet' tense cannot be correct and that his analysis of this tense seems rather to be based on its usual, but deceptive translation. This, however, does not mean at all that his analysis of English "we have not yet gone" as involving an implicature is incorrect. Since I have related the 'not yet' notion to presupposition, while the English expression "not yet" is analysed by Comrie as involving an implicature, this question deserves closer attention.

Whether n sDm.t=f and te-tu-nna-genda are translated literally with "he is/was not to hear yet"/"we are not to go yet" or with the common "he has/had not yet heard"/"we have not yet gone", in both versions of the English translation "not yet" is present. This arouses the strong suspicion that the English expression "not yet" also involves the same presupposition of the future occurrence of the Event. Either English translation can be analysed in terms of the location of an Event in a future relative to a Reference point, though the occurrence of the Event is not grammaticized in the verb forms as a presupposition.

In favour of my presupposition analysis is that the expression "not yet" taken as a unity can be considered as the outcome of a negation test to detect presuppositions, as has just been demonstrated above for the Luganda 'not yet' tense. The presence of a presupposition is particularly clear from the literal translation of n sDm.t=f with "he is/was not to hear yet". In this case we are dealing with contrary negation which leaves the presupposed occurrence of the Event in a relative future untouched. "He is (/was) to hear (the future Event), but not yet (/then) (Reference point), just as in, for example, "I have not come for you", which means "I have come, but not for you" and which leaves "my coming" unaffected as a presupposition. The Event of "hearing" is formulated from the viewpoint of its future occurrence ("is/was to") as located relative to the Reference point ("yet"), at which time the Event is restrictively asserted "not" to hold.

The problem of "not yet" as implicature or presupposition turns up in the common and accepted translation "he has/had not yet heard". When analysed as an implicature "not yet" must be split up, "not" now functioning as a contradictory negation in "he has/had not heard" and asserting that the Event of "hearing" had not taken place at the Reference time; the addition of the time adverbial

\[212\] Note that the Luganda 'not yet' tense can also occur in an absolute past context, see Ashton e.a., Luganda Grammar, 312-313. Note Schadeberg's remark, op.cit. (1990), 2 that the KSwahili 'not yet' HA-JA form contains the negative morpheme ha- and the formative -ja-, which certainly derives from the verbal stem -ja- "to come"; on p. 3 it is pointed out that this HA-JA form is semantically--though not morphologically--similar to the Luganda 'not yet' tense; id., op.cit. 3-4 analyses the Luganda 'not yet' tense somewhat differently, but in the sense of a presupposition.

\[213\] For the presuppositionally more marked status of negative speech acts in comparison with their corresponding affirmatives see Givon, On Understanding Grammar, 93-115 (3.2).
"yet" is responsible for what is either an implicature or a presupposition that this Event of hearing is/was expected to take place at a later, future time. Here the formulation concerning this Event proceeds from the viewpoint of the Reference time.

"Not yet" taken on its own account—for example, as an answer to a question—expresses in paraphrase in a present context approximately "the Event does not hold at the present moment, but it is expected to hold later", and in a past context "the Event did not hold at some time (specified), but, under normal circumstances, it is assumed (or confirmed) to have taken place beyond that time point and before the present".

Much specialised linguistic and philosophical debate is still going on about implicature and presupposition, and I shall therefore refrain from getting involved in this debate. On account of the obligatory analysis of a presupposition in "not yet" when grammaticized in certain verb forms—as it seems to me, at least—and taking the negation test as a valid method to detect a presupposition, I am inclined to opt for "not yet" as involving a presupposition in any case, thus also in English.

The key question is then why English "not yet" also involves a presupposition. In the preceding chapters of the study I have suggested that in the sDm.t=f the occurrence of the Event is a presupposition because the verb form also grammaticizes a Reference point relative to which the Event is located in the future. No location in time of the Event is possible without the Reference point, but the grammaticization of a Reference point in the meaning of the sDm.t=f deems the occurrence of the Event located in a future relative to it to be presupposed: if the future Event is asserted not to occur, then the presence of the Reference point to which the Event is related would be pointless.

This argument for the grammaticalization of two time points in the verb form cannot be used to explain English "not yet" as involving a presupposition. For "not yet" as being presuppositional I have to seek support from two other time adverbials, i.e. "still" and "no longer", which equally contain a presupposition that can be grammaticized in a verb form, as shown by the Luganda 'still' and 'no longer' tenses, and which in English too have been suggested to contain a presupposition.

"Not yet", "still" and "no longer" all involve the relation of one verbal situation to two time points/segments which are explicitly related to each other. The assertion about a situation of "being still seated" not only involves the time segment of the present for the Event of "sitting", but also explicitly stretches it back into the past, to "having been seated continuously up to the present"; the assertion about the situation of "being no longer seated" equally involves two time segments concerning the situation of "sitting", namely "not being seated" at the present, but "having been seated" in the past. By asserting that the occurrence of an Event located in a future relative to some other time point does not hold at that time point, the expression "not yet" relates one verbal situation to an Event time and a Reference time.

Thus, in all three cases we are dealing with a dependence relationship of two time points/segments involved in one verbal situation, in which the occurrence of the Event at one time point (with "not yet" in a present context only as an assumption!) is the precondition for relating it to the other. Consequently, the presupposition is located at the time point/segment in which the preconditioning Event occurs.

Without dropping my arguments in favour of the grammaticalization of two time points/segments in the tenses discussed, which is revealed by their translations with "still"/"no longer" and "not yet", as preconditioning the presence of a presupposition, I hesitantly suggest that the argument can possibly be taken one step further, namely that the involvement of two time points/segments in these English expressions makes them, too, carry the same presupposition.

Although I opt for English "not yet" as involving a presupposition, there may be much in favour of Comrie's implicature analysis with regard to the origin from which the presupposition has developed. Since "he is/was not to hear yet" is very uncommon or unacceptable English, this suggests that the origin of the expression "not yet" must be sought in the common formulation "he has not heard yet", in which "yet" can be replaced by "as yet". In "he has not heard (as) yet (= so far, presently)", the addition of "(as) yet" creates the implicature that the Event of "hearing" might occur at some later, future time. It seems plausible to me that "not yet" (or "not...yet") taken as a unity has developed into expressing simply the location of an Event in a future relative to a Reference point, by asserting that this Event does not hold at the Reference time. That "not yet"
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and "not... yet" are different from "not as yet" appears from their use in past contexts, where "yet" rather signifies "then", i.e. the Reference time located in the absolute past.

A presupposition is a mental concept of the speaker which underlies his utterance. In the case of "not yet" when used in a non-past context it is a belief, a strong expectation or an assumption that some Event will be realized in the real world. When used in a past context, it is the knowledge or the tacit assumption that this Event has been realized in the real world between the Reference time and the present. Even if the Event has not taken place at some expected time, due to unforeseen intervening circumstances, the postponed occurrence beyond the present is still presupposed.

By actions performed at a past Reference time the occurrence of the Event in a relative future can even be 'aborted', and yet "not yet" can still be used felicitously. In "when the king was killed, he had not yet announced the coregency with his son" the use of "not yet" is possible because in my opinion "not yet" in practice does nothing more than locate an Event in a future relative to a Reference point, and refrains from the reality issue. However, the presupposition of the future occurrence of the Event may be seen as still at work in the background when the subordinate and the main clauses of the above sentence are reversed: *(?) "the king was killed, when he had not yet announced the coregency with his son". Now there is an alternative, namely the use of "before", and it seems to me that "the king was killed, before he had announced the coregency with his son" is preferable in cases where the Event cannot be realized. In my view, this supports the presupposition analysis.

---
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