CHAPTER VI. THE FUTURE MARKER WRITTEN t (=), ti (\(\ddot{t}i\)) OR ty (\(\ddot{t}y\)) AND FUTURE/PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPIAL FORMS

In the concluding section of my study on the sDm.t=f form proper I remarked that there is a morpheme written ti or ty which marks the future.\(^1\) As we have seen, the writing ti is present in the suffix conjugation forms of the sDm.t=f form\(^2\) and the Subjunctive Prospective sDm=f forms iw.t=f and in.t=f. The future time reference of these forms needs no further consideration here.

I have noted that this marker appears written optionally plene as ti/ty in the sDm.ty.ty participle. Following Gunn I shall argue that a very rare invariable active Future Participle written plene sDm.ti (allograph ty) is most probably the base of the sDm.ty.ty form.\(^3\)

The well-known phenomenon of the particular writing ti showing up in the feminine passive Prospective Participle and Relative Form I am inclined to consider as not deriving from the tense marker written ti in the Future Participle sDm.ti, but rather as consisting of the feminine ti followed by another future/prospective marker, i.e. the t-morpheme (written y, rarely i in the masculine).\(^4\)

In order to make a convenient working distinction between the various future/prospective participials to be discussed, I shall in the following refer to the sDm.ti form as the Future Participle sDm.ti and to the other participial formation ending in masculine -yi and in feminine -yi as the Prospective Participle (and the derived Relative Form).

---

1 Studies sDm.t=f V (sDm.t=I), § 20 [pp. 89-90].
2 Exceptionally written ti in Ptahhotep, 266-267/L2; see Studies sDm.t=I IV (passive sDm.t=I/mi.(yi)=I), § 7 [p. 63].
3 Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 42. See also Sander-Hansen, Äg. Grammatik, 86-87 (§313) and 121 (§454); however, I see no good reason to consider his examples PT [516] §1184b (sD.ti:tm); cf. Sethe, Übersetzung und Kommentar PT V, 77-78: sD.ti and PT [301] §447b (arti nTw wTi nTw smnt nTw: dual ending, cf. Edel, ÄAg, 304 ([628,cc) and 504 (§986), and Sethe, op. cit., II, 239) as having future time reference; for the example PT [374] §659d see § 3 below. Note that for reasons of convenience the familiar name "sDm.ty.ty form" is retained here instead of the more correct "sDm.t=i form", as pointed out by Schenkel, Einf. Sprachwissenschaft, 101, Anm. 2.
4 The passive Prospective Participle (and the derived Relative Form) has not as yet found general recognition. Fundamental and, in my opinion, convincing evidence is presented by Gunn, op.cit., I-39 (chs. 1-2 + Appendix to chs. 1-2); in any case, it is true that where the -i-ending appears a translation with a future tense is a good or better choice. Polotsky, Transpositions, IOS 6 (1976), 12 (2.2.9) did not doubt its existence, but considered only one of all the examples given by Gunn to be really indubitable. In my opinion, it is implausible to assume that, whereas the participial form sDm.ty.ty covering the future time field in the active voice is known to exist, the future in the passive voice has to be covered by a passive Perfective Participle, which in its certain past uses shows the ending -yi. Of the older grammars only Lefebvre, GEC, 223-224 (§445-446) treats the passive Prospective Participle as a separate form; De Buck's stance, Grammaire élémentaire, 56 (§84, Obs.1), is ambiguous where the Prospective Participle is considered very problematic, but see p. 65 (§105), where the derived Prospective Relative Form is accepted! In more recent grammars and grammatical studies, the passive Prospective Participle is recognized in Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 224-229 (§306-308), where an excellent survey and discussion of the arguments both for and against are given. It is further recognized in: Sander-Hansen, Äg. Grammatik, 86-87 (§313); Callender, Middle Egyptian, 48-49 (3.5.11.3); Graefe, Mittlärg. Grammatik\(^1\), 124-125 (§49.1), though much more hesitantly in op.cit.\(^2\), 119 (§51.1); Grandet - Mathieu, Cours d'égyptien II, 224-225 (48.3-4); M.enu, Petite grammaire, 131; Englund, Middle Egyptian, 51 (NB2); Schenkel, Tübinger Einführung, 216-217 (hesitantly; see his Anm. 1-2); id., Einf. Sprachwissenschaft, 102 (3.3); Hoch, M.Eg. Grammar, 174 (§121.3.b); Zonhoven, M.-Eg. Gramm., 131 (§54c3); Théodoridès, Relatif prospectif, Annaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves 14 (1954-57), 85-108 (part. p. 102); Satzinger, Attribut und Relativsatz, in: Stud. zu Sprache und Religion. Westendorf, 140. It is not recognized in Borghouts, Egyptisch I, 165 (§75.b-NB) and 175 (§78.b-NB2); Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 88 (recognized only in the earliest Egyptian).
§ 1. The invariable active Future Participle sDm.ti with masculine antecedent.

One of the first to collect evidence for this active Future Participle sDm.ti was Erman, who ranged it together with the sDm.ty.ty under the denomenator of the "verbal adjective".\(^5\) In an observation he remarks that it stands to reason to connect this form with the Prospective Participle with the ending written ti, were this certain itself. Since he recognized that it here concerns a Future Participle sDm.ti occurring with masculine antecedents, it is remarkable that he did not connect this form with the sDm.ty.ty dealt with by him next.\(^6\)

Noting that the suffix pronouns .fy, .sy, .sn in the sDm.ty.ty form as formative elements to express number and gender are abnormal among participles, Gunn regarded the sDm.ty.ty form as consisting of an invariable element sDm.ti followed by suffix pronouns "in apposition functioning as determinatives of gender and number".\(^7\) Recognizing a feminine active Prospective Participle sDm.ti too—as the counterpart of a masculine form sDm.ti—\(^8\) he found it very difficult to believe that a feminine form could constitute the base of the sDm.ty.ty.\(^9\) After drawing attention to the Future Participle sDm.ti with masculine antecedents he wondered what the connection between this form and the sDm.ti/sDm.ti couple might be.\(^10\) Under the proviso of a possible connection, he saw no other way of explaining these odd phenomena than to assume that the feminine form sDm.ti lost its specifically feminine use early on, and became a word of common gender and number. To avoid ambiguity in this respect the suffix pronouns were appended to it.

The existence of a future marker written ti in suffix conjugation forms is excellent grounds for connecting the tense marker in the sDm.ty.ty form with an invariable Future Participle sDm.ti.

To create a clear picture, I shall begin in this section by only presenting instances of the Future Participle with a masculine antecedent.

Tomb Siut III, 11-12.\(^11\) n sXm=.(i)? r nDs Hr-ïwtt xpr=f r=i m spr(t).ti in inw m mt(y)t nt ib.\(^12\) "I was not rude against the commoner, because he was not towards me as one who wants to oppose my heart".\(^13\) The mistaken ti before the spr-sign F 42 makes it clear that this sign functions here as a phonetic determinative after a full sound-value writing rather than as a triconsonantal sign. Owing to the fact that ti is written behind this sign, ti can be nothing else but a verbal ending: it is not possible to simply read here the substantive spr.ty "petitioner",\(^14\) a nomen agentis with the ending written ty expressing an expected activity, as Gardiner and Lefebvre have suggested.\(^15\)

The existence of a Future Participle of the verb spr invites a reconsideration of the instances where this alleged substantive spr.ty, deriving from spr "petition",\(^16\) is written in the text called the

---

5 Erman, Äg. Grammatik, 217 (§430).

6 Erman, op. cit., 218 (§431).

7 Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 40.

8 Gunn, op. cit., 35-39 (ch. 3). Note that Gunn subsumes all the examples with feminine antecedent which I take to be instances of the invariable active Future Participle under this active Prospective Participle.

9 Gunn, op. cit., 41.

10 Gunn, op. cit., 42.


12 For the reading ti mistakenly written with the nmt city-sign see Brunner, op. cit., 21, n.27. For a most probable other instance of this word in the same inscription see line 4: TAm Hr n spr[t][i] "indulgent towards the one who comes to petition".

13 For mr/nmy HÀtyib see Janssen, Trad. eg. autobiografie l, 38.

14 Brunner, op. cit., 17. Interestingly, Brunner, op. cit., 21, n.20 identifies the Future Participle xsf.t(i) in the form written xsft in line 8 of the same inscription (publ. Brunner, op. cit., 43), which reads as follows: n ir=.(i) w n wn xsft ib=.(i) r ir=nî lsft(?). On p. 17 Brunner translates "I did not do wrong to one who wanted to oppose my heart, until I had created justice(?)"). He explains the presence of wn as follows: "Durch das vorgesetzte wn wäre diese der Bedeutung nach prospektive Form in die Vergangenheit gesetzt". Assessing the passage and the form spr.ti under discussion, I consider his solution to be rather improbable. Furthermore, wn and xsf.t(i) cannot both be participles without the m of equation in between, unless a mistake is assumed. I propose translating: "I did not do wrong to one who neglected what my heart opposes, until I had created awe (?)".

15 Gardiner, EG, 280 (§364) and Lefebvre, GEC, 230 (§459). They leave unexplained why this type of word formation at the basis of the sDm.ty.ty is unable to form a feminine *nDtyt and a plural *nDtyw. Note Lefebvre's remark: "forme en -ty ... probablement identique à des mots mi-substantifs, mi-participes, ayant le sens futur, qui se rencontrent exceptionnellement, comme mn\$\text{yr}$ (sur stèle Caire CG 20030, i, 5)".

16 See Valloggia, Messagers (wpwtwyw), 8-9 (§102).
Duties of the Vizier. 17

Urk. IV 1110,7-12. 18 ir g<rt wsp(y) nb h(A)b TAT(y) rwD u(y) srtywD nb lw di=f Sm n=f ir grt spr.ty(y) nb TAT(y) HAbt wD=fn sw n=f. Van den Boorn translates “as for any messenger whom the vizier sends for concerning any petitioner, he (the vizier) will let (him; the messenger) go to him (the petitioner). However, as for anyone who shall make a petition to the vizier concerning fields, it is to him( self; the vizier) that he orders him”. 19 Translating “anyone who comes to petition” is another possibility, as also in the following example.

Urk. IV 1111,9-10. 20 ir sprty/spr.ty nb n(y) r Dd nnmn.(w) tASwD=n xr mA.t(y) n(y) tD hr xmr n snw iry “as for any petitioner/ anyone who comes to petition (and) who will say ‘our boundaries are moved’, then it is inspected whether they are under the seal of the appropriate officials”. 21

Though this word also occurs in the same text in Urk. IV 1111,2 and 15, I shall confine myself to the above examples because in the first passage the sprt.y in the first clause is taken up in the next by the sDm.ty.ty form of this verb, and because in the second passage there is a relative clause with future time reference, my r Dd to introduce the oratio recta. It has been noted by Van den Boorn that the Duties contain two derivations of the verb sprt, i.e. the sDm.ty.ty form and the “curious” word written pXrty, used instead of the common sprt.w, the latter two words being basically provided with participial meaning. 22

On the basis of this evidence, the occurrence of the Future Participle in the above passages cannot be excluded. This is also true of the final example from the Duties, other translations of which are also defendable.

Urk. IV 1112,6. 23 n f sb pXrty nb wDyt nbt n pr-nsw. Van den Boorn’s preferred translation is “it is he who dispatches everyone who will circulate all messages of the palace”. 24 Assuming that the word written pXrty is indeed a participle, this explains the use of a direct object wDyt nb. 25

As will appear from the example to be presented next, the stem of the sDm.ty.ty of IIae gem. verbs differs from that in sDm.tr-, 26 that is if the irregular verb wnn is to be representative of this class.

Urk. IV 576,17. 27 iw=k m fr Hry-typ Awty wn.ty wn xftyw=D "you are (as) Horus, the chief of the Two Lands, who will exist when (as long as) his enemies exist”. There are several reasons for following Gunn’s identification of wtn.ty as the Future Participle, and not to consider wnt for an incorrect or, at the very least, a most unusual writing of the form wnt of the independent Stative 2nd person singular, 28 because that would leave the suffix pronoun in xftyw=D unexplained (=f instead of the expected =k). Moreover, this Stative form is written correctly in the following line. Nor is it likely to read n ntD instead of wnty here. 29 The use of the suffix pronoun -f can only be grammatically correct if we are dealing with a participial construction, which is always in the third person. 30

The following may be another example of this Future Participle with masculine antecedent serving as a divine epithet.

Tomb of Wahka II, Qau. 31 Wsr anx.ty m lwnw “Osiris-who-will-live-on-in-Heliopolis”. 32 The epithet of Osiris may well refer to his living on as member of the Heliopolitan Ennead after his

17 See now Van den Boorn, Duties of the Vizier.
20 Van den Boorn, op.cit., 185 (R20); Lorton, op.cit., 153-154.
21 For sDm.tr=f as a contingent tense see Depuydt, Conjunction, 208-233.
22 Van den Boorn, op.cit., 205 (2). For another writing sprt see Stela Petrie Museum UCL 14333, 14 (quoted in Studies sDm.ti=f IV (passive sDm.ti=f/ ms.(y)ti=f), §7 [p. 63]).
24 For this and alternative translations and their discussion see Van den Boorn, op.cit., 205-207.
25 For the question of the direct object see also §1 below, ex. Ptahhotep, 49-50/L2.
26 Gunn, op.cit., 43.
27 Gunn, op.cit., 41, ex. 2.
28 Sethe added “so” here, but I am not sure that he meant this identification. What may support this is that he added another “so” after the suffix pronoun in xftyw=D; he may have expected =k.
29 See Urk. IV. Übersetzung, 145: “für die (n n(y)), die deine Feinde sind”. A part from the improbable emendation, a construction n ntD wn xftyw=D to render the above meaning seems to me to be impossible in Middle Egyptian.
30 For an exception among the sDm.ty.ty forms as vocatives see Urk. I 202,1: ir.ty.Tn.
31 Publ. Petrie, Antaeopolis. The tombs of Qau, pls. 26-27 = Vandier, Tombe de Ouahka, CdE 19 (1944), fig. 14 (facing p. 182) and 184 (text 3).
32 Translated by Vandier, op.cit., 185 (No. 3: “le vivant dans Héliopolis”).
In the following example the identification is confirmed by the image, he will not reach his home".

Reliable evidence for future time reference comes from the Appel aux Vivants and the other formulae addressing a reader. There are several examples where this Future Participle occurs instead of the expected sDm.ty.fy.

Stela Cairo CG 20030, i, 5, i anx tp tA mrnx ans msDmt wmt wab nb Xry-Hb nb sS nb Hm-ka nb m mr.ty wAH tp tA "O you who lives upon earth, who loves to live and hates to die, any priest, any lector-priest, any scribe, namely one who will want to stay upon earth".

Stela Cairo CG 20038, a, right. Htp-di-nsw nTrw imyw tA mr.t(y).f(y) nTr pn swA.t(y).f(y) Hr is pn Dd.ti "the-boon-which-the-king-gives and the gods who are on earth (to) the one who will love this god, to the one who will pass by this tomb and will say:"

Stela Cairo CG 20518, a, 4-6. Dd=f mr.t(i) 2nty-imntyw nb AbDw mr.t(i) nsw mr.t(i) Wp-wAwt nTr pn n(t) Dt mr.t(i) wAH m AbDw snb.(w) Xr Xrd m Hmw-nTr nb m rmT nb swA.Hr hr AbA pn Dd.t(y).f(y) "he says: the ones who will love Khenty-amentiu Lord of Abydos, who will love the king, who will love Wepwawt, this god of eternity, who will love to stay in Abydos healthy and with a child, namely all priests and every man who passes by this offering stone and who will say:".

Stela Stuttgart 10, cols. 6-8, i anxw tp tA Xry-Hb nb sS nb wab nb wt nb iAty nb swA.ty Hr wD pn "O you who lives upon earth, any lector-priest, any scribe, any common priest, any embalmer, any functionary who will pass by this stela".

Stela BM 156, horiz., last line. i rM T nb anx tp tA sS nb Sd(d?)ty mdt tn "O any man who lives upon earth, any scribe who will read this inscription". The stem of the IIIae inf. verb Sd here displays reduplication, as against the evidence for the short stem in mr in the example above. However, this reduplication may well be a mistaken writing owing to the dental environment.

This problem of a dental environment also turns up in the following example, but if taken as it is written the example must contain the Future Participle.

"Now as for one who will damage this...": 37

This alternative participle for the sDm.ty.fy may also be expected in threat formulae beginning with "as for anyone who will...".

"Stela Hatnub", 9. [ir] grt HD.t(i) twt pn nn pH=f pr=f "now as for one who will damage this image, he will not reach his home".

In the following example the identification is confirmed by the sDm.ty.fy form in the parallel versions.

On the position of Osiris in the Heliopolitan Ennead see Griffiths, Origins of Osiris, 118-121.

Ranke, Personennamen I, 68 (22+24) and 314 (23+25). For the meaning of these names see Ranke, op.cit. II, 29-30; Vandier, Tombe d'Ankhhtifi, 13 translates the owner's name, but gives no further commentary on its meaning.

Ranke, op.cit. I 68 (20) and 314 (22). It is possible that the name Neferti also belongs here, although no name Nfr.ty.fy/sy is known.

Indeed, Ranke, op.cit. II, 31-33 did not consider the possibility of this name type when dealing with names construed with the Pseudoparticiple (Stative).


Does the form mri.tw.ty(fy) stand for regular mri.w.ty(fy)?


Pub. James, Hieroglyphic Texts BM 9, pl. 28. Ex. = Erman, Äg. Grammatik, 217 (§430, ex. 5).

For other mistaken spellings with this verb see Uruk. IV 966,1 (Sdjt.t.y.fy). Further, Sdjt.t.y.fy on stela MMA New York 12.184, 18 (= publ. Sethe, Lesestücke, 80,4; photograph in Hayes, Scepter of Egypt I, 298 (fig. 195)).

Correctly written in "Stela Hatnub", 6 (see §1 below).

Faulkner, Coffin Texts II, 262, n.13 identified the participial form under discussion. There is possibly a specific reason for using the Future Participle here, due to the dependent pronoun, see below, ex. Phathotep, 49-50.

Publ. Posener, Stèle de Hatnoub, JEA 54 (1968), pl. 9 (between pp. 70-71); note the "sic" added after HD.t(i).

Among the rich collection of examples, this is the only one with the Future Participle in Morschauser, Threat-Formulae, 46 (9).
CT [277] IV 19 c-d/B1Bo. ir mwtn nb mwtt nb(t) ns.w.t(i) r=f xft N pn m hrw pn xr=f n nmt "as for any male dead of any female dead who will (brutally?) open his mouth in front of this N on this day, he will fall to the slaughterhouse". It is most important to note that in the form ns.w.t(i) the -w-infix appears, which also optionally shows up in the Middle Egyptian sDm.ty.fy form of verb forms with a final weak radical and causatives.\(^{47}\)

In the next example from the Coffin Texts an identification problem arises that must remain unsolved, despite the parallels having a suffix pronomon -t(y) following the t.

CT [343] IV 360 a-b/B4Bo. srs [n=k] aqin.t[i/i/in.(tw)] mXnt tw DAAt Axxw aprw im=f "awaken Aqen, who will bring/ that may be brought this ferry in which the equipped akh-spirits ferry across".\(^{48}\)

The identification choice between the passivized Subjunctive Prospective sDm=f or the active Future Participle runs parallel with the other versions, where the writing int./=f could easily be identified as the sDm.ty.fy form in.t(y).t(y) "who will bring", or as the Subjunctive Prospective sDm=f form in.t=f "that he may bring".\(^{49}\)

The Future Participle may offer a grammatically solid solution as opposed to the assumption of corruptions or garbled versions.

CT Spell 830 appears to be one such garbled text, in which the deceased seems to be addressing a god.

CT [830] VII 31 c-f. sxm=(i) m-xt anx.ti rxx//ink sA imy-irt=f ip.t(w) ib=f sAq.t(w) awt=f wT.s.t(w)=i im anx.ti n nHH. Whereas Faulkner introduces a Stative 2nd person singular in circumstantial use into these passages entirely concerned with the speaker, "you being alive," without a referent of the 2nd person being mentioned,\(^{50}\) I suggest--unclear though the spell is--translating the passages with "may I have power in the future, one who will live, know.../// I am the son of He-who-is-in-his-eye. May my heart be counted, may my limbs be assembled, may I be raised thereby, one who will live forever".

The above example is reminiscent of a curious formulation on a Middle Kingdom stela.

Stela Berlin 1191, section C.\(^{51}\) Htp-di-nsw n imy-r pr wr 2nt(y)-X(ty)-wr m saHw=f nbw m swt=f nb(t) <m> mrt=f nb t(nrf=f im xr xTr xa.ti m Sms nsw-bty "a-boon-which-the-king-gives to the Great Steward Khenty-khety-wer in all his dignities, in all his places, in all what he wishes to be good for him near the god, one who will appear in the following of the king."\(^{52}\)

There is only one example of the Future Participle from the literary Middle Egyptian texts that I consider certain.

Ptahhotep, 49-50/L2. m Axt n sDm.t(i) st m wggt nt th(t)i st. I agree with Erman and Gunn's identification of the Future Participle,\(^{53}\) and not with the nomen agents with -ty-ending, here taking a direct object, as suggested by Gardner and Lefebvre.\(^{54}\) I translate "as something useful to him who will obey it [the instruction], but as something woeful to (lit., of) him who will transgress it". The Prisse version has sDm.ty.fy and nty r tht st here; the Carnarvon Tablet has sDm.ty.fy.sDm.ty.fy and thl.ty.fy.sDm.ty.fy. Burkard notes that the Prisse version was certainly changed for stylistic reasons,\(^{55}\) although the nice parallelism is now broken up. Whereas the Carnarvon Tablet version omits the expression of the dependent pronoun sw as object in both sDm.ty.fy forms, the Prisse version only altered the second sDm.ty.fy form into the stylistically inferior nty-construction. I surmise that this was done because an object was felt to be necessary with the transitive verb thi "to transgress", because, possibly, in the redactor's opinion the suffix pronoun endings of the sDm.ty.fy form did not favour the expression of a pronominal object 3rd person singular or plural. In the first form, sDm.ty.fy, however, the expression of the pronominal object could be spared because the verb sDm may, in addition to the more frequent transitive meaning "to hear", also mean intransitively

---

\(^{47}\) Its absence among his examples was noted by Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 43. For the Middle Egyptian evidence see Gardiner, EG, 281 (§364). In Old Egyptian there is also evidence for this -w-infix in the sDm.ty.fy of the IV-inf. verbs and of causatives; see Edel, ÄAÄ, 343-343 (§681).

\(^{48}\) For the akh-concept see now Jansen-Winkeln, Horizont und Verklärtheit, SAK 23 (1996), 201-215.

\(^{49}\) Faulkner, Coffin Texts II, 279, n.23 identifies Prospective sDm=f forms.

\(^{50}\) Faulkner, op.cit., III, 20.

\(^{51}\) Publ. Å. Inschriften Berlin I, 184-185; photograph in Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, pl. 58 (ANOC 40.1).

\(^{52}\) For the use of the verb nfr in this funerary context see also the example CT [925] VII 128 d-e, dealt with in §2 below.

\(^{53}\) Erman, Å. Grammatik, 217 (§430, ex. 6); Gunn, op.cit., 41, exs. 3-4.

\(^{54}\) See my note 15 above.

\(^{55}\) Burkard, Textkritische Unt., 148.
"to listen to", which fits the instructional context particularly well. The alteration supports the view that st in the L2 version functioned as object and that, consequently, the verb forms should be identified as the sDm.ti form.

The instruction genre may contain another instance of the sDm.ti form.

Merikare, E 106-107, shA tAS=k r a [rsy] PDty(y) pw sSp.t(i) aAgsw 

"'draw' your boundary against the southern region. It is the Bowman who will take up the armour(?)." Westendorf has argued that this passage contains the Future Participle, because the form PDty "Bowman" should be read here rather than a feminine singular word PDrx. I consider this instance doubtful.

One more example of this Future Participle identified as such by other scholars that I have come across also comes from a literary text.

Berlin Leather Roll (Pap. Berlin 3029), 1,5-6, ms.n=f wi [m?] ir.t(i) ir.t(f) r expr wD<6,b,n-f ir<f, "it was in order bring into existence what he had ordained to do that he fashioned me as one who was going to do what he had done". After consideration, on account of a tiny trace, De Buck, the editor of this text, rules out the plausible restoration of r + infinitive, although it is nicely in parallel with r expr. He hesitantly suggests the restoration m ir, but is evidently aware that m + infinitive cannot be smoothly translated: "he fashioned me in doing" (unless this is understood as "forming" in the sense of education). Indeed, De Buck translates with "as one who should do".

Certain examples cannot be excluded on principle from containing the Future Participle, but given its rarity the utmost caution is warranted. If an alternative identification of a regular form or construction is possible, this should be given preference, thus, for example, in the following example.

CT [637] VI 259 n-q, iry-mnit=f ir n N pn wAt swA N pn anx(w) wDA(w). snb.(w) nn ir/t(i) xt nb r N pn Dw. Faulkner translates here: "O Keeper-of-his-Mooring-Post, prepare a path for this N, so that this N may pass, he being alive, prosperous and hale, for there are none who will do anything evilly against this N."

On the basis of this translation the Future Participle ir.t(i) should be identified, but I suggest that we are dealing here with the very common construction of nn + infinitive: "without anything being done against this N evilly"

The participle with anomalous -t-ending in the following example is probably not a Future Participle for several reasons.

CT [1061] 319 a/B12C (male owner). ink apr(t) nTrw "I am the one who has equipped the gods". The first reason is that all other variants, except B3C with a female owner, have no -t-ending. Secondly, the normal future variant of the Participial Statement is ink sDm=i. Thirdly, only one instance is known to me of the sDm ty ty form in this construction. Therefore, it is most unlikely that, in turn, the sDm ty ty form has been replaced by the Future Participle. Indeed, it appears that translators have rightly paid no special attention to this version.

A final word on the Future Participle with masculine antecedent should be devoted to the expression ir=k anx.ti Dt, which Gunn has hesitantly suggested contains this participle. His hesitations were evoked by the fact that the variant versions in the 3rd person singular have ir=f anx Dt or ir=f di anx. Despite the strong morphological indications which, on this account, can only lead to an identification as the Static, I agree with Gunn when he states that the forms anx.ti and anx can hardly be the Static.

Indeed, from a grammatical point of view, it seems incontestable that di anx contains a participle, presumably the passive Perfective Participle, and that, consequently, anx Dt is also a

---

56 Wb. IV, 385 (sub B-C).
57 Ed. Quack, Stud. Merikare, 188 = Ed. Helck, Merikare, XXXVIII [a-b].
58 Quack, op. cit., 62-63 favours saHA instead of shA as the original form.
59 See Quack, op. cit., 63 (c) for the word aAgsw.
60 Westendorf, Gebrauch Passivs, 134, n.2; I assume that he is referring to the nise of a feminine word, as in sxy "peasant".
62 De Buck, op. cit., 49, n.(h) and 54, n.7.
63 Cf. the German verb "bilden".
64 De Buck, op. cit., 52.
65 Faulkner, op. cit. II, 217.
66 Urk. IV 221,14: swt HqA.t(y).s(y); see Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 59 (5).
68 Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 41-42, ex. 5.
69 For the di anx construction see Schenkel, Dij:y-anx, MDAIK 37 (1981), 427-432 and Kammerzell, rDj + Pseudopartizip, GM 67 (1983), 57-64. I would like to suggest a simple alternative to these complex explanations: diy
participial construction. When the active form anx.ti is approached from this grammatical viewpoint, nothing obstructs its identification as the Future Participle. It is unfortunate that there is no evidence from genuine Middle Egyptian for the expression ir=k anx.ti Dt/ ir=f anx Dt, because this would have shed more light on this difficult matter. It appears that in the New Kingdom, the expression ir=k anx.ti Dt was used without a proper understanding of the identity of the verb form—which is indeed conceivable for this very rare participle—and was reinterpreted on the basis of the verb form's formal similarity to the Stative 2nd person singular in independent use as expressing "may you be a 'may you live forever'- (person)". This may have led to ir=f anx Dt "that he may be a 'may he live forever'- (person)".

Apart from this 'circumstantial evidence' for anx.ti being a participle, the Future Participle would suit the context very well: ir=k anx.ti Dt "may you be one who will live forever".

§ 2. The invariable active future participle sDm.ti with feminine antecedent.

So far I have deliberately only dealt with masculine antecedents, whether implicit or explicit, but the feminine form sDm.ty.sy suggests that the Future Participle sDm.ti may just as easily have a feminine antecedent.

Gunn deals with such instances under the heading of the active Prospective Participle, which very rarely occurs beside the better known passive form. On morphological evidence alone there is no way of conclusively establishing whether in an active participial form with -ti-ending and feminine antecedent this ending is the marker of the invariable Future Participle sDm.ti or the feminine ending -ti + marker i of the Prospective Participle sDm.ti (masculine sDm.ty). Some indication for identification might be provided by the circumstance that among all Gunn's examples of the feminine passive Prospective Participle that are written plene there is none showing the writing ty.

Except for the very few masculine and feminine couples of the active Prospective Participle in the Pyramid Texts passages presented by Gunn, there is, in principle, no grounds for not ranging forms written sDm.ti and occurring singly, with a feminine antecedent, under the heading of the invariable Future Participle. Moreover, evidence for the active Prospective Participle is even rarer and does not occur outside the Pyramid Texts—that is, judged on the basis of the unequivocal masculine form. I therefore consider it more likely that in the case of a form written sDm.ti it concerns the Future Participle sDm.ti. The stem rdi in the form rdi.ty.ty does not favour a connection with the active Prospective Participle, the passive of which appears to have the stem di. Finally, it is hardly conceivable that the feminine ending -ti of the Prospective Participle lost its 'femininity' in the active voice only, while retaining it in the passive.

I shall start with an example which, taken as it is written, must contain the Future Participle on the active voice only, while retaining it in the passive.

CT [1087] VII 365 a-b/B2L. ir s nb rx.(ty).f(y) s(y) n sk.n=f im Dt Dr rx-f wn.ti <rn> R-sTAW "as for

---

103

anx is the well-known nfr-Hr-construction with a passive participle instead of an adjective, for which see, for example, im n "the one hidden of name" in CT [148] II 223 a; it is well known that in the adjectival sentence nfr sw too a participle can be substituted for the adjectival predicate, cf. Gardiner, EG, 289 ($374). This suggestion seems compatible with the approach to the nfr-Hr-construction as a relative phrase of Jansen-Winkeln, Exozentrische Komposita, ZÄS 121 (1994), 51-75.

70 All instances given by Gunn, op.cit., 41-42, ex. 5 come from Urk. IV, reign of Tuthmosis III.

71 For an approach to the comparable problem of a clause or verb form with the syntactic distribution of a noun in the construction ink m=f see Borghouts, ink mr(i)=f, LingAeg 4 (1994), 12-24.

72 Cf. CT [830] VII 31 c-f, quoted above in this section.

73 Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 35-39 (ch. 3).

74 See Gunn, op.cit., 22-25 and 31-32.

75 Mentioned below in §3.

76 The evidence for the derived Prospective Relative Form is neatly presented by Gunn, op.cit., 24 (C); for Gunn's problem with the stems rdi and di see p. 43.

77 Westendorf, Gramm. med. T., 227 ($307,2, a) presents an example from the medical texts, case Bln 193 (Pap. Berlin, vo. 1, 3-4): siA st ms.t(i) r st nn ms.y=s "Erkennen einer Frau, die gebäret worden, gegenüber einer Frau, die nicht gebäret wird", which has a parallel in case Kah 19 (Pap. Kahun, 3,2-3): siA ms.t(i) Xrd "das Erkennen einer, die ein Kind gebäret wird" (quoted by Westendorf, op.cit., 229 ($311,2)). However, as appears from the transcription of case Bln 193 (publ. Grapow, Med. T., 471), there is a lacuna at the spot of the -i-element after ms; although Westendorf's restoration is plausible, we cannot be certain.
any man who will know it, he cannot perish there forever, because he knows what will exist (in) Rosetau*. Note that the parallel versions have wn.t(y).s(y), with the stem wn,* the alternative wnt=s/wn.t s(y) giving no good sense.

In the following example the writing of the participial ending as T seems to exclude even the 'common' feminine t.*

Urk. IV 261,9-10. **I nfr n xaw n wpt-npt m HAT mpwt Htp.T(i) tnt ir<s>s Hhw m Htw-sd aSA.wt "as he knew the perfection of a coronation of New Year's Day as the beginning of peace-promising years of her celebrating very many millions of sed-festivals". Since among the T's written in this passage the participial ending is the only one written with T, this, in my view, corroborates the identification of the Future Participle.

The next two passages, both of which play on the same theme of Hatshepsut's peaceful reign or regency, may just as easily contain the Future Participle.

Urk. IV 262,7. **Ipy Axt wpt-npt tp mpwt Htp.t(i) "the first (month) of akhet, New Year's Day, the beginning of years which will be peaceful".

Buhen, South Temple, speech of a goddess to the boy king Tuthmosis III. Beginning of years which will be peaceful*. The oldest instance of this expression dates to the Pyramid Texts. The word written in this passage the participial ending is the only one written with T, this, in my view, corroborates the identification of the Future Participle.

The word written in Ptahhotep, 116/Pr. (=157-158/L2). The word written in this passage the participial ending is the only one written with T, this, in my view, corroborates the identification of the Future Participle.

Fourthly, I would like to present a possible example from the Instruction of Ptahhotep, where the word written in this passage the participial ending is the only one written with T, this, in my view, corroborates the identification of the Future Participle.

Urk. IV 1217,1-4. **NTr nTry xpr Ds=f Dd xpr.xpr.ty "the divine god who came into being of himself, who says to happen what is going to happen".

Finally, I would like to present a possible example from the Instruction of Ptahhotep, where both the Prisse and L2 versions display the same form.

It is probable that the following example should also be interpreted in this vein.

Proceeding with passages from the Coffin Texts, I shall present two examples which have been identified as the passive Prospective Participle.

It is possible that the following example should also be interpreted in this vein.

Note Faulkner's remark, *Coffin Texts I*, 12-13 (2.2.9) and Graef, *Mitteläg. Grammatik*, 119 (§51.1).
CT [925] VII 128 d-e. m sahw=f nb m swt nbw mrt(y).i=f nfr.t(y) n=f im wr nTr “[offerings for N] in all his dignities, in all the places which he would desire, things that will be fine there for him near the god”. I agree with Polotsky that nfr.t(y) has the offerings as antecedent rather than the desirable places. With an intransitive adjective verb there must in the case of a passive participle construction be a resumptive pronoun. Indeed, Polotsky translates “[offerings] through which it will be good for him near the god”, but my translation cannot be ruled out. It might concern the Future Participle.

Although the context in the following example is unclear, it seems certain that it contains a Future Participle wn.t.

Pap. BM 10059, 14.7. ... n phwyt Xt mi ... Dr wn.t wn.t “the hind parts and (/of) the belly ... before that which was destined to exist existed”.

§ 3. The distinctions between the active and passive future/prospective participles in Middle Egyptian and the relations with suffix conjugation forms.

For want of a better explanation, Gunn considers the suffix written ti/y in the masculine sDm.ti form and the sDm.ty.fy form as a defeminized ending of the feminine Prospective Participle. Now that his evidence for an active sDm.ti form with feminine antecedent has been rearranged under the same sDm.ti form that occurs with masculine antecedent, the picture is, in my opinion, considerably clearer. I feel justified in following Gunn’s view that an invariable participial formation of the type written ti/y in these forms, which solves his problem of ti as connected with the feminine gender.

Except for the Future Participle written wn.ti/y of the notoriously irregular verb wn.t, the common sDm.ty.fy form of which is wn.ty.fy, nothing contradicts this derivation. I agree with Gunn that this obstacle is by no means insuperable. Furthermore, the derivation is supported by the particular morphological detail of the -w-infix facultatively showing up with the IIIae inf. verbs, of which there is one certain and one probable instance.

The relation between the invariable active Future Participle sDm.ti and the sDm.ty.fy form is nicely confirmed by evidence from the classical phase of later Old Egyptian and Middle Egyptian: apart from the very few exceptions with passive meaning, the sDm.ty.fy form is also always active.

---

90 Faulkner, op. cit. III, 66 and Barquet, Textes des sarcophages, 53 translate quite differently.
91 For this example see my Studies sDm.t=x (Dr sDm.t=x), §13 [p. 17].
92 For a survey and brief discussion of the various theories of Sethe, Erman, Gunn, Gardiner, Westendorf, Edel, and Schenkel on its origin and construction see Barta, sDm.ti, GM 105 (1988), 7-9; after consideration he prefers Schenkel’s theory, Suffixkonjugation, 58 (5.2.8), who argues in favour of a nomen actionis + suffix pronoun "der mit den beiden Zuhörungen, d.h. der auf jeden Fall hört"; Barta, op. cit., 9: "einer, der besonders gut hört". I cannot see at all in Barta’s view that an invariable participial formation of the type sDm.ti/y in these forms, which solves his problem of ti as connected with the feminine gender.
93 Except for wn.ti/y in CT [1087] VII 365 a-b, dealt with above in §2.
94 Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 43.
95 The instance in CT [277] IV 19 c-d/B1Bo (in §1 above) seems to me to be certain; the one in CT [925] VII 128 d-e (in §2 above) is probable. The form written wAH.w.t=i/f (CT [473] VI 9 b/B1C) is argued by Bidoli, Sprüche der Fangnetze, 80, n. (a) to be the passivized suffix conjugation form wAH.wi/f, but by Osing, in: Denkmäler Dachla, 27, n. 63 is considered to be a possible sDm.ty.fy form with -w-infix wAH.wi/ty.f(y) (thus also wAH.wi/ty.f(y) in version B9C). See also the spelling mr.y.ti/ty.f(y) in stela Cairo CG 20038 (see §1 above). The form hAH.wi/ty.f(y) with reduplication in the stem in Urk. I 205,11 is probably irregular; see Edel, ÄA, 342 (§681, 3): “wohl fehlerhafter Versdoppelung”.
96 There are only a few exceptions to the rule that the sDm.ty.fy is an active form; see Gardiner, EG, 280 (§363). For more examples with passive meaning see Edel, ÄA, 344 (§682) and Westendorf, Gebrauch Passivs, 137-139 (6.2). Add Monument Dachla 21 (false door of Khentyka), right, lower part, cols. 2-3 (publ. Denkmäler Dachla, pl. 4), which reads in mr.w.ti/y.sn msw m sS(w) nb Sddw sS pn Hr mnt xtn did=f i Hntq m ntt m-aa=ten “it is ones to be loved (by) the king among all scribes who read this inscription on this memorial stone and who give bread and beer to me from
One such unique exception with passive meaning among the instances of the Future Participle may be the substantive \textit{mr.wy.ty/ mr.y.ty} "the loved one, the beloved, the favourite",\textsuperscript{97} which word is well known and has a long history down to Coptic times, but whose formation is somewhat elusive. If the word is indeed a substantivized Future Participle, its meaning has become lexicalized, with, strictly speaking, the meaning "the one who is to be loved/favoured", "the lovable one" instead. In any case, it can hardly be a nisbe form deriving from \textit{mrwy} "love"\textsuperscript{98}, firstly because the writings of nisbe forms with the ti-sign (U33) are uncommon,\textsuperscript{99} and secondly, because the referent is the undergoer of love, and not the agent, as would be expected on the basis of a comparison with active nomina agentis like \textit{wpwy} "messenger", \textit{spry} "petitioner" or \textit{nDty} "helper".\textsuperscript{100}

It is worth noting that the word is curiously written \textit{mr.wy.ty} in Tomb Siut III, 4,\textsuperscript{101} in the same way as \textit{xnty} in line 11 of the same inscription,\textsuperscript{102} which writing rather points to a participial formation. Unfortunately, the preceding context is missing, but the word can hardly have anything but a masculine antecedent. I wonder whether the curious writing with a -w- and a -y-infixed is connected with the passive meaning, the appearance of a -y-infixed being related to the similar infix in the passive \textit{sDm.t=f/ms.(y)t=f} of the ult.inf. verbs.\textsuperscript{103}

The Future Participle and the \textit{sDm.ty.fy} form I suggest are the adjectival counterparts of the suffix conjugation form \textit{sDm.t=f}.\textsuperscript{104} In the case of the \textit{sDm.t=f} of the verb \textit{wnn}, which is \textit{wn.t=f}, the stem is in accordance with that in the Future Participle \textit{wn.ni}, though not with the \textit{sDm.ty.fy} form \textit{wnn.ty.fy}; the \textit{sDm.t=f} of the verb \textit{r}, which is -or, at least, can be -\textit{r.t=f}, accords with the \textit{sDm.ty.fy} form \textit{rdi.ty.fy}.\textsuperscript{105} Also, the IIIae gem. have the full stem in the \textit{sDm.t=f} and the \textit{sDm.ty.fy}. A n evident disaccord, however, is the stem \textit{iy} in the \textit{sDm.t=f form iy.t=f} versus the stem \textit{iw} in the \textit{sDm.ty.fy} form \textit{iw.ty.fy}, but it may be that the stem \textit{iw} in the latter form is connected with the -w-infix showing in ult.inf. verbs.

The special bond between the -i-morpheme and the active voice evident from the Future Participle and the \textit{sDm.ty.fy} form may be connected with the question of why, contrary to other active suffix conjugation forms, the \textit{sDm.t=f} cannot be passivized with the -w-morpheme and has its own passive formation,\textsuperscript{106} although I am at a loss as to offer an explanation. I do not exclude the possibility that the appearance in Old and Middle Egyptian of an optional -w-infixed in the \textit{sDm.ty.fy} forms of IIIae inf. and other verbs with a final weak radical\textsuperscript{107} has to do with the same principle of word formation that also results in the appearance of the equally facultative -y-infixed in the passive \textit{sDm.t=f/ms.(y)t=f} of this verb class.\textsuperscript{108}

On the other hand, in Classical Egyptian there is the Prospective Participle with gender distinction showing in the feminine as i and with a tense marker written iy,\textsuperscript{109} which almost exclusively occurs in the passive voice. Some very rare instances with active meaning in the oldest

---

\textsuperscript{97} Wb. II, 103, 11 ff.

\textsuperscript{98} For this identification see Westendorf, \textit{sDmwt}, ZÄS 90 (1963), 128.

\textsuperscript{99} Except in \textit{xnty} "foremost", which nisbe derives from a preposition that--at least originally--reads xnt rather than xnt, given certain writings with the ti-sign; see Edel, \textit{ÄAG}, 394 (§767) and Wb. III, 303, 10 ff. In Wb. 304, 10ff. it is noted that from the Middle Kingdom on a writing of the nisbe with ti is preferred.

\textsuperscript{100} See my note 15 above.

\textsuperscript{101} Publ. Brunner, Texte aus den Gräbern von Siut, 42.

\textsuperscript{102} See ex. Tomb Siut III, 11 in §2 above [p. 98].

\textsuperscript{103} See below in this section. See further Brunner's note, op. cit., 20, n.9: \textit{mrwy} = Coptic merit (Wb. II, 103-104 mrwy.tj/ mj "the loved, the favourite").

\textsuperscript{104} Loprieno, \textit{sDmt}, GM 37 (1980), 23 has only in passing noted that a morpheme (i) with prospective value occurring in an occasional writing with ti in the r \textit{sDm.t=f} construction (he suggests that the verb form was originally a Prospective Relative Form [see his p. 22]) also occurs in the Subjective Prospective Form \textit{w,t=f/in,t=f} and the \textit{sDm.ty.fy} form; note that in id., Verbal system, 101 with his "sDm.t=f/ms/s" the Subjective Prospective Forms \textit{w,t=f/in,t=f} mentioned on p. 100 are actually meant (see my note 84 above). Sander-Hansen, \textit{Ag. Grammatik}, 86 (§313) and 121 (§454) considers the \textit{sDm.t} participle and the \textit{sDm.ty.fy} form to be related to the \textit{sDm.t=f} form.

\textsuperscript{105} See Studies \textit{sDm.t=f} V (sDm.t=f), §1 [p. 67].

\textsuperscript{106} See Studies \textit{sDm.t=f} IV (passive \textit{sDm.t=f/ms.(y)t=f}), §1 [p. 55].

\textsuperscript{107} Edel's suggestion, \textit{ÄAG}, 342-343 (§681) to connect this -w-infixed with the w-marker of the Prospective \textit{sDm.w} is not very probable because the \textit{sDm.ty.fy} form is a formation apparently unconnected with this suffix conjugation form.

\textsuperscript{108} See Studies \textit{sDm.t=f} IV (passive \textit{sDm.t=f/ms.(y)t=f}), §1 [p. 55].

\textsuperscript{109} Thus also analyzed by Schenkel, \textit{Tübinger Einführung}, 217 (Anm. 1-2), only as a possibility, however.
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Given the evidence from the passive Prospective Participle of the verb rdi, which has the stem di, it seems to me that its future marker written iy is connected with the Old Egyptian Subjunctive sDm=f (stem di) and the subjunctive variant (optional -y-affix) of the merged Middle Egyptian Prospective sDm=f rather than with the Old Egyptian Prospective sDm.w=f (stem rdi).

Whereas the existence of a future tense marker written tiy in participial forms seems incontestable on account of the evidence presented above, the most interesting question why, contrary to other participles, the Future Participle ending with this marker is invariable for gender and number must remain unsolved. The fact that the grammatical solution of appending suffix pronouns to indicate gender and number in the sDm.ty.fy form is in current use in the very old corpus of the Pyramid Texts suggests that this marker may belong to the oldest substratum. When naming the Stative the "Old Perfective", Gardiner remarks that it is the sole surviving relic in Egyptian of the Semitic finite verb. Given the fact that the Akkadian perfect iptar has which has been related to the Egyptian sDm.t=fi is used in particular when posterior time reference is emphasized, I do not exclude the possibility that the ti-morpheme stems from the Semitic substratum and entered historical Egyptian already in a petrified form. It seems to me that the writing of this morpheme as i in the suffix conjugation and as tiy in the participials points instead to the iy representing a vowel. In agreement with Satzinger's opinion--at least as far as the sDm.t=fi is concerned--any connection of this morpheme with the feminine ending -i would seem most improbable to me.

In the introduction to the present study I have referred to the -ti-ending showing up in the feminine passive Prospective Participle and the derived Relative Form. It seems to me that, given the relation of this participle with the future marker yiy and its marking of the feminine gender, this -ti-ending is morphologically unconnected with the future marker ti. However, because of the fact

110 For the rare instances where the masculine Prospective Participle with the ending -iy and active meaning may be identified in the PT see Gunn, Studies in Eg. Syntax, 35-37, exs. 1a-c, 3 and 4; possibly also ex. 5 from the Middle Kingdom. See also Hoch, M. Eg. Grammar, 173-174 (§121.3.a).


112 Cf. Grandet - Mathieu, Cours d'égyptien II, 221 (48.1) and 224 (48.3).

113 Gunn, op.cit., 24 (C).

114 Vernus, Future at Issue, 15.

115 Schenkel, Verbalflexion PT, 489 (table).

116 Vernus, op.cit., 29.

117 Gardiner, EG, 234 (§309).

118 See Satzinger, sDm.t,f, JEA 57 (1971), 68 (4).

119 Von Soden, Akkadische Grammatik, 130 (§80.d): "Nachzeitigkeit in der Vergangenheit, wenn diese besonders betont werden soll!"; cf. also the situation in Late Babylonian, see Streck, Zahl und Zeit, 220 (II §48c.50: "Liediglich der Ausdruck der Nachzeitigkeit ist -ta zu zugeordnet" (I owe the latter reference to Prof. Schenkel).

120 This is also assumed for the comparable passivizing morpheme .tw by Reintges, sDm-tw-f, GM 153 (1996), 79, n.1.

121 Satzinger, sDm.t,f, JEA 57 (1971), 68, n.5. See Thacker, Semitic and Eg. Verbal Systems, 267-271, who argues that the form is a special employment of the feminine singular Relative Form. In taking a prehistoric nomen actionis sDm.timj.t as the basis for the sDm.t=fi, Schenkel, Suffixkonjugation, 45 obviously has the feminine ending in mind, because the t-element is not ranged under the formative elements in the suffix conjugation n, in, xr, kA and tiw. Edel, AÄG, 368 (§732, Anm.) also opts for a nomen actionis, which is formally identical with the infinitive in the case of the IIIæ inf. and caus. 2-rad. verb classes. Loprieno, Verbal system, 44: "der historischen Analyse zufolge geht die t-Form auf eine nominale mjt-t-Basis zurück, die in der klassischen Sprache als Infinitiv einiger Verbalklassen oder als sog. 'Komplementsininitiativ' in produktivem Gebrauch auftritt". For an altogether different approach see Janssens, Verbal System in Old Eg., 21-23 (§28-29).

122 Note that, from a synchronic viewpoint, the sDm(t).n=f Relative Form also undeniably shows that the tense marker n follows the feminine ending.
that this special -ti-ending in the feminine Prospective Participle could maintain itself in Neo-
Middle Egyptian, the future marker ti at work in the regularly used forms sDm.t=f, sDm.ty.fy, iw.t=f
and in.t=f may well bear responsibility.